

New Laws Will Allow Unions To Expel On Political Grounds

Unions will be given the right to expel members for belonging to a political party under proposed new laws. It comes after train drivers union Aslef defeated the UK government in the European Court of Human Rights over the expulsion of a member of the BNP.

The UK government argued the union could not exclude someone for belonging to a legitimate political organisation. But the European court said Aslef had the right to expel members whose views were incompatible with its stated aims.

The case centred around Virgin train driver Jay Lee, who was expelled by Aslef after standing as a BNP candidate in 2002. Mr Lee won the right to remain a member of Aslef at two employment tribunals,

which both said that a union could expel someone because of their conduct, but not because they were a member of a particular political party. But the European Court over-ruled the tribunals, saying Mr Lee would not suffer financially as a result of being expelled, as Aslef did not operate a closed shop and he was free to join another union.

In background documents issued with the Queen's Speech, the government said its new Employment Bill would amend trade union membership laws "in the light of the European court judgement in Aslef v UK".

Under proposed new legislation, unions will be able to "expel members on the basis of their membership of a political party," it added.

Adam Walker, the President of the Independent Union Solidarity commented:-

"This is part of the new McCarthyism sweeping our country. It shows why we need a strong Union like Solidarity which does not discriminate on political grounds. There is no point in joining an establishment Union if you support a controversial or

non-establishment Party. They will simply use this legislation to kick you out. They will not be there when you need them. Today it is the BNP being witch-hunted but it could be anyone. If you are a member of an establishment Union you are giving money to corrupt bullies. You should leave and help build the independent alternative - Solidarity."



BROWN: INTRODUCING NEW MCCARTHYITE LAWS

A message from our GS

Solidarity has been in the headlines as a result of fighting cases where individuals have been victimised and discriminated against on the grounds of their political beliefs. We have used all means at our disposal to campaign against this. Some of our techniques are borrowed from the political sphere and not often used by Unions. We supported the picket called by Civil Liberty (a group with which we are and will continue to work closely with) outside Sunnydale Community College. In the run-up to the picket our activists manned stalls in the local High Street and I and others toured the area in speaker-cars calling for support. One of our Executive has also established an online petition calling for the reinstatement of Mark Walker at Sunnydale which has over two thousand signatories at the time of writing. I have attended several meetings at the School and County to support and assist Mark in my role as his Union representative. Now we are supporting a legal fund so that lawyers can be paid to act on behalf of Mark. The message is simple we can't guarantee victory but we can guarantee that if you mess with our members **you will have a fight on your hands.**

Most of my work, however, is far less newsworthy but equally important to those concerned. It is bread and

butter Union work. I've been busy representing people at investigatory meetings, grievance hearings and disciplinaries. I've also been helping to put people in touch with lawyers who can progress accident at work claims as well as chasing SSP and benefits for them. I expect that it is this kind of work which will form the bulk of what we do as a Union over the coming years.

Over the next year I see our Union entrenching: training new reps; establishing a regional infrastructure; establishing a political fund; cultivating links with accountants, auditors and lawyers; and most importantly recruiting new members.

Can we compete with the big, establishment Unions? Well, we can't currently offer all the services they do. We are simply not large enough. As we recruit each new member our finances improve and what we can offer extends. We already offer a basic service (and what we lack in resources we make up in enthusiasm and commitment!) but we want to do so much more! Consider joining us. **Together we are strong.**

Patrick Harrington

Solidarity Elections

Solidarity is holding internal elections at present. Nominations for the office of President and General Secretary have been received from only two candidates. Accordingly, Adam Walker and Patrick Harrington have been elected unopposed as President and General Secretary respectively. All members of Solidarity were given the opportunity to stand.

There are six candidates for the remaining five Executive positions. These are Garry Aronsson, Simone Clarke, David Durant, David



ADAM WALKER

Kerr, Lindsey Nieuwhoff and Mark Walker. Details of how to stand were sent by bulletin to all members who have a postal address registered with us and a prominent notice was placed on our website. In order to stand a member had only to find a proposer and seconder.

The election is being administered by an Independent Scrutineer who is responsible for posting out the ballot

papers and election addresses (each candidate was given 150 words to make their pitch), counting the votes and declaring the result. The Independent Scrutineer is Frank Hogarth (FCA BA) of Silver and Co.

