

149th ANNUAL TRADES UNION CONGRESS

.....

Held at:

**The Brighton Centre,
Brighton**

on:

**Sunday, 10th September 2017
Monday, 11th September 2017
Tuesday, 12th September 2017
and
Wednesday, 13th September 2017**

.....

Congress President:

DR. MARY BOUSTED

.....

**PROCEEDINGS — DAY THREE
(Tuesday, 12th September 2017)**

.....

**Conference reported by:
Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,
1st Floor, Quality House,
6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane,
London WC2A 1HP.
email: info@martenwalshcherer.com**

.....

THIRD DAY: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12TH 2017

(Congress assembled at 9.30 a.m.)

The President: Thank you, Congress. We have not had any music this morning. I have heard that is because the musicians are afraid that they are in danger of being upstaged by our Assistant General Secretary, Paul Novak, whose turn last night on the guitar and with his vocals was fantastic. *(Applause)*

To get down to the business of Congress, may I remind delegation leaders that the ballot for section C of the General Council takes place this morning. Unions eligible to vote for section C should collect their ballot papers from the TUC Information stand, situated on the lower-ground floor. Ballot papers will only be provided in exchange for the official delegate form. Please note that the ballot closes at 12 noon today.

I would also like to remind you that the *Will there be justice for Colombia* fringe meeting takes place this lunch time, and that Huger Ballesteros will be addressing Congress on Wednesday.

The Economy

The President: Delegates, we start with section 1 of the General Council Report, The Economy, and the section on Transport from page 51. I call paragraphs 1.6, 4.9 and Motion 11: A safe, secure, accessible, publicly owned railway. It is going to be moved by the RMT, seconded by the TSSA and Unite has indicated that they want to

speaking. I have been given a T-shirt. I don't wear T-shirts, but I will hold it up.

(Applause)

A safe, secure, accessible, publicly owned railway

Sean Hoyle (*RMT, National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers*) moved Motion 11. He said: Congress, to begin with, I would like to pay a special tribute to our guard/conductors and drivers. Our members have been taking action now, some of them for over 18 months, longer than the famous miners' strike of '84. They are real heroes fighting for a safe, accessible railway. *(Applause)* Why are they doing it? I will tell you now. We have been working closely with groups like DPAC (Disabled People Against Cuts), the National Pensioners Convention and other groups, who are passionate about retaining that second safety-critical person on the train. They are looking at a situation where people with disabilities will have to book 48 hours in advance before they are allowed to travel. Where does it say that in the Equality Act? Where does it say that people with disabilities are allowed to be treated less favourably by people without disabilities? This is a disgrace!

The RMT will not give up this fight. Two years ago, a gentleman by the name of Peter Wilkinson was invited to a meeting by Croydon Tory MP, Gavin Barwell, and Peter was proud to boast how there was a three year plan to crush all of the rail unions. He bragged how there is going to be a punch-up, and he bragged how, if guards, drivers and so on have got credit cards, if they've got mortgages, if they've got hire purchase for cars, then the laugh was going to be with them, because he was going to kick us out of this industry and we were going to be on the breadline. That's

two years down the road of a three-year plan. I've got a message for Peter. You need to re-evaluate your three-year plan because we ain't going nowhere! (*Applause*) The RMT and the other unions that are fighting this send a strong message to Peter and his like: You may think you've got a three-year plan, but you and your type won't even be around. We are going to have a Jeremy Corbyn socialist-led Labour Party Government, and on day one they will be looking to re-nationalise the railways. (*Applause*) We will have a guard on every train and we will have a safe railway for all to travel on.

Let me tell you a couple of little stories. We have just been in contact with a young lady by the name of Ellie Ward. She was travelling on Merseyrail the other day. Merseyrail, I remind you, is run by a wholly-Labour council, but they decided to order trains where there is no guard. That's what their plan is. Steve Rotherham, the Metro Mayor, was looking for support not so long ago. I must admit that in Liverpool a brown paper bag would win with "Labour" written on it, anyway, so maybe they knew that they didn't really need that much support. Ellie was travelling at half-9 at night, having had a few drinks, on the train. She was on the phone to her boyfriend with the guard approached her and suggested she came and sat nearer him because he noticed that a strange man behind her and looking at her. Then that same man approached another woman and the guard again intervened. Both women were kept safe. Ellie realised, when she left the train, that she could have been at risk. She immediately contacted 38 Degrees, and within days 15,000 signatures had been collected about keeping the guard on the train. (*Applause*)

Did you know that there has been a doubling of sexual attacks on trains in the last five years? I repeat, a doubling. So why would we even contemplate taking away the second safety-critical person? You would not do that. But it's okay because we've got lots of departments out *there* doing reports, but unfortunately he who pays the piper plays the tune. We've got the Rail Delivery Group, the bosses' Rail Delivery Group, and they commissioned a report a little while ago, but when the conclusion was that people with disabilities and older people need a guard on a train, it's funny how that report hasn't actually come out. It is being suppressed. We have to highlight what's going on.

I don't think anyone in this room, and I certainly know it is the view of the general public, wants to travel round on our networks with no second safety-critical person on that train. Nobody! Last year a delegate came to the rostrum when this subject was debated and they reported that they were on a driver-only train, coming to the TUC and the alarm went off. The driver spoke over the tannoy and said, "Is it a mistake. Have you meant to pull the alarm?" No one replied, apparently, so 10 minutes later, he said, "The alarm is still going off. It's in a toilet. Can you get off at the next station if you need help?" Just think about that. Was it somebody having a heart attack or were they being attacked in some way? They certainly needed help. Is that what we want to hear: "Can you get off at the next stop?"?

A little while ago — as a result of a landslide at Watford — a train cab got separated but the driver got trapped. Thankfully, there was a guard on that train and she evacuated the passengers safely, turned off the power and got everyone off in a safe manner.

The President: Sean, can you come to a close now?

Sean Hoyle: These are real things that are going on. So, Congress, we can't just move this motion and agree it unanimously. Everybody must go back to your unions. All your members travel on the network. You all travel on the network. We in the RMT say we want a safe, accessible railway for all, and we say we want it publicly-owned, publicly-funded, run for the people of this country and not for profit. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Jill Murdoch (*TSSA, Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) seconded the motion. She said: President and Congress, is private profit a natural ally of safety for workers and for the public? I think Grenfell has, tragically, shown us that it is not, as did the Hatfield and Potters Bar crashes in the early days of rail privatisation. Public transport should be about providing a service to the public, for people travelling for leisure or on business. But at present the privatised public service that is the railway, and it is not the only one, of course, is purely about providing profits to owners and dividends to shareholders. There is nothing new about that. Indeed, it is why the railways were built in the first place and, historically, it did not take long for it to be found out that it was a bad idea. It is a point, however, that we have seemed to need to hammer home repeatedly to many people, hopefully, mostly outside this hall. No profit-driven industry will retain staff in jobs that do anything more than just keeping the wheels on the train going round and round and the profits coming in.

For the travelling public to have the luxury of open ticket offices, to have staff on trains and to have the safety, protection and assistance offered by a guard, and for workers to have proper staffing levels to maintain safety standards, on the privatised railway these are becoming memories and dreams. Ticket-office free stations and driver-only operated trains offer the lure of more profit to the owners. Driving is a stressful job at the best of times. Hopping in and out to watch doors to see if it is safe to depart adds enormously to the pressure on drivers. Only a railway operated to provide a service as part of an integrated, publicly-owned transport service, rather than with the sole goal of profit, will offer the safety and accessibility that is required.

This motion reaffirms the TUC's commitment to such a railway and welcomes the Labour Party's long-awaited manifesto commitment to the public ownership of the railways and the buses. Make the railway a service to industry and the public again, and in public ownership. Keep trains safe and keep guards on trains. Support this motion. (*Applause*)

Paul Ainsworth (*Unite*) spoke in support of the motion. President and Congress, as a London bus driver from a union representing both rail and bus workers, I am pleased to support this call for public ownership and control of our railways and, indeed, our buses as well. Privatisation and deregulation have absolutely wrecked key parts of our transport sector. We need a shift away from further privatisation and deregulation and a move towards more public ownership and accountability.

Deregulation in the bus industry outside London makes the strongest possible case for the public control of buses. Research by Transport for Quality of Life shows a

fundamental conflict between deregulation and a world-class bus system. The report says that bus deregulation has seen higher fares, worse service, a fall in bus use and lower pay for bus workers. It really is the race to the bottom.

In the big cities outside London, passenger journeys have halved from about two billion per year before deregulation to less than a billion now. The report also shows that the best bus companies are municipals, like Reading, Lothian and Blackpool. They are run by local councils, yet this Government have driven through a Bus Bill which actually bans setting up any more, despite opposition from Labour.

This Government's plans for rail are another attempt to dismantle a key service in pursuit of private profit at the expense of passengers and rail workers. This is the same blind ideology that led to the disastrous privatisation of the railways, designed to appease the interests of privatised train operating companies, yet £1.5 billion — think of that figure, £1.5 billion! It's a big, big number — could be saved over five years if routes including Northern, Trans-Pennine and West Coast Mainline were operated by the public sector. Yet this Government have ignored the facts and have extended franchises, with disruption and cost borne by us, the taxpayer, not the franchise-holder transferring investment risk. Unite welcomes the commitment in the Labour Party manifesto to bring private rail companies back into public ownership.

Finally, Congress, what public ownership and control gives is the opportunity for a properly integrated transport system. Bus networks need to interlink with rail networks and park and ride systems. Public transport requires transferrable ticketing and access to properly regulated taxis. Ports and airports need good road and rail

links. Support a properly accountable, properly integrated and properly accessible public transport system. Please, comrades, I implore you: support the motion. Let's get our railways and buses back to where they belong, which is back into public ownership. (*Applause*)

The President: I will now put the motion to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That motion is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 11 was CARRIED*

British shipping

The President: I now call on Motion 12: British shipping. The General Council supports the motion, to be moved by Nautilus International and seconded by the RMT.

Ronnie Cunningham (*Nautilus International*) moved Motion 12. He said: Congress, this year, in case you haven't noticed, marks the 150th anniversary of the Shipping Forecast. Well, I've got a shipping forecast for you. On current trends, the future of the British shipping industry, sadly, is in dire straits. In the space of a generation, we've gone from having an owned and registered fleet of more than 1,600 ships to just 452 last year. That is a very big drop.

Sixty years ago the UK merchant fleet accounted for 18% of the world's total tonnage. Today it is 0.8%. Forty years ago there were nearly 90,000 British seafarers. Today, there are just 23,000, and with more than half of them over the age of 45 and with recruitment into the industry at less than half of what we need, these numbers are set to fall by a further third over the next 10 years.

This devastating decline really matters for an island nation like Britain. Nearly 95% of everything we consume, from fuel to food, from TVs to telephones, come and go by sea. But more of it is coming and going on ships that are not actually fit to be at sea, with poorly paid and trained crew, from low-cost labour countries.

There are ships in our UK waters that have conditions that would have been shocking 250 years ago, let alone today in 2017. Take the case of the Panama-flagged cargo ship *Tashin*, currently detailed in Sharpness Docks, with a crew that is owed three months wages and were forced to drink sea water and eat out-of-date food because the Turkish owners had failed to provide provisions for the ship. But what about the crew of the oil-industry supply vessel, *Malaviya 7*, who have been stranded in Aberdeen, Scotland, for the past 15 months with more than US\$850,000 owed? These are, by no means, isolated cases.

All sides of the shipping industry have been sending out an SOS for many years now, and exactly two years ago we thought we had got somewhere when the Government's Maritime Growth Study came up with 18 recommendations that Ministers claimed would keep Britain as a great maritime nation. It is essential that the Government delivers the Smart Plus plans for improved support for maritime training. For the

price of less than half-a-mile of a motorway, Ministers could ensure a substantial supply of British seafarers with every 1£ of support delivering a £4.80 return for GDP. This has got to be backed up by effective action to stamp out unfair competition and conditions akin to modern-day slavery. Effective employment laws should not stop at the shoreline. We need proper enforcement of the national minimum wage and work permit requirements for all seafarers working on UK-domestic shipping services. We should follow the example of other major maritime nations who have laws to protect their ships and their seafarers from unfair competition in their own waters from ships with sub-standard safety and working arrangements.

Ministers keep saying that Britain needs to trade its way to the recovery, but if we don't have working arrangements in place for the maritime trade in a post-Brexit world, our ambitions, sadly, will be sunk. Shipping is still an essential industry for a maritime nation. It's time we treated it as one. Congress, thank you. *(Applause)*

William Jones *(RMT, National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)*

seconded Motion 12. He said: Congress and President, exactly one year ago today I stood at this rostrum following Nautilus on a similar subject on skills and the future. I would like to take that back because there are no skills and there is no future, not in the British merchant fleet, anyway. It's dying on its feet this very present day. If we don't do anything about it now — I've been at sea for 47 years and I've seen nothing like it. It's getting worse, week by week, month by month, even day by day — it will get much worse. I'd like to move this motion on behalf of Nautilus and the RMT because we need to do it and we need to do it now, not next week or the week after,

but now. Just like protesting saved the guard on the train, the maritime industry has put out an SOS. We don't like the term SOS, because it means that someone is going to die, but SOS 2020. Save our seafarers. Please, I call upon you. We need to do this and we need to do it now. Thank you. (*Applause*)

David Semple (*PCS, Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of the motion. He said: Congress, I want to draw attention to the fact that it is 30 years since the disaster when the *Herald of Free Enterprise* sank and 29 years — it will be 30 years next year — since the P&O dispute in Dover where I first really learnt how to be a trade unionist with the PCS. My colleagues in the Dover Shipping branch remember well and tell all their new reps the stories of what happens whenever an employer comes for staff and when a government doesn't back their seafarers to support staff. It results in 72 hours worth of shifts for people. It results in people falling asleep and not able to close gates. These are the kind of disasters that we can expect if we don't have the support of the Government to redress the decline in the number of seafarers and also the decline in safety standards.

I want to draw Congress's attention to the fourth operative clause, which talks about the Maritime & Coastguard Agency. The Maritime & Coastguard Agency is, in many respects, in the same dire straits as seafaring. There are not enough staff. You have watches where there are not enough staff to properly man the operations room. The Maritime & Coastguard Agency is our fourth emergency service and it is a direct threat to search and rescue operations if we don't have the staff in there that we need. It is also a direct threat to the safety of our seafarers. That's not acceptable, Congress, and we must absolutely pass this motion.

Other things have been going on as well. Attempts have been made to privatise the UK Shipping Register and the attempt to privatise the surveying work that goes on. This must be opposed because commercialising these kind of things will prevent us enforcing adequate safety standards on our ships and it will prevent the Maritime & Coastguard Agency being able to do its jobs. So, Congress, please support the motion. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The President: I am now going to put Motion 12, British shipping, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? All those against? The motion is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 12 was CARRIED.*

The superyacht sector

The President: I now call Motion 13: The superyacht sector. The General Council supports the motion, to be moved by Nautilus International and seconded by the RMT.

Gary Elliott (*Nautilus International*) moved Motion 13. He said: Congress, we have just heard a discussion on the future of the merchant fleet and the future for young people, which runs through the whole theme of the TUC and what we are here to talk about this week. There is a future out there for young seafarers. It can be diversified into different sectors and the superyacht sector is one of those sectors.

Congress notes the massive growth of the superyacht industry and the thousands of new jobs for young British seafarers. It is estimated that 33,000 jobs are available just within the superyacht sector, and a large amount of them will be within the Red Ensign fleet on UK registered vessels. So the opportunities exist, and Nautilus International is at the forefront of organising members worldwide across this sector and making sure that there are good jobs and, in themes, again, of the TUC, there are great jobs for young British people to enter into that sector. We have seen a large influx and we have got to make sure that it is heavily regulated, that they receive the benefits and make sure that they are protected by the trade union Movement.

So what is the reality? The reality is that for many, many decades the sector has been heavily unregulated: no contracts of employment, no terms and conditions, no collective bargaining, no sick pay, no pensions and no social security. Nothing! Someone turns up on the quayside, they get on a yacht, go to the south of France, over to Miami, Fort Lauderdale and then they have to leave. That has been the reality of what has actually occurred. Until a couple of years ago when we had the introduction of the Maritime Labour Convention, which is imperative for young people entering into the merchant navy part of the superyacht sector, it brings with it a minimum standard, a minimum requirement, contracts of employment, social security, pensions and sick pay, everything that everyone else would take as granted within their normal employment.

From a Nautilus perspective, there is another element to it as well, which is heavily within the MLC, the Maritime Labour Convention, and that is the isolation, the fear of

harassment, bully and discrimination, age discrimination, and so on. We, again, are at the forefront to make sure that that does not occur, that we are organised for our people, that wherever they are, that's where we are worldwide.

Congress therefore calls for the TUC to support and secure action to get effective enforcement of the Maritime Labour Convention, ensuring global standards apply for British seafarers, such as working conditions, wages, hours of work and leave. It is vital that the Maritime Labour Convention is applied, given that two-thirds of the world's superyachts use the UK flag. Therefore, I ask Congress, please, to support.

(Applause)

Karlson Lingwood *(RMT, National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)*

seconded Motion 13. He said: Congress, I am pleased to support and second this very worthy motion which, if you reflect on the motions that were passed yesterday, in particular Composite Motion 2 — the safety risks of light-touch regulation — what we are considering here is no regulation. This is a sector which is current deregulated. If you look at page 13, you will see the 2017 to 2018 TUC Campaign Plan. This moves directly into this area because those seafarers, those workers who we are talking about in this sector, are young workers. We already know that 6% of 21 to 30 year olds in the private sector are trade union members, so what this delivers are minimum standards. The Maritime Labour Convention 2006 is an International Labour Organisation convention. It is not just about your contract or your terms and conditions, but it contains some of the basics you would expect and take for granted if you work ashore, such as your accommodation, your food, the quality of that food, health protection, medical care, welfare and even social security protection. Those

are things you would take for granted if you were working ashore. In this sector, where do young workers turn who are thousands of miles away from home? Who do they look to? If they have got an issue where there is no respect in the workplace, are they expected to stand up in a sector where you are dealing with not millions but billionaires?

I urge you to support this motion and to vote on this unanimously because it absolutely fits hand in glove with what this Congress spoke about yesterday and the plan that has been mapped ahead in the next two years. So support these young workers. It is a good opportunity. There are opportunities for young workers to make their way in the world. So let's protect them, let's respect them and let's make sure that they are not discriminated against, that they have protection in the workplace and they actually enjoy their working lives. In seconding this motion, I am urging you all to support. (*Applause*)

The President: I am now going to put Motion 13 to the vote: The superyacht sector. The General Council supports the motion. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 13 was CARRIED*

Transport policy — bus services

The President: I now call Motion 14: Transport policy — bus services. The General Council supports the motion. It is to be moved by the TSSA, seconded by Unite and UNISON has indicated that they want to speak.

Mick Carney (*TSSA, Transport Salaried Staffs' Association*) moved Motion 14. He said: Congress, back in 1995 the Tories introduced the Transport Act. As with anything produced by the Tories at the time, it was all about the introduction of competition, this time across bus services. Bus deregulation was supposed to introduce competition and improve services to the consumer. As ever, it failed. It allowed operators to cherry-pick which routes to support and which were left to wither on the vine. It led to chaos. Profitable routes were fought over, in some cases literally. It led to gridlock. I personally remember the nightmare it caused in Darlington town centre, with bus drivers fighting in the streets, cutting each other up and blocking bus stops for rival companies. Deregulation led to unsafe work practices and an increase in dangerous buses running on our roads. Yet 30 years on the feted Tory mantra of competition has been stifled by the big companies.

More than 70% of the market is controlled by the Big Five: Arriva, now with Deutsche Bahn, an Abellio conglomerate; Stagecoach; First; Go Ahead and Viola. Those are the very same leeches that are sucking out profits on the back of our railways.

I was back in Darlington recently, hoping to catch a bus after 7 o'clock in the evening. Now there are not enough bus drivers there to have a hearty squabble, never mind a fight. Services are being cut to the bone, buses cancelled with no notice, and when

one does turn up the driver is copping it in the ear from irate passengers asking them to explain why no bus had turned up. Well, it's simple. It's because of the cutbacks made by the very same privateers who now hold privatised monopolies across our towns and cities.

Bus services are still the most popular and affordable form of public transport in this country and are as important as ever, but concern remains that the numbers are falling. Back in 1986 Thatcher was quoted as saying, "A man beyond the age of 26 who finds himself on a bus can count himself to be a failure". That quote may or may not be true, but what cannot be denied is the Tory love of the car, the car they have long held as being synonymous as a symbol of success.

Jeremy Clarkson, the country's leading petrol head, attended Thatcher's funeral in 2014, but now the cost of driving, especially for the young but also for working families, is becoming prohibitive. Car insurance for 17 to 20-year olds is, on average, over £3,800 a year. That sum, along with the £1,000 plus that it costs for 47 driving lessons, on average, means that car usage among the young continues to fall and they rely on other forms of public transport. But it is not just us who cannot afford to drive. The elderly often rely on bus services. In rural areas, especially, the lack of affordable transport can leave them isolated.

The recent Tory Bus Bill is somewhat unusual for a Tory Bill because it actually has some decent stuff in it but, as ever, there's a catch. Clause 21 seeks to prevent local authorities from setting up municipals. 12 municipals exist across the country outside of London. They come under much closer council control and are subject to much

more scrutiny. They encourage the regulation of services. To deny local authorities this right, denies them a stronger hand when dealing with the privateers. The municipals, such as those in Reading, Nottingham and Edinburgh, consistently provide better service than the private operators. A decade of Tory austerity has left many without the means to drive and many communities isolated. We need to review what is best, what serves the travel needs of all and what will only come with publicly run bus services. Buses should be affordable. Buses are green. One bus can take up to 50 cars off the roads, and bus services are exactly that – a service. Please support.
(Applause)

Diana Holland (*Unite*) seconded Motion 14. She said: Congress, I am the Assistant General Secretary for Unite’s quarter-of-a-million transport workers. Getting our transport services right — all of them — is vital for jobs, families, communities, the economy, the environment and for social justice, too. It is time for integrated transport for all. Buses are the most frequently used and, as has been said, the most democratic form of public transport. They are lifelines of our communities for people of all ages, younger and older alike, and women in particular. Yet their importance is often overlooked or taken for granted. But, as has been said, the legacy of 30 years since the shameful Tory privatisation and deregulation of our buses, and austerity cuts on top, mean that many communities, particular rural communities, feel let down and left out. What use is a bus pass if there is no bus? We have services that are run for private profit, not local need, while every day Unite’s 90,000 bus workers face threats to their pay and pensions in the race to the bottom on standards. It’s just no way to run a bus service.

Our amendment to this motion is about what is happening in the bus industry right now. This year's Bus Services Act enables re-regulation of buses, which is, of course, welcome, but it is in the implementation of that re-regulation. We have to make sure that that happens. The union must be at the table as agreed, as of right, together with the agreed TUPE and pension rights, rights that we must win for new workers, too.

As Paul said earlier, the Bus Act could also have provided an opportunity to extend bus use satisfaction and to save £506 million a year through municipal operation, bringing buses into public control and ownership while meeting local needs. But the Government inserted that clause in the Act to ban councils from setting up new municipal bus companies. They are hell bent on destroying all levels of our democracy. So if we want the best for the bus industry, for workers and our communities, we need to join together today to get that clause out. A decent accountable bus service is within our grasp. It is what people who use buses want, it is what bus workers want, it is what our Movement wants and it is good for our environment, too. Please support. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Ruth Davies (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Motion 14. She said: Congress, UNISON is pleased to support the excellent motion by TSSA, with the important amendment from Unite. Our members in bus companies and in the passenger transport executives are working every day to deliver excellent bus services. Beyond this, many thousands of our members and fellow workers depend on the buses to get to and from their work at hospitals, schools and council offices. The motion is quite right when it says that local control of bus services is crucial in making sure that services meet strategic local needs. Services need to be co-ordinated with shifts at

hospitals and school timetables as well as servicing estates, suburbs and villages properly. Deregulation — yes, that old favourite — has prevented this across the whole country, other than in London where bus deregulation never happened. It is no coincidence that only in London has bus use increased since the 1980s.

The Bus Services Act, which came in this year, gives our cities a new way to control bus services through franchising. Andy Burnham, as Mayor of Greater Manchester, is going to be taking this forward and, hopefully, that will show effective this mechanism can be. So the tide is turning, but franchising is unlikely to work for rural areas or small towns, so the motion is quite right in that we need to see more change.

The ban on starting municipal bus companies needs to be reversed. The cities which never sold off their bus companies, including the likes of Reading and Nottingham, have already proved the effectiveness of the model, and the full impact of cutting services needs to be properly taken into account when authorities are deciding whether services should be supported. The motion is absolutely right that buses are critical to social and community inclusion, when over 60% of job seekers and 65% of single pensioners simply have no access to a car, and that is before we think about young workers who are simply trying to get to work and from work. Congress, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

The President: I am now going to put Motion 14: Transport policy — bus services, to the vote. The General Council supports the motion. Those in favour, please show? Those against? The motion is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 14 was CARRIED*

The President: Delegates, we stay with section 1 of the General Council Report: The Economy and creative industries. I call Motion 15: Valuing entertainment workers. The General Council supports the motion, to be moved by Equity, seconded by the Musicians' Union and supported by Prospect.

Valuing entertainment workers

Mary Lane (*Equity*) moved Motion 15. She said: President and delegates, this is my first time at Congress. (*Applause*) I am a singer, entertainer, Bristolian and proudly working class. Being working class and having a successful career in the entertainment industry is, sadly, not the norm. It is a startling fact that over 90% of jobs in the creative economy are held by people in more advantaged socio-economic groups. Historically, variety and entertainment, the areas in which I have mostly worked, has been one of the most important routes for working-class people to access a career in the performing arts. Working in live entertainment was my job, but also my route into trade unionism.

In May we celebrated the 50th anniversary of Equity and the Variety Artists' Federation joining together. The amalgamation came about largely in response to the growth of commercial TV in the late '50s and early '60s. Equity and the VAF were, at that time, heavily engaged in negotiations to secure contractual agreements with performers. Both unions went out on strike against ITV to win better terms for their members in 1961. During and in the period following the dispute it became clear that

one union representing variety artists and performers would be stronger and better able to counter the power of the employers. This remains the case.

Today thousands of entertainers are at work around the country performing in working men's clubs, pubs, circuses, care homes, at weddings, in public spaces and many other venues. These performers often face huge challenges in the course of their working lives, including night-time and lone working, the withholding of payments by deliberately making the booking a "no pick-up" where the performer gets his fee from the agent sometimes weeks later. Other challenges are the closure of venues, health and safety risks involving PAT tests for electrical equipment, which are advisory but not mandatory, yet a performer can be denied work in particular venues if no PAT test is available. They are largely self-employed and can experience huge problems accessing social security, help with housing and parental entitlements. Providing insurance, legal support and other services for these workers is vital but we need to do more than that to be sure that we are valued, able to earn a living and that our jobs don't disappear. We need help to campaign against the closure of entertainment venues, threatened by developers wanting to turn them into luxury flats and for the agent of change to be fully incorporated into planning laws.

We need help to lobby the Government to recognise the right of all self-employed workers to access welfare and to challenge all employers who do not pay the living wage. We also need to expose agents who exploit workers, push for licensing and an increase in powers and resources for inspectors enforcing existing agency legislation. Currently, performers effectively appear at many showcase events with no guarantee

of paid work, and are sometimes offered contracts whereby they are not even told what venues are being charged for their performance by an agent.

More broadly, we need to continue to campaign for working-class representation in all art forms, against higher education fees, insecure and atypical work, low and no pay in some sectors, unconscious and conscious bias, and many other factors are stopping equal access to the arts. As well as organising and campaigning to remove these barriers, we must value and protect those routes, particularly live entertainment, that have helped working-class people gain a foothold in the entertainment industry. Please support. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Barbara White (*Musicians' Union*) seconded Motion 15. She said: Congress, as you already know, this year is the 50th anniversary of the amalgamation of Equity and the Variety Artists' Federation. Equity has celebrated by doing its best to highlight the work done by entertainment workers and to ensure that they receive the awards and support they deserve. Equity, the Musicians' Union and the Writers' Guild are always trying to ensure that we are not a fibrous group of people but we are workers, the same as all present, who deserve good working rights, including health and safety, which is frequently absent through lack of enforcement. It is not a glamorous profession, but one which demands hard work, frequently for little pay and, in some cases, people expect you to work for nothing.

As a member of the public who enter a venue, frequently walking on a lovely new carpet, where the carpet ends is where the entertainers start their work. Sometimes the working conditions are appalling, with a lack of dressing rooms and toilets. Quite

frequently, the dressing rooms are used to store tables and chairs which are not required.

