

GMB ANNUAL CONGRESS

held on:

SUNDAY 6TH JUNE – WEDNESDAY 9TH JUNE 2010

at:

SOUTHPORT FLORAL HALL, SOUTHPORT

.....

**SIS. MARY TURNER MBE
(President of the GMB Union)
(In the Chair)**

.....

PROCEEDINGS

DAY TWO

(MONDAY 7TH JUNE 2010)

.....

**Conference reported by:
Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd.,
1st Floor, Quality House,
6-9 Quality Court,
Chancery Lane,
London WC2A 1HP.
Telephone: 020 7067 2900
email: info@martenwalshcherer.com**

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY 7TH JUNE 2010

MORNING SESSION

(Congress assembled at 9.00 a.m.)

THE PRESIDENT: Will Congress start coming to order, please. We have a busy, busy day. Congress, I know you are all bright-eyed and bushy-tailed after your receptions last night. Settle down.

Congress, I just have one or two quick announcements. First of all, I know most of you last night had your dos, regional dos, and I did visit all of them. I want to say thanks for making me feel so welcome, and Malcolm; we did enjoy it. Most of all I want to thank a young man who gave up his evening to run me and Malcolm from one to the other, and only had a glass of coke, so I owe him a pint somewhere. I think we owe him more than a pint. Steve Sergeant from Remploy: Steve, thank you. *(Applause)* I understand that Steve became a granddad; he had a baby granddaughter on Friday. Congratulations, Steve. *(Applause)*

Please do not forget the Remploy stand. As you know, it is one of our most cherished areas that the union has fought to protect. Please give generously as they are trying to raise funds for their projects. Thank you.

Raffle in the Clifton, ticket number 281 to 285 was not collected. Will the owner of these tickets go and see Dougie. Thank you.

I ask all visitors and delegates to check that you have switched off your Blackberries and mobile phones, or make sure they are on silent. OK. Could I now call the Chair of Standing Orders, Helen Johnson, to move Standing Orders Committee Report No.4. Helen.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT NO.4.

(Adopted)

SIS. H . JOHNSON (Chair, Standing Orders Committee): President, Congress, on the subject of withdrawing motions, the SOC has been informed that two further motions have been withdrawn, that is Motion 103, The General Election and the People's Charter, and Motion 104, Return to the Labour Movement.

On the subject of Emergency Motions, the SOC has accepted two further motions as being in order for debate, that is, EM4, Remploy Non-Disabled Trainees, standing in the

name of Yorkshire & North Derbyshire Region, and EM5, Government Funding of Regional Development Agencies, Save our Steel, standing in the name of Northern Region.

Would delegates please bear in mind that given we now have five emergency motions on the agenda the speakers' times are likely to be revised on Wednesday so that those who are putting forward a motion may be reduced to three minutes. We will keep Congress advised of that as things progress this morning.

President, Congress, I move Standing Orders Committee Report No.4. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Helen. Anyone wish to put any questions on Standing Orders Report? (*No response*) Accept the report? (*Agreed*) Thank you very much. Thanks, Helen. Thanks, Barry.

Standing Orders Committee Report No. 4 was adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, you can see the General Secretary is back to his old self today. (*Applause*) I can assure you of that. You know these practical jokes he plays, well, I got a call from him at 7 o'clock this morning to tell me he was in Liverpool Hospital, and he finished it off by saying he met a nurse last night and she took him back to her quarters. (*Laughter*) So, you know he is better. Anyway, Paul, glad to see you back, fit. Take the bucket away, won't you!

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS BY RICHARD MOORE, FOUNDER AND DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN IN CROSSFIRE

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, I have been joined on the platform by someone that we have the highest respect for and it gives me great pleasure to introduce Richard Moore, founder and director of Children in Crossfire. When he was 10 years old Richard was blinded by a rubber bullet during The Troubles. Richard put his own experience of adversity to positive use, building up an international charity helping other children caught in conflict and poverty. His charity provides the most basic amenities such as water, sanitation, housing and healthcare, for communities in places like Ethiopia and Tanzania that would otherwise go without. I call Richard to address Congress. Richard. (*Applause*)

RICHARD MOORE: Good morning, everyone. I met quite a few people at breakfast and there were quite a few hangovers. Hopefully, I will not add to that this morning.

May I, first of all, say how delighted I am to be here. It is my first time ever at a congress meeting so I suppose I should say I am a first-time speaker, is that right? (*Applause*) I am really overwhelmed by the warm welcome that I have received not only today but when I went to meet Paul and Mary at their office a few months ago, and I met some of the rest of the lads there as well, and lasses.

The reason why I am here today is to talk a little bit about Children in Crossfire and also to let you know the reasons why I started Children in Crossfire and, hopefully, to enlist support.

Children in Crossfire is what is commonly known as a relief and development organisation with supported projects throughout Africa and Asia, and South America, and countries like Malawi, Mozambique, Kenya, Colombia, Brazil, Bangladesh, Ghana, Guinea, Gambia, and so on. For the last few years and for the foreseeable future we will be supporting projects in Ethiopia and Tanzania and we are working with some of the most vulnerable children on this planet. I have had the humbling experience of being able to sit in the villages and hold the hands of those children over the last few years.

When I think about poverty, for me poverty is not an issue of charity, poverty is an issue of justice. (*Applause*) All these children are asking for is the basic human rights that you and I, and my children, have come to expect in our lives. The year before last I had the opportunity to read the Human Rights Convention on the rights of children. It was devised 60 years ago. The purpose of that was to draw up a set of rules that every one in this planet is protected by, the right to an education, the right to a family life, the right to opportunity, the right to have a home, the right to be protected from abuse. When I read those articles I thought to myself that the children that I met in Africa may as well read their local newspaper as read that article because every human right possible has been violated regarding these children. They are mentally, physically, and sexually, abused every single moment of every single day of their lives. What Children in Crossfire, in our small way, is trying to do is turn that around, change that.

A few years ago I met a lady called Anne Duffy who was a Chief Executive of the CDNA who now have amalgamated with the GMB. I took her out to a graveyard in Addis Ababa not to see the dead but to see the living. There were 260 people, over 50% of them children, living and sleeping on top of graves in the middle of their own excrement. These children as young as eight years of age, and younger, spent their day on the street of Addis Ababa selling their bodies to earn money to feed their families.

As a result of Children in Crossfire's work we have now purchased the houses to rehouse those families. We have been feeding them for the last two years and they no longer have to sell their innocent bodies on the street. (*Applause*)

We also went to a place called St. Luke's Hospital, two hours outside of Addis Ababa. This hospital, which would not be much bigger than this room that we are in, facilitates a million people. I am delighted to say that the CDNA have trained 13 nurses along with another 10 that Children in Crossfire have trained, so 23 nurses have been trained there to work with children in their villages. This August the first batch of students will graduate. Having these nurses is the nearest any of those people in those villages will ever get to a doctor, so it is a very, very important innovation. I want to thank the CDNA here today. I am delighted they have amalgamated with you. (*Applause*) It is proof how it can work.

I am also here today to ask for your support. I have already spoken to Paul and Mary about the Nourish Project and, briefly, in that area of Showa, two hours outside of Addis

Ababa there are 20,000 children who are malnourished. There are 1,500 children who are seriously malnourished. They call it serious acute malnourishment. These children will die - there is no question about that - unless we intervene.

I put a project to Paul and Mary, and the GMB, asking that we intervene, that the GMB come into a partnership with us, take ownership of this project with us, and make sure that at least 500 of those children do not die this year, next year, and the year afterwards. We can do it. There is a therapeutic feeding centre there that we can get behind tomorrow and ensure that at least 500 of those children do not die by this time next year. From what: the lack of basic food.

I am going to tell you a wee bit about myself and the reason why I started Children in Crossfire. I come from Derry, in Northern Ireland. I come from the Creggan Estate in Derry which was a very violent place in the 1970s. I was 10 years old in 1972. I was at Rosemount Primary School. When I got out of school on 4th May 1972 I was running along the bottom of the school football pitch and a British soldier fired a rubber bullet. It hit me here on the bridge of the nose. I lost this eye and was left completely blind in my left eye, so I have been blind now 38 years. I am glad to say to you that blindness has never been a problem for me. I have never allowed the experience to hold me back or make me feel bitter in any way. I eventually returned to school, university, got my degree, got married in 1984 and got divorced in 1985. No, I am only joking. (*Applause*) I have two children now and I am a very happy and contented blind person. I do not mind being blind; in fact, in many ways blindness has been a positive experience for me. For example, I do not have to look at you lot down there today. (*Laughter*)

I am not the only person that suffered as a result of my blindness. My mammy and daddy suffered enormously. They were two lovely people. They were not involved in politics and promoted any opportunity of peace in our home. It was a very loving caring home. They watched their 10-year old son being blinded and his life changed for ever. It was very difficult for them. My mammy is 91 in June and my daddy died five years after I was shot. She is still as sharp as a pin.

I ask myself how is it that a 10-year old boy from a pretty poor family on the Creggan Estate in Derry was able to bounce back so well from blindness and losing his eyesight in such a traumatic way, and it is down to four things, I think. I come from a good family. I come from a good community. Despite everything, I had choices and opportunities available to me, which is why I started Children in Crossfire. I realised there were children in other parts of the world who might have had their eyesight but did not have what I had, they did not have the choices that I had. I remember one time being in Malawi in a famine situation and I thought to myself, I would rather be blind and live in Northern Ireland than have my eyesight and have to endure this.

So, that is what Children in Crossfire is about, it is about providing those opportunities. We cannot do it alone. We can only do it through the goodness and kindness of people like you.

Another very important thing was that I never had any anger or any bitterness about what happened. I always wanted to meet the soldier that shot me. I did not know his name until 2005 and on January 2006 I flew to Scotland and sat at a hotel in Edinburgh for the first time opposite the guy that blinded me for life and caused so much hurt to my family and me. I have to be honest, delegates, or members (I am not sure of the terminology, I hope I have it right) and say it was the most amazing experience of my life.

We will call the soldier Charles. He and I are good friends now. I have stayed in his house. He has stayed in my house. He has met my family. I have met his. Three weeks ago him and I went to India together and had a private audience with His Holiness the Dalai Lama who agreed to become patron of Children in Crossfire.

I learnt two things about forgiveness. First of all, forgiveness is a gift to yourself. Whether Charles wants my forgiveness or not is irrelevant, what is important is I forgive him. That is for me personally. The second thing is forgiveness is never going to change the past but what it did do and has done in my case is changed the future. The fact that I forgive Charles will not give me back my eyesight. It will not take away all the hurt but what it has done is change my future and I do not believe that I could stand here today being the tall, dark, handsome, good looking guy that I am – (*Laughter*) – at least that is what everybody tells me. I do not know if it is true or not. (*Laughter/Applause*) Mary said I was tall, dark, and handsome but I think her eyesight is worse than mine. (*Laughter*)

I could not do all of that if it were not for the fact that I have that gift of forgiveness. People have put the wind in my sails throughout my life, everywhere I go. I did not go to school for blind people. I went back to the normal school. At every stage of my life there have been people there to give me a helping hand. All I want to do is use that experience to change the lives of the children in Ethiopia and Tanzania that I come across as well.

I am going to finish with a story about my mammy. My mammy was a very powerful woman. She was a very prayerful woman. She used to say her prayers every day. When I got out of hospital after being shot I used to wear a wee vest and pinned across this vest here was every blood holy medal that you could think of. (*Laughter*) There were about 40 holy medals. When I walked I rattled. Every night my mammy used to bring me in and stand me beside the kitchen sink and she used to lift every holy medal and rub it on my eyes and make the sign of the cross. It used to drive me round the bend. (*Laughter*)

Then she would get out the Lourdes water and rub that on my eyes. Then the Doon Well water. Then the Knock water. Then the St. Anne's oil. Somebody said I was lucky I did not drown. (*Laughter*)

My mammy's prayers were that I would get my eyesight back. Well, I did not get my eyesight back, as you know, but I got a hell of a lot more, a hell of a lot more. I always say, you can take away somebody's eyesight but you cannot take away their vision. My vision is the work that I am doing with Children in Crossfire and I am asking you today to support that. Thank you very much. (*Standing ovation*)

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, is Anne Duffy in the hall? Anne, would you like to come up here? We would like to pay tribute to the CDNA, who are now our sisters with the GMB and it is their work that they care very deeply about. Well done, Anne. *(Applause)*

THE GENERAL SECRETARY: I just think that when we come to Congress, you will not read in the *Daily Mail* about the work that we do. You saw the work yesterday with young George and the diabetics. You will not read about the work that our branches and our stewards in our workplaces do in helping out our communities in fundraising. You will not read about it in the *Daily Mail*. They are not interested in that side of what we do, but we care. When I first met Richard I got exactly what you got today, what a fantastically wonderful warm person. Despite all the difficulties and problems that have been thrown at him in his life, the only thing he is interested in doing is helping others, relieving the suffering of children.

He put a question to us just now, he said, are we going to stop 500 of those children dying this year, are we going to stop that? *(Calls of "yes".)* Let's ask you again because I was not quite clear, are we going to stop 500 of those children dying this year? *(Shouts of "yes").* Absolutely. A big project has been put forward. It is going to require us to raise £50,000 a year for the next three years but within the collective interesting ways that stewards and branches have of raising money, screwing dough out of employers, and everybody else they can lay their hands on, I think it is a challenge we will rise to.

I would like you to join me and the Executive in committing fully to provide that money to make sure that not only 500 of those kids do not die, but all 1,500 of them get the full life they are entitled to. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Richard, I would like you to accept a bottle of GMB whisky - you will not buy this anywhere but we will drink it - on behalf of Congress, and a gift of glasses that were made by our members. Thank you. *(Applause)*

RICHARD MOORE: Brilliant. Thank you. I came out here seeing nothing, tonight I will be seeing double! *(Laughter/Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: That was emotional. Well done. Thank you Richard, very much indeed. It is a pleasure and an honour to have met you.

REGIONAL SECRETARY'S REPORT: SOUTHERN REGION

SOUTHERN REGION

1 MEMBERSHIP AND RECRUITMENT

FINANCIAL MEMBERSHIP	82,230
Section Financial Membership (by each Section):	
COMMERCIAL SERVICES SECTION	24,520
MANUFACTURING SECTION	8,975

PUBLIC SERVICES SECTION	48,735
Grade 1 members	49,518
Grade 2 members	26,101
Retired, Reduced Rate & Others	6,611
Male Membership	38,868
Female Membership	43,362
Total number recruited 1.1.2009 – 31.12.2009	13,209
Increase/Decrease 1.1.2009 – 31.12.2009	3,710 increase
Membership on Check-off	50,645
Membership on Direct Debit	24,885

The Region

For the fourth year in a row the region beat its previous enrolment figure for the calendar year. At the end of 2009 the region had enrolled 13,209 new members. At the same time, the Region grew to 82,230 members which was 3,710 more than at the end of 2008.

The combination of beating the previous year enrolment and growing by such a substantial amount during the worst recession for over 70 years, demonstrated an outstanding effort by all concerned in the Region.

Once again, GMB@Work is the core of all organising activity. In 2008 officers had been trained in GMB@Work and in 2009 all regional staff attended the same training.

The region's and the Union's objectives have been fully rolled out within the region to meetings involving branch secretaries and activists.

Recruitment Targets and Campaigns

The ROT team has continued to develop successful recruitment campaigns either on their own or in conjunction with Area teams.

The region has organised a Contractors Forum which has helped to strengthen and consolidate our position within a number of contractors.

The region has established an NHS sub committee where nominated delegates across the region meet on a quarterly basis. The committee encourages the co-ordination of regional activities and to communicate information about the NHS throughout the region.

South West Area

Since Congress 2009 the South West area of the Southern Region, despite the dire economic conditions, has continued to demonstrate membership growth. Successful organising campaigns have been carried out by local officers and key activists assisted by the Regional Organising Team in the schools of Devon and Cornwall counties.

The Public Sector continues to underpin the membership growth of the area against a backdrop of budgetary pressures and job cuts within both local government and the NHS. Through good workplace mapping and following the principles of GMB@Work more stewards are being identified and trained through a series of courses co-tutored by officers. The establishment of a key Rep network across the area has given stewards the opportunity to gain support from representatives within different industries across the area other than their fellow workplace stewards, branches and officers.

South Coast Area

The Team have supported both regional and national campaigns within such areas as Asda and Southern Cross and also received support from the Regional Organising Team with a number of campaigns.

Within local authorities campaigns have been run with Portsmouth City Council, Dorset County Council (within Education) with ongoing activity in Hampshire County Council (Education). Other campaigns involved Dorset County Council (Civic Offices), Portsmouth City Council (Residential Care Homes), Southampton City Council, Bournemouth Borough Council and Poole Borough Council.

Within the Private Sector a successful campaign was run within SGN amongst SGN 'C' employees who were formerly employed by Contractors and mostly not unionised. All fifteen depots in Southern and Scottish Region were visited resulting in the recruitment of 900 new members and a Rep in every depot. The success of the activity culminated in recognition for the SGNC Group and the establishment of proper consultative forums. All SC team members participated in this activity supported by a number of lay Reps from the industry.

An ongoing campaign at Nicholas & Harris Bakery has finally resulted in a sole recognition agreement for GMB. This campaign has been ongoing for some time and the outcome is particularly pleasing as the employees are predominantly Eastern European (mainly Polish). This campaign was conducted with support from the Project Workers using Polish speaking skills to maximise the potential.

Despite the rundown of Gatwick Airport following the announcement of its sell off from BAA, activity there has resulted in a minimum of sustained membership with increases in some areas as a result of campaigns run on the back of TUPE transfers.

Team members have been involved in ongoing industrial activity which has sustained GMB's position with businesses without necessarily resulting in noticeable increases in membership. An example of this is the Gaming industry where a downturn in activity has meant that membership growth was difficult despite improvements for employees brought about by GMB activity.

Another example is within the Portsmouth Naval Base where an industrial dispute situation brought about renewed interest in Trade Union activity but no significant membership growth because membership levels were already at 99% amongst shop floor employees. However, organisation within the workplace ensures that the membership levels are maintained with ongoing recruitment of all new employees into the business.

Central Area

The Central Area has seen recruitment and organising campaigns within the national targets ie Southern Cross care homes, Asda stores and schools.

In particular the issue of equal pay and single status were used to improve membership in Swindon Borough Council where a substantial number of equal pay claims and victimisation claims have been lodged through Thompsons solicitors.

The Regional Organising Team also undertook a successful campaign in West Berkshire schools which improved membership significantly.

Resources were also allocated to Heatherwood and Wexham Park NHS Trust around the outsourcing of work to Sodexo and improved membership amongst the directly employed NHS staff.

With responsibility for the Security industry, the area team continued to be involved in recruitment and organisation within G4S and Securitas in particular.

The area continued to be a focus for migrant worker organising and the Union continues to grow toward recognition at LF Beauty (formerly PB Beauty in Trowbridge).

Towards the end of 2009 officers and the local branch in Swindon were actively assisting a GMB member, Victor Agarwal, to secure the position of PPC in North Swindon following the retirement of Michael Wills MP.

London and South East Area

The South East area has continued to improve membership across a number of London Boroughs. In the majority of cases this recruitment is linked to a local campaign. For example, in Lewisham the local branch has visited schools to support the staff negotiating body and these visits also include the upgrading and single status of the support staff in schools.

Within the borough of Bexley the area used the imposition by the Council of single status agreement to campaign and build the membership.

Within Surrey County Council the area has continued to see growth over a period of fifteen months growing from 2000 members to 2700. The principles of GMB@Work have been applied to ensure that more stewards were involved in organising.

The area has once again see growth in Kent County Council. In Medway Council there has been a successful negotiation for further release of stewards. This extra facility has enabled the branch to concentrate on planning, recruiting and organising activities. This branch continues to grow and works well with Medway Council in organising training through our Education Department and lifelong learning.

As part of the organising agenda within East Sussex County Council the area has secured release for another part-time convenor.

The area has also recruited well within contractors; specifically Veolia and Verdant.

Within the NHS the area has built on the transfer of ASU Ambulance Service members into the region to grow our membership within that sector and to establish a local branch.

Within the Private Sector the area has continued to see growth within Wilkinsons, not only in terms of membership but also in organising activity with new stewards appointed in a number of new stores.

Overview of Region's Economic and Employment Situation

As has already been indicated, despite the serious economic situation the region has continued to grow with very little job losses. The South East and South West of the region is not immune to the pressures of the economic situation but in the main the sectors and industries that we operate in have not been hit as much as some sectors that we do not operate within.

It would appear that whichever party wins the forthcoming General Election that there will be an impact in the Public Sector. Whilst the region is not complacent about the impact that this will have, many of its recruitment targets are within front line services whether in education or the health service.

2 GENERAL ORGANISATION

Regional Senior Organisers	5
Membership Development Officers	2
Regional Organisers	24
Organising Officers	4
No. of Branches	113

New Branches	4
Branch Equality Officers	27
Branch Youth Officers	9

3 BENEFITS

Dispute	NIL
Total Disablement	NIL
Working Accident	£3,610.85
Occupational Fatal Accident	NIL
Non-occupational Fatal Accident	NIL
Funeral	£29,614.25

4 JOURNALS AND PUBLICITY

In common with other regional magazines, the region's magazine 'Vision' in 2009 incorporated national pages and the magazine appeared three times.

The region has been involved in a number of high profile campaigns particularly in regard to Pubco which, as a result of the region's involvement, has seen steady recruitment within that sector. The region has also been involved in a number of high profile equal pay campaigns, particularly in Brighton.

5 LEGAL SERVICES

The Region's principal provider of employment and personal injury services, Rowley Ashworth, amalgamated in April 2009 with Thompsons. In the majority of cases though the same teams that were in Rowley Ashworth continue to service the membership in Thompsons. It is anticipated though that there may be some changes in 2010.

(a) Occupational Accidents and Diseases (including Criminal Injuries)

Applications for Legal Assistance	Legal Assistance Granted
624	582

Cases in which Outcome became known

Total	Withdrawn	Lost in Court	Settled	Won in Court	Total Compensation
556	241	3	274		
			£2,774,338	£0	£2,774,338
Cases outstanding at 31.12. 2009			1355		

(b) Employment Tribunals (notified to Legal Department)

Claims supported by Union	101
---------------------------	-----

Cases in which Outcome became known

Total	Withdrawn	Lost in Tribunal	Settled	Won in Court	Total Compensation
101	10	-	82 £454,581	9 £156,347	£610,928
Cases outstanding at 31.12. 2009			54		

(c) Other Employment Law Cases

Supported by Union	Unsuccessful	Damages/ Compensation	Cases outstanding at 31.12.2009
164	2	£1,938,432	13

(d) Social Security Cases

Supported by Union	Successful	Cases outstanding at 31.12.2009
15	7	14

6 EQUALITY & INCLUSION

The Regional Equality Forum is now firmly established in Southern Region with regular bi-monthly meetings. The new structure has been bedded in and the Forum is working very effectively within the Region. We have organised one Regional Conference and there is another planned for March 2010. The Forum is active and covers and reflects all areas of the equalities agenda and this has been a positive development for the whole Region.

The Forum has been actively involved in a number of activities throughout the year and has taken part and played an active role in various Festivals and Pride events, such as Brighton. Forum members have led the way in terms of attendance at several Equalities Conferences encouraging activists in the Region to do likewise; this has had the effect of building up networks, contacts and knowledge, which in turn has had a positive effect in raising awareness and activity within the Region.

A Women's activist course was held and was a huge success and a follow on course has been planned. The Forum has been instrumental in working with the Education Department in helping to develop a range of equalities courses, such as Tackling Racism, LGBT and Migrant Workers. Three have now been held as well as the fore mentioned Women's course. These courses are a great development for helping activists in the Region in building their confidence and knowledge around a whole series of equalities issues. With the equalities message being taken back to the workplace and issues addressed as well as being used as an excellent recruitment and organising tool.

The Equalities Forum has also been active within schools and ran a successful competition within a school in Lambeth to design our Regional Equality banner. This was a fantastic success and raised the equalities agenda, as well as the role of the GMB as a major campaigning union. We are looking to organise a course on the main aspects of the new Equalities Bill and at our Regional Equality Conference, this will be one of the main themes that will be discussed.

There is now a migrant workers website within the Region and the migrant workers strategy is still doing great work, with 10% of regional recruitment being migrant workers. This demonstrates a very pro-active approach in terms of the Region being committed to representing and organising migrant workers. Several hundred migrant workers continue to join the union as a result of coordinated work by the Forum, the Education Department and the Regional Organising Team.

We are pleased with the development and progress of the Regional Equality Forum and the good work that we are achieving for our members. However, we are not complacent and are aware that there is more to be done and we will continue to look at ways in which we can continue to progress the work of the Forum.

Ethnic Breakdown of the Regional Equality Forum in Southern Region:-

White Irish	1	White English	2
White British	2	Mixed White & Asian	1
White Other (Polish)	1	Black	1
Black African	3	Black Caribbean	1
Black Other (Seychelles)	1		

7 YOUNG MEMBERS REPORT

The young members section took part in a number of activities in 2009 and while activism was patchy across the region, there were some significant developments.

National Equalities Forum

We have been working with the national equalities officer on putting together some more youth branded materials. Specifically we are looking at a joining form which identifies 5 reasons why a young person should join the GMB (this will be alongside others for each of the equality strands). To accompany this a Young Members Guide to their rights at work. This will identify key employment legislation as it relates to young people – working hours, breaks, night work etc. Two of the regions key activists have been central in helping to put these together and we are hoping they will be launched in 2010.

Regional Equalities Forum

Unfortunately the Conference scheduled for 2009 had to be postponed. This has been rescheduled for March 2010. We will endeavour to convene the Young Members workshop that had previously been planned.

TUC Network

The GMB have been involved in the TUC's new young members officers network and there have been a number of exciting new initiatives to come out of this.

The first is a more coordinated approach to the 'Speakers in Schools' idea. While we have struggled in the past with resourcing the project, in terms of getting enough reps and officers to deliver lessons, a new off the shelf package is currently being put together. A working group has been set up which we will attend to look at lesson plans with various multimedia packages that teachers and support staff in schools can help deliver to students as part of their citizenship classes. GMB will be able to call upon their contacts in

schools up and down the country to ensure this is rolled out. In turn we can also ensure that the GMB message is delivered and that young people will be entering the workplace with a fuller picture of what trade unionism is all about.

We have also been looking at the potential opportunities that the Future Jobs Fund can bring about for recruiting young workers. This is part of the Governments 'Backing Young Britain' agenda which attempts to address the growing number of youth unemployment. The Fund offers 6 months posts to young people working for predominantly unionised employers up and down the country. The challenge for GMB now is to ensure we approach this young people when they enter their employment, campaign to promote the rights that the Fund offers and in turn boost our young member levels.

Finally there has also been much debate around Apprenticeships. While this is not something that I have had much experience of in southern region, it does seem that there are significant opportunities to approach young people in the workplace where their rights are limited and prone to erosion.

Cuba

A youth activist from Plymouth attended the May Day Brigade representing the GMB. She was able to take part in various activities; volunteering in the local community, attending international trade union conferences, meeting with local trade unionists and learning about their youth structures, and most significantly, attending the 50th anniversary rally of Cuban independence on May Day. The trip gave the delegate some key experiences which she will take with her forever. She also wrote an interesting piece for Vision magazine, and her own local branch.

Workers Beer Company

Delegates from across the region attended various festivals and events with the Workers Beer Company. Teams from Plymouth and Brighton went to Glastonbury, Reading and others raising money which we can use for future events. Some of the funds raised from the Brighton team were also donated to the Royal Sussex's Kaysleigh Kennard Baby Unit – set up in honour of a young member who tragically died.

Regional Young Members Forum

Work is starting again to develop around a new regional young members forum. While this is very early days, one of the regions activists is keen to help kick start this and will be sending a mailing out to all members in the new year with the hope of getting things started.

8 TRAINING

(a) GMB Activists Basic Mandatory Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
2-Day GMB@Work	18	142	84	226	452
1-Day GMB@Work	1	8	4	12	12
5-Day Induction for New Reps Part 1	14	124	59	183	915
5-Day Induction for New Reps Part 2	9	83	42	125	625
TOTAL	42	357	189	546	2004

(b) GMB Activists Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
5-Day Union Learning Reps	4	31	14	45	225
5-Day Union Learning Reps F/On	2	12	6	18	90
5-Day Accompanying Reps	1	5	4	9	45
3-Day Introduction to Employment Law	1	9	-	9	27
5-Day Introduction to Employment Law	1	5	3	8	40
5-Day Advanced Employment Law	3	22	3	25	125
3-Day Training the Trainers	1	3	4	7	21
5-Day Industrial Relations Part 1	1	5	3	8	40
5-Day Industrial Relations Part 2	2	10	2	12	60
3-Day Stress at Work	2	22	8	30	90
3-Day Women Organising for Equality	1	-	6	6	18
3-Day Organising Against Job Cuts	1	6	1	7	21
TOTAL	20	130	54	184	802

(c) Health & Safety Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
5-Day Health & Safety Part 1	6	63	14	77	385
5-Day Health & Safety Part 2	3	31	11	42	210
TOTAL	9	94	25	119	595

(d) Other GMB Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
1-Day Role of the Branch Secretary	3	44	4	48	48
TOTAL	3	44	4	48	48

(e) TUC Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
1-Day/Week Diploma in Occupational H&S	1	-	1	1	
1-Day/Week Stage 3 Health & Safety	1	1	-	1	
5-Day Tutor Briefing	1	4	4	8	40
3-Day Trade Unions & the Environment	1	1	-	1	3
TOTAL	4	6	5	11	43

(f) GMB Officers & Staff Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
2-Day Time & Office Management	3	30	23	53	106
2-Day Role of the Organiser	2	23	7	30	60
TOTAL	5	53	30	83	166
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
GRAND TOTAL	83	684	307	991	3658

2009 has shown an increase of 19.25% in the number of Reps, Officers and Staff attending training courses.

9 HEALTH & SAFETY

The Region continues to support the Reps in the workplace to enable them to support and represent our members. Training courses are increasing giving skills and training to all Safety Reps and advising them of campaigns within their industries. This has had a positive effect in enabling Reps to organise within their own workplaces.

Where possible, we will always try to deliver training to Reps from similar workplaces and relate the course to them and their industry.

Issues that have been dealt with by the Health & Safety Officer are as follows:-

1. The working time directive
2. Ventilation in confined work areas
3. Control of pests in the workplace
4. Working in cold conditions
5. Personal Protective Equipment

These are just some of the areas where we have been able to support our members and ensure that safe working practises are maintained.

We have received support in many cases by the HSE, when we have not been able to enter workplaces and will continue to work closely with them.

In many industries we are facing cut backs, but in particular with PPE members being told that they will have to wear eye protectors over their prescription glasses, foot protection either not given or given in the wrong size and told to make do, migrant workers having to work long hours or told that they will not have a job if they make a fuss.