General Secretary, Pat Harrington, commented:-

"This election gave anyone who wanted to stand a chance to put their case direct to our members in an independently administered election. It shows that our Union is democratic and that it is our members who decide who will lead them forward. All of those standing are fine, strong, independently minded folk and I look forward to working with whoever the members choose."

The Election Result will be declared on November 20th.



DAVID KERR



GARRY ARONSSON



DAVID DURANT



MARK WALKER



LINDSEY NIEUWHOFF



SIMONE CLARKE

Solidarity urges Posties to vote "No"

Solidarity has some that hold dual membership with the CWU. We have also been contacted by some posties who are not yet members of ours asking our opinion of the deal and advice on which way to vote. Here it is - **the deal between the CWU union and Royal Mail to end the dispute over pay, pensions and conditions is a sell-out. It is surrender, a capitulation to a management agenda. It is a betrayal.**

130,000 workers took eight days of official strike action but the union's executive voted to accept the offer and recommend it to the membership. Only five out of 14 executive members voted to reject it.

The deal does not meet the demand for decent pay and pensions. Nor does it remove the threat implied by Royal Mail's demand for 'total flexibility'.

This is what the deal means:- **On pay**, the deal will mean a below-inflation settlement. The establishment media promoted figure of 6.9 percent over 18 months is false. The real figure is 5.4 percent over two years. That is just 2.66 percent a year – well below inflation. The 6.9 percent figure has been reached by adding a 1.5 percent extra payment. But this is conditional on the implementation of the entire flexibility package, and many offices won't get it! On top of that posties have lost the ESOS bonus scheme and many opportunities to earn overtime.

On pensions, on 1 April 2010 pension age will be raised from 60 to 65, unless you want to accept a loss of benefits. Changing the pension scheme from one that is based on your final average salary to one that is based on career average earnings will almost certainly have the effect of reducing benefits for many. The closure

of the existing scheme to new entrants, leading to a two-tier workforce.

The union has accepted that the current deficit in the pension scheme is "unsustainable" and that it "leads inevitably to the conclusion that either employee contributions must rise or benefits reduce or both".

Yet the crisis in Royal Mail's pension scheme arises partly out of the company's 17-year pensions holiday (the period in which Royal Mail didn't pay into the fund).

On 'flexibility' the union has conceded the employers' position almost completely. Local reps are going to be forced into agreeing "efficiency deals" with managers – that will mean the same amount of work being done in fewer hours.

In addition there could be long and short days, with workers

having to work shorter hours on days when it suits the company, and longer hours when mail volumes are greater – something that the union has previously opposed.

There will also be 30 minutes of flexible extra work. Managers will be able to extend workers' shifts when it suits them, and give the time back at an unspecified later date.

The aim of these changes is to get everyone to work harder, and to cut overtime payments.

This deal falls far short of the demands that motivated thousands of CWU members to take strike action. Activists must urgently build opposition to this deal. If the deal is pushed through CWU members should seriously consider whether they want to remain with a Union that has betrayed their sacrifice and effort. **They are Lions led by Donkeys.**

Anger at CWU finance for NuLab

According to the Electoral Commission, between February and June this year the postal workers' Union (CWU) donated £277,627 to the Labour Party. In the week of the first postal strike in June, the Labour Party accepted £3,500 from the CWU to help pay for its leadership contest. Within days Brown was condemning the postal workers and telling parliament that their union must show restraint. NuLab has wholeheartedly embraced privatisation.

No wonder that CWU members are opting out of the Union political fund. At a mass meeting during an unofficial postal strike in East London, the greatest cheer went to the rep who said she would take forms to leave the political fund

around all her workmates at the end of the dispute. "There must be no more money for Gordon Brown" she declared. Anger against Labour is rising. The CWU leadership is unlikely to revise the way its political fund is used. The deep crisis in the CWU union is focused on its political fund but indicates much wider troubles in the relationship between the unions and the Labour Party.