In order to get to your place of employment, you might have to leave home at about 2 pm and arrive home about 12 hours later. Are you lucky enough to have a child, I ask? This is a time when you might not think you are so lucky when it comes to arranging a babysitter. We are all aware of the costs and problems attached to babysitters, but you try and find one who is happy to sit until 2 or 3 am.

We read on a daily basis of a pub or venue closing down. These are the venues where young artists learn to cut their teeth. We are all aware of the need for more homes, but as a women's trade union song says, "We ask for bread but roses, too". Developers are the people who seem to know the price of everything but the value of nothing. I am sure that many of you remember where we cut our trade union teeth, in little clubs, singing such songs as *The Ballad of Joe Hill*. These are the small venues that are vital to live performers but are seen as nothing more than money by property developers. Many people do not understand the value of live entertainment venues that are threatened by developers. They read — pardon me while I swear — *The Sun* or the *Daily Snail* about new homes at affordable prices, and they believe it! Affordable! Or as another entertainment worker, Ricky Tomlinson, might say, "My derriere!" Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Denise McGuire (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Motion 15. She said: President and Congress, I want, particularly, to address the issues faced by BECTU members, which is now part of Prospect. First, no pay. To get into the skilled and technical jobs in

audio-visual production people often have to work for free, and we are not talking about volunteering options or a week's internship. We are talking months. People contribute so much that when the credits roll their names are on that list at the end of the production, because that is what they are asked for when they apply for jobs. Ordinary working-class families and working families can't afford this. As Mary said, it's a class issue. You need the bank of mum and dad. As my BECTU colleague, Mike, said yesterday, this shameful model is the cynical business planning of some of the richest companies in the entertainment industry. Respectable, properly-funded productions exploit workers.

Some independent films operate like this, too. In their case, the volunteers are told that they will benefit spiritually from their experience, but these alleged volunteers make a genuine economic contribution and get no pay. It is shameful, Congress, totally shameful.

On up-front payments to agencies, I need to get a bit technical. The Conduct Regulations of 1993 and 2003 state that somebody seeking work can't be charged in advance, except for the entertainment industry. Background artists — some of you know them as “extras” — are the lowest paid end of the acting profession. They work through agencies because the production companies won't deal with them directly. Agencies want up-front payments, everything from £50 to £150, but there is no guarantee that any work will arise from that payment. If you haven't paid up front, the agency's fee is taken from your fees when they do get paid. So it is either “Pay now or we take it from your earnings”. Up-front fees are abhorrent and abusive, they exploit genuine workers and they are bait for unsuspecting members of the public

who think they are in with a chance to appear on the screen. So we say no exception for the entertainment industry.

On low pay, Congress, I want to give a shout out to the mostly young members and reps fighting for the living wage in our dispute at the Ritzy Cinema and with the Picture House across London and here in Brighton. *(Applause)* Thank you, Congress. Well done to them and thanks to all of you for your support. Please, support the boycott of Picture House cinemas, support the strike, support the strike fund and support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Thank you. That is the end of the speakers. I am calling now Motion 15 to the vote: Valuing entertainment workers. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously. Thank you.

* *Motion 15 was CARRIED*

1% for Art

The President: I call Motion 16: 1% for Art. The General Council supports the motion with an explanation. I will call upon the Deputy General Secretary to explain the General Council position during the debate. It is to be moved by the Artists' Union England and seconded by Equity.

Martin Sundram *(AUE, Artists' Union England)* moved Motion 16. He said: President, Congress and fellow trade unionists, this is our first Congress as an

affiliated trade union. (*Applause*) Indeed, it is our first ever motion, which perhaps shows slightly. It is, indeed, my first time, or anybody from our union, speaking to Congress. (*Applause*)

Within this motion there are, I hope, a couple of principles, a big aspiration and a modest proposal. The idea of a 1% for Art scheme, where those involved in public building and renovation projects commit to investing a minimum of 1% of budgets to commissioning art from living and working artists, not a Rembrandt in the safe, takes place in various parts of Europe, the US and elsewhere in the world with varying degrees of success, it has to be said. It has never succeeded in getting off the ground here in the UK, despite some historic local attempts. This, for us, is an example of how our country has not traditionally respect the work that artists do outside the glittering world of the few who do enjoy commercial success and sell their work for high prices in the commercial auction rooms of London. There are superstar salaries at one end of the pay spectrum and sub-minimal wages or working for nothing at the other is something we share with our colleagues in other entertainment unions.

The creative industries suffer from the misapprehension that somehow what we are doing is our hobby and not our jobs. The first principle is this. Being a professional artist is a job like any other, but one that shares many of the disadvantages that seem to afflict those working in the leisure and creative sectors. Artists, alongside musicians, actors, technicians and other workers in these fields need to work for a living, often in extremely insecure conditions and often with long periods with little income or none from their chosen profession at all. However, those who choose this difficult and uncertain career path have chosen something that they love to do, or

hopefully, but it is not their hobby. It is for those who choose it their job and their profession. We are proud to visual artists in our part of the trade union Movement, and we are indebted to our colleagues across the union world for helping to make this happen.

Artists' Union England is now unionising a part of the workforce that has not had an independent voice in the workplace in England before, despite attempts in the past to create one. Scotland, however, has had an Artists' Union for a decade now, and we have both worked with them and learnt from them as they encounter many of the issues that we will be facing ourselves south of the border. In short, we need trade union help to support the principle of creating paid work for artists.

The second principle we wanted to highlight is that artists can have something directly to contribute to communities, and that investment in art is an investment in society.

This country is in desperate need of publicly-funded housing and other community building projects and policies that genuinely raise the quality of people's lives. Our big aspiration is for artists to be part of that transformation, and investment in art should become a normal part of planning decisions taken by government and its agencies. We will be back asking for support from our trade union colleagues when we intend to lobby this Government and their agencies on a per cent for arts scheme in all future public building projects. As I have said, we have come with a modest proposal. We would like trade unions, in the first instance, to set the benchmark and be in the vanguard when renovating or building to incorporate a per cent for art in all

such projects. It is important to say at this stage that we are not being prescriptive about mechanisms that might put this motion into actions. We simply want to see artists paid for the work they do, and that art is recognised as an important part of working as well as the gallery and the living environment. An aspiration to the idea of a per cent for art when unions set out their own budgets would help to normalise the idea of art in every workplace and public building. In doing so, it would support artists as workers, like any other. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Louise McMullan (*Equity*) seconded Motion 16. She said: Good morning, Congress. Before speaking directly to the motion, I wanted, briefly, to welcome Martin and the rest of the Artists' Union England to the rest Federation of Entertainment Unions. For anyone who doesn't know, the FEU is a sub-committee within the TUC that brings together all those unions representing creative and cultural workers, including Equity, the NUJ, the PFA, the BECTU section of Prospect, the Writers' Guild, the Musicians' Union and Unite. It is great to have the Artists' Union joining us and we look forward to working and campaigning alongside you.

We welcome the sentiments behind this motion very much. To us the motion speaks to the need we have as a movement to reclaim access to art for working people. Barbara, from the Musicians' Union, beat me to it already this morning, but I am going to say it again. Yes, it is bread we fight for but we fight for roses, too. This is not just a pretty song, but it is the expression of a right that we, as working people have, to enjoy the good things in life beyond our basic needs. The motion also reminds us, once again, of the need to ensure that artistic jobs are not limited to those who can afford to work for free or as close to free as possible. So many do because

there is so little access to funds at the grassroots level right now. For us, a whole superstructure is built on an inadequately funded base that in other industries would simply be regarded as research development. In our sector, sadly, that initial investment is all too often the free labour of arts workers.

We know that in our union at least 40% of our members have worked without pay at least once in the last 12 months. This is a decrease on previous years, but we have a long way to go before no and low pay work in our industry is eradicated.

Finally, we recognise, as Martin has just said, that it might be realistic, as the motion calls for, to expect all federates in the TUC to commit straightaway to the 1% for Art scheme, but it is certainly an aspiration that we think is worth supporting longer term. If trade unions are prepared to lead the way, public bodies are more likely to follow what is a great aspiration, so please support the motion. (*Applause*)

The President: I call upon the Deputy General Secretary to explain the General Council's attitude to the motion.

The Deputy General Secretary (*Paul Novak*) spoke on behalf of the General Council. He said: The General Council's position is to support Motion 16 with an explanation. First of all, though, let me add my voice to the welcome to our newest affiliate, the Artists' Union England, a new union representing artists, many of them young, in one of our most important creative industries, giving artists a much-needed collective voice, tackling the insecurity that affects most of the profession, and highlighting not just the cultural importance of art but its economic significance, too.

Motion 16 calls on Congress to endorse the principle that unions spend 1% of their budget for major construction or refurbishment works on commissioning public art. The General Council supports that principle and the motion with this explanation. We all agree that public art makes buildings, our public spaces, indeed, our workplaces nicer, more attractive and more interesting places to be. At Congress House, the TUC is fortunate enough to have a number of magnificent pieces of art in the building, including an Epstein sculpture. But while, obviously, unions would like to invest more in art and artists, at the moment the 1% figure should be seen as an aspiration rather than a target or a binding commitment on unions. In these straightened times with our finances under pressure, with our members requiring yet more and more support, we, obviously, have to make difficult and balanced judgments when it comes to resources. So, please, support the motion; please, welcome the Artists' Union England to the TUC family and, please, get behind British art and British artists. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Joanna De Groot (*UCU, University and College Union*) spoke in support of Motion 16. She said: President and Congress, I am very happy to support Motion 16. When I walk into my union's headquarters, I am delighted to see the fine photographs which we have hanging on the walls of our ground floor, to be enjoyed by the people who work and visit there. They are, of course, the work of photographic artists whose skill and creativity gives us pleasure and stimulates thought. I think that the principle of art in the workplace, as in other parts of life, is a very fine one. Support for artists and art work is, therefore, support for something which improves our lives, but it is also support for workers in the creative industry who are our fellow workers. Public art is

a public good. Art workers are valued workers who deserve the proper opportunity to use their talent and skill, not just for individual patrons but for public and civil society bodies.

We recognise that unions may not be able to make immediate financial commitments to a 1% for Art. We do support the principle and the need for the fair and transparent ways to make funds available to artists. Please support motion 16. (*Applause*)

The President: I am now going to put Motion 16: 1% for Art to the vote. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 16 was CARRIED.*

Strong unions

The President: Delegates, we turn to section 5 of the General Council Report: Strong Unions, the section on Organising from page 56. I call paragraph 5.1 and Motion 71: Valued workers. The General Council supports the motion. It is moved by the NASWUT, seconded by UNISON, and the National Education Union have indicated that they wish to speak.

Valued workers

Fred Brown (*NASUWT*) moved Motion 71. He said: Congress, over recent years successive Conservative and Conservative-led Governments have launched attack

after attack on ordinary working people and their ability to organise in defence of their hard-earned terms and conditions of employment. The consequences of these attacks are clear: 1.7 million people employed on zero-hours contracts with numbers rising steadily, wages stagnating year on year as executive pay explodes, with some receiving 40% pay increases last year alone, while public sector workers have faced real-term pay cuts for nearly a decade; employers attempting to deny the rights of workers with impunity, aided and abetted by the Government's imposition of employment tribunal fees intended to deny workers natural justice, thus demonstrating the importance of UNISON's recent victory on this issue.

Congress, we have seen some truly shocking examples of employers creating conditions akin to Victorian workhouses rather than the 21st century workplaces, and education is no exception. Supply teachers are increasingly exploited by unscrupulous agencies, often through the use of offshore-based umbrella companies, where abuses include teachers being required to pay their employer's National Insurance contributions. This abuse is not just confined to supply teachers. The latest figures from the NASUWT's annual 'Big Question' survey revealed that 71% of teachers experienced a culture of blame or criticism. Almost two-thirds reported that their wellbeing was not considered important by their employer, and three-fifths of their jobs had impacted negatively on their mental health. A third did not feel respected by their employer.

However, we must recognise that there are employers who treat their employees fairly, with dignity and respect, and these employers should be recognised and used as an example to those poor employers and to highlight the employers who will treat

them well. For this reason, the NASUWT has, in partnership with GMB, UNISON and Unite, been developed the Valued workers scheme, setting out principles of good employment practice that employers are asked to sign up to. These principles include ensuring that workers have safe working environments, are treated with dignity and respect, are able to access continuing professional development, have good pay and conditions, including a commitment to the living wage, and to have formal agreed mechanisms for working in partnership with trade unions. It is hoped that the Valued workers scheme will cause the poor employers to up their game. It will also provide trade unions with leverage over employers who wish to be seen as the employer of choice. We already have a number of employers, both large and small, who wish to sign up to the scheme. By opposing and campaigning against poor employers, whilst simultaneously developing relationships with good employers, we can achieve the aims of this motion.

Congress, we must work together to ensure that every example of poor practice is challenged and union membership is developed in under-represented workplaces. We must also work with the many good employers and highlight the good practice that exists in workplaces to further pressurise those who refuse to treat their staff with dignity and respect. Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Margaret McKee (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 71. She said: Congress, UNISON is a great believer in joint union working. We work with sister unions whenever we can to defend workers' rights. The pressures caused by real-term funding cuts across the UK have had a significant effect on education support staff, leading to significant job cuts across the UK in recent years. The fear of job losses, added to Tory trade union

laws, which have undermined the principles of secure employment in the education sector have put back the whip into the hands of the employers. We hope that UNISON's win on tribunal fees at the Supreme Court can be seen as one way of redressing that imbalance of power in the workplace. Our highest court was clear when they gave ministers a lesson straight from the textbooks. Rights are worthless if you can't afford to enforce them and employers can act with impunity. Congress, if it was right at the time of the Magna Carta, it is right in the 21st century. Yet, sadly, alongside redundancies, many employers have taken the opportunity to make terms and conditions weaker. We have seen the proliferation of low-paid jobs and precarious employment, which has led to major inconsistencies, such as support staff being paid on term-time contracts, while most teachers can access all-year round contracts. We have also seen the move to academy and free schools in England, further undermining employment rights and trade union organisation as some seek to limit facility time.

In the light of that, it is important to ensure that we encourage school and college employers to treat workers well and recognise the important role of trade unions in the workplace. Therefore, joint work with our sister support-staff unions and led by the NASUWT to ensure that employers value their workers is a welcome, additional campaign. It is important that workers feel welcome and able to join trade unions, that the reach of unions is extended across the education sector and that as unions we continue to show solidarity with one another by respecting established boundaries for recruitment and organising.

Congress, workers face continued hostility from the Government and employers. We need to make sure that our members are valued employees and a campaign to get employers to accept this can only benefit us all. How many times over the years have you heard the employer or management say, “You’re lucky, you have a job”? No. “You’re lucky that you have such dedicated workers”. Thank you, Congress.
(Applause)

Amanda Martin (*NEU, National Education Union*) spoke in favour of Motion 71. She said: Congress, to be valued as a worker should be a fundamental right afforded to all in the UK. Poor quality conditions, low pay, victimisation, hostile environments, fear of job losses, ever-changing terms and conditions and inequality are, sadly, today still too frequent occurrences in the workplace, particularly in the workplace where unions simply are not present. The image of the trade union Movement depends on which media outlet you look at: public enemy no. 1; enemies of promise; male, pale and stale, but that view is, at best, outdated. Historically, trade unions have stood up for all union members and all workers. Recent photographs of demonstrations show the demographics of what a trade unionist looks like is, rightly, changing. It is vital that we promote that trade unions are for all workers.

The trade union Movement, for me, is the family you choose to belong to. We, in this room, need to do our bit by promoting the positives of the trade union Movement and do our bit by recruiting non-union members, as well as speaking proudly of the successes of the trade union Movement as a whole. Nationally, I am fortunate and proud to be in a strong, progressive union, a union that makes a difference, a movement not a monument. Locally, I am fortunate and extremely proud to be the

secretary of a thriving, active division, developing grass-root activists. Nine out of 12 of my officers are women, working in education, managing caring responsibilities, successful in their careers and proud trade unionists, committed to helping and supporting others.

But national and locally, the National Education Union does not work in silos, but we stand side-by-side with our sister trade unionists supporting and standing in solidarity on so many issues. The National Education Union wholeheartedly supports this motion, and particularly bullet point (c). We, too, commend the partnership formed between unions and the successes that this can bring. The late, great general secretary of the National Union of Teachers, Steve Sinnett, always said “Working together is winning together”. We have heard in Trade Union Congress 2017, in Composite 9, how the “Scrap the cap” campaign needs us all to unite, to ensure that public sector pay is addressed. We have heard in this TUC ’17 from our President how Steve’s mantra plays a huge part in the success of the school funding campaign in the general election and in bringing this information to the public. www.schoolcuts.org.uk successfully brought together the NUT, the ATL, NHT, GMB, Unite the union and UNISON. Congress, I think you will agree that that is a formidable force.

Let me give you just one example of collective trade unionism. Congress, this is a campaign that is far from over. As Justine Greening, at the end of term, announced £1.8 billion, we still do not know where that money has come from. We do not know where it is going, to which pupils. Is it recycled? We, the National Education Union, in taking this campaign forward, want to extend our hand to all sister education unions to join this formidable force. Please, come together and work with us so that

we, together, can ensure the real enemies of promise are the Tory Government.

(Applause)

The President: Thank you. I now put Motion 71 — Valued workers — to the vote. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 71 was CARRIED.*

A new model of trade unionism

The President: We now move to Motion 72: A new model of trade unionism. This motion is to be moved by the CWU and seconded by the Society of Radiographers. The General Council supports the motion. The National Education Union have indicated that they wish to speak.

Dave Ward (*CWU, Communication Workers Union*) moved Motion 72. He said: Congress, the CWU believes that there has never been a better time and a more important time for us to come together, led by Frances, to have a more honest, more open and more constructive discussion on what is the best model of trade unionism to re-assert our values across society and in workplaces, and to make sure that actually shape the future world of work.

Let me say from the outset, I sense that the tide is turning and I think we all recognise that there are some fantastic people in our movement — there always has been — in all unions. At the workplace, there are some great local reps. There is a lot going on

at the moment and there is a lot for us to be proud about, and we need to build on that. But we also have to recognise that last year the recorded figures of loss of trade union membership across the whole of our movement was 275,000 people. So we have 275,000 less people in the trade union Movement now than the year before. What that also means is that density of our movement and the coverage of collective bargaining is at a record low. Contrast that with what has happened within the Labour Party under Corbyn's leadership. Labour has trebled its membership, it has definitely broken through with young people, and what you are seeing, surely, must be an opportunity for us to say to some of those young people, "Yes, you can change society politically, but you can also change it through industrial work and belonging to trade unions".

What we are calling for is the TUC to lead a major transformative project where we can all input into it — no one has all the answers to this — but we can all bring our collective enthusiasm, our collective experience, to really have a proper discussion about this. We have listed a few things in the motion that we just want to run through. So what we are saying we should consider — it is not exhaustive — is (i) to see how we can significantly increase the levels of engagement with members. We hear a lot about the trade union laws. None of us like them but we've got them. I'll tell you what would be fantastic. If we use the attack to turn it back on them by engaging with members and smashing through that threshold and making it something regular across our movement when there are strike ballots, that would be a great thing for this movement.

Number (ii) is how we strengthen local workplace activism. CWU has undertaken a redesign project at the moment, and we want to make sure that the outcome is to ensure that — we have an amount of income — more of it needs to be going to the front line. That is where unions will strengthen. It's not about the bureaucracy of our organisations. It's about the frontline.

(iii) We need to improve the co-operation, methods and effectiveness of organising, and I know there are some unions that are way ahead of where our thinking is at the moment on organising. You are doing some great stuff, but let's share it. There is also too much internal competition in our movement at the moment with organising, and a little trend is coming in that we need to counter, where when we put the pressure on to get organising done, the bosses and the employers are starting to choose which union they want, and that can't be right.

We need (iv) a stronger focus for the TUC in co-ordinating solidarity and supporting workers in dispute. We think that that needs to become the clearest and strongest focus of the TUC overall. We think that that is the role of the TUC and we want to see what is the role of the TUC. Let's have that debate going forward as well.

We need to bring forward a younger generation of representatives, and that is clearly a priority. But let the young people shape what the future of our movement is, not just bring them through as reps but let them tell us what they think we need to do. We have to ensure that the whole movement better reflects the gender, ethnicity and diversity of the workforce, and improving the scope and reach of collective and sectoral bargaining.

This is a moment where, if we have that discussion, we can be optimistic that we are on the way back as a movement. The signs are there and we believe that, if we all input into this particular project, it will deliver a new deal for workers and will reassert trade union values in society. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Paul Moloney (*SOR, Society of Radiographers*) seconded Motion 72. He said: Congress, this is a very important motion and we need not only to support it but to implement it fully, but let's not be defensive and inward looking. This country needs a strong trade union Movement, and this motion is about pro-actively making sure that we recognise the obligation that we have to the millions of our members, and to the millions who should be our members, to make sure that this movement remains strong.

Colleagues, as has already been said this week, we are a successful movement, and let's look at the evidence: the CWU's groundbreaking, pragmatic and forward-thinking approach to pensions in the Royal Mail, their suggested middle ground between defined benefit and defined contribution pension schemes, has attracted interest across the political spectrum; Unite's groundbreaking work to enforce better employment conditions in Sports Direct, working with shareholders to persuade them that their interests are very much linked to those of the workforce in the company. Again, that's an approach which is both pragmatic and progressive, and UNISON's success over the employment tribunal fees in the highest court in the land is little short of astonishing, a victory not just for this movement but also for democracy, as the ability of citizens to call the Government to account under the law remains a

fundamental requirement that stops a democracy becoming a dictatorship. That is another pragmatic but progressive action by a trade union this year, and there are many other examples.

So what does that have to do with this motion? Quite simply, we should not be losing members with this approach to the problems thrown up by this dangerous and dysfunctional Government. Those three examples, and the many others, not least of which are the successes achieved by my own union in pushing forward the contribution that radiographers can make to improving the nation's health, show how successful we are.

But the latest membership figures show that we are losing members at an alarming rate and density levels are at an all-time low and getting lower. That's not the case for all unions. Some of the smaller unions have much higher density levels than the average. My own union has more reps than ever, the vast majority being under 45, and it has increased membership in each of the last five years with our density now about 90% among registered radiographers. This growth, by the way, began when we participated in a national strike over pay and has not stopped since. However, we need an honest assessment of what puts people off from joining unions today. It is certainly not our record of success or our approach to resolving problems, our commitment to the values that society holds dear or our dogged determination to represent working people despite the constraints placed upon us by the state. But we cannot carry on in decline. Ultimately, there is no point in my union having 90% density levels if we are one of only a few unions in that position. We and our members need strong representation, a strong representative movement, as much as

anyone. We can stand up for radiographers, but our members need a strong movement standing up for education, decent transport and for the arts, among the other things we do. So, colleagues, please support this motion. Let's have the review it calls for. Let's learn from every union and let us apply the same pragmatic but progressive approach that has delivered such important and groundbreaking victories this year. Please support. (*Applause*)

Gewain Little (*National Education Union*) spoke in support of Motion 72. He said: Congress, this is one of the most important motions in front of us this week. If we don't get this issue right, if we don't fundamentally change the way we work in order to reverse the decline in trade union membership, organisation and collective bargaining, everything else we commit ourselves to at this Congress becomes meaningless. If we don't have the industrial and political power to put our policies into action, they remain just that: policies. The motion, rightly, identifies its first three priorities as engaging members and reps, strengthening workplace activism and improving the effectiveness of our organising work. It's absolutely essential that these remain our key priorities as they address the fundamental role of trade unions to organise workers, to give them power to negotiate improvements in their working lives. It goes on to identify the importance of bringing forward a young generation of members and activists. To do this the project must include a review of the TUC's young member structures and must include the views of our existing young members in that review.

However, trade unions also have another fundamental role – an educative role. In organising workers to improve their terms and conditions, unions give agency to

working people. They allow them to understand the conditions of the society that they live in and how to change those conditions. By giving power to working people through acting collectively, they change those people's world outlook. This is an essential function, and to do it unions need to invest in trade union education. Our current organising takes place against a backdrop of a massive decline in the power of working people. This necessarily means that we will suffer defeats and setbacks as well as victories. Workers who understand that there is an endless struggle for control over work and wages and that problems arise from fundamental differences of interests between them and their employer are much better equipped to take a longer and more strategic view of events in the workplace. Rather than attribute setbacks and defeats to individual failings or flaws in the organising approach, they see them in the context of the power relations in society, but all of this takes effective political trade union education and that means investment.

The attacks by this Government on trade union education funding are a blow to our movement, but they also provide an opportunity to re-invent and re-develop the trade union education we need for a new model of trade unionism.

Congress, please support this motion and let's review and change our practice, but let's also take a long, hard look at our unions and the priority that we give to trade union education. It is a fundamental, not an optional extra. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: I am now going to put Motion 72 — A new model of trade unionism — to the vote. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously. Thank you.

Collective bargaining – good for football and good for all

The President: Congress, I now call Motion 73 — Collective bargaining — good for football and good for all. Despite my statement in the Congress Guide that I would stop anybody who made a football joke talking, I will allow this motion, so thank you.

Nick Cusack (*PFA, Professional Footballers' Association*) moved Motion 73. He said: The PFA is unique in our movement in that we have 100% membership with every professional footballer being in the union. Our success in this regard is in no small measure due to the all-encompassing collective bargaining agreement that we have in place. This agreement ensures that every player in the Premier League and EFL signs the same contract and benefits from the best terms and conditions anywhere in the world. We have also negotiated a standard players' contract for the women's game, and we are very proud to have all the WSL players within our ranks.

The solidarity amongst the players has enabled the PFA to protect them and ensure that the employers deal with us on a level playing field. Over the years, this has led to the influence of the union growing as restrictive regulations have been challenged and swept away. The abolition of the maximum wage, the reform of the retain and transfer system and the changes following *Bosman* are good examples of the union making its mark, and we have built on these successes so that today we sit at the top table in football and are consulted on all aspects affecting players. The standard players' contract is the cornerstone of our collective bargaining agreement, with an

array of protections and regulations that are good for players but also good for the game.

The authorities recognise that in our industry if every player had their own separate contracts and disputes were played out in the courts this would be impossible to manage and cause huge disruption.

The PFA has also used its strength to establish itself as a key stakeholder involved in all the major decisions on regulations and how professional football is run in England. This is reflected in the PFA's membership of the Professional Football Negotiating and Consultative Committee — the PFNCC — which meets regularly with all the other footballing bodies to deal with matters arising in our industry. This is a very important body as it not only deals effectively with emerging issues but it also operates like the United Nations in that the union has a veto on any proposed changes that affect players.

What this all adds up to is the kind of work involvement and consultation that was once an integral part of industrial relations in Britain, and its demise has had a hugely detrimental impact on workers in a wide range of industries. The statistics speak for themselves. In 1979 82% of workers had the benefit of collectively bargaining terms and conditions but, sadly, today, only 20% have that privilege against a Europe-wide average of 60%. For the remainder of workers, they are at the mercy of employers and the free-for-all in the labour market. This state of affairs has seen wages stagnate, pensions cut, terms and conditions slashed and the proliferation of insecure working by zero-hours contracts and false self-employment. What we need to be declaring

loud and clear from this conference is that it does not have to be this way. Football proves that it is not difficult to rubbish neo-liberal arguments that collective bargaining and trade unions are bad for business. Indeed, the PFA has demonstrated that unions representing their workers responsibly and having the strength and solidarity to back that up are good for employers, too. Of course, the PFA is helped by the fact that footballers' skills are very specific and employers cannot easily replace them. But, nevertheless, other industries should take note that a vibrant and active trade union is not something to be feared but should in fact be recognised as a positive and progressive presence in the workforce. That being said, it would be naïve to expect all employers to embrace this approach. It has been all too apparent that the more the state has left businesses to their own devices, the more that workers have suffered. Therefore, we cannot accept the current situation that allows the market to dictate. When agreements cannot be reached between employers and employees then there needs to be statutory intervention to bring about collective agreements that apply to all employers and workers in the industry. This kind of intervention will not presently be needed in industries like football where agreements and mechanisms are in place and work well. But elsewhere, the sooner legislation is brought into force through change, the better.

In conclusion, everyone in this hall knows that the trade unions are a great force for good and the battles we have fought over many years have transformed the lives of millions of working people. In recent years the dramatic fall in collective bargaining has paved the way for so many advances to be put into reverse. As a movement, we must all work together to turn back this tide because failure threatens everything we stand for.

