

TRADE UNION CND

22-24 UNDERWOOD STREET, LONDON N1 7JG

01-250 4010



AGM 1989

March 4th.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUCND'S AGM 1989
REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

This report contains:-
General introductory remarks
The new EC and Officers
Transcript of the speech by Bill Morris
Transcript of the speech made by Sue Chavez
Notes from the introduction given by Frank Allaun
Transcript of the speech made by Jim Barnes
A copy of the amendment to the annual report put by the UCW.
A copy of the motion put on behalf of the Greater London Association of Trades Councils

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS:-

Just under 100 people registered for this years AGM including delegates from - ACTT, AEU, BETA, CATT, COHSE, FBU, FTAT, GMB, IRSF, MSF, NALGO, NAPO, NCU, NGA, NUM, NUPE, NUR, STE, T&GWU, UCW together with delegates from a number of Trades Councils and County Associations of Trades Councils.

There were 20 people nominated for the 15 EC positions. The constitution states that we had to have at least 5 women on the EC and so we had an election for 5 women prior to the election for the remaining 10 positions.

This year for the first time instead of having a motion put to the conference by the outgoing EC an expanded version of the annual report was produced. This included an assessment of the coming years work and was open for amendment. Two amendments were put one by the UCW and the other by the GMB. The amendment from the UCW was accepted and is given below.

LIST OF THOSE ELECTED:-

Officers:-

John Geleit NGA-Chair, John Chowcatt MSF-Vice Chair, Elsie Broad FTAT-Vice Chair, Peter Tuck T&GWU-Treasurer.

EC Members:-

M Broomfield NGA, B Didsbury T&GWU, Kate Duerdon MSF, S Evans NUM, D Harrington GMB, P Haggart T&GWU, K Hopkins NALGO, G McFarlane BETA, Dian Menaul ACTT, A Milburn MSF, Dr Adriene Morgan MSF, H Newsom ACTT, Gail Squires NALGO, Carol Stevenson MSF, A Reed UCW.

**SPEECH TO THE AGM BY
BILL MORRIS (T&GWU DEPUTY GENERAL SECRETARY)**

Thank you very much for inviting me to your Conference today.' I bring you greetings from my Executive Council .

We in the TGWU have always seen TUCND as a vitally important body in the labour movement, and I'm delighted to have the chance to make a few remarks to you before you begin your discussion. Today your Conference takes place at a time of hope and optimism. So

ourselves. CND and the peace movement generally has often faced an uphill task. We've often felt that we were protesting alone in a world where peace and disarmament were just not on the political agenda. Whatever our popular support the ruling elite just looked too fixed to budge. But all that's changed now, and our long and patient work can take part of the credit.

Above all, of course, Gorbachev and the new Soviet leadership have made a decisive break for peace. And they've done it, in part at least, through their own unilateral steps:

The nuclear test freeze

The proposal of deep cuts in ICBM's

The scrapping of tactical weapons

The troop cuts in Eastern Europe.

If you're a unilateralist these days, you certainly don't walk alone.

And I don't think these developments will always be confined to the Soviet bloc. There is always a chance that some of the softer elements in NATO will win the day, and the West may take some unilateral steps of its own.

'Modernisation' of tactical nuclear weapons, for example. Will the West Germans win the day and scupper the idea? Or will Mrs Thatcher and the hawks prevail? I'll come back to that later. It's a one-sided question if you like. The choice is ours, we can reciprocate the Soviet gestures, or we can ignore them. Even the United States seems to be waking up to the dawn of a new age. Listen to the new Secretary of State, James Baker, at his Senate confirmation hearings:

'The US must adjust to a world that has outgrown the post-war era.

These realities will not permit a reckless unilateralism or a blind isolationism. Only through a realistic approach can we write a new chapter of American leadership for a rapidly changing world'.

So it looks like a non-reckless unilateralism may be back on the agenda. Well that's what we've always wanted. And even if that isn't really what Baker had in mind, it still looks as though the pack-ice of the Cold War is gradually breaking up. We can all be thankful for that. And we can be pleased, too, that there is such a widespread recognition that unilateral action is a necessary component of global disarmament. It's ironic that that is being recognised at the same time as the TGWU is facing questions about its own policy. Will we? Won't we? Which way will we jump? The curiosity of the political commentators is only matched by their ignorance of the way our Union works.