Solidarity General Secretary, Pat Harrington, commented:- "Posties contributing to the political fund of the CWU are effectively bankrolling their enemies. Brown and NuLab have made it quite clear whose side they are on. Don't give them another penny - opt out now. Think about why your Union leadership is signing these cheques and whether they really have your interests at heart."

Fed-up with contributing to the Labour Party or extremist groups favoured by Trade Union bureaucrats? If you send the notice below to your Branch Secretary (by Recorded Delivery!) you can exempt yourself. It's a very good time of year to do this as it should take effect in January 2008 if you do it now. If you get any problems let us know and we will help you take further action.

Name of Trade Union

Political Fund Exemption Notice

I hereby give notice that I object to contributing to the political fund of the union and am in consequence exempt, in the manner provided by Chapter VI of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, from contributing to that fund.

Signature

Address

Date

Solidarity Training Focus: *Discrimination on grounds of Belief*

Discrimination on grounds of religion and belief is wrong. Yet till 2nd December 2003, there was no specific legislation in the UK (with the exception of fair employment legislation in Northern Ireland) that outlawed it.

The Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003 changed that. Workers in Great Britain can now challenge discrimination in this area.

What protection does the legislation give me?

The new regulations outlaw:

- **Direct discrimination** - treating people worse than others on the basis of religion or belief (or instructing someone else to behave in this way). There is no defence available to an employer to a claim of direct discrimination. There are however exemptions in relation to genuine occupational requirements (see later).
- **Indirect discrimination** - applying a provision, criterion or practice (whether intentionally or not) which disadvantages people of a particular religion or belief, unless it can be justified. To be able to justify it, employers have to show there is a real business need for the practice.
- **Harassment** on the grounds of religion or belief. Harassment is defined as subjecting someone to unwanted conduct that violates their dignity or creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment. The harassment does not have to be intentional to be caught by the regulations - for instance it can be jokes or banter that someone finds offensive.
- **Victimisation** - treating people worse because they made or intend to make an allegation about discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, or because they have given or intend to give evidence under the regulations. It does not matter if the allegations turn out not to be true, providing they were made in good faith.

Who does the law protect?

The legislation applies to all workers, including contract and agency workers, office holders, the police, barristers and members of the armed forces. It extends to partnerships, trade organisations (including trade unions), qualifications bodies, providers of vocational training, employment agencies and institutes of further and higher education.

The regulations extend to people who are discriminated against because someone thinks they practice a certain religion or have a certain belief, even if they do not. They also protect people who have friends or family who practice a certain religion or hold a certain belief.

Where do the regulations apply?

They apply to those working wholly or partly in Great Britain, as well as those who work outside it as long as the employer's place of business is in Britain and the work is for the purpose of that business. The worker must ordinarily be resident in Britain when he or she applies for the job or at any time during their employment.

The new regulations apply in England, Scotland and Wales. Northern Ireland already has fair employment legislation that covers these grounds.

What do they cover?

The 2003 Regulations defined religion or belief as "*any religion, religious belief or similar philosophical belief*". However legislative changes has changed the definition to by removing the word "*similar*" (section 77 Equality Act 2006). The change took place on the 30 April 2007. This change makes it clearer that being of no religion or belief is covered. The change also widens the scope of philosophical belief, making it possible that employees who adhere to a shared philosophical belief system, such as animal rights activism or a political ideology may also be protected from workplace discrimination.

Would the legislation protect someone who is a member or supporter of a political Party?

The short answer is that no one is sure. Political activists – including members of the British Nationalist Party (BNP) - could bring religious discrimination claims in the workplace.

Previously this was not the case. Mr Baggs brought a religious discrimination claim against a medical practice that refused to interview him on grounds of BNP membership. His lawyers claimed that he was entitled to protection under religious discrimination laws because his membership of the BNP amounted to a "*similar philosophical belief*" to a religion or other religious belief.

However, the claim was dismissed after the employment tribunal ruled that the word "*similar*" meant that the philosophical belief in question must be similar in nature to a religious belief and that membership of the BNP did not meet this test.

But according to Cath Thorpe, an employment partner at Reynolds Porter Chamberlain: "*Under the amended regulations, the Baggs case may well have been decided differently.*"

Other lawyers also say that the amendment could extend to cover those with other beliefs.