One of the greatest of football men and former PFA member, Bill Shankley, said: “The socialism I believe in is everybody working for the same goal and everybody having a share in the rewards. That’s how I see football. That’s how I see life.” These are wise words, and we would do well to remember them in our fight to get collective bargaining back where it belongs in every workplace in the land. We know that if we are successful it will transform the lives of workers and their families and bring about the kind of fair and decent society we all crave. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Kevin Buchanan (*GMB*) seconded Motion 73. He said: Congress, the work of the PFA and, indeed, its sister organisation, PFA Scotland, should be recognised for the progress in their steps to establishing collective bargaining in an industry as challenging as professional football. However, Congress, we must also be mindful that there is a mountain of unseen tasks which contributes to the running of football clubs, which does not involve kicking a ball. In addition to the full-time backroom staff, there is an army of match-day staff, without whom professional football would not take place. Stewards, programme sellers, catering staff, turnstile staff, just to mention a few who are essential to the running of clubs. I am sure that there are many people in this hall today who support clubs the length and breadth of Britain. With the Champions League tonight, there will be discussions in many pubs, I am sure, about the billions that are spent on playing staff.

Yet in England, only two clubs — Chelsea and Everton — have living wage accreditation. In Scotland, of the senior clubs, only Hearts have been accredited. All

of us, both as trade unionists and football supporters, should be pestering our clubs, in whatever way we can, to become living wage accredited as a minimum.

We echo the call in the motion for statutory intervention to mitigate the worst excesses of bad employers. We should all remind ourselves regularly why this is essential. The daily stories of exploitation of staff are a sad but familiar story to us all as activists, stories of blacklisting, low pay, zero-hours contracts, sexual harassment, unfair charges for uniforms, for spillages and breakages, long shifts without breaks and work cancelled without notice. The damage which results from these shameful individual stories is not just financial. Last week research from the Mental Health Foundation Scotland said that low pay, job insecurity and mental health problems brought increased suicide risks. One of my colleagues in the Scottish TUC-backed Better Than Zero campaign put it very succinctly last week when they called in the Scottish Government to do everything in their power to encourage employers to allow trade recognition in their workplaces by highlighting the benefits. For employers who continue to bully, harass, underpay and discriminate against their own workers, these companies should be named and shamed, stripped of any Investors in People awards, and tax incentives should be taken away or any measure that would hit them where it hurts, in their pockets. A similar call to the UK Government should be made by this Congress to offer some prospect of protection to those suffering under unscrupulous employers. I second. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I am now going to put Motion 73 to the vote. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 73 was CARRIED.*

Apprentices

The President: I will now call Motion 74: Apprentices. The General Council supports the motion. It will be moved by Andrew Baker on behalf of the TUC Young Workers Conference, seconded by the GMB and then PCS, Unite, the FBU and the NEU have indicated that they wish to speak.

Andrew Baker (*TUC Young Workers Conference*) moved Motion 74. He said: President and Congress, you will have to forgive me because I didn't know I would be moving this motion until yesterday, so this speech was only written last night. When I was sitting down and writing, I tried to think of the things that motivate me or inspire me about this topic, and there were a few things that immediately sprung to my mind. The President's amazing Address on Sunday, where so many of the eloquent points she made about the problems facing young workers had me nodding my head in recognition and agreement. What are the Four Horses of the Apocalypse facing young workers? They are low expectations, a lack of trust, a sense of futility and an ignorance of their rights in the workplace.

Apprenticeships offer an amazing opportunity for young workers to have a pathway to ethical and gainful employment and to address the record levels of youth unemployment we have had in this country. Instead, what have we seen? We have seen the apprentice national minimum wage of £3.50 enticing employers to use apprenticeships as a way to undercut pay, conditions and secure cheap labour. We

have also seen another worrying trend, which is that apprenticeships are being offered to older workers to erode their pay and conditions all under the guise of re-skilling or retraining. Over 40% of all apprenticeships last year were offered to those over 25. We need to be clear when we talk about this. This is not an opportunity to develop. This is not something that benefits the employee. This is slave wages. *(Applause)*

There is another way, though, exemplified by UNISON's Apprenticeship Charter, which calls on employers to give apprentices a job at the end of their apprenticeship, payment at the rate for the job and access to high-quality training, and all of the other rights which they should be entitled to as employees. It also lays out standards for how an employer should consider and approach the administration of a scheme to ensure that they understand that they are investing in the future of their labour force, not undercutting it. We know that the best apprentice schemes are those that are formulated and developed in conjunction with unions and meeting the standards that that charter sets out. That's why I believe this motion is so important. It shows the willingness of the TUC to address the issues facing young workers.

At the start of moving this motion, I spoke about the things that motivate me. The other really big thing that sprung to my mind was the hope offered by Jeremy Corbyn and the Labour Party to young people and young workers that there is another way and there is hope and opportunities available. We have the opportunity to recognising the engagement of young people — it might be a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity — for us to renew the trade union Movement. Congress, I urge you to support this motion to help resolve the issues of young workers and also to secure the future of the trade union Movement. Thank you.

The President: Considering you wrote that last night, that was an excellent speech. Thank you very much. Can I now have GMB to second, please.

Craig Dawson (*GMB*) seconded Motion 74. He said: Congress, I am seconding the TUC Young Workers' Conference motion on Apprenticeships. We live in an age when what was once a universally accepted truth is now in jeopardy. It was taken a given that a young worker entering the world of work would be better off than those who went before. My generation are now poorer in terms of wealth and income than our parents. It feels like the system has simply broken down. I can think of no greater shame than a generation held hostage by the inadequacies of our education system. The Government would have us think that they are addressing this problem by promising to create three million young apprentices by 2020, but, to use a modern adage, if you take a quick run through the wheat fields of Government propaganda and you see the ugly truth.

If you are a young hairdressing apprentice, the likelihood that you are paid below the already abysmal £3.50 apprentice minimum wage is not just growing, but it is reaching crisis point. Coupled with appalling rates of advancement to advance to higher levels, you have the shameful face of slave wages in the United Kingdom today. Imagine, for a moment, if you will, how one of the richest nations in human history can arrive at a point when the fundamental principle of a decent day's pay for a decent day's work becomes an alien concept and you see mine and many other young workers' frustrations.

Congress, the Government have had three years and two reports funded by the taxpayer to begin to address this issue and, despite claims to the contrary, action is not forthcoming. Our challenge to the Government is this: sort this mess out or we will! This motion is the start of this process. It commits the TUC to campaigning across all sectors against low paid, insecure apprentice jobs, while commending those high-quality schemes that pay a decent rate and do lead to a proper job. It outlines a clear strategy which reiterates the central creed of my position as chair of the TUC Young Workers that we are not simply the future but we are the present. We are not a problem for tomorrow. We are the issue of the day.

The plight of young apprentices is clear and it demands our attention. The challenge before us, Congress, is great, but I say this to you all: challenge accepted. Congress, I urge you to support this motion. (*Applause*)

Sarah Broad (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Motion 74 .

She said: I am especially proud to speak on this motion as it originated from PCS and came here through the Young Workers' Conference. I pay tribute to my comrade, Laura, who wrote this original motion.

It can be said that young workers are bearing the brunt of austerity with increased university fees, cost of living increases, casualisation of their labour and housing benefit cuts. This is disgraceful and this needs to change. Young people are our future.

Apprentices are only adding to this hardship. These workers are being paid the minimum amount for the maximum amount of work. Whilst preparing for this motion, I had a perusal of the available apprenticeships on the gov.uk website and found a number of opportunities with a salary of £3.00 an hour. I was shocked to hear that the minimum wage is £3.50 an hour, which is also pretty disgraceful. I am not even sure what you can get for £3.00 an hour – maybe some Freddos! As a Movement, we talk about a living wage and you definitely cannot live on that. PCS is not opposed to apprenticeships per se, but we are opposed to low-paid exploitation of workers. In fact, it is expected that by 2020, there will be approximately 30,000 apprentices within the civil service so we want the best for these workers, as we would for any worker. Also, 30,000 new members of PCS would be very beneficial.

PCS has already won a significant agreement with the Cabinet Office, including fair pay, job security and redundancy avoidance. Additionally, we have reassurance that no apprentices will replace redundant workers. Furthermore, we have the guarantee that we can speak to, and hopefully recruit, these apprentices at their inductions. This gives them an opportunity to join PCS, the biggest civil service union.

It is vital that the TUC campaigns on apprenticeships and addresses the challenges of unfair pay and conditions. The union Movement has a proud history of campaigning and winning and I believe that this issue needs a robust and consolidated approach to ensure that we win guarantees for these workers. Obviously, not all apprentices are young, but the majority are and it is crucial that we organise them. PCS does have a proud organising tradition, particularly with the Young Workers, and I recommend the Young Members' Network and the work that they have done.

This motion therefore instructs the TUC to campaign for permanent jobs and fair conditions for all, campaign against the casualisation of apprentices, produce TUC recruitment materials and coordinate a campaign across all sectors against low paid, insecure positions. After all, young people definitely are the future. To win together, we need to campaign together. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Thomas Butler (*Unite*) spoke in support of Motion 74.

He said: I thank the President for letting me speak. I just want to say a few words about apprenticeships and the Young Workers' Movement in the TUC and across the trade union Movement in general.

Congress, Unite has always been a supporter and it is one of the main proponents, as a union and organising model, in organising young workers by telling them that good apprenticeships are a good workplace model. They are a good way of developing people. They are a good way of establishing decent pay, decent skills and establishing a good economy. They are certainly mutually beneficial.

What I would say, if I am being constructively critical, is that we are very concerned about organising young workers and establishing good apprenticeships across our labour economy, but I think the trade union Movement in general needs to step up to the plate. We have an organising strategy for young workers and we try very hard to make sure that our apprentices join as soon as they start work, but other unions need to step up to the plate as well. We all need to realise that it is a major concern for the Labour Movement that we stay modernised.

The Labour Party needs to realise that not every young person is a student. They are also apprentices. As somebody who wanted to be a history teacher, when I am teaching, I want my kids to work in places where we represent members, such as in Nissan, Vauxhall, BAE, Toyota and Rolls Royce, where they do get good wages. They are mostly all in a union so they do have trade union recognition. That should be the norm, Congress. We treat it as if it is some wonderful thing or as if we are some oracle. We are not; it should be normal. This was normal 100 years ago when we had collective bargaining. We had strength in the workplace. Congress, Unite wants genuine, industry-recognised apprenticeships that are an excellent investment for the UK's industry and economy. Also, we need to fight on behalf of those apprentices who are not in a recognised workplace. We need to have political policy which plans industry and possibly takes it into public ownership.

Congress, in summary, we need to set out our values and display our socialism in caring for our young people. We need to tell employers that we will not tolerate exploitative apprenticeships where people get paid £2.50 an hour. We are only going to tolerate people who show equality and justice at work. Unite the Union is a big proponent of apprenticeships. They are mutually beneficial for all. Let us get into those workplaces and organise the apprentices because it is a concern of the trade union Movement and not just of Unite. Let us do it, comrades. *(Cheers and applause)*

The President: Thank you, Thomas. That was a rousing speech. Now for the FBU.

Andy Noble (*Fire Brigades Union*) spoke in support of Motion 74.

He said: I want to thank the TUC Young Workers' Conference for bringing this motion on apprenticeships. The FBU supports the resolution because it reflects the experience that we have had with apprenticeships in the fire and rescue service.

Historically, we have long had what were called junior firefighters although that number has dwindled over recent years. Their pay was determined by collective bargaining through our National Joint Council, but other terms and conditions were not. The FBU has always fought for junior firefighters to be offered whole time – that is full-time jobs in our industry – on the completion of their training courses.

Pre-employment apprenticeships have recently been established in our industry but, at the present time, there are not very many. Our experience of these schemes, however, is pretty mixed. Some have been relatively good and others much less so. The FBU has been clear that apprentices should be organised into trade unions and should have decent employment rights, including those on pay, hours and rest breaks. We are even clearer that apprenticeships should not be abused. They should not be used as a poor substitute for traditional recruitment into our industry. They should not be used to casualise our industry by undermining nationally-agreed terms and conditions. There should be guaranteed jobs at the end of each and every apprenticeship scheme. Apprentices should be fully trained and have a reasonable expectation of a job in the fire and rescue service when they have finished that apprenticeship.

Recently, the FBU has become a provider of training for post-employment apprenticeships via our National Union Learning Centre. At the beginning of this year, 21 fire and rescue services in England were participating in the scheme with

over 400 people undertaking actual apprenticeships. Another 250 people have started apprenticeships this year and it is intended to increase both the number of fire and rescue services and individual participants in the future. We want these young firefighters to benefit from the lessons that our union has learnt from almost a century of organising within the industry. We believe that union learning offers a valuable route for ensuring decent treatment of apprentices and their integration into the workforce. Support the motion. Organise young workers in every apprenticeship in the UK. (*Applause*)

Joe Lord (*National Education Union*) spoke in support of Motion 74.

He said: I teach maths to apprentices and this morning I would like to highlight two further considerations to add to what we have already heard from previous speakers.

First, there is the appropriateness of the roles within the apprenticeship entry. The Government is currently considering apprentice teachers, a very dangerous prospect. The schools will use the scheme as a way to recoup the levy they have paid as well as addressing the teacher shortage and the funding crisis by paying lower salaries. It is a triple win.

Existing teachers are overworked and too often lack adequate support so how will an apprentice teacher fare? Nursing is facing a similar concern. Apprenticeships must be of high quality, but they cannot replace the existing intense standard of professional training. The Government thinks apprenticeships are a way to address the staffing shortages in some sectors, but they are not. It takes the focus away from more deserving high-quality apprenticeships.

Secondly, there is the role of education providers in ensuring high-quality and appropriate apprenticeships. Due to the pernicious cuts in education funding, careers advice services in schools barely exist. Schools are encouraging students to follow familiar routes into further education such as sixth form rather than considering an apprenticeship. If sixth form does not work out in the first year then an apprenticeship may be suggested as a consolation option. This is absolutely wrong. Employers, unions and education providers need to work together far more closely to raise the profile of quality apprenticeships as an appropriate and equal route for students and to campaign for those high-quality apprenticeships.

A CBI study recently found that two-thirds of employers are to reconfigure existing training routes into apprenticeships, meaning less levy funding for colleges.

Apprentices must have sufficient paid time off the job to study in a college or a dedicated workplace training centre, but further education cuts are making this difficult. Taking training away from colleges has very damaging consequences. Learndirect, which was in the news this morning, has been rated inadequate by Ofsted. It has failed in its apprenticeship training yet it has received £600 million worth of public funding over the last five years and to ensure no further disruption to students, its contract will carry on until at least next summer.

We believe that further education providers should play a bigger role in the current apprenticeship programme and the Government should reverse the unacceptable cuts made to the further education sector as part of this. High-quality apprenticeships in suitable sectors, with standard recognised qualifications and ongoing careers advice

and support, will lead to a raised profile of apprenticeships. This will allow students, parents and teachers to make more informed choices of appropriate routes into work.

Please support this motion. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I am now going to put Motion 74 on Apprentices to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 74 was CARRIED*

Reaching Out to Young Workers

The President: Congress, we now move to a really important special feature, Reaching Out to Young Workers, a key area for our campaigning work. I would like to invite Craig Dawson, General Council Leader on Young Workers, to introduce this work.

Craig Dawson (GMB) introduced the special feature on Reaching Out to Young Workers.

He said: I am here today to introduce this special feature on Reaching Out to Young Workers. Two Congresses ago, we made it a priority campaign of the TUC to come up with an organising strategy. That is because this Movement is getting older. We are out of sync with the workforce. I am one of the unusual people under the age of 30 who is in a trade union. While I have had good experiences in my own trade

union, the GMB, of which I have been a member for about ten years, I am one of the exceptions to the rule.

Where unions are present and active, the work they do to recruit is essential. It is true there is great work in the private sector, but there is also great work in the public sector. That is why campaigns like the recent Bakers' Union strike, Unite's Sports Direct action and the GMB's work on Deliveroo and Hermes are so important as well as their work in the public sector. They show unions doing what they do best – organising workers facing exploitation – and they give hope to thousands of other young workers that things can change.

I have heard trade unionists say that getting young people into trade unions is just about getting trade unions talked about in schools or it is just about getting trade unions on Twitter – those things are important but we know they are not enough – as if solving the problem is that simple. Something we can get frustrated about is why young workers are not joining our Movement rather than thinking critically about whether what we offer is relevant and appealing to them.

The presentation that we are about to play is about this problem and how we work to fix it as I believe it can be fixed. Over this year, with the support of the President and a small working group of trade unions, we have run a huge research programme to find out what trade unions need to do in order to appeal to young workers. Some of it is quite surprising and it is a wake-up call. This is what we found.

(Presentation on Reaching out to Young Workers shown to Congress)

The President: Thank you, Congress. If there is any research that the TUC has done which is more important than this, I do not know what it is. I went on a Young Workers' Immersion Day organised by the TUC. I got my phone and purse taken off me and I went to three typical workplaces where there were young workers. By the end of the afternoon, after I had spent time in a factory, a call centre and a restaurant, I was completely exhausted. I knew at first hand the insecurity, the desperate nature and the exploitation faced by many young workers.

They are absolutely the future of our Movement and we have to connect with them, recruit them, organise them and let them forge better lives for themselves as many of them feel they have no prospect of that at the moment. That is why I talked about this in my President's speech. I do commend the TUC's Young Workers' Project to unions. I ask that you get involved in it so we can turn the tide regarding young members and their density in unions. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Delegates, we may have time later this morning to take additional business. That additional business is Emergency Motion 1: Royal Mail, to be moved by the CWU and seconded by Unite. If possible, if Congress is disciplined and organised, we will also take Emergency Motion 2: Birmingham refuse workers and upholding Acas agreements, to be moved by Unite and seconded by PCS. I will advise Congress nearer the time. Will the unions moving and seconding the emergency motions please be ready.

Good Services

The President: Delegates, we now turn to Section 4 of the General Council Report: Good Services. I call Composite Motion 12: New settlement for the civil service. The General Council supports the motion, which is moved by the FDA, seconded by PCS and supported by Prospect.

New settlement for the civil service

Gareth Hills (*FDA*) moved Composite Motion 12: New settlement for the civil service.

He said: Congress, just a few weeks after the General Election, along with thousands of other civil servants, FDA members attended events held across the UK with the theme of celebrating a brilliant civil service. Here is what the civil service live website had to say about that: “A brilliant civil service helps to keep the United Kingdom prosperous and secure, supporting the governments we serve in implementing their commitments and delivering high-quality services for the public. United by our strong sense of public service, we continue to live by the enduring values – integrity, honesty, impartiality and objectivity – that run through all we do. To make the vision a reality, we will deliver improved outcomes for the country from effective leaders leading skilled people in a great place to work.”

Congress, these are powerful and inspiring words and a vision the FDA (and I am sure everyone in this hall) can share. As we move through the post-Brexit landscape, Britain certainly needs a brilliant civil service more than ever. It is civil servants who have been tasked with preparing the Great Repeal Bill. It is civil servants who are at

the heart of negotiating new trade relationships. It is civil servants who are expected to transpose EU laws into British ones and to overhaul immigration, customs and agricultural policies currently handled by the EU.

Congress, as we know all too well, along with other comrades in the public sector, it is civil servants who have born the brunt of austerity with resources ravaged, close to a decade of pay restraint, cuts to pensions and a raft of other conditions. The continuation of the 1% pay cap introduced in 2012, combined with those other changes to terms and conditions, means that many civil servants have now experienced a real-terms pay cut of 20%.

It is not just the FDA saying this. A recent National Audit Office report commented on departments being asked to take on more and more work as staff numbers fall while austerity and pay restraint continue to chip away at the ability of departments to recruit and retain. Did you know that one in four senior recruitment competitions run by the Civil Service Commission in 2015/16 resulted in the post not being filled? Congress, that exacerbates excessive hours and further damages the health and wellbeing of civil servants.

FDA members recently took part in our 2017 Pay Survey. The results, published in June, found that a third of civil servants say they would like to leave the service as soon as possible. Even more concerning is the view expressed by 86% of respondents that departments are not sufficiently resourced to meet the challenges of the year ahead. Members also highlighted problems in recruiting new staff and retaining those recruited with a universal reason being dissatisfaction with pay.

In calling the General Election, the Prime Minister said, “This is a moment of enormous national significance.” Congress, it was also a moment of enormous opportunity, an opportunity for the Government to tread a different path from its predecessor, an opportunity to discard outdated spending plans drawn up in a pre-Brexit world, an opportunity to change “past its sell by date” approaches to workforce planning and pay and to introduce fresh produce with renewed shelf lives.

Right now, it feels like an opportunity lost. With nearly a third of our members considering leaving their posts as soon as possible, we urgently need a new settlement to ensure Britain has the strong and impartial civil service it needs to tackle the unprecedented challenges facing us in the years ahead. Lifting the pay cap would, of course, be a great start, but FDA also calls for more open dialogue about pay reform to give departments greater freedom to pay market rates for the skills our civil service needs. Also, of course, the civil service must be properly resourced to deliver an exit from the EU that works for all industries and all sections of society. That means we must be able to have grown-up conversations about pay without the 1% straitjacket.

Congress, FDA agrees that the public needs a brilliant civil service. The public needs a professional, talented and impartial civil service, one that is properly resourced and properly rewarded. Now that really would be brilliant. I move. (*Applause*)

Fran Heathcote (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Composite Motion 12.

She said: Congress, the PCS amendment to this motion addresses the issues of resourcing the civil service. The EU Referendum created huge economic and political uncertainty. Economically, the prospect of Brexit has led to increased instability over the last year along with increased inflation at a time when growth and wages are already struggling. It has created uncertainty for PCS members, many of whose jobs are at the heart of changes to government structures and the implementation of Brexit. The scrapping, merging and forming of government departments by new Prime Minister, Theresa May, as well as major policy changes, has affected members across the civil service.

Our amendment calls on Congress to put pressure on the Government to ensure full consultation with unions on any bodies that are established in relation to the EU Referendum decision and its consequences. Following the referendum, PCS wrote to the Head of the Civil Service, Jeremy Heywood, to say that all plans for cuts and closures should be halted in the wake of the result. We also requested information from the Cabinet Office on all functions in the civil service and its related bodies where there is interaction with the UK EU's membership and an urgent meeting at the highest level to discuss the implications. We did not receive a full response from the Government and have received no assurance on the key points.

We believe that substantial extra resources should be made available for the work required in implementing Brexit and we are also seeking assurances for members who are nationals of other EU countries. This is why our amendment calls on Congress to campaign for the Government to halt all planned staffing reductions, privatisation and

changes to the terms and conditions in the civil service and its related bodies, including planned cuts to redundancy pay.

Post-Brexit changes to UK policy such as VAT, customs and excise and land border controls will potentially create a huge need for more training and staff at a time when cuts are being made on both fronts. Negotiations on exit terms are already under way and yet the minority Tory Government has still to act to provide the civil service with the resource it needs to cope with the significant challenges that Brexit poses. As lower-paid workers have born the brunt, the proportion of senior staff has increased, leading to an increase in the official median wage not reflected in most people's pay packets as the 1% cap continues. After seven years of Tory cuts, the civil service is nowhere near fully staffed.

Congress, PCS members are on the front line, whether in the border force, the HMRC and immigration, or at the heart of developing new laws, policies and trade relationships in government departments, but that work is under-staffed and under-prepared. While the UK engages in the long, complex process of withdrawal from the EU, there will be no let-up in the demand for existing services. Our public services are struggling to cope after years of swingeing cuts and austerity and this weakened Tory Government must sit down with us to discuss the staffing and resources needed to ensure that the civil service is fully able to meet the demands placed upon it.

Congress, please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Mike Clancy (*Prospect*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 12.

He said: We are all clear that the punishment of civil servants through the pay cap, resource deductions and workload increases has to end and it has to end now. We have the statistics – we have been rehearsing them all week – which include drops in real income, survey evidence of wide recruitment difficulties and the long hours culture impacting on wellbeing. In fact, I often feel now that the civil service looks increasingly like a poorly-run private company.

We anticipate the end of the pay cap, but that is only the start. The years of constraint are not going to go away very easily. It is more than pay: it is about valuing the civil service, having a vision for its future and investing in its people. That is why Prospect has launched our vision for a contemporary and modern civil service. This addresses the size and role of the state, pay, development, employment security and, most importantly, status. It is about reinvigorating the confidence amongst civil servants that their political leadership understands their contribution and the obligations they have to them. It is about a machinery for negotiation and consultation that actually works and reflects best practice in the rest of the public sector.

I think there is a very limited time for the Cabinet Office to respond to current conditions and show it means to address our agenda. I fully suspect that we will be underwhelmed by their response. I add Prospect's voice to those who are prepared to take real action born out of enthusiasm and engagement in workplaces. We have talked for a long time and, yes, probably the time for talking is coming to an end, but we should not assume the support of civil servants and we should not assume the support of members. What we have to ensure is that we have members emotionally and numerically engaged in our campaign. I know, as a negotiator, that the employer

pays attention when they know we have the numbers. These threshold and ballot laws are unreasonable and they are an offence to democracy, but they are the thresholds we have to meet. If we meet them, they will listen to us.

Prospect's focus is not only asking for a renewed vigour and improvement in the lot of civil servants is to be clear that we may have to galvanise our members to take real action. There is a place for campaigning, there is a place for marching along the Embankment, but there is a place for delivering in the workplace by invigorated representatives leading our members in the emotional and numerical belief that we can actually make the Government change course and not just ask them to change course. Congress, please support the composite. (*Applause*)

The President: I will now put Composite Motion 12: New settlement for the civil service, to the vote. The General Council supports the motion. All those in favour, please show? All those against, please show? The motion is carried unanimously.

* *Composite Motion 12 was CARRIED*

Probation inspection and professional standards

The President: Delegates, we stay with Section 4 of the General Council Report: Good Services, Probation. I call Motion 68: Probation inspection and professional standards. The General Council supports the motion. It is moved by NAPO and seconded by UCU.

Yvonne Pattison (*NAPO*) moved Motion 68.

She said: It may be a little unusual, but I would like to start by saying something positive. On behalf of our membership, I would like to pay tribute to the Probation Inspector, Dame Glenys Stacey, who has continued to give an accurate but damning view of the services she has inspected whilst laying no blame on the staff, who are simply doing their best in a difficult set of circumstances. Her latest report highlights systemic failures in the managing of risk of harm, applying measures to help offenders move away from crime and the inadequate delivery of court sentences. She goes on to say that despite the heroic efforts of staff, the service provided by the Aurelius Working Links Enterprise in the South-West and Wales was nowhere near the expected standard.

This paints a pretty dire picture, but it is not dissimilar to previous inspections with an earlier London-based report being one of the worst we have seen. Congress, let us face it: I am sure Theresa May and her Government really do not like hearing that their big probation revolution is a complete failure, held up only by the staff's dedication, commitment and professionalism. Yes, these are the same staff that were responsible for the former publicly-owned, gold standard service that was decimated under the watch of the Secretary of State for Justice, Chris Grayling, and whilst Theresa May herself was the Home Secretary. Our members have been treated appallingly and I would like to put on record what a credit they are to the profession, working tirelessly in their resolve to reduce re-offending and thus protect each and every one of us from the risk of harm and victimisation. Yes, Mrs. May, that includes the whole of your Cabinet too.

For those of you who may not know, the probation service was part-privatised in 2014 with low and medium-risk cases going to the private sector and the public sector retaining the high risk of harm. I do feel a bit like a broken record as I get up and say this every year, but I am not going to apologise because I am going to say it over and over again until somebody somewhere listens to us. Would it surprise Congress to know that in many of the privately-owned companies, there is little evidence of offence-focused work, with examples of some of the lower risk cases being serviced by telephone contact (if at all) and numerous failures to engage not being properly enforced and returned to court.

The probation service has always been a service based on professional standards with the required level of training, qualifications and expertise necessary to engage with this difficult group, many of whom have deeply-entrenched patterns of behaviour and who also have justifications for doing what they do. Since the inception of the transforming rehabilitation revolution, we have haemorrhaged numerous staff down to early retirement, long-term sick, mass redundancies or alternative careers and those that have been replaced have been replaced by younger, less-qualified, less-experienced staff. I am not knocking them as there is a place for those staff in our organisation, but they do need to be placed in established teams, properly supported, and not just left to their own devices with little or no help.

Workloads across both sectors are critically high, leaving no time for reflection. To be fair, as professionals, we do not always get it right first time and, despite some employers' views, one size does not fit all. Our client groups are individuals with complex needs, who need to be properly assessed, resulting in an individual and

tailored approach to their rehabilitative journey. Sadly, there is little time for this in our profession these days and I feel we are on a fast and slippery slope, which is becoming increasingly difficult to turn around.

I would like to mention the judiciary briefly. The case is clear. They have lost all confidence in the probation service. They need to know that when they pass a sentence, that is what is going to be delivered and that X, Y and Z does not become A, B and C or even D and E. This has resulted in many people going into custody who could otherwise have been managed successfully in the community.

It makes me really angry that it appears that the offending population are viewed as second-class citizens and do not matter. Where is it written that they should not be treated properly, with respect, by professionals who can do their best for them? The introduction of a licence to practise, similar to other parallel professions, will ensure that continued professional development for staff will benefit them, our service users and the public we are there to protect. Congress, I move. *(Applause)*

Rob Goodfellow *(University and College Union)* seconded Motion 68.