These are some of the reasons that we have to ensure that Safety Reps are fully trained, are kept up to date with new laws and legislation affecting their industry and have the full support of the Regional Health & Safety Officer.

10 POLITICAL

In anticipation of the forthcoming General Election, the region has set its priorities for key seats that will be supported. In a number of cases officers have been appointed as key seat co-ordinators and have attended the appropriate training.

The region has continued with its policy of trying to roll out a programme for political training for activists

There are a number of key seats in the Southern Region a number of which have GMB supported candidates where the election could be won or lost.

Conclusion

Despite the adverse economic situation the region has continued to consolidate and grow.

(Adopted)

THE PRESIDENT: Can I now ask Richard Ascough, the Southern Regional Secretary, to move his report, pages 136-144. Richard?

The Regional Secretary's Report: Southern Region (pages 136-144) was formally moved.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any questions on the report? No. Agree to accept the report? *(Agreed)* Thank you very much.

The Regional Secretary's Report: Southern Region (pages 136-144) was adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: Can I now move to item 3, Social Policy. I will be calling Motion 163, moved by Midland & East Coast, Brenda Fraser to reply. Then I will 65, 71, 74, 75, 76, and 77, and then June Minnery will reply on 65, 74, and 75.

**SOCIAL POLICY – GENERAL
SAVE THE LOCAL PUB
MOTION 163**

163. SAVE THE LOCAL PUB

This Conference calls on the CEC to lobby Government to re-open the mergers and monopolies commission report into tied public houses.

GRIMSBY FOOD & LEISURE BRANCH
Midland & East Coast Region

(Carried)

THE PRESIDENT: Colleagues, I know we were all enthused by the last speaker but we now have our speakers on the platform and I would like you to show them the same respect. Thank you.

BRO. T. OWEN (Midlands & East Coast): Congress calls upon the CEC to lobby the Government to reopen the Office of Fair Trading investigation into how Pubcos operate. A recent OFT report concluded that the average tied lessee is being overcharged by Pubcos by around £12,000 per annum or £230 per pub per week but after higher “wet rents” and lower “dry rents” are factored into the equation this overcharge has not resulted in higher retail prices to the consumer and attributes the higher retail prices in tied pubs to them being nicer pubs, and the overcharging is something outside of the remit of the competition authorities to remedy.

The GMB in Pub Revolution do not agree with the OFT stance on this matter but agreed to seek to progress matters on the basis that the issues in contention form part of a trade dispute. While the OFT are washing their hands of this matter people’s lives are being ruined and dreams are being shattered. The pubcos make fat profits and in 2008/2009 five pubcos made pre-tax profits of £1,500 million, while some of their 25,000 tenants work up to 60 hours per week and earn as little as £15,000 a year. The GMB has already done the maths; this is less than the minimum wage. So, for the regulators to say this is a trade dispute between employer and employee is less than contemptible.

What did we expect? We should be used to politicians not imposing regulations as this upsets the capitalists and we know that self-regulation does not work; bankers have shown that. We also know that not every employer will do the right thing unless they are forced to. So, when the breweries were forced to sell off some of their tied pubs to improve competition the OFT did not put too much effort into it and left the back door open for our old friends the venture capitalists and other blood-sucking parasites to set up an extortion racket allowing them to siphon off huge profits while tying tenants to unfair terms and conditions.

The hospitality sector is highly competitive and with these terms and conditions it leaves very little scope for tenants to promote their business and prosper, as you can see in most towns around the country the boarded up pubs, and signs attached to them saying, “To let. Business opportunity.” These should be accompanied by a government health warning.

We as consumers show our contempt by going elsewhere or staying at home buying cheaper off-sales from supermarkets, but Sam and Andrew, who were the tenants of The Seven Seas, Grimsby, do not have an easy opt-out and they wish they had more options. They have been in the pub trade for 26 years and the last 15 of them at The Seven Seas, eight years as managers and the last seven years as tenants, and if it was not for the fact that it would put them further into debt they would shut the door and put the keys through the letterbox. With their ground rent at £44,000 a year they were struggling and asked Enterprise Inns for help. They cut their rent for a while and then put it back up and now it is currently standing at £37,000 a year. They are also at the mercy of beer deliveries; they must pay up front and are charged extra if they want their beer within 48 hours.

The local pub is part of our national heritage and has been the pulsing heartbeat of communities for centuries. This kind of treatment is not acceptable and reps would stop it happening in their own workplaces so why is it allowed to happen within the pub trade? Once again, we call upon our politicians to act and confront these parasites and save the local pub from disappearing into the history books. I move. Thank you. *(Applause)*

BRO. M. RALSTON (Midlands & East Coast): President, Congress, we need your support. My local pub, The Green Dragon, and many like it, have been bled dry by tied tenancy agreements. After it closed the vandals moved in. When they had done their worst it was turned into building plots. This is all in the name of maximising town centre locations and profits. On a personal note, I am really pleased to see that everybody from the GMB have so far and hope will continue to support the pubs in Southport. I second. *(Applause)*

SIS. B. FRASER (CEC, Manufacturing): President, Congress, the CEC is supporting Motion 163 with the following statement. Behind the friendly face of that great institution the great British pub lays an evil that threatens their very existence. Large property companies known as Pubcos have behaved outrageously by amassing vast property portfolios at a borrowed cost of much more than these properties are worth. It is estimated that this policy has saddled these pubcos with a debt of £20bn. To service that debt these Pubcos are systematically abusing their tied landlords and landladies up and down the country.

It is well documented that the majority of tied tenants work in excess of 60 hours a week and earn less than £10,000 a year. Colleagues, that is £3.20 an hour. It is also a fact that more than half of these tied tenants actually lose money and subsidise their business by taking an additional job. Tenants are forced to purchase all products from these pubcos at twice the normal wholesale price. This, of course, leads to the grossly over-inflated prices you and I get charged at the bar. There is no limit to the price pubcos can force their tenants to pay. They can charge what they want, and they most certainly do.

To enforce the tie they employ bullyboy companies using unverified and uncertified measuring equipment to make unfounded accusations and demand money with menaces. This, colleagues, is a legalised protection racket where people are living under the continued threat of losing homes and livelihoods if the money is not paid.

Pubcos operate a well-publicised cartel by fixing prices at both ends of the market. They also blacklist independent suppliers forcing them to be complicit in the protection racket. It is not just beer that these tenants are falsely overcharged for, every time you put a pound in the jukebox of a tied pub, or play a game of pool, the pubco gets more than the tenant. Pubcos are virtually in every aspect of the pub industry and so control almost the entire marketplace.

Colleagues, please support Motion 163 and give us back our local pubs. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Brenda. Does Midland & East Coast accept the statement? *(Agreed)* Can I put Motion 163 to the vote? All those in favour, please show? Anyone against? Thank you. That is carried.

Motion 163 was carried.

EMPLOYMENT POLICY: RIGHTS AT WORK
RIGHT TO STRIKE
MOTION 65

65. RIGHT TO STRIKE

This Conference notes with dismay the absence of a protected right to strike in UK law. Conference is mindful of the detriment that anti union laws cause to workers' organisation and struggle. Conference observes the recent positive decisions of the ECHR regarding trade union rights, and encourages the union to pursue appropriate cases to the ECHR in order to establish the right to strike as a human right.

NOTTINGHAM NO.1 APEX BRANCH
Midland & East Coast Region

(Referred)

SIS. N. REDHEAD (Midlands & East Coast): President, Congress, this motion is concerned with the absence of a protected right to strike in this country and proposes an alternative way to protect members' interests which includes their right to strike. Times have changed dramatically since the 1960s and 1970s and so, too, has trade union legislation. It is no secret that when it comes to the obligations which British law imposes on trade unions when exercising their members' right to strike it does not compare to our trade union colleagues in Europe.

The restrictive laws that the Tory Government imposed on trade unions in the 1980s and 1990s in relation to strike balloting and giving notice were created to frustrate unions and deprive them of their fundamental right. Despite the Labour Government's attempt to simplify legislation in 2004, the amendments just created further problems for unions when exercising their right to take official collective action.

The legislation is very complex and open to interpretation and therefore an argument that notice obligations have not been complied with can easily be raised by the employer. This allows the employer to issue legal proceedings in the High Court and make

injunction applications to prevent industrial action being taken. We have seen this recently in the cases of Metrobus and Unite the Union, BA and Unite the Union, and EDF and the RMT.

So, what can we do? Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights provides for the freedom of association and has been of late the basis of trade unions' legal arguments in both British and the European courts. The argument is that Article 11 includes the protection of collective bargaining and the right to strike. Last year the European Court of Human Rights made a judgment which recognised that Article 11 protects the right to strike. Equally, both the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation and the European Social Charter also recognised the right to strike but still the British courts are resisting the European Court's decision.

As previously mentioned, the RMT failed in their Article 11 argument. However, last week it was reported in The Tribune that, "the RMT have launched a legal challenge in the European Court of Human Rights in a bid to stop unions being ordered to call off strikes on legal technicalities." Should the RMT be successful, then the British courts will surely be in breach of Article 11. So, maybe the way forward is to pursue appropriate cases in the European Court of Human Rights because the only certainty at the moment is that this Government is not going to change their anti-trade union laws and when negotiations irretrievably break down we must protect our fundamental right to strike. Congress, I move. (*Applause*)

BRO. M. RALSTON (Midland & East Coast): President, Congress, to withdraw your labour has always been and will continue to be a human right of all workers. Without strike action we would not have a trade union movement. The willingness of workers to take industrial strike action with all of the hardships that this would involve is not taken lightly. We are not serfs or slaves, our freedoms have been hard fought and hard won. The struggle is not over and we should use every avenue open to us. I believe, and I hope you agree, that strike action is a human right. I second. (*Applause*)

REDUNDANCY RIGHTS MOTION 71

71. REDUNDANCY RIGHTS

This conference recognises that workers in the UK are seen by employers as the easiest and cheapest employees to dismiss in an economic recession.

During the recession it has repeatedly been UK workers who have been placed on short time working or made redundant as work in UK plants has moved to other European plants or other parts of the world.

Conference calls the following legal response

- (1) That administrators be placed under a legal obligation to sure the business and jobs before the interests of shareholders and creditors.

(2) That redundancy payments be increased to match the highest level elsewhere, to ensure that making the workers redundant is not simply seen as the cheapest option.

(3) That the 2 year qualification period be abolished for Statutory Redundancy Pay.

HARTLEPOOL 2 BRANCH
Northern Region

(Carried)

SIS. E. JEFFREY (Northern): President, Congress, as trade unionists representing hundreds of thousands of workers across the northern region we are all too well aware of the inadequate redundancy rights of UK workers and the response of UK employers during the recent downturn. UK workers are amongst the least protected workers in Europe during the 13 years of a Labour government. It has been a disgrace that minister after minister has extolled the virtue of our flexible working market. Ministers have argued that in the battle against unemployment it is essential to lower the costs and barriers that prevent employers from taking on new workers.

Well, Congress, as we all know, flexible cuts both ways. By making it cheap and easy to employ by cutting regulations and rights to workers, the Government also make it cheap and easy to dismiss workers. Congress, as the recession cut into the economy of Europe and the wider world, it was the UK workers who disproportionately paid the cost. Faced with spiralling costs and dwindling markets employers set about cutting costs in the only way they know how, cutting workers' jobs, and if a company had more than one plant across Europe and if one of those plants was in the UK, every time it would be UK workers on the shortlist or made redundant.

Congress, this motion calls for nothing more than a level playing field. UK workers deserve the same employment rights as colleagues in Europe. EU law requires fair competition between European neighbours. Support this motion and let's get campaigning for fairness and justice for our members. Congress, please support. Thank you.

BRO. M. McALLISTER (Northern): First time speaker. *(Applause)* Congress, the mover of this motion has outlined the case for fairness for workers in Europe. In a single market that is meant to be fair and just it is simply wrong that workers in the UK have less protection against redundancy than their fellow workers in France and Germany.

Congress, none of us want to see workers on short time and be made redundant. As trade unionists we fight to avoid redundancies every day but we all know that on occasions redundancies are inevitable and in such situations we fight for fairness and justice. We make sure that redundancies are justified and those made redundant are fairly selected.

That is all the motion asks for. We are not asking for legislation to stop redundancies, although that would mean workers could not be made redundant, we want legislation to ensure that workers across Europe have the same protection if redundancies have to happen, or if short time has to happen. We want fairness for UK workers. We want the

same rights and the same protection as workers in France and Germany. Congress, let's make Europe fair and equal, not just simply a bosses' club. I urge you to support this motion. I second. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. London Region, Motion 74, Written Statement of Contract of Employment Particulars. London Region? OK, colleague, I will move to the next one and if the individual is not back by then it will fall.

PAID BEREAVEMENT LEAVE MOTION 75

75. PAID BEREAVEMENT LEAVE

This Conference is called upon by the A40 – Asda Distribution branch to ask the GMB to lobby the Government to make paid bereavement leave a statutory right for all workers.

We believe that the minimum entitlement should be in the event of the death of: partner, children, grandparents, brothers and sisters should be two weeks paid bereavement.

And in the event of the death of: mother in law, father in law, grandparents in law, uncles and aunts should be one week paid bereavement.

The branch feels this should be the minimum legal requirement and asks this conference to give this motion 100% backing.

ASDA DISTRIBUTION BRANCH
Yorkshire & North Derbyshire Region

(Referred)

BRO. M. DOLAN (Yorkshire & North Derbyshire): I propose Motion 75 because I find it unacceptable that in the 21st century an individual who has lost a loved one is caused to be facing financial difficulties at a time of such personal grief. They should not have to make the choice between taking unpaid time off, using their holiday entitlement, going on the sick, or even turning up to work whilst grieving. Employers should be offering support and understanding, not counting the pennies, holding an individual to ransom and forcing them to come to work when they should be at home with other family members supporting one another.

I believe it is the responsibility of us, the GMB, and other unions, to raise the issue of paid bereavement leave with the Government of today and use the influence we have to encourage them to make it a statutory right for all workers. Thank you. *(Applause)*

SIS. R. KNOWLES (Yorkshire & North Derbyshire): President, Congress, this motion is a very delicate subject as it affects everyone at some time or other. Companies vary as to leave granted; some do two weeks for close relatives and one week for non-immediate, and all with pay. Then there are the others who give no time off whatsoever, the bereaved have to negotiate what they need, and this is not needed at such a time. Some

sort of statutory rights need to be implemented to help a person at this most distressing time. Please support. I second this motion. (*Applause*)

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT PARTICULARS MOTION 74

74. WRITTEN STATEMENT OF CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT PARTICULARS

This Conference notes, despite clear Employment Legislation that stipulates that employer has a duty to give employee a written statement of contract; within two months of you starting work, some employers are not providing one. This may be due to cost cutting or wilful disregard. This seems on the surface a small matter, but cause workers stress and in some instant terms and conditions are amended or changed later without employee consent. Although contract can be applied in legal terms, it causes undue problems if no written statements of particulars are given. Therefore a fixed penalty of £100 should be imposed on employer after two months if no written contract provided increase on sliding scale each month for a 12 month period.

GMB LONDON SECURITY BRANCH
London Region

(Referred)

BRO. A. HAFEEZ (London): First time delegate. (*Applause*) Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: And that is not going to get you off the hook! (*Laughter*)

BRO. A. HAFEEZ (London): Despite clear employment legislation, it seems that employers are still bending the rules to abuse short-term contracts. It is only normal for somebody at work from day one to get a job that will give them opportunities to be employed under the employment law and give them rights from day one. At the place I work some staff have been recruited for less than three months, which gave them no employment rights at all. I call on Congress to support this motion and put up a statement that would protect short-term employment. Please support. I move. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I will see if I can reduce the sentence! (*Laughter*)

BRO. B. DUFFIELD (London): President, Congress, in almost any other instance in the country if someone breaks the law and it is subsequently proven that they have broken the law, then a penalty is administered. That penalty will be determined by the seriousness of the breach of the law but a penalty there will be. Most minor offences are dealt with by a fixed penalty, for example, for certain motoring offences and littering.

The important thing is that no matter how minor the offence a penalty of some sort is issued.

So, colleagues, why is it when an employer is required by law to issue a contract of employment within two months of someone starting employment and does not, no action is taken against the employer? Is that employer not breaking the law? For whatever

reason an employer has for not issuing a contract, and let's face it, colleagues, it will not be so that the employee benefits, that reason will not stand up in law. Are we ever going to get to ensure fair treatment for our members when employers can flout this law with impunity? It is simple, Congress, no contract, so pay a fine. I second. *(Applause)*

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT – A FAIR DAY'S PAY MOTION 76

76. YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT – A FAIR DAY'S PAY

Congress recognises that young people are some of the most vulnerable people in the European labour markets. Five million young people are currently unemployed: this is a rate of 18.3% compared to the overall unemployment rate of 8.2%. We have no way of knowing how many are unpaid but working.

Unpaid internships, temporary agency work and limited working contracts are the reality for young people today. These issues must be addressed at national and European levels.

The number of unpaid internships is increasing, meaning that an individual's financial situation can prevent them from working in an industry. Conference calls on the CEC to fight to create a legal distinction between real internships and cheap labour. The exploitation of interns must be forbidden through European-wide legislation.

B59 BRUSSELS BRANCH
Southern Region

(Carried)

SIS. K. DILLON (Southern): First time speaker. *(Applause)* Thank you. Congress, President, five million young people are unemployed in the EU right now and the figure is growing. The transition between education and the workplace is getting increasingly more difficult. I am from Generation Intel. To get into some of the most competitive professions nowadays you have to complete an internship. It is not just desirable, it is absolutely essential. So, yes, an internship will give you skills, it will give you knowledge, and it will give you a network that will help you in your job, but it is just not fair and it is not fair because most of these internships are unpaid. So, if you want a job in TV, in newspapers, in politics, then you better be prepared to pay. If you are not prepared to pay, then it is tough. So who can afford to live on nothing for six months, or up to a year? You might get lunch expenses if you are lucky. Well, it is not the working class. It is not people from a diverse range of backgrounds. It is not the people, quite frankly, we need to see in politics or we need to see in journalism. So, talent and skills mean nothing. Ability to pay means everything. A culture shift is needed and a wholesale change of attitudes. The work many interns carry out is just that, work. Companies and organisations need to recognise this and to start to pay people an appropriate wage. Legislation needs to be introduced to enforce this and to ensure that an internship is not just exploiting workers. Congress, the phenomenon of unpaid internships is creating financial barriers and preventing equal opportunities. Please support this motion and help end this discrimination. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The motion was formally seconded.

**FREELANCE WORKERS
MOTION 77**

77. FREELANCE WORKERS

This Conference asks the CEC to highlight the practice of non payment of holiday pay to freelancers who work on projects in production companies commissioned by broadcasters. This practice is exploitative and is widely practiced with disregard to employment legislation and should not be tolerated. Freelancers who work contracts must have their employment rights recognised. We call on broadcasters to take a lead and not allow the production companies the commission to continue with this practice.

LONDON CENTRAL GENERAL BRANCH
London Region

(Carried)

SIS. S. DAVID (London): I am a first time delegate. *(Applause)* This Congress asks the CEC to highlight the practice of non-payment of holiday pay to freelancers who work on projects in production companies commissioned by broadcasters. This practice is exploitative and is widely practised with disregard to employment legislation and should not be tolerated. Freelancers who work contracts must have their employment rights recognised. We call on broadcasters to take a lead and not allow the production companies the commission to continue with this practice. It is a question of fairness and a hazard in health and safety as freelance workers, who are forced to take a holiday day off, then work additional hours to make up their loss and thereby the positive effects of time off is reduced. The motion specifically references freelance workers in broadcasting. I think the principle should be extended to all freelancers. Thank you. I move. *(Applause)*

The motion was formally seconded.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Does anyone wish to come in on the debates? No. Thank you. Can I ask June Minnery to reply on Motion 65, 74, and 75? June.

SIS. J. MINNERY (CEC, Public Services): President, Congress, the CEC is asking Congress to refer Motions 65, 74, and 75, and support Motions 71, 76, and 77.

Turning firstly to Motion 65, this motion calls on the GMB to pursue appropriate cases to the European Court of Human Rights on the right to strike. A number of recent cases on Article 11 of the Human Rights Convention would appear to give some support to this argument. This is in contrast to the approach taken by the European Court of Justice in cases such as Viking and Laval. This is a complex area and the CEC is seeking reference as the position needs to be investigated further so that we can develop a clear policy.

Motion 74 calls for a fine of £100 with a sliding scale each month thereafter for employers who fail to issue written particulars within two months of starting work.

Although the general sentiments are in line with existing GMB policy, further work needs to be done to identify the financial penalty that would act as a deterrent. We are therefore asking Congress to refer this motion.

Finally, on Motion 75, which calls for paid bereavement leave, the GMB supports the principle of improved bereavement leave but the motion is very prescriptive. We are asking Congress to refer the motion so that we can examine this issue further and develop a clear policy on this issue.

So, to recap, the CEC is asking Congress to refer Motions 65, 74, and 75, and support Motions 71, 76, and 77. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, June. Congress, can I now put Motions 71, 76, and 77 to the vote? We are asking you to support. All those in favour, please show? Anyone against? They are carried.

Motion 71 was carried.

Motion 76 was carried.

Motion 77 was carried.

THE PRESIDENT: Can I ask Midland & East Coast Region, do you accept reference back? (*Agreed*) Congress agree? (*Agreed*) Thank you.

Can I ask London Region on 74, do you accept reference back? (*Agreed*) Does Congress agree? (*Agreed*)

Can I ask Yorkshire & North Derbyshire, do you accept reference back? (*Agreed*) Congress agree? (*Agreed*) Thank you.

Motion 65 was referred.

Motion 74 was referred.

Motion 75 was referred.

THE PRESIDENT: Can I now move to Social Policy: Housing, and ask the movers of 166, London Region, Composite 16 (covering Motions 167 and 168), Birmingham & West Midlands to move, Northern Region to second, and Motion 169, Social Housing 2010, to be moved by Birmingham & West Midlands Region.

**SOCIAL POLICY: HOUSING
COUNCIL HOUSING PROGRAMME
MOTION 166**

166. COUNCIL HOUSING PROGRAMME

This Conference congratulates the Labour Government's decision to build four thousand more council houses.

We would apologise for any misunderstanding but when calling for a massive council house rebuilding programme last year we did mean the other thirty one London Boroughs and the rest of the country.

GMB SOLO BRANCH
London Region

(Carried)

BRO. J. RICHMOND (London): President, Congress, this motion applauds the commitment of the last government to build 4,000 council houses but regrets that most of the country seemed to ignore it. Colleagues, before the recession this country was crying out for affordable housing. Post-recession the need is much more, with repossessions and evidence of such occurrence every day. It will be argued that we must stop all council house building as part of the drive to reduce the deficit. Colleagues, that does not stand up. Public money spent on building homes generates wealth, it creates jobs in the construction industry, and creates spending in the local economies. Congress, it is a no-brainer. Please support. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Are you seconding, Terry?

BRO. T. FLANAGAN (London): It would appear so. I only arrived last night and someone tells me I should have been moving it.

THE PRESIDENT: That's no excuse.

BRO. T. FLANAGAN (London): Council housing – a human right, surely. The last government, not surprisingly, betrayed that human right. How many thousands of people, millions of people, are homeless in this country? How much money could we have spent on doing it? It has not been done. It needs to be done. It is a human right. Let's get stuck into it. Let's see the GMB flex its muscles and get people a roof over their head. Support the motion. *(Applause)*

**COUNCIL HOUSING
COMPOSITE 16
*(Covering Motions 167 and 168)***

C16. COVERING MOTIONS:

- 167. HOUSING (Northern Region)
- 168. LACK OF COUNCIL HOUSING (Birmingham & West Midlands Region)

COUNCIL HOUSING

Conference recognises that despite the fact that the current economic crisis was initially created by a house prices boom which has been followed by a dramatic decline in prices, the underlying position in the UK is one of a chronic under supply of decent affordable housing.

Affordable council housing needs to be built to kick start our economy and provide decent homes for young people and vulnerable families, but councils also need to take stock of the amount of properties lying empty and the unnecessary delays between properties becoming empty to being occupied. This Conference calls upon this Government to make local councils accountable when houses are vacant while young people and vulnerable families are placed on waiting lists.

Conference welcomes recent government announcements that local authorities can build council houses, albeit limited in scope

The GMB calls upon the government to recognise that all previous housing crisis have been resolved by local authority building programmes and that the only solution to the current crisis is to again allow local authorities the freedom and resources to do what they do best, build quality affordable housing.

Conference calls for the reversal of all legislation and regulation that restricts local authority housing and for the government to fund a regeneration programme lead by a local authority home building programme.

(Carried)

SIS. M. CLARKE (Birmingham & West Midlands): This motion was proposed by one of our young members who had experienced difficulty in securing housing for himself and his young family. The situation we find ourselves in today in what is the 21st century almost goes back to the 1950s when it was normal practice to have more than one family sharing a house, having to live in cramped and depressing conditions. We are now 50 years on and what has changed? This is an issue that is vitally important to the younger generation just starting out in life. Some may already be weighed down with debt from higher education, the recession making it harder and harder for young people to get good quality, well-paid, and secure employment. It is near impossible to be able to begin your adult life or raise a family in your own home.

Now that council housing has been sold off for profit, the majority of people have to look to get on the property ladder to obtain a decent place to live but inflated house prices and the banks holding firmly on to their money means that today the best our young people can hope for is to share a room in the home of a relative or a friend. The lucky ones could rent a basic bed-sit where they may become victims of greedy, unsavoury landlords and never be able to save for a deposit for their own home.

So, who is to blame? There is always a lot of talk about broken Britain and the unsocial behaviour of young people in this country but you reap what you sow and if we cannot provide decent quality, affordable housing which is a basic right for all, then what else can we expect? Despite this, the subject of decent, affordable council housing is not high on this or any previous government's agenda. The National Office of Statistics has released figures that state currently in the West Midlands alone we have 3,500 properties vacant and 34,600 across England. Why, when there is a long list of needy people crying out for housing, are these properties lying empty? It will not deliver on the overall housing problem but it would make a vast amount of difference to many of the most

vulnerable young people, and families, if local authorities on direction from government made it a priority to speed up the letting process for these vacant properties. How many times have we walked past a boarded-up council house that stays that way for months on end until any work at all is started and the property is re-let? I bet there is not one person in this room who has not witnessed that type of delay in the area where they live.

Our young people need to be able to live with dignity, give them a reason to feel motivated enough to make a valid contribution to society. I call upon this Congress to support this motion. I move. (*Applause*)

BRO. W. STEWART (Northern): First time speaker. (*Applause*) Thank you. Congress, the mover of the motion has clearly laid out the background to this motion. Yes, the UK and the rest of the world have been through a house-price bubble followed by collapse. That collapse plunged the world economy into crisis but the crisis was not caused by the greed and speculation of the banking sector, it was not helped by their greed of course but it was not the speculation and greed that caused the crisis, it was the long-term crisis caused by under-supply, particularly at the very bottom of the market. There has never been a shortage of luxury housing because that is where the profits are made. No, the shortage has always been at the bottom end of the market. Congress, it is no coincidence that the world economic crisis was caused by problems in the sub-prime housing market in the USA where chronic under-supply and too many desperate people in need of homes combined to cause that crisis.

Congress, the long-term solution to the UK housing problem is that we need a massive increase in the number of affordable family homes and local authorities must lead the way in that building programme. Congress, I urge you to support this motion. I second. (*Applause*)

SOCIAL HOUSING 2010 MOTION 169

169. SOCIAL HOUSING 2010

This Conference accepts that although we as a union are opposed social housing outsourcing by local authorities, but most local authorities have now outsourced their housing stock and Congress is appalled by the lack of emergency provision provided for serious emergencies experienced by tenants. Councils still have the responsibility of providing accommodation without any housing stock in the most part and must therefore accept the vital role as a duty of making certain that all its social landlords have in place a procedure that will make the provision of emergency accommodation for its tenants.

There have been several cases when late at night a major disaster has occurred which were not in any way the fault of the tenants who may have young children and are expected to remain in dangerous accommodation or spend the night on the street.

Congress therefore instructs the CEC to seek legislation from Government to make this provision a statutory requirement. To campaign with the TUC and other Trade Unions through their links with

local authorities to make this provision as part of their requirement with housing bodies prior to any legislation.

W50 WELLINGTON BRANCH
Birmingham & West Midlands Region

(Carried)

BRO. T. HACKETT (Birmingham & West Midlands): Congress, President, I believe that we should all accept that most local authorities have now outsourced their housing stock, something that has been and is strongly opposed by this union. We now find ourselves in the appalling situation of the lack of emergency provision for the most vulnerable in our society faced with homelessness due to unforeseen circumstances. We have seen many cases where due to a major disaster people, especially those with young children or the elderly and frail, had to spend nights in dangerous accommodation or even in some cases sleep rough on the streets. We therefore implore councils to fulfil their duty and make sure that the social landlords have procedures in place to provide emergency accommodation for these tenants.

We therefore ask Congress to instruct the CEC to seek legislation from the Government to make this a statutory requirement. We need a campaign with the TUC and other trade unions to put pressure on local authorities to make this a provision in any outsourcing bids with housing bodies, to address this serious issue now and continue to campaign to make this a statutory requirement. Congress, I move. *(Applause)*

The motion was formally seconded.

THE PRESIDENT: Would any delegate like to come in on the debate on council housing? Can I put them to the vote? Motion 166, Composite 16, and Motion 169, the CEC is asking you to support. All those in favour, please show? All those against? They are carried. Thank you.

Motion 166 was carried.

Composite 16 was carried.

Motion 169 was carried.

REGIONAL SECRETARY'S REPORT: NORTHERN REGION

NORTHERN REGION

1 MEMBERSHIP AND RECRUITMENT

FINANCIAL MEMBERSHIP	72,544
Section Financial Membership (by each Section):	
COMMERCIAL SERVICES SECTION	19,141
MANUFACTURING SECTION	26,130
PUBLIC SERVICES SECTION	27,273

Grade 1 members	45,143
Grade 2 members	9,886
Retired, Reduced Rate & Others	17,515
Male Membership	45,156
Female Membership	27,388
Total number recruited 1.1.2009 – 31.12.2009	6,830
Increase/Decrease 1.1.2009 – 31.12.2009	1,687
Membership on Check-off	38,824
Membership on Direct Debit	16,134

Response to Organising Agenda

Our approach to workplace organising is embedded within the wider GMB@Work strategy. Organisers undertake Initial Support Training (IST) targeted at new lay activists including union learning representatives, with recruitment, workplace organising and retention the key elements, supported by GMB benefits and services. Once the IST is undertaken, new lay activists are eligible to attend the two day GMB@Work course with the key features of workplace organisation explained, discussed and practiced within the course environment. The two day GMB@Work training courses are delivered by Organisers and we have two Northern Regional Organisers nationally qualified in teaching adult learners as a way of overlaying the practical on the ground Organiser knowledge of workplace organisation, with professionally recognised approaches to tutoring our lay activists. To date we have trained approximately 425 new lay activists on the two day GMB@Work course. In addition new lay activists must undertake the IST and attend the two day GMB@Work course as a gateway to embarking on the other parts of the Regional Education Programme.