Audrey Williams, an employment expert at Eversheds, said: "*it is possible that due to the changes, people who adhere to any shared, philosophical belief system such as animal rights activism or Marxism could also be protected from workplace discrimination.*"

In discussing this amendment in the House of Lords, baroness Turner of Camden, suggested that 'philosophical belief' should be interpreted in line with case law at the ECHR and that the beliefs intended to be protected are those that amount to "*a world view or life stance*".

What does the law apply to?

The regulations provide protection throughout the employment relationship, and apply to both prospective and

existing workers. They also apply after the employment relationship has ended if the discrimination arises out of and is closely connected with the employment relationship. They take effect at the recruitment stage and apply to terms and conditions of employment (including benefits such as pensions), pay, promotions, transfers, opportunities for training and dismissal and post-termination discrimination such as the conduct of appeals or letters of reference.

What do the regulations exclude?

The regulations allow for a number of exceptions to the principle that people should not be discriminated against because of their religion or belief:

- Genuine occupational requirement (GOR)
- The religious organisations' genuine occupational requirement
- Positive action
- Protection of Sikhs on construction sites
- National security

What is a genuine occupational requirement (GOR)?

Employers can rely on the general GOR as a defence to claims of direct and indirect discrimination, as long as they satisfy the following test:

- That subscribing to a particular religion or belief is a genuine and decisive requirement for the job.
- That it is proportionate to apply that requirement in this particular case.
- That the person either does not meet the requirement to be of a particular religion or belief, or the employer is not satisfied that they do and it is reasonable in all the circumstances for them to reach that conclusion. This exception does not require employers to show that their business is based on a particular religion or belief. They just have to show that being of a particular religion or belief is a genuine requirement for the job - for instance a hospital wishing to recruit a chaplain to minister to patients of a particular faith. The GOR exemption is only

likely to apply to a very few jobs and the courts and tribunals will narrowly construe it.

How is the GOR exception applied to religious organisations?

Some organisations - like faith schools - are founded on an ethos based on a religion or belief. Where employers can show that is the case, the test is very similar to the general GOR, but slightly wider in that subscribing to the religion need not be a decisive requirement for the job. So it might, for example, allow faith-based organisations to insist that the workers who actually carry out the roles of caring for people's spiritual needs (or whatever the work of the organisation involves) have that religion or belief.

What positive action can employers take?

Employers are allowed to take positive action in favour of members of a particular religion or belief, where it seems a reasonable thing to do to compensate for past disadvantages that they may have faced.

They can provide training that would fit them for particular work, or encourage them to take advantage of opportunities for doing particular work.

What protection do Sikhs have?

The legislation states that if an employer requires a Sikh to wear a safety helmet while on a construction site that would amount to indirect discrimination that can never be justified. But the clause only applies to construction sites - if a turbaned Sikh were to try to enforce this provision in other circumstances, he would be unlikely to succeed. Under the new regulations, it may also be indirectly discriminatory to impose, say, a safety helmet requirement on people who practise other religions which required special head wear. However, employers might well be able to justify it on health and safety grounds.

What is the national security exception?

Basically, no act is unlawful if it is done to safeguard national security.

Who is liable under the regulations?

Employers are liable for the acts of their employees, whether or not they knew or approved of them.

They are also liable for acts done by anyone else acting on their behalf or with their authority.

They are not likely to be liable, however, for acts by third parties, such as pupils in school who are harassing a teacher.

Employers have a defence to a claim to anything done by an employee if they can show that they took all 'reasonable steps' to prevent the behaviour from happening.

For instance, the employer may be able to show that he or she has a policy that deals with discrimination on the ground of religion or belief, that the policy is actively implemented, that staff receive regular training and possibly even that workers have been disciplined in the past for unacceptable behaviour.

Can employers impose a dress code?

Dress codes at work may give rise to claims of unlawful indirect discrimination.

Employers cannot, however, impose a code if it seems to discriminate against someone on the grounds of their religion or belief, unless they can justify the requirement.

If the employer can show that the refusal is reasonably necessary for the business on health and safety grounds, then the refusal will be justifiable. But note the exception about Sikhs on construction sites.

In general, it is good practice for employers to allow staff to wear clothing that reflects their religious convictions.