He said: So why is UCU, an education union, seconding this motion? Well, a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, especially when it comes to inside of a prison.

Prison educators are our members. Whatever happens in prison has an effect on those educators. They are professionals who understand what they do and why they do it.

Do we really want the probation service members to be any different? Many of them are not called probation officers any more. Guess what, they are called case workers, 70% of which are now in the private sector.

What does that tell you about where things are going? Education and professional standards are critical to maintain safety in that sector. This is, of course, all about saving money, but ironically it is much more expensive to have re-offending rather than rehabilitation. Probation or education on the cheap is a false saving and it is dangerous. Even Gove said that education in prison is important. Who are we to argue with him?

Prisoners who do not take part in education are three times more likely to be reconvicted than those who do. 46% of people entering prison have literacy skills no higher than those expected of an 11 year-old. Deprofessionalising probation officers is not just wrong; it is expensive. Please support. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I am now going to put Motion 68: Probation inspection and professional standards, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? Thank you. That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 68 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, as I indicated earlier, I may be in a position today to take Emergency Motion 1 and Emergency Motion 2 after today's scheduled business. I intend to try to take Emergency Motion 1: Royal Mail, moved by CWU and seconded by Unite, after Motion 70 if time allows. I will take Emergency Motion 2: Birmingham refuse collectors and upholding Acas agreements, moved by Unite and seconded by PCS. Will both those unions please be ready.

Probation crisis

The President: I now call paragraph 4.6 and Motion 69: Probation crisis. The General Council supports the motion, moved by NAPO and seconded by UNISON.

Ian Lawrence (*NAPO*) moved Motion 69.

He said: I move Motion 69 on behalf of NAPO and welcome UNISON's amendments.

Congress, the probation service is broken and, as Yvonne has said, we know why. We also know what is not working with the collapse of through-the-gate services for short-term offenders, the flagship of Grayling's ill-considered reforms. They are now identified by probation inspectors as a spectacular failure which could be wound up tomorrow with nobody noticing – through the gate to nowhere. There is inadequate (bordering on non-existent) supervision of clients, especially domestic violence perpetrators, with huge cuts in the provision of support programmes. There is evidential linkage to a staggering 26% rise in serious further offences across England and Wales, including a number of murders, with more recent cases currently under investigation. Yes, Congress, this is what a so-called safe system looks like.

Let us not forget the impact on victims of such awful crimes where support for brave families is often just not up to the required standard. There are massive and unmanageable caseloads faced by our members across both arms of the service because (let us not kid ourselves) the state-run NPS is not problem-free. There are

staff shortages, a litany of administrative problems over pay and pensions, and, as you will hear more about shortly from UNISON, the outsourcing of night supervision in approved premises.

The privateers have not brought much by way of innovation, but they have given us job cuts averaging 40% across the sector and shambolic community payback in some areas where sessions do not happen because too many clients turn up or not enough. As we heard earlier this year from the Working Links empire, this is because the vans used to transport clients and supervisors to their assignments had not actually been insured for several weeks. This is Working Links, the subject of that damning report from inspectors last week. This is the Working Links who, by the way, boast about their successful education contracts in places such as Saudi Arabia, but cannot run a wheel stall in England and Wales. Even a colony of rats, which occupied one of their decaying buildings last year, left pretty sharply when they realised who actually owned it – a kind of rodents’ revolt against privatisation!

So to all failing providers, I say this. Our members care about their profession and stand ready to help you mend the chaos you have created, but if you will not engage and you will not listen, if you cannot show your staff the respect and dignity they deserve then, for goodness sake, just go. Do everyone and yourselves a huge favour: hand in the keys and go. Let us have probation returned to professionals who know what they are doing. *(Applause)*

Congress, you know the history of how it has come to this, but insult has been added to injury as we learn that failing providers have had more – yes, more – taxpayers’

cash thrown at them with a recent £22 million bailout, including a waiver of service penalties, known as “a reconfiguration of the contracts”. Worst still, news has come that a further £277 million reconfiguration has been signed off by ministers over the remaining four-year life of the contracts, supposedly to provide reassurance to the market. I will tell you what it is; it is a bung from the magic money tree! It is a huge promissory note in reward for abject failure. This disgraceful privatisation must be called in for Parliamentary and public scrutiny.

Congress, the probation service – an institute of over 100 years in the making – is broken and we ask who will fix it? We are not Chris Grayling, the architect of this disaster, aided and abetted by spineless advisers and a gutless Lib Dem partner in that dreadful coalition. You remember that, don’t you! What we need is a Labour Government, pledged to restoring the service back to where it belongs, which is full public ownership and control. (*Applause*) While Government ministers prevaricate and fail to publish their own review into this mess, what is desperately needed at this juncture is local accountability so that we know how much these contracts are worth, what the kickback is for shareholders and the truth about commercial transactions, which are funded by the taxpayer but conducted in secret.

NAPO’s plan is to try and resolve these fundamental anomalies by pressing for city mayors, the London Mayor and police and crime commissioners to be given oversight of these contracts in order to bring back some much needed transparency. We seek support from Frances and the General Council to engage with these people to help us ramp up the pressure on failing privateers and to supplement the Parliamentary campaign that NAPO and UNISON have been running, which is gaining increasing

political traction. Finally, to every union representative here today, we need your help in publicising what is happening in probation amongst your members. Your members form part of our communities, whose public safety is being jeopardised. The safety of your families and children is being put at risk because of the quest for profit and the failure of this inept Government to take appropriate action. Congress, I move.

(Applause)

Mark Trask (*UNISON*) seconded Motion 69.

He said: UNISON welcomes this motion from NAPO, our sister union in the service. Probation is an essential service which helps reform the lives of those who have broken the law and protects the victims in our communities. Together, UNISON and NAPO have been campaigning against the disastrous privatisation of probation since the Conservative Justice Secretary, Chris Grayling, initiated it in 2014. He split the service down the middle and sold off half of it to the unscrupulous private sector, Private companies now own the 21 community rehabilitation companies, which are contracted to provide probation across England and Wales, and now they simply are not providing probation.

This is not the fault of the staff, who are working heroically to maintain services against all the odds. It is clearly the fault of the Ministry of Justice and their bodged privatisation and the fault of profiteering private companies. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation is independent of the Government and, over the last 12 months, it has published a damning series of reports into the failings of the probation companies. The independent evidence is clear: probation is broken. UNISON, NAPO and others have given evidence to the Parliamentary Justice Committee about

the service failings and we hope that the Justice Committee will follow through and announce a full Parliamentary inquiry into the disaster that has unfolded in probation because otherwise the Ministry of Justice will just carry on because it cannot, and will not, acknowledge that Chris Grayling's "back of a fag packet" reforms have failed.

Instead of holding private companies to account for their failings, at the end of July, the new Justice Secretary gave them a massive bailout of more taxpayers' money because they were complaining that they were not making enough money out of the contracts. This shows that the Ministry of Justice is not fit to manage the contracts of the 21 probation companies. It has centralised control of what used to be a local, democratically-accountable service and has tried to run a command-and-control regime like it does with the prison service. You can see how a similar approach has worked in prisons with a rise in violence, drugs and gangs, making our prisons less safe and less effective at rehabilitating prisoners.

Congress, the amendment to this motion simply asks that the private probation companies which continue to fail should have their contracts terminated and the service brought back under public ownership and control. The amendment also asks for Congress to support our call for the latest reckless probation privatisation experiment to be called off, namely, the proposal to outsource supervision of the National Probation Service's 110 probation hostels. These hostels are based in our communities and house some of the most dangerous service users when they leave prison. It beggars belief that the Ministry of Justice would try to follow its disastrous privatisation programme by privatising yet more of the service, but that is exactly what is proposed. Please support the motion and the amendment. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I am now going to put Motion 69: Probation crisis, to the vote. Those in favour, please show? Those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 69 was CARRIED*

Social security

The President: I now call Motion 70: Social security. The General Council supports the motion. It is moved by CPS, seconded by Equity and supported by EIS.

Janice Godrich (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) moved Motion 70.

She said: Congress, PCS is pleased to move this motion. As well as being the union which represents workers in the DWP, we have been privileged to work alongside other unions and organisations in defence of social security. We have been working, for example, with colleagues from Unite, Community, DPAC (Disabled People Against Cuts) and the Unemployed Workers Combine, exposing the impact of sanctions and against Job Centre closures.

However, it is clear that there is an urgent need for a debate in the Labour Movement around social security that focuses on developing an alternative vision to the decimated, punitive and piecemeal system that survives after decades of political attacks and Government cuts. We do represent experts in the field and, as such, are well-placed to start a discussion on social security that goes beyond our recent work

on exposing individual Government policies and looks to develop a real alternative. We have campaigned for an end to sanctions and extra conditionality, an increase in benefit levels to restore dignity to those on out-of-work benefits, and more universalism within the social security system. We have campaigned against Job Centre closures, which provide a lifeline for unemployed people. The closures are forcing them to travel further, which undermines the support to get people back into work. The Government consultation was a sham and the DWP has failed to publish the equality analysis it carries out for each site closure.

The number of sanctions imposed on people claiming Job Seekers' Allowance or UC rose to 33,000 in December. In the six months to March, the most recent month for data available, the number of sanctions had risen by 50%. They rocketed under the Coalition and peaked at about 90,000 in October 2013. Sanctions are frequently imposed on people for trivial reasons such as being late for routine Job Centre meetings and are a key driver of food bank usage.

Universal credit, the Government's flagship policy, has been a disaster. It was led by the Tory's political choice to cut public spending and to vilify people who rely on social security for support. We are clear that the roll-out should be suspended and cuts to DWP staff and resources reversed to give the Department the means to develop a system that offers genuine help.

Congress, the concept of a universal basic income to replace social security is increasingly being advocated as a method of ensuring that the economic benefits of a rich country are distributed to all in society. It has been referred to as a citizen's

income, a social wage or a basic income guarantee. It is a regular universal payment to everyone as an individual right, without a means test or the obligation to work or perform other services in return, and high enough to ensure an existence in dignity and participation in society. The structure and design varies a great deal. We have seen versions providing what amounts to the equivalent of the current state pension and others the equivalent of a full-time living wage. In its most radical and complete form, it represents a net transfer of wealth and reduces inequality and there are a range of options and different approaches.

The current debate, though, has tended to overlook key issues such as the dignity of work and, in particular, the role of trade unions. It is vital the Movement is part of this growing debate. It is important to recognise that it can be used to turn against the most vulnerable in society. The version of UBI trialled in Finland demonstrates how the concept can be manipulated by the right to undermine social security as well as how it can be misapplied so there is a need for us to lead that debate and come to our conclusion on it.

Congress, let us have clarity on this issue and what is at stake. For decades now, we all know that we have seen a systematic ideological, legislative and political attack on the welfare state. The twin powers of our society are the NHS and the social security system and it is no accident that the assault on the NHS is being ramped up. This is, in part, because the Tories believe that their assault on the social security system has been, from their point of view, a real success. They thought they could get away with it. It is an issue for our whole Movement. If universal credit is ever implemented, between five to seven million people in work will be eligible so the strategy is not just

about trashing the social system, but the utilisation of low pay. It is therefore no longer enough to say that we must defend this social security system. We have to defend the very concept of social security, a basic human right, as a citizen, to live a life free of poverty, want and hunger, with access to real jobs and decent pay.

Congress, I move. (*Applause*)

David John (*Equity*) seconded Motion 70.

He said: I am seconding the motion and speaking in support of our amendment. The universal credit was introduced in 2010 by the Coalition Government. One of the architects of it, David Freud, stated in September 2012, “We are going to make sure there is parity between the self-employed and employed.” However, despite extensive lobbying, universal credit, in its current form, clearly does prejudice the self-employed and we are a very long way from parity. Much of this is because of the effect of the minimum income floor or MIF. Under the MIF, claimants who are deemed to be gainfully self-employed are treated as having a notional income whether or not they are actually earning it. At the current rate, this amounts to £12,575 per year. This is assumed irrespective of what you are actually earning.

This penalises workers like those in the entertainment industry who have variable incomes from month to month and sometimes from week to week. Here is an example. Jenny lives on her own and she rents a one-bedroom flat for £670.00 per month in outer London. She is professionally trained. She has been working as an actress for the last 15 years. Last year, she earned £30,000, which was a great year, but this year, her earnings are much lower. This month, she does not expect to earn anything. DWP says that she is gainfully self-employed so they apply the minimum

income floor. This means her award is £257.00 for this month. If she were an employee, there would be no MIF and her universal credit award would be £917.00 because it would be based on her actual income. So the difference in this award is a staggering £659.92.

The Government expects to save £1.5 billion by applying the MIF. Much of this will be because self-employed workers will have their benefits artificially reduced. The Work and Pensions Committee, in May this year, stated, “The incoming Government should commission an independent review of the MIF with a view to improving its sensitivity to the realities of self-employment. Until this is complete, the MIF should not apply to self-employed universal credit claimants.”

Congress, the MIF is causing the self-employed real harm in this country. This independent review should happen soon and we need to call for the MIF to be abolished. It is harming our workforce and is increasing in-work poverty levels. Please support the motion and the amendment. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Nicola Fisher (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) spoke in support of Motion 70.

She said: In supporting this motion today, I would like to focus on one particular cut, that being the child cap and its vicious companion, the so-called rape clause, which will form part of the child element of universal credit.

I would like to ask you to think of child 3, the child that is going to be affected by this. We all know, or have known, or perhaps have been a child 3 – a child full of joy, hope and promise, full of wonder and dreams, but now the child that the Tory

Government considers is less worthy and less deserving. Imagine for a moment being that child, the child who is a greater burden on the family, a child whose accident of birth will mean that its family may be worse off by £60.00 a week. In our family, when we were growing up in the 1980s, we had a child 3, a child 4 and a child 5 so we would really have been on the naughty step! I still see the impact of growing up in poverty on my siblings. We have two child 3s in our family, one who is saved from this by being a twin but one who is not. He is the youngest child of one of my sisters. He is a wee fellow with a loving heart and a lively mind, who is as sharp as a tack, but who is considered less deserving by accident of birth.

The DWP describes this and describes the rape clause as the most effective and most compassionate way of taking this benefit forward and it would be laughable if it were not so despicable. I would like to talk about the rape clause for a moment. In a so-called civilised society, how have we come to this? How can we be asking women to prove they have been raped in order to be able to feed their children? The fact that this has been signed off by a third party organisation, say the Tories, means, “It is okay, nothing to see, don’t worry about it, move on.”

Part of that form asks women to aver that they are no longer living with the biological parent of their child. This ignores the realities of domestic abuse. It ignores the fact that rape occurs within as well as outwith relationships. The idea that, having been raped, you should then go along and ask a third party to fill out that form for you is, quite frankly, horrifying. In Scotland, the leader of the Tory Party, Ruth Davidson – we are suffering with her just now but we believe she has ambitions to appear in a Prime Ministerial office near you – is a real charmer. She said that all women have to

do is tick a box. So that is okay; let us not worry about it. What about Northern Ireland where failure to disclose a crime may mean a prison term? What of the women living there?

All these cuts feed into the Victorian idea of the deserving and undeserving poor and the rape clause and the child cap are certainly an attempt at social engineering. It says that only those with money are allowed to have free choice over the size of their families and it talks about entitlement and not aid. So, for child 3, for child 3's mother and for everyone affected by these cuts, please support. (*Applause*)

The President: Congress, I am now going to put Motion 70: Social Security, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? The motion is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 70 was CARRIED*

Royal Mail

The President: Congress, as I mentioned earlier, we are now in a position to take emergency motions. I call Emergency Motion 1: Royal Mail. The General Council supports the emergency motion, moved by the CWU and seconded by Unite.

Terry Pullinger (*Communication Workers Union*) moved Emergency Motion 1. He said: I am extremely proud to move this motion on behalf of postal workers across this country and, of course, the public that we serve.

Dave Prentis said yesterday that our time has come again and I absolutely agree with him but, Congress, we need to grasp that time. Action inspires. There are more and more workers in this country who are starting to take industrial action to defend themselves. It is important that every one of us, all our trade unions, with respect to the leadership of the TUC, support all of these actions as publicly as we possibly can. There should be solidarity with our colleagues in the RMT; solidarity with the Birmingham refuse workers; solidarity with anyone taking action; and especially solidarity with those incredibly brave young workers in McDonald's in making their stand against that organisation. *(Applause)*

You are about to be joined by 110,000 postal workers who are now being balloted in this country to take industrial action in defence of their jobs and this much-loved public service. This dispute is about honour. Our members have it in abundance, but the Royal Mail has none. The leadership of the Royal Mail – the same leadership that was there when it was privatised – made the case for privatisation and we opposed it. You supported us in that. The people of this country did not want the Royal Mail privatised and yet they sold it off cheaply to move it on quickly on the promise that privatisation would bring this Utopia to the organisation, to the service and to our members. They said it had been starved of investment in the public sector and now it would not be a political football any more as there would be new money to invest in new products and services to protect it. It would ensure that our members' standard of living, job security and retirement security would be protected.

Well, here we are, just over three years on. They have had all the hanging fruit in the business. They have been selling off our buildings and flogging the assets. Now they are turning their sights to maintaining their profits to feed the shareholders, who have had increased returns year on year. Nearly £1 billion has gone to shareholders since Royal Mail was flogged off. In order to keep up that momentum, they are now turning their sights onto our members and onto this great public service. They are attacking our terms and conditions and they are attacking our security at work.

Every one of us has been debating all week that one of the most important things for workers is to have job security, standard of living security and retirement security. It is what we have got to fight for and it is what we will be fighting for in Royal Mail. They have also shown their hand as they want to bring in a two-tier workforce in Royal Mail. They want the next generation to be paid less with worse terms and conditions and more insecure employment models. Our union has made a decision: we will not pull up the ladder on the next generation. *(Applause)*

Generations of postal workers fought for the conditions we have enjoyed.

Generations of trade unionists fought for the conditions and the security that our members have enjoyed. No employer gave us those things: unions fought for them.

We have now got to do our bit to fight for the next generation. As I say, that is a key part of our dispute.

Our members deserve security at work. They serve this country well and have done for hundreds of years. They deserve a decent standard of living and a pay rise, which is currently not being offered. They deserve security and dignity in retirement.

Yesterday, Frances, you said that we have got to start reinventing things. We need to start rethinking and reinventing pensions because the only pension that gives you dignity in retirement is a wage in retirement. It is not cash out at the point of retirement and not lump sums that get spent. (*Applause*) We have seen the evidence that that theory is failing people and they will have poverty in retirement.

There is legislation sitting there which has already been cleared and is waiting to be pushed through. The TUC can help us push that legislation through. Let us come up with new pension models. We are fighting for that as part of this dispute so that we can give people dignity in retirement.

Let me say this to you. I know our members. They have got far too much dignity, self-respect and pride not to stand up for themselves. They will fight for themselves and to protect this public service. We want your support. We are asking them to pick sides: "Pick your union or forever accept less." We are asking you to pick sides as well. Support us. We will be asking the public to support us. Go on our social media. Show the postal workers that you are 100% behind them and I promise you we will ensure that there is still a public service worthy of re-nationalisation when Labour comes into government. I move. (*Applause*)

Kevin Terry (*Unite*) seconded the motion.

He said: We are offering solidarity to our CWU colleagues across the Royal Mail Group and our support on the ground. We are continuing our intention to do all we can with our own members to join you in taking industrial action. Royal Mail has

repeatedly attacked its workforce's pay, terms, conditions and future pensions as a continuing race to the bottom since privatisation.

Unite members share the concerns of the CWU members, not just on the theft of pensions, but on the need for a secure future for the Royal Mail Group, including its return to public ownership and control as the people's Post Office. That future cannot be built on the weak foundations of privatisation, deregulation and ever more insecure contracts and employment models. I see the impact of policies in action. I work as a driver (previously for one agency and now another) contracted to the Royal Mail.

Congress, we have all fought the fight against privatisation and will continue to support the campaign to defend our members' pensions, our Royal Mail and our Post Office, returning it to public ownership under a Labour government already proudly committed to doing so. Congress, please support this motion. *(Applause)*

The President: Congress, I call Emergency Motion 1: Royal Mail. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? Congress, that emergency motion is carried unanimously. *(Applause)*

* *Emergency Motion 1 was CARRIED*

Birmingham refuse collectors and upholding Acas agreements

The President: I now call Emergency Motion 2: Birmingham refuse collectors and upholding Acas agreements. It is moved by Unite and seconded by PCS.

Howard Beckett (*Unite*) moved Emergency Motion 2 to protect the sanctity of Acas deals.

He said: Congress, we have a Labour council in Birmingham, a Labour council keen to do the job of the Tories. Birmingham City Council has a history of mismanagement – sins of the Tories – but the present day sins are those of a Labour council.

There are three people on a bin wagon. One is a driver (Grade 4) and two are loaders (one a Grade 2 and one a Grade 3). The Grade 3 has safety-critical responsibilities are the back of the bin wagon; the eyes and ears of the driver. This Labour council has passed proposals that will see the Grade 3 loader go to a Grade 2, safety removed recklessly to the responsibility of the driver, and will see our members go from £19,000 a year to £15,000. Members who have been subject to a public sector pay cap for seven years are now being asked to lose up to £5,000 to justify austerity brought in by a Labour council.

This matter, Congress, was resolved at Acas on 15th August when it was agreed that safety would remain with the loader and consequently they would not lose money.

However, on 31st August, Labour reneged on that deal and issued 113 members with redundancy notices for 1st October. This austerity is being driven by Stella Manzie, a chief executive appointed cross-party and, make no doubt about it, a Tory. She is a chief executive who earns £180,000 a year and who, in one year, took home £160,000 in claimed expenses on top of her salary. She is a chief executive who goes home at night and takes satisfaction in telling stories of working people losing £5,000 a year.

Be in no doubt, Congress, these cuts are the thin edge of the wedge. It is intended to bring in cuts across Birmingham City Council and our members deserve better.

For those of you who were at the National Shop Stewards Network, you will have heard our convenor, Richard, tell stories of members crushed at the back of bin wagons; of a member who waited four years to be upgraded to a Grade 3 only to receive this redundancy notice two weeks later; and of a member who has already put his house up for sale, knowing he cannot afford his mortgage. However, Congress, Richard has his own story. He is a man who, four years ago, held his wife in his arms as she died of a massive heart attack. His daughter was nine years' old. She is now 13 and stands on the picket line with Richard and his comrades. (*Applause*) Richard is Labour to his very core. He is standing strong, protecting members who simply cannot afford to lose the wages the council ask of them.

His core is not shared by those Labour councillors. They are councillors who talk of hard decisions in language that has no place in a socialist party. Those councillors should feel physically sick at the proposal to remove thousands of pounds from our members. Let us be honest, a Labour council which does not stand up for its members has no place in our Movement. (*Applause*) If they sound Tory, if they talk Tory, if they act Tory, then let us call them Tories. (*Cheers and applause*) I say clearly to those councillors that if they continue to act as Tories in this region then Unite will treat you as if you are Tories.

Congress, my union is in court this week to make the council enforce the Acas deal. My members are being balloted as we speak to continue industrial action. I have no

doubt that that ballot will be overwhelmingly in favour of continuing industrial action because my members have something in themselves. I have seen them and stood with them on the picket line. It is something that the likes of Stella Manzie can never understand. They are part of our Movement. They take confidence from our successes of the past and they know that this success will give confidence to disputes of the future.

I will finish by saying to those councillors who will vote on whether to implement the Acas deal, “The resignation of John Clancy is not enough. You are a collective. Remember what it was that brought you to Labour. Find inside yourselves what my reps have. Be proud of wanting to give a legacy that says you stand on the side of workers. Reject the ideology of austerity. Reject the likes of Stella Manzie. Uphold the Acas deal.” Congress, I move. *(Cheers and applause)*

Mark Serwotka *(Public and Commercial Services Union)* seconded Emergency Motion 2.

He said: On behalf of PCS, I proudly second the emergency motion to support our refuse workers, members of Unite, who are striking in Birmingham.

Congress, this resolution and the fantastic speech that Howard has just made tells us the real story of austerity. We should not forget that the workers now being subjected to further pay and job cuts already suffered job cuts in 2011 made by the council. All of those workers have had pay restraint because of the public sector pay cap going back to 2010. What we now see, in a further frenzy of austerity affecting workers and

the public they serve, is a further 120 jobs at risk and pay cuts for workers of up to £5,000, many of whom have worked for decades in dedicated public service.

Let us call something out, Congress. When people tell us they are making pay cuts because of equal pay, we should tell them that stinks. We did not fight for equal pay in this Movement for it to mean the levelling down of pay levels. Equal pay should mean the levelling up pay levels. Nobody should take pay cuts in the guise of equal pay. *(Applause)* As it is a council which has issued the redundancy notices which have threatened this workforce and now threatens their income, the stand being taken by these workers is brave and principled. The strikes in McDonald's and St Barts and the PCS members on strike for weeks to keep a Job Centre open indicate that our members have had enough of the injustice of austerity.

So, we should carry this resolution. We should tell the council their actions are unacceptable. We should tell them that John McDonnell, the Shadow Chancellor, supported the bin workers at the rally on Sunday so they should listen to their leadership and not force their cuts onto working people. *(Applause)* We should say that our Movement will stand up for workers and against cuts, whoever makes those cuts, because they cannot be justified.

While we are at it, Congress, let me also say this. When you go to Acas and reach a deal, it is right for that deal to be honoured. However, let us also remember that PCS members work at Acas and they have seen massive cuts imposed on them by the closing of an office in Bootle, the downgrading of work, making workers redundant and reducing 11 helplines down to four. It is hard working in Acas. For those

listening, we should support the bin workers, stop cutting jobs in Acas and put resources in to help our members with industrial relations disputes around this country. Congress, we should be proud to support the resolution from Unite. We should send a clear message on Sunday, when there is a demonstration, by mobilising all our union members in Birmingham and the wider area to go and support the refuse workers. *(Applause)*

I will finish with this. There is a lot of talk about public services and who deserves and who does not deserve. We are going to get an announcement at lunchtime that they may breach the pay cap for prison workers and police officers. We said yesterday that there should be a pay rise for all. Bin workers resemble those public sector workers that everyone takes for granted, but they notice when they are not there and our streets are not clean. They do a vital job. We should respect and honour them. We should support this motion, support the demonstration and call on the council to do the right thing. Victory to the bin workers! I second the resolution. *(Cheers and applause)*

The President: Congress, I put Emergency Motion 2: Birmingham refuse collectors and upholding Acas agreements, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That motion is carried unanimously.

* *Emergency Motion 2 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, that concludes this morning's business. Can I remind delegates that there are various meetings taking place this lunch time. Details of these

meetings can be found on pages 13-16 of the Congress Guide. I would also like to remind delegates to complete and return the equality monitoring survey that was sent to delegates by email before Congress. You still have time to return the survey and also the opportunity to enter the data on a tablet at the TUC information stand situated in the exhibition area.

Congress, the hall is now closed until 1.30 a.m. Please make sure you take everything you need when you leave. You will not be able to access the hall before 1.30, but please be back promptly for this afternoon's session. I declare this hall and Congress closed.

Congress adjourned for lunch

TUESDAY AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS

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

The President: I call Congress to order. Thank you, delegates. While the fringe activities are advertised in the Congress Guide, I would like to remind you that the launch of the Disable People's Summing fringe meeting takes place this evening in room 8 of the Brighton Centre.

Congress, the General Council has asked me to share their appreciation that the bucket collection yesterday in support of victims of the Grenfell Tower fire raised an amazing £637.81p. *(Applause)*

Congress, as reported yesterday, agreement has now been reached on Composite Motion 14: Health and social care, transformation, integration and cuts, comprising motions 57 and 58, to be moved by UNISON and seconded by the SCP. I intend to take the complete composition motion after the scheduled business this afternoon.

Video and presentation of Congress awards

The President: Congress, it is now time to celebrate the work and achievements of those who bring the benefits of trade unionism to tens of thousands of workers every day – our workplace union representatives. Every single day of the year they advise, guide and represent members. Quite simply, they make life inside and beyond the workplace better for working people. They are the grassroots heroes of our movement. First, we are going to watch a short video that celebrates their work before the General Secretary presents the winners with their awards. *(Video shown)*

Congress, I am sure you will all agree that it is always inspiring to see our lay reps in action. The General Secretary will now present the winners with their awards.

So this year's Safety Rep Award goes to Anthony Lampey of Usdaw. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

The winner of this year's Organising Award is GMB member, Steven Garelick. *(Presentation made amidst applause)*

The winner of this year's Learning Award is Daphne Robbins of Unite. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

The winner of this year's Young Members' Award is PCS activist Stephen Warrick. (*Presentation made amidst applause*)

The final award is the Women's Gold Badge, and this year's recipient is Jean Rodgers from Equity. (*Presentation made amidst applause*) Congress, can we give all the winners a huge round of applause. (*Applause*) Thank you.

