

**Tuesday  
11 July 2023**

**Volume 736  
No. 188**



**HOUSE OF COMMONS  
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**PARLIAMENTARY  
DEBATES  
(HANSARD)**

**Tuesday 11 July 2023**

---



# House of Commons

*Tuesday 11 July 2023*

*The House met at half-past Eleven o'clock*

## PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

## Oral Answers to Questions

### HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

*The Secretary of State was asked—*

#### NHS Dentists: North Shropshire

1. **Helen Morgan** (North Shropshire) (LD): What progress his Department has made on improving access to NHS dentists in North Shropshire constituency. [905889]

**The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Barclay):** Last year, we announced a number of reforms to the NHS dental system, making the NHS more attractive and helping patients to access care. Treatments and dental care delivered in England went up by a fifth between 2021 and 2022.

**Helen Morgan:** In North Shropshire, the number of adults seen by a dentist between 2019 and 2022 fell by more than 10%, from 47.5% to 35.4%, and the number of children seen by a dentist in that time has fallen by just about 10%, from 59% to 49.8%. Constituents report not being able to access a dentist, and are being turned away from their NHS dentists as they seek to take on only private work. Can the Secretary of State reassure me that he is taking steps to ensure that dentists in rural areas will continue to provide NHS services, because this healthcare problem will continue into the future?

**Steve Barclay:** We recognise that we need to do more. That is why we are making NHS dentistry more attractive by creating more bands of units of dental activity, having a minimum UDA value, and increasing to 110% the amount of activity that dentists can do. Indeed, Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin NHS trust, for example, was above the national average in the 24 months until June 2022. We are putting reforms in place to build more capacity.

#### Elective Care Waiting Times

2. **Ruth Cadbury** (Brentford and Isleworth) (Lab): What steps his Department is taking to reduce waiting times for NHS treatments. [905890]

15. **Mr Gagan Mohindra** (South West Hertfordshire) (Con): What recent progress he has made on reducing the number of patients waiting more than 18 months for elective care. [905904]

**The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Barclay):** The elective recovery plan sets out clear steps to eliminate long waits, and that is supported by £8 billion of revenue funding and £5.9 billion in capital over three years.

**Ruth Cadbury:** The waiting list for elective care has risen to more than 7 million people, including one constituent who is unable to work while waiting months for an orthopaedic assessment, and another who has been waiting three years for a prostate operation. Both have had to seek emergency care while they wait for an agonisingly long time. Is it not true that the longer the Conservatives stay in power, the longer patients will wait?

**Steve Barclay:** On the last bit of the question, the average waits in Wales are 20.4 weeks as of April, and in England they are 13.8 weeks, which is the exact opposite of the point the hon. Lady raises. We are taking action. We are boosting diagnostic capacity; 111 community diagnostic centres are now open. We are increasing treatment capacity through our surgical hubs programme. We are giving patients choice, which is not available in Wales under the Labour Administration—we are giving them more choice. We are also making better use of the independent sector, which some on the Labour Front Bench support but others do not.

**Mr Mohindra:** One of my constituents has now been waiting 14 months for a hysterectomy, while another waited years to receive a much-needed hip replacement. That is way over the 18-week standard set out by the NHS Constitution. Can the Secretary of State tell the House what is being done to get wait times down to that 18-week mark?

**Steve Barclay:** We recognise the challenges from the pandemic, and that is why we are boosting capacity, particularly through our community diagnostic centres. The additional capacity has already delivered more than 4 million extra tests and scans. We are rolling that programme out with the target of 160, and 111 are already in place.

#### Cancer Outcome Targets

3. **Mr John Baron** (Basildon and Billericay) (Con): What steps he is taking to implement section 5 of the Health and Care Act 2022. [905891]

**The Minister for Social Care (Helen Whately):** In accordance with section 5 of the Health and Care Act 2022, the Secretary of State's mandate to NHS England for this year set out ambitious objectives to improve outcomes for cancer patients, including the specific aims of improving one-year and five-year survival of all cancers.

**Mr Baron:** Many on the Conservative Benches are pleased that section 5 is finally being implemented, but we would urge the Government to ensure, when consulting on the NHS mandate, that the focus is on outcomes such as the one-year survival rate to encourage earlier diagnosis, and is not watered down in favour of softer objectives such as patient experience surveys, because patients may not be aware of how badly the NHS compares on international survival rates, as recent research from the King's Fund has shown.

**Helen Whately:** I congratulate my hon. Friend on his commitment to ensuring that we are focused on cancer outcomes and on his successful campaign for that to be included in the NHS mandate, which it has been, as I just mentioned. The best way to improve outcomes for cancers is by catching cancer early. That is one reason why we have a range of metrics, including process metrics, which measure early diagnosis and therefore help us to achieve our ambitions on outcomes. Other metrics such as patient experience are important as well.

**Derek Twigg** (Halton) (Lab): I agree with the hon. Member for Basildon and Billericay (Mr Baron). One of the problems is the time it takes from the GP's referral to the consultant at the hospital and the treatment then starting; there are still concerns about delays in that. What is the Minister doing to speed up the process from not just the GP's referral to the consultant but from the consultant to treatment starting?

**Helen Whately:** The hon. Member is right that the duration is very important. One reason why we are focused so much on increasing early diagnosis is because we know that the sooner we diagnose people, the more likely they are to have a successful outcome from cancer treatment. We are seeing improvements in cancer survival. For instance, in 2010, two thirds of people would survive for one year after a cancer diagnosis; now the figure is three quarters. The NHS is working very hard on further improving cancer diagnosis, and we have reduced the number of people waiting more than 62 days since the pandemic by over a third.

### Cervical Screening and Ovarian Cancer

4. **Mrs Sharon Hodgson** (Washington and Sunderland West) (Lab): What steps he is taking to increase awareness of (a) cervical screening and (b) ovarian cancer. [905892]

**The Minister for Social Care (Helen Whately):** We are catching more cancers early than ever before, and work to raise awareness of cancer signs and symptoms, screening programmes and investment in early diagnosis are all playing their part. We fund community events to raise awareness of ovarian cancer, and NHS England is working to increase cervical screening take-up by providing more convenient appointments, including at weekends and evenings.

**Mrs Hodgson:** I thank the Minister for that answer, but Target Ovarian Cancer has found that 40% of women in the UK wrongly believe that their smear test will detect ovarian cancer. There is currently no viable screening process for ovarian cancer. However, messaging remains unclear when women are going for their smear test. What steps are being taken to ensure that information provided at such screening is clear?

**Helen Whately:** On the one hand, cervical screening is incredibly important and very effective at saving lives from cervical cancer—we estimate that it saves around 5,000 lives per year. There is no evidence to support a screening programme for ovarian cancer, and I will take away the hon. Lady's question about whether there should be communications about that when people go for a cervical smear.

### Vaping: Young People

5. **Alex Cunningham** (Stockton North) (Lab): What steps he is taking to tackle vaping by young people. [905893]

**The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Barclay):** The hon. Gentleman raises a point of concern across the House that we recognise. That is why we have already taken action, through £3 million to crack down on those selling vapes illegally to children, closing the loophole that allowed free samples to be offered to children, and our call for evidence, so that we can examine what further measures we can take, particularly on the concerns about disposable vapes, which are prevalent among children.

**Alex Cunningham:** That is helpful, but Labour proposed a new clause to the Health and Care Bill that would have given the Government the primary powers needed to stop the use of sweet names such as gummy bears and Skittles, bright colours and cartoon characters on packaging and labelling of e-cigarettes. The Minister will agree that such promotion aimed directly at young people is highly unacceptable and takes us back to the worst days of cigarette advertising. If the Government are so committed to acting in this space, why did they vote down that new clause?

**Steve Barclay:** As I say, we have already taken action. We took measures in April, and the Prime Minister announced further measures in May. We are keen to follow the evidence. That is why we have had a call for evidence. The ministerial team are looking extremely closely at this, and we will take further action to clamp down on something that we all recognise is a risk to children, which is why we are acting on it.

**Maggie Throup** (Erewash) (Con): Vapes are smoking-cessation products; they are not confectionery to be sold to children or a way of replacing one generation hooked on nicotine with another. Will my right hon. Friend update the House on the progress that the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency has made on licensing e-cigarettes and other inhaled nicotine-containing products as medicines, which would put out a strong message that vaping is a dangerous pastime?

**Steve Barclay:** As a former Health Minister, my hon. Friend is well aware of the risks posed by vaping. As the chief medical officer has said,

"If you smoke, vaping is much safer; if you don't smoke, don't vape".

That is why we are toughening up the regime. We are also working with industry as part of our call for evidence, but we are clear on the need to go further. That is exactly what we will do.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the SNP spokesperson.

**Martyn Day** (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) (SNP): Youngsters who try e-cigarettes are at much greater risk of both nicotine addiction and later going on to use tobacco itself, so what consideration have this Government given to banning disposable vapes completely as a way of protecting our young people?

**Steve Barclay:** Again, I agree that disposable vapes are a particular concern: in our view, the growth in youth vaping is largely due to the growth in the use of disposable vapes. That is why we have particularly focused on that issue in our call for evidence, and that is what we are considering.

### City-centre GP Premises

**6. Daisy Cooper (St Albans) (LD):** What assessment he has made of the potential impact of guidance issued by District Valuer Services on the availability of city-centre GP premises. [905894]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Neil O'Brien):** While it is a very long-standing system, we keep the approach to funding for GP premises under review. We have taken action in the primary care recovery plan to improve access to section 106 funds, so that new homes always come with the GP infrastructure that is needed.

**Daisy Cooper:** The Secretary of State and his Ministers will know that I first raised this issue in the Chamber on 6 June this year. Integrated care boards, GPs, and now the medical property sector are all telling me that the Treasury rules are out of date and are a massive block to securing much-needed primary care premises in the right places, particularly in city centres such as St Albans. When I have asked the Department via written parliamentary questions for its assessment of how much of a problem this issue is, the Department has told me that it just does not know. Could the Minister please tell us when he will be speaking to colleagues in the Treasury to resolve this issue, so that we can make sure that GP premises are secured where people need them most?

**Neil O'Brien:** We talk all the time. I am conscious that there are 60% more full-time patient-facing staff in the hon. Lady's constituency than there were in 2019, which of course puts pressure on premises. The capital allocation for her local ICB between 2022-23 and 2024-25 was £200 million, so the money is there, but I am happy to continue the conversation about how we get the premises in the places where we need them.

### Pharmacy Services

**7. Chris Green (Bolton West) (Con):** What recent progress he has made on increasing the range of services in pharmacies. [905895]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Neil O'Brien):** We have already been growing the range of NHS services available in pharmacies: we have set up the community pharmacist consultation service, the discharge medicines service, the new medicine service, the blood pressure check service, smoking-cessation services and the contraception service. We are now investing £645 million to go further through the new Pharmacy First scheme for common conditions.

**Chris Green:** I thank my hon. Friend for his answer, but does he agree that the services offered by pharmacies can be made more efficient? For example, 62 million prescription items are subject to "split and snip" per year. That is where, to get the right number of pills, a

pack has to be manually opened up for a couple of pills to be snipped out, then repackaged and relabelled before being reissued. The spare pills are often thrown away. Can that system not be better?

**Neil O'Brien:** My hon. Friend is completely correct. That is why at the end of last month we laid a statutory instrument before the House to fix the system, so that pharmacists can spend more time using their skills to provide high-end clinical services and less time snipping blister packs.

**John Cryer (Leyton and Wanstead) (Lab):** Given the national shortage of GPs, does the Minister recognise that there is a potential danger in asking pharmacists to take on the duties of GPs—duties that they are not necessarily qualified to undertake—especially given the already large workload undertaken by pharmacists?

**Neil O'Brien:** We absolutely recognise the need for patient safety, which is why there will be clear patient group directions and clear pathways about what pharmacists do. They are not taking on the role of GPs, but are providing additional services that will make things more convenient for all of our constituents.

**Dame Maria Miller (Basingstoke) (Con):** I warmly welcome the Government's commitment to investing £645 million to enable pharmacists to provide for far more common conditions. I have already visited one of my own local surgeries, the Shakespeare Road medical practice, and seen at first hand how pharmacists are already working in GP surgeries to try to reduce waiting times. Surely, more surgeries should be doing the same, involving pharmacists with enhanced roles in order to cut waiting times in a manner that is safe.

**Neil O'Brien:** My right hon. Friend is completely correct. That £645 million, of course, comes on top of the £100 million that we have already put in. We have grown the pharmacy workforce hugely—there are 82% more pharmacists now than in 2010—and we are also enabling those people with their high-end skills to do more by reforming regulations. That is not just the blister packs issue; we are enabling them to do convenient things such as hand out bagged medicines even if the pharmacist is not present.

**Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP):** Will the Minister undertake to liaise closely with local community pharmacy representative groups to ensure that the excellent work they have been doing can be maximised, particularly given that the NHS is under severe pressure at the moment?

**Neil O'Brien:** Absolutely, and I always try to learn lessons from right across the UK. In fact, some of the ideas for reforms have come from listening to local partners. For example, our reforms to enable modern ways of working, hub-and-spoke dispensing and empowering pharmacy technicians have come from talking to those local partners.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the shadow Minister.

**Karin Smyth (Bristol South) (Lab):** People across the country rely on local, accessible pharmacies, but whether it is high street closures or supply problems leading to the absurd situation where women are phoning or visiting



multiple pharmacies for a prescribed dose of hormone replacement therapy and other drugs, the Government are again letting people down. They have repeatedly announced plans to expand the role of community pharmacies, but have failed to update legislation that could possibly help. They keep collapsing the business in this place, so we have time to sort it. Why will they not do so?

**Neil O'Brien:** I have given a flavour of the four different reforms we are making. To give the wider picture, there are more pharmacies in England than there were in 2010, there are 24,000 more pharmacists in England than there were in 2010 and we are putting in £645 million to provide a bunch of services that were not there when Labour was in office. We are very happy to take lessons from the pharmacy sector, but not from the Labour party.

### Brain Cancer Treatments

**8. Dame Meg Hillier** (Hackney South and Shoreditch) (Lab/Co-op): What steps he is taking to help improve the effectiveness of brain cancer treatments. [905896]

**The Minister for Health and Secondary Care (Will Quince):** We are working closely with research partners, and although I am pleased to say that more research is being funded, we want to see more research in brain cancer treatments. We continue to encourage more researchers to become involved in what remains a challenging scientific area, with a relatively small research community, but I am confident that the Government's continued commitment to funding will help us make progress towards effective treatments.

**Dame Meg Hillier:** I thank the Minister for that answer, and I am sure—and I know—he will take this very seriously. I have had three constituents in the last year come to see me who have suffered serious brain tumours, and they have had a very similar pathway, which is basically that after a certain point there is little the NHS can do for them. In particular, there is a shortage of neuro-oncologists, and one has spent their life savings on private treatment, even though that was difficult to find. Is there any hope, in the NHS workforce plan, that there will be more oncology training and more support for neuro-oncology, because the survival rate for this cancer is still woefully low?

**Will Quince:** I thank the hon. Lady for her question, and I am sorry to hear of the experience of her three constituents. There certainly is hope within the long-term workforce plan. As she rightly alludes to, we are reliant on researchers to submit high-quality research proposals, and that requires clinicians specialising in this area. It is something I take very seriously, and I would be very happy to work with her on it.

**Paul Bristow** (Peterborough) (Con): I refer Members to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests.

My father, the late Alan Bristow, died of a brain tumour in April 2020. He was 77, and that was incredibly sad, but when a child dies of a brain tumour, it is unbelievably wicked. Brain tumours are still the biggest killer of young people. What can the Minister do to

ensure that appropriate funding is being put into research into brain tumours, especially for younger people, and when will the Government respond to the O'Shaughnessy review into clinical trials in the UK, which would help the brain tumour community?

**Will Quince:** I thank my hon. Friend for his question, and I am sorry to hear of his own personal experience. He is absolutely right that, in relation to children, I am very keen to find a way forward. The Government are committed to finding high-quality brain cancer research, and we expect to spend more as new research progresses. The £40 million of funding announced will remain available, and if we can spend more on the best-quality science, we will do so. We worked really closely with Lord O'Shaughnessy on his review, we have accepted his recommendations and we have put in £121 million to support it.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the shadow Secretary of State.

**Wes Streeting** (Ilford North) (Lab): The Minister is aware, I know, of the outstanding campaigning work that my hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh) is doing, not least because of the experience of her sister—our late great friend Margaret McDonagh—with glioblastomas. Over decades now, we have seen no improvements in outcomes, no drug trials of any seriousness and no mandatory training of oncologists. I have learned through experience that, when the McDonaghs come knocking, it is best to say yes, and if anyone says no, they will be hit by this unstoppable steamroller. With that cautionary note in mind, might the Minister be prepared to meet me, my hon. Friend and relevant stakeholders across the Department, NHS England and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence to see what more can be done? There are challenges, I know, but what more can be done to make sure that, for families such as my hon. Friend's and Margaret's, and for thousands of others each year, glioblastomas are not simply a death sentence?

**Will Quince:** I thank the hon. Member for that question and join him in paying tribute to the hon. Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh), especially after the tragic loss of her sister, for all the work that she has done in campaigning on this issue. I have spent significant time on the issue and I have met her, the hon. Member for Leicester West (Liz Kendall), campaigners, charities and other hon. Members from across the House. Funding for research is available and, having spoken with the Secretary of State, I know that he is as keen as I am to work with colleagues from across the House. There are issues that transcend party politics and this is certainly one of them. I would be very happy to meet the shadow Secretary of State, the National Institute for Health and Care Research, NHS England, the Tessa Jowell Brain Cancer Mission and clinical specialists to find a way forward.

### Mental Ill Health: West Yorkshire

**9. Fabian Hamilton** (Leeds North East) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the adequacy of treatments for complex mental health illnesses in West Yorkshire. [905897]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Maria Caulfield):** NHS West Yorkshire integrated care boards have increased their investment in mental health services in line with their overall allocation increase. They have spent more than £591 million in the past financial year on their mental health services.

**Fabian Hamilton:** I thank the Minister for that answer. My constituent, Joanne Allotey, has custody of her young granddaughter, who has complex mental health problems, but local mental health services in Leeds are still chronically underfunded after 13 years of Conservative Government cuts. Will the Minister join me in commending Roundhay high school for the support that it has given the family—this is the same school that the former Prime Minister claimed “let down” children—and commit today to delivering truly effective children’s education, health and care plans?

**Maria Caulfield:** I absolutely pay tribute to the school in the hon. Gentleman’s constituency. I also point out that Red Kite View is a new unit specifically for young people in his constituency. That 22-bed mental health unit opened last year and aims to eliminate out-of-area placements for young children with mental ill health. I am sure that he would welcome that investment in his constituency.

**Sir Charles Walker (Broxbourne) (Con):** The Joint Committee on the Draft Mental Health Bill reported back in January this year. One of the most important recommendations we made was about how people, during a period of wellness, could set out how they wish to be treated during a period of illness. The Government have yet to respond to the Joint Committee, but can we have a mental health Bill in the forthcoming King’s Speech, please?

**Maria Caulfield:** I thank my hon. Friend for raising that issue. There were many recommendations during pre-legislative scrutiny. We are working through those and we hope to be able to respond fully shortly after the summer recess.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the shadow Minister.

**Dr Rosena Allin-Khan (Tooting) (Lab):** As my hon. Friend the Member for Leeds North East (Fabian Hamilton) highlighted, all too often, children are stuck on long waiting lists for treatment. In West Yorkshire, 30,000 children are currently stuck waiting for mental health treatment, and more than 9,000 people have had their mental health referral closed without accessing treatment. Does the Minister find that acceptable? If the answer is no, what will her Government do about it? This picture is not unique to West Yorkshire, but replicated across England. This Government are letting patients down. When is the Minister going to act to tackle the crisis in mental health services?

**Maria Caulfield:** I thank the shadow Minister for her question. To highlight another initiative in West Yorkshire, the Night OWLS—Overnight West Yorkshire Living/Advice Service—helpline has been set up for children and young people. It is open between 8 pm and 8 am seven days a week for young people to access, in addition to the 24/7 helpline that is available. I am sure that the shadow Minister will also welcome the fact that we have more

than 400 mental health support teams in schools in England, covering 3 million children, so that they can access mental health support directly at school.

### Health Inequalities

**10. Kate Osborne (Jarrow) (Lab):** What steps he is taking to help tackle health inequalities. [905898]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Neil O’Brien):** We are tackling the root causes of health inequalities. We have doubled the duty on cigarettes and brought in a minimum excise tax on the cheapest cigarettes. That has helped to drive down smoking rates from 21% to a record low of 13%. We are going further, helping a million smokers with our scheme to get people to stop smoking and start vaping. We have provided £40 million to start rolling out new weight-loss drugs and, in the major conditions strategy, we will talk further about how we will tackle health inequalities.

**Kate Osborne:** People in the north-east die younger than people in the rest of England and spend more years in ill health. Increased NHS waiting times leaves them on medication for longer. The north-east has the highest level of people living in poverty, leaving many of my constituents unable to afford prescription charges. Some have told me that they are taking paracetamol instead of prescribed medication, worsening health inequalities. Will the Minister commit to scrapping these unfair prescription charges?

**Neil O’Brien:** Nine out of 10 prescriptions are not paid for, but free at the point of delivery. On the various important points that the hon. Lady makes, tackling health inequalities is hugely important to us. That is why we are creating 160 extra community diagnostic centres, which are targeted at areas of the highest deprivation. It is why we are rolling out targeted lung health checks in 43 areas of the most deprivation. It is also why we are providing cost of living support worth about £3,300 for the average household in this country. It is one of the most generous schemes anywhere in Europe, exactly to tackle those cost of living pressures and health inequalities.

**Mr Louie French (Old Bexley and Sidcup) (Con):** My hon. Friend will be aware that health inequalities can also be geographical within the south-east, with boroughs such as Bexley having historically received less funding than other parts of London. Does he therefore agree that further investment in the fantastic Queen Mary’s Hospital Sidcup would address that issue and improve health outcomes for people in south-east London?

**Neil O’Brien:** My hon. Friend is assiduous in making the case for his constituency. Ministers of course will meet him to discuss this matter. I know he is closely following the progress of the CDC bid, which we have been talking about. Those diagnostic centres are doing fantastic work to get earlier diagnosis and save more lives, particularly in areas of deprivation.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the shadow Minister.

**Andrew Gwynne (Denton and Reddish) (Lab):** From this complacent Minister’s replies already, one would think that health inequalities in England were improving, not widening. Last year, 11,000 people, including 312 children, were hospitalised for malnutrition in the

United Kingdom. That is the highest number since comparable records began. Why are so many people in Britain going hungry under the Tories?

**Neil O'Brien:** We need to have care in discussing these subjects. Eating disorders are a sensitive subject and the statistics the hon. Gentleman is quoting are a mix of different things. I have already talked about the £3,300 of cost of living support that this Government are providing to the average UK household, with more targeted help for more vulnerable households. It is something we are seized of and are working on.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the SNP spokesperson.

**Martyn Day** (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) (SNP): Millions of people with disabilities or serious medical conditions rely on specialist equipment, such as ventilators or home dialysis, which personally costs them more money to run, while giving considerable savings to NHS hospitals. Will the Minister urge Cabinet colleagues in the Department for Work and Pensions to help to tackle health inequalities by ensuring that those people receive a fair and timely reimbursement for those additional costs, which are essential to run the equipment to help keep them alive?

**Neil O'Brien:** Absolutely. We are conscious of the additional needs of people who have equipment like that. By the end of June, the Government had covered nearly half of a typical household's energy bill through the support schemes we put in place, but we are always looking at what more we can do to help vulnerable households.

#### Primary Care

11. **Ian Byrne** (Liverpool, West Derby) (Lab): What assessment his Department has made of the potential impact of primary care service closures on public health. [905900]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Neil O'Brien):** Each integrated care board is required to ensure access to GP services for all. Overall, more people are being seen in general practice than ever before—about 10% more than before the pandemic—but where some practices close, the local ICB has to ensure that patients are transferred smoothly to other practices.

**Ian Byrne:** Park View medical centre in West Derby, one of the most deprived areas of my city, is facing imminent closure, and there has been a lack of transparency and accountability throughout the process when dealing with the ICB to get the decision reversed. In the Minister's reply to my letter, he said it was essential that, if a GP surgery closes, it does not lead to a reduction in the quality of care for patients in the locality. Park View patients have been clear that dispersal to other surgeries would be catastrophic, especially when all GPs are already facing huge pressures. Will the Minister urgently intervene to halt the closure due to the legal insufficiency of the consultation process and meet me and patients?

**Neil O'Brien:** I have looked carefully at that case, on which the hon. Gentleman has been campaigning. The incumbent provider chose not to bid for the future contract for Park View medical centre, and NHS Cheshire and Merseyside decided that the best thing was to help patients to transfer to neighbouring practices. Patients

will only be transferred to practices rated as good, and there are 10 other practices rated as good within a 1-mile radius of Park View. Since 2019, there has been an increase in the number of patient-facing staff of about 50% in the constituency. That means there are more people in his GP surgeries. We are working hard to ensure high-quality GP services in his constituency.

**Virginia Crosbie** (Ynys Môn) (Con): Health is devolved to Labour in Cardiff. Ynys Môn is represented by five Members of the Senedd, yet health represents a third of my postbag, particularly relating to access to primary care in Holyhead. Does the Minister agree that families in Holyhead are not getting the healthcare they need and deserve?

**Neil O'Brien:** Yes, it is true, I am afraid. People are about twice as likely to be waiting for treatment in the Welsh NHS. Waits are also longer in Wales, with 30,000 people waiting more than two years for treatment, even though those have been eliminated in England. England spends more on general practice than Scotland or Wales, despite the fact that Wales has 20% more funding, and England has also grown spending on general practice faster than either Scotland or Wales. We are highly focused on getting good primary care services in England. There are always lessons that we can learn from each other, but there are definitely lessons that Welsh Labour can learn from the English NHS.

#### Vaccine Development and Evaluation

12. **Neale Hanvey** (Kirkcaldy and Cowdenbeath) (Alba): What steps his Department is taking to create a vaccine development and evaluation centre. [905901]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Maria Caulfield):** The vaccine development and evaluation centre, backed by £65 million for state-of-the-art facilities, at the Porton Down site has been operational since early last year. It supported the autumn vaccine roll-out and the spring vaccine roll-out earlier this year.

**Neale Hanvey:** In November 2021, Dame Kate Bingham rightly called the decision to withdraw support for the Valneva whole virus vaccine “inexplicable” because a broad portfolio of vaccines is important as we move forward against future variants. The British Society for Immunology states that there is an urgent need for second and third-generation covid vaccines, including universal mucosal vaccines with longer-lasting protective immunity. With growing public concern and mounting clinical and scientific evidence of vaccine injury from mRNA, why is the UK not seeking to harness the power of all technologies instead of establishing an inexplicable exclusive relationship with Moderna?

**Maria Caulfield:** I confirm to the hon. Gentleman that, in the recent spring campaign, we deployed four approved vaccines—Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, Novavax and Sanofi-GSK—as part of our roll-out. We are using a range of vaccines to protect us from the pandemic.

#### Young People's Mental Health: Housing

13. **Sir Edward Leigh** (Gainsborough) (Con): Whether his Department has made an assessment with Cabinet colleagues of the potential impact of the availability of housing on young people's mental health. [905902]



**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Maria Caulfield):** We are working with a number of Government Departments, including the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, to tackle the effect of housing insecurity on young people's mental health.

**Sir Edward Leigh:** The mental health of young people is being impacted by the fact that net migration is far too high and we are not building nearly enough houses. The Government need to take action on that, but young people worry that, with an ageing population, the health service will not be able to provide for them in future. May I commend to the Minister the excellent paper published by the former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair, which suggests things such as co-payments and personalised apps? Would it not be ironic if a former Labour Prime Minister were more radical on reform of the NHS than a Conservative Government?

**Maria Caulfield:** Actually, under this Government, last year, the number of first-time buyers passed the 400,000 mark, which is the highest number in 19 years. I will not take any lectures from a former Labour Prime Minister because when Labour was in government it saddled the NHS with a £10 billion failed IT system that never saw the light of day, an £80 billion failed private finance initiative contract that NHS trusts are still paying for, and a GP contract that enabled opt-out at weekends and evenings, which patients still suffer from.

**Sarah Olney (Richmond Park) (LD):** Today marks the three-year anniversary of the death of Tom Pirie, who tragically took his own life just days after being assessed as at low risk of doing so by his counsellor. Over the last few years, I have been working with Tom's father Philip on his campaign to improve suicide risk assessment procedure, particularly in view of the upcoming 10-year suicide prevention strategy review. Will the Minister join me in paying tribute to Tom's life and Philip's excellent work in his memory by providing us with an update as to when we can expect the review to be published?

**Maria Caulfield:** I absolutely pay tribute to Tom and to his father. I reassure him that we have many campaigners. Only last week, we received the baton of hope at No. 10 from those campaigning to reduce the number of suicides in this country. We are working on the suicide prevention plan and hope to be able to publish it very soon.

### Hormone Replacement Therapy

14. **Carolyn Harris (Swansea East) (Lab):** What steps he is taking to tackle shortages in hormone replacement therapy. [905903]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Maria Caulfield):** We continue to engage regularly with our suppliers to prevent and mitigate supply issues in the short term. We have over 70 HRT products. The vast majority are available. We have two that have serious shortage protocols attached to them, but we are hoping to improve supply on those very soon.

**Carolyn Harris:** Although shortages of Utrogestan are ongoing, there is no alternative progesterone product recommended on the serious shortage protocol. Taking oestrogen without progesterone can be dangerous. Provera is a synthetic progesterone alternative to Utrogestan, but it is not included on the HRT prepayment certificate. Will the Minister commit to placing Provera on the list of products covered by the prepayment certificate as a priority and issue a public health warning highlighting the risks of taking oestrogen without progesterone?

**Maria Caulfield:** We are in the process of issuing another bulletin to both GPs and pharmacists on the serious shortage protocols and to make clear the alternatives available. That is a clinical decision. I will certainly look at the issue of Provera because medicines have to tick off a number of criteria to be eligible for the prepayment certificate. I will certainly look into that particular drug on the hon. Lady's behalf.

### Social Care Workforce

16. **Sir Desmond Swayne (New Forest West) (Con):** What steps he is taking to increase the social care workforce. [905905]

**The Minister for Social Care (Helen Whately):** Social care depends on the skills and compassion of our care workforce. That is why we are investing £250 million in reforming care as a career, with a new care qualification, specialist training courses for experienced care workers and a new career structure to support progression, alongside increased funding for social care, our national recruitment campaign and the care worker visa.

**Sir Desmond Swayne:** We need many, many more domiciliary care workers. How will we get them?

**Helen Whately:** My right hon. Friend is right. We have some good news: Skills for Care data shows that home care job vacancies are falling—something I hear when I speak to home care providers. Looking ahead to next winter, I want every local authority to have enough home care on hand. That is why I emphasised the importance of home care when we distributed £600 million of discharge funding to local councils and NHS organisations in April. We are asking all local authorities to plan ahead and book enough home care in advance for this coming winter.

**Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op):** Is this not the very day to thank our care workers up and down the country? So many families depend on those people who toil away, day by day, visiting houses, often not being paid in between their visits. Could we look closely at recruitment and the agencies involved? Let us get real pay for care workers up, now.

**Helen Whately:** I think that every day is a good day to thank our care workers for their skills, compassion and hard work. We gave social care a record funding settlement of up to £7.5 billion in the autumn statement, which is being used to help local authorities increase the fees that they pay to care providers, in turn enabling care providers to pay their workforce better. That is going hand in hand with extra funding to support discharge into social care this winter and our reforms for the care workforce.

### Care Settings: Family Visits

17. **Dan Carden** (Liverpool, Walton) (Lab): What steps he is taking to ensure that people in care settings are permitted family visits. [905906]

**The Minister for Social Care (Helen Whately):** I know how important it is for people in care homes, hospitals and hospices to see their family and friends. The majority of health and care providers follow national guidance. I do not want anyone to worry about not being able to visit a loved one, which is why in June we launched a consultation to change the law on visiting.

**Dan Carden:** As the Minister knows, last month I introduced my ten-minute rule Bill, the Care Supporters Bill, to make sure that we recognise in law the value of the care of a loved one. Will her consultation differentiate between a care supporter and a visitor? Currently, the Care Quality Commission does not investigate individual cases. Will it have the power to do that in future?

**Helen Whately:** First, I commend the hon. Member for his campaign on this issue. He has been a powerful advocate and draws on his own experience, as do I. He is probably asking me to pre-empt the outcome of the consultation. I encourage him and others concerned about this matter to put their views into that consultation, and we will respond once it is closed.

### International Health Regulations

18. **Esther McVey** (Tatton) (Con): What recent progress he has made in negotiations with the World Health Organisation on proposed amendments to the International Health Regulations 2005. [905907]

**The Minister for Health and Secondary Care (Will Quince):** The UK continues to negotiate on amendments, alongside other member states of the World Health Organisation. We want to ensure that the International Health Regulations are effective in preventing and responding to potential health threats, leaving the UK better prepared for future health emergencies. We anticipate negotiations to continue until the 77th World Health Assembly in May next year.

**Esther McVey:** Will the Minister assure me that the proposed changes to the International Health Regulations being negotiated will not give new rule-making powers, such as those tabled by Bangladesh, to the WHO director general to make binding directions on matters including border closures, quarantining and vaccine passports? Even the WHO's own expert review committee has raised concerns over such significant increases in power.

**Will Quince:** As my right hon. Friend will know, the UK has a strong commitment and duty to implement international law, but on this matter we have been absolutely clear. I can certainly assure her that we will not sign up to any IHR amendment or any other instrument that would compromise the UK's ability to make domestic decisions on national measures concerning public health.

**Andrew Bridgen** (North West Leicestershire) (Reclaim): Can the Minister confirm whether the House will get a vote on the amendments to the International Health Regulations, or will we not?

**Will Quince:** Should the UK Government wish to accept an IHR amendment, changes to domestic law to reflect proposed obligations may indeed be required. The Government would therefore prepare draft legislation and bring it before Parliament in the usual way. Let me repeat that in all circumstances, the sovereignty of the UK Parliament would remain unchanged and the UK would retain control of any future decisions around national public health measures.

### Coroners: Stillbirths

19. **Tim Loughton** (East Worthing and Shoreham) (Con): If he will publish the results of the consultation on giving powers to coroners to investigate stillbirths. [905908]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Maria Caulfield):** The consultation on giving powers to coroners to investigate stillbirths received 334 responses, including from bereaved parents, charities, the Chief Coroner, clinicians and a range of other organisations.

**Tim Loughton:** Mr Speaker, you are very familiar with the problems over the implementation of my Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths (Registration etc) Act 2019, which passed this House in February 2019. Section 4 remains incomplete. The consultation was completed in June 2019. Mr Speaker, you are aware that I made six attempts to get a meeting with the Minister and a Justice Minister. Eventually, I got it in March, after the Leader of the House intervened. Four months on, I have heard nothing and the consultation remains unpublished. What will it take to get this legislation, which everyone wants and which was passed unanimously, into law?

**Maria Caulfield:** I thank my hon. Friend for his work in this space and I apologise for the delay in publishing the consultation. I met him along with a Justice Minister, and I assure him that we hope to publish it very soon.

### Topical Questions

T1. [905914] **Mrs Flick Drummond** (Meon Valley) (Con): If he will make a statement on his departmental responsibilities.

**The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Barclay):** Last week, on behalf of the Government, I signed a landmark partnership agreement with the pharmaceutical giant BioNTech. It aims to deliver 10,000 personalised mRNA cancer immunotherapies, including vaccines, to UK patients by 2030. This work will harness the groundbreaking mRNA technology that BioNTech used in its world-first cancer vaccine. Cancer vaccines work by stimulating patients' immune systems to recognise and eliminate cancer cells, preventing their spread. Trials for BioNTech's colorectal cancer vaccine are under way at multiple sites across the UK. To accelerate trials further, BioNTech is partnering with NHS England's new cancer vaccine launch pad, a platform that makes it easier for both early and late stage cancer patients to join vaccine trials. In the coming years, hundreds of patients identified by the launch pad will join trials for BioNTech's personalised cancer therapies, broadening the treatment options available to cancer patients. I hope the whole House will welcome the opportunity the deal offers future patients.

**Mrs Drummond:** The announcement that a new hospital between Winchester and Basingstoke is going ahead is much welcomed by my constituents who will use it, as well as by those from other constituencies. It will provide a centre of excellence with better medical outcomes. Will my right hon. Friend meet local MPs, so we can update him on why the hospital needs to be built as soon as possible?

**Steve Barclay:** I am always very happy for my hon. Friend and other colleagues to meet me or Lord Markham, who leads the capital programme. It is an important scheme. We are delivering it through the standardised Hospital 2.0 approach, using modern methods of construction. We are keen to progress early supported works on site, working closely with colleagues.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the shadow Secretary of State.

**Wes Streeting** (Ilford North) (Lab): Last week, the Health Secretary said that he was willing to offer doctors a higher pay rise. Last night, the Chancellor slapped him down, saying that any increased offer will have to be paid for by cuts. How can the Health Secretary negotiate an end to the NHS strikes when he cannot even negotiate with his own Chancellor?

**Steve Barclay:** We have been clear throughout that Government decisions on the pay review bodies' recommendations are taken on a cross-Government basis. The agreement that we reached with the largest group of NHS staff, those on "Agenda for Change", has demonstrated that we are willing to work constructively with trade union colleagues, but the demand from junior doctors for a 35% increase is not affordable—indeed, the hon. Gentleman himself has said that he does not support it.

**Wes Streeting:** But the worst strikes in the history of the NHS are still to come. The impact of the junior doctors' strikes and the consultants' strikes will be devastating for patients. The Secretary of State has failed to stop these strikes for seven months. He has lost the confidence of nurses, radiologists, junior doctors and consultants, and he cannot even successfully negotiate with his Chancellor, so what is his plan to stop these strikes going ahead?

**Steve Barclay:** The hon. Gentleman's message is not even consistent with what he said at the weekend in the media: that he was not in a position to offer more money to the NHS, and that the shadow Chancellor had made that clear—in a vain attempt to demonstrate some sort of fiscal responsibility. The hon. Gentleman has been clear that he does not support the 35% demand from doctors in training. We are demonstrating that we are working constructively with groups such as the "Agenda for Change" group—the largest staff group, made up of over 1 million staff—with which we have reached a deal. We have also been responding constructively to the British Medical Association's principal demand for consultants, which was for changes to pension taxation. We are willing to engage constructively with trade union colleagues, but the 35% demand is not affordable. He needs to decide on his position. Which is it: his position at the weekend that the Opposition are not offering more money, or his position today, which seems to be that they will?

T2. [905915] **David Johnston** (Wantage) (Con): I have campaigned for more health services for my constituents since I was elected, and 97% of those who responded to my recent health services survey felt that we did not have enough doctors for the number of people in the constituency. Will my hon. Friend meet me to discuss how to sort this out and get my constituents the health services that they deserve?

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care** (Neil O'Brien): We are conscious that more is going on in general practice than ever before. There are 10% more appointments than before the pandemic, as well as 29,000 extra clinicians and nearly 2,000 more doctors, but we are conscious of the pressures that puts on the estate locally. I would be very happy to meet and have further conversations with my hon. Friend.

T3. [905916] **Kirsten Oswald** (East Renfrewshire) (SNP): I am sure that the Secretary of State shares my concern that school nurses report increasing rates of children presenting with health issues resulting from poor nutrition. In Scotland, the SNP Government have rolled out universal free school meals for all pupils in primary years 1 to 5 and special schools, and the expansion of the programme continues. What discussion has the Secretary of State had with Cabinet colleagues about following Scotland's lead and expanding free school meal provision in England to improve children's health and wellbeing?

**Steve Barclay:** Of course we have regular discussions, not just with Cabinet colleagues, but with our counterparts across the UK. I had a meeting just yesterday with Health Ministers, including my counterpart in Scotland, on the shared challenges. On the issue that the hon. Lady raises, as the Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, my hon. Friend the Member for Harborough (Neil O'Brien) said a moment ago, we are providing significant support for households—over £3,300 in support—but we also have measures that target schools, including holiday support measures and wider health and wellbeing measures, such as our significant investment in school sport.

T4. [905917] **Julian Sturdy** (York Outer) (Con): The Minister is fully aware of Bupa's decision to close its dental clinic in York, at Holgate Park. I put on record my thanks to him for working with me to find a solution for those constituents affected by the decision. What is being done to reassess out-of-date dental contracts, so that we can ensure that increased demand is met and that my constituents get the access to dental care that they deserve?

**Steve Barclay:** We are taking action, which is why the Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, my hon. Friend the Member for Harborough met my hon. Friend recently. In his area of Humber and North Yorkshire, there has been an increase in the number of children seen by NHS dentists over the previous 12 months, so the picture is improving, but we recognise that there is more to do; that is why we have made a number of reforms to the dental contract and why we will announce further plans shortly.



**Mike Kane** (Wythenshawe and Sale East) (Lab): A recent freedom of information request by the Labour party revealed that mental health patients were left waiting more than 5.4 million hours for treatment in A&E last year. Last week, one of my constituents spent five days in A&E waiting for a bed on a psychiatric ward. When will the Government bring an end to this shameful situation?

**Steve Barclay:** We are taking significant action on mental health, which is why we are investing £2.3 billion more, compared with four years ago. We have targeted measures as part of our urgent and emergency care recovery plan, including 100 mental health ambulances. We are putting in additional capacity, such as crisis cafés, to support emergency departments. We are also making mental health support available through 111 for the first time, which will allow us to get to issues early, before people are admitted to hospital.

T5. [905918] **Matt Vickers** (Stockton South) (Con): I was delighted when the Government awarded Stockton a new £25 million diagnostic hub, but my local Labour council, which is a partner in delivering the project, appears happy to accept months of delays in completing it. Does my hon. Friend agree that Labour's delays could cost lives? Will he work with me to ensure that all partners understand the urgency of the project?

**The Minister for Health and Secondary Care (Will Quince):** That is hugely frustrating, because I know how hard my hon. Friend campaigned for the Stockton community diagnostic centre and that he recognises the urgency of increasing diagnostic capacity locally. Delivery plans have to be agreed at a local level, so I urge Stockton council to work with him to meet the ambitious timeline and get Stockton CDC open as soon as possible.

**Steven Bonnar** (Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill) (SNP): A recent report by the Trussell Trust warns that people facing hunger are more likely to be affected by spiralling debt and a decline in their physical and mental health. The same report shows that one in seven people in the UK faced hunger in the last year due to a lack of money. Will the Minister make representations to his colleagues at the Department for Work and Pensions about increasing support for low-income households, thereby improving public health outcomes for all?

**Neil O'Brien:** It is to protect public health that we have provided cost of living support worth £3,300 on average per household, and that is why we have been paying about half of people's average electricity and other energy bills. However, we always look at further things we can do to drive improvements in public health.

T7. [905922] **Andrew Lewer** (Northampton South) (Con): What steps is the Department taking to prevent chronic kidney disease, given that the recent report published by Kidney Research UK predicts a significant rise in cases of kidney failure in 10 years' time?

**The Minister for Social Care (Helen Whately):** In the last three years, the National Institute for Health and Care Research has invested more than £30 million in kidney disease research. NHS England is following a

national approach to reduce healthcare inequalities, with a specific focus on some of the risk factors for kidney disease, such as chronic respiratory disease. As diabetes is the most common cause of kidney disease, it will be a focus of our major conditions strategy.

**Marsha De Cordova** (Battersea) (Lab): Four in 10 people who visit low vision clinics have been diagnosed with clinical depression. It is vital that blind and partially sighted people have access to psychological therapies throughout their sight loss journey to address the impacts. However, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidance does not include psychological support in the eye care pathway. Will the Secretary of State commit to reviewing the NICE guidance to ensure that psychological therapies are integrated into the eye care pathway?

**Steve Barclay:** The hon. Lady raises an important issue. I would be keen to take it away and look at it to see how we can work together to pick it up.

T8. [905923] **Jason McCartney** (Colne Valley) (Con): Many of my constituents are still struggling to get NHS dental appointments, so what is happening right now—this week, this month—to increase the availability of NHS dental appointments for them?

**Neil O'Brien:** I know how intensely my hon. Friend is campaigning on this issue. The amount of NHS dentistry being delivered has gone up by a fifth over the last year, partly as a result of the reforms we are already rolling out. He will have seen in the workforce plan that we are going to increase training places for dentists by 40% so that we have the NHS dentists we need. However, that is not all we will do, and our forthcoming dental plan will take further steps.

**Debbie Abrahams** (Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Lab): We have known for a while that our life expectancy is shorter than it was in 2010. However, we are now seeing impacts on children in the UK, who are about 7 cm shorter at five compared, for example, with the children of our neighbours in Holland. What is the Secretary of State doing on this issue, and will he support the all-party parliamentary group on health in all policies in assessing the impacts on health and health inequalities?

**Neil O'Brien:** Of course we are taking action to improve public health, and that includes children's nutrition. That is why we are spending £150 million on healthy food schemes, such as the school fruit and vegetable scheme, the nursery milk scheme and Healthy Start. It is also why we are investing £330 million a year in school sport and the PE premium and a further £300 million through the youth investment fund. We will continue to take action on this key issue.

**Mr Jonathan Lord** (Woking) (Con): I am delighted that a new diagnostic centre is shortly to be built at our terrific Woking Community Hospital, very close to Woking town centre. Does the Minister agree that providing state-of-the-art diagnostic care right in the heart of the community can cut NHS waiting lists, reduce carbon emissions and, most importantly, help to optimise health outcomes for patients?



**Steve Barclay:** Not only do I agree, but I have been with my hon. Friend to see this scheme at first hand. He has championed the scheme vociferously and helped to secure that investment for his constituents. I look forward to working with him to ensure it is delivered as quickly as possible.

**Tim Farron** (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): Plans to remove overnight primary care clinicians from Westmorland General Hospital three nights a week are a massive risk to our community and mean that, overnight, people will be reliant on Barrow or Penrith for an out-of-hours doctor. Will the Secretary of State instruct the ICB to intervene to protect people in South Lakeland from this massive reduction in the quality and accessibility of services?

**Steve Barclay:** Some of us remember when the Lib Dems were for greater localism. One of the things we are looking at is how to empower commissioners, on a place-based basis, to make decisions on where best to place services. We need to move more services into the community upstream, to address the frail elderly before they get to hospital and to have more community services. I am happy to look at the specific issue the hon. Gentleman raises, but I would have thought the Lib Dems would support the general trend of empowering integrated commissioning systems to make place-based decisions.

**Greg Clark** (Tunbridge Wells) (Con): Several important pharmacies in my constituency, including the one in Hawkhurst, have been experiencing pressures, with long queues of customers sometimes going outside the door. It is said that access to trained pharmacists is proving very challenging. Will the Secretary of State comment on the situation and say what steps he might be able to take to alleviate the pressure?

**Steve Barclay:** There are a number of measures in the primary care recovery plan, from how we better use the skills mix within pharmacies to how we deregulate some of the tasks that take up pharmacists' time, such as the requirement for a pharmacist to be present after drugs have already been prepared or to clip out tablets because they do not match the number prescribed by a GP. There are a number of areas in which we can better use the skills mix, and there are areas where we can take load off pharmacists. We are also funding additional services through Pharmacy First to support the pharmacy model.

**Rachael Maskell** (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): The number of deaths increased by 13.5% in December 2022, particularly around influenza and pneumonia—up by 26.2%—so York's public health team want to know what the Government are going to do about winter planning and when.

**Steve Barclay:** We set out comprehensive plans for winter preparation in the urgent and emergency recovery plan. Similar to what I said a moment ago, this includes making much better use of community schemes, particularly those targeted at the frail elderly, and making better use of technology through schemes such as virtual wards. It has also put additional bed capacity into hospitals, with more than £1 billion of funding for 5,000 more permanent beds to help alleviate the pressure on bed occupancy and get flow through hospitals, which is so important to addressing the pressure on ambulances.

**Mr Speaker:** I call the Chairman of the Health and Social Care Committee.

**Steve Brine** (Winchester) (Con): Back to NHS dentistry, I am afraid. Later this week, the Select Committee will publish its report on NHS dentistry services. Spoiler alert: it will be uncomfortable reading for some. Will the Secretary of State tell us when and how he plans to bring forward plans for the tie-in of newly qualified dentists? Could that go hand in hand with a "return to the NHS" campaign for dentists who have already left that part of the service?