Do employers have to allow observance of religious holidays?

If a worker wants to take a day off in observance of a religious

holiday or festival, employers should try to accommodate this as long as the request does not interfere with the smooth running of the business. Otherwise, a refusal may amount to unjustified indirect discrimination.

All organisations (big and small) should have clear procedures for handling leave requests, which should be applied equally to all staff. For their part, staff should give as much notice as possible of a holiday request and be aware that the employer may not always be able to accommodate it.

Do employers have to provide prayer facilities?

There is no explicit requirement under the regulations to provide facilities, such as a prayer room, for workers who want to practise their religion.

However, if employees ask for a quiet place in which to pray and the premises can accommodate the request without adversely impacting on the business or other staff, then it is hard to see how a refusal could be justified.

There may also be issues about the time that workers take in order to practise their religion. However, if the time off to practice the religion is restricted to the normal tea, coffee and smoking breaks taken by others, then the workers are not being treated any more favourably than anyone else is in the workplace.

What about catering for special dietary requirements?

Many religions involve specific dietary requirements.

If the employer provides a canteen at work, the menu should reflect the dietary needs of the staff.

The same principle applies to work-related meetings and social activities.

How do workers enforce their rights?

Although most issues should be resolved in the workplace, there are times when this is

not possible.

The Regulations impose strict time limits throughout the procedure for bringing a case for religious discrimination. Good cases can be lost before they start through hesitation or delay.

If someone suspects they have been or are being discriminated on religious grounds they must take advice immediately, contact their union as soon as possible and raise a grievance under the statutory procedure. From October 2004, unless there are special circumstances (e.g. threats or continuing harassment by the employer) the employee must write to the employer raising a grievance and wait for 28 days before bringing a discrimination claim to an employment tribunal.

This is even where the complaint relates to disciplinary action short of dismissal or another grievance. If a grievance is not raised the Tribunal will not have jurisdiction to consider the claim.

The time limit for making a claim for religious discrimination to the employment tribunal is three months from the act of discrimination. This time limit is extended by three months to allow the statutory grievance procedure to take place provided a grievance has been raised within three months of the act of discrimination.

A discriminatory act may extend over a period of time so that it may be a continuing act if it takes the form of some policy; rule or practice in accordance with which the employer takes decisions. In these circumstances the three-month period runs from the end of the continuing act.

Tribunals do have discretion to allow late claims to proceed, but it is not safe to assume that this discretion will be exercised.

The questionnaire is normally sent to the employer before tribunal proceedings start. If so, it must be sent within three months of the facts complained of.



Brown: British jobs for British workers?

Gordon Brown declared in his keynote speech to the Labour conference on 24 September:-
"As we set out on the next stage of our journey, this is our vision." Then he got to his soundbite for the day: "Drawing on the talents of all to create British jobs for British workers."

Brown had played with this idea before using more cautious language when he spoke to the GMB union:-
"It is time to train British workers for the British jobs that will be available over the coming few years and to make sure that people who are inactive and unemployed are able to get the new jobs on offer in our country,"

The truth is that almost everyone knows that the bulk of new jobs created in Britain since 1997 have gone to people moving into the UK from other countries. We know too that there is a problem with long-term unemployment which has left many of our folk consigned to living more or less permanently on State Benefit. Brown is seeking to respond to legitimate questions and calm fears but no one believes he has the answers and unease grows. British Jobs for British Workers could only be implemented if our economy and welfare system was radically re-structured. Under our present economic system it will remain only a soundbite or slogan.

Surge in donations for Mark Walker Legal Fund



Supporters of freedom of expression and association from across the British Isles and the world have given generously towards the Mark Walker Legal Fund Appeal, which was advertised online last month. Mark Walker is a popular and respected teacher in County Durham in the North East of England who was put in the shooting-gallery because of his politics.

The first few days saw money pouring in. The fund continues to grow. Many of the donations are small. These are from people with little means but who are moved to anger and outrage by the story of Mark Walker's persecution. They feel they must contribute. It is like the 'widow's mite' in the Bible.

The following is just a sample of comments made:

"Good luck to Mark in his fight for justice. I am encouraging all my friends to help in this just cause"
– JL, Texas.