The President: I call paragraph 6.7. Delegates, we return this afternoon to section 1 of the General Council Report, the Economy, the section on Industrial Policy from page 18. I call paragraphs 1.2, 1.3, 1.7, 1.8 and Composite Motion No. 1: A strong economy that works for all. The General Council support the composite motion, to be moved by Unite, seconded by ASLEF, supported by Community and PCS and CWU have indicated that they would like to speak and I will accept those speakers.

A strong economy that works for all

Steve Turner (*Unite*) moved Composite Motion 1. He said: Congress, the economic challenges we face are political challenges, in reality, and this debate is really about political ideas, choices and, of course, priorities. For the Tories, state intervention in the market is an abandoned social concept from a past era, never, of course, to return. As far as industrial strategy is concerned, they wouldn't recognise one if it came up

and punched them in the face, while their obsession with ideological economic models based on failed austerity remains the order of the day.

For Labour, what a difference an election makes. Both the two elections which confirmed Jeremy Corbyn as the leader of our party and, of course, the recent general election. We saw Jeremy, John MacDonnell and the team present a radical, popular, anti-austerity manifesto that laid out a vision of hope and opportunity, supported by a new economic model. It was an interventionist programme to support UK business and punch-start investment, coupled with an industrial strategy to transform our economy.

Colleagues, we can be proud of our role in that development, both inside our party, of course, but also in keeping alive the arguments for a real alternative to austerity inside our workplaces and our communities through fantastic organisations like the People's Assembly, developing thoughts and a narrative on an alternative economy, one based on intervention, on investment and growth, growth that creates decent work for all, that ensures the fair distribution of that work and the wealth created by the many but currently hoarded by the few, growth that rebuilds our manufacturing base and invests in people, in skills, our public services, our infrastructure, housing, research and development, growth that makes the most from the opportunities provided by technologies and shares the benefits of that technological advance, growth that reduces working time, eases us into earlier retirement, brings the greener, sustainable economy that we all strive for and, of course, deals with the looming loss of millions of today's jobs to automation and artificial intelligence.

For too long governments have failed to deal with our deep structural problems of short-termism and a serious and long-term failure to invest, both by a state and, of course, at a corporate level, and coupled with a relentless drive to deregulate, to liberalise and, of course, to privatise UK Plc. It has led to a stagnating economy and wages, an obscene growth in inequality and growing levels of personal debt. It is a model that has allowed powerful economic forces to sweep aside all else, no matter the human cost. Of course, austerity has served only to accelerate those trends. Austerity is a weapon and it is a weapon that is being used to shrink the state, to dismantle our social fabric and the gains of our collective movement.

Congress, in Britain today one in eight workers are skipping meals to make ends meet. Almost half are worried about meeting basic household costs. In the real world, wages, on average, continue to be worth £2,000 less than they did before the 2008 financial crash. Such is the spread of low pay that the majority of people living in poverty are actually in work. Within the next five years, of course, unsecured debt per household is set to hit record levels at over £15,000. Congress, when we hear about the obscenities of nurses and other workers having to use food banks to get buy, we know that something desperately needs to change. Of course, we can win that industrially, but the general election showed that there has never been more support for a positive political alternative that puts people first. So it is our job to maintain and harness the energy from Labour's election campaign. It is our job to build a strong, powerful trade union movement to replace fear and despair with hope and opportunity, to defeat austerity industrially and, of course, politically, to win a Labour government that will transform the economy for the many, not the few.

Congress, it is time for a better Britain for working people and a new economy that plans, intervenes and succeeds. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Gary McKenney (*ASLEF, Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*)

seconded Composite Motion 1. He said: Congress, I am proud to be seconding Composite 1. Political parties across the spectrum talk about the importance of infrastructure investment, but we have yet to see anywhere near enough investment under previous Tory governments and the last Tory-led Coalition, nor do we hold our breath with this Tory minority Government.

We are told of the need to have a flexible workforce, which is nearly always at the cost of the worker in order to make the economy competitive in our globalised world, yet the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index ranks Britain 24th in the world of perceived quality of infrastructure. On transport infrastructure it is ranked 13th and on our railways, 18th. Britain is the fifth-biggest economy in the world. Therefore, creating infrastructure to match our status could dramatically bolster the economy. Borrowing to invest makes economic sense and it is supported from groups as diverse as trade unions, the CBI and the OECD.

The OECD points out that governments in many countries are currently able to borrow for long periods at very low interest rates, and therefore has urged them to increase spending on public investment projects. This will, in turn, more than pay for themselves. The report explains that 0.5% of GDP in investment in infrastructure, which amounts to about £9 billion could boost GDP by almost 0.6% and knock 0.2% off the nation's debt share of GDP. This means that a scheme such as this effectively

pays for itself. Yet, in July, the Tories reneged on their promise to electrify the Great Western Mainline from Cardiff to Swansea, the Midland Mainline and tracks in the Lake District. This was despite many assurances over the years that the work was going to happen. Electrified rail is faster, greener, more efficient and more reliable, despite the Government's protestations that biomould trains are a better alternative. We know that this is not a long-term answer for our transport needs. This represents short-termism and the same old Tory agenda of cuts.

Not only have the electrified lines improved the transport network, the work would have brought good quality jobs in regions that have not had the same investment as the south-east as well as the possibility of apprenticeships and training opportunities.

The headline employment figures, superficially, have looked okay, despite the economic turbulence, but a small scratch below the surface shows that many of the jobs are insecure, on zero hours, low pay and offer little opportunity to develop in the workforce.

Infrastructure investment could be an opportunity to stimulate the economy through creating jobs in sectors such as engineering, transport and the growing green economy.

The Government has a legally-binding target to reduce carbon emissions by 57% by 2030 on 1990's levels. This will not happen without a substantial investment. We need to take these challenges as opportunities to have a just transition to the green economy and create employment and training opportunities in the new industries,

especially the regions and communities which have been neglected for far too long. I urge you to support. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Jan Bownes (*Community*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1. Congress, my region of the union is based in Kidderminster, a town built on the back of the carpet industry, an industry that once employed thousands of workers and supported countless families and communities. In fact, it breaks my heart to see what has happened to the industry and the town in recent years. Today the carpet industry is a shadow of its former self after cut upon cut resulting from years of irresponsible management, neglect and off-shoring. It's tragic.

As events of recent years have proven, the UK needs a vibrant manufacturing sector. We cannot stake our country's economic future on the unpredictable fortunes of big finance and services, so we must protect our manufacturing industries that remain. We must nurture new opportunities and give UK manufacturing the best possible chance to succeed in the modern world. There is no doubt that successive governments have neglected their responsibilities. We need more investment in the infrastructure to drive economic growth.

The Government's investment and procurement policies must support UK business right through to the supply chain, just like they do across Europe. Publicly-funded invested projects must be made to work for our home industries and support UK jobs, like HS2. If the railways are not made from rail rolled in the UK, which in turn is produced from UK billets forged from UK steel, then it will be a national disgrace. Value for taxpayers does not mean procuring manufactured products at the cheapest

price. It means exacting maximum value for UK business throughout the supply chain. It means supporting employment and skills and to encourage companies to invest and grow. It also means the Government giving us a sign that our manufacturing industries are valued and have a future. It is not just us here in this room who are prepared to fight for it. Please support. (*Applause*)

Kevin McHugh (*PCS, Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1. He said: President, I am the Deputy President of PCS and supporting Composite 1. PCS did have an amendment in on tax justice but it was rejected by the TUC GPC on the ground that it did not relate substantively to the motion. In 2015/16 me and my colleagues collected £537 billion so I think we helped the economy just a little bit, considering that is the majority of the Government's money.

PCS is clear that you cannot have a debate about developing a strong economy without discussing the issue of tax justice. Tax is a fundamental part of any plan for a fair economy. Tax avoidance on society is a scourge that undermines public trust and deprives our public services of the funds that they desperately need. Tackling tax avoidance and evasion is crucial to funding a universal social security system. Creating a fair tax systems that works for the interests of the many and not the very wealthy few is key PCS policy and at the heart of our campaign. We support a Robin Hood tax, but we also support an immediate halt to the cuts and closures of HMRC offices and potential redundancies of HMRC staff.

Just do the maths. With less tax workers, you collect less tax. It is not rocket science. The Government claim that there is no alternative to the austerity agenda but by failing to close the tax gap that loses £120 billion a year. At the same time, benefits are slashed, public services are closed, yet high earners have been given a tax cut when public sector workers, and those in HMRC, see their income fall against inflation and the rising cost of living.

In November 2015 HMRC had to announce plans to cut their offices from 170 to just 17 offices in the country. That will have a significant effect to the operation of HMRC, its service to the public and to the working lives of staff. There is a booklet at the PCS stall — it is free — have a look at it and see where a tax office is closing somewhere near you, because there will be one. If you are in Wales, for instance, there are two offices. If you live in Leeds and you want to travel north to the next office, it is my office in Newcastle. That is if they get away with their plans.

In addition, the Government's Finance Bill, which is currently going through Parliament, props up a rich system by preserving non-dom status of off-shore trusts and loosens the rules on business investment relief which increases the scope for non-doms to avoid tax when they bring funds into the United Kingdom. We need a strong economy. Let's make the rich individuals and large corporations pay the tax that is due. They are the real scroungers, not the people claiming benefits. Stop the cuts in HMRC. We help the economy. By doing that, we will prosecute the fiddlers. Support the motion. *(Applause)*

Andy Kerr (*CWU, Communication Workers Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 1. He said: Congress, the CWU is fully behind this motion which calls for the crucial investment needed in infrastructure across the UK, but in particular we would like to draw out one element in communications, which is investment in high-quality Broadband, universal Broadband, which is essential for Britain to thrive and to ensure full participation in society and the economy. It is, crucially, at the centre of the future world of work.

Broadband networks are increasingly being used to deliver public services, and you have heard Kevin making a comment a minute ago about financial services and tax services, especially healthcare. Improved connectivity is expected to bring a net increase in jobs, improve social cohesion and reduce carbon emissions. Affordable Broadband communication services are now a prerequisite for a full participation in a knowledge-based society, enabling everyone to go on line. As part of a broad digitisation strategy, it could add another £63 billion to the economy.

Although there has been investment in UK communication networks, infrastructures and speeds of at least 30 megabytes per second are now available to 89% in the UK, there are still 1.3 million households, which is 5% of the UK, who are still unable to receive a speed of at least 10 megabytes per second. Without a government taking action that provides positive financial incentives for operators to invest and to compete, including hard-to-reach areas, these households will be left behind in the digital divide.

The CWU has, for a long time, consistently argued for a universal service obligation. We welcome the Government's commitment to a USO of at least 10 megabytes per second to premises across the UK. We do, however, have some concerns over the design. The demand-led approach with a Broadband connection is provided on request, for combined connection requests, in order to reduce costs, but this creates barriers to achieving a USO, and it is unlikely to be the most effective solution to achieve maximum digital inclusion in the short and medium term.

BT, for example, has made clear that it is willing to contribute to the provision of a USO for 10 megabytes per second for Broadband if the regulatory and policy environment supports its investment case. This includes investing more than £6 billion over the next three years to extend superfast Broadband beyond 95% by 2020. The Government note in their USO consultation that they are considering this option, but to date no decision has been made. In addition, the CWU supports the need for full inclusion of the UK's population with digital skills, and more needs to be done to get people online if the maximum benefit for the economy, businesses and individuals is to be realised.

The CWU believes that the regulatory environment must have a part to play in providing the UK's digital infrastructure. We believe that Ofcom should avoid an approach which focuses narrowly on reducing prices in the short term. It must establish a regulatory environment in which long-term investment and resourcing considerations are properly accounted for, including a highly qualified, highly skilled workforce and one that we believe should be fully unionised. This is essential for

strengthening the UK's digital infrastructure and ensuring worldclass connectivity for the nation.

I congratulate Unite for putting forward this motion and I ask you to fully support it. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The President: Delegates, I am going to put Composite No. 1: A strong economy that works for all, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 1 was CARRIED.*

Guest speaker – Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, Leader of the Opposition

The President: Congress, I would now like to invite on to the platform, the Leader of the Labour, Jeremy Corbyn. (*Applause*) Congress, I am absolutely delighted to welcome Jeremy to Congress. As many will know, before entering Parliament Jeremy was a trade union organiser, helping to win workplace justice for low paid public sector workers. In Parliament, Jerry has an unprecedented track record of standing up for working people both here and around the world. As Leader of the Labour Party, he was responsible for that fantastic manifesto.

He has helped to inspire a new generation of voters to go to the ballot box and he showed that the Labour Party, truly, was on the side of the many, not the few. Jeremy has been a friend and ally of the trade union Movement. You have already given him

the warmest of welcomes, and I am sure you will give it to him again as he walks up to the podium. Jeremy, we are dying to hear from you. *(Cheers and applause)*

Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP (Leader of the Labour Party): Congress, thank you. It is an absolute delight to be here today. Thank you for that very warm welcome. Mary, I have a message for you this morning from the Shadow Cabinet. One of your pupils, who was taught by you, did very well in her English 'O' Levels and puts it all down to you. Shami Chakrabati sends her solidarity to you and the TUC. *(Applause)* So you never know where teachers' work might end up.

Thank you for everything you do as a movement for our people and our country to secure better pay and conditions for working people, to give them a voice in the workplace and a say in our politics.

Trade unions are far and away the biggest voluntary and democratic organisations in this country. They are the roots and the lifeblood of the Labour Party. You are abused by the powerful and your rights are attacked, including by this Government. But the trade union Movement represents the best of Britain, and it is a vital engine of progress in our democracy. Of course, trade unionism has always had international solidarity at its heart. It is wonderful to see Huber Ballesteros, who was unjustly imprisoned for his trade union activities in Colombia — *(Applause)* — freed by international solidarity action by many people in this hall, and he is here with us today. I have just had the honour of speaking to him for a few minutes before I came into the hall, and I am looking forward to him giving a more detailed briefing of the situation facing trade unionists in Colombia. Thank you for all you do for trade

unionists under threat and imprisonment anywhere around our world. Solidarity is vital. Please keep it up.

But despite all your tireless efforts as trade unionists, modern Britain is marked by growing insecurity at work, which undermines and holds back both low paid workers and the better paid. In fact, insecurity now goes to the very top of our public life. Think of poor Theresa May and the insecurity that she is facing at the present time.

(Laughter)

Congress, this escalating insecurity is not only bad for individual workers and their families as it weakens bargaining strength and holds down pay, just as it fuels stress and powerlessness, it is also bad for our economy and our whole society. This epidemic of low pay, which is closely tied up with insecurity at work, ruins people's lives, leaving workers and their families locked in poverty, it damages the economy as people have less to spend. It costs us all because it means more is paid out in tax credits and housing benefit from the public purse, and it means less tax being paid to fund public services.

So I want to pay tribute to those unions which are working so hard to organise insecure workers and have taken on the exploiters, as Unite has done at Sports Direct, as the Bakers Union did so impressively last week at McDonald's. McDonald's boss is paid 1,300 times more than the lowest paid of his staff. That is symbolic of the deep inequality and injustice that scars our society. That is why it is crucial for our movement to organise the lowest paid and most vulnerable workers. The TUC needs

to represent all workers and the least secure have to be our priority because they need our solidarity the most. Their needs for representation are the greatest.

Last week I raised some of these cases at Prime Minister's Question Time. Theresa May could not bring herself to utter one word of condemnation of McDonald's or Sports Direct. This is from a Prime Minister who tried to rebrand the Conservatives as the workers' party. No, it's okay. I didn't buy into it either. *(Laughter)*

It is essential that we work together as a movement, the trade unions and the Labour Party, as part of local communities to stamp out low pay and insecurity. I know it is not easy. As Mary explained, I was once a trade union official in NUPE and before that I worked in the Tailor & Garment Workers' Union, as it then was, representing low paid garment workers, mostly women, victims of some of the most appalling practices by unscrupulous employers who denied them what they were owed. Exploitation and discrimination at work cuts across all sectors and pay grades. That is why UNISON's victory against tribunal fees in the High Court was such an outstanding gain, won on behalf of all workers. *(Applause and cheers)* Thank you, UNISON, for that effort in winning that. It has meant so much to so many people.

Rights mean almost nothing if you cannot afford to get access to them. Congress, we are united behind the CWU and the one hundred thousand Royal Mail workers who are about to be balloted who are fighting against cuts to their pay and pensions. *(Applause)* Their fight is all of our fights because it is the usual story of privatisation. First, the company get the assets on the cheap. Then they hike prices and cut services to the public. Next they cut workers' pay and pensions. Privatisation is about

transferring wealth and power from the many to an elite few. When the workers who provide the public services that we all rely on are having to use food banks you know that something is deeply wrong in this country. Seven years of Tory pay cuts have not only caused real hardship but they have damaged our public services by hitting recruitment, retention and, crucially, morale.

This Government's position seems to change by the hour. At the weekend we were led to believe that the pay cap was a thing of the past. Yesterday, the Prime Minister's spokesman said it would continue as planned. Today, as inflation rises to nye on 3%, they try to divide people on the cheap. The POA is right. A pay cut is a pay cut. We must be united in breaking the pay cap for all workers. (*Applause*) So let me be absolutely clear today. The Labour Party totally rejects the Tories' attempt to divide and rule, to play one sector off against another. A Labour Government will end the public sector pay cap and give all workers the pay rise they deserve and so desperately need. That is our policy. (*Applause*)

Congress, in the case of the Birmingham bin workers, which I know you have discussed today, we, collectively, as the labour and trade union Movement, have a duty, as a labour movement, to find a resolution to this dispute as soon as possible. Please, let's get that done quickly.

Congress, we often talk about workers' rights, but we are not just talking about rights at work. We are talking about people's lives, about the chance to live a decent life, about the work/life balance, the security of your home, living standards, your family life and your mental health, too. A University of Manchester study recently found that poor quality jobs are actually worse for mental health than unemployment. Most

people spend most of their lives as workers, selling their time, labour and skills. Workers' rights are human rights. They give protections to every single person in employment and indirectly to many more, children and carers as well as those who need care. They are fundamental to any society that claims to be advanced or democratic, yet these rights, your rights, as workers, hard won over generations, are currently being sacrificed by this Conservative Government on the altar of a failing and ever more ruthless form of capitalism.

Increasingly, flexible employment is sold to us as a benefit. They call it the "gig" economy, and who doesn't like going to a gig? (*Laughter*) Of course, it is a benefit to unscrupulous employers, but it is the source of continuous worry and insecurity for millions of people, and it is, in part, responsible for the worsening mental health of a country that has lost over 6,000 mental health nurses in recent years!

When employers want genuine flexible work, TUC researchers found that, shamefully, those parents and carers, often women, requesting flexible working all too often found themselves punished instead with fewer hours and fewer opportunities to progress, and some even losing their jobs. So the next Labour government will take action right across the board to help protect people in the workplace. Although we would like to see another general election as soon as possible that delivers more labour gains, and this time a Labour government, in the meantime we will challenge the Government in Parliament and outside every step of the way to defend working people, to stand by you, the trade unions battling for people's rights day in and day out. (*Applause*) Rights are won by all of us together, but they have to be constantly defended and enforced, and that is why we are opposing the Tories' dangerous EU

withdrawal Bill, not out of any attempt to frustrate the vote to leave but because of the extraordinary unaccountable powers it would hand to a Tory government, to impose decisions, scrap protections and rip up workers' rights without Parliament having any say whatsoever. This is a threat to every worker in this country. You simply cannot trust the Tories with your rights at work, and that's why Labour voted against the Bill last night. *(Applause)*

There is no doubt that the British workplace is already one of the most unequal in the world. We have a huge and damaging imbalance of power between employers and employees, which has led to the proliferation of low-wage jobs, race to the bottom agency workers, zero-hours contracts and employers avoiding paying sick pay, holiday pay and even the minimum wage through bogus self-employment. That has been effectively targeted by unions, such as the GMB, fighting for Uber drivers denied their basic rights at work. Such practices are rife throughout the gig economy, which presents itself as somehow or other as modern and dynamic but all too often it uses technology as cover to deny both employees and customers basic protections. Technological innovation is crucial for our economic success, but technological advance cannot represent real progress if it means we drag back to 19th century employment practices or it is used to impose deregulation that leaves people without dignity or security. Technologic advance is driving change in the economy and the workplace at unprecedented speeds, but what is not inevitable is who benefits from it. We need a government and economic and industrial policies that are not stuck in some 1980's time warp of neo-liberal dogma but are driven by the need to channel and shape technological change to benefit the many, not the few. *(Applause)* That will not happen if we leave it to the market or corporate boardrooms.

The Bank of England estimates that 15 million jobs could be at risk of automation during the next decade and, as is so often the way, those most at risk are those who are paid the least. The deregulated gig economy is ripe for automation. It is no basis for economic advance and rising living standards. No. That demands high investment in the cutting-edge jobs of the future. When you add the Conservatives' continuing determination to hack away at the role of the state, cutting investment, squeezing public services and removing your rights, it is not hard to see the dangers of the present course that we are headed on. We already know that the Tory way of running the economy has dramatically widened regional inequalities, sharply increased the wealth gap with tax breaks for the few and public service cuts for the many.

The Tory approach to Brexit is to use the process of leaving to go much further and much faster in that direction, delivering a deregulated, free-market tax haven off the shores of Europe, underpinned by a race-to-the bottom trade deal with Donald Trump, a Shangri-La for bosses and bankers but nothing of the kind for everybody else. *(Applause)* The point is that that is the real divide over Brexit: a Tory Brexit to drive down standards or a Labour version that puts jobs first? We respect the result of the referendum but we want a jobs-first Brexit, which guarantees full access to the European market as part of a new trade agreement and relationship with the European Union, which maintains and develops workers' rights, consumer and environmental protections, and uses powers returned from Brussels to support a new industrial strategy with investment in good jobs in every region and nation of Britain, where work pays, where employees have security and decent conditions, and prosperity is shared by the true wealth creators, the workforce.

When we leave the EU the current free-movement rules will end. Labour wants to see fair rules and management of migration, fair rules that put jobs, living standards and the economy first, not fake immigration targets, as the Tories do, that will never be met, and we will continue to assert that the rights of European Union nationals must be guaranteed immediately. *(Applause)* We must never allow ourselves to be duped and divided. It is not migrants who drive down wages and conditions, but unscrupulous employers, supported by a government that slashes rights and protections at work whenever it gets the chance. *(Applause)* It is our Movement which has been the bedrock of resisting racism and fascism in the workplace and on the streets, and we must continue to oppose the division that the far right would seek to impose.

So if we want to tackle low pay and insecure work, we need a Labour government strengthening workers' rights, enforced by strong trade unions taking action to prevent employers undercutting pay and conditions, not closed borders, xenophobic intimidation and scape-goating.

That is why our general election manifesto set out a 20 point plan for security and equality at work, including equal rights for all from day one in a job, banning zero-hours contracts, guaranteeing unions a right of access to workplaces, raising the minimum wage to a real living wage, ending the public sector pay cap, setting maximum pay ratios of 20:1 in the public sector and beyond — *(Applause)* — banning unpaid internships, doubling paternity pay, reinstating protection against harassment

at work and support the Dying to Work campaign to protect workers suffering from terminal illnesses.

Ultimately, protections at work depend on those who work themselves. Winning a Labour government, even one with a programme to transform the country, which is now our goal, is simply not enough. That's why the most important thing any worker can do is join a trade union. *(Applause)* I want young people especially to hear this message. Many young people have recently got involved in politics for the first time. Tens of thousands of young people have joined the Labour Party in the recent months. At the recent general election we saw the long-running decline in young people voting totally reversed, with young people voting in higher numbers than they have for a generation. Politics is about power, and democratic politics is about putting power in the hands of the many, not just the few. The principle applies to the workplace, too. If you want a job that pays a decent wage that gives you a chance to get on in life, to live independently and enjoy your work, then join a trade union! *(Applause)* For those watching, wherever you are, go on line and do it today. You'll never regret it. *(Applause and cheers)*

Trade unions are often demonised in the right-wing press — I know that that is a real shock to you *(Laughter)* — but billionaire tax-dodging press barons don't like trade unions. I know it is a shock and I'm sorry to bring you this kind of news. Do you know what, they don't like us because our movement, through which the values of solidarity, community and social justice run like a thread from top to bottom. Our movement challenges the unaccountable power of both government and bosses. But, of course, the power of the billionaires, who control great chunks of the media, is not

what it was. They tried to dictate the election result in June with a blizzard of propaganda and millions of voters simply ignored them. Trade unions don't just defend their members. They defend the institutions which benefit all employees; our National Health Service, our schools, our social care and they defend our rights.

We don't know when the next general election will come — we are not in control of that — but you are in control of whether you join a trade union, organised in your workplace or in your community and start changing people's lives for the better right now. *(Applause)* We don't know how long it will take but this weak and chaotic Government will be prized out of Downing Street. We know that the advances we made in the general election in June are just a powerful springboard to win the radical Labour government we want to see. So together we can change our country so that it truly works for the many, not the few. Thank you. *(A standing ovation)*

Thank you, Congress Thank you very much. Thank you for the honour of inviting me to Congress and thank you for all you do as trade unionists, day in and day out, supporting people who need that help and support. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The President: Jeremy, that was really fantastic. You can tell by the reaction and, indeed, the seeing of “Oh, Jeremy Corbyn” – it feels like a vocal wave — and thank you for recognising that trade unions are the biggest voluntary democratic organisations in this country and that we represent the best of Britain. You will be pleased to know that we have been discussing at length at this Congress the issue of organising low paid, insecure workers, and in particularly young workers, who suffer most from insecurity and austerity. Thanks for saying that workers' rights are human

rights, thanks for saying that we simply can't trust the Tories for getting decent jobs at work, and thanks for raising another thing that has been talked about at this Congress, which is digitalisation and automation. The trade union Movement is ready to respond to that challenge. We want better training, we want a better curriculum and we want better preparation for the new world of work. Also, thanks for saying that everyone should be in a trade union. We agree. Thank you so much. (*Applause*)

Delegates, don't all just exit because it is not fair on the next union. We continue with section 1 of the General Council Report: The Economy, and Motion 7: Save our Steel, which we need to do. The General Council supports this motion. TSSA has withdrawn their amendment. It is moved by Community, seconded by Unite and the TSSA has indicated that they wish to speak. Thank you.

Save our steel

Jacqueline Thomas (*Community*) moved Motion 7. She said: Congress, as you know, our union represents thousands of steel workers across the UK, and I am one of them. I work at Tata Steel in Llanwern. Over the past 18 months myself and my colleagues have faced uncertainty and heartbreak that comes with the lack of a decent industrial strategy. It was in March of last year that in the heat of the steel crisis Tata announced that they were pulling their business from the UK. The simple truth is that they couldn't turn a profit. Chinese dumping played a part, but the dumping also hurts our competitors, but what really threatened to kill us was the lack of support from successive governments, who failed to understand the importance of heavy

industry. For decades government policy has prioritised the city of London over manufacturing. As a result, thousands of jobs have been lost in our communities.

Steelworkers did not stand by while their jobs were under threat. Instead, we launched the campaign *Save Our Steel*. We marched in our communities, in Scunthorpe, Motherwell, Newport, Corby and Port Talbot, joined by our colleagues from Trostre, Shotton and Hartlepool. We even rallied in Sheffield. We marched in Brussels, we marched on Parliament, marching as steelworkers, steel unions and steel communities, lifting up our voices on the Government to save our steel.

Last year you invited the steelworkers to Congress, where you gave us your support, which we thank you for again. Our campaign has made a difference. We got the Government to listen. Now we need to see if they will act, which is why we are calling on your support again.

Industries like steel now compete in the global market, and given a fair chance I back our workforce against any in the world. But we are forced to compete on a playing field that is not level, and against countries like China, which don't play by the rules. Countries like Germany find ways to support its industries, through their energy policy, tax system and procurement, which is why we must follow their lead if we want a steel sector in 20 years. That is why we need a proper industrial strategy to enable industries like steel to prosper in this changing world.

During the past year we have been working in the industry to develop a sector strategy for steel. There is now a deal on the table which has been backed by all steel

unions and employers. We now need the Government to back it, to support high-quality jobs and communities that depend on them. We still have to keep pressurising the Government, even if means from the feet on the back of their necks. Believe you me, with my stilettos they wouldn't want that. The point is that the UK needs a steel industry, and I am proud to propose the motion and, please, support it. Join us in our fight to save our steel. (*Applause*)

Mark Thomas Turner (*Unite*) seconded Motion 7. He said: Conference, our steel industry is facing one of the greatest moments of crisis in its long history, but that crisis, though, is far from over, but I am in no doubt that had it not been for our movement and the heroic *Save Our Steel* campaign, the furnace lakes would have dimmed across our industry at both Port Talbot and Scunthorpe. Unite supports this motion because it is vital that we continue the campaign and make sure that our members' futures are secured.