**Steve Barclay:** It is characteristically astute of my hon. Friend to zero in on the tie-in, which is an important part of the long-term workforce plan. Around two thirds of dentists do not go into NHS work after training, so having a tie-in is more pertinent there than it might be elsewhere in the NHS workforce.<sup>1</sup> I look forward to the Select Committee's report but, with some of the reforms already in place, we are boosting the number of patients treated. There were a fifth more dental treatments in 2022 than in the previous year. We are also making NHS dentistry more attractive with some of the changes to the previous 2006 contract, but we recognise that there is more to do, which is why we will shortly set out our dental recovery plan.

**Barbara Keeley** (Worsley and Eccles South) (Lab): I have received a wave of concern from clinicians on the safety of using physician associates, following my Adjournment debate last week in which I raised the death of Emily Chesterton, the 30-year-old daughter of my constituents Marion and Brendan. Emily died of a pulmonary embolism after being seen twice by the same physician associate at her GP practice. The physician associate failed to refer her to a doctor or to a hospital emergency unit for tests, which the coroner concluded could have prevented her death.

Yesterday, on "Good Morning Britain", the Secretary of State boasted of increasing the number of people working in primary care, presumably including the workforce plan proposal to triple the use of physician associates. Will he look urgently at the details of Emily Chesterton's case and ask himself whether lessons can be learned to avoid other preventable deaths?

**Will Quince:** Having responded to the hon. Lady's Adjournment debate last Thursday, I hear the calls she has made. I know that she has also written to the Secretary of State, and I will ensure that she gets a full response, with answers to all the questions she raises.

**Mr William Wragg** (Hazel Grove) (Con): My good friend the mental health Minister—the Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, my hon. Friend the Member for Lewes (Maria Caulfield)—will know that I have been busy beaver away, together with the UK Government's mental health ambassador, Dr Alex George, on the early support mental health hubs project. It will relieve pressure on child and adolescent mental health services and save undue distress and money. The pilot scheme is ready to go. Might I suggest that the shared outcomes fund could be the means to press on with the pilot?

1.[Official Report, 12 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 8MC.]

**Steve Barclay:** Dr Alex George does a lot of fantastic work. I am due to meet him shortly in the coming days, and I look forward to that discussion. My hon. Friend is right to highlight the importance of getting more mental health support into the community, which is exactly what our additional funding is focused on delivering.

**Mike Amesbury** (Weaver Vale) (Lab): Eighteen community pharmacists in my constituency are reporting challenges on medicine supplies. What more is the Minister going to do to get a grip of this situation?

**Steve Barclay:** We have a long-standing team in the Department focused on medical supplies, which are a continual issue; as a matter of routine business, there are often challenges in that area. If the hon. Gentleman has specific issues he wishes to raise, we would be happy to look at them, but we have a dedicated team in the Department that focuses on that exact point.

**Anna Firth** (Southend West) (Con): As my right hon. Friend knows, I have been campaigning for £118 million of capital funding, the majority of it for Southend University Hospital, ever since I was elected. I am grateful that he has recently confirmed that the funding is secure. A new business plan is being submitted, including £9 million of enabling funding. Will he look upon that favourably and swiftly?

**Steve Barclay:** As my hon. Friend knows, I have already met her to discuss this scheme, and the impediment was the business plan that came forward from the local

trust—further work was being done on that. She is right to highlight our capital investment more widely. This Government have committed to investing in the biggest ever hospital building programme, with more than £20 billion. That is in addition to our long-term workforce plan—the first time the NHS has done this—in which we are making a further £2.4 billion of investment.

**Mary Kelly Foy** (City of Durham) (Lab): Is the Minister aware that the NHS North East and North Cumbria mental health and wellbeing hub is due to close this September? With mental health care in crisis in County Durham, that is an insult to the health and social care staff who desperately rely on those services. Will the Minister reverse that decision?

**Steve Barclay:** There are two issues here. One is how much investment we are prioritising towards mental health; the other is how local commissioners choose to prioritise services within those communities, and whether we try to run all of those decisions from the centre in Whitehall or embrace the 42 integrated care systems and allow them to make commissioning decisions. The bottom line is that we are spending much more on mental health, with an increase of £2.3 billion compared with the position four years ago. That is allowing us to replace 500 dormitory beds and provide 100 mental health ambulances, three new mental health hospitals, 160 projects such as crisis cafés to support accident and emergency, and £75 million to help those with mental health challenges get back into work, which is one of the best prevention measures we can take for people who are suffering with their mental health.

## Financial Services Reforms

12.39 pm

**The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Andrew Griffith):** With permission, Mr Speaker, I will update the House on the Government's latest efforts to make the UK the most open, innovative and competitive financial centre in the world.

We know how important financial and related professional services are to this country. They employ more than 2.5 million people and generate more than £100 billion in tax revenue. Two thirds of those jobs lie outside the south-east and London. As we lay the foundations for long-term growth, it is vital that these sectors continue to succeed.

Last night, at Mansion House, the Chancellor made clear some of the policies that this Government will pursue, building on last year's Edinburgh reforms. The full package of policies was published this morning, and I am pleased to share some of them with the House at this first opportunity. They fall under three themes: first, through a series of measures, improving outcomes for long-term savers and increasing investment in high-growth companies by reforming the UK's pension market; secondly, incentivising companies to start and stay in the UK by strengthening our position as a listings destination; and thirdly, reforming and simplifying our financial services rulebook to ensure that we have the most growth-friendly markets possible, without compromising our commitment to high-quality regulation.

I begin with our pensions market, which is the largest in Europe and worth more than £2.5 trillion. The market is meant to provide safe retirement income for later life. In many cases, it does a very good job of that, but it can do so much more. I pay huge tribute to the Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, my hon. Friend the Member for Sevenoaks (Laura Trott), for her crucial work on this.

In laying out our plan, the Chancellor has set three golden rules: first, that in everything we do, we will seek to secure the best possible outcomes for pension savers, with their needs first and foremost; secondly, that we will always prioritise a strong and diversified gilt market as we seek to deliver evolutionary change in our pensions market; and thirdly, that the decisions we take must always strengthen the UK's competitive position as a leading financial centre.

Today, however, UK institutional investors invest less in UK high-growth companies than their international counterparts. While many defined-benefit funds are in surplus, their returns are lower than some international peers, and some may still be underfunded. At the same time, on their current trajectory, some defined-contribution schemes may not provide the returns that their pension fund holders expect.

Critically, DC schemes also invest less than 1% in unlisted equity. Australian schemes, for example, invest around 5%. To bridge that gap, the Chancellor joined the Lord Mayor and chief executives of many of our largest DC schemes to sign the Mansion House compact. Its signatories, who represent around two thirds of the entire market, are committed to the objective of allocating at least 5% of their default funds to unlisted equities by 2030, unlocking up to £50 billion of investment in high-growth companies by that time—helping companies to grow while improving rates of return for investors.

To further boost returns, we will facilitate a programme of DC consolidation. As the Department for Work and Pensions, Pensions Regulator and Financial Conduct Authority response to the value for money framework consultation makes clear, investment decisions should be made based on long-term returns and not simply on cost. Pension schemes that are not achieving the best outcome for their members will face being wound up by the Pensions Regulator, and we will set out a road map to encourage new collective DC funds.

To help schemes access a wider range of investment opportunities, we have launched the LIFTS—long-term investment for technology and science—competition, which enables them to invest quickly and effectively in unlisted high-growth companies. Bids have already started to come in for up to £250 million of Government support, and we are considering them closely. We will also explore the case for Government to play a greater role in establishing investment vehicles, building on the skills and expertise of the British Business Bank's commercial arm.

Meanwhile, on defined-benefit schemes, we recognise that the regulatory landscape is too fragmented and believe that there is scope for consolidation. We have launched a call for evidence on the role of the Pension Protection Fund and the part that defined-benefit schemes play in productive investment.

Taken together, our pensions announcement will have a real and significant impact. For an average earner who starts saving at the age of 18, these measures could increase the size of their pension pot by 12% over their career. That is more than £1,000 a year in retirement. That is a real upgrade to the power and the outcomes of our pension schemes.

We already have the largest stock market in Europe, and, in 2021, we attracted the most IPOs—initial public offerings—outside the US, but we want the world's fastest growing companies to grow here and to list here. We have now published our near-final draft legislation on prospectus reforms, which will create a more effective regime than its EU predecessor, giving companies more flexibility to raise even larger sums from investors more quickly. We welcome Rachel Kent's excellent Investment Research Review, which was published this morning, and the Government are accepting all the recommendations made to us.

As we continue to free ourselves from outdated retained EU laws, we have abolished protectionist rules, such as the share trading obligation and double volume cap, so that UK businesses can access the best and most liquid markets anywhere in the world.

Finally, we are ensuring that our financial services sector has the regulatory freedom to innovate at a speed that matches our modern world. To that end, the House recently passed the Financial Services and Markets Act 2023, which requires our regulators to facilitate growth and international competitiveness alongside their other objectives. With it, we have published today legislation to repeal almost 100 pieces of retained EU law for financial services that are irrelevant to our markets, such as payment account regulations and long-term investment funds, and we say farewell to the unloved packaged retail and insurance-based investment products. This is not divergence for divergence's sake, but sensible reforms working with the sector.



[Andrew Griffith]

This is a significant body of work. This Government's vision for the UK is one of long-term growth, fuelled by strong British finance, providing returns for savers, funding for businesses, and investments for our economy. That is what we are focused on, and that is what these reforms deliver.

12.47 pm

**Tulip Siddiq** (Hampstead and Kilburn) (Lab): I thank the Minister for an advance copy of his statement. However, after 13 years of a low growth, low investment economy, these promises are too little, too late. On this Government's watch, far too many high growth firms, particularly in the tech sector, have been bought by foreign competitors or have chosen to list in the US, in order to scale-up and grow.

Arm holdings, a UK tech success story, is now set to float in New York rather than in London. The Chancellor has been completely silent on this. When alarm bells were ringing, the Ministers shrugged their shoulders. Capital held in pension funds is vital for the growth of our most innovative companies. In the US, approximately 70% of venture capital funding comes from pension funds, while in the UK the figure is below 20%. That is just not good enough. This Government's failure to mobilise pension money into productive assets comes at a cost. British pension savers have not been getting the returns that they should expect. It seems that a person is more likely to own a share in UK infrastructure today if they are a Canadian teacher rather than a British citizen.

Time and again, the Conservative party has promised action to unlock the patient capital that British firms need to thrive and grow, but has failed to deliver. There would surely be greater confidence given to savers, growing firms and financial services if the Government had provided more detail yesterday on how to turn this around. The Chancellor's compact for DC pension funds lacks any plan to ensure that this will increase investment in UK assets rather than simply going overseas. What guarantee can the Government provide that British high growth firms will be able to access the capital they need to thrive and create good jobs in every part of the UK? With no clear roadmap, how will that be achieved?

I turn to what the Chancellor said last night about wanting to make London a listings destination. It is as though his party had not been in government for 13 years now. I remind the Chancellor that he was sitting around the Cabinet table for the best part of a decade during that time. Labour has been calling for action on listing for months and the Government have refused to listen. In the first quarter of this year there were just four London listings, raising only £81 million, the sixth-worst quarter for IPOs in London since 1995. That is pitiful.

I acknowledge and indeed welcome the fact that in some areas the Government are rather belatedly starting to follow Labour's lead, but what has taken them so long? Where was the urgency, the ambition and the drive? Can the Minister explain why there was nothing at all in the Chancellor's speech on green finance? That complacency puts our status as a net zero financial centre at risk.

Labour is committed to ensuring that the City retains its competitiveness outside the EU, whether through creating a positive environment for fintech or reform of Solvency II, and doing so without compromising on stability. Yet the Government have promised Solvency II reform 10 times in recent years with nothing to show for it.

We, and the country, will not take any lessons on financial stability from a Government that set fire to the economy last autumn with their mini Budget. That resulted in a Tory mortgage bombshell, with families facing £240 per month in higher mortgage costs when remortgaging, through no fault of their own. The truth is that the Chancellor's Mansion House speech was not a big bang at all—it was a small splutter. There was none of the detail required to build confidence, no responsibility taken for the last 13 years of economic failure, and no strategy to end the doom loop of Tory economic failure.

The Labour party has a plan to unlock the full potential of the private sector to get the British economy growing again in the national interest. Through our active partnership with the City, reforms to the British Business Bank and a modern industrial strategy, we will grow the economy and help Britain to become the best place to start and grow a business. This tired Tory Government are out of time. It is time for them to step aside so that we can have a Government who will favour the national British interest—[*Interruption.*] There is no point Conservative Members laughing. The truth is that we need a Labour Government to provide the energy, the ideas and the leadership that our country and our constituents desperately need.

**Andrew Griffith:** It is always a pleasure to listen to the hon. Lady. In general, what I learn is that the Opposition have no plan. It is all critique and no counter-proposal. She talked about this being too little, too late, but this Government are moving at pace, in what the sector acknowledges as one of the fastest rates of implementation of financial services reform for a generation, taking advantage of our Brexit freedoms and the regained control of our rulebook, which she and her party seek to oppose again and again.

The hon. Lady talked about the lack of growth, but under Labour I am told that the percentage of the workforce with a private pension declined by 20%. She also talked about patient capital, which should not be a point of disagreement between us. This Government have done an enormous amount to support British patient capital, with £2.3 billion of investment, and we have recently increased the length of the British patient capital scheme for a further period.

The hon. Lady also talked about capital going overseas, but that is nothing to the degree to which capital would be flooding overseas were her party ever to return to power, accelerating us to the point where once again the Chief Secretary to the Treasury is writing notes to remind us there is no money left. I potentially discern a point of difference between us, which perhaps in due course she will clarify, in the approach to the compact. It is not the position of this Government to mandate where people's pensions should be invested. Indeed, the last time a Labour Chancellor decided what was good for our pension schemes, it did not end well.



Finally, the hon. Lady talked about green finance. This Government are doing a copious amount on green finance; only yesterday my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero met some of the world leaders in green finance, and earlier this year we published an ambitious green finance strategy, continuing the UK's progression to being one of the world's first net zero-aligned financial centres.

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** I call the Chair of the Treasury Committee.

**Harriett Baldwin (West Worcestershire) (Con):** I should probably note in this context that I am a trustee of the Parliamentary Contributory Pension Fund.

I warmly welcome the work that the Economic Secretary and the pensions Minister have done in this important area, and strongly endorse what the Economic Secretary says about its meaning that future pensioners will be able to retire with higher pension incomes. However, he will know that I have put another piece of urgent work in his inbox, about helping the 93% of our constituents who are unable to afford access to financial advice and have to rely on bog-standard generic guidance. Can he update the House on how his review of the advice-guidance boundary is going and how he will help the majority of people who save in defined-contribution schemes to get access to some sort of personalised coaching or guidance?

**Andrew Griffith:** It is always a pleasure to respond to my hon. Friend and to the work of her tremendous Treasury Committee, which rages across this broad financial sector. She is right to raise the question of access to financial advice; I am afraid the world of financial services regulation is fraught with unintended consequences, and one unintended consequence of financial regulation and a growing compensation culture is to move financial advice beyond the financial ability of so many people who would benefit from receiving it. That is called the advice gap. I and my officials continue to work on that and I look forward to sharing proposals with the House and with my hon. Friend and her Committee in the autumn.

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** I call the SNP spokesperson.

**Stewart Hosie (Dundee East) (SNP):** I thank the Economic Secretary for his statement. I agree with him on regulation, where he said that regulators would be required to facilitate growth and competitiveness alongside their other objectives. However, as he knows, unless the central bank is obliged to do the same, we might end up in the rather odd and undesirable position of regulators and the central bank taking contradictory actions. I want to ask mainly about pension reform: under the Mansion House compact, potentially 5% of the DC funds are to go towards unlisted equities. There is huge potential in that for growth, for innovation, for jobs, for global competitiveness and for scaling up to compete, but that comes with a commensurate risk, which is presumably up to 5% of the value of the DC fund, should the value of that unlisted equity be wiped out.

While I hope the scheme succeeds, what liability would fall on the Pension Protection Fund should it fail? What liability might there be on the taxpayer? If the scheme works and the value of the funds increases,

what guarantee is there that the pension holder will receive the entire value of that increase and it will not be gobbled up by unnecessary and excessive fees?

**Andrew Griffith:** I thank the right hon. Gentleman for his support for growth and competitiveness. We have talked regularly about the need for regulators to improve their performance and deliver better outcomes for those whom they regulate. He talked about the 5%, and I emphasise that, ultimately, it is a voluntary pact; it is for the individual trustees to make those decisions, and the Government continue to have in place a strong programme of regulation. However, I hope he respects the fact that there is risk in inaction as well—the risk that our pension beneficiaries do not receive the pensions that they deserve or the sort of performance from their pension that other international long-term savers benefit from. He raises the issue of defined contribution and the liability for the taxpayer. Of course, that does not attach to defined-contribution schemes, which is why it is so important that they continue to benefit from the highest-quality regulation. I and my colleague the pensions Minister remain very committed to that and will continue to work with TPR and the FCA to ensure that that remains the case.

**Stephen Hammond (Wimbledon) (Con):** I refer the House to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests. Like my hon. Friend the Member for West Worcestershire (Harriett Baldwin), I warmly welcome the work that my hon. Friends on the Front Bench have done. The Mansion House compact is a huge step forward, but does my hon. Friend the Minister agree that getting the Kent investment review reforms right, particularly on unbundling, will also help us to have high-quality research, enabling better decisions and more investment into high-quality firms?

**Andrew Griffith:** My hon. Friend, who knows so much about this topic and has engaged so lucidly on it, is absolutely right about the importance of investment research. It provides access to markets, makes our UK stock exchanges an attractive international venue, narrows spreads and drives fair valuations for investors and companies seeking investment. This is one example of where we inherited a European fact pattern that was not quite right for the UK. I look forward to pensioners, investors, savers and companies benefiting from our research review.

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** I call the Chair of the Work and Pensions Committee.

**Sir Stephen Timms (East Ham) (Lab):** Defined-benefit pension funds have long been under pressure to invest in Government gilts rather than the productive economy, so I welcome the change of direction that the Minister has announced. He has indicated how much extra pension fund investment will go into high-growth companies in future. Will he indicate what share of that he expects to go into UK high-growth firms rather than overseas? He has indicated, I think, a replacement for the current charge caps on pension funds, with a wider value-for-money assessment, but can he indicate when we are likely to see the detail on what exactly he and the Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, the hon. Member for Sevenoaks (Laura Trott), have in mind for that?

**Andrew Griffith:** I thank the right hon. Gentleman for his contributions on how we can deliver the best pensions for long-term savers. There are no estimates for the share of the UK. We are mobilising an additional £50 billion of assets over time. That is evolution, not revolution. We would expect—and it is the job of this Government—to present that investment capital with a wave of attractive options across some of the fastest-growing sectors, as the Prime Minister and Chancellor have laid out, and to remove frictions and obstacles as people seek to invest in the UK, creating a conducive environment for that investment but falling short of mandating it, in the knowledge that the allocation to international investments for some of our actively managed schemes already exceeds that of other comparable companies. On the charge cap, we are this morning publishing a consultation on the new value for money framework. Clearly, we want to continue ensuring that pensioners benefit from fair charges, but also that that does not come at the expense of the underlying performance that they receive.

**Mr John Baron** (Basildon and Billericay) (Con): I welcome this set of measures, particularly the ending of the packaged retail and insurance-based investment products regime and the introduction of the Mansion House compact, on which some of us have lobbied the Government. I will share two key concerns with the Minister. On fintech and early-stage businesses, we have a problem in this country because the pension fund industry has divested itself of UK equities, to the detriment of the London stock exchange and, ultimately, of financial services generally. It troubles me that that 5% is not focused on early-stage start-ups in the UK, unlike many other domestic pension funds, which do support their own. More generally, a bigger piece of the jigsaw is missing in my view. Pension funds have generally divested themselves of UK equities to such a great extent—some estimates suggest a 90% reduction since 2000—that we need to see more encouragement by Government to get the pension funds to use their wealth by putting it into UK equities for the betterment of the UK economy. After all, they do benefit from tax breaks.

**Andrew Griffith:** I thank my hon. Friend for his, as ever, apposite points. That encouragement is exactly what the proposals are all about: working voluntarily with the sector and encouraging it to lean in. I want people to see 5% as a potential floor, not a ceiling. Many will seek to go much further forward. The broad objective of the Government is to provide good access to capital at every stage of a Government's life, whether it is our support for the seed enterprise investment scheme, the enterprise investment scheme or the venture capital trust; the expansion of the pool of individual investors who are able to invest directly in the stock market; and some of the opportunities that he talked about, all the way through to ensuring that our listed and private capital markets work extremely well. That is the objective of the reforms.

**Madam Deputy Speaker** (Dame Rosie Winterton): I call the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee.

**Dame Meg Hillier** (Hackney South and Shoreditch) (Lab/Co-op): I draw the House's attention to the fact that I am a trustee of the parliamentary contributory

pension fund. Forgive me if I am a little sceptical about Government involvement in pension funds. We have seen how the annual and lifetime allowances, announced at the Dispatch Box by a former Chancellor, have played out. It was also this Government who took us through McCloud in the public sector. The Minister said that the average earner who starts saving at 18 could increase the size of their pension pot by 12% over their career. Can he give the House examples of the assumptions behind that figure, and will he publish the modelling behind it?

**Andrew Griffith:** The Government Actuary's Department is the source of those figures, which we published this morning—I draw the hon. Lady's attention to that fact. Clearly, there are a number of assumptions within that. I do not think it is right to be sceptical. These are reforms that have been formed with wide consultation, including from across the House. I hope that we can form a growing consensus so that the industry receives a signal from this place that it is ultimately time to stop talking and to get on with investing. That is the outcome that we seek.

**Robbie Moore** (Keighley) (Con): I welcome the statement, particularly the aim to unlock assets in the local government pension scheme through an acceleration of pooling with the aim of doubling existing investments in private equity to 10%, which could unlock £25 billion by 2030. Does the Economic Secretary agree that the reforms are a welcome step to improve our growth prospects and boost investments?

**Andrew Griffith:** I absolutely agree with my hon. Friend. The local government pension scheme is a huge opportunity for this country. In many cases, it is already very progressive. It is investing in local opportunities and allocating its capital to the sort of private growth assets that we wish to seek. With £365 billion under management, an increased rate of progress towards asset pooling, which, as the Government have made clear, should attract at least £50 billion, will provide the scale to invest well on behalf of beneficiaries. That is a great opportunity for us all.

**Sarah Olney** (Richmond Park) (LD): The number of companies listed on the London stock exchange has plummeted to such an extent that the market value of Apple is now greater than the entire FTSE 100. Recently, Cambridge-based chip giant Arm decided to list in New York rather than in London. Does the Minister think that the Mansion House compact will reverse the trend of British-based companies deciding to list elsewhere?

**Andrew Griffith:** Yes.

**Sir Desmond Swayne** (New Forest West) (Con): This is an excellent package, but one way to ensure that investment flows to productive enterprise is to prevent it from being crowded out by growing Government debt, isn't it?

**Andrew Griffith:** Our objectives are threefold in that respect: to bear down on inflation; to reduce Government debt, with the benefits that my right hon. Friend seeks; and to grow the economy. These are long-term plans and ambitious programmes, and ultimately, the acid test will be how we can grow our economy.

**Nick Smith** (Blaenau Gwent) (Lab): The Minister says that he wants the “best possible outcomes” for pension savers. The pensions dashboard, which is designed to help pensioners understand their pension’s performance, was promised by Chancellor George Osborne, but it is still delayed. When will the pensions dashboard be delivered to support UK pensioners?

**Andrew Griffith:** My hon. Friend the Minister for pensions is proceeding at pace to deliver that important element in people’s ability to access the most information. It is just one component. We want people to have good pension choices and to understand the ways that investments are being made. The hon. Gentleman will understand, because we have engaged in the past about pensioners not necessarily having had the best information available to them in a regulated way, that it is better to be right in this case than to be fast.

**Nickie Aiken** (Cities of London and Westminster) (Con): I was delighted to attend the Mansion House dinner last night as the Member of Parliament representing the City of London and to listen to excellent speeches by the Lord Mayor and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Does the Minister agree that the Mansion House compact will do much to secure the City of London’s position as a global powerhouse in the financial services sector and will also create more jobs across the country?

**Andrew Griffith:** My hon. Friend, who knows so much and speaks so lucidly for Cities of London and Westminster, is absolutely right. These are a bold and ambitious set of reforms. They will not just help communities across the whole of the United Kingdom—I never fail to remind the House that financial services touch almost every constituency—but continue to underwrite the strong and leading position of the City of London, which she so ably represents.

**Bill Esterson** (Sefton Central) (Lab): It is always fascinating to hear Ministers justifying their failure over the last 13 years. The Minister would do well to recognise that business investment is at a record low in this country. One way to address the record low in business investment is to listen to the professional services sector, which says that a mutual recognition agreement with the EU would increase that performance and contribution. Why have the Government made no progress on that mutual recognition agreement?

**Andrew Griffith:** I am enormously proud of the fact that we have recently reached agreement with all the member nations of the European Union on the memorandum of understanding in respect of financial services. That joins a number of such agreements, all of which have the objective of seeking access to as many of the growing markets in the world as possible for our financial and professional services. Only last week I met my opposite number, the German deputy Finance Minister, and next week I will be meeting the Luxembourg Finance Minister.

**Sir Christopher Chope** (Christchurch) (Con): By how much will today’s announcement reduce the burden of regulation on UK business? I ask that because the Government promised that there would be no net increase in the burden of regulation on business during this Parliament, but so far we are £14.3 billion in the wrong direction.

**Andrew Griffith:** My hon. Friend may wish to ask that question in due course. With respect to the Secretary of State for Business and Trade, I can only speak for the financial services sector. Today we are publishing documents to repeal 100 elements of retained EU law. That builds on reforms we already had in train, such as the prospectus directive. I can certainly give him my confidence and assurance that we are significantly lightening the burden of regulation, but more importantly, making it appropriate for the unique fact pattern of the UK as an open, innovative global market.

**Debbie Abrahams** (Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Lab): The Minister will be aware that the Bank of England had to intervene in the gilt market after the disastrous mini-Budget last September to restore market functioning, when sharp and rapid rises in gilt yields led to widespread selling of gilts by pension schemes’ liability-driven investment arrangements. We all recognise that we need to do more to ensure that our pensions—especially our defined-contribution schemes—are better. My question is about the risk. What risk assessment has been made of this proposed reform, particularly in terms of where the burden of risk falls?

**Andrew Griffith:** We have published today a consultation, and I hope the hon. Lady will feel that she can raise points during that. My hon. Friend the Minister responsible for pensions will always be happy to undertake engagement with the sector. Needless to say, we believe that we have the right balance of risk. The hon. Lady talks about volatility in the gilt market. That is one of the reasons we are so focused on not making unfunded spending commitments. The last thing that pensioners or the wider economy need is Labour’s £28 billion unfunded spending plans.

**Richard Fuller** (North East Bedfordshire) (Con): I welcome the announcement of these reforms, but will the Chancellor and the Minister look further at two consequential areas? First, to make the most of the newly available capital, this country needs to attract the world’s best innovators, insurgents and entrepreneurs. The Labour party has already said that it does not want them here and will change tax policy to make sure they look to other countries. This Government need to come forward with measures that say, “We want the best and the brightest to come to the UK.”

Secondly, to make the most of these reforms, we need to ensure that our businesses can work speedily and with clarity. That means that regulators need to focus on what our companies are doing with these reforms, as well as protecting customers and consumers. Will my hon. Friend look at what further measures we can take on regulatory reform?

**Andrew Griffith:** The work of regulatory reform to make this country globally competitive and an attractive place to invest is never done, as my hon. Friend knows. He will also know that we are seeing right now the fruits of the Prime Minister’s vision and strategy, with firms such as OpenAI and Andreessen Horowitz—two of the leading technology firms changing our world—both choosing in recent weeks the United Kingdom out of the entire rest of the world as the place to do business.

**Jonathan Edwards** (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (Ind): Further to the question from the hon. Member for Blaenau Gwent (Nick Smith), what assurances can



[Jonathan Edwards]

the Minister give that when the pensions dashboard is launched, it will be mandatory for all providers to participate in it and will not be done on a voluntary basis, to avoid it being what one analyst described as “half-baked”?

**Andrew Griffith:** The hon. Member is quite right: it will be mandatory for all providers. That will be underwritten by legislation. The focus is to ensure that it is a usable, well regulated and well understood user experience for members.

**Mr Philip Hollobone (Kettering) (Con):** Over the last decade, thanks to automatic pension enrolment, an extra 10 million people have been able to save more for their retirement, but until now, due to investment restrictions, those returns have been limited. What my constituents want to know is, would the reforms announced today have been possible without Brexit, and how much better off will they be when it comes to retirement?

**Andrew Griffith:** I hope that my hon. Friend can reassure the constituents he so diligently represents that on average, as supported by the Government Actuary's Department, if they started their working life now under the new assumptions about the compact, they could be up to £1,000 a year better off in retirement. That is a meaningful difference. At the end of the day, this is about making people's money work better for them and harder for them and delivering them better outcomes. He is also right to observe that our ambitious programme of regulatory reforms, although it will never be divergence for divergence's sake, could not have been achieved if it were not for the ability of this place to set the corpus of regulations under which financial services operate.

**Nigel Mills (Amber Valley) (Con):** I welcome the Mansion House compact and the focus on auto-enrolment pensions delivering a better pension for their scheme members, but if the Minister looks at the websites of the firms that have signed up to his compact, he will see that they are all still marketing themselves as being cheap and simple for employers, rather than the best quality and best return for savers. What more can we do to give individual members a choice of which scheme they are auto-enrolled in? Will he look at a clearing house scheme, under which it would be individual employees who choose where their pension savings go, not their employer a few years ago based on what was easy and cheap?

**Andrew Griffith:** My hon. Friend is absolutely right to talk about the need for that culture to change, moving away from an excess focus on cost to the detriment of performance—that is what these reforms will achieve over time. He is also right to talk about giving agency to individual long-term savers over time. Making sure that we have that usable journey for pensioners that delivers across the whole of their life is something that my colleague, the pensions Minister, is passionate about.

## Points of Order

1.20 pm

**Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Brighton, Kemptown) (Lab/Co-op):** On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I have written to the Treasury twice without a substantive reply about Sea Lanes, the first new public lido opened in my constituency in 30 years, and the National Open Water Swimming Centre. They are owed a VAT rebate of over £170,000, which was due back on 19 April. I am sure that Government Front Benchers understand the importance to new businesses of getting speedy rebates.

His Majesty's Revenue and Customs has no hotline for MPs to ring up. If our question is on VAT matters, we have to ring up the public line, and every 48 hours, Sea Lanes has to reauthorise my office to speak on its behalf. On 25 June, we were told that there was nothing delaying that payment, yet three weeks later, no payment has been received. Madam Deputy Speaker, as there is no hotline and HMRC has not responded to my letters, could you advise me how best to pursue this matter with the Treasury?

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** I thank the hon. Gentleman for his point of order. From what he has said, I can understand his concern. Miraculously, he has managed to raise his point of order when he has a Treasury Minister right in front of him, and I have a feeling that Ministers may well take back his comments.

**The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Andrew Griffith) indicated assent.**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The Minister is nodding in agreement, so I think the hon. Gentleman has succeeded in raising his case effectively. We will leave it at that.

**Crispin Blunt (Reigate) (Con):** On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I distinctly remember that during last week's Second Reading of the Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill, when the Communities Secretary was asked in an intervention whether there had been any advice against the Bill from diplomatic posts, he replied that he was not aware—that he knew of no such advice. It has now become clear that a senior official in the Foreign Secretary's own office sent a letter to No. 10 expressing such concerns about the consequences of the Bill. I wonder whether, Madam Deputy Speaker, you have had any notice that the Foreign Secretary intends to correct the record, or whether he will rely on the fact that the Foreign Secretary's office is not a diplomatic post in any formal sense.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I thank the hon. Gentleman for his point of order. He did not give me notice of it, so I have not been able to get any other information. There were two parts to his point of order: first, that the Foreign Secretary answered by saying that he was not aware, and then that there had been no such representations. The hon. Gentleman has raised the issue; if any correction is necessary, I am sure it will be made, and I am confident that those on the Government Front Bench will pass back his comments. However, it was a little difficult to work out whether the hon. Gentleman was saying that there was no awareness, or that there had been no representations.



**Mr William Wragg** (Hazel Grove) (Con): Further to that point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think my hon. Friend the Member for Reigate (Crispin Blunt) hon. Friend misspoke; it was the Communities Secretary.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry—that is probably my fault. At first we had the Communities Secretary, then we had the Foreign Secretary. Whoever it is, I am sure they will be on this immediately, unless Mr Blunt wants to be more specific.

**Crispin Blunt:** Further to that point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Communities Secretary gave the assurance to the House that he was unaware of any such advice in the context of diplomatic posts. It appears that that advice did exist, and that it came from the Foreign Secretary's own office.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sure that between those points of order, we can sort out the various channels that need to be fed back to. The hon. Gentleman has raised the issue, and I am sure it will be taken back.

**Andy McDonald** (Middlesbrough) (Lab): On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Through you, may I express my thanks to Mr Speaker for his support yesterday? There was a very unpleasant social media posting containing a threat. I can report that the gentleman concerned has unequivocally and unreservedly apologised, and has made a significant donation to the Jo Cox Foundation.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I thank the hon. Gentleman for informing the House of that. I will certainly pass his thanks back to Mr Speaker, and I am glad to hear that there has been a satisfactory outcome.

## BILL PRESENTED

### RURAL CRIME (STRATEGY) BILL

*Presentation and First Reading (Standing Order No. 57)* Richard Foord presented a Bill to require the Secretary of State to establish a task force to produce a strategy for tackling rural crime; to require the Secretary of State to implement the strategy; and for connected purposes.

*Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time on Friday 24 November, and to be printed (Bill 348).*

## Bullying and Respect at Work

*Motion for leave to bring in a Bill (Standing Order No. 23)*

1.25 pm

**Rachael Maskell** (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): I beg to move,

That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for a statutory definition of bullying at work; to make provision relating to bullying at work, including to enable claims relating to workplace bullying to be considered by an employment tribunal; to provide for a Respect at Work Code to set minimum standards for positive and respectful work environments; to give powers to the Equalities and Human Rights Commission to investigate workplaces and organisations where there is evidence of a culture of, or multiple incidents of, bullying and to take enforcement action; and for connected purposes.

I refer the House to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests.

We all have power: how we use it matters. We can use it to encourage and elevate others, or we can use it to denigrate and destroy. For those who are harmed, there are few protections. We see it in schools and online, we see it with elder abuse, and we see it in workplaces. My Bill will break the cycle of bullying at work. It will call to account those who abuse their power, while protecting others and, for the first time, providing a legal definition of bullying at work. The TUC reports that bullying is the second biggest workplace issue. Some 29% of workers will experience workplace bullying at some point, and one in 10 has experienced it in the past six months. Academia backs those figures up. That lack of access to redress and justice explains why 53% of those who are bullied never report it. What is the point, if it exposes you further and there is no legal protection?

My Bill will not just help people at work; it will help employers. Bullying costs UK businesses £18 billion a year, and according to the Health and Safety Executive, over 17 million working days are lost each year due to work-related negative behaviours such as bullying. Sometimes bullying is corporate, embedded in the culture of an organisation. Sometimes it is peer on peer, where workers are left out, denigrated publicly or privately, and targeted or ignored. Slowly and painfully, the worker dies inside. Bullying hurts: it destroys confidence, crushes mental health and causes physical ill health. For some, the pain is so great that they simply crumble. There is lasting trauma; some never recover, and some lose their lives. The power of a human to destroy another is very real.

As a Parliament, we have failed millions of workers by not legislating. Like most MPs, I have had a constant stream of constituents seeking help, but there is no legal definition, no legal protection and no legal route to justice. Without protection, many workers will leave their employment. Without a route to an employment tribunal, people depend on the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 or a claim for constructive unfair dismissal following resigning from work. Most suffer, or leave their place of work. While my Bill seeks to promote respect at work and positive behaviours, it recognises that legislation is needed to protect workers and to have a chilling effect on negative workplace cultures for employees, workers, the bogus self-employed or office holders. As with other rewards, the tribunal service

[Rachael Maskell]

would depend on the remedies determined by the Vento tariff, and would therefore access the compensatory award for injury to the applicant.

Twenty years ago, there was a concerted effort by Government, trade unions and employers to address bullying at work. They formed the Dignity At Work Partnership, undertaking important work to understand bullying, its causes, its effects and how to reduce incidents. Sadly, the impact did not last and its reach was limited. Labour's late Baroness Gibson sought to legislate. Since, barristers and solicitors have been calling for a change in the law. Trade unions want their members protected.

ACAS has, within its code of practice, set out a definition. Any definition would require a subjective test—what is its impact—fettered by an objective test of the behaviours being offensive, malicious, intimidating or humiliating. As ACAS has more recently determined, this does not have to be a repeated act, but could be. Such tests provide for a robust threshold for a claim.

Bullying can be by an individual or group. It can be organisational, as with deliberate procedural delays in grievance management—delayed to cause harm. Fundamentally, it springs from a power imbalance—positional from a manager, psychological or relational. It can be direct or through a third party, by proxy. It can be with intent or without, although remorse can be the judge of this. Often, the perpetrator will reverse the blame and those innocent of bullying are accused of being a perpetrator. This can be the worst bullying of all—being publicly labelled by the very people who bully while they play victim themselves.

Currently, employment tribunals only hear cases of constructive unfair dismissal. We know that the time and thresholds for such claims are high, the applicant first having to resign, and they would also be required to have two years of employment. Civil courts may further be used to handle a personal injury claim. While employers have an implied duty to provide a safe working environment, the absence of legislation makes this difficult to enforce or address harm. Many workplaces have policies, but ultimate restitution is yet to sit with the tribunal, since bullying is not a legal concept, while discrimination and harassment rightly are.

For those with a protected characteristic, section 26 of the Equality Act 2010 provides a route to seek remedy. For someone who does not qualify under the Equality Act, there is no legal protection. However, with legislation, a dismissal arising from bullying could seek remedy, under the Employment Rights Act 1996, as an automatically unfair dismissal. The power of that approach is that, once the threshold tests have been met, the burden of proof moves to the employer to demonstrate that the reason for the resignation of the employee was or was not due to their failure to protect the individual from the perpetrator.

My Bill follows the tradition of harassment, but extends it to those without a protected characteristic. Like harassment, it will have a six-month limitation to bring a claim. My Bill seeks to extend the ACAS code of practice to promote positive workplace behaviours. Clearly, the failure of an employer to instil this could see a compensatory award raised, but, moreover, also see positive change ensue at work.

A perpetrator of bullying often targets more than one individual. My Bill empowers employers to challenge and bring about change. Failing to would enable the tribunal to compel an employer to abide by the code, securing better workplace safety. Should the perpetrator continue to bully, the code assists employers to manage the situation through conduct procedures and, where necessary, escalate a case to gross misconduct. However, it must be recognised that some places of work have an endemic bullying culture. I have therefore set out a role for reporting, investigation and enforcement in line with the management of environments where discrimination occurs.

In extending the role and powers of the Equality and Human Rights Commission to investigate and report, and to issue enforcement notices, workplace cultures will change. We need only look at some recent reports on the NHS to recognise failure, but we are acutely aware that we need to get our own House in order. Indeed, political parties would not be exempt from my legislation. This will clean up workplaces and clean up politics. The UK is behind the curve. Jurisdictions from Canada to Australia, Scandinavia to many across Europe have well established law in this field.

It is my experience that all can be subject to the destructive forces of bullying and all must receive protection under the law. In bringing forward this legislation, I hope that we can change the culture of work—for workers to no longer fear a day in the office, on a ward or even in this Parliament, but instead for them to know that the law is on their side, justice is protecting them and they can receive the very help they need. We have an obligation to protect people at work, and my Bill passing its First Reading today is the first step.

*Question put and agreed to.*

*Ordered,*

That Rachael Maskell, Andy McDonald, Dawn Butler, John McDonnell, Mrs Emma Lewell-Buck, Ian Lavery, Wera Hobhouse, Ian Mearns, Bell Ribeiro-Addy, Barry Gardiner, Caroline Lucas and Andrew Jones present the Bill.

Rachael Maskell accordingly presented the Bill.

*Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time on Friday 24 November, and to be printed ( Bill 349).*

## ILLEGAL MIGRATION BILL (PROGRAMME) (NO. 2)

*Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 83A(7)).*

That the following provisions shall apply to the Illegal Migration Bill for the purpose of supplementing the Order of 13 March 2023 (Illegal Migration Bill: Programme):

### *Consideration of Lords Amendments*

(1) Proceedings on consideration of Lords Amendments shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion at 5.00pm at today's sitting.

(2) The Lords Amendments shall be considered in the following order: 1, 2, 6 to 9, 12, 20, 22, 23, 30 to 67, 73, 74, 90, 93, 95, 102 to 104, 107, 3 to 5, 10, 11, 13 to 19, 21, 24 to 29, 68 to 72, 75 to 89, 91, 92, 94, 96 to 101, 105, 106 and 108 to 114.

### *Subsequent stages*

(3) Any further Message from the Lords may be considered forthwith without any Question being put.

(4) Proceedings on the first of any further Messages from the Lords shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion two hours after their commencement.

(5) Proceedings on any other further Message from the Lords shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion one hour after their commencement.—(*Robert Lorgan.*)

*Question agreed to.*

## Illegal Migration Bill

### *Consideration of Lords amendments*

#### Clause 1

#### INTRODUCTION

1.37 pm

**The Minister for Immigration (Robert Jenrick):** I beg to move, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 1.

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans):** With this it will be convenient to discuss the following:

Lords amendments 2, 6 to 9, 12, 20 and 22, Government motions to disagree and Government amendments (a) to (o) in lieu of Lords amendments 2, 12, 20 and 22.

Lords amendments 23 and 30, and Government motions to disagree.

Lords amendments 31 to 36, Government motions to disagree and Government amendments (a) and (b) in lieu of Lords amendments 31, 35 and 36.

Lords amendments 37 and 38, Government motions to disagree and Government amendments (a) to (e) in lieu of Lords amendments 37 and 38.

Lords amendments 39 to 67, and Government motions to disagree.

Lords amendments 73 and 74, Government motions to disagree and Government amendment (a) in lieu of Lords amendments 73 and 74.

Lords amendment 90, Government motion to disagree and Government amendments (a) to (c) to the words so restored to the Bill.

Lords amendment 93, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 95, Government motion to disagree and Government amendments (a) and (b) in lieu.

Lords amendments 102 to 104 and 107, and Government motions to disagree.

Lords amendments 3 to 5, 10, 11, 13 to 19, 21, 24 to 29, 68 to 72, 75 to 89, 91, 92, 94, 96 to 101, 105, 106 and 108 to 114.

**Robert Jenrick:** This Bill is vital to stopping the boats and preventing the dangerous, illegal and unnecessary journeys across the channel. The Bill as passed by this House made it unambiguously clear to illegal migrants and people smugglers alike that, if they come to this country by unlawful means, they will not be able to stay. Instead, they will be detained and swiftly removed either to their home country or to a safe third country.

The Government brought forward a number of amendments in the Lords to enhance the Bill. These are largely of a technical nature, so I will not detain the House by setting these out now. Instead, I will confine my remarks to the non-Government amendments passed by the other place. I am grateful to the House of Lords for undertaking its proper role as a revising Chamber. Some of the changes made by the other place are, however, little short of wrecking amendments, and are not ones that the Government can support. There are a few honourable exceptions and I will deal with those first.



[Robert Jenrick]

**Aaron Bell** (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con): As the Minister says, most of the amendments we are going to be debating and voting on later are wrecking amendments. Does he agree that none of these amendments addresses the fundamental need to address the actual incentives for people to cross the channel? That is what the Bill does and these amendments take that away.

**Robert Jenrick:** My hon. Friend is absolutely right. I would direct Members to the speech made in the other place by Lord Clarke. He said, very powerfully, that, as a former Home Secretary and long-standing Member of this House, and as someone who is interested in and knowledgeable about this issue, he sat through many hours of debate and did not hear, from any of the critics of the Bill, a single credible alternative to the Government's approach. If hon. Members follow that logic, they need to get behind the Government and support them in delivering this approach.

Another point that Lord Clarke made, which I agree with, was that, if we fail to tackle this issue—if we dismiss the concerns of members of the public—we will see very serious consequences in the years ahead, with a fragmentation of community cohesion and a weakening of the successful multi-ethnic democracy that all of us, on both sides of the House, are proud of and want to see sustained for future generations.

**Dawn Butler** (Brent Central) (Lab): The Minister says that the other place put forward wrecking amendments, but is it not true that the other place proposed amendments that ensure that we honour treaties, respect our judiciary and ensure that the Home Office is acting within the law?

**Robert Jenrick:** I do not agree with that. There are a few important exceptions, which I will come on to. I hope that, in my remarks and in answering any questions, I will reassure the hon. Lady that, on the points of substance made by those who want to see the Bill proceed and the issue tackled, the Government are making the right changes to the Bill.

**Joanna Cherry** (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): The Minister says that no one has proposed a credible alternative, but four Lords amendments do. Lords amendment 102 proposes a

“Duty to establish safe and legal routes”.

Lords amendment 103 would amend the Crime and Courts Act 2013 to confer on the National Crime Agency specific functions to tackle cross-channel organised crime. And under Lords amendments 104 and 107, the Government would set up a 10-year strategy on refugees and human trafficking, working with foreign Governments. Do those four amendments not constitute a credible alternative?

**Robert Jenrick:** As it happens, I will come to each of those points later in my speech, if the hon. and learned Lady does not mind, but in each case, we are already doing what she asks us to do. The Bill has a specific provision in respect of safe and legal routes and, when we had this debate in this House previously, we agreed further to set out the details of that. As for the National Crime Agency, its officers who work on organised immigration crime—I met them in recent weeks in

Belgium, France, Italy, Tunisia and Libya—would be very surprised to hear that the agency does not have the authority to act on organised immigration crime because those in some cases very brave men and women are doing that work every single day on our behalf already.

**Several hon. Members** *rose*—

**Robert Jenrick:** Let me make a small amount of progress and then I will give way to the hon. Member for Oldham East and Saddleworth (Debbie Abrahams).

I turn to the first issue of substance, which is Lords amendment 2. That would provide that the duty to make arrangements for removal applied to persons who entered illegally from the date of commencement of clause 2, rather than on or after 7 March 2023, as originally provided for in the Bill.

We acknowledge the position advanced by some in the other place and in this House about the retrospective effect of the Bill, but these Lords amendments go too far in resetting the clock. The closer we get to commencement of the Bill, the greater the risk that organised criminals and people smugglers will seek to exploit that, and we will see an increase in crossings as the deadline looms, which would only put more people at risk.

To guard against that, we have brought forward amendments in lieu to move the application of the duty from 7 March to the date of Royal Assent. The date of 7 March, however, would continue to apply for the purpose of the Secretary of State's power to provide accommodation for unaccompanied children and for the purposes of the bans on re-entry, settlement and citizenship. That Government amendment in lieu has a particular advantage with respect to the concerns about modern slavery expressed by my right hon. Friends the Members for Maidenhead (Mrs May) and for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith), but I will come to that in a moment.

**Debbie Abrahams** (Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Lab): Can the Minister tell me how many Afghan women have been able to avail themselves of the Afghan citizens resettlement scheme phase 3 programme? That is the Government's position on a safe and legal route. As we have understood from various Westminster Hall debates, we are looking at a handful in phase 3. Everything else refers to what has happened in 2021. I also draw his attention to the recent horrific drownings off Greece. This included a number of Afghan nationals and people from Pakistan-administered Kashmir. What really is the point of these ineffective, supposed safe routes?

1.45 pm

**Robert Jenrick:** The hon. Lady and I share the same objective: to ensure that the schemes that the Government have established are operationalised as quickly as possible, so that people who are eligible—perhaps including the women she is in contact with—can come to the United Kingdom, settle here and find sanctuary. It is incredibly important that the UK is a beacon in the world for resettlement schemes. We have already supported more than 20,000 people under the Afghan relocations and assistance policy and the ACRS to come to the United Kingdom. I appreciate her point that the numbers in recent months have been lower than she or we would



like. One reason is that there is so little capacity in the UK today to properly house individuals, and one explanation for that is that the sheer number of individuals entering the country illegally on small boats has placed an intolerable pressure on our social housing and the contingency accommodation that we have available. If we are to bring further individuals to the UK—as we want to do and are continuing to do—they risk being housed in hotels, which is an unacceptable way to house vulnerable people and, in particular, families.