It reminds me of the old Ford talks, where we used to have three broadsheets printed - depending on how things came up. 'The best yet' - that meant triumph all round. 'This is the bottom line' - we can just about sell this one. 'Our members will decide' - oh

dear, better luck next year. Well of course our members will decide our policy, the democratic way, at our BDC, not in some smoke-filled room or by some political arm-twisting. But I see no reason to be sorry for the 27 years in which we have led the way on peace in the labour movement. I don't see why we should back away from that now, when we are so close to success. History has vindicated my Union position and we are not about to turn our back on that history.

I want now to say a few words about the details of the international disarmament process. I think they're important, because they point the way forwards for us as activists in the peace movement. In all policy-making and political debate, the devil is in the detail. First I want to mention conventional stability talks now going on in Helsinki.

They're of vital importance to nuclear disarmament, even though they don't concern nuclear weapons directly. For a start NATO still depends on a policy of the first use of nuclear weapons. That's never been acceptable to us in the peace movement. But it will rapidly become even less defensible with the general public if what is seen as Soviet superiority in European conventional forces is ended or reduced. A military balance that was purely defensive on both sides would be a huge gain for common security. And what would be the point of massive nuclear stockpiles, of thousands of ICBM's, if escalation to nuclear war was not possible, because conventional forces could never be used for aggression? The conventional stability talks will also deal with the thorny question of dual capable systems, particularly the aircraft that can carry either conventional or nuclear weapons. If the number of such aircraft can be reduced, then of course, the nuclear capacity of both sides will be reduced too. That means a big cut in British based US F1-11's, for example.

We in the peace movement need to be out there arguing for that as part of our campaign to remove US nuclear capacity from Britain altogether. And we need to be involved in the crucial debate I mentioned earlier on the 'modernisation' of tactical nuclear weapons. Kohl and the West Germans are resisting that process, of course. The Norwegians, the Spanish, and the Italians are not very happy either. But of course Mrs Thatcher is as gung-ho as usual for any American weapon that comes along.

The dangerous news is that the US administration has made its choice on a replacement for the tactical Lance missiles. It's worth looking at what that will mean in practice. NATO has 88 Lance launchers, and 700 missiles. The replacement, the '750 MLR', will be numbered in the thousands. And its explosive power and accuracy will be greater. That frightening escalation of the Western nuclear arsenal must be fought at all costs. That is among the highest priorities of the peace movement in the coming year.

But of course we have a political task too. In particular, we are going to have to deal with the realities of public opinion in

this country, or at least with what the politicians perceive those realities to be. I have to say that I do not accept the manufactured version of public opinion that is pushed at us day after day by the media and by our political opponents. They have said for a long time that British public opinion will not countenance the giving up of nuclear weapons. But we have also known for a long time that people desperately want disarmament. I think that the INF deal changed the situation utterly.

How can the public see Gorbachev and Reagan make deals, see the missiles packed up and shipped out of Greenham Common, see the military men of the two blocs walking round each other's airfields, and not draw the obvious conclusions? How could they be hostile - seeing all that going on - to their country making a positive gesture to help the peace process along? I don't believe that for a minute. Mrs Thatcher may want to keep the British public wrapped in a cloak of fear and hostility, but the new confidence and hope in peaceful future right across the world will defeat her. I do not believe for one minute that the Labour Party is going against the logic of the times, or the will of the people, by insisting on the central importance of unilateral action in the disarmament process.

But of course, the British people need to feel certain that a future Labour Government is going to produce a more secure future for our country. That's what all of us involved in the Party's Policy Review Group are trying to achieve. That's why Ron Todd and the Party delegation went to Moscow, to find out how the Soviet Union was moving on the issues. And a useful and informative visit it was too. Of course debate in our movement is healthy. Policies are not fixed in stone, ignoring the changing reality around us. But nor are basic principles for sale, for any price, to any bidder. Of course the British people need to know that the defence of Britain is safe in the Labour Party's hands. They have no reason to fear, but if they seek reassurance we must give it to them. And all of us colleagues in the labour movement must work to that end. I simply do not believe that public support for positive policies of nuclear disarmament is harder to win than in the past. Look at the polls. A recent Gallup survey showed that

*71% of the British people want serious negotiations for further disarmament, and that includes no less than 61% of Tory supporters.

*52% don't think that US nuclear weapons are needed in Britain or in Europe.

*45% thought that US troops should leave Britain altogether.