In addition we have rolled out a concentrated programme of one day GMB@Work training focused on existing lay activists and union learning representatives. The one day GMB@Work courses are being piloted in the first instance within our Public Services Section lay activists, and will then be extended to the rest of our existing regional lay activists. The training of existing lay activists and union learning representatives is delivered by our network of Organiser Tutors. To date we have trained approximately 75 existing lay activists within our Public Services Section.

Workplace consolidation of members in recognised companies is our key priority with particular emphasis on workplaces where we have less than 60% density. Our Regional Corporate Strategy and Development Plan covers our regional organising agenda and our approach to effectively train our army of lay activists will help us in our goals of consolidating and growing our regional membership.

In developing our regional membership base and as part of our regional planning, we are taking a proactive approach to breaking new ground with new targets aimed at bringing additional GMB recognition in our regional workplaces. Organisers as part of the workplace auditing and mapping process, are encouraged to identify potential targets for increasing local GMB membership, with emphasis on building membership above the 10% requirement under the recognition regulations; organising a petition to pass the 50% threshold; lodging the recognition application. This approach has proved extremely successful in winning new recognition agreements and extending our Regional GMB influence.

As part of our Regional Corporate Strategy and Development Plan, Organisers in our Area Teams are dedicated to undertaking two days per week membership consolidation in organised workplaces, and in so doing entrench the GMB@Work culture. Our Regional GMB@Work NOT Information System provides valuable support to turning our plans into action.

Recruitment Targets and Campaigns

The focus for our activity is aligning our Regional Planning with the GMB@Work approach to workplace organisation within national target areas, in conjunction with the National Organising Team. Workplace

organisation, targeted recruitment and retention are aimed at Southern Cross, Schools, Security and ASDA. In addition regional targeting of Wilkinson Stores, Professional Drivers and PUBCOs is aimed at building our regional membership base and locking in to the national organising strategy.

In seeking to develop new organising opportunities, we beat off hostile and renewed attempts by ASDA to win a major victory in gaining recognition at the Distribution site CDC, Washington, Tyne and Wear. We have secured further recognition agreements across the Northern Region including in TRW, Washington, Tyne and Wear in the teeth of an aggressive anti-union company campaign to keep us out. In addition we have made a further attempt at achieving recognition at the former Magna Kansei Company. We took on the Company, now known as CalsonicKansei Corporation, which is particularly hostile, anti trade union and American owned, and succeeded in winning GMB recognition, which was a tremendous achievement and won despite the best efforts of the company's anti-union propaganda aimed at keeping us out. We have also been successful during 2009 against the back drop of a massive recession, in winning recognition in companies within Food and Leisure; Engineering; Construction, Furniture, Timber and Allied areas as we seek to extend the Northern Region's workplace influence.

We continue to develop our Regional Young Members with focused campaign work based on workplace, education and social issues. Several new young member lay activists have completed IST and GMB@Work courses and in our regional planning we are targeting growth in young members as part of the next phase of the Region's development.

Overview of Regions Economic and Employment

As the economy appears to be in recovery mode from the worst recession in modern times, our fears have been realised in that the sting is in the tail of the economic downturn.

Redundancy in the Region is on the increase with big job losses across the board in the Manufacturing Sector, which initially had been holding up well.

The closure announcement of Corus Steel is a body-blow to Teesside where so many jobs depend on the steel-making business, both directly and indirectly. Our Members of Parliament have been working tirelessly to find a solution to save this plant, alongside the Joint Trade Unions. The campaign is ongoing; however, we do not see a remedy without Government financial support.

A large number of businesses have taken the opportunity to shake out jobs, re-organise and, in the process, attack workers' terms and conditions of employment under the veil of the recession. In most cases, unnoticed, apart from the victims in this process.

The threat of future job losses in the Public Sector, despite the colour of the Government, following the much awaited General Election, has added to the doom and gloom.

Yes, the recession may be technically over, but the pain shows no sign of easing.

2 GENERAL ORGANISATION

Regional Senior Organisers	5
Membership Development Officers	2
Regional Organisers	18
Organising Officers	2
No. of Branches	127
New Branches	0
Branch Equality Officers	15
Branch Youth Officers	15

Two of GMB Northern Senior Organisers, Helen Marshall and Jackie Woodall, have elected to take early retirement along with Jim Marshall our Health, Safety and Education Officer.

Three long-serving officers of our organisation whose contribution has been outstanding over the many years of service.

The procedure is underway to replace these positions and we look forward to a smooth takeover and back to the business of growing Northern Region, albeit in these difficult economic times.

3 BENEFITS

Dispute	0
Total Disablement	0
Working Accident	2612.65
Occupational Fatal Accident	4000.00
Non-occupational Fatal Accident	0
Funeral	64803.00

4 JOURNALS & PUBLICITY

Northern Star Magazine

Throughout 2009, three Northern Star Magazines were delivered direct to every member of GMB Northern Region, keeping members updated on relevant news throughout the Region and the organisation Nationally including industrial issues, legal successes, congress and some fantastic personal achievements and charity fund raising articles from both members and GMB staff.

From industrial issues such as the averted strike action at BNFL and ongoing campaigns at Corus, ASDA and Npower through to education learning agreements across the region and more, the magazine aims to cover all aspects of the regions campaigning activity.

As always a substantial contribution was made to the magazine's by the union solicitors Thompsons and Browell Smith & Co. Providing detailed reports and articles on an ongoing basis regarding specific cases, general information and changes to relevant legislation.

In the July issue of the Northern Star a prize draw was developed to encourage people to update their contact details and to provide their email address so that we can improve our communication to members whilst reducing costs. This project increased the email addresses held in the region by around 25%.

Recruitment Booklet

In conjunction with a local design agency, the Northern Region re-designed and developed the Recruitment Booklet which is now the standard publication for recruiting new members to the union.

The booklet was given a more professional image, in line with the newly launched website. Feedback on the Recruitment booklet has been positive and the pre-paid, sealable application forms are proving popular.

Workplace/Branch/Section Newsletters, Flyers and Posters

A variety of publications were issued throughout 2009 to members within Workplaces, Branches and Industrial Sections including some of our largest companies such as Southern Cross, ASDA, NPower and a number of Local Government locations across the region.

Website

After a long wait, the Northern Region website (www.gmbnorthern.org.uk) was finally launched again in late 2010, providing a valuable information source for members and representatives as well as giving the region another medium to encourage recruitment, organisation and retention.

Advertising

The Northern Region has continued to include adverts in relevant publications across the region and nationally with adverts appearing in the Morning Star, local NHS handbooks, the Durham Miners Gala brochure and more.

In 2009 further advertising was arranged with an LCD advert the full length of St. James' Park, the home of Newcastle United FC, ensuring that the union is seen at every home game and by millions across the world watching on TV. We also have an advert at Barrow FC in Cumbria spreading our support across the region.

5 LEGAL SERVICES

(a) Occupational Accidents and Diseases (including Criminal Injuries)

Applications for Legal Assistance	Legal Assistance Granted
890	890

Cases in which Outcome became known

Total	Withdrawn	Lost in Court	Settled	Won in Court	Total Compensation
1163	436		727		
			£6,797,108.38	£	£6,797,108.38
Cases outstanding at 31.12. 2009			2928		

(b) Employment Tribunals (notified to Legal Department)

Claims supported by Union	344
---------------------------	-----

Cases in which Outcome became known

Total	Withdrawn	Lost in Tribunal	Settled	Won in Court	Total Compensation
304	119	9	107	69	
			£303,887.31	£376,672.67	£680,559.98
Cases outstanding at 31.12. 2009			213		

(c) Other Employment Law Cases

Supported by Union	Unsuccessful	Damages/ Compensation	Cases outstanding at 31.12.2009
		£	

(d) Social Security Cases

Supported by Union	Successful	Cases outstanding at 31.12.2009
107	47	9

GMB Northern Legal Services

Protecting members at work and ensuring their employment rights, health, safety and dignity at work are fundamental principles of GMB. Our legal service continues to play an important role in supporting our aims through campaigning, lobbying and fighting claims to secure the best possible terms and working conditions for GMB members.

In the field of employment rights the GMB continued its commitment to resolving disputes in the work place. Where that proved impossible it supported hundreds of members through the Employment Tribunal in claims against their employers. In some cases this meant securing new information and consultation rights from the TUPE Regulations (GMB Northern v Cable Realisations), in others it meant securing employment rights for hundreds of members that worked under sham self-employment status (Callaghan & ors v Lafarge Aggregates Ltd). Our solicitors secured awards and settlements of well over £600,000 through the Employment Tribunal for GMB members, including £270,000 in one claim alone against Circatex. The union's continuing fight for equal pay in the workplace has also borne fruit in 2009 with thousands of claims receiving settlement offers in 5 local authorities.

Working with our lawyers, GMB Northern Legal services secured more than £6.6m in compensation for injured members and their families in 2009. In order to raise awareness of the union's legal service, its considerable successes and the perils of using heavily advertised "No win- no fee" lawyers, members receive regular communication on legal issues and many GMB Northern cases have been highlighted in the national and regional media. We have distributed thousands of Legal Services cards and workplace posters featuring our Legal Service freephone number. Regular monitoring indicates that most members use the legal service as a result of the support and guidance they receive from Officers, Shop Stewards and activists.

We hold regular legal advice surgeries for members at locations across the Northern region and every branch now has a dedicated lawyer assigned to it in order to ensure maximum support and the best possible communication. All new Shop Stewards receive training to assist them in supporting members and raising awareness of the union's legal service.

We routinely monitor the views of our members on the legal services provided in order to develop and improve the service. In 2009, more than 95% of the members surveyed were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the legal service provided.

To ensure that our full-time and lay Officers have the best possible skills to support our members, regular legal training and updates are provided on employment rights and Health & Safety issues. GMB Northern are committed to ensuring that our members continue to receive the best possible legal representation and support.

6 EQUALITY & INCLUSION

During the last year we held an inaugural meeting of the Northern regional equalities forum. We had a number of guest speakers. We discussed the role of the Equalities forum could play in the region, how we could use issues in the equalities agenda to recruit and organise around, and what issues the group were most pressing at the moment.

The issue of carers seemed to be one of the most pressing to our group, many of whom felt they were a group of people who were almost hidden from society and very vulnerable. We also discussed the forthcoming Equalities Bill and the impact that it would have on the country, and in particular GMB members.

We elected a chair and secretary who have agreed to take the work forward and hopefully in the New Year the Equalities Forum will go from strength to strength

7 TRAINING

(a) GMB Courses Basic Training					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
Introduction to GMB (2 days)	14	140	31	171	
GMB/TUC Induction (5 days)	7	64	13	77	
GMB@WORK					

(b) On Site Courses (please specify subjects)					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
3 Day Introduction	6	77	14	91	

(c) Health & Safety Courses (please specify subjects)					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
5 Day Health & Safety	5	43	8	51	

(d) Other Courses (please specify subjects / weekdays/ weekends)					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days
Northern College Barnsley Residential					
5 Day Advanced Health & Safety	1	2	0	2	
3 Day Understanding Disability Discrimination Act	1	3	0	3	
5 Day Employment Law	1	3	0	3	
5 Day Specialist H&S & Environment Impact	1	7	0	7	

(e) TUC (STUC & ICTU) Courses					
	No. of Courses	Male	Female	Total	Total Student Days

8 HEALTH & SAFETY

The RHSO sits on the Asbestos Sub-Committee of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Occupational Safety and Health.

This group deals with all issues relating to industrial disease contracted through exposure to asbestos eg mesothelioma and pleural plaques, dealing with all aspects from exposure risks, identifying potential workplace hazards both in the Private and Public Sectors including treatment and care for sufferers, regulations to prevent exposure and compensation for this debilitating and killer disease.

The main emphasis from, a Regional perspective, is to avoid the risk through alerting and training our activists to carry out risk assessments in their workplace when there is any questions relating to the presence of asbestos materials, as well as promoting a general public awareness of this hidden killer.

To this end GMB, UNITE, UNISON and UCATT are collaborating with union-backed solicitors in setting up a Northern Region Asbestos Support and Campaign Group under the umbrella of the Northern Region TUC. This will bring all of the issues together in a co-ordinated approach, giving advice and support to sufferers and their families by raising awareness and campaigning for justice.

This newly-formed group will work with and add value to those like-minded organisations already engaged in this activity across the Region.

We continue to campaign on issues connected with the workplace environment generally and are presently involved, through the Regional Health Authority and TUC, in encouraging employers to adopt a policy of individual wellbeing in the workplace and lending support to workers who wish to improve their physical and mental health.

(Adopted)

BRO. T. BRENNAN (Regional Secretary Northern): There is just one little tiny matter that is subsequent to the written report, Chair. This is following, I have to say, the abuse that was metered out without mercy, absolutely without mercy, and indeed from the Chair at the last Congress, and I think it is only right and proper that I make this statement: Newcastle United is now back in the Premier League! Thank you very much.
(Applause/Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: When you said a tiny problem, I was wondering! Are there any questions on that, apart from Sunderland coming in, and others? Any questions on 107-113? No. Thank you. You got out of that one a bit quick, Brennan! Congress accept?
(Agreed)

The Regional Secretary's Report: Northern Region (pages 107-113) was adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: Colleagues, I would like to announce a visitor sitting on our platform, our newly elected GMB MP in Scotland, Tommy. *(Applause)* He does not do things by half - he has become the proud father of twin girls as well. Every vote counts! Can I say we know him as Tommy Gateau in London. Tom is a great friend and I know he will be a great MP. So, Tom, good luck and we are always here to support you, as I know you will support us; if not we will break your ruddy arms, so please yourself. *(Applause)* Well done. I could not say the name of the constituency. Rutherglen, is it not, or Rutherglen and Hamilton West? Well done.

CEC POLITICAL STATEMENT

CONGRESS 2010 - POLITICAL STATEMENT

Dear Colleagues,

Now that the dust has settled and we begin to see the shape of this new coalition Government, I thought I would now take the opportunity to thank all GMB members, officers and staff across the Union for the assistance and help that so many of you gave in the run up to and during the election process itself.

It is absolutely beyond doubt that the trade union effort delivered somewhere between 40 to 50 seats that the Labour Party would have lost.

It is a matter of record that trade union organisation and involvement on the ground, in virtually all parts of the UK, delivered great turn outs, and even where we were unsuccessful in winning the Westminster constituency vote the organisation and turn out contributed greatly to the return of more than 400 Labour councillors and the return of many councils to Labour control which will ultimately be of benefit to our members and their communities within the areas.

I hope that those who participated enjoyed the experience and gained much from it. I think that everybody in the GMB can be extremely proud of our efforts.

We will now deal with the new Government and the policies it seeks to promote, in an open and democratic way. We can be proud of our current position. The GMB is in a much stronger position than we were the last time there was a Tory in Downing Street and we will not surrender or offer ourselves weak excuses for failing to tackle the challenges which lie ahead as unfortunately was the case far too often in the past when the politics of Westminster did not suit us.

Best wishes to everybody and here's to a successful Congress and once again thank you to everybody who participated. I can assure you it did make a difference!

Best wishes.



PAUL KENNY
GENERAL SECRETARY

Executive Summary

- GMB and other unions played a crucial role in this election and if it wasn't for the work and support of the unions the Labour Party would have lost another 40 to 50 seats.

- The turnout in the General Election was 65.7%, this meant that nearly 4 in every 10 adults registered to vote did not. In the responses to the GMB political survey 90% of our members said they were sure to vote.
- The Labour Party would greatly benefit from more trade union candidates; who understand and can effectively represent their local communities.
- As a trade union, organising has always been at the core of our existence. We need to build the local organisation in the target marginal seats to ensure we win back the seats needed to regain power.
- We have a trusted relationship with our members; they listen to what we have to say and our views. The messages and information we communicated were crucial in increasing volunteers and voter turnout.
- Labour's Manifesto, coupled with the more positive achievements whilst in government, allowed us to highlight a number of policy commitments that had and subsequently would benefit members.
- There are now 84 MPs in Westminster who are members of GMB. This is nearly 33% of the total number of Labour MPs.
- Party finances played an important part in this election; Labour could not match the millions being poured in the Tory key seats by Lord Ashcroft.

Index

Executive Summary

Introduction

General & Local Election Results

Where now for GMB & Labour?

GMB Election Strategy

GMB Key Seats

Appendix 1 – 2010 GMB MPs by Region

Appendix 2 – Retiring MPs

Appendix 3 – GMB Regional Political Officers

Appendix 4 – GMB Candidates in General Election

Introduction

GMBs engagement in politics has always been motivated by the desire to protect and enhance the lives of our members and their communities. To achieve this, over 100 years ago, Trade Unions formed our own political party and have campaigned for Labour ever since. GMB will continue to use the political process as well as the industrial one to strive to improve member's daily lives.

The 2010 General Election result for Labour was, to put it mildly, disappointing; Labour's campaign lacked drive, vision and the opposition were never fully challenged on their policy commitments. Labour lost 91 seats, lost power and as a consequence the country is now being governed by a Lib Dem / Tory coalition. Many of the new government's cuts now being planned, will impact harshly on our members their jobs and their families.

However, the election result could have been worse. In a way none of the political parties did well. The Tories did not win the overall majority they so badly coveted. Labour did not drop into 3rd place in the national share of the vote and the Liberal Democrats lost 5 of their MPs dropping from 62 to 57. At the same time the results in the local elections were the best for Labour since 1996.

GMB and other unions played a crucial role in this election and if it wasn't for the work and support of the unions the Labour Party would have lost another 40 to 50 seats. Without the collective efforts of the unions we would not be analysing the vagaries of a coalition, or agonising over whether it will last. We would be reacting to a far harsher Conservative attack.

Arguably Labour has only itself to blame for the poor result. The loss of the connection with working people, lack of trust following the expenses scandal and the sense that Labour were no longer on their side. This is not the final chapter in the history of Labour; it may well however be the end of New Labour. Going forward, GMB must ensure its vision and values are at the heart of the Labour Party.

General & Local Election Results

The Tories only needed to win 26 seats to deprive Labour of their overall majority. To put this into perspective only 2 of these seats had majorities of over 1,000. More importantly the Tories needed to win 116 seats to give an overall majority in Westminster.

There was no set pattern to the results, in Scotland there was a swing to Labour, in parts of the Midlands and Southern Counties we saw large swings against. MPs that ran strong locally focused campaigns in many cases bucked the national trends and won. Many of the candidates who were selected for seats late in the election campaign suffered badly because they were not in place long enough to build that local profile.

There were a number of seats that had well organised, resourced and professional campaigns, but unfortunately there were far too few. On election night you could see what started off as a sea of red turning blue as the results came in. Many of those seats that bucked the trend were those supported by GMB.

Labour suffered from a triple whammy of problems:

- After 13 years in government the Tories were able to argue it was time for change.
- The National broadcast and print media was overwhelmingly supporting the opposition.
- Where MPs had neglected their local constituencies there were simply not enough volunteers to do the work.

These three problems were amplified by a very presidential and personality driven leader focused campaign. This did not play to Labour's strengths as the polling following the leaders television debates showed.

Party finances played an important part in this election; Labour could not match the millions being poured in the Tory key seats by Lord Ashcroft. The opposition funded thousands of poster sites across the UK, outspent Labour on direct mail and campaign literature.

In the face of this, local organisation and campaigning took on an even greater significance. Labour must learn the lessons from this election and work with the Trade Unions to build effective grass roots campaigns.

General Election 2010: National share of the vote – Great Britain

The turnout in the General Election was 65.7%, this meant that nearly 4 in every 10 adults registered to vote did not. In the responses to the GMB political survey 90% of our members said they were sure to vote.

	Votes	% Share	Seats
Conservatives	10,683,787	36.9%	305
Labour	8,603,242	29.7%	258
Lib Dem's	6,827,938	23.6%	57
Nationalists	656,780	2.3%	9
Others	2,206,580	7.6%	2

Diversity of the House of Commons

The number of women in parliament continues to increase. In 1979 there were only 11 women in the Parliamentary Labour Party equivalent to 4% of Labour MPs. In 2010 the figure is now 81 and 31% of the PLP. In the House of Commons as a whole the number of women MPs has increased from 20% in 2005 to 22% following the 2010 election.

Party	Number of Women MPs	Percentage
Labour	81	31%
Conservative	48	16%
Liberal Democrat	7	12%
Others	6	21%

The total number Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) MPs in Parliament is 27 up from 16. The percentage of BAME MPs is now 4% up from 2%.

Party	Number of BAME MPs	Percentage
Labour	16	6%
Conservative	11	4%
Liberal Democrat	0	0%
Others	0	0%

Where now for GMB & Labour?

We have an opportunity through the Labour Party leadership election to look at what kind of Labour Party organisation we need, what kind of politics we want to see and how best the Labour Party can change to face the new challenges.

As a trade union, organising has always been at the core of our existence. One recurring theme kept coming to the fore throughout the election campaign; many local constituencies were just not able to deliver the campaign on the ground. Too often the constituency parties did not have the people or the resources to run effective campaigns. In many cases the canvass information we came across dated back to 1994.

We need to build the local organisation in the target marginal seats to ensure we win back the seats needed to regain power. GMB can play a key role in delivering this. Where we were able to work in conjunction with constituencies and support them, we saw the results buck the national trend.

GMB currently affiliates to every Constituency Labour Party (CLP). This is very much a first step, the next stage is to encourage GMB branches to build the links with local constituencies, send delegates and get union members involved. The Labour Party would benefit greatly from more trade union candidates; who understand and can effectively represent their local communities.

Local Authorities and public sector members are vital to the future of GMB growth. With the current government in Westminster it is the perfect time to re-engage with Councils and Councillors. We will develop networks and a strategy for increasing GMB involvement. Like the council elections this year the next few years should, with well run campaigns, deliver more councils and councillors for Labour.

Many of our shop stewards and reps have the skills and knowledge to become effective councillors and council leaders. We will look to develop this with the regions, delivering training and support to increase the number of GMB Councillors.

This election saw a co-ordinated approach to getting union members selected. As a first stage it worked well, moving forward we will develop with the other affiliated unions ways of ensuring our supported candidates have all the opportunities in Parliamentary selections.

GMB Election Strategy

The GMB General Election strategy aimed to target finances and resources where they would make a real difference; seats needed to be targeted on a priority basis. A scattergun approach of spreading resources widely across the 350 Labour MPs would achieve little.

Identifying seats to target was the first part of the strategy, this was worked out analysing a number of factors; how well MP's worked with GMB, the relationship they had with us at a national, regional and local level and the marginality of the seat they were fighting. These were the seats Labour needed to win to stop the Tories gaining an overall majority in parliament.

GMB, very early on in the campaign, developed the messages and themes that would help bring out support for Labour. We identified our members aspirations, their concerns and their fears for the future through the electronic surveys. We developed 4 themes that framed all our conversations and communications with members. These were:

- What it was like the last time the Tories were in power
- What has been achieved over the last 12 years
- What the Tories will do if they gain power again
- What Labour will do if they are re-elected

We have a trusted relationship with our members; they often listen to what we have to say and our views. The messages and information we communicated was crucial in increasing volunteers and voter turnout.

Key seat co-ordinators

A number of Regions appointed GMB key seat co-ordinators to liaise with target seat MPs, their agents and the constituencies. This provided a number of functions, most notably support for campaigns on the ground. However these volunteers also provide a quick feedback on issues and problems to the GMB, through our Regional Political Officer.

GMB Regions and their key seat coordinators provided most of the day to day support work with the key seats. In discussions with candidates, whether or not elected, the greatest thanks are often for those individuals who volunteered providing that vital support and liaison.

Through our membership system we can identify GMB members by key seat. Membership in constituencies varies greatly and ranges from 450 up to 3,000. On average we have around 950 members in any one constituency.

During the election there were many examples of great campaigns and innovative work carried out by GMB Regions. One that did attract the attention of the Labour Party nationally was the large volunteer blitz teams, often in excess of one hundred people. For a demoralised or un-organised local constituency this was a breath of fresh air and in many cases a badly needed morale lifting boost.

Voter Registration & Postal Votes

Ensuring members could vote was a priority for the union. In much of the correspondence with members, the General Secretary reiterated this message 'ensure you use your vote'.

In response to the automated telephone calls carried out, we sent out over 3,000 letters to members who had requested postal vote or electoral registration application forms thus ensuring members who had moved were registered and that those who couldn't make it to a polling station on Election Day had a postal vote.

Workplace and industry Leaflets

Labour's Manifesto, coupled with the more positive achievements whilst in government, allowed us to highlight a number of policy commitments that had and subsequently would benefit members. A number of leaflets were produced for the final week of the campaign; these were targeted to individual work groups. Leaflets were produced specifically for; construction members, public service members, school support staff, ASDA members, those working in the security industry and Southern Cross members.

Communications & GMB Magazine

The three editions of the GMB Regional magazines produced in the run up to the election carried numerous political articles. The articles highlighted what Labour had achieved and attacked the Tories on their policy priorities. The final all members magazine in March was used by the regions to promote their GMB candidates standing for election.

GMB National Communications Department directed and analysed research on candidates, their background and work history. This information was press released locally and attracted significant local media coverage.

Members Survey

We were keen to use the internet and e-mail to raise the level of communication with members. The first exercise was to ask members to rate Labour's achievements. This survey asked members their political preferences but more importantly, asked them to rate what they thought were Labour's best achievements. Over 7,000 members took part in the online surveys. The results from the survey are set out below:

Q6. Public Services - The Top 10 Labour Achievements - All Respondents.	
	Rank
Introduction of the National Minimum Wage.	1
The shortest waiting times since NHS records began.	2
A new flexible points-based system to ensure only those economic migrants who have the skills our economy needs can come to work in the UK.	3
Introduced protection for part-time workers. Giving them, for the first time, equal treatment with full-time workers.	4
Devolution in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, an elected Mayor and Assembly for London.	5
The NHS can now guarantee that you will see a cancer specialist within two weeks of diagnosis.	6
Signed the EU Social Chapter and introduced measures including: four weeks' paid holiday; a right to parental leave; extended maternity leave; a new right to request flexible working.	7

Introduced a new right to Trade Union recognition.	8
All prescriptions are now free for people being treated for cancer or the effects of cancer, and teenage girls are offered a vaccination against cervical cancer.	9
12 million pensioners benefiting from the Winter Fuel Payments	10

The survey showed that unlike previous elections there were a large number of members who, going into the election, were undecided over which party they were going to vote for. In the second survey we carried out, following the televised leadership debate, we saw a shift both to Labour and the Liberal Democrats. From our first survey in February through to the end of the campaign our analysis showed very little move towards the Conservatives. Those members who historically voted Tory stayed with them, but they did not attract any significant new support.

We also asked members for their thought on Labour's policy mistakes in government. The 2 most frequently quoted issues were the Iraq war and immigration policy.

Local Elections

While Labour was losing seats and its majority in Westminster at the General Election, the party was picking up new Councils and Councillors in the local elections. It was the Labour Party's best set of council election results since 1996.

Voters went to the polls on May 6 to elect 164 local authorities – including 32 London boroughs, 36 metropolitan authorities, 20 unitary authorities and 76 district councils.

Labour won control of 15 councils, with a net gain of 412 seats. The Conservatives lost control of eight councils and 119 seats, while the Liberal Democrats lost three councils and 129 seats. This was in stark contrast to the Local Authority and European Elections over recent years.

Additional Councils now being run by Labour: Ealing, Enfield, Harrow, Brent, Merton, Camden, Hounslow, Islington, Lewisham, Southwark, Waltham Forest, Liverpool, Coventry, Doncaster, Hartlepool, Hastings, Oxford, St Helens. Most pleasingly for GMB members, following the bitter dispute with the Lib Dem Tory coalition, Leeds is now back under Labour control.

There were mayoral contests in Hackney, Lewisham, Newham and Watford. Sir Robin Wales, Labour's candidate in Newham, was re-elected mayor for a third term. Steve Bullock and Jules Pipe were re-elected in Lewisham and Hackney respectively.

The BNP courted much publicity in the run up to the elections and had hoped to take control of Barking & Dagenham, they however lost the 12 seats they held. GMB worked closely with the Local Government candidates and Labour swept the board in the borough, winning all 51 seats. Overall the BNP lost 27 council seats across the country.

Analysis of Local Council Control and Seats

Party	Councils		Councillors	
	Total	Net + or -	Total	Net + or -
Conservative	66	-3	3447	-119
Labour	37	+15	2945	+412
Lib Dem	14	-3	1714	-129
Others	0	0	286	0
Resident Associations	0	0	36	0
Green	0	0	35	-9
BNP	0	0	19	-27

Selection of Candidates

A key GMB priority was to ensure that we had good candidates selected to fight the election. The GMB Parliamentary Panel interviewed and selected nearly fifty candidates to go forward for the National Labour Panel. Parliamentary selections were often bitterly contested with some seats receiving more than fifty candidate applications.

The unions took the early decision to work together to help ensure that one union's candidate did not cancel out that of another's. This was not always possible, however the cooperation helped ensure that in many selections we were not splitting the vote and letting non-union candidates through.

GMB Key Seats

GMB put its resources into the 45 key target seats (listed below). For the Tories to win an outright majority in Westminster they needed to take nearly all. As you can see from the table we lost twenty one but did manage to retain twenty four, enough to prevent a full Tory majority.