**Debbie Abrahams:** The Minister is being generous with his time. We in the all-party parliamentary group on Afghan women and girls have hundreds of civilians who would like a “homes for Afghans” scheme. These people are waiting and have already volunteered. This scheme is ready and it is equivalent to the Homes for Ukraine scheme, so I urge the Government to take us up on it and make sure that the supposed safe routes are actual safe routes.

**Robert Jenrick:** I strongly endorse the hon. Lady’s comments. The Homes for Ukraine scheme has been superb and we should all be proud of it—I took part in it at one point. If it is possible to create a comparable scheme for Afghans, we should consider that. I know that the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, who has responsibility for that issue, is considering it.

On the broader point about resettlement, the UK has a strong record in this regard. Of course, we would all like to go further, but since 2015 we have welcomed 550,000 people to this country on humanitarian grounds, mostly on resettlement schemes. We are one of the world’s leading countries for such schemes.

**Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con):** While we are on the question of dates, does the Minister have any idea when the Supreme Court may consider and conclude its judgment? That is relevant not only to the question of the Bill’s progress, but to the question of the Parliament Act, in case that were to be needed.

**Robert Jenrick:** It is for the Court to determine, in the first instance, whether it intends to take up the appeal and at what time it will be heard. I can only point my hon. Friend to the final paragraph in the summary judgment from the Court of Appeal, which expressed the view of the three judges that this is a matter of great urgency and that it needs to be handled expeditiously. I hope that the Supreme Court, if it chooses to hear our appeal, does so swiftly, but that is a matter for the Supreme Court.

**Gavin Robinson (Belfast East) (DUP):** Will the Minister give way?

**Robert Jenrick:** I will, and then I should make some progress.

**Gavin Robinson:** The Minister will know that, from his perspective, I had a difficult approach to the Bill on Second Reading. When he embarked on addressing Lords amendment 2, he said he would now address the first Lords amendment of substance, yet Lords amendment 1 deals with our international obligations. We had the curious start to this Bill that it could not have a full declaration on the front of it about compatibility with

some of those international obligations. Perhaps it was just a turn of phrase, but it would be incredibly helpful if the Minister not only addressed Lords amendment 1 and the Government’s approach to international legal obligations but outlined exactly what is contained within Lords amendment 1 that the Government take issue with.

**Robert Jenrick:** I will come back to that issue later in my remarks, but let me be clear, if further reassurance is required, that the Government take our international law obligations extremely seriously. We believe that all the matters outlined in the Bill are within our international legal obligations, and should the Bill or any aspect of it be legally challenged, we will contest that vigorously to defend the position we have set out.

I point the hon. Gentleman to one important element of the recent judgment in the Court of Appeal, which was on this question: if a state such as the United Kingdom used another state and entered into a partnership, such as we have with Rwanda, for the purposes of asylum, would that be compatible with the refugee convention? I point out that all three judges agreed that that was compatible with the refugee convention. On arguably the central international law issue at stake, the Court of Appeal was clear that the Government’s approach is compatible with international law.

**Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab):** The Minister has made that commitment about the refugee convention, but Lords amendment 1 says that the Bill should be read so as not to conflict with the European convention on human rights, the refugee convention and the conventions on statelessness, the rights of the child and anti-trafficking. Why are the Government so opposed to that clarification and that clear statement on the face of the Bill, if we are the beacon and an adherent to international obligations and law?

**Robert Jenrick:** It is not normal practice to state that on the face of the Bill. It goes without saying that the Government obey our international obligations, as we do with all pieces of legislation.

**Joanna Cherry:** Will the Minister give way?

**Robert Jenrick:** I will make some progress, because I appreciate that this is a relatively short debate. If the hon. and learned Lady does not mind, there are other questions I need to address.

Detention has attracted a great deal of interest from Members from all parts of the House, as indeed it did in the other place. Detention is a necessary part of the scheme provided for in the Bill. The duty on the Home Secretary to make arrangements for removal is accompanied by strong detention powers. We know from experience that once a person is released from detention, the prospects of being able to effect removal are significantly reduced, because they typically abscond. That is why the Bill restricts, but does not exclude, judicial challenges within the first 28 days of detention. That is so that illegal migrants can be processed and removed, rather than simply absconding on arrival. The powers cover family groups the same as others, so as to not provide a perverse incentive for people smugglers and migrants to co-opt unaccompanied children into bogus family groups to avoid detention, putting children at risk in the process.

[Robert Jenrick]

Lords amendments 31 and 35 to 38 seek to restore the existing 24-hour limit on the detention of unaccompanied children and the 72-hour limit on the detention of pregnant women. I recognise that there are particular sensitivities around the detention of those cohorts, and we debated those at some length in earlier proceedings in this House. Recognising the health concerns around the detention of pregnant women and the particular vulnerability of unaccompanied children, we have brought forward amendments in lieu that maintain the existing 72-hour limit, extendable up to a week with ministerial authorisation, on the detention of pregnant women, and that enable the first-tier tribunal to consider granting immigration bail after eight days for unaccompanied children, rather than the 28 days provided for in the Bill. A number of Members of this House spoke out on the issue of pregnant women, but I pay particular tribute to my noble Friend Baroness Sugg for campaigning in the other place.

**Mrs Natalie Elphicke (Dover) (Con):** My right hon. Friend knows at first hand the impact this issue has on Dover and Kent—on our schools and other important local services. Given the proposed continuation of special measures for unaccompanied young people and now pregnant women, will he confirm that he will meet me and Kent colleagues to discuss the impact of these proposals, particularly bearing in mind the poor state of our local maternity services and the incredible pressure already being placed on our communities?

**Robert Jenrick:** I would be pleased to meet my hon. Friend, as I have in the past. She knows that I have met local authority leaders in Kent on a number of occasions. I want to do everything I can to support them. Historically, they have borne a high burden as a result of their location adjacent to the points of entry, and that has placed some public services in Kent under a great deal of pressure. In the past 12 months, we have created the national scheme to ensure that unaccompanied children are moved across the country and that all local authorities play an equitable part in supporting them. We have also provided substantial financial incentives to local authorities to help them play their fair part.

I appreciate that nothing is ever as simple as that. Developing further capacity with local authority children's homes or foster carers takes time, but I hope that the measures we have put in place will make a noticeable difference. Prior to the recent seasonal increase in individuals crossing the channel, we had successfully managed to clear all the UASC—unaccompanied asylum-seeking children—hotels that the Home Office had utilised, and I hope we can keep reliance upon them to an absolute minimum this summer and autumn.

In the case of unaccompanied children, the change I have just described will apply where an unaccompanied child is detained for the purpose of removal, and it aligns with the eight-day period for making a suspensive claim. That approach will ensure that we can continue to detain a person whom we suspect to be an adult, but who claims to be a child, pending the outcome of an age assessment.

**Stuart C. McDonald (Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East) (SNP):** It is important for the Chamber

to note that this is not really a concession; it is not even a time limit on the detention of children. It is the ability to apply for bail, as I understand it, after eight days. The person has to be aware of their rights and have access to the ability to challenge detention. It also applies only to a small cohort of children; the vast majority of children detained under the Bill will not have access to this process at all.

**Robert Jenrick:** Respectfully, the hon. Gentleman has misunderstood what we are proposing. If a child who is a genuine child and not subject to age assessment arrives unaccompanied in the United Kingdom, they will be swiftly processed. They will then be sent out into the local authority care system as quickly as possible, until they turn 18. We will seek to remove unaccompanied children in two circumstances, as I set out when we last debated this in the House. The first is where we, the Home Office, manage to reunite them with parents in other countries, as we do in a small number of cases today. The second is where we, the Home Office, manage to return them to their home country, which is a safe country, and in most cases into the care of social services immediately upon arrival. Again, that happens already in a small number of cases. There is no intention to change present practice. We are taking the power to detain, if required, a young person in that situation for up to eight days, housed in age-appropriate accommodation to enable us to make that removal effective.

**Vicky Ford (Chelmsford) (Con) rose—**

**Sir John Hayes (South Holland and The Deepings) (Con) rose—**

**Robert Jenrick:** If I may, I will give way in the first instance to my right hon. Friend the Member for Chelmsford.

**Vicky Ford:** I am listening closely to what my right hon. Friend is saying, and I am thinking in particular about arrivals as well as leavers. Can he confirm that children who are clearly children will be placed in child-appropriate accommodation? Will all those who may or may not be children have appropriate safeguarding? If that is the case, when will we see that in writing?

**Robert Jenrick:** I am grateful for my right hon. Friend's interest in the Bill. She and I come at this with exactly the same concern: to protect unaccompanied children. Any genuine child who comes into the United Kingdom will be swiftly taken into the local authority care system, which she is familiar with thanks to her former work as children's Minister. To the extent that that child is in the detained estate, they will be housed only in age-appropriate accommodation.

**Vicky Ford rose—**

**Robert Jenrick:** I will set out in a moment how that age-appropriate accommodation is determined in law today. I give way to my right hon. Friend one more time.

2 pm

**Vicky Ford:** To dig deeper into that, the Minister has suggested that a child may be detained on arrival, which is not currently the case, but that if that happened, that would be in child-appropriate accommodation.

**Robert Jenrick:** That is correct. The law today is that a child can be detained for eight days for the purpose of examination—that is not routinely done by the Home Office. Today, a child is detained for 24 hours or less and, whether for 24 hours or, if the Home Office chose to make use of the power, for eight days, they are detained only in age-appropriate accommodation. It would be unlawful to house an under-18 in accommodation that did not meet the standard set out in law. I will come on in a moment to describe that standard.

**Sir John Hayes:** I am immensely grateful to my right hon. Friend for all the work he has done on the Bill and these amendments. He will understand that the matters he is discussing bring age verification into sharp focus. As he knows, I tabled an amendment on that, which the Government ultimately re-presented as an amendment of their own. Will he confirm that age verification measures will be obligatory and comprehensive so that we do not any longer get the nonsense of people pretending to be children in order to game the system?

**Robert Jenrick:** My right hon. Friend is right. We take age assessment extremely seriously. As he knows, there are some young adults and individuals who abuse the system. Indeed, some are not so young—as I understand it, the oldest individual we have encountered who posed as a child was subsequently found to be 41 years of age. That is wrong as a matter of principle, and it is also a serious safeguarding risk to genuine children and all the caring people who are involved in supporting them, whether they be foster carers, teachers or members of the general public. We therefore have to take the issue seriously. That is why the Bill retains the power to detain an individual who is subject to age assessment for up to 28 days. During that period, the Home Office or local authorities would conduct age assessment. Today, that is done through the Merton system, which is proving to take longer than we would like, but which we want to be conducted within 28 days.

We are now taking advantage of the powers taken through the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 to begin to roll out scientific forms of age assessment. That will happen over the course of this year. Initially, it will happen concurrently with the Merton assessment. We want to ensure that that system is demonstrated to be robust and as swift as possible. I hope that hon. Members on both sides of the House will unite in common agreement that it is important that we weed out cases of abuse, because they pose such a risk. I am afraid that we have seen some very tragic instances such as the murder that occurred in Bournemouth at the behest of somebody who had posed as a child. The state has to do everything in its power to prevent that from happening again.

**Stuart C. McDonald:** Will the Minister give way?

**Robert Jenrick:** If I may make some more progress, I will happily come to the hon. Gentleman later. I want to conclude the point that I was making to my right hon. Friend the Member for Chelmsford (Vicky Ford) on the detention periods and standard of accommodation, because that is important. I assure her, and indeed my hon. Friend the Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton), who has also taken an interest in the issue, that we will seek to detain unaccompanied children for the shortest possible period. Where there is no dispute that someone is under 18, they will be transferred

to the local authority accommodation estate as quickly as possible. Where there is doubt about whether a person is indeed under 18 as they claim to be, they will be treated as a child while an age assessment is undertaken. Such a person will be detained in age-appropriate accommodation, as the law already provides. That is set out in the Detention Centre Rules 2001 made under section 153 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. Rule 11 provides that:

“Detained persons aged under 18 and families will be provided with accommodation suitable to their needs.”

If no such accommodation is available, they will not be detained and instead will be transferred to a local authority as soon as possible. I hope that provides my right hon. Friend with the assurance she seeks.

**Tim Loughton (East Worthing and Shoreham) (Con):** The Minister quoted the Detention Centre Rules 2001, which are of course 22 years old. Rule 11 says:

“Detained persons aged under 18 and families will be provided with accommodation suitable to their needs.”

Although there is a checklist of about 65 things, virtually all of them are about fabric, freedom to practise religion and access to personal hygiene. Which of the rules contains support services that are relevant and age-appropriate to children?

**Robert Jenrick:** The rules are related to 2001, as my hon. Friend says, but as I understand it they have been updated since then. They have also been tested on a number of occasions in the courts, and the Home Office takes seriously its responsibility to live up to them. It would be unlawful if we were to accommodate an under-18 inappropriately. If I may, I will read out the other limbs of rule 11, entitled “Families and minors”. They are, first:

“Detained family members shall be entitled to enjoy family life at the detention centre save to the extent necessary in the interests of security and safety.

Secondly:

“Detained persons aged under 18 and families will be provided with accommodation suitable to their needs.”

Thirdly:

“Everything reasonably necessary for detained persons’ protection, safety and well-being and the maintenance and care of infants and children shall be provided.”

That, I think, is a comprehensive set of principles. It is one that has stood the test of time over the last 22 years. If it needed to be strengthened, of course we will do so, but I hope that my hon. Friend will take my strong assurance from the Dispatch Box that that is the standard of accommodation in which we intend to house anyone who is a minor. If that accommodation were not available, we would not house those individuals in detained accommodation at all.

**Tim Loughton:** Will the Minister give way again?

**Robert Jenrick:** I will give way one last time.

**Tim Loughton:** The Minister is being generous. I will elaborate on this point if I am lucky enough to catch your eye, Mr Deputy Speaker. Where in those 65 rules are relevant child-appropriate support services such as social workers, child psychologists and others that would be necessary mentioned? Nothing that he has described



[Tim Loughton]

guarantees that children will be in age-appropriate accommodation that has age-appropriate care. That is the point.

**Robert Jenrick:** I am happy to write to my hon. Friend detailing all the support that would be available. The point that I am making is that this is the existing law, and it has existed for more than 20 years. Nothing in the Bill changes that framework. The Home Office will rely on the existing framework that has been in place throughout the years, including when he was the children's Minister, and it was considered satisfactory throughout that period.

**Paul Bristow** (Peterborough) (Con): I congratulate the Minister on everything he is doing on this issue, especially in relation to unaccompanied minors. Is he convinced that everything he is doing will not create a perverse incentive for evil people smugglers to push unaccompanied minors on to boats to cross the English channel? Of course, once they are here, they can bring over their family and so on. Is he convinced that we will do everything we can to stop that perverse incentive?

**Robert Jenrick:** The changes that we are proposing in the Government amendments in lieu strike the right balance, whereby we preserve the intention of the scheme that lies at the heart of the Bill but provide some further protections for minors. My hon. Friend is right to make the broader point that more substantial changes to the Bill, such as those envisaged by some Members of the other place, would undermine its very purpose.

In considering each and every one of the Lords amendments, we must ensure that we do not drive a coach and horses through the core deterrent effect that we are trying to achieve. Why do we want that deterrent effect? Because we do not want anyone, whether an adult or a child, crossing the channel in small boats, placing themselves in danger and being under the support and control of people smugglers and human traffickers. We must keep in mind the original purpose of the Bill, and ensure that we do not do anything to undermine that.

**Hilary Benn** (Leeds Central) (Lab): On age-appropriate accommodation and family life, could the Minister explain why he felt that the murals on the wall at the Kent intake unit damaged the deterrent effect of which he has just spoken? In that context, if parents are to continue to have family life with their children for the time that they are detained, will there be any chance of them having access to picture books to enable them to read to their children?

**Robert Jenrick:** I do not know whether the right hon. Member has been to any of the facilities, but we provide very high-quality facilities for families and children upon immediate arrival in the UK. I have made it a particular focus to ensure that we support those individuals appropriately, ensuring that conditions in those places are decent and compassionate at all times. The cohort of unaccompanied children who passed through the location that he describes last year was largely teenagers. We did not feel that the site was age-appropriate, but it contains a range of support for children and infants, including all the things that he has described. Nothing

about the decoration of sites changes the fundamentals: if someone comes to the United Kingdom, we will treat them with decency and compassion at all times.

**John McDonnell** (Hayes and Harlington) (Lab): I want the Minister to be explicit about the type of detention centre that we are talking about. For example, will children, whether unaccompanied or with their parents, be detained in detention centres such as Harmondsworth and Colnbrook? We agreed on a cross-party basis that they should never again be detained in those centres.

**Robert Jenrick:** The right hon. Gentleman is particularly knowledgeable on this issue, because he represents immigration removal centres. It is not the Government's intention that families or minors will be housed in those settings. Minors and families will be housed in age-appropriate accommodation, which is entirely separate and different in nature from the immigration removal centres that he represents. There are facilities such as those today, though not a large number of them. As part of the operationalisation of the Bill, we will need to invest in further facilities and ensure that they meet the standards set out in the detention rules as I have just described. I hope that gives him some reassurance.

**Vicky Ford** *rose*—

**Robert Jenrick:** I will give way, but then I really must make progress, or else other Members will not have an opportunity to speak.

**Vicky Ford:** I thank my right hon. Friend. There is a huge amount of concern about how the Bill will be implemented. We thought that hotels would be only temporary, yet they seem to have carried on. The Minister has said that when a child comes in, they will be moved into local authority care as soon as possible. Under the Bill, what is the maximum amount of time that a child could wait before they are in that local authority care?

**Robert Jenrick:** The position today is that a child arrives in the United Kingdom and is immediately processed in an age-appropriate setting. We then seek to place them with local authorities. Only if local authority care is not immediately available do we deploy the Home Office UASC hotels. There have been incidences, such as last year, when young people were waiting in those hotels for a period of days. That is not our intention. The only limiting factor is the availability of local authority care to support them. If more local authorities were able to come forward—as I said, that is not simple because they have their own capacity constraints—we would not use those hotels at all. It is not our intention to detain minors for a long period for examination. We want them to flow straight out into local authority care, as is the right thing to do.

2.15 pm

**Yvette Cooper** (Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford) (Lab): The Minister is being pressed on the nature of accommodation or detention that children and young people will be held in. The spirit behind the Minister's intention matters. Therefore, will he tell us if it is true that he gave orders to the asylum reception centre to paint over children's cartoons? If so, why? Nobody believes that Mickey Mouse cartoons encourage or

deter boats from arriving; they simply think that the Minister is not showing common decency towards vulnerable children.

**Robert Jenrick:** I have been clear in answer to the right hon. Member for Leeds Central (Hilary Benn) that we provide very high quality care at all the centres in which we support unaccompanied children. We did not think that the set-up in that particular unit was age-appropriate, because the majority of the individuals who passed through it unaccompanied last year were teenagers. That does not change the fundamentals that we support with decency and compassion anyone who comes to this country.

The right hon. Lady is missing the point: this Bill seeks to reduce the number of unaccompanied minors coming to the United Kingdom, precisely because we want to protect them and ensure that they are not victims of people smugglers and human traffickers. I take at face value her support for those individuals, but if she wanted to reduce that trade, she would support the Bill or come forward with a credible alternative. She has not done so. Her compassion is, to a degree, performative, because she does not come forward with alternatives that would genuinely support individuals.

Let me move on to modern slavery. The provisions in the Bill relating to that have been of particular concern to my right hon. Friends the Members for Maidenhead and for Chingford and Woodford Green. I welcome the opportunity in recent days to discuss with them the Lords amendments on this issue. It remains our view that there are clear opportunities to misuse modern slavery protections, and it is therefore essential that we take steps in the Bill to prevent misuse. The national referral mechanism rate for people arriving in the UK on small boats and being detained for return has risen from 6% for detentions ending in 2019 to 73% in 2021. The referral rate has since fallen slightly to 65% for detentions ending between January and September. The 33% increase in NRM referrals from 2021 to 2022 has put the NRM under serious strain, which is only getting worse as the trends increase in one direction. There is significant and increasing pressure on public services, which is why we want to take action.

**Mrs Theresa May (Maidenhead) (Con):** I am grateful to my right hon. Friend for the discussions we have had recently. He knows that I have a problem with the statistics: he has, yet again, quoted the statistics that the Minister in the other place quoted as well, which imply that the percentage of people coming on small boats and claiming modern slavery has risen from 6% to 73%. It did not. He is talking about people who are subsequently detained for removal. Will he now confirm that the average percentage of people coming on small boats and claiming modern slavery has not changed over the last three years, and is around 7%?

**Robert Jenrick:** I think that my right hon. Friend and I agree that the point at which individuals misuse the NRM is the point at which the state tries to remove them from the country. Our concern is that there is a significant increase in the number of people misusing the NRM—and the good work that my right hon. Friend has done on this issue—to bring about a spurious, frivolous, last-minute way of frustrating their removal from the country. So the statistics I referred to are the

most relevant statistics, because that is the point at which individuals are in the detained estate for the purpose of removal. Their removal from the United Kingdom is imminent and we are seeing a very high proportion of them using the NRM to try to delay that removal. Delay, as she knows from her great experience, is particularly relevant, because once someone has delayed their removal, they are liable to be bailed and to go back out into the community. Some will be very difficult to bring back into the detained estate, or may abscond and never be seen again. Even under the current system, that makes it extremely difficult to remove people.

Under the scheme envisaged by the Bill, we will seek to remove many of those people to a safer country such as Rwanda, while today we predominantly remove people back home to their own countries, such as Albania and Romania, so the incentive to misuse the NRM will be significantly higher. It is reasonable to assume that a very large number of individuals will make use of that as a route to frustrate the scheme. As I said earlier, that risks driving a coach and horses through the purpose of the Bill, which is a swift and speedy form of removal to act as a deterrent to prevent people making the crossing in the first place.

**Sir Iain Duncan Smith (Chingford and Woodford Green) (Con):** There are two elements here. First, the whole system can be massively speeded up, which is a fact of the NRM, straightaway. That was an obligation I was meant to have been given in the previous Bill, but it was never brought into the guidance. But the main point here is that nothing that happens outside the UK can be evidenced on this particular point. We are talking about the Minister's fear that people are departing to within the UK and then subsequently making a claim. The real problem with the Bill right now—he knows I have concerns about this—is that much of the prosecution process against the traffickers can take place only because of the evidence given by those who have been trafficked. On Report, the presumption in the Bill suddenly changed dramatically—it was done without any notice. There is now a presumption that they do not need to be here at all, other than if there is some evidence that somehow they do, whereas before it was that in order to get that evidence, they do need to be here. Why are we knocking out the amendment, rather than amending it and specifying which categories are exempt? He runs the risk of people not giving evidence and not co-operating with the police, and us not getting prosecutions. If they are going to be cleared out of the UK while giving evidence—this is the point—the reality is that they will stop doing so, because they will be in danger of being picked up by the traffickers again outside the UK. Will he therefore rethink this and put something on the face of the Bill to define those who are exempt?

**Robert Jenrick:** First, I am grateful to my right hon. Friend and to my right hon. Friend the Member for Maidenhead for their advice and wise counsel. We have sought to make changes and to listen to their point of view. That is why we brought forward two significant changes. One, as I have outlined, with respect to retrospection, means that the cohort of individuals who entered the United Kingdom from 7 March to Royal Assent who have not been in the detained estate and are then, if you like, in the community at large—in many cases they are living in supported accommodation and

[Robert Jenrick]

in some cases are liable to exploitation by human traffickers and other criminals—will now not be included in the full extent of the Bill's provisions and so can be supported in the ways that my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodgreen wishes. That has significantly reduced the pool of individuals he has concerns about. We are also—I will come on to this in a moment—committing to bringing forward statutory guidance, which I hope will provide further reassurance on the question of how law enforcement authorities would interact with victims of modern slavery to ensure that they can be appropriately supported, and have the time they need to recover and bring forward their claims so that we can all achieve our shared objective, which is the prosecution of human traffickers.

**Sir Robert Neill** (Bromley and Chislehurst) (Con): I recognise that the Minister has moved in some measure on these issues and I am grateful for that, but may I return to the point about the statutory guidance? Surely, given that we all accept that we will only deal with the organised criminals who run modern slavery with the co-operation of their victims, we cannot proceed with the clause as it currently stands without knowing what the statutory guidance will be? It was well known that this was going to be an issue, so I am surprised, frankly, that the draft statutory guidance has not been available to us today. That might well have reassured us sufficiently to support the Minister in his contention. As it is, that is still left hanging in the air. When will we see that statutory guidance?

**Robert Jenrick:** Let me answer my hon. Friend's questions by setting out what will be contained in the statutory guidance. The operation of the exception for potential victims of modern slavery to remain in the United Kingdom for the purpose of co-operating with law enforcement agencies in connection with the investigation of a trafficking offence will be subject to statutory guidance. The guidance will provide that an individual who has arrived in the UK illegally and has a positive reasonable grounds decision based on an incident that has taken place in the UK, will be afforded 30 days from that positive decision to confirm that they will co-operate with an investigation relating to their exploitation. They will not be removed within that period, which accords them with protections that are equivalent to those set out in the European convention on action against trafficking in human beings. Should they continue to co-operate with such an investigation, they will continue to be entitled to the support and protections of the NRM. Should further time be required in addition to the 30 days, that period is extendable so that the police and the victim have the time necessary to ensure that traffickers are brought to justice. I hope that that answers his question. I appreciate his desire to see the letter of the statutory guidance, and I will take that away, but that is the essence of it—the position that mirrors the ECAT provisions.

**Sir Robert Neill:** When will that come into force? Surely, we have to have that in force before the provisions in the Bill come into force. Can he give us that assurance and confirmation?

**Robert Jenrick:** It is our intention that the statutory guidance will be provided and in place for the

commencement of the Bill. I hope that that also answers the question of my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green about the fact that he feels that previous assurances in prior legislation were not fully delivered.

**Sir Iain Duncan Smith:** I welcome some of the moves the Government have made and I support the principles of what the Bill is trying to do. However, this is a really significant problem of the Government cutting off their nose to spite their face. The positive we have is that when victims give evidence and a prosecution takes place, it cuts down the likelihood that traffickers will be allowed to traffic boats across. When that is turned around, it contradicts the purpose of the Bill. The point I made to the Minister earlier was that the sudden change to the presumption power of the Secretary of State is really where the problem arises. Surely the way to deal with that is not through the guidance mechanism, but to ensure, on the face of the Bill, that that presumption is restricted, and clearly restricted. He talks about the intention of the guidance. I was given that assurance on the other Bill in December. No guidance emerged subsequently so he will forgive me, having sat in Government myself, if I do not always take the word of the Government absolutely as a categorical assurance. The only way we can get this is by doing something on the face of the Bill. The amendment, as amended, would really help enormously to reassure people and achieve the Government's objective, which is more prosecutions and fewer boats.

**Robert Jenrick:** I understand my right hon. Friend's position, but I hope he will accept that we intend to bring forward the statutory guidance and that it will set out the points I have just described. They do accord with ECAT. I appreciate that there are those who would like a longer period than 30 days, but that seems a reasonable place to settle, given that that is what the framers of ECAT themselves chose as the period for recovery and for bringing forward claims.

**Mrs May:** I am just a little confused and I hope my right hon. Friend can help me. He says that the Government want to bring forward the guidance, yet they oppose Lords amendment 57. Lords amendment 57, as I read it, would confer a power on the Secretary of State “by regulations to make provision about the circumstances in which it is necessary for a person present in the UK to provide cooperation of the kind mentioned” earlier in the clause. That is precisely the guidance he is now saying he will bring in, so why is he opposing Lords amendment 57?

**Robert Jenrick:** We do not need that power, so the amendment is superfluous; we already have the power to bring forward statutory guidance. It was our intention to do that. The guidance is being drafted, and it will set out what I have detailed.

2.30 pm

I am conscious that I need to draw my remarks to a close, so that others can speak. On the question of legal proceedings, Lords amendments 1, 7, 90 and 93 are, in the Government's view, wrecking amendments, pure and simple. For the Bill to succeed, we have to break the cycle of late, repeated, spurious legal challenges, but the amendments would perpetuate those. Lords amendment



1 in particular removes the clear purpose of the Bill as set out in clause 1, which is to prevent and deter illegal migration. The amendment takes a wrecking ball to our well established constitutional arrangement whereby we treat international law as being separate from domestic law. The amendment would incorporate the refugee convention, the UN convention on the rights of the child, and other conventions into domestic law by the back door. It would tie up the Bill in legal knots, and result in every removal being subject to endless litigation in the courts.

**Jeremy Corbyn** (Islington North) (Ind): Will the Minister give way?

**Robert Jenrick:** I will not, if the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me. I feel that I have to make progress now.

Lords amendments 1, 7, 90 and 93 are all the more unnecessary as the Bill already affords adequate protections against removal to a country that is unsafe for a particular person. That brings me to Lords amendment 23, about the removal of LGBT people to certain countries. Let me say unambiguously that we treat the safety of LGBT people with the utmost seriousness, and do not want to do anything that would in any way compromise their safety and security. I regret to say that Lords amendment 23, though clearly well intentioned, misunderstands the approach taken in the Bill. With the exception of EU and European economic area nationals and those of Switzerland and Albania, people will not be returned to their home country if they make a protection claim. If a person is issued with a third-country removal notice, they can challenge their removal to the specified country on the basis that they would face a real risk of serious and irreversible harm there, including persecution. If a serious harm suspensive claim is refused, the person has an avenue of appeal to the upper tribunal. The amendment is well meant, but the concerns that underpin it are unfounded. We take pride in the UK's support for LGBT communities globally, and our commitment to this cause remains unwavering.

**Joanna Cherry:** Rwanda has no laws prohibiting discrimination against same-sex attracted people, and people whose gender identity is different from their sex at birth. Can the Minister not understand why an LGBT person might rather come to the UK for asylum, where we have such anti-discrimination laws, than be sent somewhere like Rwanda, which does not?

**Robert Jenrick:** I understand the hon. and learned Lady's point. I say two things in response. First, the premise of asylum claims being handled in safe third countries is that those countries must be safe. Through our partnership with the Government of Rwanda, we have done work to ensure that appropriate safeguards are put in place. That has been tested by the courts, and remains an ongoing matter for the courts. Secondly, we placed a safeguard in the scheme: a person can claim that their removal to that country would put them at real risk of serious and irreversible harm, which includes persecution. I completely understand why the hon. and learned Lady says what she does, and the legitimate concern that she voices, but I do not think that the instance that she raises is founded in reality. If it were, we would take that very seriously indeed, because the Government do not want to do anything to compromise the safety and security of LGBT people.

In response to Lords amendments 73 and 74 about the power to amend the meaning of "serious and irreversible harm", we have sought to provide further assurance by bringing forward an amendment in lieu to ensure that the power cannot be used to remove the provisions in clause 38(4) that set out what constitutes serious and irreversible harm.

Lords amendments 8 and 9 undermine a key plank of the Bill, which is the provision under which asylum and relevant human rights claims can be declared inadmissible. Lords amendment 8 would incentivise people smugglers to prioritise unaccompanied children, which would put more young lives at risk and split more families. Amendment 9 would simply afford illegal entrants yet another opportunity of playing the system and dragging things out as long as possible, in the hope that they would become eligible for asylum.

Lords amendment 50 seeks to limit the Secretary of State's power to transfer a child out of local authority accommodation and into accommodation provided or arranged by the Secretary of State, by providing that the Secretary of State may do so only where that is necessary to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child. Again, the amendment is unnecessary and duplicates existing law. Under section 55 of the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009, the Home Secretary is already required to have regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child when making a decision to exercise the "vice versa" power.

Moving on to safe and legal routes, Lords amendment 102 relates to clause 59, which requires the Home Secretary, within six months of Royal Assent, to prepare and publish a report on the safe and legal routes by which persons may enter the UK, including any proposed additional safe and legal routes. Lords amendment 102 would in effect mandate that such additional safe and legal routes be brought into being within two months of the publication of the clause 59 report. Again, the amendment is unnecessary. As I set out on Report in April, we will implement any proposed new routes as soon as practicable, and in any event by the end of 2024.

**Sir Robert Buckland** (South Swindon) (Con): I have listened very carefully to everything that the Minister has said on this subject, and I know that he is sincere in his intentions. We agree on the need for a quota when it comes to safe and legal routes, but will he accept that 18 months hence is an inordinately long time, bearing in mind that the Bill will have come into force? While we might not be able to have complete synchronicity of new routes with the coming into force of this important Bill, can we at least have a much greater sense of urgency, and bring forward proposals for safe and legal routes much sooner than the end of next year?

**Robert Jenrick:** My right hon. and learned Friend and I share a concern on this issue. We want to bring forward any new routes as soon as is practical; he has my assurance, and that of the Government, that we will move as quickly as we can. I do not think it is practicable for new routes to be brought into being within two months of the publication of the report provided for in clause 59. It inevitably takes time to work with partners such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on developing a credible scheme, and to implement it. It is important that we give the Home Office the

[Robert Jenrick]

necessary time. However, I have been very clear that we will move as quickly as possible. *[Interruption.]* The right hon. Member for Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford (Yvette Cooper) says that we have had 13 years; more humanitarian visas were issued last year by this Conservative Government than probably any Government since the second world war. Since 2015, under a majority Conservative Government, 550,000 people have entered the UK on humanitarian grounds. That compares extremely favourably with the record of the Government of which she was a member.

**Hilary Benn:** Will the Minister give way?

**Robert Jenrick:** I will; then I will need to bring my remarks to a close.

**Hilary Benn:** The Government have said that they are committed to bringing forward safe, legal routes, but that they will not do that until they have stopped the boats. Does the Minister not recognise that one thing that the Government could do that would help stop the boats is bring forward safe, legal routes?

**Robert Jenrick:** No, I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman. I think there is a role for safe, legal routes, and I want the UK to be respected internationally for the way in which we support those seeking sanctuary. That is what we have ensured in recent years by creating world-leading schemes, such as those for Ukraine, Syria and Hong Kong, and indeed there is also the global scheme, which is operated by the UNHCR. I do not accept the argument that I think he is advancing, which is that if we produce a larger safe and legal route to the United Kingdom, it will lead to a reduction in the number of individuals crossing illegally in small boats. The individuals we would likely bring to the United Kingdom under a safe and legal route are quite different, in the main, from those coming across in small boats. Most of our small boat arrivals are young men in their 20s and 30s who are already in a place of safety—France—with a fully functioning asylum system. The kind of scheme the Government envisage for safe and legal routes is one where we take families and vulnerable people directly from conflict zones or refugee camps elsewhere in the world. That is a very different system from offering a safe and legal route to predominantly young men in a place of safety to come to the United Kingdom. That does not denude the value of having safe and legal routes, but the purpose is different.

Lords amendment 103 relates to the functions of the National Crime Agency, and I am afraid that it just amounts to legislative grandstanding. The NCA's statutory functions already cover tackling organised immigration crime. As such, the amendment simply risks undermining

the operational independence of the director general by tying his hands as to how to organise the NCA to best deliver its objectives. As I said in answer to an earlier question, our colleagues at the NCA who work every day on organised immigration crime would be very surprised to hear the contention that they are not focused on this work, because they certainly are.

Finally, Lords amendment 104, which was tabled by the Archbishop of Canterbury, is well-meaning but unnecessary. It is a distraction from the immediate priority of stopping the boats and tackling the threat to life arising from dangerous, illegal and unnecessary channel crossings. That is the aim of the Bill, and the Lords amendment does not reflect the actions that we have already taken through cross-Government initiatives to tackle the refugee crisis and through the ongoing work to deliver our strategic approach to tackling human trafficking. Moreover, it does not recognise how this country has responded to the result of crises, offering sanctuary to over 550,000 people through safe and legal routes since 2015.

By getting a grip on illegal migration, we aim to reduce the pressure that it places on our public services and on community cohesion and to increase the capacity to support those who seek sanctuary here in the UK. The stop-the-boats Bill is designed to ensure that the UK can be an even greater force for good in the world by using our finite resources on those who truly need it.

In conclusion, it is vital that this Bill reaches the statute book quickly and in a form that will stop the boats. It is riddled with exceptions and get-out clauses placed in it by the other place. If they remain, it will simply not work. We have to send a clear message back to the other place that it is now their turn to think again and to respect the will of the elected House. The public expect us to tackle this issue, to secure our borders and to stop the boats.

**Several hon. Members rose—**

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans):** Order. I am looking to see whether people are standing who did not put in to speak, and there are a couple at least. Thank you very much. You can resume your seats.

## ROYAL ASSENT

**Mr Deputy Speaker:** I have to notify the House, in accordance with the Royal Assent Act 1967, that His Majesty has signified his Royal Assent to the following Acts:

Finance (No. 2) Act 2023

Supply and Appropriation (Main Estimates) Act 2023  
National Security Act 2023.

## Illegal Migration Bill

*Debate resumed.*

2.44 pm

**Stephen Kinnock** (Aberavon) (Lab): Here we go again: another day, another Bill designed to chase headlines and manufacture controversy, rather than tackle the asylum crisis that has been caused by the incompetence and indifference of the last 13 years. That said, a casual observer of the Prime Minister's recent trip to Dover could be forgiven for thinking that it was all sorted—job done. There he was sporting his super-sized new boots and boasting about the slight decrease in crossings, while apparently failing to realise that strong winds in the channel were the actual cause of his somewhat premature celebrations. Since he danced his victory jig in Dover, we have seen channel crossings skyrocket, with the busiest June yet for the criminal people smuggling trade, with 3,824 asylum seekers making the dangerous journey last month. Call me old-fashioned, but an asylum strategy that is based on the weather is probably not a sustainable strategy.

Then we have the Home Secretary. She jetted off to Rwanda on a taxpayer-funded vanity photoshoot to champion the new housing being built for the asylum seekers she dreams of one day flying over there. But again, all was not as it seemed: the housing estate she was showcasing is largely due to be used to house Rwandan nationals. Last week, the Court of Appeal reminded her that, even if her plan does go ahead, the Rwandan authorities can process only around 100 asylum claims per year—less than 0.3% of last year's small boat crossers. I am not sure what the Home Secretary plans to do with the other 99.7% of asylum seekers or, indeed, why she thinks a 0.3% chance of removal to Rwanda is likely to put off a single asylum seeker considering paying money to a people smuggler. For a deterrent to be effective, it must be credible, and a 0.3% risk of deportation to Rwanda is not going to deter.

**Sir John Hayes:** I know that the hon. Gentleman takes these matters very seriously and he will remember that I was very complimentary about him in various ways in a debate in Westminster Hall. However, he must recognise that the deterrent effect of being processed offshore, which the Australians experienced during their Operation Sovereign Borders, would mean fewer people coming here. As he described, the people traffickers' branding is that, if someone gets to Britain, they will never leave. By challenging that sales pitch, we will deter people from coming.

**Stephen Kinnock:** I thank the right hon. Gentleman for his intervention, but I think he misunderstands the basic psychology here. We are talking about people who have already risked life and limb and taken a very dangerous journey to get as far as the channel. The idea that a 0.3% chance of being removed to Rwanda is going to deter people who have already taken such massive risks is simply for the birds, and that is why the Rwanda scheme is fundamentally flawed.

Last but not least, we have the Immigration Minister, whose latest foray into playing the tough guy was to order that Mickey Mouse cartoons in immigration centres be painted over because they were just too cheery for his liking. Many of those children are running away from

unimaginable horrors, so I really do hope that the Minister will take some time to reflect on the morality of his actions. The sheer pettiness and petulance are also quite astonishing, because painting over Disney characters in immigration centres will not stop the boats—I cannot believe I even need to say those words. Those three short stories about the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary and the Immigration Minister make it clear that we are not exactly dealing with a well-oiled machine here.

Last week, we finally received the Home Office's impact assessment for this legislation, which revealed that it will cost the Government £169,000 per asylum seeker sent to Rwanda—five times the figure being briefed out when the partnership was announced last year. That is on top of the £140 million that has already been handed over to the Rwandan Government for what must surely be the most expensive press release in history. This whole sorry tale is a shambolic farce, and the cost to the taxpayer of the Rwanda policy, this legislation and the asylum backlog has become utterly extortionate.

The cost of the asylum system is estimated by the National Audit Office to be seven times as large as it was under the last Labour Government—at an astonishing £3.6 billion. Almost 50,000 people are stuck in hotels, at £7 million a day, with 172,000 in the backlog. For the avoidance of doubt, that is the real backlog, not the imaginary “legacy cases” invented by the Prime Minister as a way of spinning the numbers. In fact, the backlog is nine times higher than it was when Labour left office in 2010. By the way, we are still waiting for the Immigration Minister and the Prime Minister to correct the record on this point after the UK Statistics Authority comprehensively demolished their claims.

As the Home Secretary and her officials have confirmed, numbers are going up, not down. Yesterday, the permanent secretary to the Home Office confirmed to the Public Accounts Committee that the Prime Minister is failing in his pledge to reduce asylum seeker hotel use. To make matters worse, the National Audit Office has declared that the Government will also fail to achieve their aim of clearing the so-called legacy backlog of 92,000 cases by the end of this year.

**Tim Loughton:** We are here to discuss rather a lot of Lords amendments. The hon. Gentleman has now been speaking for six minutes. I have been listening hard and, by my reckoning, he has not mentioned a single amendment. Can he give us an ETA for when he is likely to start talking relevantly about what we are here to discuss? Many of us would like to discuss the amendments.

**Stephen Kinnock:** I thank the hon. Gentleman for his intervention. I simply note that the Immigration Minister was on his feet for one hour and 15 minutes. There was plenty of context and background in his comments, too. We need to understand that the Bill has been brought forward against a backdrop of crisis and chaos and it is important that we have that on the record.

Interestingly, the Prime Minister seems to have concocted a new solution, which is simply to allow asylum seekers to slip off the radar, never to be seen or heard of again. The Government claim that their decision-making rate has increased and that they are getting on with clearing the backlog, but the reality is that more than half of the



[Stephen Kinnock]

so-called asylum decisions are withdrawn applications or so-called administrative decisions. In other words, asylum seekers are melting into the underground economy, and many of them will never be heard of or seen again by our authorities. The Government are just letting them go. Withdrawals, as a proportion of completed cases, have increased from 20% to 55% on this Prime Minister's watch. If that is not turning a blind eye to people absconding and disappearing into the system, I do not know what is.

It is against that backdrop of crisis and chaos that Ministers introduced the legislation before us this afternoon. As we have consistently pointed out, the Bill will only make a terrible situation worse. Far from cleaning up the awful mess that has built up over 13 years of ineptitude, it will simply grow the backlog, increase the cost and ensure that people smugglers are laughing all the way to the bank.

At the heart of the Bill are two instructions to the Government—to detain and remove every asylum seeker who comes to the UK via irregular routes—but with our asylum accommodation capacity already at breaking point, where on earth will the Home Secretary detain them? And with her unworkable Rwanda plan in tatters and with negotiations with the EU on a successor to the Dublin regulation nowhere to be seen, where on earth is she going to remove them to? We therefore commend the work of all the Lords and Baronesses who have sought to improve this profoundly flawed and counterproductive Bill. They really had their work cut out for them, given that the Government were defeated a staggering 20 times in the other place.

Amendments throughout the Bill's passage have focused on mitigating its most egregious excesses, while trying to steer the Government in the direction of Labour's five-point plan to fix the broken asylum system that, despite their protestations, Conservative Members know full well is a comprehensive agenda based on hard graft, common sense and quiet diplomacy, rather than the headline-chasing gimmicks they have come up with. Our plan includes repurposing the Rwanda money to the National Crime Agency to recruit a specialist unit of officers to tackle the criminal gangs upstream. Lords amendment 103, in the name of Lord Coaker, places responsibility on the NCA to tackle immigration crime.

Of the other substantial Lords amendments, the majority seek to prevent the utterly unnecessary attacks on some of the most vulnerable people in society, commit Britain to complying with international law, or seek to find long-term solutions to the global asylum crisis via international solutions and controlled and managed routes.

To ensure that Britain meets its obligations under international law, we support Lords amendment 1, which adds a requirement that nothing in the Bill should require any act that would violate the UK's relevant commitments under international law. We are extremely concerned that the Government are subjecting unaccompanied children to the so-called hostile environment. While the Minister paints over Mickey Mouse murals, we on these Benches want unaccompanied children to be treated with respect. That is why we support Lords amendment 33, which retains the current 72-hour limit on the detention of children, and Lords

amendment 31, which retains the current 24-hour limit on the detention of unaccompanied children, both in the name of Baroness Mobarik. We do not believe the Government's concessions offer enough.

**Sir Robert Neill:** I was superficially attracted to Lords amendment 1, but will the hon. Gentleman consider these two points? First, it is an established principle of interpretation that the courts will always read statute in accordance with international convention obligations, as far as it is possible to do so—that was most recently established in the Assange case. Secondly, Lord Wolfson raised the point in the other place that the effect of clause 1, as amended, however intended, is substantively to entrench or incorporate those conventions in UK domestic law. Surely that is not something that should be done through an amendment to an Act of Parliament. There may be arguments for or against it, but that is its effect. It is not an interpretive clause but an incorporative clause, and some of us have a problem with doing it in that way at this time in this particular Bill.

**Stephen Kinnock:** I thank the Chairman of the Justice Committee for that intervention. Let us not forget that page 1 says the Government cannot confirm that the Bill complies with international law. I also remind him that we are dealing with a Government who seem to be more than prepared to break international law, with the Northern Ireland protocol being just one example. I am afraid it is just not possible to take the Government's word on trust or at face value, which is why additional safeguards have to be built into the process.

Lords amendment 8, in the name of Lord Dubs, seeks to ensure that asylum and human rights claims from unaccompanied children who are exempt from the duty to remove are treated as admissible, and Lords amendment 50, in the name of the Bishop of Durham, limits the Secretary of State's power to transfer a child out of local authority care and into accommodation provided by the Home Office to cases where to do so is "necessary to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child."

We are also determined to protect vulnerable women, particularly those who are pregnant or victims of modern slavery. In that spirit, we on these Benches support Baroness Lister's amendments 37 and 38, which retain the 72-hour limit on the detention of pregnant women. We are less than satisfied with the Government's concession on this point.

We support the amendments that protect victims of modern slavery, including Lords amendment 56 in the name of Lord Randall, which exempts victims of modern slavery from being removed and from being denied access to support during the statutory recovery period, and Lords amendment 57, tabled by Lord Carlile, which removes the Bill's presumption that it is not necessary for victims of modern slavery to remain in the UK for the purposes of co-operating with any criminal proceedings against alleged perpetrators. That of course might sometimes be the case.

Ultimately, the Government need to accelerate the national referral process as a matter of urgency because the average wait time is 553 days, which is unacceptable. The Immigration Minister's incorrect comments on modern slavery have been well documented, and he was recently rebuked yet again by the UK Statistics Authority for making those unfounded claims.

The constant stream of factually incorrect claims distorts the debate and plays into the hands of the people traffickers. I strongly encourage us to start seeing the facts and evidence before us as the basis for debate, otherwise there is such a danger that the Bill will turn into a traffickers charter, with the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary and the Immigration Minister effectively enabling the criminal gangs.

We also support Lords amendment 23 in the name of Lord Etherton, as we cannot have a situation in which we remove LGBT refugees to third countries with Governments that pursue homophobic and transphobic policies.

I stress that, on these Benches, we are strongly committed to working with our international partners as we seek to find long-term solutions to the global migration crisis. In Committee and on Report, we tabled an international co-operation amendment to connect the need to achieve a returns deal with the EU and France for small-boat migrants with the need for Britain and other European countries to play our part in giving sanctuary to genuine refugees in need of our support, starting with those who have family in the UK. This remains our commitment for when we enter government.

To that end, we support Lords amendment 104 in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which requires the Government to publish a 10-year strategy on countering human trafficking and responding to international refugee crises, and Lords amendment 102 in the name of Baroness Stroud, which places a duty on the Government to establish safe and legal routes to asylum.