We know that a Tory Government has to be forced, kicking and screaming, to take any action. We also know that assistance, in the 11th hour, at the height of an emergency, is simply not enough. Instead, we need a long-term vision that sees steel as a foundation industry, the beating heart of an ambitious industrial strategy for Britain. We know the arguments from the construction of new power plants to the assembly of electric vehicles. There is a growing demand for high-quality steel. We should stoke that demand and use it to guarantee high-skilled, secure jobs in a world-class steel industry.

Brexit presents our industry with new challenges, and we must meet it with new ideas. We are told that the Government want to embark on a new era of free trade, signing us up to trumped-up deals with China and America and anyone else who will have us. We, with one voice, must demand that the future of our steel industry must not be offered up in exchange for a quick signature on any trade deal. This means protecting steel from Donald Trumps “America First” agenda. That means protecting steel from the damage of Chinese dumping. This is why my union, alongside comrades in the GMB and Community, has been working on a series of trade defence remedies. These defences must include enforceable labour rights and the legal right for trade unions to take up international trade disputes directly, rather than being reliant on our Government, at the World Trade Organisation, a body which has never had working people’s interests in mind.

At last year’s Congress, I stated that we would not accept a crisis caused by this Government’s cowardice, and that Teresa May brings to a halt the dumping of cheap, poor grade steel and not bottle it. With the onset of Brexit, I make that call again, protecting not just steel but the whole manufacturing supply chain with a proper and fair industrial strategy. Please support this motion. *(Applause)*

Mick Carney *(TSSA, Transport Salaried Staffs’ Association)* spoke in support of Motion 7. President and Congress, steel, like so many of our industries, is in crisis. Many years of failure to invest from the private profiteers, many years of neglect from the British Government have taken their toll, and it is too easy to blame the EU for this failure. The German and Italian governments have supported their steel

industries, so why haven't our governments? It's simple. Good old Tory dogma: let the markets decide and screw those that fall by the wayside.

Personally, I have always had the belief that we should take back all of the industries and utilities stolen from us by Tory governments. (*Applause*) However, I respect the views of the unions that organise in the steel industry which say that at this moment it is not the right time. That is why TSSA withdrew its amendment.

For me the destruction of the steel industry is personal. I am from Middlesbrough, and despite nye on 30 years in London, I am and remain a proud Smoggie. My granddad worked all his life in the steel industry at Cargo Fleet. My dad worked and died in the steel industry, first in Middlesbrough and then at Corby where he passed on at work, aged just 41. My first march and demonstration as a kid against the Tory attacks was on the steel industry in the early '80s, which was done to make it right for the coming privatisations. I have seen the devastation of proud working men thrown on the scrapheap in Middlesbrough and right the way across to the east of the River Tees, where back in 2015 170 years of Teesside steel making was callously ended, throwing approximately 10,000 people onto the dole in the steelworks and its associated industries in Redcar.

Teesside steel built the Sydney Harbour Bridge, Churchill's War Rooms, and for any Geordies in the room the Tyne Bridge, too. Now it has gone. I was only five when my dad passed on, so I don't know what he would have thought about what the Tories have done to our steel industry. I did, however, know my granddad well enough, and

I know exactly what he would have said, but not one word of it is repeatable from this rostrum. Please support. (*Applause*)

The President: Congress, I am now going to the vote on Motion 7: Save our steel. All those in favour, please show? Those against? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 7 was CARRIED*

Rebuilding the finance sector

The President: I now call Composite Motion 3: Rebuilding the finance sector. The General Council supports the composite motion, to be moved by Accord, seconded by Aegis and Unite has indicated that they wish to speak.

Ged Nichols (*Accord*) moved Composite Motion 3. He said: Congress, I am the General Secretary of the finance union, Accord. A functioning and accountable banking industry is a facilitator of the economic growth that is needed for all of our futures. Composite 8, yesterday, addressed the challenges of digitalisation and technological change. These factors, taken together with economic uncertainty and record low interest rates, mean that the environment for Britain's banks is as difficult as it ever has been.

The UK has extended its position as the world's leading financial centre ahead of New York, Hong Kong and Frankfurt, but the uncertainty over Brexit is making the environment less stable. In this uncertain time, what banks think they can control is

their costs. This has led to large scale branch closures, with banks disengaging from the communities that they are meant to serve; business restructuring exercises, with inevitable redundancies are seemingly constant, and outsourcing and off-shoring are commonplace.

Ordinary bank workers have faced pay restraint and cuts in their pensions and other benefits. Congress, this is now the time to ask how the finance industry can best serve the British economy and working people. 10 years after the global financial crisis some banks are still reluctant to lend to businesses. Lending is available to support a housing market that is increasingly out of reach of working people, and there is growing alarm at the scale of consumer credit as families struggle to make ends meet. But lending to businesses has been negative in six out of the last eight years. Many working people are facing the most severe re-learning crisis in decades, and what the finance industry should be doing is supporting high-quality work that delivers productive growth and decent wages.

We call on the General Council to examine the policy recommendations from the excellent report: An economic and social audit of the City. But the banking sector employs far more people in branches, call centres and operation centres outside London than it does in the City. We should support bank workers but not their fat-cat bosses to build a better financial system, to provide decent jobs, to offer more support and value to the wider economy and to create a banking sector that works for Britain. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Brian McDaid (*Aegis*) seconded Composite Motion 3. He said: Congress, we all have the perception that those who work within the finance sector are on high pay, high bonuses and high benefits. But for unions like ourselves and other unions that represent members in this sector, that is not the truth. We recognise daily that the reality is very different.

When the financial crisis of 2008 hit society, public trust in the UK finance sector quickly dwindled, and quite rightly so. Whilst we all know that there were those at the top of these institutions who were culpable for the crisis, the impact on most workers in the sector has resulted in mass redundancies, low pay awards, pay freezes, the erosion of employee benefits, increased working pressures and increased regulations that make our members' day-to-day working conditions more stressful.

A recent study found, with 33,000 employees, that finance workers are second only to those who work in healthcare who lose an average of 27 days of productive time every year. The loss of productivity is estimated to cost the UK around £57 billion a year. Brexit may have a detrimental impact on the sector, where some UK-centred companies with business across Europe could look to relocate to other European finance centres, such as Frankfurt, Paris or, in some cases, Dublin. This will have an impact on our members' job security and continues the uncertainty that they face in their jobs.

The threat of redundancies are ever present for our members and it is now a common thing to be asked "When am I being made redundant?" or "Can I be made redundant?" We want to hear our members ask us every day, "How can I grow in my

job?”, and “What can I do to have a long career in the industry?” We need to support and work with employers to help our members have jobs and careers, not be constantly involved in the process of them leaving their jobs. It is also imperative that we focus on eradicating the apathy that our members constantly feel in their jobs. Most of our members are facing their customers each day, answering the phones, ensuring that all the IT functions are operating successfully and all our finances are managed the right way. Therefore, it is essential that they work within the right environment, are rewarded and recognised for their dedication, their performance is managed consistently and fairly and, more importantly, they are proud of the industry they work within.

We call on the TUC to work with bodies like the Banking Standards Board, whose deputy chairman is an old friend, Sir Brendan Barber, and other organisations to raise standards of behaviour and competence in the UK sector, to facilitate change and help the sector deliver better outcomes for employees as well as customers, and create working environments in which our members can flourish and not stagnate. A successful finance sector is essential for the growth of our economy, and the bloodline of that success are those members who work there for us. Please support. (*Applause*)

The President: I call Unite next.

Unite (*The delegate gave no name and no name was captioned*): She said: President and Congress, in 2008 when the then Labour government bailed out the banks, it was done in an attempt to avoid the UK financial service sectors crashing, and in the main they did that. The major mistake at that time was that the bailout was funded without

placing any restrictions or conditions on the big banks' behaviours. Remember, it was them that caused the crisis in the first place.

That left the lords of the universe, the banks' chief executives, to carry on as usual. They continued to do what they had always done best: use the cash as an opportunity to squeeze our members even further. No one should be fooled. These captains of industry carried on as before, only this time, in the case of RBS and Lloyds, with taxpayers' money bolstering their grandiose schemes. They have showed no regard to repaying the loyalty of their staff who had helped them return to profit. They show no sign of any conscience in closing down bank branches in remote areas, leaving communities without banking facilities. They also will show no hesitancy in moving lock, stock and barrel out of the UK if Brexit negotiations do not suit them. In fact, this is already happening and other EU countries are preparing to welcome them.

The members we represent will create a better financial system that works for those who work in the sector and the wider community, a sector that serves the many, not the few. It will not happen under this Government, so we know what we have to do, don't we? Please support. (*Applause*)

Jane Loftus (*CWU, Communication Workers Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 3. She said: During the past couple of days and on to tomorrow we will have spoken about what is broken in our society, what industries are broken, what services are broken and what financial problems exists, right across from transport to healthcare and welfare. We stand here this week where we look around us and we know that we are not in the best place. We know we are at a crossroads and a

crossroads that needs to go the right way. I believe Jeremy Corbyn and his vision of the future of the Labour Party and what Britain could look like both here and internationally is the way to go.

For too long we have seen division and for too long we have been seeing the rise of racism, fascism and Islamophobia. At the time of the privatisation of Royal Mail, the Post Office was kept in public ownership. The Post Office, apparently, was supposed to be growing and it was there to show that not only the Tories but the Government had listened to the public. What do we see in those three years of the Post Office? We've seen closures on the High Street, we've seen it starved of vision and we've seen it starved of investment.

We, as a union, have been campaigning for a Post Bank. We believe that people have been left behind in financial services and we believe that the Post Office is vital to every community. We believe it brings cohesion and it does offer services that are relevant to people today. But, as a public service, along with everyone else, the Government, both within the Coalition and now the Tories within this Government, don't believe that there is a future in the Post Office. So we are seeing closures. We are out on the streets campaigning regularly every weekend to keep Post Offices open on the High Street, and we see more franchising, a backdoor privatisation of the Post Office in any other name. However, the union hasn't sat back. The union has put the case for a Post Bank, and I know that Jeremy Corbyn and the Labour Party support that. Recently, we have actually put the meat on the bones of how that Post Bank could work. We haven't sat on slogans. We've gone out and got the material that says "This can work. We can provide banking services on the High Street, in the Post

Office”. That will keep the Post Office open on your High Street, give our members the valuable jobs that they deserve, and I’d like to thank everyone in this hall who have campaigned with us to keep those Post Offices open, to carry on doing that, but join us in the Post Bank campaign, and make sure that no one is left out in our society from being able to have access to financial services on the High Street, near where they live, and not having to go just online which, obviously, discriminates against them. Support us and support everyone else fighting back. Thanks very much.
(Applause)

The President: Those are all the speakers. So I am going to put Composite Motion 3 to the vote: Rebuilding the finance sector. All those in favour, please show? All those against? That is carried unanimously. Thank you.

* *Composite Motion 3 was CARRIED*

Climate change

The President: We now move to Composite Motion 4: Climate change. The General Council supports the composite motion with an explanation. I will call on Sue Ferns during the debate to explain the General Council position. The composite is to be moved by the Bakers’ Union, seconded by the CWU and supported by the FBU, ASLEF and TSSA. I will then call on Sue Ferns to give the General Council explanation. Other speakers indicated are Unite, UNISON, USDAW and Prospect.

Sarah Woolley (*BFAWU, Bakers, Food and Allied Workers' Union*) moved Composite Motion 4. She said: Congress and President, I am going to focus on the impact of climate change on the food system and the rigged energy system we currently have.

Climate change is impacting the global system of agriculture in which many of our members, and the Global Union Federation, the IUF members, depend on for jobs, whether they are in producing, processing, packaging, retail or food outlets.

Agriculture accounts for around 10% of greenhouse gas emissions in the UK. One side of the food industry that is often ignored is the process from soil to table. This includes transportation, which the ASLEF amendment points out is responsible for a quarter of greenhouse emissions. Add to this product manufacturing, refrigeration, retail and the hospitality industry, including fast-food outlets, the levels are actually far higher.

The need under the Climate Change Act 2008 to reduce these by at least 80% on 1990 levels means that climate change is, arguably, the biggest threat to workers' jobs today. We are witnessing the impact of climate change through increasing numbers of severe weather events, such as heatwaves, droughts and floods. Storm Harvey in Texas stole the headlines not long ago and, more recently, Irma, the largest storm of record, but devastating floods have ravaged many parts of the world in the past few months, including Nigeria and Sierra Leone in Africa, China, Nepal, Bangladesh and India, all resulting in loss of life, damage to infrastructure, such as homes and schools, transport disruption and the loss of food crops, which are particularly impacting and

volatile to climate change and extreme weather events affecting international production, trade and supply chains.

Moving on to energy, it is central to all our lives as workers and citizens within our communities, but the markets will not deliver the rapid transition needed to reach our 2050 targets. UK energy was privatised in the '80s and '90s as part of the Thatcherite drive to privatise public assets in what she famously called a “share-owning democracy”. The UK is fairly unique in having a fully privatised energy system, generation, transmission, distribution and supply. However, transmission is a natural monopoly and should be in public hands so that we can redefine energy as a public good to achieve important public and social objectives, such as the development of renewable energy, control of non-renewable energy generation, universal coverage, affordability, efficiency and democratic accountability.

Privatised energy companies have high profits and high prices and are not concerned with energy transition and fuel poverty, which comes as a result of high prices, low pay and poorly insulated homes. Mass retro-fit programmes should be part of a programme of public works to address energy poverty by making homes warmer and, at the same time, reducing energy consumption and carbon emissions.

The Labour Party election manifesto says that we will stop our financial system being rigged for the few, turning the power of finance to work for the public good and committed to transition to a publicly-owned, decentralised energy system. The media often focuses on climate change levies as being the cause of increases in energy bills. However, little attention is given to the vast profits taken by energy companies, such

as the “big six” or network providers. Citizens Advice has been critical of the price-setting controls for energy networks by Ofgem, saying that this approach results in huge profits that consumers have to pay for through their bills. A later report stated: “Energy consumers are subsidising 7.5 billion in unjustified profits made by the businesses responsible for the UK’s gas and electricity networks over an eight year period.”

As the Transnational Institute report highlights, there is a global kickback to reclaim public services from private corporations and show that ever-declining service quality and ever-increasing prices are not inevitable. There are many reasons for this but, largely, there is a recognition that corporations deepen rather than address the social and environmental challenges. This includes climate change, and it is clear that we are not able to address the challenges of climate change and energy transition unless energy is under public ownership as part of the public sector function. This should be central to an industrial strategy for climate change, without abandoning workers to the market and profits that we see today, with precarious work, zero-hour contracts and low pay. It is important that all sectors and unions look at the impact of climate change on their members’ jobs and develop just transition programmes to safeguard workers’ livelihoods and pensions, supported by environmental reps within the workplace. Please support. (*Applause*)

Tony Kearns (*Communication Workers Union*) seconded Composite Motion 4.

He said: I make pretty much the same points I made last year when I stood up here and you defeated the motion on climate change. We are now hoping for a different

outcome. I think it is somewhat ironic that we are having this debate on the back of Hurricane Irma and the damage that it has caused.

Let me deal with the science first and make one thing clear. Climate change does not cause hurricanes, but it does make them inexorably worse. The scientists among you will know that it is called the Clausius-Clapeyron Equation. It means that for every 1% rise in the earth's temperature, 7% more water goes into the earth's atmosphere. That water has to go somewhere so it deposits itself in hurricanes and floods countries like Bangladesh, Cuba and, as we have seen, parts of America. What happens then? When the water hits the earth, we have more floods. People go without food and shelter. We will end up with millions more climate refugees around this planet so we have to do something about it.

What you see in the United States is complete denial of the science by Trump and his advisers, the same people who pulled out of the Paris Accord. The Committee on Climate Change have said that we need to reduce our 1990 carbon emissions levels by 80% by 2050 so change is coming. This week, we have seen that energy from offshore wind is now cheaper than new nuclear and, in some areas, cost-competitive with gas. Over the weekend, we have seen the first consecutive 24-hour period when this country went without the use of coal.

Industry has got to change. One-third of all carbon emissions in this country come from industry. To meet carbon emissions reduction targets, industry will have to change with a reduction needed of around 70%. We have already seen some actions as we are now talking about petrol-free cars. If you are in energy-intensive industries

like steel or petrochemicals then the cost of fuel to you is over 50%. Those industries will change with or without us, governments are going to change with or without us and companies are going to change with or without us, but it will be for profit reasons at the workers' expense.

In this composite, we are trying to engage with every trade union to get on board and develop an industrial strategy and a just transition to make sure that when climate change happens, the trade union Movement in this country takes over this issue. It is long overdue that everyone in this hall plays their part in developing a sustainable future for all people on this planet. I second. (*Applause*)

Andy Noble (*Fire Brigades Union*) supported Composite Motion 4.

He said: I want to thank the Bakers' Union for putting climate change back on the TUC's agenda. It is absolutely vital that we keep discussing climate issues and for the TUC to maintain its profile on this work, whatever other remaining pressures are upon us.

That is because the threat of climate change is real and it will not go away. Even now, when the British and American governments are stalling on climate issues, as trade unionists and internationalists, we cannot relent. They may want to ignore climate change, but as the recent floods in South-Asia and the USA have shown, together with other weather-related disasters, climate change should not, and cannot, be ignored.

Firefighters continue to tackle the effects of climate change as part of our daily work, both in the UK and abroad, whether it is responding to floods and storms or dealing with fires, often made worse by the impact of droughts and heat waves. The FBU is continuing our own campaign on climate-related issues in the UK. I am pleased to inform delegates that we have had a further success in our campaign on flooding this year. After many years of campaigning, the Labour Government in Wales has implemented a statutory duty on the fire and rescue service to respond to flooding. This was achieved last year and already the provision of new resources and equipment has been provided to our members for the next set of floods, as and when they happen.

This means that Scotland, Northern Ireland and now Wales have that statutory duty. Only England is left to convince and obviously when I say “England”, I mean Westminster. We know there will be more floods and we know that the public expects firefighters to assist so we will keep campaigning on this issue. Hopefully, with the election of a future Labour Government, this task will become a lot less difficult given what appears to be widespread support amongst Labour MPs.

We also want to thank the Bakers’ Union for raising the issue of public ownership in democratic control of energy companies, one of the biggest indirect factors in climate change. The FBU supports the Trade Unions for Energy Democracy campaign, which has raised issues of ownership and control of these companies and links together other trade unionists across the globe. This is important for living standards too. Putting profit before the environment is, in the end, both economic and environmental madness. Three years ago, we published a pamphlet on public

ownership of energy resources. We said it would make sense on climate grounds. We said it would make sense to get control of energy bills and fight fuel poverty. Recent price rises in gas and electricity have just shown that this Government is allowing the industry to carry on with profiteering as before.

We think it is time to renew our demands for public ownership and democratic control. We believe that the TUC should take up those demands. We want the Labour Party also to make this a priority when it forms the next government. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Cliff Holloway (*Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*) supported Composite Motion 4.

He said: As you would expect, ASLEF fully supports the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions for the development of a sustainable transport policy for the UK based on improving the public transport sector and moving more freight transport from road to rail. The 2008 Climate Change Act established a target for the UK to reduce its carbon emissions by at least 80% from 1990 levels by 2050 to limit global warming to 2%. Transport is responsible for a quarter of the UK's greenhouse gas emissions so we see large cuts in transport emissions of carbon dioxide as being essential if the UK is to meet its climate change targets.

This is a nation which is spending billions of pounds on major new roads and airport expansion which will harm the environment and make the problem worse. We would like to see priority given to investment in public transport, which is vital to play a part

in helping to reduce carbon emissions. Trams in city centres, for example, can reduce road traffic by up to 14% and produce three times less CO₂ than travelling by car.

Our vision is for everyone to have access to affordable green transport options that protect the environment, improve commuters' quality of life and offer a genuine alternative to the use of private cars. Unfortunately, our rail fares, as those of you who have travelled down to Brighton by train will obviously know, are currently amongst the highest in Europe. Many of our services are overcrowded and rely on worn-out rolling stock. We believe that the UK Government should replace the current fragmented system with a publicly-owned accountable railway which makes sure the system operates as a coherent whole. We need a railway that delivers for people and for the environment before profits and shareholders.

Emissions could also be massively reduced by moving freight transport from roads to rail. A single freight train can remove 70 HGVs from our roads and rail produces 76% less carbon emissions than lorries. Moving goods around the country currently puts a lot of heavy lorries on roads for which they were never designed. Network Rail has calculated that a ton of goods can travel 246 miles by rail as opposed to 88 miles by road on a gallon of fuel. In spite of these environmental benefits, the amount of freight being carried across the rail network is falling and job cuts have been announced in the rail freight sector across grades. This clearly demonstrates the need for better promotion of rail freight as a green alternative to lorries.

We need councils to set firm carbon emissions targets in their transport and economic strategies. We need the Government to develop future transport policies which bring

train operating companies back into the public sector and which promote freight on rail for a better, more coherent, greener transport system. Acting on carbon emissions will make our lives better in many ways by reducing the amount of traffic, improving air quality and promoting healthier lifestyles.

The effects of climate change are now being played out as our oceans are getting warmer and warmer. As the General Secretary said in her address, we have had 150 years of the trade union Movement. Let us just hope we have all got a planet to live on in 150 years' time. Congress, I urge you to support this motion. *(Applause)*

The President: The TSSA waive their right to speak. Sue, can you give the General Council's explanation, please?

Sue Ferns *(Prospect)* explained the General Council's position on Composite Motion 4.

She said: Congress has long supported action to tackle dangerous climate change and to ensure a plan for a just transition that protects the livelihoods of those working in the energy sector and in energy-intensive industries. We agree that action to tackle climate change cannot be left to the market alone and we support calls for a Government-led sustainable industrial strategy, developed in consultation with unions, which includes an energy strategy and a mass programme of retrofitting with stronger rights for workplace environmental reps.

Greater public ownership of energy (for example, at community level) could have a role to play in delivering our future energy needs. However, any such decision must be taken in consultation with workers and unions working in the sectors that might be considered for public ownership. So, Congress, with this in mind, the General Council supports the motion. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you, Sue. Unite has indicated that they wish to speak.

Andy Jones (*Unite*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 4.

He said: Congress, there is an old saying that you may not be interested in politics, but politics is interested in you. The same is true of climate change. That is a lesson that Donald Trump is learning the hard way, at a horrific cost to the American people. It is only four months since Trump announced that the US would pull out of the Paris Agreement yet, as we meet here today, hundreds of thousands of people across Florida, Texas and the Caribbean are rushing to take shelter or are reclaiming their lives from the wreckage.

These disasters show that it is always our people (working-class people) who are forced to pay the price for Government inaction. It is only right that our Movement must play a central role in meeting the climate change challenge. That means democratic control over our rigged energy system. That means an environmental rep in every workplace. It also means having trade unions in the driving seat to support our members in a just transition to highly-skilled, low-carbon jobs. No one must be left behind and every part of our Movement has its role to play, including energy and

transport. We note the reference to moving more freight to rail, but it must recognise that roads still have a part to play in a proper strategy.

In construction, for example, which is my own sector, this motion proposes a public work programme for the mass retrofitting of insulation for our homes and public buildings. This would be a positive step and an economic shot in the arm, creating thousands of jobs in the low-carbon economy. However, the Grenfell tragedy and the scores of tower blocks which have failed safety tests in its wake serve as a stark reminder. We will not accept cutting corners. We will not put private profit over public safety. Such a programme must be safe and it must be public, involving workers and residents together. Such an initiative must be the start of an ambitious, long-term industrial strategy which invests in a balanced energy policy, creating secure jobs and investing in re-skilling workers. Please support the motion.
(Applause)

Nicky Ramanandi (*UNISON*) supported Composite Motion 4.

She said: Congress, this motion is welcome and long overdue. The breadth of our public services means that UNISON members see the effects of climate change at work, whether working for the Environment Agency and local government at the time of flooding or the NHS staff seeing the impact of the rise of air pollution in conditions such as asthma. We were proud to support the Paris Climate Change Agreement and to lobby with international unions for workers to be recognised in the final text, but why does a just transition to a carbon-free economy matter?

I am a trade union member who campaigns alongside my UNISON brothers and sisters who work for the big energy companies and distribution networks like the National Grid. They have decent-paid jobs, secured by trade unions in communities where the alternatives are often bleak. They recognise that energy is an essential public service and should not be left to the market. They openly discuss with me and others options to improve public control and ownership of their industry. For their honesty in discussing the future of their jobs and industry, we owe it to them to make the just transition real. It is not a phrase to trot out to show our sympathy, but real Government investment to help the company shift to renewables with real jobs in their communities and real training for their new roles.

We made that commitment to them at our conference this year when we agreed to lobby for a major shift to renewables in the investment of the local government pension scheme. If you want a model of best practice about trade union trustees seeking sustainable investments then look no further than the Environment Agency, where the staff pension fund is world-leading. I come from Newcastle where our council is desperate to expand bus provision in a planned way to reduce congestion and to improve the environment. The Tories Bus Services Act is designed to shackle that initiative in our area. So much for the Northern powerhouse!

Congress, what unites UNISON members from British Gas with health visitors, teaching assistants, nurses and housing officers is a hatred of fuel poverty. We have high energy bills and poor energy efficiency. We have some of the oldest housing stock in the world with some of the lowest insulation. It appals me to say that the UK has more preventable pensioner deaths in the winter than Norway, Sweden and

Denmark. So, Congress, let us unite to say that one death from fuel poverty is one death too many. Support the composite and let us make sure that energy and climate change are taken seriously. I support. *(Applause)*

Iain Dalton *(Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers)* supported Composite Motion 4.

He said: I am a first-time speaker at the TUC, speaking in support of this composite. *(Applause)*

Congress, the issue of climate change is becoming an increasingly urgent one, as other speakers have pointed out. Over the last few years, we have had some of the hottest summers on record and, of course, the increasing occurrence of extreme weather events. However, year after year, we see meetings of the world powers discussing climate change, but failing to agree any serious measures to tackle this issue. Ultimately, this attitude is driven by the fact that they do not want to disadvantage those companies based in their countries whose industries emit greenhouse gases. Their attitude is to agree that climate change is an important issue, but the main responsibility for doing something about it lies with somebody else.

Should we really be surprised, Congress, that that is their attitude? I think one of the themes we have had running through this Congress has been that the private sector employees and their allies in Parliament put making the largest profits first and concerns such as our jobs, the cost of living and the planet are distant considerations

for them. That is why the question of public ownership under democratic control is the key part of this composite.

Congress, it is important that on these issues, our Movement should follow the lead of unions in the energy industry. By “democratic control”, though, we do not mean leaving the same old people at the tops of those companies in charge with some vague oversight. We mean real democratic control involving workers and trade unions in the energy industry, consumers and elected representatives because that means a different set of priorities. That means protecting our communities from climate change and guaranteeing that every worker in those industries at present will still have jobs on their existing pay and pensions. That will keep jobs in the new energy industries for people in the future as well. It also means making sure those workers and all of our members can afford to heat their homes so they do not have to make the choice of heating or eating and we can end the scandal of pensioners dying over the winter.

This issue is far too important to be left to the markets. If it is left to them, they will invest in whatever makes their profits the biggest, regardless of how destructive the techniques that have to be used are to our environment. What we need is a policy that develops an alternative that puts our members and our future members first. Please support. (*Applause*)

Ele Wade (*Prospect*) supported Composite Motion 4.

She said: Congress, this is clearly a really important motion and there is a lot in it to like. We support the composite and we welcome the General Council's statement.

Prospect workers working in the emergency services, environmental protection and in the energy sector are among those who have been at the front line of responses to flooding. Climate change must not be ignored and we agree that to combat it, we cannot rely on the market alone. It is clear that action by the energy sector will have a role to play and actually it is already doing so. The Government's Committee on Climate Change reported in June 2017 that since 2012, emissions reductions have been largely confined to the power sector. Emissions from transport and building stock are still rising. The Committee says that new policies are needed across the economy. By 2030, current plans would, at best, deliver around half the required reduction in emissions.

The motion calls for a stronger role for the public sector and it is certainly the case that stronger Government leadership is required. Although it already intervenes in the energy market for nearly all fuel sources, including renewables, it does not do it in a transparent way that provides long-term certainty for investment. There is a debate to be had about what form greater state involvement should take. Prospect believes that debate must take in the interests of workers in the energy sector, including our members, and must be grounded in their expertise.

Just transition is, of course, the right principle, but we need to be much better at explaining what that means, what a truly just transition would look like to the workers affected. Prospect members would certainly like to see increased funding for

investment in skills and in R&D, for example, but this is not just a matter for the public sector. There is a much broader industrial and societal challenge. We need to use all of our expertise, wherever it is located in the economy, and we need to bring people with us. Whatever approach we adopt, we must listen to workers in the energy sector and respect those technical experts because our fellow citizens will not thank us if the lights go out or if they cannot heat their homes in winter. Please support the motion. *(Applause)*

Glenroy Watson *(National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers)*
supported Composite Motion 4.