"I am shocked at what this Headmistress has done. 'Rotten boroughs' are still alive and well in the North-East. Anyone who doesn't fit in with the local 'bosses - in this case Labour - are thrown to the wolves. They have no compassion, just hatred towards those who won't kowtow. I enclose £5 from my meagre pension but if everyone did the same it would mount up to a pretty penny. Good Luck"
– Pensioner, Darlington, County Durham.

"We are turning into a Big Brother state that crushes dissent. It's ironic that there are so many organisations that defend the rights of minorities but the silent majority has no-one? Well it seems in Solidarity and Civil Liberty they have found good men and women who will champion the underdog! I have sent a tenner. I would like to give more and will send a further cheque next month. Don't let them grind you down"
– Silent Majority, Battersea, London.

"Mark Walker has done little wrong and certainly nothing to warrant losing his job. Could you imagine anyone else being sacked because of their politics? I don't happen to belong to Mark's party but frankly who is safe if we allow political bias to enter the job market? God Bless you and keep up the good work."
– Patriot, Birmingham, UK.

This is just a small sample of the letters sent with contributions. The comments have touched us and Mark and his family. We are heartened to see that the British people and our friends from across the globe have still got a bit of fight left in them! If we continue to raise funds we shall be able to make the little-Hitlers sit up and take notice!

Every pound, dollar and euro will go directly to fight the bullies!

Mark Walker and his family deserve to be treated as human beings rather than just 'collateral damage'. If you agree that political discrimination and malice have no place in the workplace, please give generously to our appeal by making cheques and postal orders payable to 'Civil Liberty' and send to the 'Mark Walker Legal Fund', Civil Liberty. P.O. Box 1132, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE99 4YT, England, Great Britain, or by paying by pay pal at their website (civilliberty.org.uk) . Help us fight injustice.

Together we are strong!

**Thousands have signed the online petition calling for the re-instatement of Mark Walker at:-
<http://www.petitiononline.com>**

Make sure you do too!

Work while you're ill' culture is wrong say bosses

Pressure to struggle into work when sick is harming workers and damaging productivity, and motivation, according to research from the Chartered Management Institute (CMI). Its 'Quality of Working Life' report reveals that 17 per cent of managers believe their health is deteriorating and more than four in 10 (42 per cent) claim illness rates in their organisation have gone up over the last 12 months.

The study of 1,511 managers also found, however, that 1 in 3 believe a culture of not taking time off work for sickness exists. Only 53 per cent of employees feel they would be treated sympathetically if they were ill. The report reveals half (48 per cent) of those reporting symptoms

relating to stomach bugs in the past year did not take sick leave and only 9 per cent suffering from stress took time off from work, despite 1 in 3 citing stress symptoms. Two-thirds of respondents (67 per cent) said their productivity was reduced by ill health.

The study is interesting as so much emphasis is placed by some employers and media on the cost to firms of sickness absence. The damage caused by this culture where illness is bemoaned as a weakness is often over-looked. Spreading sickness and making costly mistakes when ill at work are often not taken into account. Solidarity General Secretary, Pat Harrington, commented:- "This report goes some way to redressing the balance on the sickness at work issue".

Praise for RMT!!!

We have our criticisms of Bob Crow and the RMT (rail, maritime and transport) Union but they were spot on with the resolution they put to TUC conference in September.

They rightly pointed out that nothing had changed between the current draft and the previous one. It is the old rejected constitution smuggled back with a few cosmetic changes. Their resolution specifically noted that the constitution would:- "consolidate the single market and the drive to privatise public services".

They went on to point out that:- "At the 2005 General Election all three main political parties promised a referendum on such changes". Now it seems that Labour has changed its mind.

The TUC once again failed British Workers.

They rejected the RMT resolution which called for a 'no' vote in the referendum but did pass another resolution backing a referendum. The TUC has failed to take a clear stand on the issue.

Our view is that the EU constitution would further entrench an economic policy which runs counter to the interests of British workers.

The treaty demands the "progressive suppression of all restrictions on international trade and investment." It states that the unaccountable European Central Bank has the sole duty of combating inflation. It commits the EU to NATO. It gives the unelected European Commission the power to force through the privatisation of essential services..