3 pm

Finally, Lord German's amendment 9 rightly states that the Government should accept asylum claims if they have not removed inadmissible claimants within six months. We cannot have refugees stuck in indefinite limbo, unable to work or contribute, at an extortionate cost to the taxpayer. The Government are already introducing this bigger backlog Bill. It beggars belief that Ministers now want to turn this legislation into an indefinite limbo Bill.

The amendments before us today enjoyed substantial support in the other place, each passing by a comfortable margin. A responsible Government would have sought compromise and made concessions, but instead Ministers chose to double down, to the point where Parliament was treated to the spectacle of Lord Lebedev of Siberia being dragged in to vote for the first time since he was ennobled three years ago, in a desperately futile whipping operation.

The truth is that the Bill is just a tawdry and deeply counterproductive attempt to show that the Government are doing something—anything—to respond to a growing asylum crisis of their making. Those on the Government Benches know that the asylum system is broken—indeed, they admit it—and they should know because they broke it. Their attempts to fix it are a shambles. They have sent more Home Secretaries to Rwanda than asylum seekers. They have had two migration Bills, yet neither has stopped a single boat. This Bill—the bigger backlog Bill—will increase asylum hotel use all around the country.

Recently, before the Home Affairs Committee, the Home Secretary failed to tell us how she will find the 154 vulnerable children missing from Government asylum

hotels; how many asylum caseworkers actually work in her Department; and how many of the 12,000 Albanians who arrived on small boats last year have been returned. It is a scene of crisis and chaos. The Conservatives have taken a sledgehammer to our asylum system, and British taxpayers are paying the price.

Perhaps the most disheartening aspect of this whole fiasco is that the Government never take responsibility and always try to pass the buck. They blame the British legal system, the civil service and the EU—they even blame the football pundits—but they have a working majority in this place, so this is on them and them only. They have failed, so they need to get out of the way. We need a general election, a Labour Government, and our comprehensive plan to stop the boats and fix the broken asylum system—and we need it now.

**Several hon. Members rose—**

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans):** Order. It is clear to me that this debate is going to go the distance, and a number of people are trying to catch my eye. We have only two hours left, so may I ask for brevity, as it would be incredibly useful in trying to get everybody in? I call Theresa May.

**Mrs May:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I want to concentrate my remarks on Lords amendments 2 and 56. I welcome the Government's movement on the issue of retrospection. Whatever the motivation, it does mean that people who come here and are subjected to slavery, and who arrived after 7 March and before the commencement of the Bill, will get support. I welcome that.

However, of course I want support to continue for the victims of modern slavery here in the UK after commencement of the Bill. Hence my interest, as a former Home Secretary and long-standing Member of this House, in Lords amendment 56, which was tabled by Lord Randall. The Bill has been marketed as a stop the boats Bill. We all want to stop the boats. Nobody wants to see people risking their lives in small boats going across the channel, as we do not want to see people risking their lives in unseaworthy vessels going across the Mediterranean. However, this Bill is not just written to stop the boats; it covers all illegal migration and its unwritten subtext is the "stop certain victims' claims of modern slavery" Bill. This is not about stopping false claims of modern slavery; it is about stopping all claims, full stop. That is where I depart from the Government.

When I was Home Secretary, we were very clear that modern slavery should not be seen as part of the immigration issue, but the Government are now taking those two together, and that is one of the difficulties. It is not clear what problem will be solved by saying that people who are here illegally cannot claim modern slavery and cannot be afforded the support and protection afforded to modern slavery victims, and, therefore, it is not clear why the Government want to reject Lords amendment 56.

Perhaps the Government's concern is that people will come off the small boats and claim modern slavery, but the amendment does not allow them to do that. It has been suggested to me that a boat might land and not be apprehended, and when somebody is caught a couple of

[Mrs May]

days later, for example, they would then claim modern slavery. First, let me say that the first responders, aided by the changes in the Nationality and Borders Act 2022, should be well able to see through that. Secondly, the purpose of the Bill is to stop the boats, so if the Bill is successful, that situation will not occur.

Lords amendment 56 is not about small boats. Almost no one arriving on a small boat after commencement of this Bill will be covered by it, but I do want to set out the type of victim who would be covered by that amendment and, therefore, is now going to be denied support as a victim of modern slavery.

Let us imagine a young woman—it could be a young man but, given the numbers, it is most likely to be a young woman—who is persuaded by a male friend to come over to the UK for what he says will be a great job and a wonderful life together. Perhaps she thinks that they are in love, that this is a way of getting out of the debt she is in, or that she wants to leave a difficult family relationship or an abusive relationship. She comes with him, probably on illegal documents, but that is unbeknown to her. As soon as she gets here, she is put into prostitution and he benefits financially from that. Forced into sexual exploitation, living in appalling conditions and not paid, she is in slavery. After several months or perhaps after years, she manages to escape. Under the Modern Slavery Act 2015, she could be provided with the support needs to get her life back and enable the police to identify and prosecute the perpetrators.

Under this Bill, the Government's response would be quite different. She would get no support. The Government's response would be, "We don't care that you have been in slavery in the UK. We don't care that you've been in a living hell. We don't care that you have been the victim of crime. We do care that you came here illegally, even though you probably didn't know it. So we are going to detain you and send you home, even if it is into the arms of the very people who trafficked you here in the first place. Or we want to send you to Rwanda." No thought would be given to whether the young woman would get her life back and, crucially, no thought would be given to catching and prosecuting the perpetrators. The evidence of the police is clear: if we want victims to provide evidence to bring slave drivers to justice, the victims need time and support, and they need to be here. This Bill ties the hands of the police and undoes the good work of the Modern Slavery Act.

I know that Ministers have said that this Bill will enable more perpetrators to be stopped, but on modern slavery I genuinely believe it will do the opposite: it will enable more slave drivers to operate and make money out of human misery. It will consign more people to slavery. There is no doubt about it: if Lords amendment 56 is overthrown, that will be the impact.

The Minister has shown a willingness—he has described this at the Dispatch Box today—to look for mitigations. However, as he said, so far those mitigations have been offered as limited change and only in guidance, not in the Bill. The best mitigation would be not to press the objection to Lords amendment 56 and allow it to stand in the Bill. In the absence of that, I hope that the Government will stand by assurances they have given to find some workable compromise, but to put it in the Bill. The Government want to deny certain victims of

modern slavery support, which will deeply damage the operation of the Modern Slavery Act. The alternative is to let Lords amendment 56 stand. If the Government persist in disagreeing with Lords amendment 56, I will have to persist in disagreeing with the Government.

**Several hon. Members** *rose*—

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans):** I call Dame Diana Johnson.

**Dame Diana Johnson** (Kingston upon Hull North) (Lab): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. May I start by agreeing with the Minister on the vital role that the other place plays as a revising Chamber—

**Mr Deputy Speaker:** Order. Sorry, Dame Diana. You are the next one to speak from your party, and I have made a faux pas. I should call Stuart C. McDonald.

**Stuart C. McDonald:** I absolutely forgive you for that, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I offer my apologies to the Chair of the Home Affairs Committee. I look forward to hearing her remarks shortly.

It is a pleasure to follow the right hon. Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May), and I echo everything she said about modern slavery. I would like to say it is a pleasure to be taking part in a debate on this Bill again, but unfortunately it most definitely is not. Members will not be surprised to hear that the position of my party is that this remains a rotten, utterly misconceived and cruel Bill that will not stop boats but will cause immense human suffering to people who have fled persecution and harm. For the reasons we have just heard, it is a traffickers charter. It has been rushed through Parliament in a most appalling way, without consultation or proper scrutiny.

Although the House of Lords has done some decent work to date, forgive me if we are not popping the champagne corks at this stage. The 20 Lords amendments add a bit of polish, but they barely scratch the surface of the problems with the Bill, and experience tells us, unfortunately, that their lordships will be bargained down to three or four moderate concessions. They have already passed up the chance to refuse the Bill a Second Reading, with Labour peers abstaining for utterly unconvincing reasons. If it was a revising Chamber with any sort of teeth or credibility, it would at least be using its powers to delay this Bill and let voters decide this issue for themselves at the next election.

In that context, it is vital that we remember during today's debate and the whole ping-pong process that only one solitary sentence in the Government's 2019 manifesto referred to asylum. It was a very benign sentence:

"We will continue to grant asylum and support to refugees fleeing persecution, with the ultimate aim of helping them to return home if it is safe to do so."

That was it. This Bill, and every single one of the Government's motions to reject the Lords amendments, is completely and utterly contrary to that pledge. Without the amendments, the Bill will essentially stop the grant of asylum to almost anyone. Instead of offering support or an assisted return home to most refugees, it will enforce unlimited detention at the whim of the Home Secretary, permanent limbo, or threatened removal to



Rwanda. Even children and trafficking victims are not to be spared, and the consequences for them will be horrendous.

This outrageous Bill, which rides roughshod over international law without any electoral endorsement, is precisely the sort of Bill that the House of Lords should be voting down and delaying. We can make that less necessary by agreeing to all the Lords amendments. That is the least we should do, and it really should not be too much to ask.

As we have heard, we are talking about amendments that will ensure compliance with our international obligations under vital international treaties such as the refugee convention, the European convention on human rights, the trafficking convention and the convention on the rights of the child. We are talking about basic respect for the rule of law, and my party wholeheartedly endorses Lords amendment 1, which incorporates those obligations into the Bill.

**Joanna Cherry:** When the Minister was asked about Lords amendment 1, he said that it “goes without saying” that the Government adhere to their international obligations, but they have not been able to certify the Bill as compatible with the ECHR and the cross-party Joint Committee on Human Rights, under my chairmanship, said that the Bill risks breaching a number of our binding international human rights obligations. Is it not the case that, as things stand, the only way we have of putting that right is to support Lords amendment 1?

**Stuart C. McDonald:** I absolutely agree. The most obvious example—I would say it is blindingly obvious—is the trafficking convention. That says that we must provide support to victims of trafficking, yet here we have a Bill that says the opposite. We are going to say, “Victim of trafficking or not, you are not getting support.” That is a blatant contravention of the trafficking convention, and that is why we need the treaties in Lords amendment 1 incorporated into clause 1.

**Sir John Hayes:** Surely, the hon. Gentleman recognises that the point of Lords amendment 1 is to incorporate a whole range of international obligations into our law. It may well be that those obligations matter and that the Bill needs to be in line with them, but Lords amendment 1 would incorporate them into law. This is not the place to do that, and it is not the means to do it.

**Stuart C. McDonald:** It is absolutely the place to do it, and it is essential that we do it, precisely for the reasons I have just given. Various provisions of the Bill clearly breach some of those conventions. I have just given the example of the trafficking convention. I cannot see how any sensible person can read the Bill and say that it accords with our obligations under the trafficking convention—I really cannot. I see no alternative but to support Lords amendment 1; in fact, I absolutely embrace what their lordships have attempted to do here.

We are also talking about amendments to stop mass and indeterminate detention at the whim of the Home Secretary. Very little attention has been drawn to those shocking and appalling powers today; I would have thought they would embarrass some Conservative MPs, yet we have barely considered them. We need to bring back the principle that it is for the courts to assess what

is necessary to effect removal, rather than leaving it open to the Home Secretary to detain just for her convenience.

We are talking about amendments protecting pregnant women, and accompanied and unaccompanied children, from lengthy detention. The concession on pregnant women is a rare positive, and I welcome it, but the so-called concession on detaining children is nothing of the sort. It means that a few, but very far from all, will be allowed to apply for bail after eight days. That is not a time limit and it will not apply universally—far from it. We should not let the Government away with detaining hundreds and possibly thousands of kids indefinitely.

The Government have been forced to concede on amendments regarding the retrospective application of the Bill, which is good. Presumably, they do not want a backlog of 10,000 as soon as the Bill goes into force. Again, though, the concession does not go far enough, as important parts of the Bill will still be applied retrospectively. In the Government’s amendment in lieu, there is a power for Ministers to change the commencement date again. It would be useful at least to have an assurance from the Minister that that will not be used to put the clock back again, whether to March or to any other time before Royal Assent.

We are talking about amendments protecting LGBT people from removal to countries where they will almost certainly face serious harm. That protection is necessary, because the flimsy procedures in the Bill as it stood when the Government introduced it were totally inadequate to stop that happening.

We are talking about amendments to remove victims of trafficking from the Bill’s horrendous reach. As the right hon. Member for Maidenhead put it, without the Lords amendments, trafficking and slavery victims will have absolutely no incentive to seek support from the Government; in fact, they will have every incentive not to. Instead, they will be driven straight back into the hands of the people who have been exploiting them.

3.15 pm

We are talking about amendments to stop the Home Office sticking children in hotels, from which hundreds have already gone missing. As the Children’s Commissioner for England and Wales said just yesterday, that cannot be allowed to happen.

We are talking about amendments to stop the Home Office removing children before the Home Office age assessment can be challenged. The Minister failed to mention that, in the majority of cases where there is a dispute about age, the Home Office is shown to be wrong. There is an appalling danger that unaccompanied children will be kicked out of the country before they have the chance to challenge the assessment that has been made about them.

We are talking about amendments to strengthen the pathetic safeguards in the Bill so that those challenging removal do not need to meet impossible tests of imminent, serious and irreversible harm. We are also talking about amendments to reinstate the fundamental right to challenge potentially illegal Government removal decisions through judicial review before people are stuck on a plane. Again, we are simply asking for respect for our courts and the rule of law. We support the worthy amendments tabled by the Archbishop of Canterbury to support safe routes and a proper strategy.

We support the pivotal Lords amendments that say that we should process asylum claims from children, and claims from people who are not removed within six months, just as happens now. Without that amendment, many thousands of people will end up permanently in limbo—either in indefinite detention or being supported indefinitely—or going underground because they have no incentive any more to keep in touch with the Home Office.

It shows how extraordinarily far to the extremes this Parliament has lurched that any of those Lords amendments are even controversial. All the risk assessments that the Government were forced to publish should have caused alarm bells to ring loudly. The Bill will be an absolute disaster, and an expensive one at that—in terms of spending and for the UK's reputation, but most importantly for the lives of the people who are caught up in its tentacles. It is the desperate last throw of the dice from a desperate Government.

The real question is whether we will, for once, see some gumption and ambition from the second Chamber. There is no point in its passing 20 amendments just to give them all up seven days later. If it is not this outrageous Bill that the House of Lords kicks into touch, then which one will it be? If not this attack on international law, utterly without electoral mandate, what will it take? If locking up children, handing powers to traffickers and destroying the asylum system does not spur the House of Lords into action, what will?

If the House of Lords is not going to use its powers now, what is the point of those powers? What is the point of the House of Lords, and what is the point of the Opposition appointing peers? The Bill does not just need all the Lords amendments retained; frankly, it needs stopped, and it is up to the House of Lords to make sure that happens.

**Several hon. Members** *rose*—

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans):** Order. I will call Tim Loughton first, and then it will be Dame Diana take two.

**Tim Loughton:** I will aim to complete my speech in less time than it took the hon. Member for Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East (Stuart C. McDonald) to start talking about the Lords amendments, which is what we are here to do—but we will see how we go. I declare an interest as the chair of a safeguarding board of a children's company.

I thank the Minister for the extensive discussions that we have had about the Lords amendments. I fear that we have not quite got there, so we may be back here again in a while. There has been an inordinate amount of debate on the Bill, and a lot of work has been done in the Lords, which is why we have so many amendments.

I support the Bill and I want it to pass, but it needs properly to balance safe and legal routes, and assurances about looking after the most vulnerable—particularly children—with coming down hard on people who are gaming the system and do not have a legitimate case for claiming asylum in the UK.

I do not have time to talk about every Lords amendment, so I will focus on two main areas: child detention, and safe and legal routes. I am pleased and grateful to the Government for the progress that we have made on the detention of pregnant women; that was a no-brainer,

frankly. I also have some concerns around the treatment of people being transported back to other countries on the grounds of sexuality, and I want further assurances on that from the Minister. I also have concerns about accompanied children. There is a real problem with so-called families, who have been put together by people smugglers, as the Home Affairs Committee saw when we went to Dover. We came across somebody claiming to be the uncle of a young girl and they did not even speak the same language. There are problems here, but I absolutely want to concentrate on unaccompanied asylum-seeking children.

I am also pleased that Lord Carlile's amendments around retrospectivity have been accepted. The Archbishop of Canterbury's 10-year strategy has some merit in it, but I do not think that it is for this Bill; it is a strategy for a Government rather than being for a piece of legislation such as this.

On the subject of child detention, despite the substantial discussions I mentioned, it would appear that the Government are setting out only a very narrow concession, just to give the possibility of bail after eight days to one small subgroup of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children detained on the grounds of removal only. The Government themselves said in March in guidance:

"A period of detention can have a significant and negative impact on a child's mental or physical health and development".

I think that we would all agree with that, so such detention needs to be used sensitively and sparingly.

This is a really sensitive issue. I think it was a proud achievement of the coalition Government when, after a Citizens' Assembly back in 2010, David Cameron said that child detention was not acceptable and pledged to end it. It was part of the coalition programme in May 2010. Detention policy changed in 2011 and was codified in the Immigration Act 2014. Large numbers of children were being detained before 2010. There were 1,065 children being detained in 2009 alone. There was a case of a three-year-old girl who had spent 166 days of her life—her short life—in Yarl's Wood detention centre. That was completely unacceptable, so it was right that the law was changed.

At the time, guarantees were also made in a debate on the Nationality and Borders Bill. The Government made explicitly clear their commitment to the rationale that unaccompanied children should not be blocked from claiming asylum and would be exempt from the inadmissibility process. As the Minister set out on Report of that Bill:

"I wish to emphasise that we will always act in accordance with our international obligations, and to be very clear that unaccompanied asylum-seeking children will not be subject to inadmissibility or transferred for offshore processing."—[*Official Report*, 7 December 2021; Vol. 705, c. 311.]

There was merit in that then and there is still merit in it now.

This matter was raised as a priority issue in the Committee and Report stages of this Bill. The Minister promised us changes in the Lords. That is why we did not push to a vote the amendments tabled in my name and the names of other right hon. and hon. Members at that stage. However, I am afraid that the promise did not materialise in the House of Lords, and only now, with amendments in lieu, are we seeing some concessions at this late stage, which, frankly, is not good enough. That is why, I am afraid, there is some scarcity of trust

in the assurances given from the Dispatch Box, rather than stuff written, *prima facie*, in the Bill, or in specific guidance linked to undertakings in the Bill. We need to see more details in the Bill, not just assurances from the Dispatch Box, which have not always been forthcoming.

In changing the law, we need to comply with a clear set of principles when we are dealing with vulnerable children. Children should be treated differently from adults. Any child in the United Kingdom is entitled to the same protections whether they arrive on a boat or they were born here. Whether we like it or not, a child is a child and, as such, should be subject to the safety of the Children Act 1989, which is as relevant today as it was when it was first legislated for.

**Jeremy Corbyn:** I thank the hon. Gentleman for giving way. I absolutely agree with the point that he has just made. This also fits in with the 1989 convention on the rights of the child, which the British Government very rapidly and quite correctly signed up to at that time. Withdrawing from that convention surely weakens that protection.

**Tim Loughton:** The paramount piece of legislation in this country is the Children Act 1989. We should be proud of it, as it is copied and envied the world over. That is how we in this country look after children who need the protection of the state for an assortment of reasons. In my book, the Children Act—I always carry it with me, and I have it here today—usually trumps everything else.

**Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con):** Will my hon. Friend give way?

**Tim Loughton:** I will, but I do not want to take too many interventions, because many others wish to speak.

**Sir Edward Leigh:** We know from the people who arrive in hotels that perhaps 20% of the migrants will be children—or say they are children. We know that that will be the case among those who arrive at RAF Scampton. As the Government are talking about 2,000 people coming here, we may need 40 or 50 social workers, which we cannot afford in Lincolnshire. We do not have the resources to look after these people properly, to assess them, to work out whether they are children and to decide how they are going to be looked after. Is my hon. Friend not making the point that it is much better to disperse people rather than to shove 2,000 illegal migrants in one place?

**Tim Loughton:** My right hon. Friend has ingeniously inserted into this debate his particular constituency interest, of which, I think, the entire House and the entire world is aware, and I have some sympathy with him. I agree that there is a problem with dispersal. The dispersal system is not operating properly in this country, which is why Kent in particular, which is at the forefront, has seen more than 600 children come through already this year, of whom many are still within the care of Kent. One local authority cannot be expected to deal with that; we need a better dispersal system, whereby the support services, as well as the fabric, are able to accommodate these children.

There is a specific problem with adults impersonating children. The Home Office's own figures say that something like 47% of age-disputed children turn out to be adults, which means that 53%, a small majority, turn out to be actual children, although it has not published the evidence for those findings. The JCHR report quotes the Helen Bamber Foundation survey of 2022, which stated that 70 local authorities had had 1,386 young people referred to them, of whom 63%—almost two thirds—were found to be children.

It is really important to have effective and accurate age assessments, and it is really important to do them quickly. The Government assured me that they were bringing forward age assessments. They take, on average, six weeks—I do not know why they take six weeks; it should not take that long to do a Merton assessment and, potentially, some X-ray medical interventions as well. The Government need to speed up that process. If a child is wrongly assessed as an adult and deported, that cannot be corrected.

We have problems with hotels and missing children—I recognise that. We have problems with children potentially going underground as they approach their 18th birthday, as they may well be transported out of the country under the Bill. We have problems with 16 or 17-year-olds, or those purporting to be 16 or 17-year-olds, absconding if they are not in the secure estate. These are the complex problems that the Government have to face.

We also have a problem with the existing law, as there is just 24 hours to detain children for the purposes of transporting them out, which is not enough. We therefore have a lot of problems. However, Government amendment (a) to clause 12 in lieu of Lords amendments 31, 35 and 36 leaves clause 10, which had a lot of Henry VIII powers leaving decisions up to the Secretary of State, largely untouched. The Government's amendment in lieu retains the position that bail cannot be granted for 28 days to those who fall within the Bill's scheme. It retains that position for unaccompanied children too where they are being detained pending a decision to grant leave, limited leave as an unaccompanied child, discretionary leave or leave as a trafficking victim.

That means that for the purposes of initial processing, unaccompanied children will be in exactly the same position as anyone else who falls within the Bill's scheme, that is, there is no statutory limit on their detention and they cannot be granted bail before 28 days. Unaccompanied child arrivals are to be treated the same way as adult arrivals in terms of their detention for initial processing, and the amendment provides nothing for unaccompanied children detained for that purpose. It would only allow for potential bail of an unaccompanied child who has been detained pending a decision to remove them or pending their removal, where the Government are using their discretionary power under clause 3(2) to remove an unaccompanied child while they are still under 18.

In those circumstances, which the Government contend will be the minority of cases, the unaccompanied child will, with this amendment, now have the opportunity of being granted bail after being detained for eight days. Whether in practice the child could apply for bail after day eight would depend on multiple factors, one key factor being whether the unaccompanied child had been transferred to local authority care and subsequently detained prior to removal, or had only ever been detained since arrival in the UK.



[Tim Loughton]

Other factors impacting whether bail is obtainable in practice would include where the child was detained, whether any outside services reached the child in detention, whether such services could refer to a lawyer with the capacity to take on the bail case in light of the failure of the legal aid market and legal aid advice, and whether the child has the capacity to instruct a lawyer. There are strong reasons to doubt whether the possibility of bail after day eight would necessarily lead to many, if any, unaccompanied children being released from detention in practice.

There is a currently nothing on the face of the detention clauses about age disputes, which I was assured there would be. There are no additional safeguards for them on the face of the Bill at all. A putative child who is treated as an adult would only be able to get bail after 28 days in line with the Bill's detention scheme. Much of what I say is on the advice of Coram, which is highly respected for how it looks after unaccompanied child asylum seekers.

3.30 pm

**Robert Jenrick:** I thank my hon. Friend for giving me advance notice that he planned to raise the interaction of clause 12 and clause 10. If I may answer his point briefly, the amendment in lieu relates to the powers to grant immigration bail, so amending clause 12, which is the power to grant immigration bail, is the correct place to set out the eight days. The detention powers themselves remain the same. That provides additional judicial oversight of unaccompanied children. The reason for amending clause 12 is that it is the clause that prohibits the first-tier tribunal from granting bail until 28 days have elapsed from the first day of detention. There is no need to amend clause 10 to give effect to that policy change. Clause 10 deals with the powers of detention and says nothing on bail. I hope that that answers his concerns, but I am happy to follow up with him later if he would like.

**Tim Loughton:** I think we may have to, because that is certainly not my understanding. There are Henry VIII paragraphs in clause 10 that still give ultimate discretion to the Secretary of State, with or without what is going to happen to clause 12. I am afraid that is symptomatic of the continuing problems with the Bill. It has become so complicated, there are many double negatives within it and only last night, at about 7.45 pm, did the Government publish their amendments, which we had just a few hours to scrutinise before today's debate.

This matter needs proper explanation and it has not been properly explained. The assurances that we were promised have not materialised—or, if they have, I am afraid no one understands them. On that basis I am afraid that we, and I hope I speak here for many on the Government Benches, cannot take these amendments in lieu at face value. More work needs to be done. I hope this House will make sure that this matter goes back to the Lords in order for further concessions to be given. Clause 10 certainly needs to be overhauled.

If we go back to the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009, there was a clear duty on the Secretary of State. Section 55(3) states:

“A person exercising any of those functions must, in exercising the function, have regard to any guidance given to the person by the Secretary of State”

for that purpose. There is no such undertaking in this Bill about having to observe and abide by guidance. Why not? Perhaps the Minister will come back to that in his response later.

The Minister keeps referring to the Detention Centre Rules 2001. They certainly need an overhaul, but I repeat my earlier point: they are all about things such as clean clothing, access to nutritious food, respect for religion, family visits and so on. Where are the special provisions for support services specifically for children, the child psychologists, access to social workers and other child support? That is what age-appropriate accommodation and support means—not just a suitable house that, without wishing to labour the point again, may or may not have cartoons on the walls.

Also, the Government have to admit that although those detention laws have been in place since 2001, that did not stop young children, and young children with families, being detained, for upwards of two weeks in some cases, at Manston, and certainly not in age-appropriate accommodation. Frankly, I am afraid that the system is not working now, yet we are looking to dilute the age-appropriateness of what is now on offer. That is where we on the Conservative Benches have serious concerns, and it is not just us: many children's charities are concerned, and the Children's Commissioner said:

“The Home Office has still not been able to provide me with vital information I have requested about the safeguarding of children in their accommodation. I am therefore unclear about how they can make informed assessments about the impact of the Home Office accommodating children without having this data.”

We were led to believe that there would be clear distinctions for children who are clearly and genuinely children: they would be detained for no more than eight days on the way in as well as, potentially for a few, on the way out; they would have age-appropriate accommodation; and there would be some form of foster care, children's homes or whatever it may be. There would then be differential accommodation for those for whom there is an age-verification question mark. We do not know if that accommodation exists, what sort of accommodation it will actually be, or how we will separate adults from those who turn out to be children.

The Minister assured us that if age-appropriate accommodation was not available for that subset, they would be treated as children and subject then to the lesser restrictions on genuine children. That is not in the amendment and it is still not in the Bill. What and where is the available accommodation for children and for disputed children? What is the legal status of detained unaccompanied children during that eight-day period, where it applies to them? What local authority duties apply on arrival and for the eight days, and what is the Home Office responsible for in those eight days? Do the children retain looked-after status while detained, or does the Home Office propose that that status ceases, as with a custodial sentence?

Those are, I am afraid, all the questions to which we needed answers, but we are still in the dark with the amendments tabled in lieu, which is why we just cannot support them. This is a far cry from the undertakings in the Immigration Act 2014, which states:

“An unaccompanied child may be detained under paragraph 16(2) in a short-term holding facility for a maximum period of 24 hours”.

In the absence of a suitable amendment in lieu covering all those considerations, as promised, I am afraid that we must oppose the amendment in lieu. Although it would revert to Baroness Mobarik’s amendment to return to the 24-hour status quo, which is not practical, I agree—we will have to come up with something more—that is all that is on offer at the moment.

I will be very brief, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I have broken my pledge. I was pleased that we got safe and legal routes on to the face of the Bill, and that some concessions were made in this place on the understanding that they could be beefed up in the House of Lords. That is what the noble Baroness Stroud’s amendment would do. Clause 59 only accepts a duty to produce a report—a work that requires consultation with local authorities. That should be happening now; it should have started months ago, so saying, “Oh it is going to take several months; we need to do the consulting” is nonsense. That work should already have started.

All the clause amounts to is a loose assurance that something will come in by the end of next year, and it is not in the Bill. The Baroness Stroud amendment seeks to make regulations come in within two months of the report. As she said on Report, her amendment

“is designed purely to place a duty on the Government to do what they say they intend to do anyway—introduce safe and legal routes”.—[*Official Report, House of Lords*, 5 July 2023; Vol. 831, c. 1248.]

That goes beyond just reproducing a report on how they might do it.

That is what we need to see, and it is why I will vote against the amendment in lieu of the child detention. I will vote in favour of the Baroness Stroud amendment on safe and legal routes. I will certainly not repeat everything that was said by my right hon. Friend the Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May), but she made a strong case, and I am tempted to follow her into the Division Lobby on the Randall amendment as well. Those are the three main areas. There is still much more work to be done on the Bill, so that is how I will vote, and I urge hon. Friends to do the same.

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** I remind Members that the debate has to finish at 5 o’clock, so please bear that in mind when making speeches. I call Dame Diana Johnson.

**Dame Diana Johnson:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker; I will try again.

I want to start by agreeing with the Minister about the vital role that the other place plays as a revising Chamber in asking us to look again, particularly when we have not had pre-legislative scrutiny of a draft Bill and when, as I think most Members would agree, this legislation has been rushed through Parliament. I echo the comments of the hon. Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) about how complicated the Bill has got and the fact that we have not had much time to consider the amendments tabled by the Government late last night.

I also want to say at the outset that, in our report on small boats last year, the Home Affairs Committee made it very clear that it was not the number of people coming across in small boats that has overwhelmed the

asylum system but the failure to process the asylum applications that have been made over a number of years. The Home Office has allowed the backlog to grow—it is now over 170,000—which has the effect of gumming up the system, and that is why we are spending £7 million a day on hotels. I know that the Home Office has in train plans to deal with the backlog, and the Prime Minister has said that the legacy backlog will be cleared by the end of the year. We all want to see that happen; it is in no one’s interest to see that backlog grow even more.

**Sir John Hayes:** The right hon. Lady is right about processing being a key part of dealing with the backlog, but Lords amendments 7, 90 and 93 would allow for further legal challenges, create more delays and, in her words, gum up the system to an even greater degree than it is now. Surely she does not support that attempt to undermine the principles of the Bill and add to the very problem that she is articulating.

**Dame Diana Johnson:** What I want, and what the Home Affairs Committee has been very clear about, is an efficient, speedy asylum claim process that is fair but timely. Germany, for example, has far more asylum claimants than we have and manages to process its claims within seven months. Many of the people who claim asylum in this country are waiting for years. That is why we have got ourselves into the problem that we are trying to address through the Bill.

**Paul Bristow:** Will the right hon. Lady give way?

**Dame Diana Johnson:** I will, but I am conscious of time.

**Paul Bristow:** I wonder whether the right hon. Lady can explain how doing nothing about thousands of undocumented people landing on our shores week in, week out will help speed up the Home Office system.

**Dame Diana Johnson:** I say to the hon. Member with the greatest respect that he might want to look at the Home Affairs Committee report on small boats, published last summer, in which we made a number of key recommendations for how the Government could start to address the small boat problem, one of which was, as I started off by saying, addressing the backlog. We know that people can come to this country, disappear and feel that their claims will not be heard for years. That is not in anyone’s interest. If he takes the time to read the report, he might get some idea of the recommendations that we have put forward cross-party, including a pilot to allow processing in France, to stop people making that perilous journey across the channel.

I turn to the Lords amendments. First, I want to deal with the removal of retrospective application under Lord Carlile’s amendment. I am really glad to see that the Government have agreed to remove the retrospective element of the Bill, with Royal Assent as the start date, which means that there will not be an immediate backlog of people waiting to be deported. However, this could provide a false sense of security about the Bill’s implications.

It seems to me that when the Bill becomes an Act, a new backlog will be quickly growing, with thousands of people detained if we see the same numbers coming across in small boats that we have seen in the last few weeks and months, and we have no third country to send them to. With the Court of Appeal judgment now

[*Dame Diana Johnson*]

being appealed in the Supreme Court, we do not know whether the Rwanda plan will be lawful. So far this year, over 12,500 people have made that dangerous channel crossing to the UK. There may well be hundreds more arriving each month once the Bill is enacted, and I am concerned about what happens to them.

3.45 pm

Even if the Rwanda plan ultimately gets the green light, the Government have yet to provide any evidence of the number of people who could be sent there—that is not clear. In fact, I was looking at documents relating to the Home Office's business plan yesterday, and the Home Office was working on the assumption that just 250 people would be removed to a third country each month, yet 3,824 people crossed the channel in June this year alone. As such, on top of the current backlog of asylum applications that I just talked about—which now stands at over 170,000—the Government could see the creation of yet another backlog, one of people stuck in detention potentially awaiting a flight to nowhere. That concerns me.

I want to comment on the subjects of modern slavery and trafficking, because the Home Affairs Select Committee is currently in the middle of an inquiry into trafficking. I agree with all the comments that were made by the former Prime Minister, the right hon. Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May). Take the example of a sex trafficking victim, perhaps tricked by the right hon. Lady's analogy of the lover-boy model—a woman trafficked from abroad into the UK to be raped by men for money. We on the Committee heard that this happens every day in almost every hon. Member's constituency through the use of adult service websites such as Vivastreet. As the Home Secretary confirmed to me at the Home Affairs Select Committee last month, under the unamended Bill, if that woman came to the attention of the authorities, she would be subject to arrest and deportation if she had been brought into the United Kingdom through illegal routes. Indeed, anyone subjected to trafficking or modern slavery in the UK who was transported here illegally would face a similar fate.

In her evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee inquiry on human trafficking, the right hon. Member for Maidenhead provided a frank assessment of the Bill's likely consequences:

"The Illegal Migration Bill risks people being left in or consigned to exploitation. They will be fearful of seeking help, because the traffickers will use this legislation to control them further, and they won't trust the authorities...I believe if the Illegal Migration Bill is enacted as it is currently proposed, it will leave more people in slavery unwilling to come forward to UK authorities."

That is quite stark from the midwife of the Modern Slavery Act 2015, and one who has done so much to promote the United Kingdom as a beacon for tackling the scourge of modern slavery and trafficking.

The Children's Commissioner has provided a similar assessment of the Bill's implications for child victims of modern slavery:

"These victims will be incentivised to avoid seeking support and help, out of fear of deportation."

It must be right that when a victim of trafficking or modern slavery is found, they are given the help and support they need, not detained and deported. That is why Lords amendment 6 and its consequential amendments

must remain in the Bill, ensuring that all trafficking and modern slavery victims have access to the support and protection they need.

I will now turn to the subject of children. The hon. Member for East Worthing and Shoreham, who has extensive knowledge of this area, has raised a number of really important points that I hope the Minister will be able to respond to. As we know, the Illegal Migration Bill will overhaul our immigration laws for the purpose—we are told—of deterring people who arrive via illegal routes. I would say that the measures proposed in the Bill are rather blunt, unforgiving and indiscriminating, meaning that anyone whose journey here was not state sanctioned will be subject to detention and deportation, regardless of whether they were fleeing war or were trafficked. We are now debating the rights and wrongs of those proposals, and in this House, there are people who think those measures are absolutely the right thing to do and people who are opposed to them.

However, the overriding message of Lords amendments 8, 31 and 33—one that should unify us all—is "Leave children out of it." The plea is: "Do not scrap what we already have as modest safeguards against further harm and exploitation of vulnerable children. Do not drop the existing time limits for detaining them. Do not bar them from accessing support provisions for modern slavery victims. Do not refuse to consider their claims for asylum, and for those children who arrive in the UK on their own and are taken into care, do not mark their 18th birthday by issuing them with a deportation notice, having refused to consider whether they should be granted permanent sanctuary." As leading children's organisations, including Barnardo's and the Children's Society, say:

"It is cruel and simply unworkable to have looked-after children spending their formative years in the UK without the Government even considering their protection needs."

While the Government have made a concession on the detention of unaccompanied children, I am concerned that what this actually amounts to is that those children can apply for bail after eight days in detention, but there is clearly no guarantee they will be granted it. As has been said already, it is for a small cohort of children and it also requires access to legal advice. Lords amendments 8, 31 and 33 do nothing more radical than preserving existing child protections, and those amendments should remain in the Bill.

On Lords amendments 37 and 38 tabled by Baroness Lister, it should have been an absolute no-brainer to retain the 72-hour limit on detaining pregnant women. When the prisons and probation ombudsman conducted a review of the welfare of vulnerable people in detention in 2016, he concluded:

"I have not sought further evidence that detention has an incontrovertibly deleterious effect on the health of pregnant women and their unborn children. I take this to be a statement of the obvious."

Yet we have had to spend time in Parliament debating whether the Government should keep the cap on detaining pregnant women at 72 hours or be allowed to detain them indefinitely. Bear in mind that, back in 2016, the then ombudsman recommended that the detention of pregnant women should end completely.

It could never seriously be argued that removing the time limit for detaining pregnant women was necessary for deterring illegal migration. We know that introducing



the time limit did not prompt swathes of pregnant women to make the dangerous channel crossing. Indeed, it was revealed during the Bill's passage in the Lords that,

"since January, no pregnant migrant women have arrived in this country illegally."—[*Official Report, House of Lords*, 3 July 2023; Vol. 831, c. 1011.]

The organisation Women for Refugee Women points out that

"the restrictions placed on pregnant women's detention since 2016 has not had an 'incentivising' effect for women claiming asylum in the UK."

While the benefits of detaining pregnant women indefinitely are hard to see, the costs are all too clear. The Royal College of Midwives points out:

"There is incontrovertible evidence that pregnant asylum seekers have poor pregnancy and neonatal outcomes and complicated pregnancies with increased morbidity and mortality... The detention of pregnant asylum seekers increases the likelihood of stress, which can risk the health of the unborn baby."

The Government introduced time limits on detaining pregnant women for a reason in the first place, and that reason has not changed. On the concession that they have granted, which is that pregnant women can be detained for no more than 72 hours without ministerial approval, which could then go up to seven days, as I understand it—perhaps the Minister can help me with this—that could result in a woman being detained, being released and then being detained, being released and being detained, because this does not say it is just a one-off.

Finally, I support Lords amendments 102 on safe and legal routes. It is clear that giving a two-month period for the Government to come back with a plan of implementation for safe and legal routes is a very sensible measure. The Home Affairs Committee made it clear in our report that safe and legal routes was one of the clear recommendations the Government should adopt if they seriously want to tackle the small boats problem. I also support Lords amendment 103 on the National Crime Agency and organised immigration crime enforcement, which I think is a very useful and helpful amendment, and Lords amendments 104 and 107 from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 10-year strategy on refugees and human trafficking, which I again think would help the Government in dealing with the small boats problem.

**Laura Farris** (Newbury) (Con): I will begin with Lords amendment 2, which would remove the retroactivity provisions that state that the Bill would apply to anyone who arrived on or after 7 March 2023, which is the date that the Bill was introduced in the House. There is a good reason generally why we do not allow legislation to apply retrospectively: so that there is legal certainty and people are bound only by the obligations that apply at the time. I accept without reservation that the law would be in disarray, for example, if new criminal offences had retrospective effect and people found themselves criminalised for things that they could not possibly have known to be unlawful at the time.

I respectfully submit, however, that this is not that kind of point. There is no principled argument to be made. First, the Government made it clear that the date the Bill was introduced was the same date on which it would become effective. Secondly, a person cannot argue

in any compelling way that they decided to make an illegal crossing to the United Kingdom in March because they believed that they might end up in a hotel in Southampton, but now that they know they might have ended up going to Rwanda, they would not have made the illegal crossing. I am afraid that that argument does not work at all. I accept the Government's position that the only way in which the policy will have the desired deterrent effect is if it has retrospective effect, so that we do not create perverse incentives for people smugglers to surge the crossings immediately before the Bill receives Royal Assent.

The second tranche of Lords amendments includes those that the Immigration Minister identified as wrecking amendments—amendments 1, 7, 90 and 93—and I will deal with them collectively. Lords amendment 7 seeks to strike out clause 4(1)(d), which states that removal should take effect irrespective of whether there is a judicial review application. Lords amendment 90 seeks to strike out clause 52, which states that interim orders may not halt deportation. Lords amendment 93 seeks to strike out removal pending an age verification appeal.

There is a wider point about those amendments. Collectively, they seek to dilute the deterrent effect of all removal provisions. Whatever we disagree on in this Chamber concerning current migration, we can probably achieve a consensus on one point: this situation will not get any easier to resolve. Whether the UNHCR is correct in saying that there are 100 million displaced people, or whether there are tens of millions, the reality is that famine, climate change, flooding and conflict will result in more and more people leaving their countries of origin to try to come elsewhere.

Any nation that tries to resolve the situation in its domestic arrangements will have to follow a strategy similar to the one that the Government are pursuing. The first element of that strategy is to decide on a cap for admissions and then—likely with UNHCR support in the future—to give proper consideration in advance to who should come under the quota scheme. The current schemes that are working very well in relation to Ukraine, Afghanistan and Hong Kong provide a good starting point. The second element is to deter all illegal migration by ensuring, with only the narrowest of exceptions, that an individual gains absolutely nothing from doing this.

The objective of the Illegal Migration Bill and, by extension, the Rwanda scheme is to remove illegal immigrants quickly without prejudice to their wider right to challenge the deportation order later, because the rationale is that speedy deportation deters others from coming to the country. Many eminent people agree with that proposition. As the former Supreme Court Justice, Lord Sumption, said in his foreword to Professor Ekins' recent paper for Policy Exchange:

"This objective is frustrated if deportees are able to hold up their removal for years while their challenge goes through potentially three tiers of appeal followed by a petition to Strasbourg. The process commonly takes years."

He continued by stating that "whatever one thinks" of the Rwanda scheme, if

"interim measures are available in cases like this, it is probable that no legislative scheme for the prompt removal of illegal immigrants"—  
could ever "succeed."

**Sir John Hayes:** My hon. Friend is making a well-made argument, and she is right about those amendments from the Lords that are designed to undermine the principle and practice of this Bill. Would she extend to legal migration her sensible suggestion that the safe and legal routes recommended by various people across the Chamber need to be capped? We cannot continue to grow our population to the tune of 600,000 a year without placing unbearable pressure on our public services, making the provision of housing impossible and changing the face of our country forever.

4 pm

**Laura Farris:** I will come back on two points. First, under the Bill, annual quotas will be decided upon with the consent of various local authorities that will be responsible for accommodating those people, and that is the right approach. On illegal migration, people arriving through irregular routes should not take precedence over those arriving lawfully through safe and legal routes. We could not allow a system where one displaces the right of the other, and that is a feature of this Bill.

The second thing I want to talk about is the effect of judicial reviews. Lords amendment 7 would permit judicial reviews. I cannot improve on the language used by David Blunkett when he was Home Secretary, introducing Labour's flagship immigration Bill, the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002, which was supported at the time by the shadow Home Secretary, the right hon. Member for Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford (Yvette Cooper). I wanted to refresh my memory of what he said on Second Reading, because it was a powerful part of his speech. He said:

"At the moment the system is virtually unworkable. People can bring a judicial review during the process of the initial appeal, and when they reach the right to appeal to the tribunal they can judicially review the tribunal for not allowing the appeal to the tribunal. They can then judicially review the tribunal's decision and they can judicially review whether they are entitled to go to the court of appeal following failure at the tribunal. The whole system is riddled with delay, prevarication, and, in some cases, deliberate disruption of the appeals process. Then they can judicially review the decision on removal even when the appeals have been gone through."—[*Official Report*, 24 April 2002; Vol. 384, c. 355.]

We have simplified the system a bit since then, but effectively he is right. He was right then to seek to effect removal after one right of appeal had been exhausted, and the Government are right now to aim for swift removal without judicial review holding everything up.

My final point, briefly, is about the speech that the former Supreme Court Justice Lord Brown made on Second Reading of this Bill in the Lords. He sat as a Cross-Bench peer, and he died on Friday. He said:

"No doubt the Bill can be improved in various ways, but we must recognise that almost every amendment we make to soften it can tend only to weaken its essential objectives: stopping the boats... We really must...give the Government the opportunity by this Bill finally to confront this most intractable of problems."—[*Official Report*, *House of Lords*, 10 May 2023; Vol. 829, c. 1806.]

**Tim Farron** (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): I start by referring Members to my declaration in the Register of Members' Financial Interests for the support I receive from the Refugee, Asylum and Migration Policy project.

Despite their lordships' best efforts, this remains in my 18-plus years in this place comfortably the worst piece of legislation I have seen come to this House. That is not because I disagree with it—I have probably disagreed

with most stuff in my 18 and a bit years here—but because it is based on several bogus understandings of the truth. Within it, there is a deplorable bias towards the inhumane.

To start with Lords amendment 1, we have an attempt to get the Government to do something massively radical: to comply with international obligations. The notion that we should not do that, or that we do not need to do that, is based upon the desire to depict the current situation—the boats situation and the asylum situation in the UK—as an emergency. I will come to that in a moment.

The two likely consequences of the UK habitually choosing to not comply with its international obligations are: first, that we become a pariah, and are seen internationally as not a team player, and thereby we are less effective in all parts of our policy around the world, whether economic, defensive or otherwise; and, secondly, that others will copy us and, as a consequence, the whole system breaks down. I often hear Members on the Government Benches say, "France is a safe country, why don't people stay there?". The simple answer to that is, "Yeah, it is. So is Spain and so is Italy." If we end up in a situation where other people copy us, the whole network breaks down and we end up in a desperate situation. If we care about our position internationally, we need to care about that.

Let us turn straight to the Government's justification for not complying with their international obligations, including issues to do with modern slavery and child detention, on which the Lords has made helpful amendments. Their explanation is that the situation constitutes an emergency. Does it? In the Home Secretary's words, we are currently being swamped by refugees. Let us look at some facts to see whether either of those things bears any scrutiny. As we speak, Germany takes four times more asylum seekers than the United Kingdom, and France takes 2.5 times more asylum seekers than the United Kingdom. If we were to add the United Kingdom back into the European Union for statistical purposes, just 7% of asylum seekers would come to the UK and, per capita, the UK would be 22nd out of 28. Demonstrably, the United Kingdom has not faced an especial problem. We are not being swamped, and such language is demeaning of this country and of the office of Home Secretary.

The Government say, "Ah, but it's different here, because we've taken in 250,000 Ukrainian refugees as well as those coming in through other routes." I am utterly proud that the United Kingdom has been among those countries who have taken in the most Ukrainian refugees, but we have not taken the most. Germany has taken 1 million Ukrainian refugees and, as I said, it still takes four times more asylum seekers than us, and Poland has taken 1.5 million Ukrainian refugees. It appears that talking about our support for Ukraine and Ukrainian refugees is an excuse for the Government in seeking to avoid their international obligations.

Britain's problem needs to be put into overall context. The reality is that 70% of the millions of displaced people and refugees on planet Earth flee either to a different region of their country or to a neighbouring country. A steadily decreasing trickle of people end up at the end of the line—and, my goodness, the United Kingdom, over the channel, is the end of the line. Again, for us to state that we face an especial emergency

in terms of the numbers of people coming here is totally bogus. It is important to state that and put it on the record.

**Sir John Hayes:** I am astounded to hear the hon. Gentleman's speech. I sometimes come into this place and think that I am in a parallel universe. I do not know whether he gets out much, but if he speaks to his constituents as often as I speak to mine, he will know that they do see this as an emergency. One hundred thousand people have crossed the channel on small boats, with every one of them knowing that they have arrived here illegally, and he will know that we are spending £6 million a day on 300 hotels to accommodate them. If that is not a crisis or an emergency, I do not know what is.

**Tim Farron:** I will come to the emergency, which the right hon. Gentleman set out towards the end of his remarks—the emergency caused by Government incompetence in not clearing the backlog. When we look at the numbers coming to our shores—I am sure he knows this as he has seen the figures—we see that statistically, compared to other countries of similar size and stature, the United Kingdom is not overwhelmed. What we are overwhelmed by is the consequences of the Government's own incompetence.