He said: I rise to support the motion as previous speakers have done. It is easy, perhaps, to have a go at Humpty-Trumpty, but I am not going to do that because I think enough people recognise that Mr. Trump is probably being taught a lesson at this very moment.

I really want to support the whole of the motion, but give some emphasis to the demand for environmental representatives in the workplace creating another level of structure for us to fight. I also want to say something about the global position. At the end of the day, the motion talks about a green international agreement on carbon emissions. That is all very well, but when we look at the effects of the hurricanes on the current situation, it is not enough just to be a fair-weather friend. At the end of the day, the position in which people in the south find themselves is not only because of the recent developments around climate change, but because of the continuing economic disparity which has been going on for years.

This agreement has to include the ability to build accommodation and to have the resources to combat climate change. It is not enough to have wishful thinking on that. I think that the initiative for an international agreement and consulting with other trade unions as to what the trade union Movement should do must include an improvement in that situation. We will otherwise have a position where it is fine in the north and disastrous in the south, regardless of the weather conditions. We need critical thinking on that beyond just carbon emissions. Thank you, Congress.
(Applause)

Chris Baugh (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 4.

He said: We very much welcome the chance to support Composite Motion 4, which obviously starts from the position that the scientific consensus is that climate change is real. Any rational person recognises that. Unfortunately, as other speakers have indicated, that does not extend to the Oval Office. Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris protocols and what we see around us confirms why trade unions need to talk about climate and why this debate is worthy of Congress's time.

I very much agree with the comments made by previous speakers about the link between trade union activity and climate. The only point I want to add from the PCS perspective is that we welcome this motion because it creates the conditions for the much-needed discussion within the ranks of the trade union Movement and across unions about how we develop a common strategy on climate change. It also helps us

address and resolve the apparent contradiction which often arises in this debate between creating and defending jobs on the one hand and, on the other hand, cutting greenhouse gases and taking action on climate change.

As trade unionists, there really can be no compromise on a union defence of members' conditions at work, whether it is the civil service, local government, steel, gas or the oil industries. It is equally clear that the threat to members' conditions across the public and the private sectors and the threat to climate itself come from the agenda of a Tory Government, from a privatised and rigged energy market and, of course, from the trans-national corporations and fossil fuel companies which dominate the world energy economy. It is this scenario that poses the real threat to the future of our members' jobs and conditions and to the planet itself.

PCS, like UNISON and many other unions in the public sector, have an interest through advisory, regulatory or distributory activities. We want to work with the unions. We agree with Sue Fern's comment that this is going to be a discussion and agreement with unions in the energy-intensive industry, who have the technical know-how, who have the union power and, I should say, the political weight and influence to help set out what we mean by a "just transition". This will be based on public ownership, public investment, government industry at regional and local level, and on a guaranteed protection of all workers in the energy-intensive industries as we make the much-needed but gradual transition towards a zero carbon economy.

By any means, I think we all recognise that this is a massive task in front of us. However, I would say that if we are intellectually honest about the science and the

consequences to our members and the human race if this does not happen, I do not think anything could be much clearer about the obligation we have as trade unions, in the here and now, to our members and to future generations, to attempt to put working-class interests at the heart of what we mean by a just transition. On that basis, Congress, please support. (*Applause*)

The President: I would now like to put Composite Motion 4: Climate change, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Composite Motion 4 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, immediately after the close of business today, there will be a chance for young delegates to have a group photographs with the General Secretary and the President. Please stay behind if you would like to take part. I do not know how you define “young delegates”. I think you should self-define and self-select.

I now call on Motion 17: Defence, jobs and diversification. The General Council position is to leave it to Congress. It is going to be moved by Moz Greenshields on behalf of the TUC Trades Union Councils Conference 2017 and it is going to be seconded by PCS. Can other speakers please come up to the front so that we can get the debate managed in an orderly and timely way. They are the CWU, Unite, the GMB and Prospect.

Defence, jobs & diversification

Moz Greenshields (*TUC JCC*) moved Motion 17.

She said: I am very honoured to be the first delegate of the Trades Union Councils Conference to move our motion, Motion 17, at Congress. Trades councils are unions developing solidarity in the community and doing an essential job, particularly in these times of rapid political change. We are proposing that we need to seize the moment to tackle the big union and community issues of industry jobs and skills. British industry has long been neglected and abandoned as capital is freely moved abroad for higher profit. In the last four decades, it has shrunk from 25% to 14% of GDP.

10% of all industry is in defence, high-skill and high-value jobs, which has been subjected to cuts and tens of thousands of redundancies with much more to come except, of course, currently the increasingly-questioned £200 billion Trident programme. As well as a coordinated industrial struggle for jobs, there is a clear, economic and political need for a national industrial strategy in which defence diversification – the planned move from the production of armaments to socially-useful products – plays a major part. There is growing opposition to British military involvement in apparently perpetual wars. The British arms trade with despotic regimes is under pressure. Of course, the future of Trident is nowhere near as certain as the Parliamentary process of approval would like us to think. Congress has shared these concerns and positions over the years, but without defence diversification, all these have further implications for existing defence jobs.

Diversification is more achievable now than it has been for decades. First, leaving the EU means that the next Labour government will be free to establish a state-interventionist industrial strategy to rebuild the manufacturing industry and to meet the needs of our people. Jeremy Corbyn's commitment to this is well-known, backed up by the establishment of a National Investment Bank.

Secondly, workers involved in diversification need to be given the assurance and confidence that not only would there be no loss of jobs or skills, but these would be enhanced as part of the process. It will take time, investment and sustained political will by the Government. It needs a government prepared to make these guarantees and for once we are able to point to a Labour leadership with our values. Jeremy Corbyn has promised "a just transition for communities whose livelihoods are based in those sectors, so that engineering and scientific skills are not lost, but are transferred into more socially productive industries." In transitioning away from nuclear weapons, we do so in such a way that protects the jobs and skills of those who currently work on Trident and in the defence industry more widely.

Thirdly, our trade union Movement's role is central. It is not a matter of just leaving it to the Government. They need our active support to make it happen. We need to step up and coordinate our industrial struggles for jobs while, at the same time, being central in constructing the industrial strategy agenda for a new Britain with new working-class priorities: for the many, not the few. It would rely on the active participation of our trade unions' plant representatives and local communities, together with the Government.

Our times are full of change, but they are also full of danger. We are deep in what Frances has described as a class war and this struggle is part of it. There will be profit-led forces who will want to kill a Labour-led interventionist industrial strategy, particularly one which features defence diversification, just as they killed earlier diversification plans, e.g. the inspirational Lucas Plan of 1976 and the much less inspirational model of the Blair Government DDA in 1999, which ended up privatised with a hefty slice for US private equity company, Carlyle Group.

If we seize the time, we can defeat such forces and help build the political and economic structures and mechanisms. Alongside our industrial fight for jobs, we need the Labour Party to set up a Shadow Defence Diversification Agency as soon as possible as part of the development of an overall industrial strategy, with jobs and skill guarantees, for inclusion in the next Labour Party General Election manifesto. Congress, we have the opportunity to force the direction and pace of change. The whole Movement must use all its power to ensure that it is not frustrated, as it has been in the past. I move. *(Applause)*

David Semple (*Public and Commercial Services Union*) seconded Motion 17.

He said: Our members, including the civil servants in the Ministry of Defence, and also staff in private sector contractors, such as Babcock International, demand that we defend their jobs regardless of whether we are selling weapons to Saudi Arabia or whether we decide to renew Trident. That must be at the absolute heart of the trade unions' agenda for diversification of the defence industry.

We firmly believe that diversification in a national industrial strategy – that is transitioning highly-skilled and highly-unionised workforces from military contracts into peaceful ones – is the best way to do this whilst defending all jobs. We have examples from elsewhere around the world about how this sort of thing would work. We could start by imposing huge waiting times before any closures and redundancies. During this period, which could last five years for the closure of a US military base, for example, employers could be compelled to discuss with the elected union representatives of their workforce about what investment is available and what redeployment options there are within that company. If there are not any within that company, they could then invoke a Defence Diversification Agency to discuss what other options there are within the public sector.

Failure of employers to engage with the unions and with workforces in this area has been the historical undoing of defence diversification efforts. A Defence Diversification Agency could compel that kind of engagement. It could also be a clearing house which ensures that defence workers are high up the priority list when it comes to planning the development of high-tech jobs in green energy, space exploration and other sectors.

Just transition is an approach which is gaining ground in many carbon-intensive industries, as we heard in the last debate. This is exactly the kind of approach we need in defence. A Shadow Defence Diversification Agency, which is what the motion says should be set up, would also be a valuable tool which, with the support of unions, could put pressure on employers and the Tory Government to plan right now for transitions at the end of contracts. It could also help unions fight on issues like pay

because there are many groups of workers in this industry who are not particularly well-paid and who do not benefit from the billions in profits which are wreaked from their parent companies.

There is a broader point to be made. If Jeremy Corbyn becomes the next Prime Minister, as we hope he will, do we want a Labour Government that is prepared to continue selling weapons to Saudi Arabia knowing, as we do, the use to which they are going to be put? It is not just about invading Yemen or suppressing democratic dissent within those countries. It is also about suppressing trade unions and the free expression of the workers' movement within their countries. I do not think we do. I do not think we will want to sell weapons to China, Oman, Turkmenistan and other dictatorships – we know the consequences of the arms trade – but nor would we ever support the loss of a single job. We must transition to peaceful jobs. That is what this motion calls for and I urge you to support it. I second. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Tony Kearns (*Communication Workers Union*) spoke in support of Motion 17.

He said: Some people talk as if a defence diversification agency is something new. Tony Blair formed one in 1999. We had one in this country, but unfortunately he privatised it in 2001 and it just vanished. The idea was to focus on a just transition for communities. Its idea was not to lose engineering and social skills, but to utilise useful production.

The argument in support of this motion was made when we unanimously carried Composite Motion 1 just over an hour ago when we were demanding a strong

economy for all. This begins to set an agenda which says that we can diversify. As the comrade who seconded the motion said, do we want to be the ones who sell arms to Saudi Arabia, causing catastrophe on a massive scale in Yemen? Is that what we are defending? Someone will have to tell me that that is worth defending because I do not think it is. What we should be doing is using the skills that exist which produce those types of weapons and those profits for big companies to invest in renewable energy, the things we talked about in Composite Motion 1. We should invest in a railway infrastructure, new housing and digital infrastructure and we should put the workforce and communities at the front of that debate.

When we talk about investment, this Government cannot find money to pay public sector workers or to invest in the health service, but if it wants to drop a load of bombs somewhere in the Middle East, it finds the money. The money exists, but we need a planned economy. We need to say that the first duty of any government is to defend its citizens, but we need to assess exactly what that means and we need to do that alongside the other needs of the country. That is what we mean by a just transition and diversification.

I was going to refer to the excellent Unite report which came out last year, but I believe my comrade is going to do that. So I ask you this question again, which comes from the issue of selling arms to Saudi Arabia; are we going to defend those types of jobs come what may? The shackles and handcuffs which go on prisoners were made in this country and the advertising slogan for the company which made them and wanted to sell them was, "As used on the famous Nelson Mandela". That is what you get when you produce weapons that are designed to kill people when, in our

own country, we are having difficulty educating people, housing people and looking after their health. We support. (*Applause*)

Mahf Khan (*Unite*) supported Motion 17.

He said: Congress, I represent defence, aerospace and shipbuilding workers at Rolls-Royce in Derby. The idea of defence diversification is not a new one to Unite or its predecessor unions. Only last year, Unite published the most comprehensive report detailing our long history of members advancing ideas of new work and spin-off technologies, including the Lucas Aerospace Plan and Oceans of Work, the Barrow Shipyard's version.

This report shows that the track record of success for defence diversification in the UK is poor and serious consideration must be given to assist it with teeth and money if it is to be a reality. Much has changed in the global defence industry in the 40 years since the Lucas Plan, but this should not stop us using it as an inspiration. However, this needs to be tempered with the realisation of the current situation and understanding of the experiences of the past. In 1976, I was three and I am now 43. I have grey hair and many years of lessons learnt. If there is a lesson to be learnt from the Lucas Plan it is this: unless there is industrial and political will, such plans will fail and risk leaving UK manufacturing fatally wounded. Congress, in our document, Unite said that the creation of a defence diversification agency is an objective worth pursuing, but it will not work in isolation. It has to be accompanied by detailed plans outlining legislation, funding and investment in order for it to be credible for all the key stakeholders, including the addition of defence workers in the UK.

Congress, I want to make it very clear. Unite's position on supporting its defence workers and the successor programme has not changed. We will engage positively in a debate about a defence diversification agency. This must be on the basis of like-for-like job replacement for existing and future workers in the industry. Let me be clear: Unite will fight without reservation, without equivocation and without hesitation to defend every single job of our members in the defence industry. Yes, there are deficiencies in the motion, but it is in line with our defence diversification document and supported by our aerospace and shipbuilding sectors. Taking these points on board, we support Motion 17. *(Applause)*

Justin Bowden (*GMB*) spoke against Motion 17.

He said: Congress, one of the consequences of this motion would be to take away from thousands of workers the certainty of good, unionised jobs that give them and their communities prosperity and economic security. The motion fails to address the issue of appropriate defence strategies to protect the security and safety of a nation of more than 65 million people in a very uncertain world. Britain is an island nation, nowhere near self-sufficient in either food or energy. The security of the nation and the wellbeing of its citizens require strong armed forces equipped with the latest weapons to keep the sea lanes open and to deter threats. Parliament has already voted to renew Trident 14 months ago by a majority of 355. Labour's superb manifesto at the General Election was explicit: Labour supports the renewal of the Trident nuclear deterrent. The Party kept hold of seats on the back of that commitment.

This motion undermines Trident and the conventional defence industry through the back door, an industry employing over 250,000 workers and 4,300 apprentices, where average pay is £39,000, some 44% above the national average, exactly the sort of well-paid, highly-skilled jobs that every one of us in this hall works to achieve and protect. The motion calls for the TUC and unions like GMB, with thousands of members employed in the defence sector, to campaign for an agency whose key aim would be to ask trade unionists to come up with ideas for replacing their own jobs, akin to asking them to become the proverbial turkeys voting for Christmas.

GMB already listens to our members in the defence industries. We know GMB members take pride in their work and their skills. We know they are proud of the contribution they make to their industries, to the economy and, yes, to the defence of their country. Congress, the Lucas Plan was about saving jobs in the face of company redundancies. This motion risks encouraging redundancies. The logical conclusion would be to actually fuel the decline in manufacturing jobs the motion is supposed to prevent. Our members in defence would vote with their feet.

GMB cannot support a motion replacing real, well-paid, unionised jobs with uncertainty, insecurity and decline. GMB members in the shipbuilding industry and the defence sector are as vital to our security as the RAF's pilots or the Navy's sailors. Congress, posturing on unilateral disarmament and neutrality undermines the security of our fellow citizens as well as undermining the jobs and communities of our members. GMB cannot support such proposals. Please oppose Motion 17. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Tom James (*Prospect*) opposed Motion 17.

He said: Congress, the Lucas Plan was a universally accepted success, but it was a product of its time when there was a much larger engineering and manufacturing base in the UK. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case. We all see the dwindling manufacturing industry and are saddened by its decline. The companies working in the field of defence are not immune to this decline and we have faced round after round of redundancies, hitting shipbuilding and aerospace particularly hard.

I cannot speak to the processes put in place by my counterpart companies, but I know that my company, working very closely with the trade unions, have produced a very robust retraining and resettlement process, which is in place whilst doing everything possible to protect and preserve jobs. The real problem is not the need for diversification; it is the trend of successive governments to give work to foreign companies who fail to deliver on their promise. There are the MARS ('Military Afloat Reach and Sustainability') ships given to Korean shipbuilders, although I sometimes think that MARS refers to the planet, whoever thought it was a good idea to have the hulls built halfway around the world and then fit them out in the UK. They are giving away to Lockheed Martin the contracts to produce armoured fighting vehicles. They promised that 15,000 jobs would remain in the UK, but the reality is less than 1,500. Most depressingly for me, there is the scandalous destruction of the Nimrod MRA4 which, if it had been accepted into service, would have been the most advanced aircraft of its type in the world. Instead, aircraft to the value of £2.6 billion were chopped up with a JCB, another British engineering success story!

Defence needs a long-term strategy that will enable the industry and its workforce to plan with certainty and security. Prospect has welcomed the Government's shipbuilding strategy published on 6th September following the Parker Report. It is particularly welcome that there is a commitment by the Government to work with unions to support the creation and sustainment of high-skill jobs, along with modern apprenticeships and expansion of technician and graduate recruitment.

However, there is still much that needs to be worked through. There will be many issues around this such as the intelligent customer role. If we have to deal with a successful export strategy, we need in-house skills. It is difficult to achieve that with Brexit and civil service cuts. Furthermore, this announcement was swiftly followed by reports of further defence cuts which I will not depress you with. At a time when the UK clearly needs to be focusing on the significant immediate challenges in the interests of national security and current jobs, this motion is, to say the least, an unhelpful distraction. The defence industry does not need diversity; we need sovereign capability and contracts placed with UK companies, preferably mine! Please oppose the motion. *(Applause)*

The President: Moz, you have the right of reply.

Moz Greenshields (*TUC JCC*) replied on Motion 17.

She said: Congress, this motion is not about a defence strategy. This motion is about addressing the job losses that have already occurred and those that we know are planned in defence. This motion is not about scrapping Trident as Congress already

has a policy on that. In 2013, you carried a composite on public finances which said that public finances can be improved by tackling tax avoidance and by the scrapping and replacement of Trident. Money saved by ending our nuclear weapons system could be used to sustain the process of defence diversification vital to our manufacturing future. Such a policy would need to ensure that the jobs and skills of tens of thousands of workers in the sector were preserved.

The motion is about a strategy to maintain skilled employment and protect pay levels. It is about using, not losing, technical knowledge. It is about job preservation, not job loss. Job losses have affected GMB members already as well as those of other unions. It seeks to establish a Shadow Defence Diversification Agency to work closely with the Shadow Department of Industry in developing an overall national strategy to stem job loss where it has not been stemmed before, offering hope to workers threatened with redundancy. I am honoured to have been able to move this in what I consider our Workers' Parliament. I am asking you to support this motion for the many, not the few. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The President: I am now going to put Motion 17: Defence, jobs and diversification, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried.

* *Motion 17 was CARRIED*

Education

The President: We now move to Section 4 of the General Council Report: Good Services, and the section on education from page 43. I call paragraph 4.4 and Composite Motion 10: Education funding crisis. The General Council supports the composite motion, moved by the National Education Union, seconded by NAHT, supported by AEP, GMB, UNISON and EIS.

Education funding crisis

Kevin Courtney (*National Education Union*) moved Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, we debated school cuts last year and we forecast that school class sizes would rise and subject choices for our young people would reduce with fewer children able to do arts, dance, drama and music. We forecast that hundreds of TAs and teachers would be made redundant or lose their jobs when they leave and are not replaced. I regret to say that those forecasts were correct.

We also forecast last year that while those changes would be bad for our staff, they would be worse for the children we teach. We forecast that while class sizes would increase teacher workload, they would also mean that children would get less attention. We forecast that while TAs would be made redundant – and that would be terrible for them – it would be horrible for the children with special needs who are going to lose that support. We were also right about that. We also forecast last year that a parent movement could, and would, grow in the context of these cuts. We did not know how right we were going to be about that.

Working together, our unions launched schoolcuts.org.uk, which told parents the truth about what was happening in their schools. It was not the Government's pathetic mantra that school funding is the highest it has ever been or their pathetic line that we have got more teachers than ever before. It told the real truth that we have more pupils than ever before, that we do not have enough teachers and TAs to go around, and that there are significant real-terms cuts in funding for each of those pupils.

Even before Theresa May called the snap election, parent movements grew around the country, supported by all of our unions. They were growing with meetings of 100 and demonstrations of thousands in Brighton, Newcastle, South Gloucester, Lancaster and many more places. Head teachers, supported by their unions, wrote to millions of parents to draw their attention to our school cuts website. The Government tried to knock our figures. Tory backbench MPs tried to say that our figures were wrong, but the IFS and the National Audit Office agreed with our figures. Theresa May then called the snap General Election. Labour's manifesto came out showing that they would put significant money into schools and every school would see a real-terms increase compared with the cuts that we were forecasting under the Conservatives. We updated our website to show that.

That website and the work that we have done were influential during the election. A video that we put out was seen by four million people. It was shared by 100,000 people. Millions of leaflets were distributed by thousands of volunteers and because of the work of all of the unions involved in this coalition, we made a difference. Independent research suggests that nearly 750,000 people changed their vote during the General Election because of school cuts. Some Tory MPs, who were defending

school cuts by saying they were the right thing, were defeated. Candidates who stood in the election opposing school cuts won their seats. So, the situation is transformed, not just by school cuts, but by everything else we see around us.

No one knows when the next General Election will be, but every MP is worried about school cuts in that election. We are expecting a funding announcement from Justine Greening imminently. We live in hope, but we are preparing for the worst. We think that there will be no new money. We think they will try to sow confusion and will want to talk about redistribution. We think that schools, especially with the most challenging children, will find themselves cut yet again.

We think that our coalition of unions working on this can put this issue back to the top of the political agenda alongside other public services and the pay freeze. Congress, we are working together (National Education Union, NAHT, ASCL, UNISON, Unite and GMB), along with parents mobilising, to call a lobby of Parliament on 24th October, during the half-term. We want there to be thousands of parents, support staff, governors and head teachers there putting pressure on every MP to demand that Philip Hammond sees the writing on the wall. We want a new settlement for our children's education in the November Budget. We want a new settlement for schools, nurseries and colleges. We want parents to say to MPs, "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance as the alternative."

If you think that our children can wait for money to come in, we do not agree. Some of our children were not even born when this crisis happened and we do not agree that

they should pay the price. We want the best education for all of our children. We want a new settlement for our schools. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Nick Brook (*National Association of Head Teachers*) seconded Composite

Motion 10.

He said: I am seconding Composite Motion 10 in the absence of our General Secretary, who is on the train back to London to brief MPs on the truth behind the statistics on school funding. I am not sure who got the more enjoyable task!

At the moment, schools do not have enough money; it is as simple as that. School leaders know it, teachers know it, governors know it, parents know it and all of us have been very noisy about the issue. The noise we made together prompted the Secretary of State to accept that the current funding situation is insufficient and to re-prioritise funding to make an additional £1.3 billion available to schools for the two years from April 2018. £1.3 billion is certainly a step in the right direction, but it is nowhere near enough.

We need to continue to be noisy because when it comes to school funding, the Treasury is getting quieter and quieter. It is time for the Treasury to step up and protect children's education. We need to get the message through to the Chancellor in time for the autumn Budget, confirmed for 22nd November. Today, NAHT launches our Schools Funding in Crisis campaign. Our members will be writing to MPs and working with parents, governors and others to tell the Chancellor that his silence on school funding is unacceptable and, quite frankly, baffling. Seven out of ten school

leaders are saying that their budgets will be unsustainable by the 2019 academic year, the very year that Britain is supposed to leave the European Union. With all the uncertainty that comes with it, that is the very moment that seven out of ten schools will cease to be able to balance their books. That is not sensible public spending; it is reckless.

School leaders care deeply about the quality of the education that they can provide for children and young people. That is what gets them up in the morning and that is what keeps them awake at night. I know that parents are right behind us. Now is the time to harness the combined efforts of the TUC. The Treasury has got to dig deep to reverse the school funding crisis if we have any chance of protecting our world-class education system. Without fair and sufficient funding, the devastating impact of real-term cuts on schools will continue with redundancies, a narrowing of the curriculum, an inability to invest in vital equipment and a reduction in extra-curricular activities. Congress, I strongly urge you to support this composite. *(Applause)*

Kate Fallon (*Association of Educational Psychologists*) supported Composite Motion 10.

She said: Congress, the AEP fully supports the campaign to stop the huge cuts that schools are facing, but the problem goes beyond school budgets. Schools function best, and children do best, when there is a wider team around the school. They sometimes need access to specialist support services. They need access to educational psychologists. Local authorities need the funds to ensure that those specialist services are available for all children and young people in all schools, regardless of their

status. Politicians from all parties say that they believe in access to education for all. If so, they must surely recognise that some children also need specialist advice and support so that they can have access to education. All school staff sometimes need specialist advice so that they can support the children's access.

The right to education is a fundamental right of every child, enshrined within the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Our current Government is not meeting that commitment. The data tells us, and our members tell us, that more and more children and young people are being denied access to proper educational provision because they, in their schools, do not have, and cannot afford, access to the specialist advice that they need. In too many areas of the country, the increasingly fragmented education system and the pressures on local authority budgets mean that schools and colleges no longer have access to regular visits from educational psychologists. They no longer receive the advice and support that their staff and children need.

Congress, we all believe that education for all, free at the point of delivery, is a hugely important principle. This should also include access to educational psychology services. We call on the Government and local authorities to recognise that many schools no longer have free access to local educational psychology services. We call on the Government and local authorities to work together to make sure that funding is in place to allow at least termly access to educational psychology services, free at the point of delivery, for all schools. Congress, please support this composite. *(Applause)*

Gordon Gibbs (*GMB*) supported Composite Motion 10.

He said: Congress, GMB wholeheartedly support this motion. We have heard about the impact of budget cuts on school workers and our school support staff members are on the front line. Without their services, schools could not function, but along with our sister unions, we have to battle academy chains that will not cut executive waste, but will cut site staff, business managers, caterers and teaching assistants.

It is not right that so many of our members are in constant fear of the next round of redundancy notifications or the next restructure. Quite frankly, it is an outrage. With a huge pupil funding gap looming, the situation will get even worse. It is not always appreciated how important school support staff are. They are the sector's hidden professionals. Many of them work far beyond their contracted hours just to keep the show on the road. Teaching assistants spend most of their time making sure that children with special needs and English as an additional language can receive an inclusive education. In many cases, their specialist skills have been formally recognised, but it is cheaper to downgrade higher-level teaching assistants than it is to acknowledge the true value of their profession. *(Applause)* When our members are under threat, vulnerable children will suffer.

Since 2010, staff have had their pay review body abolished and their pay capped, with teaching assistants set to lose £9,000 in real terms by 2020. Half of all teaching assistants have faced violence in the workplace, but too often they do not get the support they need. Congress, no one should have to work under the constant threat of losing their job or losing their hours or not having violent assaults taken seriously by their employers. Under the plans of the out-of-touch Tory ministers, support staff will bear the brunt of future cuts. We need campaigning unity on behalf of all school

workers because there is a real fight ahead. Congress, we are proud to support this motion and we ask for your support in defending the jobs and pay of school support staff in the months and years to come. (*Applause*)

Nicole Berrisford (*UNISON*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

She said: Congress, UNISON welcomes this motion and the opportunity to add our support to this important debate. As you have heard, England's schools are now experiencing the largest real-term cuts in funding in more than a generation. That is not only unacceptable; it is shameful. The new promise of an additional £1.3 billion for schools is proving to be false. As we all know, it is simply diverted from other parts of the schools' budget. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not additional funds.

As schools funding has fallen dramatically, class sizes have risen. Subjects have been dropped, resources cut back and teacher and school staff's jobs lost or unfilled. It could not be clearer that unless the Government put new money into the overall budget, all schools will face an impossible struggle to make ends meet. What about the impact on the most vulnerable in our schools? The brutal truth is that the most vulnerable are always most at risk from budget cuts.

UNISON is well aware that teaching assistants, valued though they are, are often the first to go, leaving vulnerable children less likely to be supported in mainstream settings. In March, *The Guardian* newspaper reported on one school which was losing one-third of their TAs to help plug holes in their budget. We know that teaching assistants not only cover the pupils with a dedicated Education Care Plan, but they

also watch out for the vulnerable pupils who struggle, not quite meeting the bar for a dedicated plan or have not yet made it through the process of applying for one.

While pupils with special needs are at risk of being turned away from mainstream schools across the country, the irony of the situation is that the Government knows that educating pupils in special schools is far more expensive. Like every other budget cut under this Tory Government, their insistence on dramatically-inadequate funding will alarm everyone who relies on the service, but particularly the most vulnerable. We know that funding cuts in England have a knock-on effect for funding in Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland schools too.

If the Government fail to grasp the importance of school funding, a whole generation of children will have a severely restricted education. That is not opportunity for all. In fact, Congress, it is quite the opposite. Our overworked and under-valued school staff deserve better and our children deserve the decent education that can only come with adequate funds. Congress, please support this motion. (*Applause*)

Stuart Brown (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 10.

He said: There is, I believe, a moral imperative behind funding education and, further to this, it makes economic sense to do so properly. It is an investment in our future. It is payment towards the society that we all wish to see.