These figures are reflected in surveys right across Europe. There is no public support whatever for nuclear modernisation. And there is a clear will for dramatic and strong disarmament initiatives.

In a meeting of Trade Union CND it would be remiss not to say something about the economic and employment facts of all this. Of course there are some awkward facts to be faced. We have to be

clear that getting rid of Trident and taking Polaris out of service will not save a lot of money. Nor will Britain going non-nuclear under a future Labour Government release great slabs of cash. The days when we could promise that are long gone. But in the present climate of economic decisions about arms levels - being taken by both the Warsaw Pact and the USA - the prospects for gradual reductions in world arms spending are certainly there. That will bring back into sharp focus the work of our movement on arms conversion. It is something that the TGWU, certainly, will be bringing back to the top of its disarmament agenda in the coming year, starting with a joint seminar with our Soviet comrades next month.

I recognise the points made in the Annual Report before you. I certainly accept the point that conversion - in aerospace for example - requires a long lead-time and large scale public investment. But it remains a necessity. If it takes 15 years of public support to get a civilian aerospace project going, and if it needs social ownership, then so be it. We need to find the political will to make that point, loud and clear. In conclusion, colleagues, I think we should stop worrying about our non-nuclear defence policy and get on with selling it to the British people. Now is the time for the peace movement - and especially ours in Britain - to start to reap the harvest of our long and patient campaigning work. We stood and fought for peace and disarmament when the situation was overwhelmingly hostile. We kept our principles in times when they were neither popular nor profitable. I am confident that we will not abandon them now. I know that the work of the peace movement will continue and develop in the coming months. And in that work, Trade Union CND will be leading the way.

I bring you the best wishes of the TGWU Executive for your meeting today. I know it will be as lively and interesting as ever and I look forward to hearing what you have to say.

SPEECH TO THE AGM BY SUE CUEVA (PHILIPINES SUPPORT GROUP)

Filipino Workers Search for Peace

There are two main reasons why there is a peace problem in the Philippines; the US intervention in the Philippines thru the US military bases and the multinational companies' control of the Philippine economy. Filipino workers suffer badly from this situation. Their search for peace is a long and risky struggle.

Military Base Agreement

The US bases in the Philippines are the largest and strategically the most important bases outside of the US mainland. Clark air base is the major launching pad for the US air fighters. This was very much used during the Vietnam war. It remains the most strategic air base in all of Asia. The Subic Naval base is housing the 7th Fleet and is a major refitting and repair dockyard in Asia. The 7th Fleet protects the US military interest in Asia. Also, it guards the oil shipping routes from the Middle east.

The recent Military Base Agreement (MBA) signed by the Philippines and the U.S. government is a reason for concern among the Filipinos. In this agreement, the Philippine government allowed the entry and passage of nuclear powered vessels in the Philippine territory. This is a violation of the Philippine Constitution which explicitly bans the entry of all kinds of nuclear weapons in the Philippine territory. Nuclear weapons will be a threat to peace not only to Filipinos but to the whole Asia-Pacific region.

Last January, the progressive forces in the Philippines sponsored a region-wide Asia-Pacific peoples conference on Peace and Development. Representatives from different Asia-Pacific countries attended the conference. The conference discuss possible solution to the peace problem in the region. They expressed strong concern on the presence of US military bases in the Philippines and the entry and of nuclear weapons in these bases. As expected, the Philippine government reacted strongly against this conference, call them communist, and sent the military to harass the delegates.

The USSR in one of its press statement offered to dismantle their base in Camh Ran bay if the USA will dismantle its bases in the Philippines.

The growing anti base feeling in the Philippines and the region made the US insecure of their position. In order to insure the continuation of their base, the US, together with other countries which has economic interest in the Philippines are bribing the Philippine government through their so called Mini-Marshall plan. This is a \$10B dollar financial package to bail out the ailing economy of the Philippines. This will be given if the government will commit to retain the US bases after 1992

Trade union situation in the Philippines

70% of the Filipinos earn their living from the land. There is approximately 24M workforce in the Philippines. A lot of them are farm workers, while others are industrial workers in mostly assembly type industries, service workers mostly in the government and commercial sectors. There are also a significantly growing number of overseas workers in the different parts of the world. Only 10 to 15% are organized. The government puts the unemployment rate at 13% while the underemployment rate at 46%. The organized workers are divided into two major organizations, the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP) and the Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU-May First Movement). TUCP was created by the Marcos dictatorship in 1975 while KMU was created by the workers, themselves, in 1981. The KMU has approximately 900,000 workers while TUCP claimed to have one million members.