I will wager, dare I say it—I am not a betting man—that I speak to my constituents more than the right hon. Gentleman speaks to his, and my constituents represent the values of the United Kingdom. They believe that it is right to provide sanctuary to those who present as refugees and that, in any event, even if those people are not refugees, we will only ever know that if we process them properly, which is what a competent, decent British Government would do.

**Tahir Ali** (Birmingham, Hall Green) (Lab): I have received hundreds of emails from my constituents. Does the hon. Member agree that the Bill will lead to more misery for thousands of refugees, cost taxpayers millions and cause chaos to a system that is already on the brink of collapse?

**Tim Farron:** Yes, I think it will. I was visiting a hostel for people seeking asylum in this country a few months ago in Cumbria. One gentleman had been an interpreter for the British and American forces in Afghanistan, and we had left him behind. By hook or by crook he got himself here, and he had been waiting more than 12 months for his case to be heard. He got to the stage where he almost did not care if he got kicked out; he just wanted a resolution. That is miserable. Those people are getting the blame, from this Government and some of their supporters, for the consequences of the Government's own failure and incompetence. That is shameful. I would be ashamed of that if I were sitting on the Government Benches. I know that some are, to their credit.

Talking of shameful things, let me move on to child detention and Lords amendment 8. As at least one Government Member rightly said, one of the great achievements of the coalition Government was the ending of child detention under a Conservative Prime Minister. Those on the Government Benches should be proud of that. The Refugee Council estimates that the Government's proposals would potentially lead to 13,000 children being detained as a consequence of this legislation.

The real question for the House—for the country, actually, but for Members here in particular—is, do we see a child asylum seeker primarily as an asylum seeker to be deterred or as a child to be protected? If the answer is not the latter, I am sorry, but shame on you. An argument is made by some that if we do not detain children—by the way, teenagers are children too, as I am a parent of several—we will create a pull factor. The fact is that the Joint Committee on Human Rights has demonstrated that there is no evidence for that whatsoever. Even if there were some evidence for not detaining children being a pull factor, in what moral universe would it be okay for the Government to use children as collateral to achieve their policy aims? Again, that is outrageous.

On modern slavery and Lords amendments 6 and 56, the right hon. Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May), who is no longer in her place, made an outstanding speech. She introduced the modern slavery legislation as Prime Minister. This Government talk about enacting many of the things in this legislation as enacting the will of the people and carrying out their mandate. As a former Prime Minister, the right hon. Member had a mandate, which I am sure the whole House supported, to deliver that modern slavery legislation. I am proud of that, as should she be. How does that mandate not trump the apparent mandate to put those victims of modern slavery at such terrible risk?

The simple fact is that if someone is a victim of trafficking and modern slavery, because of the Bill and the failure to accept the amendments put forward, that person's choices are to remain in exploitation, or go for prolonged detention or removal to Rwanda or some other country. For many victims of trafficking and exploitation, remaining in exploitation will seem the least worst option. Far from being an attempt to tackle evil gangs, the Bill plays into their hands. This is a traffickers charter.

Throughout the Bill we see the rhetoric of crisis, emergency and of our being overwhelmed. We are, indeed, overwhelmed—by the Government's epic incompetence. Some 177,000 people are waiting for an initial decision. Those people do not want to be in hotels; they want to be processed. If the Government wanted to bring about a real deterrent, they would process people efficiently like other countries somehow manage to do, and they would return the ones who are not refugees. That would be a deterrent, but it is beyond the Government's competence.

According to the Government's own figures, of the top 10 nationalities of people presenting as refugees here, 80% are granted asylum. Even the Government's own processes accept that they are genuine refugees, even though others characterise them in terrible and unflattering ways. Some 83% of them are from Sudan and 99% are from Eritrea. That is crucial, because there is no provision in the Bill whatsoever for those people to come here safely. It is so important that we tackle the issue of safe routes. A Government who were really serious in trying to stop the boats would do carrot and stick, so to speak.

The fact is this: desperate people will take dangerous routes until safe routes are available. If people have fled terror in whatever country—many are from the horn of Africa and have fled through the absolute hellhole that is Libya these days, and then crossed the Mediterranean—



[Tim Farron]

then I am sorry, but we are not going to deter them from taking a relatively short journey across the channel unless we provide safe routes. That is why the Government need to put safe routes on the face of the Bill. If they were trying to solve this problem holistically, they would make sure that safe routes were part of the Bill.

4.15 pm

Briefly, on Lords amendment 9, in the name of my noble friend Lord German—[*Interruption.*] I am concluding—I apologise, Madam Deputy Speaker. Lord German's amendment would prevent people from remaining in limbo. If the Government proceed with the Bill and cannot remove arrivals to Rwanda in time, the amendment would ensure that anyone who is still here after six months would be entered into the asylum system. That would be humane and would also prevent a greater backlog.

This is an emergency, but not compared with other countries. There is an emergency in that there is a global refugee crisis, yet there have been zero attempts, in any mature way, to make an intelligent, informed response to that international emergency—the opposite, in fact. What that does is alienate our allies who might help us to tackle it. Instead, we have an ill thought out attempt to tackle one symptom. The political emergency here is the Government's desire to lash out, seeking culture war points and blaming desperate people for the Government's own incompetence. The underlying attempt throughout the Bill is to make the UK unattractive. It is stupid to think—[*Interruption.*] I am finishing—I am sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is stupid to think that the rest of the world does not hear, and that only potential asylum seekers hear that. It undermines Britain's reputation in the world. Patriots care about how we are seen around the world. That is why patriots oppose the Bill.

Finally, the percentage of people in this country convinced by the Government's position on this issue is reducing by the day. They see it as a distraction from the fact that they cannot afford to pay the rent or the mortgage, or to feed their kids. The ultimate tragedy of the Bill is that it completely ignores the overriding problem. It will not fix the symptoms it identifies and it will not even give the Government the political benefit they crave, which is the one thing in this debate that constitutes justice.

**Several hon. Members** *rose*—

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):** It is quite important that we think of others and remember that, as I said, the debate finishes at 5pm. I call David Simmonds

**David Simmonds** (Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner) (Con): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will endeavour to be swift and to the point. Like the hon. Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale (Tim Farron), I must draw the attention of the House to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests as someone who is sponsored by the Refugee, Asylum and Migration Policy project—RAMP—to provide research capacity.

As the Minister outlined, the UK has proved willing to rise to the challenge of the international refugee situation, with 550,000 people settled in the UK through humanitarian routes. In 24 years in a local authority

covering the area of Heathrow airport, I certainly have experience of being on the receiving end of many different sets of Government policy—not just from the coalition and Conservative Governments, but from Labour Governments, too—many of which sounded very good when debated in this place but which did not always work in contact with the real world. I would express the concern that until we have a fully comprehensive asylum visa system, we will not have full control of the way in which we interact with the global refugee situation.

I want to see this policy pass through Parliament and be implemented in a way that works operationally to stop the boats and deliver all the other objectives that Members throughout the Chamber broadly support. There are clearly plenty of disagreements about the detail, but none of us wishes to see the continuation of the cross-channel traffic in human misery and criminal activity that the Bill seeks to address. I know that my constituents share the concern, beautifully expressed earlier, about the fact that we, as British people, believe in the fine old British tradition of queueing. When we see people using criminal means to jump that queue at a time when our country is seeking to be more compassionate through resettlement in a global world, we are concerned about that.

I remain concerned about a number of aspects of how the Bill will operate in the real world. It is enormously positive that the courts decided, having considered the matter, that the Rwanda policy was lawful and compatible with the UK's international human rights obligations, but we cannot provide sufficient evidence of the effectiveness of one element of our agreement with Rwanda. That element is one example of the things that could, operationally, derail what we all agree are worthy objectives in the Bill. I took part in the Joint Committee on Human Rights evidence session that considered modern slavery in detail, and that has convinced me to follow the lead of my right hon. Friend the Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May) this evening.

We need to ensure that we live up to the standards we have set for ourselves in this House, and that the positive obligations that much legislation, including the Modern Slavery Act 2015 and the Children Act 1989, places on our public authorities do not undermine the objectives of the Bill. Detention is a good example of that. I totally agree with what the Minister said about his approach to the detention of unaccompanied minors. A major challenge for Hillingdon Council was the arrival of unaccompanied children at Heathrow airport. The right hon. Member for Hayes and Harlington (John McDonnell) will know that many of them were accommodated in his constituency, at Margaret Cassidy House and at Charville Lane children's home, both of which I visited.

It was at the point of arrival that those children were at the greatest risk from traffickers. The right hon. Gentleman will remember examples of traffickers arriving on Bath Road to collect girls whom they had targeted for trafficking. We as the local authority were powerless to stop that, because there was no power of detention that we could use to keep those young people safe. In one case that I am aware of, Hillingdon recovered a girl from the sex trade on the continent of Europe, after six months of tracking her from place to place. During that time, she suffered a great deal of abuse, which potentially could have been prevented if we had been able to intervene more swiftly at the beginning.

I am entirely sympathetic to the Minister's motivations for introducing provisions on that issue, but these questions need to be answered: who will ensure that the places where those children are accommodated and detained are of an appropriate standard? What discussions have taken place with local authorities, such as Hillingdon and Kent, to ensure that a secure estate, based perhaps on secure children's homes, is available, so that the children coming through the system can be appropriately accommodated? What arrangements have been made with Ofsted—in my view, it is Ofsted, rather than the chief inspector of prisons, that needs to regulate this—to ensure that regulation will give us confidence that the accommodation for children, and for families, is appropriate for children?

Finally, I have asked this question many times, but I do not get the sense that we have reached an appropriate answer. The Bill sets out how individuals are to be dealt with under the asylum and immigration process, but it does not take away the obligations on local authorities under the Children Act, the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000 or the Modern Slavery Act, or the other many obligations on local authorities. Members will say, "Let us pass this legislation and demonstrate that we are tough, and wish to stop the boats," but in six months, will we be looking at a slew of judicial reviews that say that the policy was in conflict with the obligations on local authorities and the police under the Modern Slavery Act and the Children Act, and is therefore not effective?

If the Minister wishes to enjoy the full confidence of all Conservative Members, and wishes them to vote with the Government tonight and over the next few days, I urge him to address those points. Literally decades of policies from Governments of all parties have not quite managed to get to the heart of these issues. He must demonstrate that this policy will do that, and that it has properly covered all bases across government. He must demonstrate that the policy does not leave us vulnerable to finding that the boats do not stop coming; that the frustration of the challenges continue; and that people continue to die. This country wishes to show that it will not walk on by and ignore the needs of refugees, that we will be compassionate, and that we will prioritise our resources on international and global resettlement.

**John McDonnell:** I, too, want to focus on the issue of children. The hon. Members for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) and for Westmorland and Lonsdale (Tim Farron) discussed the coalition Government effectively banning the detention of children in 2014, which we all welcomed. I was part of the campaign to achieve that ban, because of my experience of the detention of children in Harmondsworth detention centre in my constituency. I visited those children, and when we explained to the world what they were going through, how they were traumatised and what impact that was having on them and their families, the world recoiled. We decided we would never have such a regime again, but my fear is that, gradually and incrementally, we are reverting to it. That is why I support Lords amendments 8, 50, 51, 31, 33 and 89.

First, I am concerned that we are bringing forward legislation that makes it inadmissible for unaccompanied children who come via the channel route to apply for asylum. Yet 96% of them, I think, actually get refugee status, which shows what need they have.

I am also worried about what happens to children who are detained. I am concerned that we are potentially reverting to the brutal regime of the past. When children were detained in detention centres and even other accommodation, the mental health impact was gauged as extremely severe, and it was lasting. Today, we have seen the amendment that the Government have brought forward on the time limit for detention, increasing it from 24 hours to eight days—as others have said, it is eight days before someone can apply for bail to a first-tier tribunal. My worry is that, in that very vulnerable period of their life, a child will be detained and trapped in the system, and the issue then is, detained where?

I raised the use of Harmondsworth with the Minister, and he gave me an assurance that that is not Government's intention or the ministerial intention. I am sure that it is not this Minister's intention, but Ministers and Administrations change. Unlike with the 2014 legislative commitment that we got, I do not believe that Government statements of intention are sufficiently strong to prevent us from reverting, unfortunately, to the detention of children in unsuitable accommodation and even detention centres. The reason we supported local authorities taking these traumatised children into care was that they have the range of expertise to provide them with the support they need. I am worried that we are reverting to type; time and again, we have explained in the House that the Home Office accommodation that has been provided is inadequate, as we have seen as a result of the number of children who have gone missing, some of whom have not even been found again.

I do not want to delay the House, because others want to speak, but I feel that the Bill is a reversion to pre 2014, and that is the result of the Government's failure to take into account the range of views expressed in this House and elsewhere. It is the most vulnerable who need our support—our succour and our kindness—the most. The children are the ones who will probably suffer the most as a result of this legislation, and that is why I urge those in the other House to hold to their task of bringing some light of humanity to the discussion of this issue. I hope they will hold to their amendments so that this appalling Bill can at least be in some way ameliorated.

**Anna Firth** (Southend West) (Con): I rise to speak in support of the Government amendments in lieu of Lords amendments 2, 12, 20 and 22 and also Lords amendment 38, on pregnant women. I also want to touch on Lords amendment 104, which I oppose.

People in Southend West want a tough but fair policy on illegal immigration that stops people unfairly jumping the queue, stops evil people smugglers and, above all, stops vulnerable people drowning in the channel. Those, in a nutshell, are the reasons why I support this Bill, subject to the amendments I have just alluded to.

I reject entirely the characterisation we have heard from Opposition Members that we are, in some way, an ungenerous country. I believe we should all take pride in the UK's rich history of rehoming some of the world's most vulnerable and persecuted people. The Minister reminded us that we have taken more than 550,000 refugees from around the globe since 2015—the highest number since the second world war—including 100,000 Ukrainians, but people in Southend West do not think this generosity and humanitarian spirit should be extended to healthy

[Anna Firth]

young men from safe countries who have paid people smugglers to help them illegally cross the channel. That is what the Bill is all about.

4.30 pm

The Minister reminded us that about three quarters of people crossing the channel last year were men over the age of 18. From 2021 to 2022, the number of Indian nationals crossing to the UK on small boats increased by over 900% from 67 to 683. India is a democratic country with its own space programme. More than 1,000 Turkish citizens came to this country illegally last year, but Turkey is a safe NATO country to which almost 2.5 million British nationals a year go on holiday. There is no reason whatsoever why Indians and Turks should be coming here illegally. There are schemes under which we would welcome them to come here legally.

Of course, this is deeply unfair on taxpayers and on those who come to this country legally. To put this point into perspective, the Government won a huge majority on a promise to level up this country, yet we now have a bizarre situation in which we are spending more each year on hotels to accommodate illegal migrants—estimated at £2.2 billion, or more according to the shadow Minister—than the Government's entire budget for round 2 of the levelling up fund and three and a half times what we are spending on homelessness. This is unsustainable and deeply unfair on the vulnerable people in this country who need our support.

We have heard it said that this is not an emergency. It will absolutely become an emergency. Lord Hague wrote of Africa and the middle east in *The Times* today:

“If only one in twenty of the people of that region migrated by mid-century—surely a conservative estimate—there would be 140 million people on the move.”

That would be a complete emergency, so our migration system must send a clear message that people will not be allowed to come here illegally.

The Lords have sent us reams of amendments to consider, many of which are designed to frustrate the will of the people who put us here and to kick the issue down the road. That leads me directly to Lords amendment 104, in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury. A 10-year strategy is all fine and well, but we need action now. We see on our television screens that people are drowning in the channel now. Of course the Government are working very hard on a long-term strategy, because other countries in Europe are facing the same problem, hence they are working with France, Italy, Albania and the EU. I reject the approach suggested by Lords amendment 104, as it is already happening and it is not addressing the emergency before us.

However, I am pleased that the Government have accepted some amendments, particularly on retrospective. There is a strong presumption in common law that statutes do not take retrospective effect, most recently summarised by Lord Kerr in the Supreme Court in *Walker v. Innospec Limited* and others:

“If we do something today...the law applying to it should be the law in force today, not tomorrow's backward adjustment of it.”

In other words, retrospective laws undermine our rule of law, which requires that the law is capable of being known and enforced today.

I understand why it was thought that retrospective effect was needed, but those reasons do not apply now that the Rwanda issue needs to be resolved by the Supreme Court. I am therefore very pleased that this sensible amendment has been taken on board and that we will fall in line with this long-held legal principle.

The second issue relates to pregnant women. Obviously, protecting them is vital, and we must do everything we can to ensure that vulnerable pregnant women are not exploited or targeted by evil people smugglers. Last year, fewer than 1% of the illegal migrants who came to this country were pregnant, and I understand that this year the figure has been none. So we have to be incredibly careful that we do not create a perverse incentive that might inadvertently increase that number. We must be extremely aware that the people who would traffic women to this country are utterly without morals, so we do not want to find ourselves in a position where women become pregnant deliberately, or even worse are made pregnant against their will, in order to bypass detention rules. The Government's amendment allows us to protect vulnerable pregnant women, ensuring that they do not spend unduly long periods in detention before they are processed. It strikes the right balance between treating these women with dignity and compassion, and not creating a perverse incentive that would target vulnerable women.

In conclusion, although our compassion in seeking to help people may be infinite, the people of Southend know that our capacity to do so is finite. That capacity to help is fundamentally undermined if we do not stop the boats and we do not stop people entering this country illegally.

**Jeremy Corbyn:** I shall be brief, Madam Deputy Speaker, because we do not have much time, although there is a great deal I could say on this Bill. There could not be a greater contrast than the one between the cold, calculating speech we have just heard from the hon. Member for Southend West (Anna Firth) and the humanitarian approach taken by the hon. Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale (Tim Farron) in trying to defend international law and humanitarian principles in what we do.

This Bill is appalling in so many ways, but it is walking us rapidly away from the European convention on human rights and, with it, the European Court of Human Rights; from the 1951 Geneva convention protecting the rights of asylum; from the 1954 convention protecting people who are suffering from statelessness; from the 1989 convention on the rights of the child; and from the 2005 trafficking of children convention. That is why I strongly support Lords amendment 1, which was introduced by Baroness Chakrabarti to try to reverse this whole process. If we walk away from international conventions that this country knowingly and willingly signed up for—indeed, we drafted many of them—who are we then to criticise Turkey, Hungary, Poland, Russia or any other country where we believe there is a breach of those convention rights? What protection would we be offering to people we know are already being badly treated and whose only protection is the rights that come through those conventions? The Government are cynically and deliberately doing this.

I attend the Council of Europe as one of our representatives, and I have to say that Members of the Council of Europe from many countries—these are not



necessarily people of the left, by any manner of means—are astonished at how Britain is walking away from all these conventions that it promoted in the past. The response from those at the Council of Europe is consternation about why we are doing that. It is consternation at the endless attacks on the European Court of Human Rights and on the European convention on human rights, which protects the rights of people in this country as well as other countries around the world.

This did not all come from nowhere; it came from the hostile environment, deliberately created by the Conservative party and the coalition Government, which had such a devastating effect on the Windrush generation. It comes from constant media references to the “asylum wave” and the horrible stories that are written about people seeking asylum. As the hon. Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale, my right hon. Friend the Member for Hayes and Harlington (John McDonnell) and others have pointed out, the number of asylum seekers in Britain is low compared with that in the rest of Europe, and the number in Europe is low compared with that in the rest of the world.

Why are there 70 million people around the world not in a place they can call their own home? The answer is: wars; human rights abuse; and environmental degradation. What are we going to do? Are we going to put up barbed wire everywhere, send gunboats everywhere, in order to try to deter desperate people? Or are we going to do something about it by trying to improve the living conditions of people in places that they are trying to flee from and improve their human rights situation? I have met people in Calais, and I have met people in this country who have come from Calais. Believe me, they are desperate. There are people who have managed to walk, almost, from Eritrea or Afghanistan. They have crossed the Mediterranean and other seas and gone through immense danger. They are looking for a place of safety—and what do we offer them? Nothing more than a hostile environment and being sent to Rwanda. Should we not look at this thing a bit differently? Should we not look at it from a humanitarian point of view?

Should we not also give refugees here the right to work? We have 100,000 vacancies in the NHS alone and a skills shortage in almost every industry, and we have highly skilled, highly intelligent people who could no longer stay in the country they came from and are looking for a place of safety. Perhaps we could be slightly more humanitarian and decent about this and accept that we have a responsibility.

We should accept that our country is enriched by those who have come here with their skills, knowledge and determination to create a better society, rather than passing this tawdry little Bill, which may well be rejected again by the Lords—I hope it is—and by the courts, knowing full well that even if the Home Secretary’s dream of sending so many people to Rwanda were carried out, they could not be housed or processed there. Can we not just turn the dial round for once and, instead of maintaining the pretence that this country was always friendly to people who are desperate, let us prove it and show that we are supportive and welcoming of desperate people who want to contribute to our community?

**Tom Hunt** (Ipswich) (Con): I will speak to Lords amendments 2, 12, 20 and 22, on arrangements for removal, to Lords amendments 31, 33 and 35 to 38, on

arrangements for those under the age of 18 and for pregnant women, and to Lords amendment 102, on safe and legal routes.

Where the Government have given some ground on the Lords amendments and entered into discussion, I feel confident that the main ethos of the Bill is still there. I was really keen to ensure that. I did not want to see the Bill watered down. I liked what I saw when it left this place, and I did not want to see it weakened and made unable to deliver.

On under-18s, my hon. Friend the Member for Peterborough (Paul Bristow) made the good point that we do not want a situation where there is a perverse incentive for young people to be sent by themselves. That is concerning to both of us. Age verification needs to be robust. We know that there is evidence of adults—particularly adult men—pretending to be under 18 when they are not. No one in this House wants to see children detained, and that was never the Government’s intention, but at the same time we cannot allow an opening for people who are not under 18 to get special treatment.

The Chair of the Home Affairs Committee, the right hon. Member for Kingston upon Hull North (Dame Diana Johnson), said that there has not been enough time to scrutinise the Bill. This is an urgent situation. The Bill was introduced early this year. It appears to have been stuck in the other place for a huge amount of time; I understand that they have been up until 6 in the morning looking at it. I do not know how much longer the right hon. Lady would like this place and the other place to scrutinise this piece of legislation that needs to be implemented urgently.

I find it deeply frustrating when I see individuals who have never had to live with the consequences of uncontrolled mass migration and illegal migration, and people who have never had to talk to constituents who are desperately concerned about the situation—they may have hotels in their constituency that have been adversely impacted by it—opining and moralising about what they think is right and demonising anyone who supports a Bill such as this.

As I have said many times before, the House of Lords should tread carefully, because it is unelected. It is oh so tempting to moralise on this deeply complex issue without engaging in any plan, and there is no plan from the other House. Lords amendment 102 would introduce uncapped safe and legal routes. What would happen if we had alternative safe and legal routes that people could apply to? If they were uncapped, they would fill up incredibly quickly, and if they were capped, the cap would be met incredibly quickly and we would be back at square one. We would still have people entering our country illegally. What would we do then? That is not a plan.

Let me turn to Labour’s five-point plan of vagaries and platitudes—because that is what it is. All we hear about are safe and legal routes. Then there is the cross-border police force—as if that has not already been looked into. Labour Members say, “We have to do more to talk to France”. Again, it is as if we are not already doing that. It is as if the Prime Minister does not already have a good relationship with the President of France; he has, but we still are where we are.

4.45 pm

Ultimately, this is an incredibly difficult situation. This can only work with the Rwanda plan. I hope that, when it comes to that Supreme Court judgment, the Rwanda plan will get the green light. However, the Government need to plan for the eventuality that that might not happen. There needs to be a plan B. We cannot put all our eggs in the Rwanda basket. I am confident that the Rwanda plan can make a significant contribution to tackling this problem, but I and many colleagues also believe that there needs to be a plan B.

**Sir John Hayes:** Will my hon. Friend give way?

**Tom Hunt:** I am sorry, but I will not be taking any interventions.

Ultimately, what Brexit was about in many respects was taking back control of our borders, and controlling the migration system. If it gets to a point where we feel that, even having delivered Brexit, the popular sovereignty of the people's wish to decrease net migration and tackle illegal migration robustly is impossible, it is only right that we then look at the legal infrastructure and the different arrangements that this country is subject to. We must listen to the British people, the vast majority of whom do support this Bill. They want to see it enacted and I will be supporting the Government every step of the way. I really hope that, before we get to the summer recess, this vital Bill gets Royal Assent.

**Patrick Grady** (Glasgow North) (SNP): When the Minister was first appointed, I thought that he was largely going along with the Home Secretary's language and policy on refugees and asylum seekers out of a sense of loyalty and collective responsibility. But as this Bill has progressed, it appears from the statements he has made in the Chamber and the responses he has given to questions and to Westminster Hall debates that he really has drunk the Kool-Aid. I think he genuinely believes the Government's rhetoric: that this country is being invaded, that people who come here fleeing war, persecution and famine are actually economic migrants on the make, and that outright hostility and denial of their basic human rights is the only way to dissuade them from coming here. So hostile does he want the environment to be, he will not even allow a splash of colour and cartoons on the walls of the family reception centres. It is more than disappointing. It is worrying that the Government's attitude seems to be that the way to stop people coming here from countries where they are at risk of oppression and human rights abuses is to create an environment that is at least as hostile as the place from which they are fleeing.

That would explain the Government's opposition to Lords amendment 1. The safeguards that it provides should otherwise be seen as absolutely essential, and make it clear that nothing in the Bill requires the Home Secretary to break with international human rights law and the treaties and convention that this country has been signed up to for decades. Nowhere in the Conservative manifesto was there a commitment to take the UK out of these conventions, so their Lordships have every right to continue to press this and similar amendments during the next stages of their proceedings.

The Chair of the Justice Committee said earlier that this was an incorporative rather than an interpretive amendment. Perhaps the Lords will come back with

something in lieu that will be more attractive to the more level-headed elements on the Conservative Back Benches. But then perhaps that is what the Government have been looking for all along—the Government want a fight with the House of Lords, they want a fight with the Supreme Court and the Home Secretary certainly wants an excuse to withdraw from the European convention on human rights. Those perhaps are the real purposes of the Bill, and the impact on refugees and asylum seekers is really only secondary.

It is ridiculous that we are being asked to consider these amendments barely 24 hours after the Lords gave the Bill its Third Reading. It shows the Government's contempt for both Houses of Parliament. The explanatory notes and the amendment documents were only available through the Vote Office at 7.45 last night, as the hon. Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) said, and yet the Government are proposing 58 motions to disagree with the Lords in their amendments this evening. If that is not picking a fight, I am not sure what is. Well, let us have that fight. Let us vote on all 58 of them and then see how desperate the Government and their Back Benchers are to get this Bill on to the statute book.

Almost all the amendments made in the Lords speak to a basic humanity and respect for the rule of law and the fundamental principles of the global asylum system. That is essentially what the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's amendment 104 calls for. Government Members may wish to wish those Lords away, but they are supposed to support the House of Lords and the system that exists. If they want to pick away at it, that is fine, because I do not think there should be a House of Lords in its current form.

**Sir John Hayes:** I do not understand the hon. Gentleman's argument. On the one hand, Opposition Members say that the Government are not doing enough, that they need to deal with the backlog, take action and be more decisive and radical. When the Government do become decisive, however, we are told that they are rushing the House, that they are going too fast and that we need more time, more machinations, more prevarication and more delay.

**Patrick Grady:** The Government are going about this exactly the wrong way, as my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry) said earlier in one of her interventions. Many Lords amendments, especially those from the Lord Bishops, propose ways to deal with the backlog and provide safe and legal routes. Those are the amendments that the Government want to vote against.

In their increasingly desperate and craven pandering to what has become the Government's electoral base, and to those elements on their Back Benches who have been returned to this House by that electoral base, the Government seem increasingly prepared to walk away from or even rip up conventions and treaties that past Conservative Governments and Ministers once had a hand in drafting. Once again, they are using their majority to simply override the considered proposals from a House of Lords that they nevertheless want to continue to pack with their donors, cronies and assorted time-served loyalists.

Among those amendments was yet another Dubs amendment, Lords amendment 8, under which unaccompanied children would essentially continue to have the right to claim asylum in the United Kingdom and the Home Secretary would not be able to declare them inadmissible. That is what the Home Secretary wants to be able to do—to declare young children inadmissible for asylum and leave them essentially in a kind of limbo in the UK until they are old enough to be sent back to where they came from, or perhaps to Rwanda or anywhere else that the Government can pay enough money to and hopefully get a court to declare is safe.

All that is supposed to have a deterrent effect and make the UK a less attractive place to seek sanctuary, but it is not working. The Bill has failed at its first hurdle. Clause 2 of the Bill was supposed to retrospectively apply its provisions to the day it was introduced to the House, 7 March 2023, and that was supposed to start to stop the boats. That was going to create the great deterrent effect, and it simply has not worked. The Government are dressing up their proposals in lieu of Lords amendment 2 as some sort of grand compromise, but in fact they are simply acknowledging the reality that backdating the Bill was not working and maintaining the clause would only create a greater backlog of cases for processing, at even greater expense to the public purse.

Of course, it would be better if many of the powers granted, and duties required of the Home Secretary, by the Bill did not come into force at all. The Lords were not content with Lord Paddick's amendment to decline to give the Bill a Second Reading when it was first debated in their House, but there is still an opportunity to stop this Bill, perhaps in its entirety. There are mechanisms through double insistence or further amendments in lieu to dramatically reduce, delay or even halt the provisions of this Bill.

The SNP has never taken seats in the House of Lords, and I hope it never will, but for Opposition Members in particular who defend the role that it plays in the UK's constitution, surely this is the time to call for it to play that role to the fullest extent. The Government have no mandate for the Bill and no mandate to undermine human rights agreements that have underpinned the world order since 1945. If the Lords will not stand up on those issues, then what is even the point of the House of Lords? If the Government are so committed to getting this Bill through, they have the Parliament Acts at their disposal, or they can put their proposals to the public in a general election.

However, in any future general election I am confident that people in Glasgow North will continue to vote to be part of a country and a society that recognises the duty we have to the poorest and most vulnerable, that reciprocates the hospitality and sanctuary shown to generations before us who left our country for other shores, and that says, "Refugees are welcome here." If that country is not the United Kingdom, it will be an independent Scotland.

*Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 1.*

*The House divided: Ayes 303, Noes 228.*

**Division No. 279]**

**[4.53 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
Afriyie, Adam

Aiken, Nickie  
Aldous, Peter

Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Anderson, Lee  
Anderson, Stuart  
Andrew, rh Stuart  
Argar, rh Edward  
Atherton, Sarah  
Atkins, Victoria  
Bacon, Gareth  
Bacon, Mr Richard  
Badenoch, rh Kemi  
Bailey, Shaun  
Baillie, Siobhan  
Baker, Duncan  
Baker, Mr Steve  
Baldwin, Harriett  
Barclay, rh Steve  
Baron, Mr John  
Baynes, Simon  
Bell, Aaron  
Beresford, Sir Paul  
Berry, rh Sir Jake  
Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Blackman, Bob  
Blunt, Crispin  
Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Bottomley, Sir Peter  
Bowie, Andrew  
Bradley, Ben  
Brady, Sir Graham  
Braverman, rh Suella  
Brereton, Jack  
Brine, Steve  
Bristow, Paul  
Britcliffe, Sara  
Browne, Anthony  
Bruce, Fiona  
Buchan, Felicity  
Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
Burghart, Alex  
Butler, Rob  
Cairns, rh Alun  
Carter, Andy  
Cartledge, James  
Cash, Sir William  
Cates, Miriam  
Caulfield, Maria  
Chalk, rh Alex  
Chishti, Rehman  
Chope, Sir Christopher  
Churchill, Jo  
Clark, rh Greg  
Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
Clarkson, Chris  
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
Colburn, Elliot  
Collins, Damian  
Costa, Alberto  
Courts, Robert  
Coutinho, Claire  
Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
Crabb, rh Stephen  
Crosbie, Virginia  
Crouch, Tracey  
Davies, rh David T. C.  
Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)

Davies, Dr James  
Davies, Mims  
Davies, Philip  
Davis, rh Mr David  
Davison, Dehenna  
Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
Dines, Miss Sarah  
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
Docherty, Leo  
Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Double, Steve  
Drax, Richard  
Drummond, Mrs Flick  
Duguid, David  
Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
Dunne, rh Philip  
Eastwood, Mark  
Edwards, Ruth  
Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
Eustice, rh George  
Evans, Dr Luke  
Evennett, rh Sir David  
Everitt, Ben  
Fabricant, Michael  
Farris, Laura  
Fell, Simon  
Firth, Anna  
Fletcher, Katherine  
Fletcher, Mark  
Fletcher, Nick  
Ford, rh Vicky  
Foster, Kevin  
Fox, rh Dr Liam  
Francois, rh Mr Mark  
Frazer, rh Lucy  
Freeman, George  
Freer, Mike  
French, Mr Louie  
Garnier, Mark  
Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
Gibb, rh Nick  
Gibson, Peter  
Gideon, Jo  
Glen, rh John  
Gove, rh Michael  
Graham, Richard  
Gray, James  
Grayling, rh Chris  
Green, Chris  
Green, rh Damian  
Griffith, Andrew  
Grundy, James  
Gullis, Jonathan  
Halfon, rh Robert  
Hall, Luke  
Hammond, Stephen  
Harper, rh Mr Mark  
Harris, Rebecca  
Harrison, Trudy  
Hart, Sally-Ann  
Hart, rh Simon  
Hayes, rh Sir John  
Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
Heapey, rh James  
Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
Henderson, Gordon  
Henry, Darren  
Hinds, rh Damian  
Holden, Mr Richard



Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie

Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philip, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Truss, rh Elizabeth  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh

Vickers, Martin (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig

Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
 Andrew Stephenson and  
 Scott Mann

## NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth

Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew

Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Robinson, Gavin  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Sarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
 Gerald Jones and  
 Liz Twist

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 1 disagreed to.*

5.8 pm

*Proceedings interrupted ( Programme Order, this day ).*

*The Deputy Speaker put forthwith the Questions necessary for the disposal of the business to be concluded at that time ( Standing Order No. 83F ).*

*Lords amendment 2 disagreed to.*

#### Clause 4

DISREGARD OF CERTAIN CLAIMS, APPLICATIONS ETC

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 6.—( Robert Jenrick. )*

*The House divided: Ayes 303, Noes 227.*

**Division No. 280]**

**[5.8 pm**

#### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Frazer, rh Lucy  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard

Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, rh  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim

Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben

Stafford, Alexander  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Truss, rh Elizabeth  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin

Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Andrew Stephenson and**  
**Scott Mann**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew



Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James

Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Sarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thompson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete

Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Marion Fellows and**  
**Peter Grant**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 6 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendment 7 disagreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 8.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 299, Noes 228.*

**Division No. 281]**

**[5.20 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg

Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Frazer, rh Lucy  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike

French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian

Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob

Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura

Truss, rh Elizabeth  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggins, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Andrew Stephenson and**  
**Scott Mann**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur

Glendon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lillian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu

Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa

Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete

Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

#### Tellers for the Noes:

Liz Twist and  
 Gerald Jones

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 8 disagreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 9.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 304, Noes 228.*

#### Division No. 282]

[5.31 pm

#### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman

Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam



Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Frazer, rh Lucy  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew

Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David

Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin

Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Steve Double and**  
**Julie Marson**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur

Glendon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lillian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu

Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa

Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete

Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

#### Tellers for the Noes:

Liz Twist and  
 Gerald Jones

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 9 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendment 12 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendments 20 and 22 disagreed to.*

*Government amendments (a) to (o) made in lieu of  
 Lords amendments 2, 12, 20 and 22.*

#### After Clause 6

#### RESTRICTIONS ON REMOVAL DESTINATIONS: LGBT PERSONS

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House  
 disagrees with Lords amendment 23.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 297, Noes 231.*

#### Division No. 283]

[5.45 pm

#### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael

Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Frazer, rh Lucy  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David

Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark

Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham

Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

#### Tellers for the Ayes:

Julie Marson and  
 Steve Double

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria



Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael

Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorrin, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Beth  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie

Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew

Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Wragg, Mr William  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
 Gerald Jones and  
 Liz Twist

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 23 disagreed to.*

### Clause 10

#### POWERS OF DETENTION

*Lords amendment 30 disagreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 31.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 290, Noes 242.*

### Division No. 284]

**[5.57 pm**

#### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara

Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo

Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)

Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard

Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris

Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Raab, rh Dominic  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel

Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim  
**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Steve Double and**  
**Julie Marson**

## NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brine, Steve  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese

Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fell, Simon  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Nokes, rh Caroline  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy

Siddiq, Tulip  
 Simmonds, David  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen

Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Wragg, Mr William  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
 Gerald Jones and  
 Liz Twist

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 31 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendment 32 disagreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 33.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 299, Noes 227.*

#### **Division No. 285]**

**[6.9 pm**

#### **AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James



Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny

Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander

Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syme, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jacob Young and**  
**Ruth Edwards**

## NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil

Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal

Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Nokes, rh Caroline  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt

Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen

Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

#### Tellers for the Noes:

Gerald Jones and  
 Liz Twist

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 33 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendments 34 to 36 disagreed to.*

*Amendments (a) and (b) proposed in lieu of Lords amendments 31, 35 and 36.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*Question put, That the amendments be made.*

*The House divided: Ayes 284, Noes 242.*

#### Division No. 286]

[6.21 pm

#### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella

Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.

Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davies, Philip  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alistair  
 Javid, rh Sajid  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 McVey, rh Esther  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David

Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Purslove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane

Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sunderland, James  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Truss, rh Elizabeth  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jacob Young and**  
**Ruth Edwards**

## NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell-Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet



Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fell, Simon  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Nokes, rh Caroline  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan

Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth

Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Wragg, Mr William  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Gerald Jones and**  
**Liz Twist**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Amendments (a) and (b) made in lieu of Lords amendments 31, 35 and 36.*

*Lords amendments 37 and 38 disagreed to.*

*Government amendments (a) to (e) made in lieu of Lords amendments 37 and 38.*

## Clause 11

PERIOD FOR WHICH PERSONS MAY BE DETAINED

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 39.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 300, Noes 229.*

**Division No. 287]**

**[6.33 pm**

## AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun

Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinéage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Francois, rh Mr Mark  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan

Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Truss, rh Elizabeth  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim  
**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jacob Young and**  
**Ruth Edwards**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben

Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale

Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte

Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Reynolds, Jonathan  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin

Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Marion Fellows and**  
**Peter Grant**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 39 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendments 40 to 49 disagreed to.*

## Clause 16

TRANSFER OF CHILDREN FROM SECRETARY OF STATE TO  
 LOCAL AUTHORITY AND VICE VERSA

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 50.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 294, Noes 228.*

## Division No. 288]

[6.47 pm

## AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard

Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob



Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkins, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi

Lamont, John  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim  
**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Amanda Solloway and**  
**Robert Largan**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara

Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard

Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Glindon, Mary  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)

McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owatemi, Taiwo  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Powell, Lucy  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy

Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
 Marion Fellows and  
 Peter Grant

*Question accordingly agreed to.*  
*Lords amendment 50 disagreed to.*

### Clause 21

PROVISIONS RELATING TO REMOVAL AND LEAVE  
*Lords amendments 51 to 55 disagreed to.*  
*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 56.—(Robert Jenrick.)*  
*The House divided: Ayes 285, Noes 243.*

### Division No. 289]

[7 pm

### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward

Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve

Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George

Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny

Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John

Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim  
**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Amanda Solloway and**  
**Robert Largan**

#### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike



Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brine, Steve  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debonnaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farron, Tim

Farry, Stephen  
 Fell, Simon  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Hanna, Claire  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 May, rh Mrs Theresa  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry

McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGinn, Conor  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Nokes, rh Caroline  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd

Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Simmonds, David  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thomas, Gareth  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Wragg, Mr William  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Mary Glindon and**  
**Taiwo Owatemi**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 56 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendments 57 to 67 disagreed to.*

### Clause 38

SERIOUS HARM SUSPENSIVE CLAIMS: INTERPRETATION

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 73.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 297, Noes 227.*

### Division No. 290]

[7.14 pm

### AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter

Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart

Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims

Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John

Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran

Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Roberts, Mr Rob  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swaine, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne

Whately, Helen  
Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
Whittaker, rh Craig  
Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
Wiggin, Sir Bill  
Wild, James  
Williams, Craig

Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
Wood, Mike  
Young, Jacob  
Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Amanda Solloway and**  
**Robert Largan**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote*  
*cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)

Abrahams, Debbie  
Ali, Rushanara  
Ali, Tahir  
Amesbury, Mike  
Anderson, Fleur  
Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
Bardell, Hannah  
Barker, Paula  
Beckett, rh Margaret  
Begum, Apsana  
Benn, rh Hilary  
Betts, Mr Clive  
Black, Mhairi  
Blackford, rh Ian  
Blake, Olivia  
Blomfield, Paul  
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
Brennan, Kevin  
Brock, Deidre  
Brown, Alan  
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
Buck, Ms Karen  
Burgon, Richard  
Butler, Dawn  
Byrne, Ian  
Byrne, rh Liam  
Cadbury, Ruth  
Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote*  
*cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Cameron, Dr Lisa  
Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
Carden, Dan  
Chamberlain, Wendy  
Champion, Sarah  
Chapman, Douglas  
Cherry, Joanna  
Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast*  
*by Chris Elmore*)  
Cooper, rh Yvette  
Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
Cowan, Ronnie  
Coyle, Neil  
Crawley, Angela  
Creasy, Stella  
Cruddas, Jon  
Cryer, John  
Cunningham, Alex  
Daby, Janet  
Dalton, Ashley  
Davies-Jones, Alex  
Day, Martyn  
De Cordova, Marsha  
Debbonaire, Thangam  
Dixon, Samantha  
Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
Dodds, Anneliese  
Doogan, Dave  
Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast*  
*by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Doughty, Stephen

Eagle, Dame Angela  
Eagle, rh Maria  
Eastwood, Colum  
Edwards, Jonathan  
Efford, Clive  
Elmore, Chris  
Eshalomi, Florence  
Evans, Chris  
Farron, Tim  
Farry, Stephen  
Fellows, Marion  
Ferrier, Margaret  
Flynn, Stephen  
Foord, Richard  
Fovargue, Yvonne  
Foxcroft, Vicky  
Foy, Mary Kelly  
Gibson, Patricia  
Gill, Preet Kaur  
Glindon, Mary  
Grady, Patrick  
Grant, Peter  
Green, Sarah  
Greenwood, Lilian  
Greenwood, Margaret  
Griffith, Dame Nia  
Gwynne, Andrew  
Hamilton, Fabian  
Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
Hanna, Claire  
Hanvey, Neale  
Hardy, Emma  
Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
Harris, Carolyn  
Hayes, Helen  
Healey, rh John  
Hendrick, Sir Mark  
Hillier, Dame Meg  
Hobhouse, Wera  
Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
Hollern, Kate  
Hopkins, Rachel  
Hosie, rh Stewart  
Howarth, rh Sir George  
Huq, Dr Rupa  
Hussain, Imran  
Jardine, Christine  
Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
Johnson, Kim  
Jones, Darren  
Jones, Gerald  
Jones, Ruth  
Jones, Sarah  
Kane, Mike  
Khan, Afzal  
Kinnock, Stephen  
Kyle, Peter  
Lake, Ben  
Lavery, Ian  
Law, Chris  
Leadbeater, Kim

Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
Lewis, Clive  
Linden, David  
Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast*  
*by Chris Elmore*)  
Long Bailey, Rebecca  
Lucas, Caroline  
MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
Madders, Justin  
Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
Mahmood, Shabana  
Malhotra, Seema  
Maskell, Rachael  
Mc Nally, John  
McCarthy, Kerry  
McDonald, Andy  
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
McDonald, Stuart C.  
McDonnell, rh John  
McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
McGinn, Conor  
McGovern, Alison  
McKinnell, Catherine  
McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote*  
*cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
McMahon, Jim  
McMorrin, Anna  
Mearns, Ian  
Miliband, rh Edward  
Mishra, Navendu  
Monaghan, Carol  
Morden, Jessica  
Morgan, Helen  
Morgan, Stephen  
Morris, Grahame  
Murray, Ian  
Murray, James  
Nandy, Lisa  
Nichols, Charlotte  
Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote*  
*cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Norris, Alex  
O'Hara, Brendan  
Olney, Sarah  
Onwurah, Chi  
Oppong-Asare, Abena  
Osamor, Kate  
Osborne, Kate  
Oswald, Kirsten  
Owatemi, Taiwo  
Owen, Sarah  
Pennycook, Matthew  
Perkins, Mr Toby  
Phillips, Jess  
Pollard, Luke  
Qaisar, Ms Anum  
Qureshi, Yasmin

Rayner, rh Angela  
Rees, Christina  
Reeves, Ellie  
Reeves, rh Rachel  
Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
Rimmer, Ms Marie  
Rodda, Matt  
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
Sharma, Mr Virendra  
Sheerman, Mr Barry  
Sheppard, Tommy  
Siddiq, Tulip  
Slaughter, Andy  
Smith, Alyn  
Smith, Cat  
Smith, Jeff  
Smith, Nick  
Smyth, Karin  
Sobel, Alex  
Spellar, rh John  
Stephens, Chris  
Stevens, Jo  
Stone, Jamie  
Streeting, Wes  
Stringer, Graham  
Sultana, Zarah  
Tami, rh Mark  
Tarry, Sam  
Thomas, Gareth  
Thompson, Owen  
Thomson, Richard  
Thornberry, rh Emily  
Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
Trickett, Jon  
Twigg, Derek  
Twist, Liz  
Vaz, rh Valerie  
Wakeford, Christian  
Webbe, Claudia  
West, Catherine  
Western, Andrew  
Western, Matt  
Whitehead, Dr Alan  
Whitford, Dr Philippa  
Whitley, Mick  
Whittome, Nadia  
Williams, Hywel  
Wilson, Munira  
Winter, Beth  
Wishart, Pete  
Yasin, Mohammad  
Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Gavin Newlands and**  
**Steven Bonnar**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*  
*Lords amendment 73 disagreed to.*  
*Lords amendment 74 disagreed to.*  
*Government amendment (a) made in lieu of Lords*  
*amendments 73 and 74.*

### Clause 52

#### INTERIM REMEDIES

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House*  
*disagrees with Lords amendment 90.—(Robert Jenrick.)*



*The House divided: Ayes 295, Noes 228.*

# Division No. 291]

[7.25 pm

## AYES

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot

Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evnnett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason

McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert

Thomas, Derek  
Throup, Maggie  
Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
Tomlinson, Justin  
Tomlinson, Michael  
Tracey, Craig  
Trott, Laura  
Tugendhat, rh Tom  
Vara, rh Shailesh  
Vickers, Martin  
Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Villiers, rh Theresa  
Walker, Sir Charles  
Walker, Mr Robin  
Warman, Matt

Watling, Giles  
Webb, Suzanne  
Whately, Helen  
Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
Whittaker, rh Craig  
Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
Wiggin, Sir Bill  
Wild, James  
Williams, Craig  
Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
Wood, Mike  
Young, Jacob  
Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jo Churchill and**  
**Fay Jones**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
Abrahams, Debbie  
Ali, Rushanara  
Ali, Tahir  
Amesbury, Mike  
Anderson, Fleur  
Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
Bardell, Hannah  
Barker, Paula  
Beckett, rh Margaret  
Begum, Apsana  
Benn, rh Hilary  
Betts, Mr Clive  
Black, Mhairi  
Blackford, rh Ian  
Blake, Olivia  
Blomfield, Paul  
Bonnar, Steven  
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
Brennan, Kevin  
Brock, Deidre  
Brown, Alan  
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
Buck, Ms Karen  
Burgon, Richard  
Butler, Dawn  
Byrne, Ian  
Byrne, rh Liam  
Cadbury, Ruth  
Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Cameron, Dr Lisa  
Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
Carden, Dan  
Chamberlain, Wendy  
Champion, Sarah  
Chapman, Douglas  
Cherry, Joanna  
Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Cooper, rh Yvette  
Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
Cowan, Ronnie  
Coyle, Neil  
Crawley, Angela  
Creasy, Stella  
Cruddas, Jon  
Cryer, John  
Cunningham, Alex  
Daby, Janet  
Dalton, Ashley  
Davies-Jones, Alex