I attended the National Education Union fringe meeting this afternoon and I was very inspired by the example outlined of collaborative campaigning between teachers' unions and parents' groups. What has been achieved so far by the Fair Funding for All Schools campaign is to be commended. Through meaningful collaboration and a shared cause, teachers and parents were able to make a remarkable and tangible impact on the result of the General Election and they did it in a way that was modern, vibrant and engaging. As was expressed at today's fringe meeting, the work of this campaign continues. The crisis in school funding remains acute.

In Scotland, we too face a funding crisis. Although we, in the EIS, are encouraged by the recent decision of the Scottish Government to lift the public sector pay cap, we know that cuts to education run far deeper than the erosion of teachers' pay. Rising class sizes, where there is a decline in support staff (both teaching and non-teaching) and a decline in teacher numbers, are the effects of cuts to education funding. Make no mistake, Congress, this is a crisis. I see the sharp end of cuts through many of the members I support. They are overworked, highly-stressed and at breaking point, if not beyond, trying their best to deliver for young people, professional to their core, but crumbling under the pressure that results directly from funding cuts.

It is sadly not surprising that a recent survey by Bath Spa University into Scotland's teacher workforce found that 40% of 5,000 Scottish teachers were considering leaving the profession in the next 18 months. These cuts also adversely impact upon young people. Bigger class sizes mean less one-to-one time with a teacher. Less learning support means greater challenges to be faced by those who need support most.

Congress, when seen in these terms, it is clear that the interests of teachers, support staff and parents are not exclusive. Cuts to funding damage both the workforce and young people. The lesson of the Fair Funding for All Schools campaign is that together, unions and parents can affect positive change for young people. Congress, I ask strongly that you support this motion and put the collective strength of our Movement firmly behind teachers, support staff and parents. Most importantly, we must show that it is the trade unions who are on the side of young people and who are fighting for a better future for all. (*Applause*)

The President: Thank you. I now put Composite Motion 10: Education funding crisis, to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Composite Motion 10 was CARRIED*

The President: I now call Motion 52: Excessive and unnecessary education workload: setting pupils a better example. This will be moved by the National Education Union and seconded by EIS. Unite and the NASUWT have indicated that they wish to speak.

Excessive and unnecessary education workload: setting pupils a better example

Niamh Sweeney (*National Education Union*) moved Motion 52.

She said: I recently tweeted, “Will the last person leaving the education profession please turn the light off?” It was a joke, a response to yet another colleague announcing that they were quitting their job, but it is not funny. It is a serious, stark and graphic reflection of the biggest recruitment and retention crisis education has ever faced and today even the DfE agreed with that.

There are intrinsically-linked causes to this crisis: funding and investment and a decade of pay cuts that you have already heard about. Add to that a flawed accountability system, a testing and exam system that sucks the love of learning out of everyone, the omission of special education need and disability in government educational policy, and the highest level of mental health illness in both our profession and, most concerningly, our young people, all of this leads to excessive workload and professional burn-out.

The DfE’s own workload survey highlighted that teachers in England work in excess of 54 hours a week, leaders over 60 and support staff way beyond their contracted hours. Several years ago, I took a major step to save my career. I went part-time. This had a huge impact on my earnings and my pension and a huge impact on how some viewed my commitment to my profession. I made the decision to work four days so that I could work unpaid at home on the fifth day in order to remain in the profession that I love, which I have to say I am very good at. I did it in order to save my relationship with my partner and my family and I did it to save my physical and mental health.

Too many educational professionals are taking this action, the only option they feel left open to them. I have worked in an establishment that had a 25% turnover of staff each year. I can now jokingly call it “the dark side”, but at the time it had an awful impact on my workload and I considered leaving the profession that I love. It was directly linked to workload pressure and micromanagement as the school leadership grew less confident in an accountability system which could, in one visit, end their career and lose the establishment its reputation. It is a disgrace that school and college leaders have less job security than Frank de Boer!

High staff turnover leads to an increased workload for those who remain. I have seen too many excellent professionals leave for good and too many burn out and suffer ill-health. We have never said that we should not be accountable as a profession, but the current inspector at Ofsted must acknowledge that it has been one of the biggest drivers of excessive workload and it is really not helpful for them to blame and tweet senior leaders in education, asking for suggestions about what SLT can do in schools to reduce workload. Ofsted, sort out your own accountability first. You may have published a myth-busting poster and leaflet, but you created the entrenched micromanagement culture in education. You are the cause of most of the useless, busy data work for educational professionals. *\(Applause)*

As the National Education Union, we will campaign and organise on the issues which matter most, empowering our members, through their Our Workload campaign, to say “yes” as well as “no”. That is “yes” to the tasks that impact on progression and achievement and “no” to the meaningless, data-driven tasks that have no impact on the love of learning. When education professionals from school and college leaders,

teachers and lecturers, and our essential support staff are given the autonomy to make decisions that they are trained and experienced in doing, workload will decrease.

The National Education Union gives us a change to take back ownership of education, our profession, our job roles and our classrooms. Our children and young people deserve a better educational deal and our profession deserves to be listened to. We are the leaders in educational research and practice. We are leaders in innovation and we are the leaders in our classrooms. I move. (*Applause*)

Susan Quinn (*Educational Institute of Scotland*) seconded Motion 52.

She said: You might be surprised that a teacher from Scotland is seconding this motion given that as a result of the 21st Century Agreement, our working week is protected under the Scottish Negotiating Committee's Code of Practice on working time arrangements for teachers. It outlines just how a teacher in any Scottish establishment should be able to manage their work in a 35-hour working week. Yet, like our colleagues south of our own border, recent surveys showed that class teachers and managers alike are regularly working well beyond this time. Indeed, as my colleague said recently, independent research shows that 40% of our colleagues are so stressed that they were considering leaving the profession in the next 18 months. For an already understaffed system, such a prospect is simply unacceptable.

So how can it be that this 21st Century Code of Conduct is not making a difference when our employers signed up to it and they are supposedly committed to a reduction and management of our workload? We saw the implementation of the CfE, with its

revised curriculum and revised qualifications, at a stage when minimal additional time was provided. In a 13-year period, there were only a couple of extra in-service days to manage the whole 3-18 curriculum, to be developed, implemented and embedded across new strategies for all.

During this time, the EIS regularly made requests for additional time or delays and these were not always accepted – in fact, rarely accepted. Getting It Right for Every Child, an ESN policy, and other implementations across the system mean that our classrooms are stretched. The policy documents always recognise the need for resources, but never quantify these and therefore we are left to get on with it within our working day.

Five years ago, our own Cabinet Secretary spoke at the EIS Conference and indicated that he understood the workload issues. He set up a working group which reported twice on this matter and yet there is still no difference. So why, in five years, have we not seen a reduction in our workload? Well, we continue to have to implement new curriculum development and new qualifications, as well as taking on board the stresses and strains of the poverty gap, and we have to do this all within our 35-hour working week. They give a nod to the recognition that an increased number of special interest groups are having an impact on our lives, but will not do anything about it. Indeed, we were surprised to hear that the Scottish Government has even managed to sponsor its own Maths Week last week for Scotland, which really makes no sense to us.

No one is coming up with practical solutions for the tackling of bureaucracy. Congress, for Scottish teachers, conditions may be managed north of the border, but some sort of workload impact assessment on all education policies will make a difference to us all. Please support. (*Applause*)

Philipa Marsden (*Unite*) spoke in support of Motion 52.

She said: Congress, I do not think I need to remind you that education is vital in our society for all our futures. A high-quality education can ensure that each child and learner has the opportunity to discover and achieve their potential, but we cannot do this if our education staff, our teachers and our support staff are battling through excessive workloads and struggling with real pay cuts.

I work in education, as do many of the people I know. I am also a county councillor and I despair at how discussions have become warped; referring to outputs, league tables and statistics, but rarely the children whose futures are in our hands. It is a discussion that has been shaped by marketisation and privatisation in the sector, with forces that have also led to education staff being underpaid. I see first-hand how those I know working in education are working up to 20 hours extra per week, their evenings and their weekends eaten up by the bureaucracy that is needed to keep this market operating, despite it not providing school places or the quality of education and accountability that children and our communities deserve.

Other speakers have already highlighted the detrimental impact of this on the mental health of education staff. We all agree that we need an education workforce that is

highly-motivated and skilled, which is able to impart their passion and knowledge to support learners and enable them to develop. Yet, we have dedicated education workers who are exhausted, who are unable to take breaks, and who are unable to spend time with their families. Just today, my sister (a former teacher) said, “Exhausted teachers cannot teach properly.” The most important thing for a class is that their teacher is well-rested and physically and emotionally well when they stand in front of them each day. A tired teacher cannot deliver to the best of their ability, even with the best-planned and detailed lesson. As the motion highlights, they are battling against the odds to deliver high-quality learning.

As trade unionists, we should be concerned that not only is this hindering children from having the best education they can, but we are also sending a signal that this is what to expect from the world of work and they deserve better. Congress, please support this motion and its call to pressure the Government into immediate action on this important issue. (*Applause*)

Alison Morgan (*NASUWT, The Teachers’ Union*) supported Motion 52.

She said: Congress, that workload is an issue for teachers is now not in dispute. There is an overwhelming mountain of evidence that teachers’ professional and personal lives are blighted by excessive workload. I witness this daily through my work as a local secretary for the NASUWT. In the NASUWT’s Big Question Survey, four-fifths of teachers stated that excessive workload was their number one issue, with the key cause of excessive workload pressures being marking and assessment systems

being created by schools in order to fulfil the demands (whether perceived or actual) of a high-stakes accountability regime rather than to benefit pupils' learning.

The cumulative impact of year-on-year increases of teacher workload is really taking its toll upon teachers with three-quarters of them recording very high levels of stress, leading to two-thirds expressing concerns over how this is impacting on their mental health. In a separate survey commissioned by the NASUWT and carried out by the independent polling company, ComRes, 69% of teachers said that they were always, or often, tired at work and 48% said that they had no control over the work they were being asked to do. As we all know, that leads to excessive stress.

Given all of the above, it is not surprising that 73% of teachers said they could not recommend teaching as a career, a rise since the first ComRes poll of 2013, which was just 16%. It is also not a shock that NASUWT evidence showed that 60% of teachers have seriously considered quitting the profession in the last year. Workload is directly leading to a recruitment and retention crisis unseen since the later years of John Major's government.

The NASUWT has ensured that workload is at the top of the Westminster Government's agenda since 2011, using this research commissioned by the union as the basis for this claim. The NASUWT is continuing to press the Government to address the workload burdens which are blighting the profession through pursuit of our union's national trade dispute. This has been allied by the action that ordinary NASUWT members have been taking since 2011, day in, day out, by taking action short of strike action – and, when necessary, strike action – to act in defence of

teachers' terms and conditions to ensure that excessive and unnecessary workload is curbed in schools. Without this action of the NASUWT, the workload pressures which some teachers face would be much worse than they are now.

Congress, being able to rest and recharge is vital in maintaining energy, enthusiasm and morale. As role models, our pupils should see us say, "Enough is enough." The Government must commit urgently to the action necessary to bring downward pressure on teachers' workload and working hours, to stop the drain of exhausted, burnout teachers, to retain teachers, and to restore the work/life balance of teachers that they so richly deserve. This can only lead to better outcomes for all the students they teach. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The President: I am now going to move Motion 52 to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 52 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, unfortunately, we are running a little behind schedule and I do want to take Composite Motion 14 today so I am asking that you agree to suspend Standing Orders for ten minutes extra to allow us to take this in today's business. Are you happy to do that? (*Agreed*) Thank you. I call paragraph 4.5 and Motion 53: Post-16 Education. The General Council supports the motion, moved by UCU and seconded by the National Education Union. UNISON and the NASUWT

have indicated that they wish to speak. Can you come up to the front to make sure we can take the motion in a timely and orderly way? Thank you.

Post-16 education

Joanna De Groot (*University and College Union*) moved Motion 53.

She said: There is a saying that knowledge is power. As trade unionists, we know how to use knowledge – that is information and understanding – to support and empower members to build our struggles and campaigns. It also works the other way round. Power is used either to support access to knowledge or to restrict it. From austerity cuts to school testing, from the abolition of the Education Maintenance Allowance, from cuts to colleges to attacks on student funding and the teaching of English as a supplementary language, we know how the Government is currently using its power to provide resources or, in fact, to take them away from education, as with health, transport and public services.

In post-16 education, we have faced, and continue to face, major attacks on colleges and universities and, outrageously and appallingly, on student access to post-16 study and qualification. This Government is doing massive damage to people's life chances and to the very skills that they claim to support. This is why UCU welcomes the Labour Party's proposal for a new National Education Service, which would be a step towards a proper cradle-to-grave education system, free at the point of use. That proposal had a key role in the surge of support for Labour at the last election, partly expressing growing concern by young people and their families about the rising cost

of post-16 study and a wish for a fair, inclusive education system which is publicly funded.

UCU argues, as it has long done, for a post-16 education to be publicly-funded as a public good, for lifelong learning opportunities to be available to all, and support for access courses to the Open University for adult and prison education. It wants no money barriers to participation. It wants learners' rights to have the well-supported, properly-trained workforce providing the education that those learners deserve.

Labour's commitment to abolishing university tuition fees was also central to their appeal to voters and matches my union's long-standing policy to end tuition fees and to use the tax system to get business to pay their share of funding for post-16 education through a business education tax. Growing fees have begun to discourage anyone with limited resources from applying to university. The 2016/17 UCAS figures saw a 4% fall in university applications from home students, with creeping discrimination and exclusion.

Now, it is claimed that we cannot afford public funding of tuition fees, but the Institute of Fiscal Studies (which is not exactly a progressive, radical body) have shown that if the cuts to corporation tax made since 2010 were reversed, it would produce £12.4 billion, which would more than cover the cost of restoring direct funding and maintenance support for higher education students. In the same way, UCU knows that direct funding for further education is also good for students, for communities and for the economy. Every £1.00 of spending on further education produces a £25.00 return.

We give equal support for the principled case for a post-16 education free at the point of use – the right thing to do – and to a hard-headed economic case for investment in further education. We argue that students should get meaningful choices of pathway to learning with equal value for academic, technical and adult learning, all of them sustainably resourced. Students deserve the chance to learn by working with staff which are decently paid, properly treated and not ground down by insecure employment and workload stress, racism and gender injustice. Students deserve such a system, staff deserve the pay, conditions and support to do their best for students, and families and communities deserve the benefits that this brings.

Congress, lifelong education is power. Knowledge is power. Power in the hands of working people changes the world. I move. (*Applause*)

Josie Whiteley (*National Education Union*) seconded Motion 53.

She said: We are very pleased to second this motion and I would like to focus on the issues of forced maths and English GCSE re-sits and also staff training needs in post-16 education.

Teachers and lecturers do not mind if their students sometimes fail. Failing is all part of the learning process and you can learn a lot from that experience. However, they do mind when a government policy forces them to sign up a student for an exam that they are highly unlikely to pass. Imagine that you want to study a performing arts vocational course at an FE college, but you are forced to sit an A-level in, shall we say, chemistry just because Michael Gove thinks that it is good that you do that. You

have to repeatedly sit that exam until you pass it, but you never pass it because not every member of the population ever could, and I include myself in that. How does that make you feel?

The post-16 sector accepts that students need maths and English qualifications, but these have to be fit for purpose. I used percentages regularly in my work, but I have never needed to use quadratic equations since the day I took my maths O-level. Some young people fare better when they are studying more practical qualifications in maths and English and these give them relevant skills that they will need, both personally and in their working lives.

The current funding rules in FE do not acknowledge this fact and those who have failed their GCSEs cannot have their vocational courses funded unless they re-sit their maths and English again and again. As only about one-third of students pass these re-sits, we can safely conclude, I think, that this system is not working. It affects the motivation and mental health of many young people who consistently feel they are a failure. Evidence shows that students can develop literacy and numeracy skills via different types of qualification. The Government just needs to understand and accept that that is the case by listening to education experts. However, we all know that the Government dislikes experts.

I need to confidently report that, in FE colleges, we love them. We want experts teaching our students, we want experts designing and developing the curriculum, and we want to teach the next generation of experts. As the Government plans to introduce T-levels, how about involving us in the process? They could use our

teaching expertise and could also perhaps invest in our training and development to ensure that we have a fully up-to-date, highly-skilled workforce in the post-16 sector.

The number of 16-18 year olds is set to grow significantly over the next decade and yet post-16 education has faced a reduction of £1 billion in funding since 2010. Now is the time to invest in FE rather than bribing the DUP. At a time of such uncertainty for our country, we need the resources to fully prepare our young people for their futures. FE staff must be funded properly to ensure that those with teaching qualifications, such as the proposed T-levels, are absolutely up-to-date in relevant techniques and are trained on, and have access to, the latest equipment used in their industries.

As the TUC General Secretary said yesterday, in this digital age, workers will need new skills on a scale never seen before. That includes FE staff. I second the motion and ask you to support. (*Applause*)

Andrew Beech (*UNISON*) supported Motion 53.

He said: I am pleased to speak in support of this motion on an issue I care passionately about and the vital difference an education can make. Education should be open to all, without a price tag attached or a future burdened with a crushing debt. Colleges, universities and workplaces are all places in which we can learn and be part of a system of lifelong learning which helps us to grow as people. It opens up life chances and builds upon our potential.

Education is not just about learning or skills for the future. It is also about our pasts. We all know that we have to learn from the mistakes of the past otherwise we end up revisiting them in the future. Further education and vocational qualifications are not the destinations of the privileged, which is why we should ask the UK Government why the adult skills budget has been slashed by 29% since 2010 and why the further education sector has been placed in a financially perilous position. We should also ask why the Government prefers eye-catching announcements about millions of new apprenticeship places, which do not have the rigour or resources they need. It makes a mockery of the promise that effort, talent and potential will be rewarded.

We know this too well in UNISON because many of our members who have returned to adult education and learning have often been made to feel that universities are not for them or that circumstances have stood in their way. We have seen a dramatic fall in the numbers of adult learners and part-time students. Part-time learners have declined 61% since 2010. UNISON and sister unions try to remove the barriers to learning in every way we can, but financially starving further education raises barriers. Tuition fees raise barriers. Abolishing maintenance grants raises barriers. The end of properly-resourced and independent careers services raises barriers. The removing of NHS bursaries for nurses raises barriers and, in my opinion, is stupid.

(Applause)

UNISON believes that the Westminster Government should look to the efforts by Scotland and currently Wales to develop a more cohesive further education system. Congress, this motion points the way to making this a political reality in England too. Please support this motion. *(Applause)*

Alan Hackett (*NASUWT, The Teachers' Union*) supported Motion 53.

He said: Congress, high-quality, public post-16 education must underpin any industrial or economic strategy which seeks to secure the future long-term health of our economy and our society. With the backdrop of Brexit, this is surely more important than every before.

Since 2010, we have seen prolonged and devastating attacks to post-16 education in England. The sector has been placed under great pressure due to the legacy of heavy cuts since 2010; the removal of the Education Maintenance Allowance; concern and confusion created by the local area review process (which continues to threaten significant numbers of college closures and mergers); confusion around Government plans for full devolution of FE funding; the continuing expansion of the FE student loan system; and the wide-ranging attacks on pay and conditions.

NASUWT members and sixth-form colleges have faced deep cuts to their budgets and major structural changes, including widespread privatisation and marketisation of education, coupled with the relentless denigration of teachers' professional competence, status and qualifications with increasing job insecurity. Cuts to post-16 education funding have meant that the entitlement to a quality education that young people should have had has been seriously compromised.

Congress, we believe that the failure to protect and enhance post-16 funding is economically short-sighted. High-quality post-16 provision is critical to ensuring that

young people have the skills to meet the changing global and economic needs. We need to restore the Education Maintenance Allowance, which did so much to ensure that young people from disadvantaged backgrounds were able to remain successfully in education, develop their skills and pursue their aspirations. We need to properly invest in the post-16 workforce and commit to establishing a system which recognises and develops teachers as professionals.

A world-class system cannot be sustained where there is no guarantee of quality professionals in every institution. A national framework of professional requirements and standards, underpinned by a framework of professional terms and conditions of service, is critical to ensuring quality education for all young people. Congress, please support this motion. (*Applause*)

The President: I move Motion 53: Post-16 education to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Motion 53 was CARRIED*

The President: Congress, thank you for your indulgence. I now call Composite Motion 14: Health and social care: transformation, integration and cuts. Can all the speakers please come down to the front? It is going to be moved by UNISON and seconded by the SCP. Other speakers are the CSP, BOSTU and Unite. Please come down to the front and be ready to speak quickly after the last speaker. Thank you very much.

Health and social care: transformation, integration and cuts

James Anthony (*UNISON*) moved Composite Motion 14.

He said: Congress, thank you for voting to stay behind longer just to hear me speak.

I feel very honoured!

Congress, we have heard all week about the impacts that austerity is having across society and public services, with the most vulnerable bearing the brunt. Nowhere is that more clear than in social care, which has been on the critical list for decades due to increasing demand and the failed policies of privatisation and fragmentation. Service users have been let down. Austerity cuts to council budgets have only amplified this as cash-strapped councils have cut to the barest essentials of funding. We have seen the rise of 15-minute care visits, a disgrace to this country.

As well as failing the vulnerable, there is then ever-increasing pressure on the NHS. The NHS, in which I am proud to be a nurse, is in crisis. It feels like last winter never went away and now NHS providers are warning that this winter could bring disaster without an urgent Government bailout. The Department of Health's response has been to ask the NHS to think the unthinkable in cash-strapped areas by axing services, treatments and beds that they know are vital.

Congress, there is a reason that those things are unthinkable. Of course, there is also this apparent silver bullet of health and social care integration and UNISON will

always support integration where it genuinely improves services. There are some great ideas and collaborations happening out there, but these need funding and support. Austerity sucks out much of the good from integration and too often leaves it as a cover for cuts.

Congress, as always, it is the staff who are just about holding the system together. Care workers in UNISON tell us that they are staying over their time to get the work done and then using their own time on top of that to do shopping and cleaning for their service users. Too often, they are not even getting the minimum wage. Too often, they are on zero hours contracts. Now, the Government is refusing to even implement their right to the minimum wage during sleep-ins. NHS staff, who have seen their training budget slashed, have been without a decent pay rise for seven years, with the lowest paid in the NHS in Northern Ireland now relying on increases in the national minimum wage as their pay increase. Congress, it is an absolute disgrace. Social care and the NHS have been relying on EU migrants to run them. They come over here to look after our sick and those in need, but with the threat of Brexit, many more of them are not coming. In fact, many of them are leaving.

However, it is not all bleak. We have had some significant victories. UNISON, with our sisters in other unions, has frustrated many attempts at privatisation since Lansley's hated Health and Social Care Act came in, from cancer and end-of-life services in Staffordshire to last week's announcement that we have stopped NHS professionals being privatised. (*Applause*) More and more councils are signing up to UNISON's Ethical Care Charter, an ethical care charter that ends 15-minute care visits and delivers a real living wage for the carers that provide it.

Unions together have delivered a real living wage for NHS staff across Scotland and Wales and in some NHS employers. We have previously heard Holyrood and now the Westminster Government saying that they are going to end the pay cap. Do you know what, Congress? Those words mean nothing if it does not put a penny in the pockets of every one of our members: the nurses like me; the medical secretaries who enable me to do my job; and the cleaners who clean the hospitals and the clinics that I work in. If it is good enough for a pay rise for nurses, it is good enough for a pay rise for absolutely every one of our health and social care members.

Congress, we have a clear message on that: pay up now and lift our members out of poverty otherwise we will take action to defeat this Government. Congress, if you want social care and the NHS to be there when you need them then you need to be there for us. Please support. Congress, I move. *(Cheers and applause)*

Katie Collins *(Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)* seconded Composite

Motion 14.

She said: Congress will be aware of the huge gulf in the provision of social care for those who can afford to pay for it and those who cannot. In a recent poll of doctors in England, 92% did not think that enough social care is available to stop patients ending up in emergency departments or to avoid them having to stay in hospital despite being medically fit to leave. Almost as many (88%) said that big reductions to social care that local councils are able to provide to older and disabled people have contributed to the pressure and the same number believe that social care services, which are

intended to help people remain safe and well-supported at home, offer an inadequate level of care for their patients.

The Care and Support Alliance, which commissioned the poll, said that chronic underfunding of social care had increased the burden on the NHS. Indeed, over the past several years NHS podiatry departments have re-profiled their patient case loads, discharging patients who require simple footcare such as nail-cutting, as this is now considered a social care need according to the Clinical Commissioning Groups. However, very little, if any, provision is put in place to assist these patients, many of whom are vulnerable, to then get this social care need met. Many dedicated private practitioners are trying to offer these patients a service, but they obviously need to charge to be able to run their businesses, which means that many patients struggle to afford this.

The Government's vision for the sustainability and transformation plans is to deliver healthcare closer to home in a more efficient manner. The action of the NHS podiatry departments, under the direction of the CCGs, is in direct conflict with this ideal. Councils in England claim that £3.5 billion has been taken out of the social care system since 2010 and, as a result of the austerity-driven cuts to many local authority budgets, some 500,000 people who would have received social care in 2009 no longer qualify for it despite the aging population.

The Society's private practice members are reporting that they are seeing more and more patients who, in their opinion, are high-risk with multiple comorbidities. These patients should be seen within the NHS system yet it is becoming harder and harder

for them to access foot health services and many have long waiting lists. For example, John is a high-risk patient as he has peripheral vascular disease and therefore poor circulation yet he has been discharged from his NHS department as he has been deemed to have simple footcare needs. However, if he gets a wound on his foot, it may not heal and turn into a ulcer or even gangrene. He is only able to go to a local private practitioner every six months. Therefore, it is imperative that these patients are looked after. Please support the motion. (*Applause*)

Bronwen Handyside (*Unite*) spoke in support of Composite Motion 14.

She said: In the trades union Movement and now in the Labour Party, we work for a world which is for the many and not the few. Margaret Thatcher famously told us that there was no such thing as society and she set out to create a world in which this was true. One of her projects was the creation of the purchaser/provider split in the NHS. It was the thin end of a wedge which has succeeded in shattering the NHS into suitably-sized and structured pieces ready for the private sector to take over. This is happening while we witness the development of an inequality-fuelled social and health crisis. Life expectancy is decreasing for the poor and increasing for the rich while infant mortality is on the rise in deprived communities and falling for the wealthy.

Secrecy and lack of consultation have surrounded the undemocratic imposition of the sustainability and transformation partnerships, which Unite is campaigning against. They have been dressed up as wonderful ways for health and social care services to

collaborate locally, but trade unionists will recognise that management-speak word “transformation”, which actually means “cuts”, in this case £22 billion worth.

Speaking of secrecy, how many know that these 44 STPs have planned to evolve into yet another structure, accountable care organisations, based on a US model, which are designed from the outset to partner with the private sector. Eight already exist and several have already announced the inclusion of private companies.

The commercial interests which have lobbied British governments for the last 30 years are achieving their aim of occupying the NHS and sucking out profit at the expense of patients. It looks like Thatcher’s project to reverse the gains of the welfare state and transfer public funding and assets to the private sector is nearing completion. The composite refers to working with campaigns and this must include the pensioners’ Movement, an organisation such as the National Pensioners Convention, which campaigns tirelessly for the NHS and social care to be adequately funded from taxation and provided free at the point of need. The best hope for the NHS and social care is for the trade unions as a whole to ramp up the battles against austerity to break this current smoke-and-mirrors Tory Government and for us to start campaigning now for a Labour election victory. *(Applause)*

The President: I now put Composite Motion 14 to the vote. Will all those in favour, please show? Will all those against, please show? That is carried unanimously.

* *Composite Motion 14 was CARRIED*

Ballot results for the General Council

The President: Congress, I now invite Adam Burns, the Chair of the Scrutineers, to give the results of the ballot for the General Council.

Adam Burns (*Equity*) presented the Scrutineers' Report.

He said: Will delegates please turn to the back of your Agenda and I will give the results of the ballot for the General Council, Section C. The members nominated for Sections A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and the General Purposes Committee are as printed in the Agenda.

Section C:

Ged Nichols (Accord) 179,000.

Simon Weller (Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen) 208,000

Dave Penman (FDA) 177,000

Eddie Saville (Hospital Consultants and Specialists Association) 196,000

Ian Lawrence (NAPO) 70,000

Mark Dickinson (Nautilus International) 204,000

Nick Cusack (Professional Footballers' Association) 202,000

Manuel Cortes (Transport Salaries Staff's Association) 197,000

Those elected are Ged Nichols, Simon Weller, Dave Penman, Eddie Saville, Mark Dickinson, Nick Cusack and Manuel Cortes. (*Applause*)

The President: Congress, that concludes this afternoon's business. Can I just remind those young delegates who want a photo with Frances and me to come to the front. Otherwise, Congress is now adjourned until 9.30 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

Congress adjourned at 5.47 p.m.