All Unions should campaign for a referendum and for a 'No' vote in it.

UNITE at the Labour Conference - Will they ever learn?

Unite is a big Union. It tabled a motion at the 2007 Labour Conference calling on the Government to extend full employment rates to agency and temporary workers. Unite produced a long list of examples where regular jobs have been replaced by agency jobs - often migrant labour. These jobs are lower paid and with far worse conditions. There have been a number of industrial disputes related to the use of agency workers to replace regular workers. Jack Dromey, deputy general secretary of the TGWU section of Unite, said: -

"The number of those

directly employed is falling and the numbers of agency workers, overwhelmingly immigrants on poorer conditions, are growing."

Clearly a problem. So was the motion passed? No. It was not even voted on following changes to the Labour Party structure introduced the week before by Gordon Brown. Next year policy motions will not even make it to debate - they will be dealt with behind closed doors by a special committee.

Solidarity has been vilified because it has opposed the large influx of migrants. Other countries acted to block this with the result that larger numbers came here - with effects on wage rates, working

conditions and demands on over-stretched services. Some of our Brothers in other Unions believe that if only the government introduces legislation to give all workers equal rights all will be well. They have been treated with contempt thus far. Others believe that the answer is to unionise the migrants. We understand this desire but we don't believe it will

work. The main advantage of cheap labour is that it is cheap. If migrants join Unions they become expensive in comparison. The strategy of the TUC affiliates is based on a misguided, shallow internationalism. What is required is a Union that stands up for British Workers. That Union is Solidarity.

NEED SOME PUBLICITY?

Accentuate is a public relations company that exists to promote campaigning non-profit making organisations. You might be a Community or Pressure Group ignored by the media and struggling to get heard, drowned out by the noise of established organisations.

We can help!

Accentuate is already a consultant to the Solidarity Trade Union and would be interested to hear from you and your group. Contact us on accentuatepr@yahoo.co.uk





The British Workers' Union

Solidarity – The Union for British Workers is an independent UK trade union formed in late 2005. It is named after the Polish trade union Solidarnosc.

Solidarity recruits from all industrial sectors and professions. We believe in 'One Big Union'.

The idea is not new. In 1834 Robert Owen formed the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union in an attempt to unite all the workers into one Union. We too see the sense of organising across trades and professions. The Solidarity Union does not bar members on account of race, religion, sexuality or political opinion.

- We represent our members at disciplinaries and grievances.
- We give advice and guidance on accidents at work and pursuing claims.
- We train reps.
- We oppose discrimination on political and other grounds.
- We campaign against off-shoring and cheap migrant labour.
- We seek to improve health and safety at work.

You need a Union that will fight for you! Join today.



The British Workers' Union

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

Send application form to:
Solidarity Trade Union,
PO Box 93, Spennymoor,
DL16 9AN

<p>Personal Details</p> <p>Title: Gender: M / F</p> <p>First name:</p> <p>Last Name:</p> <p>Date of Birth:</p> <p>Address:</p> <p>..... Postcode</p> <p>Work Details:</p> <p>Trade/Job/Profession</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Current Employer</p> <p>.....</p>	<p>Standing Order Details</p> <p>To (your bank's name):</p> <p>Postal address of your bank (found on cheque book/statement)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Solidarity Account Information</p> <p>Please pay - Bank of Scotland Account Number - 06072921</p> <p>Beneficiary Name: Solidarity Trade Union Sort Code: 80 11 00</p> <p>Pay immediately and thereafter the sum of £5 (five pounds) per month - until further notice in writing.</p> <p>Date commencing:</p> <p>Name of Account to be debited (your name appears on your statement or cheque book):</p> <p>Sort Code (of your account):</p> <p>Account Number (of your account):</p>
<p>Pay by Cheque</p> <p>If you prefer to send a cheque then write out a cheque payable to 'Solidarity Trade Union', for the sum of either £30 (for 6 months) or £60 (for 12 months)</p>	<p>Sign & Join</p> <p>I, the undersigned, agree to abide by Solidarity rules and affirm that I am not debarred, and authorise the Standing order mandate (unless I have sent a cheque)</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: / /</p>