Day, Martyn  
De Cordova, Marsha  
Debbonaire, Thangam  
Dixon, Samantha  
Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
Dodds, Anneliese  
Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Doughty, Stephen  
Eagle, Dame Angela  
Eagle, rh Maria  
Eastwood, Colum  
Edwards, Jonathan  
Efford, Clive  
Elmore, Chris  
Eshalomi, Florence  
Evans, Chris  
Farron, Tim  
Farry, Stephen  
Fellows, Marion  
Ferrier, Margaret  
Flynn, Stephen  
Foord, Richard  
Fovargue, Yvonne  
Foxcroft, Vicky  
Foy, Mary Kelly  
Gibson, Patricia  
Gill, Preet Kaur  
Grady, Patrick  
Grant, Peter  
Green, Sarah  
Greenwood, Lilian  
Greenwood, Margaret  
Griffith, Dame Nia  
Gwynne, Andrew  
Hamilton, Fabian  
Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
Hanna, Claire  
Hanvey, Neale  
Hardy, Emma  
Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
Harris, Carolyn  
Hayes, Helen  
Hendrick, Sir Mark  
Hillier, Dame Meg  
Hobhouse, Wera  
Hodge, rh Dame Margaret  
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
Hollern, Kate  
Hopkins, Rachel  
Hosie, rh Stewart

Howarth, rh Sir George  
Huq, Dr Rupa  
Hussain, Imran  
Jardine, Christine  
Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
Johnson, Kim  
Jones, Darren  
Jones, Gerald  
Jones, Ruth  
Jones, Sarah  
Kane, Mike  
Khan, Afzal  
Kinnock, Stephen  
Kyle, Peter  
Lake, Ben  
Lavery, Ian  
Law, Chris  
Leadbeater, Kim  
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
Lewis, Clive  
Linden, David  
Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Long Bailey, Rebecca  
Lucas, Caroline  
MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
Madders, Justin  
Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
Mahmood, Shabana  
Malhotra, Seema  
Maskell, Rachael  
Mc Nally, John  
McCarthy, Kerry  
McDonald, Andy  
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
McDonald, Stuart C.  
McDonnell, rh John  
McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
McGinn, Conor  
McGovern, Alison  
McKinnell, Catherine  
McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
McMahon, Jim  
McMorrin, Anna  
Mearns, Ian  
Miliband, rh Edward  
Mishra, Navendu  
Monaghan, Carol  
Morden, Jessica  
Morgan, Helen  
Morgan, Stephen  
Morris, Grahame  
Murray, Ian  
Murray, James  
Nandy, Lisa  
Newlands, Gavin  
Nichols, Charlotte  
Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Norris, Alex  
O'Hara, Brendan  
Olney, Sarah  
Onwurah, Chi  
Oppong-Asare, Abena  
Osamor, Kate

Osborne, Kate  
Oswald, Kirsten  
Owen, Sarah  
Pennycook, Matthew  
Perkins, Mr Toby  
Phillips, Jess  
Pollard, Luke  
Qaisar, Ms Anum  
Qureshi, Yasmin  
Rayner, rh Angela  
Rees, Christina  
Reeves, Ellie  
Reeves, rh Rachel  
Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
Rimmer, Ms Marie  
Rodda, Matt  
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
Sharma, Mr Virendra  
Sheerman, Mr Barry  
Sheppard, Tommy  
Siddiq, Tulip  
Slaughter, Andy  
Smith, Alyn  
Smith, Cat  
Smith, Jeff  
Smyth, Karin  
Sobel, Alex  
Spellar, rh John  
Stephens, Chris  
Stevens, Jo  
Stone, Jamie  
Streeting, Wes  
Stringer, Graham  
Sultana, Zarah  
Tami, rh Mark  
Tarry, Sam  
Thomas, Gareth  
Thompson, Owen  
Thomson, Richard  
Thornberry, rh Emily  
Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
Trickett, Jon  
Twigg, Derek  
Twist, Liz  
Vaz, rh Valerie  
Wakeford, Christian  
Webbe, Claudia  
West, Catherine  
Western, Andrew  
Western, Matt  
Whitehead, Dr Alan  
Whitford, Dr Philippa  
Whitley, Mick  
Whittome, Nadia  
Williams, Hywel  
Wilson, Munira  
Winter, Beth  
Wishart, Pete  
Yasin, Mohammad  
Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Mary Glendon and**  
**Taiwo Owatemi**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 90 disagreed to.*

*Government amendments (a) to (c) made to the words so restored to the Bill.*

**Clause 55**

## DECISIONS RELATING TO A PERSON'S AGE

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 93.—(Robert Jenrick.)*  
*The House divided: Ayes 296, Noes 220.*

**Division No. 292]****[7.36 pm****AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris

Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris

Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit

Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel



Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles

Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Wood, Mike  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jo Churchill and**  
**Fay Jones**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex

Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon

Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorrin, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena

Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke  
 Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Mary Glindon and**  
**Taiwo Owatemi**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*  
*Lords amendment 93 disagreed to.*  
*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 95.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 295, Noes 220.*

**Division No. 293]**

**[7.47 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bottomley, Sir Peter  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian

Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Green, rh Damian  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark

Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morrissey, Joy  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Morrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Wayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael

Tracey, Craig  
Trott, Laura  
Tugendhat, rh Tom  
Vara, rh Shailesh  
Vickers, Martin  
Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
Villiers, rh Theresa  
Walker, Sir Charles  
Walker, Mr Robin  
Wallis, Dr Jamie  
Warman, Matt  
Watling, Giles  
Webb, Suzanne

Whately, Helen  
Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
Whittaker, rh Craig  
Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
Wiggin, Sir Bill  
Wild, James  
Williams, Craig  
Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
Wood, Mike  
Young, Jacob  
Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Jo Churchill and**  
**Fay Jones**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
Abrahams, Debbie  
Ali, Rushanara  
Ali, Tahir  
Amesbury, Mike  
Anderson, Fleur  
Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
Bardell, Hannah  
Barker, Paula  
Beckett, rh Margaret  
Begum, Apsana  
Benn, rh Hilary  
Betts, Mr Clive  
Black, Mhairi  
Blackford, rh Ian  
Blake, Olivia  
Blomfield, Paul  
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
Brennan, Kevin  
Brock, Deidre  
Brown, Alan  
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
Buck, Ms Karen  
Burgon, Richard  
Butler, Dawn  
Byrne, Ian  
Byrne, rh Liam  
Cadbury, Ruth  
Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Cameron, Dr Lisa  
Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
Carden, Dan  
Chamberlain, Wendy  
Champion, Sarah  
Cherry, Joanna  
Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Cooper, rh Yvette  
Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
Cowan, Ronnie  
Coyle, Neil  
Creasy, Stella  
Cruddas, Jon  
Cryer, John  
Cunningham, Alex  
Daby, Janet  
Dalton, Ashley  
Davies-Jones, Alex  
Day, Martyn  
De Cordova, Marsha  
Debbonaire, Thangam  
Dixon, Samantha  
Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
Dodds, Anneliese  
Doogan, Dave  
Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Doughty, Stephen  
Eagle, Dame Angela  
Eagle, rh Maria  
Eastwood, Colum  
Edwards, Jonathan  
Efford, Clive  
Elmore, Chris  
Eshalomi, Florence  
Evans, Chris  
Farry, Stephen  
Fellows, Marion  
Ferrier, Margaret  
Flynn, Stephen  
Foord, Richard  
Fovargue, Yvonne  
Foxcroft, Vicky  
Foy, Mary Kelly  
Gibson, Patricia  
Gill, Preet Kaur  
Glendon, Mary  
Grady, Patrick  
Grant, Peter  
Green, Sarah  
Greenwood, Lilian  
Greenwood, Margaret  
Griffith, Dame Nia  
Gwynne, Andrew  
Hamilton, Fabian  
Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
Hanvey, Neale  
Hardy, Emma  
Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
Harris, Carolyn  
Hayes, Helen  
Healey, rh John  
Hendrick, Sir Mark  
Hillier, Dame Meg  
Hobhouse, Wera  
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
Hollern, Kate  
Hopkins, Rachel  
Hosie, rh Stewart  
Howarth, rh Sir George  
Huq, Dr Rupa  
Hussain, Imran  
Jardine, Christine  
Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
Johnson, Kim  
Jones, Darren  
Jones, Gerald  
Jones, Ruth

Jones, Sarah  
Kane, Mike  
Khan, Afzal  
Kinnock, Stephen  
Kyle, Peter  
Lake, Ben  
Lavery, Ian  
Law, Chris  
Leadbeater, Kim  
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
Lewis, Clive  
Linden, David  
Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Long Bailey, Rebecca  
Lucas, Caroline  
MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
Madders, Justin  
Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
Mahmood, Shabana  
Malhotra, Seema  
Maskell, Rachael  
Mc Nally, John  
McCarthy, Kerry  
McDonald, Andy  
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
McDonald, Stuart C.  
McDonnell, rh John  
McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
McGovern, Alison  
McKinnell, Catherine  
McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
McMahon, Jim  
McMorrin, Anna  
Mearns, Ian  
Miliband, rh Edward  
Mishra, Navendu  
Monaghan, Carol  
Morden, Jessica  
Morgan, Helen  
Morgan, Stephen  
Morris, Grahame  
Murray, Ian  
Murray, James  
Nandy, Lisa  
Nichols, Charlotte  
Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Norris, Alex  
O'Hara, Brendan  
Olney, Sarah  
Onwurah, Chi  
Oppong-Asare, Abena  
Osamor, Kate  
Osborne, Kate  
Oswald, Kirsten  
Owatemi, Taiwo  
Owen, Sarah  
Pennycook, Matthew  
Perkins, Mr Toby

Phillips, Jess  
Pollard, Luke  
Qaisar, Ms Anum  
Qureshi, Yasmin  
Rayner, rh Angela  
Rees, Christina  
Reeves, Ellie  
Reeves, rh Rachel  
Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
Rimmer, Ms Marie  
Rodda, Matt  
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
Sharma, Mr Virendra  
Sheerman, Mr Barry  
Sheppard, Tommy  
Siddiq, Tulip  
Slaughter, Andy  
Smith, Alyn  
Smith, Cat  
Smith, Jeff  
Smith, Nick  
Smyth, Karin  
Sobel, Alex  
Spellar, rh John  
Stephens, Chris  
Stevens, Jo  
Stone, Jamie  
Streeting, Wes  
Stringer, Graham  
Sultana, Zarah  
Tami, rh Mark  
Tarry, Sam  
Thompson, Owen  
Thomson, Richard  
Thornberry, rh Emily  
Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
Trickett, Jon  
Twigg, Derek  
Twist, Liz  
Vaz, rh Valerie  
Wakeford, Christian  
Webbe, Claudia  
West, Catherine  
Western, Andrew  
Western, Matt  
Whitehead, Dr Alan  
Whitford, Dr Philippa  
Whitley, Mick  
Whittome, Nadia  
Williams, Hywel  
Wilson, Munira  
Winter, Beth  
Wishart, Pete  
Yasin, Mohammad  
Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Gavin Newlands and**  
**Steven Bonnar**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*  
*Lords amendment 95 disagreed to.*  
*Government amendments (a) and (b) made in lieu of*  
*Lords amendment 95.*

### After Clause 58

DUTY TO ESTABLISH SAFE AND LEGAL ROUTES  
*Motion made, and Question put, (That this House*  
*disagrees with Lords amendment 102.—(Robert Jenrick.)*



*The House divided: Ayes 282, Noes 234.*

**Division No. 294]**

**[7.58 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey

Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Farris, Laura  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Graham, Richard  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heapey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherilyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny

Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather

Whittaker, rh Craig  
Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
Wiggin, Sir Bill  
Wild, James  
Williams, Craig  
Williamson, rh Sir Gavin

Young, Jacob  
Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Joy Morrissey and**  
**Mike Wood**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
Abrahams, Debbie  
Ali, Rushanara  
Ali, Tahir  
Amesbury, Mike  
Anderson, Fleur  
Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
Bardell, Hannah  
Barker, Paula  
Beckett, rh Margaret  
Begum, Apsana  
Benn, rh Hilary  
Betts, Mr Clive  
Black, Mhairi  
Blackford, rh Ian  
Blake, Olivia  
Blomfield, Paul  
Bottomley, Sir Peter  
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
Brennan, Kevin  
Brine, Steve  
Brock, Deidre  
Brown, Alan  
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
Buck, Ms Karen  
Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
Burgon, Richard  
Butler, Dawn  
Byrne, Ian  
Byrne, rh Liam  
Cadbury, Ruth  
Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Cameron, Dr Lisa  
Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
Carden, Dan  
Chamberlain, Wendy  
Champion, Sarah  
Chapman, Douglas  
Cherry, Joanna  
Chishti, Rehman  
Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Cooper, rh Yvette  
Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
Cowan, Ronnie  
Coyle, Neil  
Crawley, Angela  
Creasy, Stella  
Crouch, Tracey  
Cruddas, Jon  
Cryer, John  
Cunningham, Alex  
Daby, Janet  
Dalton, Ashley  
Davies-Jones, Alex  
Day, Martyn  
De Cordova, Marsha  
Debbonaire, Thangam  
Dixon, Samantha  
Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
Dodds, Anneliese  
Doogan, Dave  
Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Doughty, Stephen  
Eagle, Dame Angela  
Eagle, rh Maria  
Eastwood, Colum  
Edwards, Jonathan  
Efford, Clive  
Elmore, Chris  
Eshalomi, Florence  
Evans, Chris  
Farry, Stephen  
Fell, Simon  
Fellows, Marion  
Ferrier, Margaret  
Flynn, Stephen  
Foord, Richard  
Fovargue, Yvonne  
Foxcroft, Vicky  
Foy, Mary Kelly  
Gibson, Patricia  
Gill, Preet Kaur  
Glindon, Mary  
Grady, Patrick  
Grant, Peter  
Green, rh Damian  
Green, Sarah  
Greenwood, Lilian  
Greenwood, Margaret  
Griffith, Dame Nia  
Gwynne, Andrew  
Hamilton, Fabian  
Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
Hammond, Stephen  
Hanvey, Neale  
Hardy, Emma  
Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
Harris, Carolyn  
Hayes, Helen  
Healey, rh John  
Hendrick, Sir Mark  
Hillier, Dame Meg  
Hobhouse, Wera  
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
Hollern, Kate  
Hopkins, Rachel  
Hosie, rh Stewart  
Howarth, rh Sir George  
Huq, Dr Rupa  
Hussain, Imran  
Jardine, Christine  
Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
Johnson, Kim  
Jones, Darren  
Jones, Gerald  
Jones, Ruth  
Jones, Sarah  
Kane, Mike  
Khan, Afzal  
Kinnoch, Stephen  
Kyle, Peter  
Lake, Ben

Lavery, Ian  
Law, Chris  
Leadbeater, Kim  
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
Lewis, Clive  
Linden, David  
Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
Long Bailey, Rebecca  
Loughton, Tim  
Lucas, Caroline  
MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
Madders, Justin  
Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
Mahmood, Shabana  
Malhotra, Seema  
Maskell, Rachael  
Mc Nally, John  
McCarthy, Kerry  
McDonald, Andy  
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
McDonald, Stuart C.  
McDonnell, rh John  
McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
McGovern, Alison  
McKinnell, Catherine  
McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
McMahon, Jim  
McMorrin, Anna  
Mearns, Ian  
Miliband, rh Edward  
Mishra, Navendu  
Monaghan, Carol  
Morden, Jessica  
Morgan, Helen  
Morgan, Stephen  
Morris, Grahame  
Murray, Ian  
Murray, James  
Nandy, Lisa  
Neill, Sir Robert  
Nichols, Charlotte  
Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
Nokes, rh Caroline  
Norris, Alex  
O'Hara, Brendan  
Olney, Sarah  
Onwurah, Chi  
Oppong-Asare, Abena  
Osamor, Kate  
Osborne, Kate  
Oswald, Kirsten  
Owatemi, Taiwo  
Owen, Sarah  
Pennycook, Matthew  
Perkins, Mr Toby  
Phillips, Jess  
Pollard, Luke

Qaisar, Ms Anum  
Qureshi, Yasmin  
Rayner, rh Angela  
Rees, Christina  
Reeves, Ellie  
Reeves, rh Rachel  
Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
Rimmer, Ms Marie  
Rodda, Matt  
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
Sharma, Mr Virendra  
Sheerman, Mr Barry  
Sheppard, Tommy  
Siddiq, Tulip  
Slaughter, Andy  
Smith, Alyn  
Smith, Cat  
Smith, Jeff  
Smith, Nick  
Smyth, Karin  
Sobel, Alex  
Spellar, rh John  
Stephens, Chris  
Stevens, Jo  
Stone, Jamie  
Streeting, Wes  
Stringer, Graham  
Sturdy, Julian  
Sultana, Zarah  
Tami, rh Mark  
Tarry, Sam  
Thompson, Owen  
Thomson, Richard  
Thornberry, rh Emily  
Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
Trickett, Jon  
Twigg, Derek  
Twist, Liz  
Vaz, rh Valerie  
Wakeford, Christian  
Webbe, Claudia  
West, Catherine  
Western, Andrew  
Western, Matt  
Whitehead, Dr Alan  
Whitford, Dr Philippa  
Whitley, Mick  
Whittome, Nadia  
Williams, Hywel  
Wilson, Munira  
Winter, Beth  
Wishart, Pete  
Wragg, Mr William  
Yasin, Mohammad  
Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Gavin Newlands and**  
**Steven Bonnar**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 102 disagreed to.*

### After Clause 60

#### ORGANISED IMMIGRATION CRIME ENFORCEMENT

*Motion made, and Question put, (That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 103.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 291, Noes 222.*

**Division No. 295]**

**[8.10 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Brine, Steve  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartlidge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chishti, Rehman  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto

Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire  
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Crouch, Tracey  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann

Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver  
 Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cherylyn  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen

Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria  
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Neill, Sir Robert  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Purslove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Selous, Andrew  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom



Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin  
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen

Wheeler, Mrs Heather  
 Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
 Joy Morrissey and  
 Mike Wood

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal

Kinnock, Stephen  
 Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke

Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
 Mary Glindon and  
 Taiwo Owatemi

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 103 disagreed to.*

**Mr Deputy Speaker (Sir Roger Gale):** Seconds out, round 17.

### After Clause 60

TEN-YEAR STRATEGY ON REFUGEES AND  
 HUMAN<sup>4</sup> TRAFFICKING

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 104.—(Robert Jenrick.)*

*The House divided: Ayes 290, Noes 222.*

**Division No. 296]**

**[8.21 pm**

**AYES**

Afolami, Bim  
 Afriyie, Adam  
 Aiken, Nickie  
 Aldous, Peter  
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Anderson, Lee  
 Anderson, Stuart  
 Andrew, rh Stuart  
 Ansell, Caroline  
 Argar, rh Edward  
 Atherton, Sarah  
 Atkins, Victoria  
 Bacon, Gareth  
 Bacon, Mr Richard  
 Badenoch, rh Kemi  
 Bailey, Shaun  
 Baillie, Siobhan  
 Baker, Duncan  
 Baker, Mr Steve  
 Baldwin, Harriett  
 Barclay, rh Steve  
 Baron, Mr John  
 Baynes, Simon  
 Bell, Aaron  
 Beresford, Sir Paul  
 Berry, rh Sir Jake  
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Blackman, Bob  
 Blunt, Crispin  
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Bowie, Andrew  
 Bradley, Ben  
 Brady, Sir Graham  
 Braverman, rh Suella  
 Brereton, Jack  
 Bridgen, Andrew  
 Bristow, Paul  
 Britcliffe, Sara  
 Browne, Anthony  
 Bruce, Fiona  
 Buchan, Felicity  
 Burghart, Alex  
 Butler, Rob  
 Cairns, rh Alun  
 Carter, Andy  
 Cartledge, James  
 Cash, Sir William  
 Cates, Miriam  
 Caulfield, Maria  
 Chalk, rh Alex  
 Chope, Sir Christopher  
 Churchill, Jo  
 Clark, rh Greg  
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan  
 Clarkson, Chris  
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey  
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse  
 Colburn, Elliot  
 Collins, Damian  
 Costa, Alberto  
 Courts, Robert  
 Coutinho, Claire

Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey  
 Crabb, rh Stephen  
 Crosbie, Virginia  
 Davies, rh David T. C.  
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Davies, Dr James  
 Davies, Mims  
 Davis, rh Mr David  
 Davison, Dehenna  
 Dinanage, Dame Caroline  
 Dines, Miss Sarah  
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan  
 Docherty, Leo  
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Double, Steve  
 Drax, Richard  
 Drummond, Mrs Flick  
 Duguid, David  
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain  
 Dunne, rh Philip  
 Eastwood, Mark  
 Edwards, Ruth  
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael  
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie  
 Eustice, rh George  
 Evans, Dr Luke  
 Evennett, rh Sir David  
 Everitt, Ben  
 Fabricant, Michael  
 Farris, Laura  
 Fell, Simon  
 Firth, Anna  
 Fletcher, Katherine  
 Fletcher, Mark  
 Fletcher, Nick  
 Ford, rh Vicky  
 Foster, Kevin  
 Fox, rh Dr Liam  
 Freeman, George  
 Freer, Mike  
 French, Mr Louie  
 Garnier, Mark  
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat  
 Gibb, rh Nick  
 Gibson, Peter  
 Gideon, Jo  
 Glen, rh John  
 Gove, rh Michael  
 Gray, James  
 Grayling, rh Chris  
 Green, Chris  
 Griffith, Andrew  
 Grundy, James  
 Gullis, Jonathan  
 Halfon, rh Robert  
 Hall, Luke  
 Hammond, Stephen  
 Harper, rh Mr Mark  
 Harris, Rebecca  
 Harrison, Trudy  
 Hart, Sally-Ann  
 Hart, rh Simon  
 Hayes, rh Sir John  
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver

Heappey, rh James  
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris  
 Henderson, Gordon  
 Henry, Darren  
 Hinds, rh Damian  
 Holden, Mr Richard  
 Hollinrake, Kevin  
 Hollobone, Mr Philip  
 Holloway, Adam  
 Holmes, Paul  
 Howell, John  
 Howell, Paul  
 Huddleston, Nigel  
 Hudson, Dr Neil  
 Hughes, Eddie  
 Hunt, Jane  
 Hunt, Tom  
 Jack, rh Mr Alister  
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil  
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard  
 Jenkinson, Mark  
 Jenkyns, Dame Andrea  
 Jenrick, rh Robert  
 Johnson, Dr Caroline  
 Johnson, Gareth  
 Johnston, David  
 Jones, Andrew  
 Jones, Fay  
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus  
 Jupp, Simon  
 Kawczynski, Daniel  
 Keegan, rh Gillian  
 Knight, rh Sir Greg  
 Kniveton, Kate  
 Kruger, Danny  
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi  
 Lamont, John  
 Langan, Robert  
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea  
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward  
 Levy, Ian  
 Lewer, Andrew  
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon  
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian  
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian  
 Loder, Chris  
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Longhi, Marco  
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Lopresti, Jack  
 Lord, Mr Jonathan  
 Loughton, Tim  
 Mackinlay, Craig  
 Mackrory, Cheryl  
 Maclean, Rachel  
 Mak, Alan  
 Malthouse, rh Kit  
 Mangnall, Anthony  
 Mann, Scott  
 Marson, Julie  
 Mayhew, Jerome  
 Maynard, Paul  
 McCartney, Jason  
 McCartney, Karl  
 Menzies, Mark  
 Mercer, rh Johnny  
 Merriman, Huw  
 Metcalfe, Stephen  
 Millar, Robin  
 Miller, rh Dame Maria

Milling, rh Dame Amanda  
 Mills, Nigel  
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew  
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan  
 Moore, Damien  
 Moore, Robbie  
 Mordaunt, rh Penny  
 Morris, Anne Marie  
 Morris, James  
 Morton, rh Wendy  
 Mullan, Dr Kieran  
 Mundell, rh David  
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll  
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew  
 Nici, Lia  
 O'Brien, Neil  
 Opperman, Guy  
 Pawsey, Mark  
 Penning, rh Sir Mike  
 Penrose, John  
 Percy, Andrew  
 Philp, rh Chris  
 Poulter, Dr Dan  
 Pow, Rebecca  
 Prentis, rh Victoria  
 Pritchard, rh Mark  
 Pursglove, Tom  
 Quin, rh Jeremy  
 Quince, Will  
 Randall, Tom  
 Redwood, rh John  
 Richards, Nicola  
 Richardson, Angela  
 Robertson, Mr Laurence  
 Ross, Douglas  
 Rowley, Lee  
 Russell, Dean  
 Rutley, David  
 Sambrook, Gary  
 Saxby, Selaine  
 Scully, Paul  
 Seely, Bob  
 Shapps, rh Grant  
 Simmonds, David  
 Smith, rh Chloe  
 Smith, Greg  
 Smith, rh Julian  
 Solloway, Amanda  
 Spencer, Dr Ben  
 Stafford, Alexander  
 Stephenson, rh Andrew  
 Stevenson, Jane  
 Stevenson, John  
 Stewart, rh Bob  
 Stewart, Iain  
 Streeter, Sir Gary  
 Stride, rh Mel  
 Stuart, rh Graham  
 Sturdy, Julian  
 Sunderland, James  
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond  
 Syms, Sir Robert  
 Thomas, Derek  
 Throup, Maggie  
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly  
 Tomlinson, Justin  
 Tomlinson, Michael  
 Tracey, Craig  
 Trott, Laura  
 Tugendhat, rh Tom  
 Vara, rh Shailesh  
 Vickers, Martin

Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)  
 Villiers, rh Theresa  
 Walker, Sir Charles  
 Walker, Mr Robin  
 Wallis, Dr Jamie  
 Warman, Matt  
 Watling, Giles  
 Webb, Suzanne  
 Whately, Helen  
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather

Whittaker, rh Craig  
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John  
 Wiggin, Sir Bill  
 Wild, James  
 Williams, Craig  
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin  
 Young, Jacob  
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

**Tellers for the Ayes:**  
**Joy Morrissey and**  
**Mike Wood**

### NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)  
 Abrahams, Debbie  
 Ali, Rushanara  
 Ali, Tahir  
 Amesbury, Mike  
 Anderson, Fleur  
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan  
 Bardell, Hannah  
 Barker, Paula  
 Beckett, rh Margaret  
 Begum, Apsana  
 Benn, rh Hilary  
 Betts, Mr Clive  
 Black, Mhairi  
 Blackford, rh Ian  
 Blake, Olivia  
 Blomfield, Paul  
 Bonnar, Steven  
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben  
 Brennan, Kevin  
 Brock, Deidre  
 Brown, Alan  
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas  
 Buck, Ms Karen  
 Burgon, Richard  
 Butler, Dawn  
 Byrne, Ian  
 Byrne, rh Liam  
 Cadbury, Ruth  
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Cameron, Dr Lisa  
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan  
 Carden, Dan  
 Chamberlain, Wendy  
 Champion, Sarah  
 Chapman, Douglas  
 Cherry, Joanna  
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Cooper, rh Yvette  
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy  
 Cowan, Ronnie  
 Coyle, Neil  
 Crawley, Angela  
 Creasy, Stella  
 Cruddas, Jon  
 Cryer, John  
 Cunningham, Alex  
 Daby, Janet  
 Dalton, Ashley  
 Davies-Jones, Alex  
 Day, Martyn  
 De Cordova, Marsha  
 Debbonaire, Thangam  
 Dixon, Samantha  
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin  
 Dodds, Anneliese  
 Doogan, Dave  
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Doughty, Stephen  
 Eagle, Dame Angela  
 Eagle, rh Maria  
 Eastwood, Colum  
 Edwards, Jonathan  
 Efford, Clive  
 Elmore, Chris  
 Eshalomi, Florence  
 Evans, Chris  
 Farry, Stephen  
 Fellows, Marion  
 Ferrier, Margaret  
 Flynn, Stephen  
 Foord, Richard  
 Fovargue, Yvonne  
 Foxcroft, Vicky  
 Foy, Mary Kelly  
 Gibson, Patricia  
 Gill, Preet Kaur  
 Grady, Patrick  
 Grant, Peter  
 Green, Sarah  
 Greenwood, Lilian  
 Greenwood, Margaret  
 Griffith, Dame Nia  
 Gwynne, Andrew  
 Hamilton, Fabian  
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette  
 Hanvey, Neale  
 Hardy, Emma  
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet  
 Harris, Carolyn  
 Hayes, Helen  
 Healey, rh John  
 Hendrick, Sir Mark  
 Hillier, Dame Meg  
 Hobhouse, Wera  
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon  
 Hollern, Kate  
 Hopkins, Rachel  
 Hosie, rh Stewart  
 Howarth, rh Sir George  
 Huq, Dr Rupa  
 Hussain, Imran  
 Jardine, Christine  
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana  
 Johnson, Kim  
 Jones, Darren  
 Jones, Gerald  
 Jones, Ruth  
 Jones, Sarah  
 Kane, Mike  
 Khan, Afzal  
 Kinnock, Stephen

Kyle, Peter  
 Lake, Ben  
 Lavery, Ian  
 Law, Chris  
 Leadbeater, Kim  
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma  
 Lewis, Clive  
 Linden, David  
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)  
 Long Bailey, Rebecca  
 Lucas, Caroline  
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan  
 Madders, Justin  
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid  
 Mahmood, Shabana  
 Malhotra, Seema  
 Maskell, Rachael  
 Mc Nally, John  
 McCarthy, Kerry  
 McDonald, Andy  
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm  
 McDonald, Stuart C.  
 McDonnell, rh John  
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat  
 McGovern, Alison  
 McKinnell, Catherine  
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 McMahon, Jim  
 McMorris, Anna  
 Mearns, Ian  
 Miliband, rh Edward  
 Mishra, Navendu  
 Monaghan, Carol  
 Morden, Jessica  
 Morgan, Helen  
 Morgan, Stephen  
 Morris, Grahame  
 Murray, Ian  
 Murray, James  
 Nandy, Lisa  
 Newlands, Gavin  
 Nichols, Charlotte  
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)  
 Norris, Alex  
 O'Hara, Brendan  
 Olney, Sarah  
 Onwurah, Chi  
 Oppong-Asare, Abena  
 Osamor, Kate  
 Osborne, Kate  
 Oswald, Kirsten  
 Owen, Sarah  
 Pennycook, Matthew  
 Perkins, Mr Toby  
 Phillips, Jess  
 Pollard, Luke

Qaisar, Ms Anum  
 Qureshi, Yasmin  
 Rayner, rh Angela  
 Rees, Christina  
 Reeves, Ellie  
 Reeves, rh Rachel  
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell  
 Rimmer, Ms Marie  
 Rodda, Matt  
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd  
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz  
 Sharma, Mr Virendra  
 Sheerman, Mr Barry  
 Sheppard, Tommy  
 Siddiq, Tulip  
 Slaughter, Andy  
 Smith, Alyn  
 Smith, Cat  
 Smith, Jeff  
 Smith, Nick  
 Smyth, Karin  
 Sobel, Alex  
 Spellar, rh John  
 Stephens, Chris  
 Stevens, Jo  
 Stone, Jamie  
 Streeting, Wes  
 Stringer, Graham  
 Sultana, Zarah  
 Tami, rh Mark  
 Tarry, Sam  
 Thompson, Owen  
 Thomson, Richard  
 Thornberry, rh Emily  
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen  
 Trickett, Jon  
 Twigg, Derek  
 Twist, Liz  
 Vaz, rh Valerie  
 Wakeford, Christian  
 Webbe, Claudia  
 West, Catherine  
 Western, Andrew  
 Western, Matt  
 Whitehead, Dr Alan  
 Whitford, Dr Philippa  
 Whitley, Mick  
 Whittome, Nadia  
 Williams, Hywel  
 Wilson, Munira  
 Winter, Beth  
 Wishart, Pete  
 Yasin, Mohammad  
 Zeichner, Daniel

**Tellers for the Noes:**  
**Mary Glindon and**  
**Taiwo Owatemi**

*Question accordingly agreed to.*

*Lords amendment 104 disagreed to.*

*Lords amendment 107 disagreed to. Lords amendments 3 to 5, 10, 11, 13 to 19, 21, 24 to 29, 68 to 72, 75 to 89, 91, 92, 94, 96 to 101, 105, 106, and 108 to 114 agreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 83H(2)), That a Committee be appointed to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to their amendments 1, 6 to 9, 23, 30, 32 to 34, 39 to 67, 93, 102 to 104, and 107;*



That Robert Jenrick, Scott Mann, Shaun Bailey, James Sunderland, Stephen Kinnock, Gerald Jones and Alison Thewliss be members of the Committee;

That Robert Jenrick be the Chair of the Committee;

That three be the quorum of the Committee.

That the Committee do withdraw immediately.—  
(*Rebecca Harris.*)

*Question agreed to.*

*Committee to withdraw immediately; reasons to be reported and communicated to the Lords.*

## Business without Debate

### DELEGATED LEGISLATION

*Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 118(6)),*

#### SANCTIONS

That the Russia (Sanctions) (EU Exit) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2023 (S.I., 2023, No. 665), dated 15 June 2023, a copy of which was laid before this House on 19 June, be approved.—  
(*Rebecca Harris.*)

*Question agreed to.*

*Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 118(6)),*

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES

That the Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing (High-Risk Countries) (Amendment) Regulations 2023 (S.I., 2023, No. 704), dated 26 June 2023, a copy of which was laid before this House on 26 June, be approved.—(*Rebecca Harris.*)

*Question agreed to.*

### ADJOURNMENT (SUMMER, CONFERENCE AND CHRISTMAS RECESS)

*Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 25),*

That this House, at its rising on Thursday 20 July 2023, do adjourn until Monday 4 September 2023; at its rising on Tuesday 19 September 2023, do adjourn until Monday 16 October 2023; and, at its rising on Tuesday 19 December 2023, do adjourn until Monday 8 January 2024.—(*Rebecca Harris.*)

*The Deputy Speaker's opinion as to the decision of the Question being challenged, the Division was deferred until tomorrow (Standing Order No. 41A).*

### LIAISON COMMITTEE

*Motion made,*

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 145, the Liaison Committee shall have power to appoint specialist advisers in relation to its inquiry on Strategic thinking in Government.—(*Rebecca Harris.*)

**Hon. Members:** Object.

## Increasing Employment: Training

*Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(Rebecca Harris.)*

8.35 pm

**Siobhan Baillie** (Stroud) (Con): I have two main points to land. The first is that the best way for someone to get work-ready and improve their life chances is to get a job and progress in the job they have. The second is that we need a clear-eyed look at existing training provision, including the apprenticeship levy, to provide thousands of jobs in small and medium-sized enterprises, which are the backbone of the country. I am thinking particularly of the jobs and businesses in the Stroud district.

Many moons ago, a boss told me that I had bouncebackability. That was a polite and positive way of noting that I get up every time I mess up and fall flat on my face, which is pretty often. That boss changed my life. Being a free school meal kid from a chaotic single-parent family and leaving home at 15 means you basically get written off. The statistics say that you are in trouble, but that does not have to be a given, as my story will testify.

I started work as a secretary. Over time, the firm saw something in me and got me into a training programme. I attended night school and law school at weekends; it took a long time, but I qualified as a solicitor. I had no debt and I had years of experience under my belt. However, I hid all of that for a long time, because I was embarrassed. Most lawyers go to university, and Tony Blair had rammed it into all of us that university was the only way forward. I was wrong to be embarrassed and he was wrong to have such a narrow focus. I did not understand that all my jobs—paper round, supermarket checkout girl, aerobics teacher and spinning instructor, which were all done to pay law school fees—and years at the coalface of work had equivalent value to a degree. I was wrong, and I am happy to admit it, because I have bouncebackability.

The best way to be work-ready and life-ready—to grasp the chances that come across your desk—is to actually go to work. Social mobility is not just about poor kids getting into Oxford; for workless families, a parent holding down any job will improve the social mobility of their children. Becoming a manager or retraining into a second career is social mobility in action. Sadly, however, snobbery about further education and having no degree continues to this day. To see that we need only look at Carol Vorderman's attack on my right hon. Friend the Member for Plymouth, Moor View (Johnny Mercer) and his wife, where she said in a tweet: "not a degree in sight...who'd employ them?".

That is the latest example of nonsense; dismissing a Minister who works tirelessly for the armed forces and veterans for not having gone to university is bad enough, but being deliberately condescending about the lives of millions of people who did not go to university is unforgiveable. I used to admire Carol Vorderman a lot, before she decided to eat so much political hate for breakfast to get social media hits. Now, sadly, I just feel sorry for her.

Thankfully, this Government recognise the quality of life that employment and training can bring, and it is absolutely at the heart of our growth strategy. Despite the global economic turmoil, the UK still has its lowest unemployment since the 1970s, at 3.9%, and the fourth

highest employment rate in the G7. I give credit to the Stroud jobcentre and the Department for Work and Pensions team, which the Secretary of State visited. They are doing an incredibly amount locally, taking a bespoke, careful look at how we help people off long-term sick and into jobs.

In *The Sun* yesterday, Matthew Elliott, the president of the Jobs Foundation, wrote about how securing a full-time salaried job cuts the risk of falling into poverty by 90%. He explained:

“Productive and meaningful employment gives us an opportunity to learn and develop our skills. It allows us to afford a better standard of living...and brings structure and routine which helps mental health and wellbeing.”

At a time when a fifth of people are not confident about their financial position, millions rely on their job. Jobs, training and in-work development are therefore the gold standard. I set up the all-party parliamentary group on the future of employability to explore this issue further after a decade of discussions about education with my friend Ronel Lehmann, who founded Finito, which helps young people get work-ready. The APPG has also been backed by the Institute of the Motor Industry and the Wise Group, which are incredibly helpful in thinking through how we can make people get into jobs and stay in them.

I turn to my second issue: I believe that we need a clear-eyed look at existing training provision to help SMEs and to help people stay in jobs. The Government are stealing a march on creating lifelong learning opportunities. There are a range of training programmes, including skills bootcamps, sector-based work academy programmes—SWAPs—the Multiply programme supporting adult numeracy, and free skills for jobs courses. Returnships are basically all of the above along with apprenticeships, but for people over 50 returning to work or seeking a career change.

However, I have a challenge for the Minister. I do not believe that we need new-fangled policy or legislation. We have everything we need. I do not want any more fancy-pants new schemes; we need to reform the ones we have. We need to accept that good products such as the apprenticeship levy require changing to make them business friendly. We should not scrap them but improve them.

Take returnships, for example. More than 500,000 over-50s have stepped away from the workplace post pandemic, so I completely understand the focus on that age group, but with the rise of technology such as artificial intelligence, it will be people in their 30s and 40s who may need to change employment. Let us tweak that policy and see who else we can help.

So much depends on the efficiency of the apprenticeship levy. I listen carefully to organisations such as the Federation of Small Businesses, to businesses such as Renishaw and BorgWarner in my constituency that have apprentices, and to local companies that desperately want apprentices. Many feel that the system is just not working for them.

I appreciate that this is strictly a Department for Education issue, but it is crucial to employment, so I am grateful that the Minister for Employment will be responding to the debate. Every apprenticeship is a job with bells on, and it so often leads to a long and

meaningful career. It is also cheaper to the taxpayer, given that the Government had to write off 44% of student loans in 2021-22.

The DWP and the Treasury are grappling with the issue of economic inactivity and the millions on out-of-work benefits. I respectfully believe that, along with the Department for Education, they need to take a keen interest in the apprenticeship levy and listen to what Stroud district employers, the Association of Colleges and chambers of commerce all over the country are telling us. It cannot be right, as UKHospitality points out, that one of my local pubs cannot transfer its levy to another pub in the same chain, and that the levy will just disappear back into the Treasury if it is not used. We can make changes to make this thing work better for business.

Let me turn to some clever bits. I cannot take credit for them; they came from the brains at Policy Exchange—I recommend the report by Iain Mansfield and Toby Hirst, “Reforming the Apprenticeship Levy”—and from my local college, SGS Stroud, which asked me to cover many of Policy Exchange’s recommendations. Before I come to my recommendations, I will outline a few points for us to have in the back of our brains.

Over the last five years, £4.3 billion has been raised by the levy but then not spent on apprenticeships. A recent report by UCAS and the Sutton Trust found that 430,000 students were interested in apprenticeships but only 5,000 a year are starting degree-equivalent courses. I have a university technical college in my patch, which was started by my predecessor, Neil Carmichael. I went there with Lord Baker. We had its students—young women science, technology, engineering and maths students—up here this week saying that they are desperate for apprenticeships but they cannot find one. These are young people with brilliant minds. We have to get them into the jobs that they want.

We know that learning on the job is attractive to people of all ages. Learning at an older stage in life in an apprenticeship, so that we can earn and learn, is crucial to those of us with families and mortgages who need or want a career change. Yet unfortunately, the total number of apprenticeship starts has gone down to 349,000 in 2021-22, which is significantly below the 393,000 in 2018-19, and lower than the high of 500,000. Therefore, while the quality has definitely gone up, the starts are something that we need to look at, because they matter.

The number of starts in SMEs has fallen by almost 50%, but small employers all over the shop, many of which I speak to locally, want to train up their own workers. As Policy Exchange explains in detail in its report, the requirement to pass English and Maths at level 2, which is a GCSE equivalent, means that somebody can be barred from achieving an apprenticeship qualification in bricklaying, childcare or IT due to a lack of achievement at school, which may have been years or decades ago. We desperately need these workers. I am fighting campaigns about childcare workers, so what is happening at the moment is madness.

**Robin Millar (Aberconwy) (Con):** I am very taken by what my hon. Friend is saying about the ordinariness—if such a word exists—of the training needs. In my own constituency, which the Minister has been kind enough to visit, tourism and hospitality are the major employers. I see on an almost daily basis employers in hotels, pubs

[Robin Millar]

and restaurants talking about how they are trying to offer employment to the young as a first job, to those in middle age who want something more flexible, to those who are returning to the workforce at an older age, and—I say this as the Minister for Employment is here—increasingly to those who are perhaps on the edges of employment in conventional settings. A little more effort and a bit of help from the Department for Work and Pensions makes them suitable for the work environment. Does my hon. Friend agree that the packages and the help that the Government offer need to be applicable in those very ordinary and routine settings?

**Siobhan Baillie:** I absolutely do agree, and I welcome the intervention. The reality is that talking about these everyday jobs—jobs that we desperately need in every single one of our constituencies—is key to impressing on the Government why these changes are needed. The bureaucracy and the pain in the neck that come with trying to work through the apprenticeship levy are actually putting off quite a lot of small businesses. They do not have the extra department to do the paperwork for them. However, Policy Exchange and I have some ideas about that.

There are loads of recommendations in the report, but I have picked out a few that would really push forward on this. The first would be to transform the levy into a growth and skills levy. That would allow employers to spend up to 25% of funds on high-quality employer-relevant skills training, including shorter and more flexible courses. On my hon. Friend's point, this is about flexibility for everyday businesses and everyday people.

Secondly, we want to see a £3,000 incentive for every young apprentice trained by an SME to help support smaller businesses with off-the-job training costs. We also think that there need to be course finishing bonuses to make sure that we encourage learners to go all the way through. The adult learning budget is a fraction of the tertiary education budget, so I would like to see some funding made available for that. I would view it as levelling up skills and jobs around the country.

Thirdly, we need to create SME roles and hubs at colleges and growth hubs to support SMEs in dealing with the bureaucracy and the recruitment of apprentices. We have regional schools commissioners, so why not a regional apprenticeship facilitator—an RAF? I am sure the actual RAF will have something to say about that, but why can we not provide these regional support systems?

Fourthly, we could abolish the apprenticeship minimum wage, with all apprentices to be paid the national minimum wage for their age. I recognise that that is a Treasury matter and that we are not flush with money in this country—nor indeed is any country in the world right now—but in financially constraining times youngsters will choose a job in a supermarket that pays more than an apprenticeship. That is not only because they need the cash, but because apprenticeships are hard graft. We need to reward them—it will help all of us. I would also like to see the immigration shortage occupations list linked to skills training. Employers should be able to use the levy to fund qualifications to help them to train up local talent instead of being forced to rely on immigration.

I would like to know what the Minister, with his employment hat on, thinks of those proposals. Will he tell us about what DWP is doing to use employment to improve the life chances of people of all ages, and to make the UK's existing training provision work for small and medium-sized businesses? I want training and education to work for work.

Before the Minister responds, I will make a short note on work placements. The APPG on the future of employability is looking at how we can increase the numbers of work placements available and allow people to gain experience at any time of their life. A constituent told me today that his daughter had an incredible work placement last week at Steller Systems in Nailsworth. It is a naval architecture company, so that is quite cool. She had a brilliant time learning with the staff in a highly specialist area; they did not need to give their time, but they did, and she will no doubt benefit from that for the rest of her career. We need to normalise those opportunities throughout the country.

On a final note, there were some empty Stroud noticeboards at Lansdown Hall during the pandemic, which were covered in the local newspapers. One of them said:

“The best way to learn anything is by doing it. Model some clay, carve a piece of wood—or a carrot! Sculpture can be made out of anything, I think it's a question of finding a material and visual language that speaks to you.”

I say, “Over to you, Minister, to sculpt your response.”

8.51 pm

**The Minister for Employment (Guy Opperman):** Good news today: vacancies are down, employment is up, economic inactivity is down and my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Siobhan Baillie) has brought forward a crucial debate that could not be more timely.

We start from a situation where we have created over 5,450,000 apprenticeships since May 2010. That is an astonishing figure, well over 5 million, and it is something to be celebrated. However, I take the tone of my hon. Friend's debate to be both a celebration of what the Government have done, rightly lauding our efforts to get more people into employment, a celebration of the apprenticeship levy and the clear successes it has brought to this country, and a desire to do better. That is something that I utterly endorse.

I am fortunate that I am responding for only one Department. I think I would probably need to respond on behalf of the Treasury, the Department for Education, the Department for Business and Trade and various other Departments that my hon. Friend rightly cited, but, bluntly, I am happy to set out the position as best I can. I endorse what she says about the Policy Exchange report, which is eloquent and well-made and makes some very good points. She and I have also spoken in the past to the Chair of the Education Committee, my hon. Friend the Member for Worcester (Mr Walker), who only a couple of months ago brought forward a specific Education Committee report looking at further education and post-16 education, all of which should be noted by the House.

It is unquestionably the case that upskilling our workforce is the most important thing. We need to do that not least because we are trying to reduce unemployment and improve social inclusion, productivity and progression.



I made two visits to the beautiful constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Aberconwy (Robin Millar) a little while back to see the work that is done by the DWP in his part of the world. I was on the phone to them this afternoon in respect of cases in Ynys Môn and the work that our hon. Friend the Member for Ynys Môn (Virginia Crosbie) is doing to try to deal with the issues in Llangefni. The staff there are fantastically committed to transforming the outcomes that we all hope for.

I was also privileged to visit the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud, to meet Tom Robinson from the business Adaptavate and go around his factory. That was in my former life as a pensions Minister; I then enjoyed a brief 49-day holiday as a Back Bencher before returning in this present role, where I hope I can contribute some further matters.

**Robin Millar:** I simply want to compliment the Minister on his visit to us, for the work that he did there and for his pronunciation of Welsh place names.

**Guy Opperman:** When I had to secure the survival of the Amlwch jobcentre, that was a particular challenge, but my mum is a Llewellyn and grew up in the Tywi valley, so I have some Welsh in me beyond the ability to order two beers in Welsh.

The jobcentre in Stroud does a great job. I will make two points before I get into the nuts and bolts of the submissions from my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud. I am also proud to call my right hon. Friend the Member for Plymouth, Moor View (Johnny Mercer) and his wife, Felicity, friends. They have very much been abused by others over the last few days. My hon. Friend is right to cite Ronel Lehmann, an old friend of mine who has done great work with Finito and in creating opportunities.

I have over the last few months met the Confederation of British Industry, the Federation of Small Businesses, all the key business organisations, and, most importantly, UKHospitality. We are trying our hardest to drive forward true change to ensure that we get proper job opportunities created to fill the vacancies that clearly exist in the hospitality industry up and down the country. I was privileged to meet all the leading players in the hospitality industry last week, on 4 July. They came to the Department for Work and Pensions, led by our right hon. Friend the Member for Vale of Glamorgan (Alun Cairns), who chairs a relevant APPG, to see how we could flex the employment offer there.

I look forward to being before my hon. Friend's APPG on the future of employability, which I am booked in to do in September—that is in the diary. It is unquestionably the case that although the Government have committed £1.3 billion this year to fund a range of opportunities designed to raise skill levels and, subsequently, social mobility, and that a huge amount of money has been invested in the national skills fund, we are also trying to remove barriers that prevent people from progressing—be it through universal credit or the in-work progression that we know is so vital, or through the utilisation of the apprenticeship levy and the skills that are there.

