The pretext for reviewing the party-union link was a scandal we now know didn’t happen.

Union members didn’t ask for it. The public aren’t interested. For them, it just creates the appearance of a divided party looking inwards rather than at what matters. And to party members, it offers nothing except likely financial disaster.

The Collins report was designed to reassure us. It talks about collective engagement, and the collective voice of the unions. It suggests that we can have individual levy-payers choosing to join Labour whilst also maintaining that collective voice. And perhaps, through negotiation, we can.

The real test is in the structure Lord Collins will propose two or three months from now. And there’s still much in the document that gives trade unions cause for concern. Not least the fact that no change isn’t even an option.

"One of the principles that will continue to underpin the relationship is a collective engagement with our party for trade unions," Lord Collins says. But engagement is not the same as collective affiliation (to which the report does not refer).

"The latest reforms proposed by Ed are … built on the principle that Labour is an alliance of individuals and organisations," says Lord Collins. But the paper implies the Party is no longer a federation - but an “alliance”.

We would not talk about CLPs having an “alliance” or “close relationship” with the party. And neither should we talk in these terms about the other pillar of Labour’s federation - the unions which founded it.

The question Lord Collins describes as “inevitable” about “the consequences for other party structures including conference and the rules for electing leaders” just inflames union concerns that this is an attack on the union link.

If you want a party with a working class base, why turn against the mass democratic working class organisations which have sustained Labour for over a century?

Priorities ballot: how CLPs can set the agenda

In today’s “priorities ballot”, CLPs and the unions can each choose four issues for debate. To maximise the number of important subjects that are debated, the four subjects the CLPs pick should be different from the four subjects chosen by the trade unions. The four the unions choose are guaranteed to be on the agenda. CLPs should not waste their votes on the same topics as the unions.

Following the priorities ballot, compositing meetings on the successful topics will take place from 6.30pm-8.00pm in the Hilton Metropole Hotel. Delegates will need to ensure that the composites that are finally agreed set our clear policies that set us apart from the Tories and Lib Dems. Party staff will bring draft composites which should be treated with caution.

1. NHS
2. School meals
3. Housing
4. Access to Justice

There are four important subjects the CLPs can put on the agenda - in addition to those from the unions.

1. Lobbying bill
2. Cost of living
3. Employment Rights
4. Royal Mail

The four subjects the unions have already put on the agenda.

These are important subjects, but CLPs would be wasting their vote on items that are already on the agenda.
Launching a Labour Assembly Against Austerity
6-8pm, Sunday, 22nd Sept.
Hanover Room, Brighthelm Centre, North Road

Speakers:
Peter Hain MP; Diane Abbott MP; Cat Smith PPC (Lancaster & Fleetwood); Cllr Kate Taylor (Young Labour National Committee)
Chair: Shelly Asquith

What should Labour stand for?
5.30-7.30pm, Sunday, 22nd Sept.
Friends Meeting House, Ship Street

Speakers:
Michael Meacher MP
Lisa Nandy MP
Andy Burnham MP
Billy Hayes

In *The State We Need*, published this month, Michael Meacher offers a thorough blueprint for the future of the British state and society.

Sinn Fein Fringe Meeting:
Towards a new Ireland
5.45pm, Sunday, 22nd September
Best Western Brighton Hotel
143-145 Kings Rd, Brighton
BN2 2PQ
(5 minutes from conference centre)

Speakers:
Alex Maskey MLA, Sinn Fein
Vernon Coker MP,
Shadow Norther Ireland Secretary
Chair: Jayne Fisher

Primary purpose?
According to Obama ‘guru’ Arnie Graf, the key to empowering Labour members is open primaries. How does this work? Party members would still be expected to pay some £45 per year, put in countless voluntary hours – and yet have no more influence in choosing a candidate than anyone who walks in off the street, who might support the Tories anyway!
Yet this apparent naivety does not stop here. Apparently, primaries will result in more working class candidates. Yet even the shadowy right-wing faction Labour First estimates that a London mayoral candidate would incur costs of £750,000 in a primary. How many working class candidates could afford that?
To top it all, party bosses say that primaries will lead to more diverse and interesting candidates stepping into the fray. But expect a beauty contest of personalities. Party members would likely reject celebrities such as Eddie Izzard and Richard Branson as candidates – underneath the spin, they have few concrete policies to offer. But they would see their chances in an open primary, keep schtum, and pump their own money into campaigns as policy-lite as Boris Johnson’s.

Blairites blast unions
The mask slipped in a Progress editorial this week, as the misnamed pro-business faction outed themselves as deeply hostile to the unions. In their view, Ed should show the unions who is boss in what they see as a “Clause IV moment”.
They want a “one member, one vote” system for electing the Party Leader - which, in reality, means disenfranchising trade union members. They want to curb the unions’ involvement on the NEC and at Conference. And they want a “primary” option for all parliamentary selections. In other words, they don’t want a Labour Party - they want an SDP Mark II.

If in doubt, call a card vote!
Sometimes a chair only seems to see part of the conference hall and declares votes ‘lost’ when, to others, they are visibly carried – or vice versa. On such occasions delegates should go to the rostrum on a point of order, and demand a card vote. Page eight of the Delegates’ Report makes it clear that delegates have this right.

50:50 vision?
Last year 50% of conference time was devoted to platform speakers. Only 18% was allotted to delegates for moving motions and debate. And yet party managers often say there isn't enough time for more speeches. So where are the time limits for platform speakers? And why did senior NEC members rule out red lights for shadow ministers? We deserve to be told.