Region	MP – Candidate	Constituency	Result
BI	Ian Austin	Dudley North	Won
LO	Karen Buck	Westminster North	Won
LO	Andy Slaughter	Hammersmith	Won
LO	Jim Fitzpatrick	Poplar and Limehouse	Won
LO	Kelvin Hopkins	Luton North	Won
MI	Vernon Coaker	Gedling	Won
MI	Chris Leslie	Nottingham East	Won
NO	Roberta Blackman-Woods	City of Durham	Won
NO	Nick Brown	Newcastle upon Tyne	Won
NO	John Woodcock	Barrow & Furness	Won
NO	Jamie Reed	Copeland	Won

NO	Julie Elliott	Sunderland Central	Won
NW	Simon Danczuk	Rochdale	Won
NW	Phil Woolas	Oldham & Saddleworth	Won
NW	Gordon Marsden	Blackpool South	Won
NW	Kate Green	Stretford & Urmston	Won
SC	Anne Begg	Aberdeen South	Won
SC	Jim McGovern	Dundee West	Won
SC	Jim Murphy	East Renfrewshire	Won
SC	Frank Doran	Aberdeen North	Won
SO	Sadiq Khan	Tooting	Won
SW	Gerraint Davies	Swansea West	Won
SW	Madeleine Moon	Bridgend	Won
YO	Mike Wood	Batley & Spen	Won
BI	Ruth Smeeth	Burton	Lost
BI	Michael Foster	Worcester	Lost
BI	Jayne Innes	Nuneaton	Lost
BI	Sue Hayman	Halesowen and Rowley	Lost
LO	Andrew Dismore	Hendon	Lost
LO	Charles Clarke	Norwich South	Lost
MI	Sally Keeble	Northampton North	Lost
NO	Mike Boeden	Carlisle	Lost
NO	Dari Taylor	Stockton South	Lost
NW	Nick Bent	Warrington South	Lost
SO	Celia Barlow	Hove	Lost
SO	Michael Foster	Hastings and Rye	Lost
SO	Jim Knight	South Dorset	Lost
SO	Simon Burgess	Brighton, Kemptown	Lost
SO	Victor Agarwal	North Swindon	Lost
SO	Gwynn Prosser	Dover	Lost
SW	Sam Townend	Bristol North West	Lost
YO	Shahid Malik	Dewsbury	Lost
YO	Linda Riordan	Halifax	Lost
YO	Jamie Lewis	Elmet and Rothwell	Lost
YO	Terry Rooney	Bradford East	Lost

Appendix 1 – 2010 GMB MPs

There are now 84 MPs in Westminster who are members of GMB. This is nearly 33% of the total number of Labour MPs. It is important we work closely with our MPs, to keep them up to speed on the local issues and concerns. MPs can also provide assistance in any local campaigns that our Branches and Regions may wish to run. If you require further information on how to contact your MP please contact your Regional Political Officer.

Name	Name	Constituency	GMB Region
Shanbana	Mahmood	Birmingham Ladywell	Birmingham
Emma	Reynolds	Wolverhampton NE	Birmingham
Ian	Austin	Dudley North	Birmingham
Roger	Godsiff	Birmingham Sparkbrook & Small Heath	Birmingham
David	Winnick	Walsall North	Birmingham
Jon	Cruddas	Dagenham	London
Rushanara	Ali	Bethnal Green & Bow	London
Kelvin	Hopkins	Luton North	London
Alan	Keen	Feltham and Heston	London
John	Cryer	Leyton and Wanstead	London
Karen	Buck	Westminster	London
Andy	Slaughter	Hammersmith	London
Stephen	Pound	Ealing North	London
Barry	Gardiner	Brent North	London
Gloria	de Piero	Ashfield	Midlands
Paul	Blomfield	Sheffield Central	Midlands
Karl	Turner	Hull East	Midlands
John	Mann	Bassetlaw	Midlands
Christopher	Leslie	Nottingham East	Midlands
Austin	Mitchell	Great Grimsby	Midlands
Barbara	Keeley	Worsley	North West
Tony	Lloyd	Manchester Central	North West
Phil	Woolas	Oldham East and Saddleworth	North West
Maria	Eagle	Garston & Halewood	North West
Derek	Twigg	Halton	North West
Kate	Green	Stretford & Urmston	North West
Gerald	Kaufman	Manchester Gorton	North West
Simon	Danczuk	Rochdale	North West
Yasmin	Qureshi	Bolton South East	North West
Mark	Hendrick	Preston	North West
Gordon	Marsden	Blackpool South	North West
Jack	Straw	Blackburn	North West
Nick	Brown	Newcastle upon Tyne East & Wallsend	Northern
Bridget	Phillipson	Houghton & Sunderland	Northern
Jamie	Reed	Copeland	Northern
Mary	Glendon	Tyneside North	Northern
Phil	Wilson	Sedgefield	Northern
Ian	Lavery	Wansbeck	Northern
Julie	Elliott	Sunderland Central	Northern
Stuart	Bell	Middlesbrough	Northern
Grahame	Morris	Easington	Northern
Jenny	Chapman	Darlington	Northern

Helen	Goodman	Bishop Auckland	Northern
Iain	Wright	Hartlepool	Northern
Pat	Glass	Durham North East	Northern
Roberta	Blackman-Woods	City of Durham	Northern
Madeleine	Moon	Bridgend	S Western
Jessica	Morden	Newport East	S Western
Martin	Caton	Gower	S Western
Peter	Hain	Neath	S Western
Nick	Smith	Blaenau Gwent	S Western
Alun	Michael	Cardiff South and Penarth	S Western
Huw	Irranca Davies	Ogmore	S Western
Frank	Doran	Aberdeen North	Scotland
Jim	McGovern	Dundee West	Scotland
Jim	Murphy	Renfrewshire East	Scotland
Lindsay	Roy	Glenrothes	Scotland
Katy	Clarke	North Ayrshire and Arran	Scotland
Fiona	O'Donnell	East Lothian	Scotland
Michael	McCann	East Kilbride..	Scotland
Tom	Clarke	Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill	Scotland
Anne	Begg	Aberdeen South	Scotland
Douglas	Alexander	Paisley South	Scotland
Anne	McGuire	Stirling	Scotland
Tom	Greatrex	Rutherglen & Hamilton West	Scotland
Mohammed	Sarwar	Glasgow Central	Scotland
Alistair	Darling	Edinburgh South West	Scotland
Ben	Bradshaw	Exeter	Southern
Sadiq	Khan	Tooting	Southern
Teresa	Pearce	Erith & Thamesmead	Southern
Siobhain	McDonagh	Mitcham and Morden	Southern
Fiona	MacTaggart	Slough	Southern
Alison	Seabeck	Plymouth Devonport	Southern
Kate	Hoey	Vauxhall	Southern
Chuka	Umunna	Streatham	Southern
Nick	Raynsford	Greenwich and Woolwich	Southern
Jim	Dowd	Lewisham West	Southern
John	Healey	Wentworth	Yorkshire
Jon	Trickett	Hemsworth	Yorkshire
Natascha	Engel	North East Derbyshire	Yorkshire
Yvette	Cooper	Pontefract & Castleford	Yorkshire
Mary	Creagh	Wakefield	Yorkshire
Caroline	Flint	Don Valley	Yorkshire
Mike	Wood	Batley & Spen	Yorkshire

Appendix 2 - Retiring GMB MPs

A number of GMB MPs stood down and did not fight the 2010 election. Many of these MPs supported GMB campaigns and fought to raise our issues and concerns whilst in Westminster. Many thanks are due to those who worked with us at a national, regional and local level.

Those who stood down were; Liz Blackman, Colin Burgon, Harry Cohen, Janet Dean, Neil Gerrard, Ian Gibson, John Grogan, Doug Henderson, Stephen Hesford, John Hutton, Fraser Kemp, Tom Levitt, Eric Martlew, Elliot Morley, Kitty Usher and John McFall.

Appendix 3 – GMB Regional Political Officers

Name	Region
Martin Hird	Birmingham & West Midlands
Vince Maple	London
Les Dobbs	Midlands & East Coast
Colin Priest	North West & Irish
Chris Jukes	Northern
Richard Leonard	Scotland
Paul Maloney	Southern
Pamela Drake	South Western
Steve Jennings	Yorkshire & North Derbyshire

Appendix 4 - GMB Candidates who stood in the General Election

Below is a list of all the GMB members who were selected to fight the General Election, this does not include GMB MPs who were re-standing. Only those newly selected to fight a constituency. There are 2 categories, those who were on the GMB Parliamentary Panel and those who were not on the panel but none the less were GMB members. Those highlighted in bold won.

GMB	Constituency	Name	GMB Region
Panel	Swansea	Geraint Davies	South Western
Panel	Wolverhampton North East	Emma Reynolds	Birmingham
Panel	Sunderland Central	Julie Elliott	Northern
Panel	East Kilbride & Strathaven	Michael McCann	Scotland
Panel	Rochdale	Simon Danczuk	North West
Member	Erith and Thamesmead	Teresa Pearce	Southern
Member	Ladywood	Shebanah Mahmood	Birmingham
Member	Darlington	Jenny Chapman	Northern
Member	Stretford & Urmston	Kate Green	North West
Member	Scunthorpe	Nick Deakin	East Midlands
Panel	Kettering	Phil Sawford	East Midlands
Panel	Wellingborough	Jayne Buckland	Midlands
Panel	Hemel Hempstead	Ayfer Orhan	London
Panel	Nuneaton	Jayne Innes	Birmingham

Panel	Bristol North West	Sam Townend	South West
Panel	Brentwood & Ongar	Heidi Benzing	London
Panel	Kensington and Chelsea	Sam Gurney	London
Panel	Wimbledon	Andrew Judge	Southern
Panel	North Swindon	Victor Agarwal	Southern
Panel	Warrington South	Nick Bent	North Western
Panel	Guildford	Tim Shand	Southern
Member	Leeds North West	Judith Blake	Yorkshire
Member	Elmet and Rothwell	James Lewis	Yorkshire
Member	Brighton Kemptown	Simon Burgess	Southern
Member	Burton	Ruth Smeeth	Birmingham
Member	Norwich North	John Cook	London
Member	Sherwood	Emily Oldknow	East Midlands
Member	Carlisle	Mike Boaden	Northern

(Adopted)

THE PRESIDENT: Can I now ask Andy Worth on behalf of the CEC to move the Political Statement and Mary Hutchinson to second. I will then call priority in debate because they have withdrawn resolutions in favour of the statement: London, Midland, and North West & Irish Region. Andy.

BRO. A. WORTH (Regional Secretary, Midland & East Coast): President, Congress, it was with a very heavy heart that I watched the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats form a coalition government that put Compo and Clegg into Number 10. *(Laughter)* It also put Osborne into the Treasury. They put somebody else in but he has bugged off now; somebody called Laws. That is one down but we have a lot of work to do to get rid of the rest as we go through.

Watching the Conservatives waltz back into Downing Street on 11th May was devastating for all of us but on a positive note it is beyond doubt that the GMB and other trade unions through their efforts delivered somewhere between 40 and 50 seats that Labour would not have won without the trade union Movement - *(Applause)* –a message that pretenders to the throne later today may care to remember.

In London and Southern we helped secure the victory of Sadiq Khan in Tooting, Karen Buck in Westminster, Andy Slaughter in Hammersmith, all excellent GMB MPs. Across Scotland we saw the Labour vote rise. In the North we saw one of our own elected, a GMB officer from the Northern Region, Julie Elliott, and congratulations to Julie. She will make an excellent MP. *(Applause)* She was elected for Sunderland Central. I can pronounce that one so that is all right. Nationally, we produced over a million newspapers for 26 key seats, organised numerous mailouts supporting candidates, and through the automated call-in register we secured 3,000 members to vote. Throughout

the regions members, shop stewards, officers and staff, all volunteered to work in key constituencies. The GMB is grateful to all of those who took part in that election.

Mass campaign events were organised across the country. Who will ever forget London Region's *Battle Bus* taking over 100 activists to support key seats? We had some excellent candidates, many of whom were successful, and we followed GMB policy working with other trade unions and GMB activists to ensure that trade unionists and GMB activists were selected as parliamentary candidates.

Ian Lavery, who is now MP for Wansbeck, and Tom, who Mary mentioned earlier for Rutherglen and Hamilton West, will be excellent MPs but, unfortunately, some of our candidates and MPs were not successful, not through lack of work or effort but because they were caught up in the swing against the national Labour Party. Victor Hardwell, an excellent candidate in Swindon North, Ruth Smeath in Burton, and Emily Oldnow in Sherwood, could not have worked harder and their activists deserve congratulations on the efforts they put in on those campaigns. There are only small majorities to overturn next time and I am sure we can do it if we get our act together. We lost some excellent MPs as well, including Dawn Butler and the two Mike Fosters, MPs who shared our values and determination to make Britain a fair and tolerant society.

Colleagues, the message is that we can hold our head up high and be proud of the way we worked. We may not have held on to power but the Labour Party is far from broken. We have 258 MPs, which is a lot better than the Tories had in 1997; they only managed 165, so it is not such a big hill to climb to take back power. We have 84 MPs in the GMB group and we will be working closely with all 84 in the coming months to ensure that our time spent in opposition is spent holding Compo and Clegg to account.

We will challenge the policies that harm our members. We will fight a tax on Health & Safety regulations. We will fight cuts in public services and, most importantly, we will fight to protect our members whether they are in public or private services, or private industry. We will do what the GMB has a proud tradition of doing, supporting our membership whilst also working to rebuild the Party. There is much to do, therefore, colleagues, and we will ensure that the GMB is at the heard of the Labour Party.

Labour in many ways did lose touch with its core vote. It lost sight of the people that it should have been protecting. It became dazzled by the City and by power. It decided that finance and the bankers – and I have been told I must say “bankers”, I usually do put the “w” in (*Laughter*) – were masters of the universe. How wrong were they!

The people responded to business leaders saying that the National Insurance rate would cost jobs. They were the same buggers that said the minimum wage would cost jobs. (*Applause*) They lied then and they lied this time when they said it and people, sadly, will live to regret that. So, we can do our bit. We will affiliate to all the Labour parties but we need you, colleagues, to get your branch members active in those parties, not just to pay the money and the affiliation, we need you to get back out to the parties and take control of the Party. (*Applause*)

We must use this opportunity to educate the politicians on what our members want to hear. People are telling us that they will listen now. Colleagues, they should have bloody listened then. We have been telling people for 15 years in the trade union Movement that you need manufacturing industry, that you need a mixed economy, and that you need to support people, and much, much more, and that you need school meals, and they did not listen properly or if they did listen it went through one ear and out the other bugger. They need to listen properly if we are going to take it back.

I expect this coalition government to last; some people differ with that but I think Compo has Clegg exactly where he wants him. He is dangling like a puppet now for PR. If he walks away he is dead and if he stays he is dead if we do our job right. They are showing their true colours. The Liberals are now yellow Tories. *(Applause)*

Colleagues, a number of our left commentators, though, should have known better when they called for tactical voting. Some of them went even further and thought that the Liberals were the most progressive option. I do not think so. They know who they are and may be they will reflect too on what they did at that time.

Colleagues, I hope that we have a situation where we can pull the Party together, where we can get the extremes of both the Conservative and Liberals to work against each other. I would like to say that we would be able to tear their souls out but they did not sell their grannies, I think they sold their souls to get power. We may have difficulty in doing that but we must fight to secure the return of a Labour government for the good of Britain, for our members, and for the working people.

I call on you to adopt the Statement from the CEC but also to get out there, work in the constituencies, and work in the Party from now, and let's take the Party back. You will not win it just by debate; we will have that everywhere. Paul kindly has put me on the NEC so that will become interesting, I think, and whether it is interesting for me or them is yet to be revealed. I think probably them. We will work through that. We can do the debate but please do the action as well, colleagues. President, I move the Statement. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Mary. While Mary is coming up, it would be wrong if I did not mention that most of the local elections we had were in London and in every council that the Lib Dems and the Tories held jointly they were booted out, and in some cases actually extinguished: Islington was one of them. They won because they had socialist policies. They ran the free school meals issue and got back into power with a 22-seat majority. One of them is here. Well done to all those councillors because it is important we win every one back. *(Applause)*

SIS. M. HUTCHINSON (CEC, Manufacturing) Seconding the CEC Political Statement, President, Congress, I am sure, like me, you all felt shock and disgust watching the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats marching to Downing Street. I know how hard we all worked and how much we all wanted Labour to win the General Election but now is not a time for regret. Now is the time to rebuild and be positive. We can clear many successes. We must not forget that Labour was in power for 13 years and won three

General Elections. We must remember how Labour rebuilt the National Health Service, slashing waiting times. Labour introduced SureStart centres and made Britain a fairer more tolerant society. Look at how strongly our Party performed in the local elections that were held on 6th May. We took back control of 17 local councils, the last one being Leeds. It may be a minority administration but we are still in control and I have no doubt that our success in the recent industrial dispute there played a significant part in the victory. I am also proud that the youngest councillor in the country, only 18 years old, is a GMB member. I am sure that we all welcome Faye Whaley who is sitting in the heart of London GMB Region today.

I am proud that we have 258 MPs, 84 in the GMB group, who will fight to hold this unsavoury coalition to account. They will fight to expose its failings and work to take Labour back into government.

We must not leave the future of the Labour Party to others, the GMB cannot, and we must play a full part in rejuvenating and reinvigorating Labour. Labour suffered in many constituencies because they did not have the organisation on the ground. In too many seats canvassing information dated back to the mid-90s. In too many seats the Labour members were demoralised being few and far between. In too many seats the campaigns did not get that positive Labour message across.

Many of you already play an important part in your constituency Labour parties and many of your branches are already affiliated. As set out in the political statement we want to do more, not just for our own self-interest but because we believe that if they had listened to our communities and addressed their concerns they would not have lost the support of the electorate and suffered defeat.

We now have the chance to forge a new political agenda with the lection of a new leader, a new leader who needs to listen and work closely with the trade unions to help deliver that crucial victory at the next General Election. Congress, I second the political statement.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mary. London Region? George, before you say anything I would like to welcome Frank Doran. Frank, are you listening to Mary? Welcome to our Congress. Frank is the Chair of the Trade Union Group in the House of Commons and a good friend to the GMB. (*Applause*) George.

BRO. G. SHARKEY (London) Colleagues, when working people talk about a political situation today and how it affects us at work, at home, or in the community, we most often refer only in terms of the Labour Party as in New or Old Labour, but that was not always the case. From its inception and for many years thereafter working people referred to the Labour Party as the Labour Movement, the pillars being the trade union Movement and the cooperative parties that helped to create and maintain a Labour Party from its early and difficult days right through the post-War years when a Labour movement blossomed and made progress in the lives of working people. There were the improvements in the world of work, like the 40-hour week to a degree but not fully achieved, equal pay, the introduction of sick pay, pensions, levels of employment

protection previously only a dream, and of course the creation not only of the NHS but the welfare state together with control of the public utilities. But, alas, that has all gone and for many years now the emphasis has been on the Party, new or old, with the cooperation of the trade union Movement being regarded not as equal and important partners but almost as necessary but lesser beings. For many years now we have been regarded almost as if irrelevant except when it comes to paying the bills and delivering the vote.

Colleagues, things are changing. With some of the fair weather friends of New Labour having gone missing the true friends, allies and partners, again are being recognised not only as partners but necessary partners. From our point of view, this has to be good, very good, but we should leave nobody in any doubt that we are back as equal partners in the Labour movement, keen to play our part, not just as a paymaster but as one of the political architects of future policies, industrial as well as social. So, it is for our members, all of us, to play our part in the Labour movement. I ask you to support this. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any questions on the Political Statement? *(No response)*
In that case I will put it to the vote. All those in favour, please show?

The Political Statement was adopted.

THE PRESIDENT: I have some more information, which Andy is aware of. In five days after the election 14,000 joined the Labour Party, a great number of them Lib-Dems. That is telling you how discontented they are.

POLITICAL: LABOUR PARTY

THE PRESIDENT: We will now move on to Motion 101 and Motion 102. As you are aware, Motion 104 has been withdrawn. Then I will move to Motion 108, Motion 109, Motion 111, Composite 10, Motion 121 and Motion 122.

LABOUR PARTY MOTION 101

101. LABOUR PARTY

This Conference reaffirms its support to the Labour Party.

We recognise that only the Labour Party will be able to deliver our purpose to 'work to improve the quality of life and provide new opportunities for all our members and their families and our aim to improve the lives of GMB members and make sure that their achievements lead the way for working people in Britain and across the world'.

NORTH LANARKSHIRE PUBLIC SERVICES BRANCH
GMB Scotland

(Carried)

SIS. L. MILLAR (GMB Scotland): Congress, the General Election has resulted in the Labour Party occupying the Opposition benches in the House of Commons. This has been a setback for those of us who believe in social justice and fairness. Yes, we lost, but it could have been worst. The Labour Party was not wiped out on 6th May. We should celebrate the massive defeat of the BNP. They have no place in our country. The defeat at the ballot box cannot be explained by just blaming Gordon Brown. We should recognise the service of Gordon Brown to the country and to our party, the Labour Party. The reasons for the defeat are wider than that. We need to examine what went wrong. The next few months of the leadership election offers us a unique opportunity to do that. The Labour government lost touch of its core supporters. This must be re-established and the link to the trade union Movement strengthened. There must be a firm commitment from the Labour Party to repeal all anti-trade union laws when back in government.

We also recognise the Labour Government for the expansion of the public sector, the minimum wage, record funding of the Health Service and a record programme of building hundreds of new schools and hospitals. We need to have a radical programme put before the country and firm manifesto commitments which a future Labour government will deliver.

Our failure to take on the corrupt bankers and banking system was a major mistake. The electors were frustrated that this did not happen. They lost sight of their core ideals. We must also work with the other countries to overhaul the international money markets. We need a new way of thinking about the money markets. We need to show that we listen to our supporters and taken their fears seriously. Our communities, families and quality of life, full employment, education, Health Service and a radical programme to end poverty here and worldwide are our aims. One certainty is that the Con-Dems will not be our friends. The Tories and the Lib-Dems Coalition may or may not survive. We need a movement that reflects modern Britain. We need to go further than the minimum wage and campaign for a living wage.

I joined the Labour Party to represent the poorest and most at risk, our children, pensioners and the sick. I have no reason to support any other party or pressure group. The reasons I joined the Labour Party are as real today as they were yesterday.

Congress, I urge you to confirm our support for the party. We trade unionists have no reason to change our membership of the Labour Party. We need to confirm our commitment to it. The Labour Party is my party, the Labour Party is your party yesterday, today and for the future. Please support.

BRO. C. ROBERTSON (GMB Scotland): Congress, I am second Motion 101 – Labour Party. President and Congress, the Labour Party has two challenges to face up to over the coming months. We need to renew the party and reconnect with the trade union Movement. What made Labour great was understanding and knowing the thoughts of working class people – trade unionists. We felt as if we were one of them. The Labour Party must develop policies that truly make Britain better for all. We need to build a society which looks once more to defend those who need help most, to work hard to

defeat poverty and to give everyone not just a minimum wage but a living wage. The Labour Party can be proud of 13 years of government but we need to reconnect, reconnect with those areas of the country that feel forgotten, to the council estates and high rises that we look to and fear to tread. Labour must not be afraid to talk about immigration sensibly and fairly, to fight for jobs, to deliver a housing policy that can give everyone a good home and safe environment.

We must get back to the trade union values of being the party that defends the weak from the strong and to do more for the many, not just for the few. This election has shown that the trade union Movement's campaigning made a real difference. It was down to the hard work of GMB activists supporting Labour candidates on June 6th that bucked national trends, cynics and Murdoch's right-wing papers and stopped the Tories from getting an overall majority.

Looking to the future, Labour in opposition should promote a good society, fair for all. Labour in opposition must reconnect with the electorate by focusing on issues which this Government is getting wrong or ignoring altogether. Labour in opposition must work with the trade union Movement for workers' rights, equality and family friendly rights. Without a living, breathing Labour Party, a people's party, not a political party, Labour will remain out of touch and out of government.

In conclusion, David Cameron mentioned and his coalition Government are promoting a new initiative, a new vision: a big society. Well, here is a bit of information here for you, David. An exceptional trade unionist, a socialist MP ----

THE PRESIDENT: Wind-up, colleague.

BRO. ROBERTSON: ---- and founder of this great trade union, Will Thorne, played a fundamental part in creating a socialist Labour Party ----

THE PRESIDENT: Please wind-up!

BRO. ROBERTSON: ---- and this trade union has been promoting a big society for years. Thank you.

WELFARE PROVISIONS MOTION 102

102. WELFARE PROVISIONS

This Conference notes that despite the improvements introduced by the Labour Government in reducing unemployment, and in particular long term unemployment, the minimum wage, Family and Pension Tax credits, investment in nursery education, Sure Start and the like, the divide between the 'haves and the have nots' has never been greater.

With the current economic climate unlikely to improve for some years, it will be the measure of this new government to sustain the current support systems, far less improve them. Labour's long term

ambition is to eradicate Child Poverty by 2020. This congress calls for the continuing of all policies and sustained improvements for welfare provisions, to enable the most vulnerable and excluded groups in our communities to integrate and step onto the social mobility ladder.

SCOTTISH PRIMARY CARE NURSING BRANCH
GMB Scotland

(Carried)

SIS. A. DEAN (GMB Scotland): I move Motion 102. Congress and President, Labour's introduction of the minimum wage, Family and Pension Tax credits and reductions in long-term unemployment were all effective to a degree in reducing some of the social inequalities in Britain, but by all accounts the divide between the haves and the have nots has never been greater. This continuation of a capitalist policy was unfortunately a by-product of the Blair era which sought to continue to Tory love affair with the fat cat bankers, hedge fund investors and the Stock Exchange, leading us into what can only be described as the worst case scenario with the current Con-Dem coalition in power and an on-going economic crisis. Labour, through the direction of the trade unions, must now be seen to defend and support the most vulnerable and excluded groups, such as the elderly and disabled, who will almost inevitably be affected by the swingeing cuts. The Tory cuts will be ruthless and Labour must also be seen to defend all those services that it clearly invested in during its time in government. But this is not enough by a long shot.

It is crucial that Labour now takes stock and seeks solutions from elsewhere in the world to prepare the case for a way forward by bringing socially just ideas to the fore in order to regain the confidence of the electorate. Differences in life expectancy and opportunity relating to income and social connection rather than ability have long been suspected as being the core roots of virtually every health and social problem.

Recently published evidence by Professors Wilkinson and Pickett in their book *The Spirit Level* draws on over 50 person years of their own research into the causes of health inequalities and comes up with fairly conclusive but, as some would say, commonsensical results. They have shown that by looking to Scandinavia and Japan we can reduce the differences between the highest and lowest paid by adjustments to pay levels and tax laws to ensure that those who have the most pay more to support more children getting out of poverty and give our school leavers the opportunities they rightly deserve, opportunities that level life expectancy, reduce crime and improve the self-esteem of this nation.

The Tories spent fortunes on insulting Britain with their claims of a broken society. We know that they are only interested in feathering their own nests, as they have in the past. They have set their sights on the weakest members of our communities and those who seek to support them within the public services. Remember what they will do to those who refuse to work. Many more of us will find ourselves on the dole in the coming years. There will be plenty of opportunities for the Tories to re-write job descriptions and redesign services to squeeze more and more out of workers for less and less reward. This threat of a withdrawal of benefits is coming to a street near you at any time now. Congress, we need to stand up with Labour and wage the war against the coming cuts.

We also need to grasp the nettle and ensure that Labour does not continue in the future down the road to further social inequalities. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Secunder. (*The motion was formally seconded*) Thank you.

FREEDOM TO EXPRESS OUR UNION'S PRIORITIES MOTION 108

108. FREEDOM TO EXPRESS OUR UNION'S PRIORITIES

This Conference calls upon the CEC to value its rights to seek the support of the labour movement as a whole on matters of vital concern to our members, such as the Economy, Manufacturing, Public Services, Remploy and Pensions.

The CEC reaffirms, in particular, its believe that, when we put forward our priority concerns at the Labour Party Conference, they should not simply be aired and then referred to the National Policy Forum without the Labour Conference being allowed to demonstrate whether or not it supports us.

The CEC continues to believe that the Party Conference should have the right not just to hear motions, but also, to express its support by voting on them in a normal democratic manner.

The CEC, therefore, welcomes Labour's commitment to take a vote at the start of its 2010 Conference to decide whether the Conference should have the right to vote on motions of contemporary concern, to be implemented immediately at the 2010 Conference itself.

Our own 2009 Congress, however, took the view that such motions should not, as formerly, be restricted to those on topics involving a specific "contemporary" incident occurring in the few weeks immediately prior to the Conference.

The CEC, therefore, calls on our representatives to campaign in favour of those constitutional amendments, already submitted by a number of constituency parties to the Labour Conference agenda, which would allow our Union and others to choose freely what motions we may wish to submit without having to worry that they may be ruled out-of-order on the grounds that they do not meet the very restrictive previous criteria for being deemed "contemporary."

The CEC calls on our representatives to campaign for such amendments to be given priority in order to ensure that our members are not denied their legitimate right to be heard on any matter which our Union may choose to put forward.

SUNDERLAND 1 ENGINEERING BRANCH
Northern Region

(Carried)

SIS. E. JEFFREY (Northern): I move Motion 108 on Freedom to Express our Union's Priorities. President and Congress, this motion is clear and absolutely straightforward. It is about democracy and honest debate. We all know why the Labour Party in the '80s and '90s had to change the rules of Conference. Every year at Conference the bitter open battles between left and right were a complete turn-off to voters. As a consequence, Labour lost four elections and we all suffered 18 years of the Tory Government. But times have changed. Even after Labour's recent defeat the Party is united and is

determined not to enter a period of bitter fighting. The aim will be to regroup, rebuild and to get re-elected. Given that unity of purpose, surely, at the annual conference of the Party, the supreme policy-making forum, the Party can allow open debate on motions.

This motion is so simple and so straightforward that there can be no valid reason why it cannot be successful. Congress, let's get some democracy back into the Labour Party. I urge you to support this motion.

BRO. G. MURRAY (Northern): Congress, I second Motion 108 – Freedom to Express our Union's Priorities. Whatever the reasons were for the result of the recent General Election, one thing is for certain. Those policies that were successful must be celebrated and remembered, and those that were not must only be remembered for their failure.

The process by which the National Policy Forum of the Labour Party was hampered by the tendency of the Party hierarchy to take control, the way in which the annual Labour Party Conference became a convention, with more interest in corporate sponsorship than policy debate, it showed how much weight the Labour Party placed on engagement with its supports. If Labour's high command thought that our union members and Labour voters would be fooled by the Party's infatuation with the media age, they were sadly mistaken, weren't they? The Labour Party is a people's party, formed by trade unions for working people.

In this era of the worst recession for a century those values are as relevant today as when the Labour Party was first formed. Let us ensure that openness and debate once more become embedded within the Labour Party's structures. I urge your support. I second.

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, I will hold up the debates for just a few moments, because our little special guest that we had yesterday has returned today. George, where are you and your family. (*George Dove and family came to the stage*) We promised you a cheque yesterday, didn't we?

GEORGE DOVE: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: For how much?

GEORGE DOVE: £7,000.

THE PRESIDENT: So would you deal or no deal with me if I give you another box? (*Laughter*) Will you swap that box for the one you've got. (*Calls of "Yes", "Go on" and "Deal"*) That deal, with the kindness of the North West & Irish, has made that donation £10,000. (*Rapturous applause, cheers and table thumping*) Congress, that's the next Prime Minister.

BRO. P. HAYES (Regional Secretary London): £2,000 donation from London.

THE PRESIDENT: There is another £2,000 from London Region. (*Applause*) Is any more coming into the pot? (*Cheers*)

BRO. T. BRENNAN (Regional Secretary Northern): Northern Region, £2,000.

THE PRESIDENT: We have another £2,000 from Northern Region. (*Applause and cheers*) (*To the General Secretary*): I hope you're adding up.

BRO. T. ROACHE (Regional Secretary Yorkshire and North Derbyshire): £2,000.