It is difficult for me, in my humble position as a junior Minister, to articulate that there will be widespread change to the apprenticeship levy, but I believe that

we should support the institution that it is, while asking ourselves how we can improve and enhance the offer. My hon. Friend set out a number of particular recommendations, one of which was familiar to me, because I have met Punch Pubs, Greene King, Budweiser, Heineken, Molson—all the big players in hospitality. They all made the simple point that they pay the apprenticeship levy but cannot then transfer that to the individual publicans in their franchised pubs up and down the country—no matter which constituency—so that they can employ an apprentice. That seems to me to be something that the Government could look at to see how they could flex that on an ongoing basis.

My hon. Friend also raised the brilliantly named regional apprenticeship facilitators—the RAF of the modern era—and she made a fair point: every one of us has, in our constituencies up and down the country, a regional schools commissioner who looks after our region and drives forward excellence in education in that way. Why would one not try to facilitate that for apprenticeships?

On the £3,000 incentive, I bow to others who know the particulars in more detail. On the abolishment of the apprenticeship minimum wage and harnessing that to the Treasury-led national minimum wage for their age, that is a matter that I am sure my hon. Friend will take up with the Treasury. What I will do, however, is ask my colleagues at DFE, HMT and the Department for Business and Trade to respond to my hon. Friend's individual points in writing so that she gets the detailed answers on how she can drive forward ongoing change, particularly in the light of the APPG that she runs with others.

It is fair to say that there is a gap we have to acknowledge between the amount of money raised from the apprenticeship levy and the actual spend. How can this country squeeze that gap to achieve the outcomes we all so willingly seek in our constituencies? I certainly hope that that is one of the major things pressed upon me. The Chair of the Education Committee, my hon. Friend the Member for Worcester, feels passionately that there must be enough entry-level apprenticeships on an ongoing basis. Others have also made that point. I have had the opportunity to visit South Essex College with my hon. Friends the Members for Rochford and Southend East (Sir James Duddridge) and for Southend West (Anna Firth) to see the benefits of T-levels, which are transformational, and other countries are copying them. There is no doubt that we should be doing more in that space and have great opportunity to do so.

I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud that our over-50s offer has to get better. She will know that we have 37 over-50s champions in each region of the country, pioneering and driving forward real change in the attitude of employers and co-workers to older workers—some of us have inexplicably reached the age of 50 and need to ensure a supportive approach to that.

There is no doubt that we need to drive forward the way in which employers look at employment. Why would a particular employer pay somebody to provide a service when the Department for Work and Pensions will provide training for free through a skills bootcamp, a sector-based work academy, returneeships and all manner of other things? We exist up and down the country in over 700 locations, in every constituency.

[Guy Opperman]

I was honoured to go to the Canvey Island jobcentre recently with the Whip on duty, my hon. Friend the Member for Castle Point (Rebecca Harris), and those who work there do a fantastic job of training people up. It is a free service to local employers, and it can be from one week up to 12 weeks. We want more employers to sign up to taking people in this way, and we would like more employers to sign up to T-levels as well. There is no doubt whatsoever that we need to do more in that space.

The childcare reforms that my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud pioneered—I know she has been a frequent visitor to the Chancellor in the previous nine months—have, without a shadow of doubt, done great work to drive forward change and provide opportunity, so that individuals

can now go to work and have their childcare supported and paid for by the state. That is certainly making a difference in universal credit.

We continue to work closely across Government and with employers and stakeholders to refine the support on offer and more closely align employment and skills. We need to do that because it supports unemployed people who are looking for work. While the present position is very positive in terms of increasing employment, reducing vacancies and a reducing economic inactivity, we all know that there is more to do, and this is a Government who are passionately committed to ensuring that we solve these problems.

*Question put and agreed to.*

9.3 pm

*House adjourned.*

# Westminster Hall

*Tuesday 11 July 2023*

[DEREK TWIGG *in the Chair*]

## UN High-level Meetings in 2023

9.30 am

**Mr Virendra Sharma** (Ealing, Southall) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered UN high-level meetings in 2023.

It is an honour to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Twigg. Most of, if not all, the pressing global challenges we face today are not confined to a single continent or country. We have all seen that—including recently with covid-19—when global challenges arise, and the consequences of those challenges are felt more widely than ever before. To face the challenges effectively, we need to use key international forums to incite support among world leaders for solutions that can save millions of lives and improve the lives of billions more.

The UN is a testament to the power of collective global resolve and the only place where 192 countries come together daily to deliberate on pressing global issues. The General Assembly is the main policy making and representative body of the UN, and it regularly calls for high-level meetings on topics of global importance. In that context, we are here for today's debate.

In September, the UN will host three HLMs on global health topics. The first, on Wednesday 20 September, is focused on pandemic preparedness and response, or PPR. This will be a topical discussion given the recent covid-19 pandemic. On Thursday 21 September, a meeting is being convened on universal health coverage, or UHC—the principle that all people should have access to the full range of quality health services they need, when and where they need them, without financial hardship. Finally, on Friday 22 September, the UN will discuss tuberculosis. As co-chair of the all-party parliamentary group on global tuberculosis, I am particularly interested in the outcome of the final meeting, but all three HLMs are incredibly important for advocates of global health.

The topics being discussed at the UN later this year are all multifaceted, and an all-society approach involving more than just the health sector is needed to resolve the issues. The HLM is the mechanism through which to convene all sectors, under the leadership of Heads of Government, to agree a plan of action that all states can implement. Precisely because the meetings call on Heads of Government to engage, they are a powerful mechanism for change. The HLMs fall in the same week as the UN General Assembly, which means many Heads of State will be around the UN, and many will be attending those important meetings. I sincerely hope that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary show that the UK is resolved to tackling PPR, UHC and TB by personally attending all three HLMs later this year. Can the Minister confirm whether they will attend?

Briefly, I will touch on the PPR and UHC meetings before turning to TB. The PPR meeting is a new HLM that aims to improve the governmental and multilateral capacities required successfully to identify and contain

a new pandemic. Moving beyond the health sector, the HLM will look at financing, social protections, educational support, and research and development requirements to address future pandemics. The meeting is an important opportunity for member states to commit to the necessary fiscal and policy changes required to prevent a future pandemic.

The UHC meeting follows on from a meeting held in 2019. The 2023 meeting provides countries and stakeholders with the opportunity to reinvigorate progress towards delivering health for all. According to the latest global monitoring information, UHC progress is not on track, and the covid-19 pandemic has taken the world further from the 2019 targets. They include progressively covering 1 billion additional people under UHC with a view to covering all people by 2030. The HLM also sought to stop the rise of catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditure, and eliminate impoverishment due to health-related expenses by 2030. Catastrophic costs are felt particularly acutely in the TB sector. Nearly 50% of people who receive a TB diagnosis will face catastrophic personal or household costs as a consequence. Concrete action is needed to strengthen equitable health systems, including public health functions that are critical for PPR and TB.

Finally, the UN is holding a follow-on HLM for TB, with the first being held in 2018. That was the first time that TB issues were discussed on such a significant international stage. The 2018 political declaration included a number of targets, which member states agreed to pursue: a commitment to provide treatment and diagnostics to 40 million people, including 350,000 children; a commitment to increase overall global investment in TB to \$2 billion per year; and a commitment to end all stigma and forms of discrimination associated with TB.

**Sir George Howarth** (Knowsley) (Lab): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing this important debate. Does he agree with the director of Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Professor David Lalloo, who has said:

“As academics, public and global health experts and healthcare professionals, we see the close interrelationship between tuberculosis, pandemic preparedness and response, and universal health coverage”?

Does my hon. Friend also agree that this high-level talk is a good opportunity to take that agenda forward?

**Mr Sharma:** I thank my right hon. Friend for his important intervention. I agree and will cover those points later in my talk, but I want to put that aside for now. Yes, it is internationally known and accepted that this is an opportunity that every state should take on board.

Those ambitious targets were widely welcomed by civil society groups and TB stakeholders, but the impact of the covid pandemic significantly limited progress. Few of the TB targets were met, and the 2023 HLM is seen as a key opportunity to regain momentum towards eradicating TB by 2030, in line with sustainable development goal 3.3.2.

TB is one of humanity's oldest diseases. It is caused by bacteria that most commonly impact lungs, but it can spread to other parts of the body. TB is spread from person to person through air droplets, with most TB infections showing no symptoms at all. In fact, 25% of the world's population is estimated to have latent, or



[*Mr Virendra Sharma*]

inactive, TB. TB becomes transmissible only when it is activated, which can be triggered by a range of health or social factors,

TB is a disease of poverty. It is more prevalent in poorer communities and can be linked to socioeconomic factors such as lower-quality housing, overcrowding and limited access to health services. TB is closely linked to other health issues, including malnutrition and HIV status. Even in high-income countries, TB is often found in migrant communities; people with alcohol, drug or mental health issues; homeless communities; or people with a history of prison.

What is most frustrating for people like me, who have been involved with TB for a long time, is that TB is both preventable and curable. Yet each year, more than 1.6 million people die from TB, including nearly 400,000 children. A lack of political will and inadequate funding continue to limit our ability to eradicate TB. All countries need to do more. There is only one existing TB vaccine. Although the BCG is effective against some serious forms of childhood TB, it provides little protection against the most infectious and deadly forms of adult TB.

There are several promising vaccine candidates in the pipeline. Six vaccine candidates are in phase 3 of the clinical development process—the final phase before the vaccine can be regulated for public use. In fact, just last month, Wellcome and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation announced funding to advance TB vaccine candidate M72 through a phase 3 clinical trial. M72 could become the first new vaccine to help prevent pulmonary TB, a form of active TB, in more than 100 years.

Promising vaccine candidates have emerged before and have fallen short, so we need to continue to finance and increase investment in TB research and development to find new vaccines. The Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office has previously supported the development of new TB vaccines through product development partnerships. However, new PDP funding has been paused in recent years. Can the Minister provide the House with an update on when we might expect new or renewed PDP funding?

We also need more new treatments for TB. According to the Treatment Action Group, the UK met 96% of its fair share contribution towards TB research and development in 2021—about £30 million—with fair share measured as spending at least 0.1% of overall research and development expenditures on TB. That funding was used to support innovation at some of the UK's most prestigious research institutions, including the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine. Although the UK might be stepping up to the challenge, it is clear that not all countries are paying their fair share. Will the Minister outline what more the FCDO can do to support UK research and development, especially in the context of TB, and encourage all countries to pay their fair share towards TB R&D?

One of the biggest concerns for TB stakeholders is antimicrobial resistance. TB is a complex bacteria and strains have become resistant to modern antibiotics. One third of all deaths due to complications from antimicrobial resistance in 2021 involved drug-resistant TB. We have some tools to tackle drug-resistant TB, but they are incredibly expensive and are not readily available

to all who need them. Medicines such as bedaquiline have cut treatment times for drug-resistant TB in half, but even the UK is struggling to access them. What are the Government doing to increase access to bedaquiline in the UK and abroad?

People with TB also suffer high levels of stigma and discrimination. TB is often associated with factors that can themselves create stigma: HIV status, poverty, drug and alcohol misuse, homelessness, a history of prison, and refugee status. Fear of discrimination can mean that people with TB symptoms delay seeking help, making it more likely that they will become seriously ill. Stigma around TB can also make people reluctant to stick with their course of treatment for fear of being “found out”. By taking treatment irregularly, people risk developing drug resistance.

The TB community has not sufficiently contested the views that reinforce TB stigma. Such an approach has previously delivered positive outcomes in the context of HIV. Countries and donors need to implement locally managed, gender-responsive and well-financed TB programmes to help overcome the stigma and discrimination associated with TB infection, so can the Minister tell the House what the FCDO is doing to help eliminate the stigma and discrimination experienced by many TB-affected actors?

Although TB is getting its own high-level meeting in September, it also has implications for both pandemic preparedness and universal health coverage. Strengthening health systems to better detect and respond to respiratory infections is crucial to PPR, as experts agree that it is likely that the next pandemic will be respiratory in nature. TB programmes are well placed to help identify new respiratory pandemics, as they are already actively involved in the treatment, diagnostics and surveillance of respiratory diseases. The ability to respond effectively to new respiratory pathogens relies on strong infection prevention and control infrastructure, an experienced and well-compensated health workforce with expertise in managing complex respiratory infections, and access to the latest medical tools and equipment.

Much of the infrastructure needed to respond to the TB epidemic already exists. However, as we saw during the covid-19 pandemic, such programmes are quickly repurposed to respond to emerging pandemics, with significant negative impacts for people with a TB infection. More needs to be done to strengthen TB programmes, surveillance and diagnosis as the fundamental pillar of PPR. Does the Minister believe that greater investment in TB programmes, diagnosis and surveillance will help the world prepare for the next novel pandemic?

UN high-level meetings on global health matters used to be unheard of. The HIV/AIDS HLM in 2001 was the first ever global health-focused HLM. Another was not held until 2011, but this has changed over the last decade. There are now years when multiple global health issues are discussed simultaneously, as is the case this year. It is a direct response to the number of global health issues that have impacted on the world over the last 10 years. The UN recognises that a new approach is needed to help address the barriers holding back progress in global health. The upcoming high-level meetings are a perfect opportunity to reinvigorate momentum and encourage global action to face the challenges of the 21st century together.

9.48 am

**Fleur Anderson** (Putney) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairship, Mr Twigg. I thank the hon. Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma) for securing this important debate. It is very well timed, as Ministers are agreeing the statements that will go forward to the three high-level meetings on universal health coverage, pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, and tuberculosis, which will all be happening in New York during the same week in September. As co-chair of the all-party parliamentary group for water, sanitation and hygiene, I will focus my remarks on the issues of water sanitation and hygiene as they pertain to the three high-level meetings, and on how we can mark the huge step change ahead by using the meetings to galvanise global commitment to improve health and wellbeing for all and accelerate progress towards universal health coverage globally.

The timing of this debate is very important, because the meetings will result in a number of political declarations that are currently being negotiated by member states. I know that the UK public want to see our Government taking a leadership role in the high-level meetings in order to bring about change in people's lives, both in the UK and across the world. I thank the Minister for Development, the right hon. Member for Sutton Coldfield (Mr Mitchell), for recently attending a joint meeting of the all-party parliamentary groups for water, sanitation and hygiene, on HIV and AIDS, on malaria and neglected tropical diseases, and on global tuberculosis to talk about a lot of issues that will be discussed at the high-level meetings.

We are so grateful in this country for the NHS, whose 75th anniversary we celebrated just last week, but as we are increasingly entwined in health globally, progress in the NHS can only be helped by progress around the world. The pandemic showed us that in the most stark way. Universal health coverage, which includes water, sanitation and hygiene, will not only save many lives in countries around the world, but save lives here and mean that we are less at risk from future global health disasters.

Two thirds of healthcare facilities in the world's least developed countries, and half of those globally, do not have access to hygiene facilities. To put that in perspective, if my local hospital or GP surgery did not have running water it would be closed down, yet half of facilities around the world do not have that access to safe water. One result is that every minute a newborn dies from infection caused by a lack of safe water and an unclean environment. Healthcare workers and patients increasingly turn to antibiotics in the absence of clean water, resulting in the misuse of antibiotics and increased resistance.

Antimicrobial resistance directly caused 1.27 million deaths globally in 2019 and contributed to an additional 4.95 million. That makes it a bigger killer than HIV/AIDS or malaria. By 2050, the death toll is predicted to have climbed to 10 million deaths annually. The UK Government have predicted that antimicrobial resistance will be the leading cause of death in the UK by 2050. *The Lancet* has called it an "overlooked pandemic". But it can be addressed right now through increased water, sanitation and hygiene in healthcare facilities around the world, which would save lives immediately: it is a good value-for-money investment and could be the huge step change that we need to see.

The common thread running through all three high-level meetings is the need to prevent and treat infections effectively. Infection prevention and control, and the vital necessity of water, sanitation and hygiene, are essential to preventing infections in the first place. Treatment is, of course, important, and if the infections are bacterial, antibiotics are vital, so we need to protect the antibiotics that we have.

Recently, the APPG for water, sanitation and hygiene and the APPG on antibiotics produced a report called "Prevention first". We took evidence from the World Health Organisation and experts around the world about the need to curb the spread of antibiotic resistance. We found that a lack of hygiene means that doctors and nurses are unable to wash their hands before and after touching patients; new mothers are unable to clean themselves or their babies; and health workers and patients do not have a safe and hygienic toilet in their healthcare facilities. That causes repeated disease outbreaks, which need to be treated with antibiotics, contributing to that resistance around the world.

Not only would greater water, sanitation and hygiene save lives immediately, but it would buy us time to develop new drugs and protect our scientific investments. It has the power to achieve safer primary healthcare services and improve health outcomes. There are lives that could have been saved by the simple act of washing, having clean water and being cared for in a clean environment by people who have washed their hands, yet women are still giving birth in environments that do not have clean water, and healthcare workers are suffering disproportionately as a result. Ensuring that all healthcare facilities in the 46 least developed countries have access to reliable water, sanitation and hygiene will cost the equivalent of just 3% of health spending in these countries. That can be a key topic at the high-level meetings.

Investment in global WASH should be seen as an insurance policy to protect UK public health, the NHS and our scientific investment, because most resistant infections treated by the NHS originated elsewhere in the world, particularly in low and middle-income countries. Tackling that problem is critical to UK public health and protecting our NHS. Healthcare-acquired infections already cost the NHS at least £2.1 billion a year, and that cost will go up as infections become increasingly resistant to antibiotics. Better alignment on antimicrobial resistance action between the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office and the Department of Health and Social Care could maximise our impact on UK and global health outcomes.

In a world of so many seemingly intractable problems, it is clear that with more investment, action and political resolve in the high-level meetings we can solve the financing gap for WASH in healthcare facilities by the end of the decade. Healthcare leaders can afford to collectively mobilise the annual \$355 million in domestic financing and \$600 million in external financing needed to support those countries. That would save millions of lives and make universal health systems dependable. There is a clear price tag, and it is not unaffordable. We must adequately fund WASH in healthcare facilities to tackle antimicrobial resistance.

As a result of the previous high-level meetings and lots of in-country work by local campaigns, many countries have costed roadmaps for WASH in healthcare facilities in place and ready to be funded. They have worked out

[*Fleur Anderson*]

exactly what needs to be done, but political leadership in those countries and by the UK and other allies is urgently needed. The UK Government have led on the issue previously and are well placed to drive it globally.

The UK Government recognise the necessity of improved WASH services globally to promote global health, but the steep decline in UK bilateral aid for WASH—a cut of about 80%—raises concerns about the UK's commitment to the sector. For most of our constituents, it is a no-brainer that the UK Government should fund aid for clean water services and hygiene, but the UK Government are not backing their commitment up with financing.

I have several questions for the Minister as we face these three important high-level meetings on universal health coverage, pandemic preparedness and tuberculosis. The first is simple: who is going? Who will be representing the UK Government—representing us—at each of the high-level meetings? I and many others here and across the country hope that there will be high-level attendance at the meetings.

Secondly, will the Government prioritise WASH in healthcare facilities in meetings with peers from low-income countries during the high-level meetings to encourage domestic investment in that area as a cost-effective, high-impact investment to advance global health security and strengthen progress towards universal health coverage?

Thirdly, will the Government identify opportunities to host bilateral meetings or small roundtable events around the high-level meetings to bring together like-minded donor Governments, global health initiatives and private finance partners to discuss investment and actions to achieve universal access to WASH in healthcare facilities? We must show leadership in the actions we take around the high-level meetings.

Finally, will the Government make antimicrobial resistance and WASH in healthcare facilities a key priority within the UK's negotiating points and ministerial speeches at the three high-level meetings? Will they protect and strengthen WASH in healthcare facilities language in the political declaration documents?

I am grateful to be able to raise the issues that matter to constituents across the country. We have an important opportunity ahead. With several weeks to go before these meetings, now is the time to build these issues into achievements so that we can be proud of the UK's leadership at the meetings in September.

9.59 am

**Ian Byrne** (Liverpool, West Derby) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairship, Mr Twigg. I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma) for securing this important debate on the upcoming UN high-level meetings on tuberculosis, pandemic preparedness and response, and universal health coverage.

The year 2023 marks the halfway point for the implementation of the UN's 17 sustainable development goals, which were adopted in 2015 and are intended to be met by 2030. They include promoting good health and wellbeing, eliminating hunger and poverty, and advancing gender equality. In April, the United Nations Secretary-General warned that

"we have stalled or gone into reverse on more than 30 per cent of the SDGs."

He called upon all states to

"recommit to seven years of accelerated, sustained, and transformative action".

I fear that the UK Government are failing in respect of these vital goals, both domestically and internationally. UK bilateral health aid in 2021 was down £620 million—39%—on 2020. That decrease was partly due to reduced levels of spend on the health sector in response to covid-19, but it also reflects wider reductions in the UK aid budget. Domestically, this Government's programme of austerity—their cutting away of the welfare state and essential services, including the underfunding of our precious and world-renowned NHS—has meant that since 2011, increases in life expectancy have slowed after decades of steady improvement. Inequalities in life expectancy have recently widened: between some of the wealthiest and the more deprived areas of Liverpool, there is a difference in life expectancy of 20 years. One in three people in my great city are experiencing hunger at this moment. As constituency MPs, we are also witnessing at first hand the decimation of local primary care services. The Park View medical centre in West Derby is currently facing closure, a matter that I will be raising with the Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, the hon. Member for Harborough (Neil O'Brien), in the House today.

I want to say a few words about the United Nations high-level meeting on tuberculosis, which the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine has carried out significant work to combat globally. In 2021, 10 million people fell ill with TB and 1.6 million people died. TB diagnosis rates fell by 18%, which indicates not that cases are falling but, worryingly, that fewer cases are being detected by health systems. Alongside that, 450,000 new cases were diagnosed of multi-drug resistant TB—strains of TB that are resistant to modern antibiotics—yet multi-drug resistant TB treatment dropped by 17%, which indicates a reduction in diagnosis and detection.

Improving access to and quality of primary health care, including increasing the capacity, capability and equity of the health workforce, is crucial to delivering universal health care, reaching more people with TB and ensuring outbreaks of novel pathogens can be detected quickly. TB is both preventable and curable, yet people are still dying from TB because of a lack of political will and a consequent lack of funding to address the epidemic. Analysis also indicates a significant fall in TB diagnosis in 2020 and 2021 due to the pandemic. As the World Health Organisation says, funding is less than half of what is needed.

Senior governmental engagement with the UN high-level meetings is vital to ensure that they are successful. Will the Minister please provide an update today on his engagement with the drafting of the political declarations for the three upcoming United Nations high-level meetings? Will he update us on his engagement with the TB high-level meeting process to date and outline what more the FCDO can do to support UK research and development, especially within the context of TB? Finally, can the Minister explain why the Government have taken the disastrous political decision to cut international aid spending and why they have relentlessly pursued an austerity programme domestically, all of which is profoundly impacting the health and wellbeing of millions of people in the UK and around the world and preventing progress towards the crucial United Nations sustainable development goals?



10.3 am

**Patrick Grady** (Glasgow North) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Twigg. I warmly congratulate the hon. Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma) on securing the debate. I recognise his long-standing commitment to international development issues, universal healthcare and global justice, demonstrated in today's debate, in his co-chairmanship of the all-party parliamentary group on global tuberculosis and in his work on other important issues.

The first debate that I led in Westminster Hall, in June 2015, was on the negotiation and implementation of the sustainable development goals. That debate reflected the general tone of consensus and optimism that there was at the time about the future in the UK and at a multilateral level. Progress had been made toward the millennium development goals; there was a sense of the kinds of intervention that were really making a difference to driving down poverty, improving water and food security and boosting access to health and education; and appropriate funding was starting to be leveraged, not least as a result of UK leadership and the cross-party consensus around meeting the ODA spending target of 0.7% of GNI. Eight years later, however, things are very different indeed.

The UN high-level meetings in September this year must focus minds and galvanise political will if we are to have any hope of meeting the SDGs or of reversing the decline that has begun to happen in some areas. As other hon. Members have said, the sequence of high-level meetings around the UN General Assembly in September indicates at the very least that there is a recognition by world Governments that more action is urgently needed to end tuberculosis, deliver universal healthcare and improve prevention, preparedness and response to pandemics. We have all just lived through one of the greatest global healthcare challenges of recent decades, and we are still living with the ongoing impacts of the covid-19 pandemic on our health services, on the ability of the international community to respond to such crises, and on our response to other diseases and health challenges.

As the points that have been made in this debate suggest, the spread of tuberculosis is perhaps the largest of those challenges, not least because it encapsulates so many aspects of the other two areas of focus for the high-level meetings. TB has overtaken covid to become, once again, the deadliest of all infectious diseases. That is, at least in part, a factor of the lack of access to basic healthcare and sanitary provision in so many parts of the world. The rise of drug-resistant TB raises the prospect of widespread infections, perhaps even to epidemic, pandemic or endemic proportions.

None of the solutions to these challenges is rocket science. If we were prepared to spend political and financial capital, we would be able to address the challenges and make more rapid progress towards all the sustainable development goals. Key interventions at a community level, ideally community-led, in developing countries and here at home can make some of the biggest impacts.

As the hon. Member for Putney (Fleur Anderson) rightly says, access to water, sanitation and hygiene is a basic human right that ought to be respected. It is demonstrably effective in reducing the spread of disease and therefore reducing reliance on antibiotics and the

growth of antimicrobial resistance in relation to TB and a range of other diseases. I fully endorse the report that she highlighted, and I congratulate all those involved in producing it.

**Graham Stringer** (Blackley and Broughton) (Lab): There has been a consensus in this debate that resources need to be directed at trying to prevent pandemics and get rid of as many diseases as we can. One of the proposals to be considered at the high-level talks is transferring some decision making—the declaration of pandemics, for instance—from nation states to the World Health Organisation. I think that that would be a huge loss of sovereignty and a mistake, particularly as the World Health Organisation is dominated by China and has a huge amount of funding from Bill Gates. Does the hon. Gentleman agree that transferring sovereignty to the World Health Organisation would be a mistake?

**Patrick Grady:** With the greatest respect to the hon. Member, I think that that is a point more usefully directed at the Minister, because it is the Government who represent the United Kingdom at the World Health Organisation. I am a believer in popular sovereignty; I would like Scotland to be an independent member of all those international, multilateral institutions, ensuring that the voice of the people of Scotland is heard in those negotiations. There has to be accountability within international mechanisms, and countries that sign up to international treaties ought to do so on the basis of consensus. They should be prepared to implement their commitments. If more Governments were living up to their commitments, perhaps we would not find ourselves in this position.

I understand that the issue that the hon. Member raises is of concern to a number of constituents; I have heard similar concerns myself. It is important that the Government are able to respond to those concerns, and that when international treaties are entered into, full transparency and accountability are built in.

There are interventions that we already know work, without having to reinvent the wheel: access to water and sanitation is one of them; food security is another. Driven by small and sustainable farmers, food security improves nutrition, which improves educational outcomes and boosts gender equality. That helps societies to grow and develop overall, and ultimately generates tax receipts that can be invested back into health and other social services. In all that, there are important lessons to be learned in the way that the world has sought to tackle other challenges, not least HIV/AIDS. Indeed, the ongoing fight against HIV should not be forgotten in these meetings.

At a higher level, investment in research and development and new technologies can help to combat and control the spread of disease. The hon. Member for Liverpool, West Derby (Ian Byrne) spoke about the work that institutions do in his constituency; similar work is going on at the University of Glasgow, and all the institutions work together on many of these issues. Regrettably, we still live in a world where more money is invested in treating hay fever and male pattern baldness—I have some experience of both—than the diseases that affect the poorest and most vulnerable around the world. Global Justice Now points out that between 1945 and 1965, when TB was a significant problem in western

*[Patrick Grady]*

countries such as ours, eight different anti-TB drugs were discovered, but once TB was no longer a significant problem in the global north, development stalled, and no new anti-TB drugs were developed between 1965 and 2012. Even today, just 4% of newly approved pharmaceutical products are for neglected diseases that affect low and middle-income countries. That has to start to change, and perhaps there is also a role in that for the WHO and other multilateral organisations.

From today's contributions, it is clear that none of the actions or outcomes needed from the high-level meetings is particularly novel or surprising. Various Members have made a good case for the levels of funding that are needed, and the Government, rather than yawning, need to listen to them. There was a habit, especially among the Government's predecessors, to announce money—£100 million for this, £1 billion for that—but those were just nice round figures. United Nations agencies and international stakeholders have analysed what is actually needed to meet the research goals, meet the delivery objectives and set targets for the amounts to be funded. That is what the Government ought to focus on. The question at all these meetings is whether world leaders will step up; for us here today, that means whether the UK Government are prepared to step up.

Of course, the Government would be stepping up, regrettably, from a lower standing than back in 2015, when the SDGs were first negotiated. Indeed, the UK helped to lead the negotiation process, but it has now taken a back seat. By the admission of the Minister for Development, the right hon. Member for Sutton Coldfield (Mr Mitchell), the UK is no longer the development superpower that it used to be, and it is trying to stretch a significantly reduced aid budget that has been further diminished by the smash-and-grab raid on FCDO resources perpetrated by the Home Office to fund its failing and unlawful anti-asylum policies.

That is the first big and clear ask for the Minister today: the Government simply need to put more money into the system and get back on track to 0.7% as quickly as possible. Within that, they have to prioritise the most effective interventions. They have to recognise the importance of the multilateral system and the effectiveness of initiatives such as Gavi and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, especially where work is delivered at a community level and with community empowerment and involvement in decision making. The Government have to be committed to a genuinely universal rights-based approach to the provision of healthcare and pandemic preparedness. Flexibility has to be built into trade and intellectual property, for example, so that profit never comes before people and the planet. There must also be a recognition of digital rights, privacy and the security of individuals' data. In all of that, there has to be political leadership. Like every other Member who has spoken today, I would be grateful if the Minister could suggest who the Government will send to the meetings. Will it be a Secretary of State, or at the very least the right hon. Member for Sutton Coldfield, who speaks on development issues in Cabinet?

Finally, I am always encouraged by the number of constituents who raise global justice, access to healthcare, tackling poverty and the sustainable development goals with me. People in Glasgow North and across Scotland

want to play their part in building a world where everyone has the opportunity to flourish free from hunger and disease, and right now they do not see the UK Government stepping up to help to make that vision a reality. That is why more and more of them are realising that an independent Scotland would have its own representation at these high-level meetings, and that it could set 0.7% as a floor, not a ceiling, for aid spending. Perhaps they will conclude that the best way for Scotland to play its part will be to take its own place as an independent member of a community of nations.

10.14 am

**Fabian Hamilton** (Leeds North East) (Lab): As always, it is a pleasure to speak in a debate with you in the Chair, Mr Twigg. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma) on securing the debate because it could not come at a more important time in the history of humanity. We have heard from three excellent Back-Bench speakers today plus the Scottish National party spokesperson, the hon. Member for Glasgow North (Patrick Grady).

Our first speaker was of course the person that tabled this debate, my hon. Friend the Member for Ealing, Southall, who said that the pressing global challenges are not limited to any continent or nation. That is at the basis and heart of our discussion. In his excellent speech, he also said that the UN is a testament to the power of global human resolve and that that is the context of the debate. The dates of 20, 21 and 22 September are key; they are the foundation of this debate and are very important in the future history of human global health.

My hon. Friend is the chair of the APPG on global TB and he gave an excellent exposition of the importance of tackling tuberculosis. He explained that many Heads of State and Government will be present at the three meetings. Will the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary and the Minister for Development be there? I await the Minister's response. My hon. Friend emphasised that 192 UN member states need to commit to the delivery of health for all and that nearly 50% of people who receive a TB diagnosis will experience catastrophic consequences for them and their families. That is an extraordinary statistic. He underlined that by reminding us that tuberculosis is one of humanity's oldest diseases and that it is a disease of poverty, closely linked to other factors of poverty. It is preventable and highly curable, but the lack of worldwide political will is preventing us from wiping out the disease, which is a threat to global human health.

We then heard from my hon. Friend the Member for Putney (Fleur Anderson), who is an expert in issues of water sanitation and hygiene and is co-chair of the all-party parliamentary group for WASH. I have heard her speak before on these issues—one great thing about our Parliament is the number of experts across the House who understand and know their subjects so well. I was delighted to hear my hon. Friend talking about the issues because she knows what she is talking about. She said something very important: this is a matter of strong interest to all our constituents across the country. I have had loads of emails about the subject, as we all have.

We then heard from my hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool, West Derby (Ian Byrne) who talked with passion about his city and again emphasised that this is

not just an academic issue—this is not a matter for UN high-level meetings alone. It matters to our constituents and that is why we are here today. The hon. Member for Strangford (Jim Shannon) is normally in this Chamber; this is the first debate I have taken part in for years without him being present. I hope someone will pass that message on to him. We have heard some excellent contributions, and I have certainly increased my knowledge of the issues. I hope we all have.

As we have heard, the UN will hold three high-level meetings in the week of the UN General Assembly this year. In our polarised world, with conflict raging on the edge of Europe, I think it is important that we reach consensus wherever possible. That is why dialogue on tackling tuberculosis, preparing for the next pandemic and ensuring universal health coverage is vital to our collective human future. Given that those issues could have impacts on every corner of the globe, it is important that the meetings succeed and result in a political declaration that member states can agree and properly implement. That collective work starts today—here in the House of Commons.

Perhaps the closest issue in our own memories and to our own interests is pandemic preparedness. The covid-19 pandemic impacted everyone across the UK and almost everyone across the world. We know that in our country 212,000 people tragically died as a result of the virus, that many businesses were forced to close, that children lost millions of hours of teaching time and that NHS waiting lists remained far too long. It is worth reminding colleagues that it did not have to be that way and that the mismanagement of the pandemic's aftermath by this Government has played a part in the problems that continue within our country.

The UK was badly prepared for a pandemic. NHS waiting lists were at record levels even before covid-19 came on the scene and at that time we already had 100,000 staff shortages in our health service and 112,000 vacancies in social care. Such a complete lack of readiness for an earth-shattering event such as the covid-19 pandemic must never be allowed to happen again.

Even after the Government had been warned in 2016 that the NHS was not prepared for an influenza pandemic, they continued to reduce stockpiles of personal protective equipment and the number of hospital beds. With that in mind, does the Minister believe that this Government are best placed to negotiate a political declaration on pandemic preparedness with our allies and colleagues at the United Nations, and what assessment have our allies made of our lack of preparedness for the covid-19 pandemic?

Labour is committed to putting the UK on a better footing at these high-level meetings by championing our domestic agenda and our NHS. The next Labour Government will deliver a new 10-year plan for the NHS, including one of the biggest expansions of the NHS workforce in our history. That includes doubling the number of medical school places to 15,000 a year, training more GPs, more nurses and more health visitors each year. We will also harness our excellent life sciences and improve technology in order to reduce preventable illness.

Secondly, the meeting on universal health coverage is welcome and a long-overdue follow-up from the 2019 meeting, which is another impact of the covid-19 pandemic.

Universal health coverage is not on track and targets have not been reached. As we in the UK have the luxury of our NHS, which guarantees free treatment for all who need it, we have a huge part to play on the international stage on universal health coverage. Our history shows that the UK can be a leader in reducing healthcare-related poverty and can work with the world's most vulnerable people to ensure that they also have access to free medical treatment in their own countries. Again, given this Government's complete mismanagement of our NHS, does the Minister believe that his Government's failures put us in a good place to take the lead on such issues at the United Nations?

Finally, I want to touch on the global fight against tuberculosis, which my hon. Friend the Member for Ealing, Southall so carefully and brilliantly explained. TB is still a global killer. In 2021, it killed 1.6 million people, even though fewer people are now diagnosed with the illness. However, the more that TB spreads globally, the more it may have an impact on these shores, as many speakers have outlined. That is why it is vital that we assist those countries that are struggling in the fight against TB, particularly Bangladesh, the Congo, Pakistan, Sierra Leone and Uganda, among many others. What steps is the Minister taking to ensure that we play our part in tackling TB abroad and what benefits does that have for us at home?

As the shadow International Development Secretary, my hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Edgbaston (Preet Kaur Gill), made clear in a previous debate on these issues, the task of negotiating an effective international treaty on pandemic preparedness will be a historic task, but we simply must achieve it. Such a treaty will save hundreds of thousands of lives in the future and will provide the foundation for sustained global economic recovery. We need to show our allies and fellow members of the United Nations that we in the United Kingdom are seriously committed to tackling these issues, and I believe that that work starts here. That is why this Government must urgently get a grip of the many NHS crises that have engulfed our country over the last 13 years.

10.24 am

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (Leo Docherty):** It is a pleasure to have you in the Chair today, Mr Twigg.

I am very grateful to all right hon. and hon. Members who have spoken today, particularly the hon. Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma), who secured this debate. I also pay tribute to him for his work as chair of the all-party parliamentary group on global tuberculosis.

Of course, I am standing in for and answering on behalf of the Minister of State, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, my right hon. Friend the Member for Sutton Coldfield (Mr Mitchell), who is the Minister for Development. I think that he has engaged previously on these issues with the hon. Member for Ealing, Southall.

As the hon. Gentleman outlined in his commendable speech, as we look ahead to the three high-level UN meetings in September, the debate provides us with a valuable opportunity to highlight the UK's leading role in working with others to address global health challenges. I am grateful for the contributions made by all Members this morning.



[*Leo Docherty*]

The meetings will focus on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, universal health coverage, and tuberculosis. They will be a hugely important opportunity to maintain momentum on global health following the covid-19 pandemic and at this critical mid-point for the sustainable development goals. Of course, that will not be easy. Global health is now more than ever bound up with geopolitics, but we will nevertheless be ambitious in our aims while being aware of the challenges involved in negotiating across all member states.

Several Members have asked about prime ministerial attendance. We place huge importance on these meetings, and we will ensure that there is extremely high-level UK representation. I cannot yet confirm who will attend on behalf of His Majesty's Government as the process is ongoing, but we recognise that this is an extremely high-level and important moment for global health, and we are therefore ambitious.

Let me turn to the content of the three substantive meetings. First, it is vital to achieve and maintain UHC at home and across the world, and strong, resilient and equitable health systems are at the heart of our approach. The hon. Member for Putney (Fleur Anderson) asked about the integration of WASH. We are supporting WASH within UHC through the international taskforce on WASH in healthcare facilities, our new WASH systems for health programme, and bilateral programmes in Malawi and Nepal. We have also integrated WASH in the UK action plan for antimicrobial resistance, recognising its role in responsible antimicrobial stewardship. I hope that attends to some of the hon. Lady's questions.

People's eyes are open to the need for robust, equitable health systems following the pandemic, so now is the time to raise global ambition. We are pushing hard for firm global commitments to achieving UHC by 2030, with country-led commitments to take tangible steps forward. We have three priorities here. The first is to prioritise universal coverage of quality primary health care, which is instrumental in ending the preventable deaths of mothers, babies and children. The World Health Organisation estimates that scaling up primary health care could save 60 million lives.

Secondly, nobody should be pushed into extreme poverty because they cannot afford to pay for healthcare, although that was the case for 381 million people in 2019, even before the pandemic struck. It is our priority that a commitment to reversing that trend is made at the meeting. Thirdly, we are working hard to secure commitments on steps to tackle the global shortage in health workers, which is predicted to stand at some 10 million by the end of the decade.

Alongside those objectives, we will continue to press for other UK priorities. Those include championing and protecting sexual and reproductive health and rights, and promoting joined-up action across nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, as I mentioned, as well as climate and the environment, to support good health.

Let me turn to the meeting on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response. We must act on the lessons of covid-19 to protect future generations, and we will use the meeting to drive forward that vital commitment. Again, we have three priorities here. The first priority is to recommit states to the negotiations in Geneva on a

legally binding pandemic instrument, which is due to be agreed in mid-2024. An ambitious instrument could transform global health security by delivering the changes necessary to withstand health threats.

Let me address concerns about the instrument head-on: nothing we agree will impact on the UK's sovereign decision making on issues such as lockdowns or domestic vaccine roll out. The Government believe that a new instrument could help to speed up the sharing of information among member states on potential pandemic threats, and help to set out the "rules of the road" for future responses.

We also need to increase the financing available for pandemic preparedness. That is one of the best investments we can make, given the extraordinary costs of responding. The UK is therefore a proud investor in pandemic preparedness, including through the new pandemic fund, which will invest in products in lower income countries to improve their resilience to future health threats. We are pressing the multilateral development banks, including the World Bank Group, to do more to stretch their balance sheets in that area. We also want national Governments in low and middle-income countries to put more of their tax receipts into strengthening health systems and supporting universal health coverage and pandemic preparedness. Our third priority is to drive efforts towards a global commitment. We will be drawing up a playbook for responding to future pandemics, so that our successors have a guide to follow when the next one strikes.

Tuberculosis has been a significant theme of the debate. We will use the TB high-level meeting to galvanise a global political commitment to end that disease by the end of the decade. Work toward that goal was, of course, severely off track even before covid, and we have now seen two successive years of rising cases and deaths. TB kills more people than any other infectious disease, and drug-resistant TB is a leading cause of deaths related to antimicrobial resistance. A successful TB declaration at the meeting would incorporate quantitative targets and mechanisms for accountability, and commitments on financing and action. We have made good progress in pushing for a strong declaration, with clear targets and accountability mechanisms, to be adopted at the high-level meeting. We are working hard to secure high-level political attendance at the September meeting, especially by leaders of countries with high incidence of TB. We want to secure game-changing new commitments to action on the provision of TB services and investment in research and development.

We remain committed to championing progress on universal health coverage so that everyone everywhere has access to the essential health services they need without risk of financial hardship, including following a TB diagnosis. We want to ensure that, in the TB high-level meeting and the declaration, countries recommit to tackling the stigma and discrimination faced by people with TB. The UK is providing £1 billion over the next three years to the Global Fund, which will help to save more than 1 million lives around the world and will tackle TB stigma and discrimination.

Of course, the covid-19 pandemic highlighted the importance of continued investment in infectious disease research and development, as well as public health capacity, such as surveillance laboratories. It showed the importance of existing public health

infrastructure when responding and adapting to new infectious disease outbreaks, which will be another theme at that meeting.

On product development partnerships, currently we are planning the FCDO's future investment in global health research. As part of that, we will renew our investment in that area, including in product development partnerships and other organisations. We expect to announce more details during the latter half of 2023. Of course, the UK continues to play a world-leading role in research and innovation to combat TB. We are a strong supporter of product development partnerships and a world leader in life sciences. We are keen to see a global increase in the funding for TB research, so we are encouraging those who can do more to do exactly that.

The hon. Member for Ealing, Southall asked about Bedaquiline. The UK supports work to develop new treatments for TB and improve global access to them. Our funding for the TB Alliance supported the development of a new drug regime that includes Bedaquiline for treating drug-resistant TB. We will lay the foundations for ambitious outcomes at next year's high-level meeting on antimicrobial resistance.

The three high-level meetings in September are a hugely important opportunity to maintain momentum on global health following the covid-19 pandemic and at this critical juncture for the sustainable development goals. We will push for the meeting on universal health coverage, to revitalise a national political commitment to delivering that goal. We will focus on ensuring that the meeting on preventing and responding to pandemics drives strong engagement and outcomes, particularly towards the negotiation of a legally binding international instrument in Geneva.

We will use the meeting as an opportunity to reignite the political commitment to get us back on track towards ending tuberculosis, backed by targets and mechanisms

for accountability. In all of these meetings, we will place a clear emphasis on strengthening health systems, which is vital to achieving our aims.

10.35 am

**Mr Virendra Sharma:** I am thankful to everybody who contributed to this morning's debate, which is very important not only here but also for what is going to happen in September. I am thankful to the Minister, too, although many questions need further clarification and I will certainly follow up later.

One thing everybody wanted to know is who will be going to the meetings. The Minister is not clear about that yet, but there are only two months left, and at that level diaries cannot be changed quickly. I hope we will find out who is going sooner rather than later, because that will give people like me and many non-governmental organisations an opportunity to approach or write to those individuals and find the best ways to represent our points of view.

My second disappointment is perhaps not appropriate, but I am a bit disappointed not to have had more contributions from Government Members this morning. I am not saying they are not interested, but that could have further strengthened the argument we are making.

I thank you, Mr Twigg, for your calm and patient approach to taking the debate through. Again, I thank all who contributed.

*Question put and agreed to.*

*Resolved,*

That this House has considered UN high-level meetings in 2023.

10.37 am

*Sitting suspended.*

## Renewable Energy in the East of England

11 am

**Derek Twigg (in the Chair):** I will call Peter Aldous to move the motion and then call the Minister to respond. There will not be an opportunity for the Member in charge to wind up, as is the convention for 30-minute debates.

**Peter Aldous (Waveney) (Con):** I beg to move,

That this House has considered renewable energy in the East of England.

It is a pleasure to serve with you in the Chair, Mr Twigg. The transition to a zero-carbon economy in which the UK's energy supply is in future sourced from low-carbon and renewable sources, puts the east of England right in the vanguard of the UK's energy system. Last year, East Anglia's renewable and low-carbon energy portfolio powered the equivalent of 32% of UK homes. The Opregy Group of energy advisers estimates that by 2035 that figure could rise to 90%. That dramatic transformation—I do not think it wrong to describe it is a revolution—presents our region with a once in a generation opportunity to drive inward investment, create exciting and enduring careers, and play a major role in delivering the UK's net zero goals.

With wages in the east of England relatively low compared with those in other regions, and with pockets of deprivation, particularly in coastal areas such as my constituency of Waveney, it is vital that we grasp this opportunity. In many respects, a good start has been made, with energy companies setting up bases in the region, such as ScottishPower Renewables in Hamilton Dock in Lowestoft; new training facilities being provided by East Coast College at the energy skills centre in Lowestoft and at the eastern civil engineering campus in Lound; and EDF partnering with the Suffolk chamber of commerce to ensure that local businesses have every opportunity to be part of the supply chain for the construction of Sizewell C.

Up until now, the process has been developer led, with each developer focused on the delivery of their own individual projects. That is no criticism of them; they have simply been responding to the rules of the game laid down by the Government. That approach, however, is no longer viable. The scale of the planned development is such that a more strategic approach is needed. The Government need to recognise the enormity of the task they are asking the eastern region to perform, and they need to put in place the necessary policies, and provide the necessary resources, so that we can help them to meet their statutory targets.

We need a laser-like focus on delivery, which requires the Government to work in partnership with business, councils, and universities and colleges. Adopting such an approach gives us a good chance of delivering for the east, providing people with the skills to take up the new jobs, giving local businesses the opportunity to be part of strong and vibrant supply chains, and putting in place the necessary infrastructure. Infrastructure, whether in our ports or in the transmission networks that run through our region transporting electricity, hydrogen and water, is critical. If it is inadequate, we will fail in our objectives.

I shall focus on three technologies: offshore wind, nuclear and hydrogen. I shall set out the changes that I believe need to be made to the national energy policy framework, what we need to do to provide the necessary enabling infrastructure, and the investment that is needed in schools and training. Generally, Government energy policy has served the UK well over the past decade in promoting low-carbon energy technologies. In today's geopolitical environment, however, with other countries—in particular the US and the EU nations—seeking to attract investment from globally footloose investors, the UK's policy framework needs some adaptation to continue to be attractive. Keith Anderson, the chief executive of ScottishPower, writing in *The Sunday Times* this weekend, said of the US:

“We can't possibly hope to outspend them. What we can do is outsmart and outpace them.”

That is the approach that we should have in mind when considering amendments to the Energy Bill.

With regard to nuclear, we are moving very much in the right direction by passing the Nuclear Energy (Financing) Act 2022 last year and creating Great British Nuclear this year. The Sizewell C project is gathering pace, and every effort should be made to fast-track early construction works, to make opportunities for significant local job creation.

In offshore wind, the Energy Act 2013 and the contracts for difference mechanism have served the UK well, and the industry is a major British success story, but the policies now require adaptation. Measures that should be considered include an increase in the contracts for difference budget, which RenewableUK has called for, to reflect increased supply chain costs and higher interest rates. In addition, a permanent investment allowance should be introduced for clean energy generators. Such capital allowances would support the growth of clean energy supply across East Anglia and throughout the UK.

The southern North sea currently hosts 37% of the UK offshore wind portfolio, with over 5 GW of capacity. That is due to expand to 15 GW, taking into account projects that are already in the pipeline, but nothing else is planned for after those projects have been delivered. If nothing is done, investment off the East Anglia coast could fall off a cliff edge after 2032. That is a disincentive to continued investment. To address the problem, the East of England Energy Group, Opregy, Cefas, the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult and other partners are developing proposals with the Crown Estate that involve innovative proposals for seabed and marine habitat restoration integrated with subsea energy storage, which, importantly, do not require new grid connections. When they come forward, I urge my right hon. Friend the Minister to give them full consideration.

