

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. LANKESTER ✓

T.

c.c. Mr. Walters
Mr. Ingham
Mr. Hoskyns O.R.
Mr. Duguid

THE TUC AND PAY

You asked me this morning for some impressions of the TUC, which as you know I attended for only a couple of days, chiefly to see what happened on pay.

The "debate" on pay was fairly reported in the newspapers. Congress, fully aware of what it was doing, simultaneously approved Composite Motion 13 (copy attached) which states that "Congress is opposed to any pay restraint policy to this end, Congress does not agree to any discussions on pay restraint", and the TUC Labour Party Liaison Committee Report which proposes "a national economic assessment, including analysis of the movement of pay and its impact on prices". Despite objections from Bill Sirs, Tom Jackson and Roy Grantham, Len Murray managed to square this circle by saying that analysing the movement of pay did not imply pay restraint. Composite Motion 25 (also attached) was, thanks to appalling mismanagement of business by Alan Fisher, lost from Wednesday's debate - this is the resolution which asks the General Council to organise "a common strategy to resist the Government's intentions" on cash limits.

V The rhetoric of the occasion was even more depressing than last year, chiefly because of the complete absence of any recognition by speakers of the responsibility of those in work towards those out of work. Speaker after speaker openly avowed the doctrine of single-minded pursuit of self-interest. If economic realities have permeated down to trade union members during the last year, that is not yet reflected in the trade union leadership. There was economic illiteracy of a high order - Ken Gill: "unemployment results from lack of orders not from high wages" - as well

/ as some

CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

as some startling honesty - Ken Gill again: "the trade unions exist to increase the standard of living of their members, and no-one joins them in order to lower his standard of living now for some future pie in the sky". David Basnett produced some astonishing rubbish in moving a motion (which was carried) for a statutory maximum 35-hour week - "overtime is stolen time: impoverishing workers and enabling employers not to take more people on".

And there was no shortage of hypocrisy in the shape of criticism of public expenditure cuts from unions from industries whose losses put those cuts into the shade. Emlyn Williams of the NUM, seconding a motion condemning education cuts, promised "whatever initiative Congress takes, they will get the whole-hearted and unstinting support of my union": and Charlie Turner of the NUR, on the Brandt Report, asserted that "we have an overwhelming obligation to assist in the abolition of poverty in the Third World". I would dearly like to use these quotes back at the unions in the context of their next pay claims, but I have no doubt that the sponsor departments would accuse us of being provocative.

The energy debate, not well reported in the media, was better than most. Frank Chapple made an impassioned speech supporting all forms of energy investment, and specifically the gas gathering pipeline ("flaring is a criminal waste of national assets for which theologians in the Treasury are responsible"), gas showrooms, the Vale of Belvoir, and the PWR; but the anti-nuclear lobby was allowed a fair say, and the demand forecasts in the TUC's Review of Energy Policy were described as fraudulent, and Ray Chadburn from the NUM made an aggressive speech against the use of nuclear power for electricity generation.

Finally, it is worth recording that Les Moody from the Civil Service Union, a menacing little figure wearing dark glasses

/even in

CONFIDENTIAL

-3-

even in the gloom of the Blackpool Opera House, whose entry in Who's Who lists "educating management" among his recreations, devoted a large part of his speech on public expenditure to a description of the Prime Minister as "a spiteful, vindictive woman, appealing to extremists with a morbid interest in suffering due to sexual deprivation in youth". The outlook for the next round of negotiations on Civil Service pay is clearly not too good.



11 September 1981

FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Motions 77, 78 and 79)

Congress congratulates the General Council on the development of the Campaign for Economic and Social Advance.

Congress reaffirms that increased purchasing power is central to the success of the Campaign.

Congress emphatically rejects the view that wage increases are the primary cause of inflation and unemployment.

Congress reaffirms its support for free collective bargaining and is opposed to any pay restraint policies, pay norms or statutory restraints which would interfere with the rights of unions to determine their own policies and resolve their own negotiating procedures and settlements. To this end, Congress does not agree to any discussions on pay restraint.

Moved by

Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers
(Technical, Administrative & Supervisory Section)

Seconded by

Association of Scientific, Technical & Managerial Staffs

Supported by

Furniture, Timber & Allied Trades Union

TRADES UNION CONGRESS BLACKPOOL 1981

Composite Motion

25

PUBLIC SERVICE PAY

(Motions 98, 100 and 101)

Congress condemns the Government's attempts to impose a discriminatory incomes policy upon the public services through the application of arbitrary cash limits, the determination of the Government to destroy established bargaining machinery, and the failure of successive governments to uphold the relative levels of pay established by independent committees of inquiry.

Congress declares its willingness to work for improved industrial relations and bargaining procedures in the public sector.

Congress agrees that every effort should be made to organise coordinated action by public service unions during the next pay round if the Government continues with its present policies. Congress therefore calls upon the General Council urgently to create the framework within which the whole of the public service trade union Movement can unite with a common strategy to resist the Government's intentions and, given the necessary support, the General Council should be ready to bring into effect the organisation and resources needed to conduct such a campaign. The General Council, therefore, are urged to make the necessary organisational arrangements so that collective action can be mounted in a more effective manner than proved possible during the 1980-81 pay round.

Moved by

The Civil & Public Services Association

Seconded by

Society of Civil & Public Servants

Supported by

The Educational Institute of Scotland