THE PRESIDENT: Hang on. We have another £2,000 from Yorkshire and North Derbyshire. (*Rapturous applause*)

BRO. R. ASCOUGH (Regional Secretary Southern): £2,000.

THE PRESIDENT: Southern Region, £2,000. (*Rapturous applause, cheering and foot stamping*)

BRO. H. DONALDSON (Regional Secretary GMB Scotland): GMB Scotland, £2,000.

THE PRESIDENT: GMB Scotland, £2,000. (*Applause, cheers and waving*)

BRO. A. GARLEY (Regional Secretary South Western): £2,000. (*Cheers and applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: South Western donate £2,000.

BRO. J. MORGAN (Regional Secretary Birmingham and West Midlands): We donate £2,000.

THE PRESIDENT: Birmingham and West Midlands, £2,000. (*Applause and cheers*).

BRO. A. WORTH (Regional Secretary Midland and East Coast): Midland & East Coast, £2,000. (*Applause and cheers*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. That means every region has put £2,000, with the exception of North West & Irish Region. So I think a big 'thank you' to you all is deserved. (*A Standing Ovation*)

THE GENERAL SECRETARY: Does anybody know how much that was?

THE PRESIDENT: £26,000! Are you pleased with that, George? Are you happy with that?

GEORGE DOVE: Yes; thanks. (*A Standing Ovation*)

THE PRESIDENT: We will make sure that that is sent to you after we have pawned all the regional secretaries. *(Laughter)* The General Secretary will also need some help. Well done, it's lovely to see you.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY: I need some reviving, Mary. Strewth!
(To a Standing Ovation the Dove family left the hall)

THE PRESIDENT: I move now to Motion 109 – Maximising Support for GMB Policies.

MAXIMISING SUPPORT FOR GMB POLICIES MOTION 109

109. MAXIMISING SUPPORT FOR GMB POLICIES

This Conference calls upon the CEC to take every opportunity to seek the support of the labour movement on key issues, for example Manufacturing Industry, Pensions and the Economy as a whole.

The CEC is concerned, in particular, that our union should be able to seek the widest possible support for our policies not just at the Trades Union Congress but, also, at the Labour Party Conference.

The Labour Conference is, at the moment, regularly presented with very lengthy and wide-ranging documents from the National Policy Forum and asked to vote for or against such documents in their entirety on a crude take-it-or-leave-it basis. This process means that popular individual policies may be excluded (and unpopular ones included), though this may not be what most members (and voters) may wish.

The CEC, therefore, believes that, in the year when the Labour Conference is considering the final stage documents from the National Policy Forum, each of Labour's affiliates and constituency parties should be able to submit an amendment to the material set out in the final-stage documents. Such amendments would then be subject to compositing for debate and voting at the Conference in accordance with recommendations from the Conference Arrangements Committee.

The CEC believes that this simple reform would significantly enhance the precision of Labour Party policy-making and would help to ensure that the policies of our Union have the chance to win wider support in the interests of our members.

SUNDERLAND 1 ENGINEERING BRANCH

(Carried)

SIS. M. MALE (Northern): President and Congress, I move Motion 109. This motion clearly sets out the process needed to ensure that the Labour Party Conference, once again, becomes a democratic forum for debate and policy forming. As any member who has been to a Labour Party Conference knows, the process is not only undemocratic but it is completely boring. Policy papers developed over the year are presented to the Conference. Trade unions and the CLPs are not allowed to make any amendments and can only vote for or against a document. As we know, this means that part of the policies are unacceptable but are voted through. The alternative would be to dismiss the entire document.

The GMB and other unions agree policy at Conference. We did so for good reasons. Open warfare between delegations on live television was a total turn-off to our supporters. We need to develop and encourage consensus, not divisions. The time has come for a meaningful debate. The Labour Party needs to reconnect with its voters. It needs to listen. It needs to ensure that policies reflect the needs of working people. The changes proposed in the motion are essential to that change. Congress, I urge you to support. I move. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: I call the seconder.

BRO. A. WALKER (Northern): I second Motion 109 on Maximising Support for GMB Policies. Congress, after the recent General Election result, the Lib-Con coalition and Labour's return to opposition, it is essential that proper democratic debate is restored within the Party structure. The Labour Party Conference is supposed to be the sovereign body of the Labour Party. The National Policy Forum provides an arena for more focused policy discussion. It has been said that one of the reasons why Labour lost the 1979 election was because of the disconnection between the Labour Government, the Labour Party and the wider labour Movement. We should be honest with ourselves. In 2010 history repeated itself. True, we may not have had a winter of discontent, but the Labour Party, in its policymaking structures, seemed to forget that it was the trade union Movement that spawned the Labour Party, not the other way round.

To get back a sense of connection with the wider labour Movement, the Labour Party must allow open debate of motions. I urge you to support this motion.

THE PRESIDENT: I call Motion 111.

INEQUALITY MOTION 111

111. INEQUALITY

This conference reaffirms its commitment to the principles of reducing inequality in particular the gap between the rich and the poor.

Despite 13 years of Labour Government, during which the general level of income and prosperity has risen considerably, the gap between the richest and the poorest 10% of the population is wider today than in 1997.

The notion that wealth generated at the top, will "trickle" down to benefit the poor, has been conclusively proven to be untrue.

We are today less equal than at any time in British modern history.

Conference calls upon the CEC to ensure that the GMB's future support for the Labour party is based upon a firm and unanimous commitment to pursue policies based upon reducing instead of increasing inequality.

(Carried)

BRO. G. MAYFIELD (Northern): Congress, I move Motion 111 on Inequality.

Congress, the terms of this motion are very clear. The Labour Party came into government 13 years ago with a great fanfare to reduce the gap between rich and poor in our society. It would be foolish to suggest that progress was not made. In many communities it should be acknowledged that improvements were made through the use of public investments. However, it should also be said that there are too many conflicts in how public policy was made to reduce the gap between the richest and poorest 10% of the population.

Look at what happened. As trade unionists, we know the best way to help the poorest in our society is to redistribute income from the richest to the poorest. We are loud and proud to say it. It is a pity that the last Labour Government seemed too paralysed by the fear of the media actually to utter the phrase “redistribution of income”. The Labour Party courted the business community when in Opposition. They courted media tycoons and they also had “Cool Britannia” on their side. When the going got rough, the Labour Party bailed out the rich and famous, but looked what happened. There was Simon Cowell, a Tory boy; Gary Barlow, a Tory boy. Many in the Labour Government believed that the ways of the 1980’s free economy had become the norm. They accepted trickle down economics. Well, the global financial collapse in the summer of 2007 put paid to all of that.

As trade unionists we represent working people, and we know they would benefit from a much higher statutory minimum wage. We also know what it means when your Government ignores the advice that cutting the 10p tax rate would hit the poorest in society the most. We know that because we represent working people. We know that redistribution from the richest to the poorest works. It is not just fair and equitable, but it is also effective government.

We need to ensure that the Labour Party really does learn from the policy conflicts that hampered reducing the gap between the rich and poor. Our support for the Labour Party returning to government – I am sure that by that time the poverty gap will be even wider – must be based on an unqualified commitment to reducing inequality. I urge your support.

BRO. J. WINTER (Northern) : I second Motion 111 on Inequality. Congress, in supporting the mover of the motion it needs to be said that the richest in society should be helping the poorest. This is not about being Robin Hood, although modern day top management executives seem to do a good impression of the Sheriff of Nottingham.

No, Congress. This motion is simply stating that if we, as a society, are going, seriously, to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor we should celebrate policies which seek

to redistribute income from the richest to the poorest. We shouldn't pussy-foot about the subject and we shouldn't spin our way around the issue as the last Labour Government all too often did. We should have a series of debates about what the Labour Party is going to do about reducing poverty for our people. After all, it was hardworking families who bailed out the reckless bankers and failed executives who were only interested in their fat salaries and share options.

Congress, the last three years have been tainted by the establishment of bad decisions, everything from sub-prime mortgages to the scandal of MPs' expenses has laid bare the failure of policymakers. We are the best and most practical policymakers there are because we are right at the coalface of society and we can see what inequitable decision making does. Therefore, we need Congress to give us support and to meet our demands to reduce inequality. Congress, please support.

WORKING CLASS LABOUR CANDIDATES AND PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

COMPOSITE 10

(Covering Motions 117 and 119)

C10. COVERING MOTIONS:

- 117. PARLIAMENTARY AND DEMOCRACY (Northern Region)
- 119. WORKING CLASS LABOUR PARTY CANDIDATES (London Region)

WORKING CLASS LABOUR CANDIDATES AND PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

This conference recognises that good government depends upon trust between the elected and the electorate, upon a democracy that ensures that those in parliament are truly representative and accountable to the electorate.

The recent MPs' expenses scandal has clearly demonstrated that our system of democracy does not work, that the essential bond of trust between represented and representatives has been shattered. In response our parliamentary system must be regenerated and trust re established.

This conference believes that essential to this renewal must be the creation of a system of democracy which sweeps away government by a remote and out of touch "political elite" and its replacement with a system which ensures government for the people by the people.

This Conference agrees there is a pressing need to:

- increase the number of working class parliamentary candidates both men and women in the Labour Party including some in winnable seats in order that the needs, aspirations and views of the vast majority of the electorate are heard.
- ensure the selection of Labour Party Parliamentary Candidates from the same backgrounds and experiences as our members.

The British Labour Party was established to ensure just such a system of democracy; to serve representation in parliament of working people by working people. This conference calls upon the GMB to work with other trade unions and others to re-establish this principle.

Congress further agrees that the GMB vigorously pursues this policy.

(Carried)

BRO. W. HUGHES (Northern): I'll tell you something, Congress. It's a good job that Paul Kenny doubled that money yesterday and not today. *(Cheers)* Allan Wylie would have had kittens. *(Laughter)*

Worthy President, let me just pay a tribute to the GMB on its education and learning programme. I think that for first-time speakers here, this Congress has been second to none in all the years I have been coming. *(Applause)* Naturally, as a regional president, I am proud of my delegation, and so will other regional presidents be, but it is nice to know that as I come to the end of my career the GMB is in safe hands. I thank you for that. *(Applause)*

Let's get down to the nitty-gritty.

THE PRESIDENT: President, our only problem is that we don't want you to retire because we want you to teach new delegates your dialect because we don't understand it half the time, never mind the rest. *(Laughter)*

BRO. HUGHES: Aye, but it's nice to figure it out, though, isn't it.

From greedy bankers to greedy MPs all in one week. It's too much for the blood pressure, I'll tell you.

I move Composite 10 on Parliamentary Democracy. On May 7th 2009 the *Daily Telegraph* announced that it was exposing the truth about MPs' expenses and in June 2010 they think its all over. What a pity! We have a lot of new MPs in the house for this Parliamentary term. So it is up to the voice of the GMB to make sure that they don't go down the same path. The point is that in the eyes of the world these people have humiliated the British public. We put them there, we trusted them and they say they can't manage on the expenses. Why don't they come and be a GMB activist for 12 months. They will sharp learn then, I'll tell you. *(Applause)*

Why do we do it, colleagues? It is because we believe in what we do. We are the voice of the people who can't speak for themselves. We protect people who can't protect themselves. I know because I've been doing for 60 years, and I've loved every minute of it, make no mistake. I'm sure that none of us in the hall need reminding of some of the sordid details of how these MPs extracted the money from innocent voters and such, but let's look at one or two. Porno movies! I'll not say much about that. It could have been more expensive if he had gone for leather whips and black tights. *(Laughter)* What about Mars Bars. That MP is claiming that it comes under his job description. *A Mars a day helps you work, rest and play!* *(Laughter)* Duck houses! Some of our members

can't even get decent council houses and he's worried about ducks! (*Cheers and applause*) You've got to laugh. If it wasn't so serious I would cry. I get so annoyed I could tear paper. (*Laughter*) Moat cleaning! What? Next he will be asking for new ropes for the drawbridge. All at the taxpayers' expense. You name it colleagues, no matter how bizarre, no matter how extraordinary, somewhere there was an MP buying something and charging it to you, me and our members. But the worst offence of them all was flipping – the practice whereby members, including Cabinet Ministers changed the address of their second home to avoid Capital Gains Tax. Of course, the latest is £40,000 to keep his partner happy! Here, what about our wives and partners? We say to them, "There you are, love. There's a £10 note. Go down to Primark, get yourself a nice summer outfit and bring the change back." (*Cheers*) No wonder they are trying to get him back into The Treasury. £40 grand! If any of our members committed these expenses they would be spending time behind bars, yet the worse they suffered was that they were forced to resign. Doves of them chose to line up for their taxpayer funded redundancy pay, rather than face the anger of the voters.

Congress, our Parliamentary system has been damaged almost beyond repair. In our Party, the Labour Party, we need to start the process of renewal. We need to sweep away the greedy and the self-interested and get back to our roots. Let's not forget those so-called MPs who used the GMB as a stepping-stone to further their own political career. Let's weed them out as well because they don't give one ounce of credibility to the GMB.

THE PRESIDENT: Worthy Northern President, you are now in the red light district.

BRO. HUGHES: Let's put honest working class people back into Parliament and let's get back to our roots. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Did you say "retire"? Never in a million years. You're first into Parliament next time. No, the House of Lords. You can wake them all up. Can we have a seconder. Follow that.

BRO. M. FOSTER (London): I second Composite 10. Following the recent General Election it is thought that there are 12 millionaires in the Cabinet. That means anything from 33⅓% to 50% of the people deciding the future governance of our country are from a class that represents less than 1% of the population. Quite simply, colleagues, that is plutocracy government by the wealthy few and it has no place in a recession-ravaged Britain. This situation could have been avoided. The Labour Party was and should still be the party of the people. Over the years, the Labour Party, born out of our Movement, had decided to mix with the wealthy and desert its roots. Old values have gone and new values have taken over. But, colleagues, new values mean nothing in Opposition. How different it could have been.

It's accepted by all that the trade union effort, especially from the GMB, in the last election saved up to 50 Labour seats. That was effort made by working class people for working class values. Colleagues, if the Labour Party had adopted a different selection

strategy and selected candidates who were from the majority class in Britain, would the result have been different? Of course, it would.

Colleagues, let's send out a message, that the next Labour Government be a government made up of people who represent the working class. Let's ensure that the majority of Labour MPs after the next election are not only union members but are also members of the working class. Please support.

MENTORING FOR PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATES MOTION 121

121. MENTORING FOR PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATES

This Conference recognises the impact that GMB members have had as elected politicians at local, regional and national levels.

Conference also recognises that the aims and objectives of the GMB and those of the wider Trade Union movement can be best be served by the election of our members as local, regional and national representatives on behalf of the Labour Party.

In order to encourage our activists to consider standing for election in the future, this Conference calls on the Union, both on a regional and a national basis, to create a mentoring scheme that will provide training and support to those of our members who wish to stand for election on behalf of the Labour Party.

CARDIFF & DISTRICT APEX BRANCH
South Western Region

(Carried)

BRO. I. BOUNDS (South Western): President and Congress, I move Motion 121 – Mentoring for Prospective Candidates. In the CEC Political Statement that we passed earlier the Executive Summary stated that organising has always been at the core of our existence. In simple terms, we, as activists, organise our branches, represent our members and campaign on their behalf, much like all MPs and all councillors. The Executive Summary went on to say that the Labour Party would benefit from more trade union candidates. I will take that a little bit further and say that the Labour Party would benefit from more GMB members as candidates at all levels. Other unions and their leaders seem to have spent most of the last decade openly criticising the last Labour Government, but our leaders have not. Ours have worked with the Labour Party to represent our members.

This motion calls on the GMB to create a formal mentoring scheme, using our national and regional political officers. At the recent election, 84 of our activists were elected as MPs. We have got more than 2,000 councillors. We have got members in the Scottish Parliament, the London Authority and, from my own region, we have got two members in the Welsh Assembly Government. Hopefully, next year we will have two more candidates standing. We have got an influence within the Labour Party that far exceeds that of far larger unions. This is because of the passion and commitment shown by our elected members, officers and all of us, our activists. However, our influence will only

remain the same if our next generation of members continues to campaign for the Labour Party with the same level of passion, commitment and skill.

Our existing MPs and councillors have a huge amount of experience and knowledge. The mentoring scheme will be in place to ensure that that experience and knowledge is shared and goes forward for future generations. Please support.

THE PRESIDENT: Seconder. (*The motion was formally seconded*)

THE STORY OF WORK MOTION 122

122. THE STORY OF WORK

This Conference notes that during the current election campaign it is surprising how quickly many working people have forgotten the lessons of the recent past. In many cases the Tories are singing from the same hymn sheet they used in the last 70s, 80s and early 90s reducing investment, reducing taxes for the wealthy, attacking the Terms and Conditions including pensions of ordinary working people which led to unemployment levels of 4½ million during the Thatcher/Major years together with the decimation of many communities and the famous statement “There is no such thing as society” We still find some working people saying “It is worth giving them a chance”.

In order to counter this we would encourage members who stood shoulder to shoulder and struggled against this in the past to write the stories of struggles and their victories so that they could be brought together as a form of working class history along the lines of an easy to read “Story of Work” ensuring that the experiences of the recent past can be passed on to tomorrow’s members.

HENDON BRANCH
London Region

(Carried)

SIS. B. BENHAM (London): Congress, I move Motion 122. This motion came about at a branch meeting where one of our members was contemplating the poor opinion polls and the likelihood of a Tory Government. He was amazed at how people could forget the horrors of 1979 – 1997. He was also amazed that if the opinion polls at the time were correct, then many working class people who had lived through these horror years must have been considering voting Tory. There had to be a way to tell of these horrors to enshrine these memories in history and to help people remember, and there was so much to remember. The very first Budget of 1979 saw high income tax rates slashed and VAT increased from 8% to 15%, a statement that would last for the next 18 years. “If you are well off, we will look after you. If you are poor, too bad.” Let’s just see what happens on 22nd June.

All of us must have stories of those dreadful 18 years, with 4.5 million on the dole, industries and communities deliberately destroyed, riots, compulsory competitive tendering, the Poll Tax, the enemy within, and the classic “There’s no such thing as

society". There must be millions of stories, tragic, sad, heartbreaking and humorous. Colleagues, I am reminded of the March for Jobs from Liverpool in 1981. We managed to accommodate them in a school in Brent for three nights, and the Brent dinner ladies gave up their time to feed them from food begged and borrowed from Brent suppliers. That was an indication of how workers can support one another and how there can be a society much more meaningful than any Tory toff would dream of. Let's contact our members for their stories, let's publish the Story of Work, and let that work be a lasting memorial to the suffering of the Thatcher/Major years. Let it also serve as a warning to the undoubted excesses of the current marriage in hell. Please support.

SIS. P. ROBINSON (London): I second Motion 122. President and Congress, given the election result of 7th May, it is not only vital that Congress passes this motion but it is vital that the CEC makes it happen.

To publish the Story of Work as told by our members would, if it were believed, rank as the greatest contemporary history manual of all time. The only trouble is that anybody who did not reach puberty between 1979 and 1997 would not accept it as a history manual. To them it would be historical fiction. What sane human being would believe that GCHQ happened? What sane human being would believe that Rolls Royce, Jaguar and Western Helicopters were sold off overseas? What sane human being would believe that VAT would be increased from 15% to 17.5% to get out of the fiasco called the Poll Tax? What sane human being would believe that our police officers were earning super tax rates of pay to break miners' heads so that the mining industry could be obliterated. Colleagues, those of who were there know it happened. Those of us who were not there, know it happened because those of who were there told them. It all happened and the story should be told. Let us publish the true story. Get your branch members to write a factual account of those dire times. Let's make history and condemn this Government before it starts. Please support.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Penny. Does anyone else wish to come in on the debates? (*No response*) Let me say that all the motions in the Political section are being supported by the CEC. To remind you, they are Motions 101, 102, 108, 109, 111, Composite 10, Motion 121 and Motion 122. All those in favour, please show? Anyone against?

Motion 101 was carried.

Motion 102 was carried.

Motion 108 was carried.

Motion 109 was carried.

Motion 111 was carried.

Composite 10 was carried.

Motion 121 was carried.

Motion 122 was carried.

THE PRESIDENT: I will now take Motions 124, 126, 128, 130 and Composite 12.

POLITICAL: DEMOCRACY & CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

SECTION 141 OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT MOTION 124

124. SECTION 141 OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Under Section 141 of the Mental Health Act, an MP automatically loses his/her seat in Parliament if detained under the Mental Health Act for a period of 6 months or more.

If one compares this with an MP who is suffering from a physical illness, there are no provisions to remove them from their seat, even if the illness is very debilitating, and substantially affects the person's ability to perform their duties as an MP.

A person can lack mental capacity and be detained under the Mental Capacity Act, but to not lose his/her seat as a result.

The type of illness, and whether the MP has been detained under the Mental Health Act, should not be the main concern, as it should focus on the effect the particular health problem has on the person's ability to perform their duties as an MP.

SCARBOROUGH & NORTH YORKS COMMUNITY BRANCH
Midland & East Coast Region

(Carried)

SIS. A. COLLIER (Midland & East Coast): Congress, I move Motion 124.

Under Section 141 of the Mental Health Act an MP automatically loses his or her seat in Parliament if detained under the Mental Health Act for a period of six months or more, without any discussion or debate. The facts are that one in four people suffer with mental health problems at some stage in their lives, yet still so much stigma and discrimination exists towards these people.

At the heart of our Government this section still exists, even though MPs support Acts and regulations regarding mental health, so they are not practising what they are preaching, meaning that in Parliament there is no democracy. If an MP suffers from a physical illness, no matter how it affects their health, they still keep their job and their seat, so why should an MP suffering with mental health problems automatically lose their seat? The Government is sending out a message that people can't recover from a mental illness and return to a challenging job. This perception is very wrong. People do recover and return to their jobs no matter what they do, so MPs' seats should be left open for when they do return.

We know that being gay or disabled is not a barrier to being an MP, as Jack Ashley, David Blunkett and Anne Begg have proved that they can do the job. So people who suffer with their mental health should also be given a chance to prove that they can do the job and shouldn't be just written off. We have the power to change public opinion and make our Government realise that this section is out of date in our modern society, and to

abolish it would be a step towards addressing the stigma and discrimination associated with mental health.

So let's campaign and raise awareness of this issue and end the discrimination once and for all. As so many people suffer daily with their mental health, abolishing this section, in my view, would make a big difference to all of these people, including MPs. Thank you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Secunder.

BRO. J. EVANS (Midland & East Coast): Congress, a recent report by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Mental Health has shown that one in five MPs surveyed have experienced a mental health issue, but they fear disclosing this because of the stigma and discrimination associated with having mental health issues. We would not allow this to go unchallenged in our workplaces. If we were to accept this antiquated rule for our MPs, then what message would this send to other employers with regard to such discrimination.

Speaking in January 2010, even Alistair Campbell has called for greater openness amongst MPs in discussing and supporting mental health issues. He felt that it would change the mood in the House. Some may feel we are too late for this now, but we must end the stigma surrounding mental health illnesses for it only serves to compound the problem. I second the motion.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that, Jason.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS MOTION 126

126. PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS

Congress is mindful of the need to restore confidence in Parliament and to engage the populous in the election process. To achieve this it is necessary to encourage voters to participate wherever possible, by making their votes count, without compromising the process.

However, there is a big problem and discouragement under the present system. Unless you are in a marginal constituency, you will have little chance of changing the incumbent party and their chosen MP to represent you. There may be many more of you who do not agree with them and their policies but prefer what candidates of other different parties have on offer, thus want a change.

Gordon Brown is proposing to change the voting system, after the next election, to allow for an alternative vote. He is doing this to make the system more democratic and accountable to the electorate, something to be applauded. This should encourage voters to vote, as they would feel their votes count and improve the turn out at elections.

Congress therefore welcomes this proposal.

H25 HEATHERWOOD & WINDSOR PARK
Southern Region

(Lost)

BRO. R. REEVES (Southern): Congress, I move Motion 126 – Parliamentary Elections – without the support of my region.

President and Congress, well, who would have thought that before the election we would now have a Conservative-Dem Coalition? How much better if we had a Labour-Dem Coalition, not ideal I know, but better. It would have happened under the system that this motion proposes. Research has been done that such a coalition would have a majority of 84.

The Lib-Dem supporters must be really gutted. In my constituency, they were telling everyone that the only chance of avoiding a Conservative Government was to vote for them. Clearly, the result showed that neither the country nor the Lib-Dems wanted what they got. How more honest, democratic and better would it be if we had a voting system that reflects the wishes of the people? Such a system would also encourage voters to vote, it would mean their votes count and they would feel their votes count, thus improving turnout at the elections.

An alternative vote would allow voters to have a second choice. There is not an overall majority. You do not have to vote for other candidates if you do not want to. Unless you are in a marginal constituency, under the present system, you will have little chance in changing the Party in power and their chosen MP to represent you. With a swing of 5% either way, less than a quarter of the seats would change hands. There may be many more of you who do not agree with your sitting MP and their policies but would prefer what other candidates have to offer and thus want to change. A part of Labour's manifesto was to change the voting system after the election to allow for an alternative vote. The country agrees.

An opinion poll published only last week stated that 78% agreed that the first-past-the-post system should be replaced by a system that reflects more accurately the proportion of votes cast for each Party.

By passing this motion today a clear message would be sent from the GMB to the Labour Party and the country supporting change to the voting system. The Labour Party uses a similar system for its elections, as do the Scottish Parliament and Welsh and Northern Irish Assemblies. Also other countries in Europe and the world work perfectly well with an alternative voting system. The result is that the best talent represents the will of the majority of the people. Democracy, in short. The Labour Party wants it, the country wants it, so let the GMB want it. Vote for this motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Can I have a seconder, please. (*The Motion was formally seconded*) Thank you.

ABOLITION OF THE MONARCHY MOTION 128

128. ABOLITION OF THE MONARCHY

This Conference calls on the GMB to campaign for the abolition of the Monarchy

NORTH WEST LONDON BRANCH
London Region

(Referred)

SIS. J. FENN (London): President, Congress and Comrades, I move Motion 128 – Abolish the Monarchy.

I used to read about kings and queens when I was a little girl but, as we have heard over the last couple of days, and as we are bombarded in the media, this ain't no fairy tale. The recession, the credit crunch or whatever you want to call it – I think Radio 4 calls it the “credit squeeze” because they are a bit posh – is not something that we did not cause it. It was not us, it wasn't our families and it wasn't our friends. Yet we are being asked to tighten our belts. On top of tightening our belts, we are being attacked through our jobs and essential services. We all know that that affects the vulnerable and the poorest in society the most.

The irony is that yesterday a comrade talked about the Civil List costing us £40 million every year. When we are talking about public expenditure and cuts, I think there is another avenue to be going down, but the Royal Family is not just a waste of money. It is outdated, it is undemocratic and it is, basically, an insult to everybody in this room. I think the concept of the monarchy is that, basically, they are appointed by God to rule the working class. If we think that having a Cabinet which includes people who went to Eton, the Royal Family embodies that we, as trade unionists, fight against every day. Being born into the Royal Family means that, basically, you are privileged and wealthy, just because of who you are and where you were born.

Having a Royal Family means that we are undemocratic. We are supposed to live in a democracy, but we saw with the new Government, which has just come into power, the farce of the Prime Minister having to ask the Queen for permission to form the new Government. Again, in the press again and again we read about union bosses and union chiefs. Our leaders are elected but the Royal Family is not elected. Basically, this system is an insult. When I hear the stories of today and yesterday and all the good work that people in this room and trade unionists around the country perform, not just in our workplaces and communities and beyond, and hear about our money being spent to support one extended family going out and getting drunk in night clubs, having lavish weddings and playing strange sports that usually involve horses and killing small creatures, my blood boils. I am asking you to support the motion to campaign against the monarchy for the reasons I have mentioned. I think our public money should be spent on us and our services, and £40 million is one cut that the Government could make and I don't think we would miss the Monarchy.

THE PRESIDENT: Jessica is a first-time speaker. Well done. (*Applause*)

BRO. T. FLANAGAN (London): Congress, I am not Lord Cardigan, I might point out to the General Secretary.

I second. The Royal Family. What an inbred shower of parasitical lunatics? (*Cheers and applause*) Why anyone in this room could tolerate that filth ponsing off us in perpetuity, I've no idea! Anti-democratic! Indeed they are. The only one I have got any admiration for is Phillip. He is a Nazi, a racist, a fascist, and he would tell you that everyday of the week, and so are the rest of them. We've got 'air miles Andy'. What a ponce! They are despicable. We passed a motion, but I think you are going to be told that you passed a motion but you didn't know the motion you were passing.

At the Newcastle Congress we said that were opposed to the Monarchy and we want its abolition. This motion did not come from the Professional Drivers Branch. It came from someone else. We are saying, "Now you've got the motion, campaign for your policy." Your policy here is to abolish the Royal Family. Let's campaign for it. Let's rid this nation of..... Ah, I've got to moderate my language. I apologise. Support the motion. It is about having a democratic organisation. We haven't got it. These people are in their privileged position as a result of their birth. Their relationship with the working class is one of contempt. If you saw on television the absolute glee that Her Majesty greeted David Cameron, I don't think you need to know much more. Let's rid this nation once and for all from this bloody infestation. Support the motion.

ILLEGAL WAR MOTION 130

130. ILLEGAL WAR

Congress is concerned that the nation has been led into war on spurious information.

Congress calls upon the Government to enact legislation to secure impeachment of any Government Minister who knowingly uses information from a dubious source and justifies that information to take us to war.

BLACKBURN 16 BRANCH
North West and Irish Region

(Carried)

SIS. M. DOCKERY (North West & Irish): President and Congress, this is my first time as a Congress speaker. (*Applause*) I move Motion 130 – Illegal War. We were led into the war with false information given by President Bush and Tony Blair. We were told about the weapons of mass destruction which they knew did not exist. The weapons' inspectors were in Iraq for months and found nothing, but Bush insisted on serving his own interest. We need something to clarify on how to get into all the aspects of the Iraq and Afghanistan invasions. It is vividly clear that British people are against the situation in Afghanistan and want British soldiers brought home, and I mean home, to be with their

families and loved ones. Therefore, this debate could help situations that clarify issues. I would like you to support this motion. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Do I have a seconder? (*Motion 130 was formally seconded*)

**INNER LONDON STATUS AND FINANCIAL EQUALITY FOR NEWHAM
COMPOSITE 12
(Covering Motions 131 and 132)**

C12. COVERING MOTIONS:

- 131. INNER LONDON STATUS TO NEWHAM (London Region)
- 132. FINANCIAL EQUALITY FOR NEWHAM (London Region)

INNER LONDON STATUS AND FINANCIAL EQUALITY FOR NEWHAM

This Conference asks that the CEC make it a policy to campaign on financial equality for Newham when compared with Inner London boroughs and requests the government to grant Inner London Status to Newham to bring equality with its neighbouring boroughs such as Hackney and Tower Hamlets.