Workers in the Philippines are paid a minimum wage of 64 pesos per day (1.7). The government estimate said that in order to feed a family of six, they would need to earn at least P165 per day (4).

Most of them work eight to ten hours per day. Health and safety conditions in their work place are very bad. The workers live in extreme poverty. Most of them live in squatters areas or urban poor areas. These places always suffer demolitions and demolition threats from the government.

Anti-labor laws created by the Marcos dictatorship are still implemented by the Aquino government. Frequently, strikes are banned, scabs and goods are allowed to cross the picketlines. Violence in the picketline is very common and worker leaders are harass and killed or disappeared. Recently, Senator Herrera, former Chairman of the TUCP sponsored a bill in the Congress which will legalize union busting by the management and again, ban strikes of the workers.

Workers and the US bases

The US military bases in the Philippines are the second biggest single employer in the country, next to the government. Approximately 67,000 Filipino

workers are employed in the bases; 23,000 are directly hired by the base, 22,000 are indirectly hired (they are hired by contractor agencies which are also sometimes American owned) and the remaining 22,000 are domestic helpers working in American households. Only the 23,000 directly hired workers have a union which is affiliated to the TUCP.

In 1987, the base workers went on strike over the issue of wage distortion. The strike was organized by a more progressive group of workers who formed their own organization because of dissatisfaction with the TUCP. The US military base command broke the strike and dismissed over 50 worker leaders of the progressive organization. The Philippine labor code and the Constitution does not apply in the base. The Americans rule over all the bases without any interference from the government.

Recently, there has been a strong tension again building up between the US base command and its workers. The workers are complaining against the American security personnel who body search both men and women workers of the base. They search them for possible contraband being smuggled out of the base. They are thus treated as criminals. These, plus the unsettled issue on wage distortion build up the growing tension in the base.

It is also important to mention the social problems in the community around the base. Prostitution and drug business affects peace and order in the communities surrounding the bases. Most of the bars and prostitution houses are owned by the Americans. There are approximately 100,000 prostitutes in the Philippines concentrated around the area of the US bases. Drugs are also brought in the Philippines by American servicemen thru the base. Youth and women abuse in the communities is largely due to the presence of these bases.

Another important issue is land. Because of the recent watered down land reform bill of Aquino, some farmers farming land owned by the American base aired their grievances. The Clark Air base in Angeles City has some 11,000 hectares reservation area which is being farmed by the local people. They claimed that the American base is getting 25% of the earnings before all the expenses have been deducted. This means that the farmers are paying for all the expenses in the land. The new Land Reform bill says that 25% should be given to the landlord after all expenses have been covered. The farmers are demanding the implementation of the land reform bill in this area but the US command does not seem keen in doing this.

The US and other Multinational companies control in the Philippine economy is another cause of peace problem in the Philippines. When workers go on strike because of very low wage and bad working condition, the military immediately break the picketline and arrest the workers. The Aquino government's record of human rights violations has now surpass that of Marcos. In the workers sector alone, 68 workers and organizers were killed and hundreds of picketline attacked by the military. All in all, during the last three years of Aquino, 11,000 people have been arrested, 1,400 civilian killed, 1,646 tortured, 224 disappeared and 199,000 people became refugees. All in defence of the interest of the capital and multinational companies.

The Filipino workers try to organize and air their grievance to the government. However, organizing in the Philippines has also become a crime. Workers are called communist when they stand up and voice their opinion for a possible solution to the peace problem. A lot of workers leave the Philippines to look for better opportunities and hope to live peacefully outside the country. There is almost 2 million Filipinos outside the Philippines. Still, their problems like poverty and security in life has not been resolved. They are continuously haunted by the problems back home, which their families and friends suffer.

The civil war going on between the New People's Army and the government troops (backed by the US) in the urban and rural area has affected the lives of the workers. The US policy of Low Intensity Conflict or total war against the people is basically directed against organized groups such as the workers. Vigilante groups organized by the government harass and threatens the lives of many people.

KMU's proposal for Peace

There is no easy solution on the peace problem. The problem is rooted on the overall economic and political system of the Philippines. The neo-colonial policy of the US in the Philippines should be put to an end. The class interest of the workers and the farmers should be made as a priority over those of the capitalists, landlords and the multinational companies.