(Carried)

SIS. S. WALDRON (London): President, Congress, I am moving Composite 12, which deals with deals with Inner London status for Newham and financial equality for Newham. This Congress asks that the CEC campaigns for the Government to grant Inner London status to Newham to bring financial equality with its neighbouring boroughs, such as Hackney and Tower Hamlets.

This composite requests that the CEC make it a policy to campaign on financial equality for Newham when compared with other Inner London boroughs. Newham is the host borough of the 2012 Olympics and the Paralympics. Stratford City is the most ambitious development within the M25. Newham is just three miles from the City, a stone's throw from Canary Wharf and 20 minutes from the West End by public transport. Yet, despite that, Newham shares many Inner London problems but is treated as an Outer London borough when central Government calculates financial settlements.

The origins of this classification stems from the Greater London Assembly. The definition may have been relevant at the time but today there is little consequence, despite Newham sharing features associated with Inner London boroughs. Newham is a dynamic and rapidly developing area, although it is still ranked as the third most socially deprived borough in the country.

The result of being called an Outer London borough means that Newham receives an estimated £58 million less in revenue funding than the Inner boroughs. A further impact of the area cost adjustments, which provide additional financial support for councils operating in more expensive areas, is that Newham was given the lowest adjustment in

London. It assumes that the wages in London are low and equates to low staffing costs. Surely, this assumption cannot take into account the salary of our chief executive. As a consequence, Newham is expected to pay Inner London pay to teachers from an Outer London pot. However, our staff come from all over the south-east and, indeed, all over the world in some sectors. This goes against assumptions made by the area cost adjustments.

As regards funding in Newham's schools, each child in Newham receives in excess of one thousand pounds less compared with neighbouring boroughs, such as Hackney and Tower Hamlets.

Despite this, Newham is the only London borough to offer free school meals to each child in primary school. This development was put in place with the help of the GMB. The Government has convened the Formula Review Group to examine the funding of the Dedicated Schools' Grant, which offers an ideal opportunity for change. So what might Inner London Status mean for Newham? It means an extra £722 per teacher and an extra 280 teaching assistants. In fact, this equates to £237 extra in services for each person in Newham. This inequality must end. Please support.

BRO. J. RICHMOND (London): Congress, I second Composite 12. This motion is all about equality for Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham and those other London boroughs which have similar levels of poverty and unemployment. That is equality. Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham have suffered equally from the recession and the dissemination of its manufacturing industries. The boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets are considered to be Inner London boroughs, thereby attracting an increased funding package, which enables them to better withstand the ravages of the recession. This is where equality ends. Newham is classed as an Outer London borough with no increased funding. Employees of Inner London boroughs receive higher London Weighting payments, such as £1,500 a year, which enriches the local economy of the boroughs. Is the cost of living £1,500 cheaper in Inner London boroughs than it is in Newham? Of course it is not! If it was, the entire population of Tower Hamlet would come along the East India Dock Road to gather bargains. There would have to be crowd control to stop Hackney residents from buying everything in Stratford market. Again, it comes back to the question of equality. The cost of living is the same in Hackney, Tower Hamlets and in Newham. However, because Newham is classed as an Outer London borough the equality stops. The people of Newham deserve better. Please support.

THE PRESIDENT: I now call the mover of Motion 133.

POLITICAL: RACISM & FASCISM
FIGHTING FASCISM
MOTION 133

133. FIGHTING FASCISM

This Conference notes:

1. The rise in the electoral credence of the fascist British National Party, with two MEP's being elected last year. They now plan to elect two MP's at the General Election in the constituencies of Barking & Dagenham and Stoke-on-Trent.
2. This Conference notes the increased confidence of racist organisations such as English Defence League, who are likely spurred on by the BNP electoral success.
3. This Conference notes the fascists' opposition to equality, trade union rights and democracy.
4. This Conference believes that racism and fascism should be challenged at every turn and this involves trades unions such as our own giving as much support as is possible.
5. This Conference believes that in times of economic severity, many feel let down by mainstream politics but should be encouraged away from support of the far-right.
6. This Conference believes that there is no place for the BNP/EDL in our unions, workplaces, schools, communities, let alone our democratically elected chambers.
7. This Conference resolves to continue making the argument that the far-right does not hold the answers to economic or social problems.
8. This Conference resolves to continue to keep the GMB central to anti-fascist campaigns across the country, providing the necessary resource and support.
9. This Conference resolves to encourage all members to get actively involved in their local Hope not Hate, Unite against Fascism or other group which campaigns against the BNP.
10. This Conference resolves to run a myth busting campaign which exposes the truth about the far-right and debunks racism which blames multicultural Britain for problems which stem from the economy.

LEEDS GENERAL BRANCH
Yorkshire & North Derbyshire Region

(Carried)

BRO. H. RAJCH (Yorkshire & North Derbyshire): I move Motion 133. The best thing about the election were the BNP results, which saw not only Nick Griffin not get elected but the BNP actually lose their 12 council seats in Barking & Dagenham, which was a brilliant and cheered up everybody. It lifted the spirits of every anti-racist and anti-Fascist activist in the country. That was just a fantastic result and a great relief because I am sure that many people felt that they were a rising political party, that they were doing well and it was only a matter of time before they got an MP. Happily, that was not the case. They did put a lot of work into the election. They spent hundreds of thousands of pounds in London and Stoke, and they also put a lot of work in in Barnsley, which is where I am from. There they did not actually increase their overall vote. In fact, it slightly fell. This was mainly due to the great work that was put in by grass roots organisations, by *Hope Not Hate*, *United Against Fascism*, trade unionists, Labour Party members and church groups, all putting out the message that the BNP is a Fascist organisation which wants a white Britain, which trade unions have nothing to do with. We hate their politics, we hate what they stand for and we campaign and actively organise against them wherever they appear or attempt to gain support.

Also in Barnsley we had a very successful *Love Music Hate Racism* event on May 1st, which despite the rain was a huge success. But it did manage to create a real anti-racist atmosphere, with kids wearing *Love Music Hate Racism* T-shirts, like *this* one, and it was really uncool amongst young people to be racist. Any talk of racism meant “You’re not acceptable”, and young people were speaking out against it. In fact when Griffin came to Barnsley to speak, a TUC demonstration was called against him, there was a picket, and young GMB members through our small Youth Group were able to get people to shout abuse at people who were going into the hall to listen to Griffin. I think the key to the success which we have experienced against the BNP has been the unity. That’s the key thing, isn’t it? Unity is what we need. We might have slight differences in the way we organise but, at the end of the day, we have successfully managed to keep them down, which is brilliant.

However, there is another organisation that the motion mentions, called English Defence League, which is a horrible organisation, which is full of football hooligans, racists, white supremacists who want a white Britain and is full of BNP members, despite what the leaders of the EDL tell us. When we first organised an event in Stoke, they were able to rampage through Stoke smashing Asians’ shop windows and attacking Asian people. After that the organisation was put in its place, making sure that that behaviour did not happen again. Since then, wherever the EDL is organising to demonstrate – by the way, there is to be an EDL meeting in Tower Hamlets on 20th June and Bradford in August – we need to be part of the organisation which is standing up against the EDL and not allow them to March. They did it Stoke, but six weeks ago they tried to march again in Bolton. I was in Bolton and we managed to keep them penned in so that they did not rampage through Bolton, did not smash Asians’ shops and that they did not attack Asian people. I think we need to be part of that group against the EDL. I want to see GMB banners on those demonstrations. I would love to see more GMB activity against the EDL because that is what we need to be involved in and that is the way of the future. Thank you.

BRO. J. SHIELD (Yorkshire & North Derbyshire): I second Motion 133. President and Congress, our Union has proudly and rightly campaigned as an organisation against the cancerous politics of the BNP and their like. This year trade unionists up and down the country have been a key force in holding back the BNP’s election drive. Nationally, they predicted that they would win dozens of new council seats. They failed massively in their bid and lost all but two of the 28 council wards they were defending. This could give us all hope and encouragement to carry on the political struggle against these Fascist bullies and thugs.

The EDL, although not representing the same kind of political danger as the BNP, clearly represents a violent, racist group of people who physically threaten citizens of ethnic minorities as well as anyone else who opposes them.

Congress, this motion asks you to recognise that this battle is not yet won. In these times of recession people may look for answers and some of them will turn to the bigoted ideas

of the BNP, who although weakened are not yet a spent political force. Our Union needs to remind everybody of the dangers that these organisations pose to the lives of decent, law-abiding people.

I work alongside some migrant workers, mainly Polish people, who are friendly, decent and hardworking and just want to provide for their families. A multicultural Britain is not to blame for all the economic problems we face today. The press seem to be creating an emotional climate which the BNP thrives on. Members must be encouraged to get actively involved with their local *Hope Not Hate* and *Unite Against Fascism* campaigns. As a Union we need to provide the necessary resources to support all peaceful anti-Fascist campaigns. We believe that there is no place for the BNP or EDL in our Union or in our workplaces. As a matter of principle, we should all oppose them. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Does anyone wish to come in on the debate?

BRO. M. SAYWELL (London): President, I am speaking on Motion 133 – Fighting Fascism. The CEC is going to ask you to qualify this motion or support the motion with a qualification that it does not support the UAF Campaign, so I would like to speak on that aspect. I think the CEC's concerns are about the tactics of the UAF. I am not sure what specific concerns they have, but the TUC has been working extensively with the UAF. All elements of the trade union Movement work with UAF. UAF does educational work and they visit schools. Their sister organisation, as you heard from Henry, with *Love Music Hate Racism*, does a lot of work. Also Margaret Hodge, who is the Labour MP for Barking said that the UAF was central to the campaign to get rid of the BNP, and if she is prepared to work with the group, why can't our Union prepared to work with this group? What we are doing by saying this is denying the right for all GMB activists, where there isn't a *Hope Not Hate Campaign* to get involved in fighting Fascism. So don't deny our members the right. I would encourage the CEC to see if we can heal these wounds and to see what the differences are. We all know that Hitler got in when we were not unified, so let's get some unity and let's fight the Fascists.

BRO. J. WOODWARD (South Western): Congress, I am a proud Remploy disabled worker. There are a couple of points I want to make. First of all, the EDL is not unique to England. In Wales we have got a WDL, a Welsh Defence League. I cannot think of a word that will not offend the ladies here, but these people exist in Scotland and in Northern Ireland as well.

The other thing I want to say is that it is all very well accusing the BNP of being racist, but don't forget that they are homophobic, anti-disabled, they do not support disabled people in work and they are totally against the working class. I will tell you this. My father's family fought Fascism in the Spanish Civil War. My father fought Fascism in the Second World War, and I'll fight Fascism wherever it is now. Thank you.

BRO. A. NEWMAN (Southern): Congress, I want to speak on Motion 133. I want to discuss this question about Bolton because Bolton was a disaster for the anti-Fascist movement and for the left, because what happened was that there were about 3,000 EDL,

most of whom are football hooligans and very violent. What happened was that the *Unite Against Fascism* campaign put a number of people into Bolton town centre and then it kicked off with the police. What happened from the local and national newspapers was that the EDL and *Unite Against Fascism* were the same. It looked symmetrical. I know anti-racists in Bolton who work in Bolton College, who said that afterwards there were racists mocking them. So I think we do need to be very careful that the idea of physically confronting the EDL is the way forward because the way to oppose them is, politically, to campaign for their marches to be banned and campaigning for them to be contained by the police. To be honest, colleagues, when there are two thousand or three thousand football hooligans we should not be putting our members at risk by trying to contain them and stopping them going on the rampage. That is a job for the police.

THE PRESIDENT: I call Gary Doolan to speak on behalf of the CEC on Motions 126, 128 and 133.

BRO. G. DOOLAN (CEC, Public Services): President and Congress, I am speaking on behalf of the CEC. Congress, the CEC is asking you to support Motions 124, 130, Composite 12 and oppose Motion 126, refer Motion 128 and support Motion 133 with a qualification.

Firstly, on Motion 126, Parliamentary Elections. Congress will no doubt be aware that the issue of voting reform played a major part in the recent elections and shot to prominence when it emerged that no political party had a majority. GMB's position on this issue is clear. Our policy of first-past-the-post is held for many reasons, but mainly because PR delivers weak and unstable government. It also gives small parties far greater power over political direction when the backroom, post election deals are done. To move towards proportional representation may be a means to increase public interest in the election process but it would not be in the best interests of this Union, our members and the Labour Party to which we are affiliated.

Mary, last time I came to this rostrum you mentioned about the success we have had in Islington in the elections. I want to point out that it was not only Islington. Many London boroughs experienced major success at that time, and it was all to do with this trade union. That is where the successes came from. We would not have got those successes if we had moved away from first-past-the-post. Things like free school meals for all children under the age of 11 – it was not just Newham, by the way – free admission to sports centres for everyone under the age of 18 is now in place, and £100 off the Council Tax for people over the age of 65 is now in place and running for a second year this year. We are moving towards moving all of the privatised services back in-house. That is what you have achieved and that is what we have achieved through using first-past-the-post. To move away from that would risk those types of things which you have gained, not us, as a trade union.

On Motion 128 the CEC asks Congress to agree to refer this motion because we want to consult more widely on the merits or otherwise of supporting and campaigning for the abolition of the Monarchy. There are opposing views on the merits of the Monarchy

across our membership and the CEC is asking you to refer this motion to look at the detail.

On Motion 133 the CEC asks Congress to support it with a qualification. Much of the motion is in line with Congress policy past at earlier Congresses. In 2008 and 2009, and Terry is right, the Congresses agreed to work with *Searchlight* and *Hope Not Hate*. Point 9 of Motion 133 would commit us to extend this to *Unite Against Fascism* and other groups. We have well rehearsed concerns related to the anti-Fascist groups and their links with political groupings and the tactics they use in combating the far right.

In the recent national and local elections we saw the total wipe out of the BNP in Barking and Dagenham, something which this Union can be extremely proud of. This vindicates our decision to work solely with *Searchlight* and *Hope Not Hate*.

Congress, the CEC is, therefore, asking you to support Motions 124, 130 and Composite 12, to oppose Motion 126, to refer Motion 128 and support Motion 133 with the qualification I have set out. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Is Southern Region prepared to withdraw Motion 126? (*Declined*) The delegate came to the platform without the support of his Region. Do you want to reply?

BRO. R. REEVES (Southern): I am exercising my right of reply on Motion 126. It is opposed because we may not have a strong Labour Government, but what we do have under this present system is a strong Conservative Government, when we could have had a Labour Government supported by other parties. It could actually have turned out much better for us under this present system. I don't think the CEC should oppose this motion because the opposite view is already GMB policy, because that is what this Congress is all about, making policy and changing policy. Please support this motion.

THE PRESIDENT: Is London Region prepared to accept reference of Motion 128? (*Agreed*) Does Congress agree? (*Agreed*)

Motion 128 was referred.

THE PRESIDENT: I put Motion 126 to the vote. The CEC is opposing. The region has not given the motion its support. All those in favour, please show? Those against.

Motion 126 was lost.

THE PRESIDENT: On Motion 133, does Yorkshire & North Derbyshire accept the qualification? (*Agreed*) I put those to the vote. That is Motions 124, 130, Composite 12, and Motion 133, we support. All those in favour, please show? Anyone against?

Motion 124 was carried.

Motion 130 was carried.

*Composite 12 was carried.
Motion 133 was carried.*

THE PRESIDENT: Colleagues, the General Secretary's Report was to be the next item on the agenda, but because of the long debate on Political, we don't have time now. We will move it, hopefully, to Wednesday morning.

I have a couple of announcements to make. I would like to welcome a visitor to the hall. I welcome Mike Goody, the HR Director of ASDA, who is working positively with our shop stewards. Welcome, Mike, on behalf of the Congress.

I would also like to thank Tommy Hall, a CEC member from Yorkshire & North Derbyshire Region, for raising £200 last night for the Jimmy Knapp Cancer Fund. He raffled a Featherstone Rovers rugby shirt, signed by the team. I would also like to thank Tim Roache and Richard Ascough for both agreeing to make it up to £500. So I thank Southern and Yorkshire regions very much, indeed. *(Applause)*

You will see outside of the Conference Centre the North West & Irish Region's Education Bus. That bus is used for visiting sites for training members and for recruiting members. It was a great idea and it has been working very well. Thank you. Will you please be back in the hall at 12.50 p.m.

Congress adjourned for lunch.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Congress reassembled at 12.50 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, please start settling down. I know it is an exciting time but before we switch the cameras on – well, somebody switches the cameras on - I would like to make the point that we have guests here this afternoon that you are going to talk to, ask questions of, and they are going to answer. Remember, this is the GMB and I expect respect from the floor for the candidates whether you like their answer or not. Thank you. Will Congress start coming to order, please?

THE HUSTINGS

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, I am about to open the session. We will now move to the special session, a hustings for the Labour leadership candidates and GMB leads the way as this is the first of many. We have with us on the platform five of the six leadership candidates. Unfortunately, Ed Balls cannot join us today; he is taking on Michael Gove in education questions at Westminster this afternoon. He sends his apologies and looks forward to addressing the Public Services Section Conference tomorrow.

May I now welcome our guests. Joining me on the stage is Diane Abbott on my left, which she usually is. (*Applause*) Not always on my right is Andy Burnham. Welcome, Andy. (*Applause*) On my left again is David Miliband. (*Applause*) Then we have the younger sibling, Ed Miliband. Welcome, Ed. (*Applause*) Last, but by no means least, a colleague you all know well, John McDonnell. Welcome, John. (*Cheers/Applause*) Do not make him too welcome. You may not get the answers you want! (*Laughter*)

I will now outline the guidelines for the hustings proceedings. This will take the format of a question and answer session. To begin, each candidate will have two minutes to explain why they want to be Labour's next leader. We will then move to questions from regions. Each candidate will then finish with a three-minute closing statement. For questions there are standing mikes in the hall. Regions have been allocated to a particular mike. Please make sure you are ready to speak. I will be calling regions in the following order: South Western, Northern, London, Birmingham, Midland, North West & Irish, Scotland, Southern, and Yorkshire. If we have time, and I want questions, I do not want resolutions, we may be able to go back around the hall.

Andy drew the short straw and he will be the first to address the hall. He will then be followed by Ed, Diane, John, and finally David. Andy?

ANDY BURNHAM, MP: Thank you very much indeed, Mary. Good afternoon, everybody. Before we talk about anybody's individual campaign, let us just focus on the collective campaign we all have. The collective campaign is that we have to commit to getting back into government as soon as possible and to winning next time.

We already have a Cabinet of millionaires making cuts without compassion and I know that already they are affecting your colleagues and your members, and we need to remember that at all times in this leadership debate.

I believe Labour can win next time but let us be under no illusion, it is going to be a long road back. We did good things in government but the harsh fact is we have left government with many people not knowing who we are or what we stand for. We have to face up to that but in facing up to it we should not get into the position of disowning our past. We must learn from our past but always remembering we did good things in government that changed this country for the better.

It was right for Labour to change, to be tough on crime and to be pro-business, and that should not change going forward, but for some in our party being pro-business meant being anti-union and that should not have happened either. Good people felt excluded from the Government and were made to feel like awkward relations, and the Movement as a whole did not often feel it had a pride or involvement in the things the Government was doing. Worse still, in wanting to look pro-business at times it looked like we were seduced by big business, putting it before people, and seduced by power, wealth and glamour. We have to learn from that and change that, too.

So, going forward, Labour needs to show that we are learning and where we got it wrong we are owning up to that and beginning to talk to people again and connect with people.

My case to you today is that to do that Labour needs a different kind of leader. Yes, it needs somebody with good judgement and somebody who can inspire, but it needs more than that, it needs somebody that people can relate to, can identify with, and somebody who will provide a real point of contrast with the Tories and the Liberals in Westminster. I can reconnect Labour because my background means I can talk with passion and conviction about the things that still need to change in this country. We still need to give our young people with no connections more chance of a better career in life, helping them break through into those elites that still run our country. We do need to give more protection and security to lower and middle income families who are living a more precarious existence in the globalised world of work today, and we do need to end the fear of old age and give our pensioners more peace of mind and a better quality of retirement. These are the things that matter to me.

I would put to you, finally, that if we focus on people, if we get our priorities right, then we can put the heart and soul back into Labour. If you believe that, too, then I hope you will support my campaign. Thank you very much, Chair. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed?

ED MILIBAND, MP: Can I start by thanking everyone in this room and GMB members up and down this country for the work you did at the General Election campaign. Although we did not win that election we did deny the Tories a majority and on behalf of my colleagues in Parliament I want to thank you for the work you did. I know that your work in many constituencies up and down this country made a huge difference. *(Applause)*

I am standing to be leader of this party for three reasons. First, values: I joined the Labour Party when I was 17 years old because going to a comprehensive in North London I saw what Mrs. Thatcher was doing to the country. That is why I joined this Party.

My analysis of the last 10 years is that where we succeeded was when we stuck to our values. Where we did not succeed, where we went wrong, was when we did not stick to those values and we became managers and technocrats, and that was true on agency workers, it was true of our failure to act on housing early enough in our term in office.

If I was leader of our party, the Labour Party, I would put values at the centre of everything I did and do not believe those people who tell you that we can win despite our values. We can win the next election and the best way to win the next election is because of our values.

The second reason I am standing is that I think we need a leader who understands the strength of our trade union links. Our trade unions link us to millions of people up and down this country and I want to say that if I was the Labour leader I would want to work with the trade union Movement to ensure that more people were in trade unions.

We need more people than the 15% who are in the private sector in trade unions because they need the representation at work that trade unions can give them.

The truth is also that it will make us a better opposition with more people in the trade union Movement, a better movement. It will help us win arguments up and down this country to help us get back into power. When we do get back into power, if I was the Prime Minister of this country it would strengthen my hand not just to be leader of a Parliamentary Labour Party but the leader of a wider movement.

The final reason I am standing to be leader of this Party is that I think we need someone with the power to inspire. I joined the Labour Party because I believe we can change society, not just manage it. I know that is why people joined the trade union Movement as well. I also believe there are hundreds of thousands, and millions, of people who can be inspired by a vision of a more just, more equal, and fairer society. That is why I am standing for the leadership. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT MP: First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting me to this conference. I feel a little bit like Daniel in the lion's den but I will pursue and move forward. I understand that you had a very good debate this morning about the abolition of the monarchy. I cannot tell you the last time we were allowed to debate the abolition of the monarchy at Labour Party Conference so congratulations to the GMB. (*Applause*) Following on from that debate, I think it is important to affirm that we in the Labour Movement do not have coronations, we do not have heir apparents, we have a contest and it is because it is a contest and should be a genuine contest that I have thrown my hat in the ring.

There are three reasons why I put my hat in the ring for this important summer-long debate. First of all, I think it is very important that the Labour Party rebuilds the party in the country and rebuilds its links with the Movement. As someone who has been active in the Party at every level, whether it is collecting subs at ward level, whether it is being a ward organiser, whether it is being a local councillor, whether it is being an elected member of the NEC in the 1990s alongside Mary Turner, one of the most distinguished long-serving women on the NEC, at every level I have served in the Party, and because I have that knowledge of the Party at every level, I believe that makes me well placed to rebuild, to start the debate on how we rebuild the Party, how we rebuild our membership, and how we build our links with the Movement.

As well as being active in the Party as a grass-root activist and a councillor, I was also an active trade union activist and for a short period in the 1990s was actually equalities officer in my union, the old ACCT film technicians union. I think we need to listen to the Movement. Had we listened to the Movement we would not have brought in the derisory 8p rise for pensions, we would not have abolished the 10p tax rate, and above all we would not have gone to war with Iraq. (*Applause*)

You may have heard Cameron this morning talking about the cuts and how they are a threat to our way of life. They are not a threat to his way of life. They are a threat to our way of life, our families. *(Applause)* I believe the public sector cuts that are being planned could have the same devastating effect on our inner cities and our urban centres as closing down the pits did all those years ago. Public sector cuts do not mean a cut in services; they mean a cut in jobs. I am here to reconnect, to rebuild, and above all to fight the cuts. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL MP: Let me tell you why I am standing. Some of you may remember I tried to stand before and we wound up with a coronation, one name on the ballot paper. Only a couple of weeks ago it did improve, we had one family on the ballot paper. *(Applause/Laughter)* It is at the stage now where what we want is an honest debate. We were not wiped out in the Election because of you. You helped us stem the Tory flow but we have to learn the lessons of what went wrong, and they are the lessons that Paul Kenny and the GMB have been trying to teach us for a number of years. Let's go through it.

On public services, yes, we welcomed the investment in public services but it is a disgrace that New Labour privatised more jobs than Thatcher and Major put together. *(Cheers/Applause)* Yes, on trade union rights we welcome what Labour did on recognition but it was a Labour minister, it was a disgrace it was a Labour minister that talked out the Trade Union Freedom Bill sponsored by this union and put forward by myself and others. *(Applause)* Never again. *(Applause)* Let me say this, never again should we ever see workers treated in this country the way Remploy workers were treated by the last government. *(Cheers/Applause)* Never again. *(Applause)*

We supported the minimum wage but we want a living wage. We supported what the Government did in Northern Ireland on peace but we supported the record with Iraq, and now Afghanistan. Also, why are we wasting billions on Trident when we need it for our public investment? *(Applause)*

The whole point of our discussions is that Labour stopped listening to us and, as Andy said, they started listening more to the CBI. They closed down effective debate within the Party by closing down democracy. What we want now are all these candidates on the ballot paper so we can have that open and honest debate. We want a proper election. *(Applause/Cheers)* I promise you this, we will then unite to resist the cuts, defeat the Tories, and return a Labour government. Solidarity. *(Applause/Cheers)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David, follow that! *(Laughter)*

DAVID MILIBAND, MP: I am always happy to follow John McDonnell. I also want to thank you for the outstanding work, not just the money but the work that was done by 3.5 million levy payers who are a democratic part of this country.

I want to say something in particular about the General Election. The BNP was beaten in Barking, in Sandwell, and elsewhere, because of the efforts of people in the GMB and throughout the Labour movement and we should never forget it.

Now, we are going to hear a lot of words today and I am looking forward to answering your questions. I am going to talk about my values and about why I came into the Labour Party, to fight against injustice and to fight for equality. I am going to talk about policies as well, from housing to immigration, to welfare.

I think you know me not through my words but because of what I have done. In 2002, tens of thousands of school support staff were treated as second-class citizens in the workplace, your union was frozen out of the negotiations, and the teachers unions did not even want you to be members. That has changed. It has changed because of the workplace reform agreement. We put that in place with Jude Brimble and Brian Strutton when I was the Schools Minister. We took those words about social partnership, about equality, about dignity at work, and we put them in practice. By the way, the GMB received 70,000 more members as a result.

That is the sort of politics that I believe in, building our Movement, one by one, workplace by workplace. *(Applause)*

We do need a fighting opposition, not fighting each other but fighting the Tories. We also need to be an alternative government. The best way of protecting our people, the best way of raising wages, the best way of getting affordable housing and safe streets, is through a Labour government. We need a leader who can fire the imagination of the public as well as the Party. We need a leader who can unite the different talents in our Movement. We need a leader who can win the battle of ideas and we need a leader who is a credible prime minister. That is the basis on which I am asking for your support. Thank you very much indeed. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all for that. We will now move to questions and I will tell the candidates they have one minute to answer the questions from around the regions. Please make sure that you state your name and where you are from, and keep to your question; do not make speeches or statements.

As Chair, I am going to pull rank. I would like to take the Chair's prerogative and ask the first question: To all my colleagues on this platform, if you are elected as Labour leader, will you invite Lord Mandelson back in the Shadow Cabinet?

ED MILIBAND: Mary, thank you very much for that question. *(Laughter)* I think all of us believe in dignity in retirement. *(Laughter/Applause)* I do want to say this about Peter Mandelson, I did not always agree with what he said or did but he did fight like a tiger to try and stop the Tories getting a majority at this General Election, and we should recognise that, I think, in this hall.

More generally, I just want to make the point that I think the people from the Shadow Cabinet should be people who are elected and accountable to others. *(Applause)* Of

course, we are going to have representatives in the House of Lords but it is right, particularly as we try and reconnect to people and reconnect to communities, that we have people who are elected as members of Parliament. (*Applause*)

DIANE ABBOTT: I agree with Ed about dignity in retirement. I would also say that of all the people on the platform I must be the one Peter Mandelson dislikes the most so not only would I not invite him back, he would not come. (*Laughter/Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: John.

JOHN McDONNELL: (*microphones not working*) I think it is no secret that we are having a whip-round to buy the yacht so that he does not have to Let's not go there! (*Laughter*) There is a wider question on this about accountability and the nature of representation. What I think we need to do now is start having really democratic selections in the Labour Party to get the working-class people involved. (*Applause*) I think it is time we ended the practice of parachuting in policy advisers with policy wants and that we get people with real experience of the shop floor within our communities who can genuinely represent our class. I think that is one of the fundamental beliefs in this union that we try to do it. Over this coming period I think that is one of the processes we should engage in now, recruiting, training, and building the confidence of working people so that they can now go into Parliament and represent our people. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: So I am assuming that is a no! (*Applause*) David.

DAVID MILIBAND: (*microphones not working*) I think we should be good haters of the Tories and not good haters of each other. Peter has earned his retirement; he has done 20/25 years of service to the Labour Party, but I think there is a new generation coming through. I do think we have to widen our base in the country. With 150,000 members of the Labour Party, I do not believe that every single one of those people could not find a friend to join the Labour Party and double our membership. We also need to recognise that selections need to be done early, not just the 650 of the safer seats but the safest seat as well so that well in advance of the next general election we have candidates in the community. That phrase, Labour Movement, is a phrase that is close to my heart and the MP for South Shields and those Jarrow marchers were the Labour Movement of the 1930s. We need a Labour Movement of the 2010s and that means being active in our communities with Labour, trade unions, and the wider community sector. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Peter did a great thing in the election campaign, he put the Tories on the spot and made sure they committed to keeping the free bus pass or maybe he had a look, a vision, into the months stretching ahead. I think this leadership election is about a new generation in the Labour Party and it is time we looked at that new generation and brought on a change in the Labour Party, refreshed our ranks at every level and brought different, new blood to the country. I hope that is what this leadership election will be all about. Peter did some great things, and David is right, he is Labour through and through,

but we created an impression that an elite was running our Party, and also then we courted elites in the country. We cannot have that any more. We must have a Labour Party that really does involve people at every single level and is a party that is a whole, the Labour family working for a Labour government. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Can I now call South Western to put their question? Then it will be Northern, and then London. Will you get in positions, please?

BRO. K. JENKINS (South Western): Can you explain why the Labour Government was so opposed to the granting of basic employment rights for temporary and agency workers, even going so far as to dilute the European Directive which is already very weak?

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Can I now put that to Ed?

ED MILIBAND: I think we were far, far too slow on agency workers, Keith, and we should have implemented it much earlier. There has been a debate in the last few days around immigration. The truth is that the root causes of the feelings that people had on the doorstep around immigration were to do with issues like housing, like wages, and living standards. Those are the issues that we need to be attacking in this campaign and dealing with. We should have moved earlier on agency workers. Why were we so slow? I think it goes back to what I tried to say in my opening remarks, that we did not remember our values. We looked for the managerial explanation which was about our economy as a whole and big business, and so on. If we had kept with our values and understood what people were saying to us on the ground, where in marginal seats around the country people were saying, we need the Agency Workers Directive because people are worried about their wages and living standards, if we had kept to those values, we would have done it earlier and it is what would guide me as leader.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: I cannot explain the Government's position because I was not actually a member of the Government. What I do know is I voted at every point to support the policy on agency workers that is a policy of this union. I think the reason perhaps, and I cannot give you an explanation but I can give you what I think was the reason, was that over the course of 13 years although our government did some extraordinary and magnificent things, investment in schools and hospitals, the minimum wage, it began to lean just a little bit too much to the cause of management, and part of this process of renewal and revival is getting the Labour Party where it should be, which is once again the voice of ordinary working people. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: The only explanation, the only explanation, is that the Government listened to the CBI rather than to this union and other trade unions. (*Applause*) That is the only explanation. There were a number of us in Parliament who time and time again raised the issue, moved amendments, moved the Trade Union

Freedom Bill, and it was blocked. I think if there is one lesson that comes out of this it is actually re-rooting the Labour Party back in the trade union Movement and to start listening again. Can I just say this on the issue around immigration that Ed Balls raised has raised as well, I supported Paul Kenny when he went to the TUC and bravely said, British jobs for British workers is a racist statement. I supported Paul on that. (*Applause*) I will tell you why. What we want is jobs for everybody, no matter where they come from. We want decent jobs and we want them paid a decent wage. The Agency Workers Directive would have given us that protection so that workers' wages and conditions were not undercut by employers introducing labour from elsewhere, so that everyone would have the same wage and we would have the trade union rights to mobilise them if they were exploited in any way. There is a lesson for the future here, is there not, and it is coming through all of this debate, listen to our own people, follow our wishes, and that way you will mobilise our support. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: I believe in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and I want to keep as many people in work as possible, in fact we have to generate jobs. The actual answer to Keith's question, and he deserves a straight answer, the straight answer is that the Agency Workers Directive came in, in June 2008, the worldwide economic crash hit in September 2008, and the reason the Government delayed was for fear of unemployment. That is actually the reason, not that we abandoned our values, not that we abandoned our principles. I do believe that the Agency Workers Directive should be in, I support it, but we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our economy. I think we can bring it in a bit earlier than the final date that was chosen. There are big issues about the details, including how it is going to work, but that is the reason why it did not come in, in September 2008. I think we can argue about the timeframe, the three years that are given for every European country, but among all the European countries we are not the last. There is a good argument we should have done it a bit sooner than we had said, but I will not stand here and kid you that I was not very, very worried about unemployment at the time when the global economy was going into recession. That is a straight answer to a straight question. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Well, for maybe the first time in this campaign, Mary, can I say I agree with John because I think we did get this issue wrong. I say that not because it is easy to say that with hindsight. My Dad was an agency worker for the last part of his working career. He came out of British Telecom in the early 1990s and he worked abroad, and what John was saying is right, British workers benefited from a two-way street free movement. He benefited going abroad and working in different places but he crucially needed protection that sometimes was not there when people were taking advantage of those on short-term or casual contracts. I think this was the issue of the time and we failed to see it.

David is right, the world was changing, the economy was changing, and that is precisely why we should have done more to put a hand underneath people and give them a bit more security in a changing world. People in my constituency are living a precarious existence. They do not feel they have the security that they need and we should have spotted that and we should have done more about it. I am not going to say in this campaign that everything we did was wrong and throw up our hands on everything. I am not going to do that and I will defend when we did the right thing, but on this I think we should have done more and we should have ensured that you do not have to wait for a year until you get full employment rights, and that is to recognise how the world of work has changed. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Question 2 is from Northern Region.

BRO. A. MAJID (Northern): The question I would like to ask is: how would you go about saving the Corus Steel Plant at Redcar and ensuring the plant's sustainable future? Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: There is no doubt that the plight of the Corus steelworks at Redcar has been a catastrophe for the adjoining area and the region. It seems to me that we have to go back to the owners and we have to use the powers that lie with government to get them to recognise their responsibilities to their workforce, to the region, and to this country as a whole. For too long multinational companies have been able to operate almost as bandits in this country and shift production at will, and close down production at will. Corus had a future, it had the contracts, the responsibility lies with the management, and I think that one of the issues looking back over 13 years was the failure of our government to have a real industrial policy as opposed to bowing to the market at every turn. I believe it is for the Government now to step in and talk to management and save that steelworks and I believe that the future of the region depends on it. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: We are in a recession. We understand the implications of that recession, but at the same time we know we have to build ourselves out of recession and to do that we need to increase demand and we need to increase investment. Let us congratulate Ed Miliband on the work that he has done in terms of the development of the green new deal, which means that we have the policies that we could develop to build a green economy, a sustainable economy. It will require the steel and it will require the manufacturing base so that every job becomes a sustainable job. That is why we will need Corus and its investment in production in the future. It does mean hard negotiations and, if necessary, public subsidy, but also I have to say we have to start rehabilitating the concept of public ownership. So, if we think there is a section of the manufacturing industry that we will need for the long-term viability of our economy, particularly as we develop our green sustainable economy, and if it requires bringing something back into

public ownership, I think we should be courageous enough to do that for the long-term investment in our country. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: Thanks, Abdul. I do not know if you are working at Corus but you will know the devastating effect in Redcar. The issue is not the ownership, the issue is customers. Corus produces slab steel there. The customer base fell apart in the middle of the recession and there are no customers for 70% of the production. I think it is right that we talk about a partnership between government and industry and that is why the Government was so active in trying to ensure that, first, the plant stayed open by finding customers and, secondly, making sure that when the company talks about mothballing it is not actually talking about closing it down and selling it off.

That is a proper role for government but I would be dishonest if I came here today and said that the answer for Corus steel and those thousands of hard workers there is public ownership of the steel industry. The problem for them is customers, and there is a wider issue here. Government does have a role. If you think about Sheffield Forgemasters (and there will be GMB members who are dependent on the Government's role there) it is not taking over the company, it is supporting it, and there is a decision for this Government – I still hate calling them the Government, by the way, but this Tory/Liberal coalition – that they have to take in the next few weeks, about whether to keep up the investment that we made in Sheffield Forgemasters. I think they should, we should all be campaigning to ensure they should, and we should ensure that the Corus issue is properly managed by a government commitment really to get that customer base back. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: I visited Redcar three days before polling day and it is only when you go and you see the plant behind the town that you realise the sheer scale of what may happen to that part of the North East were not a future to be found for the plant. This is an area where the Government can stand up with some pride. If you live in Ellesmere Port you know that Labour did help people at Vauxhall and if you live around Sunderland you do know that we helped people at Nissan and helped with the development of the electric car. That is what we were doing; we were helping support communities whose jobs were threatened. It now falls to this opposition, as David says, hard to say that but it does, to say how can cutting the North East Development Agency possibly help give hope to those people in Redcar. That is what we have to do. We cannot oppose every cut that the Government comes up with but when we say these cuts will damage people's hopes, people's confidence, people's future, then that is the place where we have to speak out loudly and say we believe in something different. We have seen Tory governments devastate the North East and the North West in times past. We will not let it happen again. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: Abdul, the principle that we have to learn from Corus and other examples is that markets on their own do not create the economy that we need, and we need the right role for government. The truth is that we came too late to industrial policy. I actually think Peter Mandelson, who was referred to in the first question, did a good job in the last 18 months working with my department in government, and others, in trying to develop a more industrial policy, but we were too late. What should we do about it in the future, then? We should use every lever that government has to try and create good jobs at good wages: procurement, money, planning, all of the mechanisms at government's disposal.

The truth is that in the case of Corus the tragedy is that there is going to be a need for wind turbines in this country but the combination of the unwillingness of Corus to enter into the kind of discussions we needed them to enter into and our failure to go too early to engage in industrial policy meant that those wind turbines are not at the moment being made by Corus.

The final point I would make is about the Government. We need to oppose them tooth and nail on their attempts to cut back on the industrial policy support that we put in place for Sheffield Forgemasters and for other wind turbine companies that are coming to locate in this country. It will be the worst of short-termism to sacrifice the future of our economy on the altar of the deficit, and whoever is the leader needs to lead that charge against this Government. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Question 3, London Region.

BRO. V. WEST (London): In Islington the Labour opposition forced the Liberal Democratic Council to implement free school meals just over 12 months ago, for every child under the age of 11. At the last election the council went from no overall control to a 22-seat Labour majority. What would you do to support the GMB's policy of universal free school meals and if elected would you be prepared to put it into a Labour manifesto? (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: John.

JOHN McDONNELL: Yes. (*Applause/Cheers*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: I think there is a really important point here because the GMB has shown itself to be absolutely committed not just to the interests of its own members but actually to the wider social interest through its free school meals campaign. I campaigned in Islington with the Islington Councillors, and with Emily Thornberry, the local MP, for that free school meals policy but also to see what the results were going to be when it was implemented elsewhere in London. The results have been positive. The good news is we are out of power in Westminster but the power that we do have is in local government. Labour local councils right around the country can make choices

about whether that is going to be a priority for them. I think that is a good campaigning issue for us. It is going to be very, very tough. The Tory cuts that have been announced in the name of giving local councils more freedom are actually targeting the poorest areas for the biggest cuts, but I think that is the sort of support and engagement that we can have even before the next manifesto comes to be written. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Could I begin by paying tribute to Mary Turner because she came to see me and made the argument, and I would just say when I was at school I wish Mary had cooked my school dinners because I think I would have been a better person today. She spoke with a complete passion. I worked with Ed Balls and we funded a pilot through the Department of Children, Schools and Families, and the Department of Health. It is a policy that could not just have health benefits. It could have health benefits if we ensure that every child gets a decent meal, at least one decent meal every day. It could also have huge educational benefit because the children are then ready to learn properly and with all the nutrients that they need they are ready to concentrate in the classroom.

It is a policy that has huge potential. I think Ed put a commitment to take it further in the manifesto. I think we owe it to Mary to see this one through and that Labour should carry on arguing for it. I funded free swimming when I was at Health and DCSF because I think you give children the best chance in life. They are Labour values to me, just make it available to everybody, and the same applies for free school meals. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: I cannot promise now that it will definitely be in the next Labour manifesto because we have to have tax and spending plans that have credibility but the principle is absolutely right. Anyone who has been to the places around the country, in Islington or in the north-east where free school meals are being implemented in practice, you know it is good for nutrition, it saves hassle and money for parents, and it brings kids and parents together. So, I think it is an absolutely right principle. I want to join with Andy in paying tribute to Mary for the tireless work, including in advance of the manifesto, that she did. This is definitely something that we should be looking at for our next manifesto.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think we should pay tribute to the GMB overall because I just carry out their policy. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: Yes, I would support this policy and actually I think a policy of free school meals in every school would be popular with parents up and down the country. First of all, it deals with the issues of childhood nutrition. With too many of our children we are seeing too much childhood obesity, too much childhood early onset of diabetes, so it deals with childhood nutrition. Too many children in areas like Islington and Hackney, and our inner cities, are coming to school without having had a proper breakfast and a

proper meal at lunchtime is very important for their learning, and of course free school meals in every school up and down the country potentially provides stable jobs for local people. I pay every tribute to Mary's work on this issue but it does not surprise me because I knew Mary when she was not your distinguished leader but when she was leading with tremendous ferocity the dinner ladies in Brent. Mary's commitment to children and schools, and these issues, is outstanding and I would be glad to put it in a Labour manifesto. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: David has just said, I'm not dead yet. I hope not. Thank you, Diane. Yes, I have known Diane since she was a young teenager, I have to say. Question 4, Birmingham.

SIS. C. SOWDEN (Birmingham & West Midlands): Before becoming a professional politician what job did you do and what life experience would you bring to the job of leader of the Labour Party? Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: David.

DAVID MILIBAND: My first ambition was to be a bus conductor when I was 4 years old living in

THE PRESIDENT: You would have lost that job, wouldn't you, a bit quick?

DAVID MILIBAND: I would have been a member of the T&G, so there you go. (*Cheers/Applause*) My first proper job was campaigning for the repeal of section 28 of the Local Government Act in the late 1980s to give dignity and equality to people whatever their sexuality. My subsequent jobs were working for John Smith heading up the commission on social justice which figured out how to rebuild the welfare state for the future. Then I went into politics to try to turn ideas and ideals into reality. That is what I have dedicated myself to doing. The biggest lesson I have learnt is that we should under-promise and over-deliver. When we do that we build confidence, build the Movement, and build trust. That is what I would do as your leader.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: My first job was as a trainee journalist in Middleton in Manchester and I had to give it up because I simply could not live on the pay that they offered. I could not ask my Mum and Dad any more to give me any more support so I had to find a job, and a job I did not like, so I worked in publishing for about three years. Now, that experience has always informed and changed my politics. I still believe that if you are a kid without connections in this world it is very, very hard to make your way. If your parents do not know somebody who can open a door, if you cannot afford to work for free, if you cannot afford to move to London to be near where the jobs are, it is very, very hard for young people in this region where you are sitting now to go on and break in and break down some of the elites that still run our country. Now, if you want to know about

me, that is my passion in politics, that is me to the core, and it was forged by my first job since leaving university. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed. You wanted to be a driver's mate, did you?

ED MILIBAND: I wanted to be a bus conductor, too, actually. *(Laughter)* Carly, I did my first job in the media but I am not going to pretend something I am not. I have worked for most of my life in politics but let me tell you why I have done that. I have done that because I had an upbringing from parents who were refugees from the Nazis and who taught me that politics was the thing that changed your society, politics was the thing that tackled injustice. I am actually going to defend politics and politicians on this platform today because politics, working with trade unions and others in society, is the thing that changes people's lives for the better. That is why I have worked for Gordon Brown and Harriet Harman, that is why I became a Labour Member of Parliament for Doncaster North, that is why I am doing the job I am doing, and that is why I am standing for leader of the Labour Party. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: My first job, actually, was as a Saturday girl in Woolworths aged 14. *(Applause)* I was very sad to see it go. I used to love the Pick & Mix. *(Laughter)* Anyway, when I came down from university I was a civil servant, I worked for Liberty the civil liberties organisation, I have been a journalist, I was a trade union official briefly, I have worked in television, and I worked for Ken Livingstone at the GLC. But if you had to ask me the most important job I have ever had and the job in a way that will always be with me, it is about bringing up my 18-year old son on my own for the past 18 years. Yes, I am an MP and, yes, I have good money, but bringing up a child on your own is not easy. I have made decisions, some of them have been controversial, but there are times when I would love someone to turn to and say, "What do I do next," and there is no one to turn to.

So, if you ask me what single thing informs my politics, I would say, first of all, my background as a child of Jamaican immigrants but also having brought up a child on my own all these years. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. We have something in common, Diane. I started work as a Saturday girl in Woolworths until the manager said, "Oi, you", one morning and I told him what to do with his job, and it was not polite. *(Laughter)* John.

JOHN McDONNELL: This gets a bit like Monty Python. I was born not far from here in Liverpool, my Dad was a docker and my mother was a cleaner. We actually lived not far from Scotland Road, and Andy. Later I read, when I was doing sociology, that this was one of the worst slums in Europe. We just used to call it home, basically. *(Laughter)* When I left school I went on the shop floor doing various industrial production jobs, and then did my A levels at night school and went to university. When I left university I worked for the NUM appointed by Mick McGahey, some of you may

remember him, and then went to work for the TUC. During that period I was also a house father in a children's home part-time. When I was elected to the GLC, Deputy Leader to Livingstone, exciting period, I was Chair of Finance at the age of 29. I controlled a £3bn budget. Can you remember we used to have a policy of shop till you drop and the GLC funded a whole range of things, including a number of GMB projects. Mrs. Thatcher abolished that. I was on any questions the other week and they asked the question, that warm-up question about ashes to ashes, if you went back to the 1980s what single act would you do to improve the world and I said, "Look, I was on the GLC that Mrs. Thatcher abolished. I worked for the NUM and we had the NUM strike. I think I would assassinate Thatcher." (*Cheers/Applause*) It had the same reaction and Dimbleby had to quieten them down until we broadcast. (*Laughter*) After abolition of the GLC I became a civil servant. I was the Chief Executive of the Association of London Authorities, managing the local authorities within London, their budgets, etc. Then I fought for a number of years for my constituency where I have lived for the last 35 years in Hayes & Harlington, lost it by 52 votes in 1992, and then came back in 1997 and won it by 12,000. That is about commitment to your community. It is not about me, it is about my community, my local party mobilising so that we can have a working-class representative to a working-class multicultural community. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. Midland.

SIS. C. CLARKSON (Midland & East Coast): You have all said to us that you will listen now. Does that mean you were not listening in the past? If that is the point, why should we believe you now? (*Cheers/Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Thanks, Mary. (*Laughter*)

THE PRESIDENT: I am doing it in rotation.

ANDY BURNHAM: I do not want to embarrass her but I would answer the question, if Sharon Holder is here go and speak to her and ask her whether I listened as a health minister. There is Sharon. I will just say ask her because I believe I did. When I joined the Department of Health it had real problems with deficits, you may remember, and redundancies. I set up the Social Partnership Forum - I am very proud of that - in the Department of Health. It led to much better industrial relations across the National Health Service. I also changed the policy of the NHS with respect to market testing. I introduced the preferred provider policy. I did things. I changed things. I brought in the NHS constitution working with Sharon and colleagues on the Social Partnership Forum. Do not take it from me, ask Sharon to find out whether or not I listened. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks, Andy. Can I now move to Ed?

ED MILIBAND: In a way you have to judge us on our records. When I was the Energy Secretary I worked with Paul Kenny and the GMB on the issues that matter to you, like

the prepayment meters issue, like the threat to your pensions from the regulator, Ofgem. I tried to be someone that listened and heard. I did not do everything you always wanted me to do but I tried to listen and hear. When it came to coordinating the manifesto I tried to listen and hear, and act as well. That is why we had a commitment to raise the minimum wage with earnings in the manifesto. That is why we had a commitment on the pub trade in ensuring, as the GMB has been asking for, that there is a non-tied option in the pub trade. I know that is something you have been debating today. In the end it does come down to the record that we have in government and you have to judge us on that, and the values that you see and hear from us today. I am very clear about my analysis of where we need to go as a party. We need to get back to the values of equality, of fairness, of dignity at work. That is the way we will win the next election. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: I have always listened and I think my record in Parliament speaks to that. It is because I listened that on occasion I had to vote against my own government, notably on the Iraq War. I mention the Iraq War because I think for a lot of people still it has a resonance and a resonance not because perhaps what happens in that region is of their central concern but it symbolises the way politicians were not listening at that time, and it symbolises the beginning of a process of a loss of faith in politics. So, I have always listened. I have always voted in the way that I understood was in the best interests of my constituents and what the Labour movement wanted of me, and maybe it is because I have always listened I was never a Labour minister, but still there is time to make that up now. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: I have not just listened, I have acted. I have never voted for a single privatisation. I have never voted for a single cut. I have never voted in favour of any war. (*Applause*) I have followed this union's policy throughout and I have supported every demand with regard to trade union freedom and trade union rights. I have done it because sometimes you have to put principle above career, sometimes you have to stand on what you believe in. (*Applause*) We will not always agree but there is a way in which we resolve our differences, is there not, which is through democracy. One of the main tenets of democracy in the Labour Party was that the Labour Party Conference was the sovereign body to make our policies. This union took one issue in particular, very importantly, and it was about council house building and tackling our housing crisis. We won that resolution four times running at Labour Party Conference. That was the way in which we felt we could actually influence the Labour Government. The tragedy of it is we allowed homelessness to double because we never built council houses. It was only in that last year or so that we had any real council house building drive.

So, the issue here is we are all learning, are we not, in this process? We need this leadership election so that people who are standing for election as leader can listen even

more and, hopefully, commit themselves to act this time round and respect democracy within our Party. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: I want to listen and I was just listening to what John said. There are plenty of people who want to trash our record. Let's not trash it ourselves. The facts are that we cut homelessness by two-thirds so let's be very, very careful when we throw around allegations about how our government betrayed everyone around the country. We are the people who should be humble about our mistakes but let's be proud about what we do well. We should listen to each other but we should not fall for the Tory claptrap that we left the country broken and bankrupt. That is just not true.

In respect of Carol's question, which is an important one, listening is a very important part of leading and when we stood up to that demand for the scrapping of rule 85 in local government when I was local government minister, we listened and we came to the same conclusion, and we defended it successfully. So, listening is important. We need the structures so that we are forced to listen. That is why I say if we are going to have a Party chair let's elect the Party chair by the membership so that he or she can represent the membership properly. Let's also listen to our trade union levy payers, 3.5 million of them. How many of our constituency parties have had the best out of them? I plead guilty. Not enough of us. We have to do more.

We have also to be clear that there needs to be a different culture in the Labour Party. The culture that was brought up after the 1980s was one in which the leadership was scared of the membership but actually the membership is a credit to the leadership of the Labour Party today and we should be proud to engage with them. I think the culture means we should be able to disagree without being disagreeable. We should be able to debate without having rancour and accusations of betrayal. That is the sort of culture we have to build and in the end if we build a relationship we will actually build a living breathing successful Movement. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David.

BRO. I. LOWES (North West & Irish): My question relates to people working for private contractors on outsourced local authority services. When you were in power why didn't you introduce primary legislation to outlaw the two-tier workforce and also allow new starters to join the local government pension scheme? (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ian. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: Ian, thanks for your question. I think we did act on the two-tier workforce in some parts of the public services but I acknowledge the fact that we probably did not do enough. The best value regime that we introduced was designed to end the automatic outsourcing of services but this is one of the ways in which we need to learn, in fact. We should face up to the fact that we lost the Election and we lost touch

with working people in some parts of the country and in some of the services. I acknowledge that and I acknowledge also that the process we have to undergo over the coming year, or however long it is when the new leader is elected, is a process where we need to listen to the people that we lost, understand the reasons that we lost, and make good on some of the things where we got it wrong. So, I think we should defend our record and I am the first to defend our record, but we should also acknowledge where we got it wrong. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: I think the issue of two-tier workforces and outsourcing is one of the key issues which has undermined people's security at work and also undermined trade union organisation. I am weary of people saying it is immigrants that have driven down wages and conditions. (*Applause*) What has driven down wages and conditions in the recent times has been the effects of globalisation, the failure to put the minimum wage at the right level, and the increasing tide of outsourcing and agency work. (*Applause*) You know, many of the people that are exploited in this situation are women workers, they are low-paid women workers, and I am sure David is right, we should be proud of our record, but you would not expect me representing the kind of people I represent and living in the area where I live to say that it was not wrong that we pursued policies that allowed thousands and thousands of workers to find themselves outsourced, lacking the protections, lacking the wages and conditions, and the support that they should have. That is what has driven down wages and conditions. That is what has led to insecurity. To blame immigrants, whether they are Eastern European immigrants now or West Indian immigrants in the 1960s, or Irish immigrants before, to blame immigrants is the old story.

Let us address the real reason why now in 2010 working-class people black and white feel insecure, feel their wages and conditions are under threat, let us address the real reasons and not engage in the phoney popularism of blaming the immigrant. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: I do not understand why we did not do anything about the two-tier workforce on the scale that we should have done and I do not understand why we did not allow people to enter into local government pensions. We live in the fifth richest country in the world but we live also in one of the most unequal societies in the world as well. What I regret is that under a Labour government it has become more unequal. What we failed to do is actually introduce a fair taxation system so that we could redistribute wealth in the corporate sector to individuals, so that we could raise living standards, so that we could invest in the public services, and in that way we could afford the decent public services that we need to provide, and we would not have to rely upon these cuts and outsourcing, and off-shoring, that cut people's living standards. It is one of those things that we have to campaign on now. The last government is now a closed door. What we are now facing is a potential tsunami of cuts. We have to explain to people now what the implications of these are and it means now building real resistance within our communities against what is coming at us as a result of this

coalition government. But it is with regret that I say those protections were not put in place, particularly with regard to trade union rights, particularly with regard to local government pensions, and also with this two-tier workforce. It is with regret that we did not put those protections in place in the 13 years we had the opportunity to do.

(Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: Poverty and tackling poverty, especially amongst children, is what brings many of into politics, but just so we are clear, there are five hundred or six hundred people in this room who are leaders of their communities. They can either go back to their communities and say “Labour increased poverty”, or you can tell the truth, which is that of the 24 most industrialised countries, 23 of them had a worse record in reducing poverty than we did during the past 13 years. Only Mexico reduced poverty faster than Britain in the last 13 years. Your Labour Government, because it shared your values and was determined to do the bidding, the work and the engagement that the people who sent us to Parliament wanted, actually tackled poverty as no government before. Can we do more? Should we do more? Of course, but I can’t allow five hundred people to go back to their communities and say, “We screwed it up”, because we did a lot that was good for this country.

In respect of the contracting out, we did not abolish contracting out – that’s true – but we were the people who said, “We are going to guarantee wages and conditions.” We were the people who intervened in the labour market.

When it comes to the Local Government Pension Scheme, there is a really big issue for us here, and we have got to treat each other as adults. The point is that the Local Government Pension Scheme does no one any favours if it is not properly funded. It is only on that basis that we can protect and defend the Local Government Pension Scheme that exists for the tens of thousands, if not millions, of people who today rely on it. We do have an unequal society but it is less unequal than it was. If there is one thing that we can go into the next election promising it is to make sure that that banner of equal opportunity that founded the Movement is actually advanced in that manifesto. That means wages, employment and education. But let’s not kid ourselves that this is a country that was immiserated by the Labour Government. It was 18 years of the Tories that actually left us with three million kids in poverty, not your Labour Government.

ANDY BURNHAM: The most valuable thing I ever did as a Minister was to take ten days out to shadow people at every level of the NHS, and then I wrote up my experiences in a report to the Prime Minister. What it brought home to me – this was in the middle part of the last decade – was that as a Government we had spent way too much time obsessing about structures, processes and all of the things that come with policy, and we have not spent enough time thinking about people and what it feels like to work in public services. I think, and this is why I developed the NHS Preferred Provider Policy, that we had not recognised and said to people that we understood it mattered to them that they worked for the NHS. I remember being in a hospital in Manchester where a porter was

telling me that he did all of the jobs that nobody wanted to do, he was on the minimum wage, working for a contracted-out company, but that he wanted to carry on because he wanted to be part of the NHS. We did not recognise that enough.

In truth I think we did do good things in health to attack the two-tier workforce. We kept the retention of employment model. I challenged hospitals in this region who were paying cleaning staff below Agenda For Change rates. I did that and I can give you the details of the ones where I challenged them. In truth, probably we did not do enough across the board, and particularly in local government, but we did act in health. David is right. Let's get things right. Where we did the right thing, let's celebrate the fact that we did the right thing. Did we do enough? I think we could always look back and say, "We probably could have done more".

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. It would be wrong if I sat here as chair and as chair of the Public Services if I did not say that we only want to hear one phrase by a Labour leader, and that is "Privatisation will end". (*Applause*) Then we would get quality. I am not saying on this platform what I have not said to Ministers' faces. Privatisation has killed off public services totally in quality and everything else. (*Applause*) Next question is from Scotland. Then I will be calling Southern.

SIS. L. MILLER (GMB Scotland): My question reflects the political situation in Scotland. Do you agree that the Scottish Parliament should have tax raising powers, and if they should what should these powers be?

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: In the end, I think it is for the people in Scotland to decide where they want to go. The whole point about the very important constitutional reforms that our Government made in the past 13 years was to give more autonomy to people in the nations and regions. I do not think it is for me to say whether the Scottish Parliament should have tax raising powers. I think the important step is to give people in the nations and regions their own voice on this and other issues.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: Diane is, obviously, right. It is for the Scottish people to decide. The Scottish TUC set up a particular commission to look at a range of powers. I think the general view was that yes, there should be greater devolution so that greater resourcing could take place, particularly with regard to public services. There are already revenue raising powers that are not being used. The most important thing is making sure that those powers are used effectively, and what the Scottish TUC and the unions in Scotland were trying to establish was that, actually, the revenue raising powers should be dedicated to the improvement of public services. So there was a discussion about whether or not, if there were greater powers, they should be hypothecated particularly, for example, to funding of the NHS and funding of local government and that there is a clear

view that the revenue that was raised was being ploughed back into the improvement of Scottish communities. I would support that.

At the end of the day, if we believe in devolution it should be for the Scottish people themselves to decide.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: Yes, they should have tax raising powers. That has been recommended. It is actually for the Westminster Parliament to pass a law to give that power to them, and we should certainly practice what we preach about devolution.

I want to say this, though. Scotland set an example of how you can be a strong Labour area and actually build your base rather than lose it in the course of a General Election campaign. Next May there is to be a massive text because the whole of Scotland is electing the new Scottish Parliament, and we have got a very important message to put out, because those Liberal votes are going to be very important. All across the United Kingdom those Liberals stood on platforms and sent out leaflets saying "Vote Liberal to keep the Tories out". Yet what did they do? At the first opportunity they put the Tories in. So in Scotland next May we should all be urging on the Scottish Labour Party to teach those Liberals a lesson, that if you want a progressive alternative you've got to vote Labour and if you don't you will end up with the SNP or even, God help them, the Tories. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Like others, this matter has to be debated in Parliament, in principle it should have those tax raising powers, and we should be very proud of devolution as a Labour Party and a Labour Movement that we brought devolution to Scotland. Personally, I am somebody who feels British first and English second. So I believe that always we should speak up and be proud of being British. I think that is a very important fact. So we recognise the need for more devolution but we are proud that we represent Britain.

Going forward, we must not as a movement become obsessed with debates about process and constitution. I am worried that at the moment we are getting too bogged down in questions about proportional representation and thinking that those were the main issues of the election. I don't believe they were. The issues of the election came through loud and clear to us about people's pay, people's job security, immigration, housing and other issues. We have got to focus on the issues that matter and in only that way will a Labour Government come back stronger. I think that that is a really important thing for us to focus on in this leadership debate.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: I think that the recommendations that were made by the Calman Commission, which was set up in Scotland for greater tax raising powers for Scotland, are right. I hope that the new Government will implement and we should push them to implement them.