KMU is totally against the entry and passage of nuclear weapons in the Philippines. They organized petitions and protest rallies against the recently signed Military Base Agreement (MBA).

They also organize workers rallies against the operation of the Bataan Nuclear Power plant in Morong. They are also one of the main sponsor of the recently concluded Asia-Pacific Peace conference in Manila.

The total dismantling of all US bases in the Philippines is also one of the primary call of KMU.

The big tracts of land occupied by the bases can be distributed to the workers and farmers of the provinces. The shipbuilding industry in Subic Naval base (one of the best shipbuilding facilities in the world) can be develop to fit the needs of the country. The Philippines being an archipelago needs better ships and naval system to avoid shipping disasters such as the Dona Paz and Dona Marilyn, which has already caused death to thousands of Filipinos.

The Filipino people are organizing towards a long and lasting peace. There is no short cut to peace. The people has to struggle and persevere in order to attain peace.

AN EXTRACT FROM THE SPEECH MADE BY FRANK ALLAUN

"Provided Labour carries out its conference policy to "Unconditionally remove all nuclear weapons and bases from British soil and waters in its first parliament", I see no objection at all to bilateral or to multilateral discussions as well. In fact they would be welcome. One method helps the other.

"This is precisely what Mr Gorbachev has done. He has made the biggest arms cuts in peacetime history - unilaterally and immediately. At the same time he has, by destroying the myth of "the Soviet Threat", greatly improved the prospects for East West detente and disarmament.

"Witness the INF Treaty signed in Washington and the Epoch-making Gorbachev speech at the UN on December 7.

"Despite the undoubted improvement in relations between nations brought about by Mr Gorbachev's remarkable series of peace initiatives the Military-Industrial-Media complex still exists - especially in the US and here in the UK. The same forces are at work behind Bush as they were behind Reagan. The Complex never gives up.

"Their immediate aim is to circumvent the INF Treaty with new Nuclear Weapons. Indeed Bush seems even less ready than Reagan to support arms cuts. He and Mrs Thatcher are pressing Herr Kohl to accept new US short range missiles. Thanks to the pressure of the West German population Kohl has told the western leaders to 'get stuffed'.

SPEECH MADE BY JIM BARNES TO THE AGM

In introducing this report, I have decided not to talk through it section by section because I think it gives quite a clear and fair assessment of the work we did last year and the areas that need developing in the future, in so far as that is possible in such a written document.

Instead, I want to talk in general terms about the way we have developed, and about what we need to do in the next couple of years. I say couple of years, because, as this year's work was a development from the previous year's strategy, so what we do in the coming year will form the basis of what develops in the year following. The size, experience, maturity, and resources we have available, will depend on how we build the organisation now.

Nine years ago C.N.D.'s membership exploded. It had a tenfold increase in direct membership in the space of one year. The peace movement then had a sense of urgency, a sense of immediacy, which it unfortunately lacks now.

Trade-Union C.N.D. developed later. Its support base did not explode as the rest of C.N.D.'s had done, instead, its development was the direct result of a lot of hard work. In some senses we have almost had to hew it from stone. Its current form of organisation and campaigning strategy has only developed over the last 3-4 years. If we are to continue building up the successes achieved over the last 3-4 years, we have to think very carefully about our long-term campaigning strategy, and about our own development.

Last year I got up and put forward a neat package of ideas and campaigns, some of which worked, some didn't. We are doing the same this year, which is what the annual report is all about, however, this year I am not going to predict quite as confidently that we will be able to achieve all that is suggested.

In looking over the last year there has been three or four disruptive factors for Trade-Union C.N.D., namely, the U.S. election, the I.N.F. agreement, the financial problems associated with our funding from C.N.D., and the rather bazar antics that have gone on, and indeed are still going on, inside the Labour Party.

At one stage last year I was confidently predicting victory for Dukakis in the U.S. presidential elections. Unfortunately I was very swiftly proven wrong, a factor which I am often reminded of by several of the executive. I couldn't believe that a majority would vote for an administration that had so obviously been proven inefficient and corrupt, but they did. What that should say to us is that tayloring our policy to fit the current political breeze does not win elections.

Perhaps that is one of the real tragedies about the attempted about turn in the Labour Party at the moment. Instead of it having any electoral advantage, it makes them look 'weak, indecisive, and politically inept. The fact that the trade-union movement is so closely allied to the Labour Party means that the problems within it are very much our central concern.