Let me make one other point ahead of the Scottish elections that David mentioned. What the economic crisis proved is that the SNP vision, which is for separatism, is not just wrong in that it would split up the United Kingdom, but it would be economically disastrous for Scotland. The point is that when you think about the action we had to take on the Royal Bank of Scotland and the other banks that we saved, and look what is happening in Iceland, which the SNP used to admire, at the moment, we were able to take that action because we are a united kingdom. So let's at those Scottish elections argue for greater tax raising powers for the Scottish Parliament, as it is the right thing to do, but let's also argue against the separatism of the SNP, which would be disastrous economically, as well as for our country as well.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Southern Region.

BRO. D. CLEMENTS (CEC, Commercial Services): The UK has the most restrictive employment legislation in the western world. The majority of British workers live in constant economic fear. Which of the anti-trade union or, shall I say, anti-working people employment legislation will you repeal and with what priority, if and when in power.

THE PRESIDENT: This question wasn't planted. I promise. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: I would like to see the Trade Union Freedom Bill, which was supported by this Union, in fact developed by this Union, taken to the TUC General Council, unanimously adopted and then promoted in Parliament and enacted as one of the first pieces of legislation of a new Labour Government. That is what I would like to see. (*Applause*) To be honest with you, the Trade Union Freedom Bill was a very mild reformist legislation. In some ways I was a bit embarrassed being associated with it. It was a very mild mannered piece of legislation which said basic things like, for example, with ballots for industrial action, we should place a duty on the employer to co-operate. We should not allow employers to use the courts to intervene and prevent industrial action if there have been insignificant errors within that ballot which do not affect the result. I have got the BA cabin crew dispute at the moment at Heathrow, which is in my constituency. You have seen what has happened there where the union has been dragged to court time and time again for relatively minor administrative problems within the balloting procedures. The Freedom Bill also says that we want to restore the right – the right – to strike in this country with solidarity action in certain very limited cases. It is very straightforward stuff like that, because at the moment we are condemned by the ILO and various other international bodies because of our failure to provide trade union rights in this country.

It is all well and good for Nick Clegg to go around the country talking about civil liberties. I believe trade union rights are civil liberties and I believe we should restore them. We have less trade union rights now – look at John Hendy’s work and others – since the Taff Vale judgment in 1906. That is a scandal in the 21st Century. So that first simple piece of legislation would enable us to organise again, to take action where necessary but also to take action on a ballot that is unencumbered by the actions of the courts that employers are now using. It is as simple as that. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: The three pieces of legislation that surround the question here are the legislation on secondary picketing, the legislation on ballots before strikes and the requirement that general secretaries are elected in a secret ballot. I am not going to promise that I am going to lead the campaign to repeal those three pieces of legislation. It would be dishonest of me to pretend that I was going to. The reason is that we have an industrial relations system in this country now which does establish an important new balance between workers, employers and the trade unions. When John says that we have gone backwards from the Taff Vale judgment, I would remind him that Kier Hardy was launching a campaign for the minimum wage in 1906. There was no right to recognition in 1906. Actually, what the GMB has shown – it is tougher in the private sector but none the less in the private sector as well as in the public sector – is that if you get out and you get angry you can get organised. The GMB has got organised and put on more members using the legislation that we have provided. I think that is the only honest way of approach this, because if this Party goes back to being a Party that says in our manifesto secondary picketing is back and ballots are out, I can tell you you are kissing goodbye to a future Labour government.

JOHN McDONNELL: No one is saying that. That is a distortion.

THE PRESIDENT: No, John. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: We have got to be in favour of good industrial relations. I said at the beginning that we should not be in a position where we are not pro business, but that is what I think this Union has demonstrated. Lots of the members who you represent are from the private sector, and I think you have demonstrated that you can be pro business and pro union. Surely, that is the position which the Labour Party has got to be in always.

I have watched the BA situation with rising concerns, I will be honest. I think it is not just the legislation we have to watch in the coming period but I think it is the actions of the courts. I think that the danger might be that some people, who are emboldened and knowing that the Government is not going to step in and do anything, may take actions which are going to be difficult. I think this labour Movement is going to have to watch that in the coming period.

As to a single piece of legislation, I would put this to you. I accept what David is saying, and we must not show that it is all about saying everything in an internal Labour Party

selection, but why should somebody who crosses a legally constituted picket line face then the threat of disciplinary action at work? That, to me, does not feel right, and that is one change that I would make.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: My principle on this issue is that the unions should be able to do the most effective job they can possibly do on behalf of their members. I said at the outset that I thought the fact that we only have a 15% unionised workforce in the private sector is something we need to change. There are three things we need to do. There are issues that have been raised around the red tape involved in balloting; not the fact of having to ballot, because of course we are all in favour of that, but even a judge in a recent case raised the issue of what injunctions were being used for. That needs to be looked at.

Secondly, though, the right to strike is important but it is always the last resort and there are other things we can do. One of the campaigns the GMB has led is around access to workplaces where people are not organised into unions. I think we do need to do something about that because getting people into unions is something that can make their lives much, much better, and we need to be for that.

The other thing I will say is that Paul Kenny proposed, in the run-up to the last manifesto, and again I think this is something we should look at, the right of either side in a dispute to make a reference to ACAS. As Paul showed in the British Gas dispute, often these things can be resolved if people will get around the negotiating table, but sometimes people refuse to get around the negotiating table. Of course the right to strike matters but it is a last resort and, actually, we need to do other things to enable unions to organise and to enable disputes to be adequately settled.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: The issue that would have to be top of an agenda to look at is the issue of balloting before strikes. That is not to say that I or anyone on this platform would do away with balloting before a strike, but it has become a nonsense if employers can go to court, as in the British Airways' case, not once but twice and have lawfully constituted ballots thrown out on a technicality. That is wrong. That shows that something is wrong with the legislation and wrong with the attitude of the court. I also think, as other members on the platform have said, that both sides in a dispute ought to be able to refer to ACAS.

Let me say this. During the past 13 years and beyond there has sometimes been a sense, not from any of the people I am on the platform with today, that organised trade unionism is somehow an impediment to the free working of the market, that organised trade unionism is somehow not particularly modern and that organised trade unionism doesn't give you the labour market flexibility that you need. It is no coincidence that working people had the most equality and the highest relative income at the height of trade union organisation in this country in the 1970s. I repeat, it is no coincidence. Where you have

organised trade unionism you have protection for the lowest paid, you have a mechanism to drive through equality and you have the single most important way of driving down inequality in this society. We, as the Labour Party, need to move away, if we were ever very close to it, from the notion that organised trade union is an anachronism and move towards knowing that organised trade unionism is the last and best hope for the weakest and the lowest paid in our society. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. Yorkshire Region.

BRO. M. CRAMPTON (Yorkshire & North Derbyshire): The Leeds' bin strike last year had at its root the desire from the Lib-Dem Council to cut pay in order to privatise services. Will you give a commitment now to end the scourge of privatisation in public services? *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: I believe passionately in the power of public services to effect change in people's lives, and I am proud that we have got bigger public services, more people in public services as well as much, much better public services. However, if you take the example of MacMillan Nurses and how they complement the work of the National Health Service, I cannot sit here today and say to you that I am going to prevent or stop the working that the MacMillan Nurses do with NHS funding. The truth is that the vast bulk of our public services are, rightly, provided in the public sector, and there are specialist and niche providers who can give particular help.

In respect of local government, I think there are big issues in respect of the two-tier workforce, an issue which was raised. We need to make sure that public services are never fighting on an unfair playing field. Those were the changes that the Government brought in while Andy was Health Secretary and that were brought in when I was working in local government. Those are very, very important changes to make.

In answer to your straight question, am I going to ban the MacMillan Nurses for working with the Health Service or others of that kind, I am not.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: When we were building up the National Health Service in the last decade we, obviously, had to bring in extra support and we brought in support from the private sector. David is right in what he said, in that we used the voluntary sector and the same is true in other public service areas. However, I changed the policy because the NHS was entering a different period, and when you are not expanding the Service any more but asking existing staff to change what they do and to look at making savings, I felt it was right to have more security for NHS staff in that position. Now, not everyone agreed, but I introduced the NHS Preferred Provider Policy, and that policy said that it should not be the case that you go straight to market testing but you give the NHS the first chance to change or improve, if that is what is needed. Let's be clear. We shouldn't

tolerate services for people if they are failing the public. We have to be able to say, “You need to do better”. Let me say that I introduced that policy because I believed we had got it wrong. We had sent a message out sometimes saying “Private good/public bad”. I wanted to send a different message as Health Secretary. I believe in the NHS and I am passionate about the NHS. The NHS is this Party’s and this Movement’s finest creation. It matters to people that they work for the NHS. That is why I changed that policy.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: I agree with much of what Andy said. We must fight for the rights of public servants and, in particular, in the Health Service. I think it is very, very important that it is a service run in the public sector, and that is what people associate with the Health Service and that is what they value about the Health Service.

Let me make one other point, though. What is most important also is that we campaign across this country for better pay and conditions for people whether they are working in the public or private sector. I launched a campaign which is built on what the GMB did with TELCO (The East London Communities Organisation) in east London around the living wage. We should be campaigning as a Labour Party, as a political movement, on a living wage for people in every sector of our society. So, yes, let’s support our public servants in the public sector but let us also campaign for people across the economy to get better wages and conditions.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: I am opposed to privatisation in the public sector. Full stop! (*Applause*) I really am. There are areas where private sector involvement is wrong in principle. It is wrong that we should have privatised sections of the Prison Service. Only the state can have the right to take away somebody’s liberty or constrain their liberty, but it is also wrong in practice. One of the first industrial actions I ever took part in was when I stood on a picket line with nursing assistants – what they used to call ‘ward maids’ – at the old St. Mary’s Hospital, Paddington. It was the beginning of the wave of privatisation in the Health Service. Let me tell you that nobody will ever convince me that the declining standards we have seen in hygiene, hospital cleaning and the rise of MRSA had nothing to do with private cleaners. (*Cheers and applause*) It is all well and good for David to talk about MacMillan Nurses, but my mum was a nurse. If you talk to real nurses about what happened when the private sector took over cleaning on their wards. The cleaners, women, who frequently were paid very little, had no commitment to the hospital, had no history with the hospital and often changed from ward to ward and hospital to hospital. It is no wonder we had the problems with hygiene that we had a few years ago. Everyone talks about the efficiency of the private sector. The only way that privatisation saves money is bearing down on wages and conditions. That is the only way. (*Applause*)

Let me make one final point. If a service is important enough to be in the public sector, it is too important to be let out to private contractors. (*Cheers and Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: We were told initially that the policy would be “What works is what’s best”. But, to be frank with you, too often it has been private sector good/public sector bad, and that seems to be the principle that has worked consistently across Government departments. There is example after example. Diane has stated prisons. What about our campaign in Southern Cross where residential care has been privatised and some of our workers are on low pay in appalling conditions? Yes, in my area, the local authority had to stop sending people to Southern Cross homes because of the problems of lack of care and abuse. That is what happens.

What about London Underground? It has cost us £400 million alone on consultants, and maybe £2 billion at the end of it. Do you know what worries me? Some of the legislation that has been introduced under new Labour is now going to be used by the Tories: academy schools are to be expanded by the Tories, which is another form of privatisation.

I want to say very clearly what an incoming Labour Government should do. It should be no just that we end privatisation of our public services but we start bringing them back. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. I think we have time for two or three questions because the platform members have to get back to the House of Commons. South Western Region.

SIS. P. PHILLIPS (South Western): Should MPs be allowed to take and be paid for second jobs?

THE PRESIDENT: Andy?

ANDY BURNHAM: No, in a word. That’s their job, that is what people have elected them to do and they should focus on their job. I think it brings politics into disrepute when people can see people doing other things or having paid consultancies. If you are an MP for this Party, I think we are going to have to get tougher as a Party, personally, as a labour Movement. Let’s have some of these people more accountable for the image they give of the Labour Party when they are in Parliament and then when they are out. I have got sick and tired of people gobbing off at times and not making it easy for people on the door steps, who are out in the constituencies day-in-and-day-out, which brought the Labour Party into disrepute. I think it is time that we have got to give the Labour members some power to say, “Let’s have people who are your representatives, doing a job for you, focus on that job, upholding the good name of the Labour Party and the labour Movement.” By doing that, it will increase the likelihood of a Labour Government at the next election. I think we have been too lax on all of this. We have allowed things to happen which shouldn’t have happened. Going forward we have to set very clear markers. I say it is not Parliament doing it to itself or MPs doing it to

ourselves, but let's have the CLPs and the affiliates laying down some principles as to what they expect from every single Labour Member of Parliament. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Andy. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: I am not in favour of MPs doing second jobs. I make an exception for Diane and her appearances on *This Week (Groans from the delegates)*, unless she is elected as leader, each week. I think MPs' jobs should be to serve their constituents. I think that is the most important thing they should be doing. We had policies in the last manifesto to ban MPs from working for lobbying organisations and very strict rules on any second jobs that MPs could have. Basically, an MP's duty should be to their constituents and we should enforce that.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: As many people in Congress know I am on television every Thursday night talking about politics, but I would stress that the programme is live, it is at 11.30 at night, it is after I have done a full day's work for the people of Hackney, and it is a full day's work. I am amongst the top ten MPs writing letters to the Home Office. For those of you don't like to see me on television saying the things I say, actually, I would do it for nothing! That is bad news, I think, for some of you. I do understand why people object to MPs having second jobs. Certainly, if that was the policy of the Party I certainly wouldn't do any paid employment.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: I am of the Dennis Skinner school of politics (*Cheers, applause and whistling*) which is one person, one job. It is not just about MPs taking additional jobs or earning large amounts of money outside of Parliament. What I also resent is ex-Ministers lining themselves up directorships in companies to which they have given private contracts when they were in office. It is unacceptable. (*Cheers and applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: There is a contract, and anyone who brings the Labour Party into disrepute should not be a Labour Party member. But Diane's case – I am sorry to personalise it – does make the point, but Diane does not bring the Labour Party into disrepute by appearing on television at 11.30 on a Thursday night. Although she doesn't agree with the Government very often, she does make the case for progressive politics. For us to say that Diane should be banned from going on telly is not a sensible way of running things. What we should say is that every time she goes on telly, or every time anyone else has a job, it is registered, clear and transparent.

Let me say one other thing. The biggest problem we had in the last Parliament was actually the first jobs, not the second jobs. It was the first jobs that got people into trouble and it was the first jobs that brought politics into disrepute. Unless we clean up the first job and make sure that people are actually accountable for everything they do

with their MPs' money and the way that is run, we are not going to get into a better situation.

Finally, politics is actually a noble profession. It is not full of scoundrels. It is actually full of people – I say this about other Parties as well as our own – who want to make a difference in their communities. We cannot go along with this idea that the only people who make it into Parliament are people who criminalise their way to the top. Honestly, it is not true. We've got to stand up to say that there are some rotten apples, there was a rotten system and we have got to change the system, but let's not get into the position of believing that all of us on this platform, whatever our political views, are somehow in it for ourselves. We are not.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. This is, possibly, the last question and it is from the Northern Region.

BRO. P. KANE (CEC, Commercial Services): My question is this: What do you see as the way forward on nuclear energy and on Trident?

ED MILIBAND: Peter, I am in favour of keeping the independent deterrent and I am in favour of nuclear power, as you know, with the work I did as Energy Secretary. I think it is very important that we don't just hold this Government to account with their position on nuclear power but absolutely hold their feet to the fire on supporting nuclear power. The problem we have is that we have a Liberal in-charge of it, who is against nuclear power, and we have a Conservative-led Government that claims it will still nuclear. That is sending completely the wrong mixed signals to the nuclear industry. The truth is that I know many honourable people who are against nuclear power, but I say this to them. The challenge of climate change is so great that, actually, nuclear power is absolutely essential to meet that challenge. Not only that, the jobs which come from the nuclear industry and from new nuclear are essential for people right across this country. So we should absolutely support nuclear power and we should make sure that it is part of the energy mix going forward.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: As far as Trident is concerned, I have no problem whatsoever in saying we should scrap it. Even generals are saying that it is the wrong weapon for the wrong war. To go forward with Trident will cost billions of pounds of public money, which could be spent on the public sector going forward. To go forward with Trident merely to prove that we are not soft on defence would be a wilful waste of public money.

On the question of nuclear power more generally, there is a view, and I know it is Ed's view, that nuclear needs to be part of the mix if we are going to face the challenge of climate change. I am not persuaded of that but if we are going to go forward with nuclear power as part of our energy mix, we need to have the real figures of the cost of the clean-up and of the potential cost to the public purse. We really need to do our sums properly if we are going to see that it is a worthwhile part of our nuclear mix. On Trident, I have

no compunction in saying that we should scrap it. We should have scrapped it when we were in Government.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: This is where people have to be absolutely straight. I don't support nuclear power. I do not support the long-term future of it. Let me say this. I compliment Ed for the work that he has done in the development of the alternative power sources that we need. In phasing out nuclear power there have to be a number of guarantees as well. One is that everybody who is employed in the nuclear power industry at the moment are guaranteed jobs, full stop, both in de-commissioning but also in transferring to alternative energy sources so that there is not an impact upon those local communities and so that people are guaranteed employment.

Secondly, let me just come on to Trident itself. I cannot comprehend why we are spending £76 billion on a nuclear weapon that is unusable, and even the military itself consider it to be unusable. The threat to this country is not from a nuclear weapon being fired at us, but the threat is from individual terrorism. Actually, some of the individual terrorism has come from within our own communities itself. So, this, I think, is a waste of resources. At a time when there is a choice between public services and nuclear weapons, I know where my decision will lie. It will be on protecting public services. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, John. David.

DAVID MILIBAND: I am strongly in favour of nuclear power. I think it is absolutely essential to our energy security when we are going to become dependent on energy from countries around the world. It is also a massive skill base and it is an enormously important part of our economy, and it is part of the fight against climate change.

In respect of the Independent Nuclear Deterrent, I am a multi-lateral disarmament. I believe in disarmament, and I can say that because four weeks ago, for the first time in a decade, the gridlock in the international system over disarmament was broken, when the two countries which have more than 90% of the nuclear warheads between them – Russia and America – agreed a path breaking deal to reduce the number of nuclear warheads. We had this debate in the 1980s. We have responsibilities in this country to the world, and those responsibilities are to be passionate advocates of multilateral disarmament towards a world without nuclear weapons. The best way we can do that is by reducing our own warheads, which we have done, down to 167, but it is also right that we are part of an international consensus that drives every single country to reduce its nuclear arsenal.

Let me just say this. At a time when North Korea and Iran are trying to get nuclear weapons, it's a bit of an odd time for us to be giving them up on our own. Let's be part of an international consensus that is serious about multilateral disarmament and serious against nuclear proliferation.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: This is where I disagree with John. I am in favour of both. Ed Miliband did wonderful work in terms of the climate change agenda, and I certainly want to recognise that, but I am in favour of nuclear for a different reason. I am thinking about the security of this country and people on the streets feeling that we have got our future protected. I say that because I think of this world going forward. If we are not self-sufficient in energy in the rest of this century, I worry a lot about what kind of world we will be living in and how secure people in this country will feel. I think of my three kids and what kind of world will they be living in 40 or 50 years time if we were not self-sufficient in energy. I see what Russia does to Ukraine and it sends a shiver down my spine. I am in favour of both, for reasons of security and particularly on nuclear weapons, as David said. I am in favour, particularly, though, of nuclear power because I think we need energy self-sufficiency going into the future, recognising that renewables, as Ed said when he was Climate Secretary, could never do it on their own. That is the main. But I am also in favour of nuclear because there are tens of thousands of people in this region who work and depend upon the nuclear power industry, and that is a very persuasive argument.

THE PRESIDENT: Colleagues, we have come to the end of the question and answer session. I am now going to give the candidates time to give their closing speeches, and then I will thank them all. This time we start with you, David.

DAVID MILIBAND: Thanks a lot, Mary, and thank you, delegates. I think it has been a brilliant discussion. My starting point is that we have a massive task in front of us. We have lost 180 seats since the 1997 General Election and we have lost 4.5 million votes. We need to get those people back.

First, we need a leader who ‘gets it’ about modern Britain, who gets it about the insecurity of modern Britain, which is why we have to catch up on issues like housing and anti-social behaviour. We need a leader who gets it about inequality, which is why we need to make up for lost time on issues like education and welfare, and we need a leader who can forge an agenda for the future, which is why I am passionate about issues to do with jobs and living standards. We do not just need that. We need something authentic about our politics and I want to tell what is authentic about me.

I am passionate about equal opportunity. That is why I invented the *Building Schools for the Future Programme* that is transforming secondary schools around this country. I am serious about devolving power. That is what I did when I was Local Government Minister. I believe that the climate change issue is transformative for our generation. It is not just an environmental issue. It is a jobs issue, it’s an energy issue and it’s a foreign policy issue. That is why I created the Climate Change Bill when I was the Environment Secretary to make sure that every successive government between now and 2050 is forced to reduce its emissions.

I also believe that this country is proud of being British but it is also an internationalist country. Diane talked about this in respect of immigration. I talk about it also in respect of our responsibilities around the world. I was proud to be the person who authored the Gaza Peace Resolution at the United Nations in January 2009, and it is a living tragedy that there is not yet peace and decency in Gaza today.

Let me finish by saying that we also need a leader who recognises that we need a different kind of politics, a politics which is not about command a control, but a politics which is actually about engagement with real people in real lives. That is why it is important that we have hustings like *this*. It is important that we learn from the *GMB@Work* campaign, and it is important that we build that living, breathing labour Movement that I talked about. Yes, let's debate our dreams, but let's be passionate about actually getting those dreams turned into reality. That is why I am standing for the leadership of our Party and that is why I am asking for your support. Thank you very much, indeed. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, David. John.

JOHN McDONNELL: This has been a great debate. I hope it goes on and I get on the ballot paper to enable it to go on. I am not standing as old Labour, new Labour or next Labour. I am standing as Labour. That is what I am standing for. The whole tenor of the debate today is how do we present a real alternative to Cameron and Clegg? The key issue is this. It is the economic crisis that we face. Our statement has to be very, very clear. This economic crisis was not caused by us, but it was caused by greedy bankers and the finance system. We should also say that this crisis was not caused by us and we are not paying for it. It is as simple as that. (*Applause*) We need to explain to people out *there* that we can tackle the deficit by a fair tax system. We must tackle the £90 billion a year which is avoided in taxation through tax evasion and tax avoidance by the corporate sector. We can introduce what we have been arguing as a Union, the Robin Hood tax on speculators within the City itself. Yes, we need to regulate the banks but we need to think more about the long-term public ownership of the finance sector to control our economy.

On public services we need to send a message out very clearly. They, the Tories and the Liberals, will be in favour of privatisation, but we will end privatisation, end the PFIs, end the PPPs, end the contracting out and all the other forms of privatisation. Actually, yes, we will restore public services that have been privatised to the public sector. (*Applause*) These are not unpopular policies. Go out *there* and ask people, "Would you want rail returned to public ownership?", and overwhelmingly they would say "Yes".

On civil liberties, I voted against ID cards as I think they are a waste of money. But I also want basic trade union rights restored, the right to strike and unencumbered ballots, but I want social rights. I want the right to a decent home, so we start building council houses again; the right to education, free education, and that means scrapping tuition fees and restoring grants; and, yes, the right to live free from poverty. That means restoring the link between pensions and earnings, a decent pension and, yes, Child Benefit to the

level that really covers the cost of bringing up a child. (*Applause*) Yes, I want the right to equality and pay audits within companies. This is a women's issue because it is women who are exploited more within the private and public sectors. (*Applause*)

I also want the right to live in peace with no more Iraqs. We must withdraw from Afghanistan and scrap Trident. That is the alternative that I believe we should be putting. It is not just popular in meetings like this but it is popular in communities throughout our country.

In the short term we recognise that the Tories and the Liberals are going to come for us. They are going to come for our services, our jobs, our wages, our conditions, our welfare benefits and our pensions. So what do we do? We do what we always do? We don't mourn after the loss of an election. We organise, and that is what we are going to do as a Union, back into our communities. We are going to organise the resistance.

THE PRESIDENT: John.

JOHN McDONNELL: Let me finish on this. We need to build the widest coalition in opposition to this Government and get back a Labour Government. Let me give you this commitment, whether I'm on this ballot paper or not, whether in Parliament or on the picket line, I'll be with you in solidarity. (*A standing ovation*)

THE PRESIDENT: Diane.

DIANE ABBOTT: This is the first of the hustings in this leadership election. I think it will be the first of the debates which will carry on all summer. This is a turn-the-page leadership election for the Labour Party. One of the reasons why I stood was that I thought it was important that in that debate going forward the range of opinion in the Party should be represented and diversity in the Party should be represented. (*Applause*) Some people, my friends and some journalists, said to me, "But, Diane, what made you put yourself forward?" Do you know something. All my life I have done things that people told me I couldn't and I shouldn't do. It's, kind of, in my DNA. I remember trying to join my local Labour Party, and they heard that there was this dangerous black woman who wanted to join the Labour Party and somebody physically came to bar the door. I remember talking about becoming an MP and people said to me, "Diane, are you sure, is this right?" But my thing has always been, "Go for it". Even if you don't get there, even if you don't get your hands around the prize, you will have made it easier for other people like you to come after you. (*Cheers, table thumping and applause*)

I have made a practice all my life of doing what black women, whose parents left school at 14, are not supposed to do, and this is just the last in the line. We are facing an emboldened and a very serious opponent in this new Tory-LibDem Government. They are not just talking about cuts, but they are talking about reconstructing out of existence parts of the public sector that we have all come to depend on. This is not about saving money. This is about attacking the public sector with very conclusive results. We need to fight them and engage the entire Movement, not just the people who come to conferences

like this, but your members, people in your communities, men, women, whatever their ethnicity. We need to have the widest possible debate and then we need to engage across the widest possible spectrum to fight this Government because the lives of our children and the future of our communities depends on it. (*Applause*)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Diane. Ed.

ED MILIBAND: Colleagues, I want to thank you for the question and discussion. I think it is very important for our Party and our Movement that over the coming months this discussion and debate continues.

As leader I would want to do four things with the trade union Movement. First, we must oppose the indiscriminate cuts that this Government wants to bring about, and we have to oppose it not just on the basis of a few billion here or there, but on the basis of a different philosophy about our society, because the truth is that we have to ask the question: yes, tackling the deficit is important but what kind of economy and what kind of society do you end up with at the end of it? That is the fight that we need to take to the Tories and the Liberals.

The second thing that I want to do with you is to show that in Opposition we can make a difference. Those people who say that it is only when in power that you can make a difference are wrong. Of course we need to be back in power as soon as possible, but we need to be, as a labour Movement, a campaigning organisation, as you are and as the Labour Party needs to become. We need to be campaigning on the living wage around this country, working with local authorities to ensure that people are paid the living wage, working with and arguing with businesses to make sure that people are paid the living wage, and we need to help ensure that more people become members of trade unions because that will protect them at the workplace. I pledge to you that, as Labour leader, I would work with you to do that.

The third thing that we need to do is to work together on the policy agenda which will get us back into power. Our Party does need to change, the culture of our Party needs to change and the new Labour needs to change. We need to listen more to the trade union Movement and we need more democracy in our Party as well to get the right policies that are in touch with people.

The fourth thing that we need to do is we need to win the election, and whoever is the leader, if it were me, I would give you this promise. We need to make sure that we don't forget the people who put us into power. The truth is that whoever is the next Labour Prime Minister, that person cannot just be the Prime Minister of a Parliament Labour Party. That person has to be the Prime Minister of a wider movement. That does not just keep you honest but it makes you a more successful government and it is more likely to sustain you in power. That is what I would do as Labour leader and that is why I am asking for your support.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ed. Andy.

ANDY BURNHAM: Mary, thank you for chairing our proceedings so well today and thanks to all my fellow candidates. I think we have kicked the hustings off in good style today and thanks must go to the GMB for getting us underway in this leadership campaign.

My first thought when I woke up this morning was, “God, this is the first of 50 we are going to have to do.” I did honestly think, “Gordon, I wish you had waited until the World Cup was over.” (*Laughter*) That’s just me, I think.

Since I have been sitting on the platform today, I think we are already sending out a message to the Tories, and they should take note of this. This Labour Party is in good heart after an election defeat. There has been no recrimination or introspection. I think we are ready for them. We are debating and we are going to come back strong, and we are going to come back strong quite soon. I think they will have seen that and taken note of that.

For me, reconnecting Labour means getting the relationship right with you. I think we have got to acknowledge, as Labour politicians, that there probably wouldn’t be a Labour Party without the efforts of the trade union brothers and sisters in recent times in giving us the money we need to carry on. I think we have to recognise that. I also think we have to recognise that Labour is nothing if it is not about breaking down elites, and the way we have run our Party for too long has been elitist. It has been in a top down way. We have got to change that. We’ve got to ensure that people at every level of the Party feel an involvement and a part of what we are trying to build.

I would put it to you that I am the person to do that. I can bring Labour back together. But more than that, I can reach the voters that we have lost. I can provide a real contrast to those Tories in the House of Commons. I can do that because I understand that many people still feel trapped by their circumstances, that it costs them £5 more a week for electricity if they have a pre-paid meter. I understand that people feel they are battling against the odds every day because of their uncertainty at home or their jobs. I understand that older people live in fear of old age because of the care costs, and I understand that young people just feel they cannot get on because they don’t have the connections to break into the elite which still runs this country. The reason why I feel that is because all of my life I have feared the tap on the shoulder to say, “You can’t go any higher because this isn’t for the likes of you”. But the reason why I carry on going in politics is because I want to open doors for others who still feel that their low expectations holds them back in life. So that is why I am standing before you wanting to be your leader.

I would build the Labour Party based on the good working class principle that everyone does their bit but everybody helps each other out. That is the Labour Party I would lead. If you want a Labour Party that has people back at its heart, then join my campaign. If you want a Party that carries on building a country with a fairer spread of health, wealth and life chances, then you should join my campaign.

Lastly, if you don't believe in new Labour or next Labour but you believe in 'our Labour', then I ask you to join my campaign. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Andy. I thank the Congress and the delegates for showing the respect and restraint that you have during this hustling. Sometimes they can get very heated, but I think you will all agree that we showed everybody the respect they deserve.

I would not the candidates to go away – everybody – to think that this Union is not supporting the MacMillan Nurses. The privatisation programme that we are talking about is when the international companies come here and make profits out of our public services. They are the people who we are talking about. *(Applause)*

Let me say that I and this Union are Labour Party through and through. We are not fair weather friends. We have always been there in the good days and the bad days. Those bad days look like they are coming back but we are in better heart now than we were in 1979 because the Tories didn't win the election, neither did the Liberals, but neither did we but we were not knocked back as we could have been. We will support the MPs and the leader of the party who support GMB values 200 per cent. *(Applause)*
(The leadership candidates left the hall)

THE PRESIDENT: Congress, I think you deserve a break. Congress will convene in at 9.30 on Wednesday. The section conferences begin later today and go on tomorrow. The Public Services Conference will be held in this hall at 4 o'clock.

Congress adjourned till Wednesday morning at 9.30.