On the positive side, the I.N.F. agreement, and the other initiatives, especially those on conventional weapons, being pursued by the Soviet Union, have demonstrated that we in the peace movement can have an effect on the arms race. C.N.D. was not one of the signatories on the I.N.F agreement, we were not a party in the negotiations, neither did we achieve the agreement, but we were a part of the political process which made that agreement possible. Even with this government, we, here and now, are in a position to achieve a great deal for peace.

For instance, because of the possibilities opened up with Gorbachev's speech to the United Nations, we may be able to create a great deal of political momentum behind the arguments for conversion. We are a part of that process, if we choose to be, and at the same time we can help create that political process towards disarmament.

The conclusions that you can draw from what I have been describing, are that the work we are involved in is long-term. Its scale is vast, its potential is vast, and it will only succeed if we think carefully about what we are doing, and what needs to be done.

The best of motions, the best of political analysis, means nothing if we do not have the vehicles through which any analysis can be put into practise. Therefore, the way in which we develop the capacity to act is just as important as the political analysis, indeed, all analysis must begin to take into account how we can develop the capacity to act.

In some senses you can substitute the words, "capacity to act", for a good regional structure and an effective national organisation. Of the two, the weakest is our regional organisation. We are working on this but, unfortunately, we are no-where near to having a really effective grassroots structure. This must not denegrate the work already being done at a local level, it is simply to state that we have got to make sure that we build up this work as solidly and as rapidly as possible.

Financing this work is obviously essential. However, it is no secret that C.N.D. has financial problems which has subsequently ensured that our income from C.N.D. is falling. As the debate within the Labour movement around disarmament becomes more acute, it is also probable that our income from the trade-union movement will fall. We are faced with expanding areas of work to cover and depleting sums with which to do them.

All we have in such circumstances is you and me. The only tools available are the committed people we can involve in the campaigns. This is a major problem for us in that most ordinary working class people do not have the resources, the experience, or the skills, to do the sort of work needed. We set up a regional organisation and you can bet that most people in it will not be able to type, may not have a car, may not have a phone, and very probably will not have access to cheap reproducing facilities essential for producing minutes of meetings and campaigning material.

If we are to do the sort of things we need to do to our political culture, if we are to move the mountains that stand in the way of a decent living for ordinary working class people, and make no mistake this is what nuclear disarmament is all about, namely, the substitution of a caring society for the current perverse and predatory society reinforced by the present governments set of priorities, then we have to achieve a position where we have far greater political and physical skills and resources than we have at present. The restructuring we implemented last year is intended to help develop Trade-Union C.N.D. in precisely that direction.

We can't depend on C.N.D., we can't depend on money from the trade-union movement. We have an enormous task, not only in retaining current policy, but in making it politically possible for a future government to put such policies into practise. That means building a much larger, and more effective, organisation than we have at present. That means developing and extending what we have at present. I have every confidence in you to make sure this happens.

AMENDMENT TO THE ANNUAL REPORT BY THE UCW

"The UCW remain committed to their policy for Nuclear Disarmament and committed to their affiliation to TUCND. We wish to make it clear on behalf of their members and their general secretary, as it fell to him to move 'composite 55' that neither the resolution nor the speech made in moving the amendment at the rostrum could in any way be read as a move away from that commitment to Nuclear Disarmament. It was others who chose to interpret it as such."

GLATC MOTION

This AGM warmly welcomes the reductions in nuclear and conventional weapons which have been implemented over the recent period, including unilateral reductions by the Soviet Union and other countries. We are convinced that such developments not only reduce the threat of nuclear and conventional war, but also greatly improve the world's ability to tackle hunger, disease, poverty, homelessness and other pressing social ills.

We are appalled, however, by the refusal of the British Government to respond positively to these developments and by the expansion of nuclear arsenals in Britain through the proposed introduction of Trident and by 'modernisation' of existing weapon systems and the expansion of US bases. Such moves run counter to world developments, damage Britain's economy, increasingly isolate Britain in the world and threaten to derail the disarmament process.

We are also seriously concerned by moves to dilute the Labour Party's commitment to ridding Britain of nuclear weapons, which is a backward and irrational move.

This AGM instructs the Executive Committee to step up campaigning in the Trade Union Movement to expose the British Government's role and its political and economic consequences, to defend the strong disarmament policies of the Labour Party and TUC and to win the mass of the British people for British nuclear disarmament and arms conversion.

Greater London Association of Trades Councils