The UK's hydrogen strategy is still in its early stages and is very much focused on industrial clusters. It must be structured in such a way that it can evolve to kickstart investment across more dispersed regions like East Anglia, where there is enormous potential for the industry and where we have three anchor assets. First, there is the Bacton gas terminal in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for North Norfolk (Duncan Baker), which can be a piece of strategic national infrastructure for transporting hydrogen around the UK. Secondly, we have Freeport East at Felixstowe and Harwich, which can play a major role in decarbonising the international



freight logistics and transport sectors. Thirdly, there is the region's primary industry, agriculture, in which hydrogen can serve three purposes: as fuel for tractors and combines; for producing fertiliser; and for heating and air-conditioning in the chicken-rearing units that are found across the region. To enable the hydrogen sector to grow, my sense is that we do need the hydrogen levy, as well as a contracts for difference mechanism for hydrogen.

At the moment, the enabling infrastructure required to support these projects, which in international terms are enormous, is woefully inadequate. The Government need to recognise the role being taken on by the east of England of hosting various power stations in the funding made available and by adopting a strategic approach to the provision of utility networks. To date, the process has been piecemeal, with each development being left to secure its own connections. We now need a much more joined-up discussion on future energy infrastructure. That could involve an independent strategic network architect working with the Government, private sector grid operators and project developers to plan the long-term future grid options and connectivity across all utilities, including electricity, hydrogen, water and digital communications.

The Government are beginning to put in place the jigsaw pieces required to enable such an approach to be pursued, with an amendment to the Energy Bill reforming Ofgem's remit and the Government's electricity networks commissioner, Nick Winser, due to publish his report on expediting grid development in the coming weeks. A consultation on community benefits is also under way. National Grid is consulting on the Norwich to Tilbury grid proposals, which would provide 180 km of new pylon infrastructure across Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex. Understandably, there has already been much opposition to the proposals, although National Grid has rightly emphasised that it is very much in listening mode. The detailed design of the proposal is a debate for another day and for those MPs whose constituencies the route runs through to lead. There will also of course be a public inquiry.

That said, I shall lay down some possible guiding parameters. First, it is important that the communities that house such infrastructure get a fair deal. There should be an enhanced package of benefits, and Government should look to overcome the technical obstacles that prevent discount electricity prices from being offered to local communities. Secondly, as well as National Grid, it is important that UK Power Networks, as the local distribution network operator, is included in the discussions. In doing so, we can explore ways of adapting the plans for the national grid so as to help to unlock investment and job creation opportunities in the region, which are currently constrained by inadequate power supplies. Thirdly, in the detailed design of the layout of such routes, it is important that steps are taken to mitigate the impact on high-quality and environmentally sensitive landscapes, undergrounding cables where necessary, and using newer pylon designs, such as the T-pylons being installed in the south-west.

It is important to comment on port infrastructure. Freeport East in Felixstowe and Harwich will play a role on the global trade stage, and ports such as Lowestoft will play a bespoke role in securing the transition to low-carbon energy. Associated British Ports has exciting investment plans for its £25 million Lowestoft Eastern

Energy Facility, but to make that commitment, it needs clarity and certainty on future offshore projects. A small ports grant, a reinvigoration of the local enterprise zone or a fiscal measure, such as a revenue guarantee, would help, acting as a catalyst for that development.

Skills should be the topic of a dedicated debate, with another Minister from another Department being beamed down to take the place of my right hon. Friend the Minister. To a certain extent, we had that debate last week with the estimates day debate on further education colleges and lifelong learning, during which colleagues from across the House emphasised the need for a significant increase in revenue funding. The construction and operation of such a wide variety of energy generators presents the east of England with a great opportunity to provide local people with the skills required for the exciting new jobs that are emerging.

Some great initiatives have been put in place by inspirational local leaders, such as Stuart Rimmer, the principal of East Coast College, who has brought together energy colleges and trainers from all around the UK in the national energy skills consortium to share best practice. In addition, the coastal energy internship programme, supported by the Ogden Trust and founded by John Best, has made great strides over the past eight years in enabling students to undertake energy internships during the summer months. Given the volume of future energy and infrastructure projects in the east, we need much greater investment in energy-related skills right across civil, electrical and mechanical engineering. Skills can only be addressed locally, in places such as Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth, but there is a desperate need for much greater national and regional co-ordination and investment funding. Local skills improvement plans will help, but I believe the Department for Education made a major tactical and strategic error in not approving the eastern region's bid for the Institute of Technology.

In conclusion, the energy transition presents the east of England with a once-in-a-generation opportunity to spread economic growth and prosperity right across the region, reaching areas that have felt overlooked and forgotten for too long. A lot of people are working incredibly hard locally to make the most of the opportunity, but as matters stand, I fear we will not realise its full potential. To do so, we need to pursue a strategic approach. Government must provide the necessary resources and work with local government and business to set up a delivery taskforce. If we do that properly, we can lay down a global exemplar of how to carry out the net zero transition, which will not only benefit East Anglian people, but can be replicated across the UK and around the world.

11.16 am

**The Minister for Energy Security and Net Zero (Graham Stuart):** It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Twigg, and to conclude this debate, which was so brilliantly set off by my hon. Friend the Member for Waveney (Peter Aldous). As you will recognise, Mr Twigg, it is rare to hear, especially in a short debate such as this, such a wide-ranging, deeply thought-through and comprehensive speech as the one that we have just heard from my hon. Friend. His grasp of the key issues in the energy space is remarkable, and it is grounded not only in his constituency, but in the wider region he represents.

[Graham Stuart]

My hon. Friend will be aware of the important role of offshore wind, as he highlighted, and other renewables in delivering secure, domestically generated energy, and of the boost they provide for economic growth, although I am sure he will also allow me to set out the Government's position. The policies set out in the British energy security strategy and endorsed in the "Powering Up Britain" papers, which I announced to the House on 30 March 2023, include bold new commitments to super-charge clean energy and accelerate renewable deployment. My hon. Friend suggests that we have the opportunity to be a global exemplar. Not to diminish the—for the most part—accurate and properly based challenges he set out, but we already are the global exemplar. We have cut our emissions by more than any other major economy on earth since 1990. We took the position—a rather parlous one, when we think about it—just 13 years ago, when less than 7% of our electricity came from renewables. That is now well over 40%. In some senses, we are a victim of our own success, which has created some of the grid pressures that he rightly highlighted.

Turning to coal, I am the co-chairman of the Powering Past Coal Alliance, an international grouping of countries and organisations committed to ending the use of coal in power production. Nearly 40% of our electricity came from coal as recently as 11 years ago, in 2012. Next year that figure will be zero. We are a global exemplar, although I share my hon. Friend's frustration when he asked whether—despite all the jobs that have been created and our success in leading—we have harnessed all the economic benefit. Have we embedded the industrial capability that we could have for the long term? If I had a mission in this job, apart from delivering and helping to facilitate this extraordinary transformation, it would be to do so in a way that leads to the long-term, high-paid jobs that my hon. Friend is so right to challenge the Government to work towards.

Wind overtook gas as our largest source of electricity during the first three months of this year, delivering more than a third of our entire electricity supply for the first time. I am proud of that. As my hon. Friend has said, the east of England plays an important role in supporting our offshore wind ambitions. Just last year, our contracts for difference scheme allocated support for a further 7 GW of offshore wind capacity, the majority of it located in the North sea and supported through the east of England. Since 2014, we have more than doubled our solar capacity in east England to more than 2 GW, with a further 1 GW of shovel-ready capacity and 2 GW more in planning.

This Government have driven that change. We have introduced the landmark Energy Bill, which is currently passing through the House, which contains measures to accelerate the rate of deployment of offshore wind farms, reduce the time it takes to get planning consent, and reform environmental regulations to streamline processes, while maintaining protection of the marine environment, but doing so in a more strategically joined-up way—a thread running through my hon. Friend's excellent speech. He may or may not be aware that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs is running the marine spatial prioritisation programme, which, on a cross-purposes analysis, aims to optimise the use of our

seas and manage competing priorities on the seabed. It is, in conjunction with my Department, leading on exactly the kind of strategic overview that my hon. Friend rightly highlighted.

We recently concluded our consultation on making changes to the national policy planning framework in England—again, as part of pulling together a more strategic approach. When designated, local authorities will be better able to respond to the views of their communities when they wish to host onshore wind infrastructure. Offshore wind developers in East Anglia will also be required to consider co-ordination of their infrastructure before submitting a planning application for any new network infrastructure. My hon. Friend rightly highlighted the project-based, linear approach and the need for a more co-ordinated and coherent one. [Interruption.] I am being given further "refreshment", which is always marvellous.

Where communities such as those in the east of England host this infrastructure, we want to thank and, to be fair to them, also reward them for doing so, as my hon. Friend said. Our consultation on guidance on community benefits for transmission network infrastructure closed a couple of weeks ago, and I hope to be able to share the results later in the year. We have also just closed our consultation on developing partnerships for communities who wish to host new onshore wind infrastructure in return for lower energy bills. My hon. Friend also picked up on that.

Finally, I want to discuss network infrastructure, which, as my hon. Friend said, is an essential component for driving renewable deployment, and we need to build it more quickly. In Great Britain, around four times as much new transmission network will be needed in the next seven years as was built since 1990. The timescales for delivering transmission network infrastructure are currently 12 to 14 years, often far longer than the time taken to deliver the generation being connected—and we all recognise that having wonderful, new, low-cost, brilliantly planned generation is no good if we cannot get the electrons where they need to go. The lack of network capacity is already a challenge, as around 5% of wind generation is currently curtailed, meaning its output is reduced because there is not enough capacity on the network to transport it. This could increase to between 15% and 20% in the mid-2020s, as wind generation increases further.

In order to accelerate the delivery of network infrastructure, we appointed Nick Winser as the electricity networks commissioner, who is tasked with advising on how we can halve the timeline for delivering new electricity transmission infrastructure. His report will be published imminently, and the Government will respond with an action plan later this year. We will also come forward with a connection plan at the more local level, precisely because of the central importance of sorting out our transmission.

Placing all new infrastructure offshore is not a feasible option, as ultimately the electricity needs to get to where the demand is, which is of course onshore. Therefore, even with offshore cables, infrastructure such as substations are required onshore at landing points. To support faster delivery of transmission and better co-ordination, the holistic network design, or HND, developed by the electricity system operator, sets out a blueprint for the connection of groups of offshore wind projects to

the grid—again, picking up on my hon. Friend's central point about the need for a more strategic and coherent approach, informed, as it will be, by high-level spatial strategies.

This is the first time that connections and transmission reinforcements have been considered together for multiple projects, and it is revolutionising the way that we design our network infrastructure. Considering multiple projects together has allowed opportunities to co-ordinate infrastructure while balancing impacts on the environment, communities, cost to consumers and deliverability of the infrastructure.

Of course, as my hon. Friend has said, concerns have consistently been raised about the proposed infrastructure in East Anglia. I would like to reassure the House that the Department is working closely with developers, transmission operators and National Grid ESO to explore voluntary options to minimise infrastructure where possible, while also recognising that timely delivery of projects in the east of England will be key to achieving the 2030 ambition for offshore wind.

In the limited time that I have left, I will try to briefly review some of the points that my hon. Friend made and consider whether I can make any reasonable response to them. He mentioned the revolution, and that is what is going on; indeed, we need to tell the story to the nation about how we are rewiring this country. If people look around even the most beautiful landscapes, they will see things that they usually do not notice because they are just so used to them—major pieces of industrial infrastructure that were required to create the foundations for the wealthy and successful country that we are. Nevertheless, we will need to rewire things. Even with the best will in the world and strategic planning, co-ordination and minimisation of impacts, as well as a real focus on good design principles, there will be impacts, and we need to let people know that delivering net zero will require them.

My hon. Friend touched on the fact that we have been developer-led, project by project, which is very much changing. He also mentioned the focus on delivery, and on skills and jobs. I co-chair the green jobs delivery group, which is the high-level Government and industry body that is looking to get the information from the engineering specialities that he mentioned, so that information can be shared with the Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education, who also sits

on that body, to make sure that education programmes are better aligned with and support the kind of revolution that is required.

My hon. Friend also mentioned the CfD budget. When he talks about that, I think he is probably talking more about the administrative strike price, as we call it in our jargon-world. That is the top level that we will pay, whereas the budget is the amount that we will commission. We always keep that price in mind, and obviously we recognise that there are financing costs, supply chain squeezes and inflation. However, those things are very much taken into account when we design these policies. We cannot always get everything right, but the industry always tells us that we have allowed insufficient funds for this type of work and typically predicts, ultimately, rather less generation coming through than actually occurs. However, we are now operating on an annual basis, so that we can better respond to those issues.

My hon. Friend also talked about hydrogen and the role of the east of England in being able to deliver it, not least in Bacton, Felixstowe and the agriculture sector. Like him, I am very excited about hydrogen. If we can properly harness our unique renewable resources and do things correctly in a co-ordinated fashion, we will not only have low-cost electricity, but we will become a leader, certainly in the European context and perhaps globally, in the production of green hydrogen. Of course, we are also blessed—he did not mention this—with 78 gigatonnes of carbon storage; we have the vast share of Europe's carbon storage potential, and we can host carbon storage for our neighbours, too.

My hon. Friend is quite right to highlight all the opportunities in these sectors, and he is also right to congratulate people such as Stuart Rimmer at East Coast College and John Best for the internships he has supported. He is also correct that not only do the Government need to get the overall frameworks right, but we need to facilitate and support local authorities, communities and individuals to play their part. If we get this work right, we will not only deal with the environmental challenges, but reinforce our industrial strength, and grow and strengthen the prosperity of this country. That process can be led, to a great extent, from the east of England.

*Question put and agreed to.*

11.29 am

*Sitting suspended.*



## Business Banking Resolution Service

[MARK PRITCHARD *in the Chair*]

2.30 pm

**Mr William Wragg** (Hazel Grove) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered the Business Banking Resolution Service.

It is an extraordinary pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard, and to welcome the Minister, shadow Ministers—the hon. Member for Hampstead and Kilburn (Tulip Siddiq) and the right hon. Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie)—and an extremely able Parliamentary Private Secretary, the hon. Member for Totnes (Anthony Mangnall), who will no doubt pass notes diligently.

I hope to outline how and why the Business Banking Resolution Service has failed to restore trust between small and medium-sized enterprises and their lenders, or to resolve a meaningful number of complaints. I also hope to outline alternative proposals that might achieve those goals. According to “Scale up to level up”, a 2021 report by the all-party parliamentary group on fair business banking, 73% of small businesses would rather grow more slowly than borrow. That is a worrying trend that needs to be reversed.

Empowering businesses to borrow with confidence can only be good news for our economy. A healthy SME lending market depends on trust and confidence that things will be put right if they go wrong. As has been stated in this place many times, most transactions between businesses and their financial service providers, including the majority of commercial lending, are neither regulated nor covered by consumer protection laws. The power imbalance between SMEs and banks and other large financial firms leaves small businesses vulnerable to poor treatment. It is, therefore, vital that SMEs have access to independent and effective dispute resolution services when they are in dispute with their lenders. The Treasury Committee’s 2018 “SME Finance” report was clear on that:

“We must introduce a system for dispute resolution and redress that gives the UK’s SMEs the confidence to engage with financial services providers, safe in the knowledge that they are not vulnerable to exploitation and mistreatment.”

**Margaret Ferrier** (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (Ind): I congratulate the hon. Member on securing this debate. Support for the BBRS is limited; many have stated that a new alternative resolution scheme should be created. Does the hon. Member agree that any new scheme should seek not to burden the tribunal system, by requiring parties first to seek agreement through mediation services?

**Mr Wragg:** The hon. Lady makes a valid, important and sensible point. I will touch on a suggestion towards the end of my remarks.

In the course of its inquiry, the Treasury Committee considered the long-standing and very large gap in provision of a financial dispute resolution service for SMEs, between those eligible to refer a complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service and those with access to enough money, appropriate legal representation, and

sufficient courage and time to be able to sue their bank. A similar shortfall was identified in the APPG’s “Fair Business Banking for All” report.

**Kirsten Oswald** (East Renfrewshire) (SNP): We should not underestimate the hon. Member’s point about the unreasonableness of expecting those who find themselves in that situation to have huge amounts of courage. I want to make that point on behalf of my constituents who have huge amounts of patience, courage and grit to right what in their case has been a very significant wrong. They would absolutely like to see an independent tribunal service. They describe the current system as a shambles and I do not disagree with them. Their trust is completely shattered by any measure. All of the resolution processes have failed. Does the hon. Member agree that there are people all over the UK who deserve significantly better?

**Mr Wragg:** Absolutely so. The courage of those small and medium-sized business owners is not to be underestimated. I have dealt with constituents whose cases go back decades. They have had more than patience; they have had the utmost resilience. Many would have given up by now, but such is the injustice—the wrongs that we need to right—that we must, on their behalf, respond with similar courage.

The expansion of the remit of the Financial Ombudsman Service in 2019 to include more SMEs and increase the maximum award level narrowed the gap to some extent, but did not close it. Neither has the gap been plugged successfully by the ad hoc redress schemes established by banks in the years following the 2007 financial crisis for those impacted by scandals such as the interest rate hedging product mis-selling, the mistreatment of small business customers by the Royal Bank of Scotland Global Restructuring Group and the HBOS Reading fraud.

The schemes that have been set up have all been heavily criticised for, among other things, a lack of independence and overly restrictive eligibility criteria. It was against that backdrop that the BBRS was established as a voluntary initiative to the specifications of, and funded by, seven participating UK banks. It was intended to help rebuild trust among the SME community by resolving historical and contemporary disputes between banks and those businesses. It thereby filled a gap in dispute resolution and redress.

**Andy McDonald** (Middlesbrough) (Lab): Does that list extend to Lloyds bank? I have a constituent who is a reasonably successful property developer and was encouraged by Lloyds bank to take out larger and riskier loans. He took independent advice, only to find that the person advising him was on commission from Lloyds bank. The ultimate outcome was that he was foreclosed upon, and his life was ruined. That example shows, in all its gory colour, that the current system of resolution is not working.

**Mr Wragg:** I am afraid that the hon. Gentleman highlights one of many cases across our constituencies. I perfectly well understand his constituent’s sense of injustice. Hopefully this debate will at least give us an idea of the way forward.

The BBRS followed from the Walker review, commissioned by UK Finance, which identified a gap in dispute resolution and recommended that a voluntary scheme be established. It recommended action to deal with legacy disputes and contemporary complaints by providing speedy resolution for larger SMEs' ongoing financial complaints. A proposal to set up a financial services tribunal was made at the time by my hon. Friend the Member for Thirsk and Malton (Kevin Hollinrake) and the Treasury Committee in its 2018 report. The Treasury Committee report noted strong cross-party support for the proposal. For a number of reasons, including a lack of parliamentary time and the significant costs involved, the Walker review did not support the creation of a tribunal.

The BBRS was also established to ensure the excesses of the financial crisis were not repeated, and that record keeping and data flows about SMEs can be used to monitor bank behaviour and culture, and can provide an early warning system for customer mistreatment. That was a key purpose of the Walker review, beyond providing a new mechanism for dispute resolution.

A 2019 letter to Stephen Jones, the then CEO of UK Finance, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, made Her Majesty's Government's position on the nascent scheme abundantly clear. It stated:

"If it transpires that the scheme is not bringing resolution to a meaningful number of complaints...then I would expect there to be further discussions around the scope of and eligibility for the backward-looking scheme."

That gets to the nub of the issue.

**Margaret Ferrier:** Despite forecasts that more than 60,000 legacy cases would be eligible for review, take-up and financial payouts have been minimal. Does the hon. Gentleman agree that further action must be taken to support businesses in bringing forward legacy claims, and that there should be a six-year time window?

**Mr Wragg:** As ever in these debates, the quality of interventions is superb. The hon. Lady pre-empts exactly what I was going to say. If she will forgive me, I will come on to that in a moment, but her point is perfectly valid.

It may not surprise anyone following the story closely to learn that the BBRS has failed to resolve a meaningful number of complaints. By the former Chancellor's standards, I think it is fair to say that the BBRS has been an abject failure and has certainly not given UK SMEs confidence to engage with financial service providers.

As just mentioned by the hon. Member for Rutherglen and Hamilton West (Margaret Ferrier), it was estimated by the then chief executive of UK Finance that more than 60,000 historical complaints would be eligible for review. However, by May of this year, the BBRS had made direct adjudications on just 28 cases resulting in financial awards. In that same time, it has been involved—whatever "involved" means—in the award of 56 financial settlements between banks and claimants. That includes cases where the dispute has resulted in a settlement following, but not necessarily because of, the involvement of BBRS. Even being generous, the BBRS has been involved in a maximum of just 84 financial awards in nearly two years out of an estimated potential of 60,000. Plainly, the quantity of resolved cases is very disappointing, to say the least.

Naturally, that raises questions about value for money. The BBRS cost more than £40 million to set up. By May of this year, according to its own data:

"Substantially more than £1 million of financial awards have been made to SMEs as a result of BBRS intervention so far".

In other words, a maximum of between £1 million and £2 million has been paid out since the launch of the BBRS. Bear in mind that it cost £40 million to set up. Would it not have been easier to simply divide that £40 million and dish it out randomly? The BBRS has proved to be very poor value for money.

The primary issue behind these abysmal figures is the design of the scheme itself. Heavily restrictive eligibility criteria have locked out and timed out almost all credible claims from businesses, and there is no indication of any willingness from the BBRS or the banks to address this. The chair of the BBRS SME liaison panel—an advisory body set up to give SMEs a voice within the service—resigned in March this year, stating:

"The very low numbers of cases resolved by the BBRS and the banks suggest an inflexible system, and I do not detect the necessary willingness and imagination within the existing system to resolve this."

Another fitting quote from an unnamed source close to the scheme was reported in *The Times* in May 2022. They eloquently put it as follows:

"Saying BBRS needs an overhaul is like saying that a tank that's been blown up could do with a service. It's completely defective."

The specific concerns about eligibility are fourfold. First, the current point of valuation of turnover is the date at which the complaint was first made by the SME to its bank. This allows the bank to artificially distress companies' assets to below £1 million, and therefore out of the scope of the BBRS, before the complaint is made to the bank. Instead, the point of valuation of turnover should be made at the point at which the bank's alleged act or omission initially occurs.

Secondly, complaints eligible for the Financial Ombudsman Service are not eligible for the BBRS. However, the FOS has a wider purpose than strictly to resolve disputes. There may be a peripheral element of a historical SME claim that either qualifies it for consideration by the FOS or has been the recipient of such consideration. In this case, the applicant would be precluded from the BBRS, although it may meet the other criteria.

Thirdly, eligibility regarding size of business thresholds is too strict. Property developers, landlords and others cannot meet the current BBRS eligibility minimum business size criteria, even if they set out to do so. Fourthly, on balance sheet limits, currently businesses are assessed on gross business assets rather than net business assets. This is restricting and illogical, because it is not representative of the true size of the business, as it includes the costs that are due to be deducted from the balance sheet in the short term.

As I have already alluded to, the chair of the advisory SME panel resigned earlier this year after proposals put forward to reform the eligibility criteria were consistently rejected or ignored. This prompted the BBRS to unilaterally dissolve the panel. As I said at the time, this was a rather shocking and cynical move. The BBRS established an advisory panel to feed SME concerns about the service back to the BBRS. The concerns raised were ignored, and the proposals were rejected out of hand. When it

[Mr Wragg]

appeared that the panel might be publicly critical, the panel was shut down. For those now unrepresented SMEs, that must have felt like a complete stitch-up.

The BBRS is indeed winding down—though I question whether it ever got into swing. The historical complaints process closed in February, and the contemporary complaints process will continue only until the end of this year. The reason that I am here—I surmise that colleagues are here for the same reason—is to put it to parliamentarians that the process has been a failure. We simply cannot make the same mistakes again. As I hope I have illustrated, the BBRS has been a waste of time and money and has certainly not resolved a meaningful number of disputes. If anything, many SMEs' experiences with the BBRS have served only to further erode their trust in the financial services sector.

As has been suggested in the past, a financial services tribunal, with a statutory footing, could be the solution. I commend the idea to my hon. Friend the Minister. Such a body would be modelled on employment tribunals and be a genuinely independent organisation with legal teeth. The creation of a tribunal would have a dramatic effect on the power imbalance inherent in disputes between businesses and large financial institutions, echoing the transformation in employer-employee relationships brought about by the introduction of employment tribunals. That must be accompanied by an amendment to section 138D of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, to enhance the legal rights of SMEs. Those changes will be significant in ensuring that SMEs have access to justice. Indeed, as the Treasury Select Committee stated in 2018:

“Taken together, these changes will ensure that the UK's small businesses will no longer be denied justice, as so many have been in the past.”

Ultimately, the BBRS has failed to achieve its aim of providing meaningful redress in a fair and independent way. As an alternative, the proposal for a financial services tribunal, endorsed by the Treasury Committee and by the all-party group on fair business banking, which I have the pleasure of co-chairing, must be seriously considered. We owe it to the brilliant SMEs in each of our constituencies to create a lending environment in which they can thrive and drive our national economy forwards.

2.47 pm

**Stewart Hosie** (Dundee East) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I congratulate the hon. Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg) on bringing this debate before us. He is absolutely right: businesses need access to a proper, functioning dispute resolution service, but I fear that the BBRS is not it. He was also absolutely correct that redress cannot be left only to those with the time, money and patience—or, as he said, the bravery—to sue the banks. The hon. Lady the Member for Rutherglen and Hamilton West (Margaret Ferrier) made the most salient point that barely a few dozen of the 60,000 legacy cases that were potentially liable to be investigated or taken up by the service have been resolved. That is a problem.

**Andy McDonald:** Are we assuming that those legacy cases fit the criteria set out by the hon. Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg)? Many of our constituents will be nowhere near those criteria, but their lives and

businesses lie in tatters. Are they not included? Are they not in anybody's thinking, in terms of the resolution that they deserve?

**Stewart Hosie:** They ought to be in people's thinking. The figure of 60,000 is commonly used. Of course, the eligibility criteria include that they must not be eligible for the FOS scheme, as was very properly referred to by the hon. Member for Hazel Grove. However, let us assume that it is a big number, in the tens of thousands, and let us hope that, at the very least, businesses do not fall through the cracks between this service and the FOS. It would be a different problem entirely if people were not eligible for any kind of access to at least one of the redress systems.

The hon. Member for Hazelgrove laid out a bit of the background. I want to go through some of that again briefly, given that it is quite important in terms of what the Government may choose to do next. The BBRS was set up in 2018 to help SMEs resolve disputes with their banks free of charge. Many high street banks, including Lloyds, NatWest and HSBC, took part in the scheme, and it has been operating—although I use that word loosely—since 2021. It was created after a spate of banking scandals involving the mistreatment of thousands of companies, including, as we know, the Royal Bank of Scotland's GRG, and similar operations at other banks in the aftermath of the 2009-10 financial crash.

The eligibility criteria, which have been mentioned, are that the dispute must have occurred after 1 April 2019, and that the SME must have an annual turnover of up to £10 million per annum and a balance sheet of up to £7.5 million, and must not be eligible to take the complaint to the Financial Ombudsman Service. Many stakeholders have noted that the scheme has not been successful in helping SMEs to resolve their disputes, despite costing—as we have heard—tens of millions of pounds to set up, which was paid for by the industry. One of the main issues with the scheme is the narrow eligibility criteria for SMEs to use the service. The recent figure was only 35, but even 50 or 60 would still represent a tiny fraction of the number that could be resolved.

**Margaret Ferrier:** When the Business Banking Resolution Service was introduced, it was marketed as an accessible service. However, data shows that, by March last year, only 776 businesses had registered with the BBRS. Does the right hon. Member agree that this suggests that either the Business Banking Resolution Service was difficult to use or, alternatively, the service was not publicised effectively?

**Stewart Hosie:** It could be a combination of both, although it is instructive that Andy Agathangelou, the founder of the Transparency Task Force, called the BBRS an “abysmal failure” that is not “fit for purpose”, so I certainly think that the opaqueness and lack of advertising might be significant factors in how few businesses have sought to use it and what happened to those that did. He also said that some small businesses are “convinced” that the BBRS is

“a mechanism through which banks have found justification for not making payments”.

Even if that is not true, if the perception among the SME community is that the service, which was put in place to resolve their disputes, is being used for contrary purposes, that alone would be a huge problem for the BBRS.



**Kirsten Oswald:** My right hon. Friend is making a very helpful speech. The point he is making feeds into the wider point about the huge imbalance in power, influence and resources that exists between the banks and those seeking redress. On his point, the behaviour of some banks has been quite shameful—I am speaking from my own casework here—so whatever happens from here on in, it is imperative that new arrangements are fair, genuinely independent and transparent, so that businesses can be confident that they really are going to work.

**Stewart Hosie:** My hon. Friend is absolutely right, and that imbalance in power and resources was writ large in the BBRS executive's unilateral decision in March to dissolve the SME liaison panel, after rejecting its numerous proposals to expand the eligibility criteria. It is a law unto itself. The liaison panel came forward with ideas to make things work better, but instead of them being taken on board and actioned—if they were appropriate—the panel was unilaterally shut down. The voice of SMEs to the panel has effectively disappeared, and that was after the SME liaison panel's chair resigned because it was “difficult to make progress”.

That short list should be cause for concern enough for the Government, but let us take a look—I give great thanks to the all-party parliamentary group on fair business banking for this—at the list of headlines that this shambles has generated: “Business Banking Resolution Service a ‘real failure’”; “‘Cynical’ closure of bank redress adviser panel prompts anger”; “New £23m Business Banking Resolution Service has yet to pay any compensation”; “Bank redress scheme ‘is completely defective’”; “Lawyer Cat Maclean quits ‘completely defective’ banking compensation scheme”; “Business Banking Resolution Service ‘done on the cheap’”, with £40 million invested and it does not work; and “Banking redress chief earns £1m despite paying only five claims”—at that point.

If I were the Economic Secretary to the Treasury, I would be deeply concerned. The process has failed. Businesses are not getting the service or the redress that they need and deserve. The headlines are absolutely diabolical. It appears that few lessons have been learned from the financial crash, or if they have, they have been forgotten. I will ask the Minister two questions and then make one final brief observation. How will the Government ensure that we widen the criteria for businesses to be able to use the service, and what mechanisms will they put in place to allow SMEs to properly, fairly and quickly settle disputes with the banks?

My final observation goes back to the financial crash. We remember the actions of RBS, GRG and a variety of comparable outfits. Instead of restructuring those businesses to allow them to thrive, prosper, trade and grow again in the future, there was a perception—backed by some fact—that the banks were looking at asset-rich, cash-poor businesses to raid and pillage. From my time on the Treasury Committee, I am happy and confident to say that. The perception among the business community is that businesses were there to be raided by the banks, rather than helped. Trust between businesses, particularly small ones, and the mainstream banks broke down entirely. If I were the Government, I would be deeply concerned, looking at the headlines that have already been generated and the self-evident failure and lack of transparency within the BBRS, that it may not take an

awful lot more for businesses to once again lose trust in the high street banks. I hope that the Minister will comment on that in his response.

2.57 pm

**Tulip Siddiq** (Hampstead and Kilburn) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve with you in the Chair, Mr Pritchard, and I thank the hon. Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg) for securing this timely debate.

Small and medium-sized businesses are the lifeblood of our economy and our communities, as I am sure everyone will agree. The smaller companies driving growth and creating jobs in every part of the UK deserve to be able to fairly resolve disputes with their lenders, and the BBRS was designed to do just that. That is why some of the issues with the BBRS, which we have heard about today from Members across the House, are so concerning and deserve to be looked at by the Treasury.

The BBRS emerged from the Walker review in 2018, after the Government chose not to accept calls from both the Financial Conduct Authority and the Treasury Committee for formal regulation of SME lending. In their 2018 response to the Treasury Committee's report on SME finance, the Government gave several reasons for not accepting those calls and to justify their view that an ombudsman-style approach to dispute resolution was preferable to a statutory body. First, a statutory body and regulation could negatively impact SMEs' ability to access finance. Secondly, there would be no real difference in how an ombudsman or a statutory body would make adjudications. Thirdly, an ombudsman would represent a less costly process for SMEs. Fourthly, an ombudsman would be able to arrive at decisions more quickly. Finally, a statutory body would require primary legislation—a response not proportionate to the problems faced by SMEs.

I hope that the Minister will address this question, five years on and in the light of the issues raised today. Does he believe that his Government's reasoning still holds, that the cost of a statutory body and formal regulation would still outweigh the benefits and that the evidence on the ground suggests a new approach is needed, including for those businesses deemed too large for the Financial Ombudsman Service and which fall under the remit of the BBRS? For example, the Walker review estimated that more than 60,000 cases would be eligible for review by the BBRS, of which 6,000 were expected to register. However, according to the BBRS's figures as of June 2023, only 28 cases, both historical and contemporary, directly adjudicated by the service, have resulted in financial awards being made.

We have heard numerous concerns about the transparency and accountability of the service in relation to the low number of cases and financial settlements, most notably those raised by Antony Townsend, who said it was too difficult for him to make progress when he resigned as chair of the BBRS SME liaison panel in March. Cat MacLean voiced similar concerns when she resigned last year, as the Minister will know. In 2019, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond stated that if the scheme did not bring resolution to a meaningful number of cases, he would expect further discussions about its scope and eligibility. Does the Minister believe his former Chancellor's threshold for further thought on the effectiveness of the scheme has

[*Tulip Siddiq*]

been reached? In particular, what assessment has the Minister made of the proposal to extend the jurisdiction of the Financial Ombudsman Service to take complaints from businesses with a turnover of up to £10 million?

I understand that the FCA recently concluded a call for input to inform its review of whether the thresholds for SMEs to access the Financial Ombudsman Service remained appropriate. However, since the consultation closed in April, businesses have received no update. Considering the concerns we have heard today, I hope the Minister will set out how the Treasury will work with the FCA to ensure that a timely and satisfactory outcome to the review is brought forward for Britain's business community.

SMEs are vital to the UK economy. British businesses deserve a tax and payment system, procurement process and dispute resolution service that work for them. That is why I look forward to hearing the Minister talk about how the Treasury will respond to the concerns outlined in today's debate. In particular, does he think we need a new approach to the resolution of disputes between SMEs and lenders? How will the Government work to ensure there is sufficient transparency and accountability in the resolution process? Finally, does the Minister believe it is time to widen access to the Financial Ombudsman Service?

3.2 pm

**The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Andrew Griffith):** It is a pleasure to serve with you in the Chair, Mr Pritchard. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg) on securing the debate on his behalf and that of the all-party parliamentary group on fair business banking. In my short time in this role, I have seen that the APPG does a significant job and gives a voice to our all-important small businesses.

We are a nation of small businesses. They employ a vast number of people in the economy and make a huge contribution and, as other speakers have said, it is vital that they secure access to the finance and capital that they need to grow, expand and do the wonderful things they do to help the UK economy. As part of that, it is critical when things go wrong—regrettably, they sometimes do—and businesses face issues with their bank, they can access efficient and unbiased dispute resolution. We all aspire to a quick, efficient and affordable process in that regard, which allows for unbiased outcomes for those businesses. Those are the higher-order objectives that we seek.

For context, it is not my role today to defend the BBRS. It is an independent body and is not a part of Government or the Treasury. I will share the same context about it being set up following a number of interventions by Parliament. We will not truthfully know whether the deficiency was in the overestimate of the number of cases or the effectiveness of the BBRS system. Given that we know that the BBRS is effectively headed for the exit in all circumstances, that is moot, although the question of how individuals and businesses get redress is not. That, I absolutely accept, is a responsibility of the Treasury; it is how we can ensure good order on this.

The more generous in spirit among us might accept that the BBRS was set up with good intentions, but as we have heard from Members here today, that has not

perhaps been the experience. I understand that and have listened very closely to today's debate, and perhaps my hon. Friend the Member for Hazel Grove would care to meet me to share his own particular constituent experience. I understand that is a long-standing piece of casework, and sometimes such specific examples illustrate the more general point that we have heard from Members today given that there are clearly a number of cases.

**Kirsten Oswald:** The Minister has offered to meet the hon. Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg), who secured the debate, which I am sure is very welcome, but might he feel able to extend that offer to others of us who have long-standing cases in this field that are difficult to resolve?

**Andrew Griffith:** I want to be a listening Minister and am of course very happy to do that, but in so doing I do not want to hold out a false expectation. These matters are not directly the subject of ministerial interventions, so while I am very happy to meet the hon. Lady, and, again, use those examples to inform the wider policy area, in fairness it is important for people in the Public Gallery or who might be following the debate that I do not raise false expectations, because some of these matters have involved great trauma to individuals and have been going on for a long period of time. I would be grateful if the hon. Lady could frame things in that important context, but of course I would be happy to meet her and, lest I receive more interventions, that is a general point for Members of this House. It is right that I approach my responsibility diligently as we try to formulate policy.

As we go forward, whatever past decisions have been made in this respect, I am very keen to understand—the hon. Member for Hampstead and Kilburn (Tulip Siddiq) talked about this—the role of the Financial Ombudsman Service, which successfully deals with tens of thousands of complaints each year now, including SMEs up to the threshold of £6.5 million. The Financial Conduct Authority—whose decision it must be, but with the support of Ministers—has looked to extend that upper threshold, and it is consulting; perhaps Members have responded, like the APPG has.

I spoke to the chief executive of the FCA and gave him great encouragement that, the consultation having been closed in April of this year, we will shortly hear the response. I hope the House will await that, because it is my belief that one should look again at the merits of this versus a statutory tribunal, which I believe still has some of the disadvantages that the hon. Member for Hampstead and Kilburn outlined, particularly in terms of the need for primary legislation but also the non-material differences between an ombudsman service which exists, is seen to work generally in practice—although I am always open to representations—versus yet another novel intervention in the form of a new statutory tribunal.

**Stewart Hosie:** Can I just get a guarantee that there will be no gap between the removal of the BBRS and the decision taken on the thresholds that can be reached and potentially another body, statutory or voluntary—that there will be no gaps or black hole that businesses might fall into at some point in the near future, whether in months or years?

**Andrew Griffith:** The right hon. Member makes a fair point. The cracks that exist in the compensation regime are a challenging feature. That is one reason why I am attracted to using as much of the existing architecture as possible precisely to avoid that point about cracks.

**George Eustice** (Camborne and Redruth) (Con): I apologise that I missed the opening speech because I had another meeting. If a lender were to try to enforce security in respect of a residential mortgage on a home, they would first need to go to a court to get a possession order. When it comes to business lending, a bank can enforce their security without any recourse to the courts at all. Does the Minister think that that is something we should look at?

**Andrew Griffith:** My right hon. Friend raises an important point. It would not be right to say that we should not look at it, but he raises this in the closing minutes of the debate and he knows that these areas can be fraught. One of the most challenging things about the regulation of financial services in general is the unintended consequences. The hon. Member for Hampstead and Kilburn talked about that, and we do not want to see any diminution in access to capital that could prevent our small businesses from growing. I would be happy to meet my right hon. Friend to understand the issue he raises in more detail, but I do not want to go any further from the Dispatch Box on that.

We have heard the importance of this matter to constituents of hon. and right hon. Members. We are united in this House on the importance of the provision of that lifeblood of business growth capital for our small businesses, which lack some of the sophistication and have been predated on by the banking sector in the

past. That is not acceptable, and it remains the position of the Government to do everything we can to deliver redress where we can and to ensure the financial regulatory regime protects those who need our protection.

3.12 pm

**Mr Wragg:** I thank the Minister for his constructive reply to this important and timely debate. I can respond positively to that kind offer to meet the APPG. Such a meeting would be invaluable for explaining some of our thinking and ideas in greater detail—whether that is an expansion of the Financial Ombudsman Service or, indeed, the establishment of a statutory tribunal system. Each has things to be said for them, but that is something to be worked through. Our preference would be on the basis of a tribunal.

To echo the remarks made by the right hon. Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie), we cannot have people falling through the cracks. We should be particularly mindful of the 600 businesses that have applied to the existing BBRS scheme and the status of their complaints. To finish on a phrase that is often used and can be seen as trite, but is absolutely applicable to this scandal, which has afflicted so many SMEs across our United Kingdom: justice delayed is justice denied. We should be mindful of that as we seek to bring about long overdue justice for those small businesses.

*Question put and agreed to.*

*Resolved,*

That this House has considered the Business Banking Resolution Service.

3.14 pm

*Sitting suspended.*



## Two-child Benefit Cap and Child Poverty

4 pm

**Kim Johnson** (Liverpool, Riverside) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered the two-child benefit cap and child poverty.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I am grateful to have the opportunity to lead this debate and raise the issue of the two-child benefit cap and its impact on child poverty. I put on record my thanks to all those who have championed this campaign in the six years since the cruel cap was introduced in April 2017, including the Bishop of Durham and the child of the north all-party parliamentary group on which I sit, who have led and supported the debate in the House of Lords and brought a private Member's Bill to the other place on this issue. I am also grateful to the End Child Poverty coalition and all the member organisations for their "All Kids Count" campaign and for providing the statistics on the widespread effect of the two-child cap on benefits that I and others will use in this debate.

The explosion of child poverty we witness today has been the No. 1 by-product of the last 13 years of Tory austerity. The current cost of living crisis is adding unbearable pressure to an already critical situation for many families who are struggling to make ends meet.

**Mick Whitley** (Birkenhead) (Lab): I thank my hon. Friend for the impassioned contribution she is making. Scrapping the cruel and pernicious two-child limit would be the most cost-effective way of reducing child poverty, lifting a quarter of a million children out of poverty in an instant. The Leader of the Opposition has rightly said that the next Labour Government will be laser-focused on eradicating poverty. Does my hon. Friend agree that to that end, our party should make an explicit commitment to scrap the two-child limit in the first days of the next Labour Government and, in doing so, give hope to the 2,700 young people in my constituency who are currently caught in this two-child trap?

**Kim Johnson:** I thank my hon. Friend for his contribution. I believe that the incoming Labour Government should make every effort to look at eradicating poverty in any way, shape or form. We are seeing a resurgence of Victorian diseases such as malnutrition, rickets and scarlet fever. Children are going to bed with empty bellies and going to school unable to concentrate or learn to their full potential. In recent years, we have heard many heartbreaking stories of children mimicking eating from empty lunch boxes or even attempting to erase their hunger by eating paper and erasers. Children are incredibly aware of the stigma of poverty, and the pressure can have lifelong psychological effects on top of the material impact on educational attainment, life chances and associated health problems.

**Ian Lavery** (Wansbeck) (Lab): It is great to see my hon. Friend bringing this extremely important debate to the Chamber. In the north-east, 12,000 children and families are unable to claim the universal credit benefit because of the two-child cap. Some 5,400 are also not considered eligible because of their child tax credits and their situation with universal credit. Will my hon. Friend say what sort of impact that has on ordinary families not just in the north-east, but up and down the country?

**Kim Johnson:** I thank my hon. Friend for his intervention. The cap has done immeasurable damage to so many families in this country, impacting poverty and driving more families into poverty and not, as this Government anticipated, into work.

**Margaret Greenwood** (Wirral West) (Lab): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing this really important debate. According to the End Child Poverty coalition, more than 2,700 children were living in poverty in my constituency of Wirral West in 2021-22—that is more than 18% of the children. As my hon. Friend has touched on, we know that poverty has an impact on children's educational attainment, happiness and life chances. Does my hon. Friend agree that this is a scandalous state of affairs, it makes absolutely no sense for us to leave this problem unattended and we must end the two-child limit as a matter of urgency?

**Kim Johnson:** I totally agree with my hon. Friend. We need to end this horrendous two-child policy and ensure all children have the opportunity to thrive and grow and not live in poverty.

Last September, when I hosted an event in Parliament in partnership with the End Child Poverty coalition and the National Education Union calling for universal free school meals to help alleviate child poverty and close inequalities in education and health, we heard from some incredible youth ambassadors. They told us of the stigma of being singled out for free school meals. One said the impact was like sitting in a classroom wearing a badge on their back saying they were poor. Another told us she remembered her mother skipping meals to make sure she and her siblings had something to eat and that now, years later, her own relationship with food and the guilt she associated with eating is still having an impact on her. Members in all parts of the House will be painfully aware of so many similar personal stories from the constituents they work with every day.

Last year the Joseph Rowntree Foundation annual report on UK poverty showed that child poverty in families with more than two children increased from 33% to 47% between 2012-13 and 2019-20, reaching levels not seen since before 1997. In my constituency, 11 children in a class of 30 are living in poverty, and of the 1,400 children in households in receipt of universal credit, 444 are not eligible for extra support due to having two or more siblings born after 6 April 2017.

**Rachael Maskell** (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): My hon. Friend mentioned the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, which is based in my constituency. It has done work not only to demonstrate that the two-child limit is having an impact on children but also that the benefits base is not focusing on the essentials and the essential costs. On top of that, the broader rental market area is not paying the way on private rent either. Families in my constituency are struggling with the accumulation of cuts and the drawback that the Government have put in place. Does my hon. Friend understand why this Government are punishing children and families in such a way?

**Kim Johnson:** I do not know why the Government are punishing children and forcing them into poverty. It is a crying shame.

These families are disproportionately affected by increases in the cost of living and, as has just been mentioned, are treated punitively by the benefits system. Some 1.3 million children across the country are currently losing out under the cap, with their families losing on average £3,235 directly out of their pockets. With new stats due on Thursday 13 July, the Child Poverty Action Group and Save the Children predict the number will rise to 1.5 million.

**Beth Winter** (Cynon Valley) (Lab): CPAG has estimated that over 4 million children live in poverty, and that figure is due to rise. More than 5,000 children in my constituency—a third of the children living there—live in poverty. The Welsh Government are currently consulting on their draft child poverty strategy 2023 and there is a big debate in Wales about how we tackle not only child poverty but poverty more widely. Wales is very clear, as Minister for Social Justice Jane Hutt has said, that the two-child limit must be scrapped. Is it not right, and time, that the UK Government listened to the devolved nations and did just that?

**Kim Johnson:** I thank my hon. Friend for the intervention and the Welsh Government for rolling out universal free school meals, and I support her and the Welsh Government in saying we need to end the two-child cap.

Does the Minister really believe it is acceptable for children to suffer more just because of the number of siblings they have? The two-child cap on benefit payments is cruel and ineffective. Larger families are punished, leaving them struggling. A majority—some 55%—of the families affected by the policy are already in work. Black and ethnic minority families and single-parent families are disproportionately impacted, as well as families who rent. The two-child limit creates a huge hole in budgets that simply cannot be plugged by working additional hours. The Government claim that the policy helps to push parents back into work, but after six years, they still cannot provide a single shred of evidence that that is actually the case. The truth is that the policy does nothing to remove barriers, and research from the University of York shows that in some cases, the cap is counterproductive in helping parents back to work.

**Mary Kelly Foy** (City of Durham) (Lab): I thank my hon. Friend for securing this important debate and for all her campaigning on the issue. I completely with her points about poverty and children suffering, but I have a slightly different concern about this punitive policy. Does my hon. Friend agree that it is an absolute disgrace that the rape clause is still in effect? I ask the Minister not to ignore that point. Why is the clause still on the statute book, and why will the Government not repeal it?

**Kim Johnson:** I thank my hon. friend for raising that important point, and I will come to it later.

Last year, 1,830 mums were forced to declare that they were raped in order to be eligible for extra support for their children—compelled to disclose horrific and personal details. The anguish that this demand creates for women has been found to have an impact on their decisions to terminate pregnancies. Just take a second to consider that. Imagine a woman having survived such a deeply traumatic ordeal, to then be faced with a Government policy that makes her feel she can no longer carry on with her pregnancy. It is so deeply cruel

and damaging that we have to ask whether the Ministers who devised that heartless policy had an ounce of compassion between them.

We know that lifting the cap would immediately raise 250,000 children out of poverty, and a further 850,000 out of deep poverty. Campaigners call it the single most effective intervention that would tackle child poverty immediately. It would cost this Government just £1.3 billion. Consider that against the £37 billion that they wasted on a failed test and trace system, the £5 billion that they found for the defence budget in March, or the £9 billion tax cut to corporations and the pensions giveaway for the 1% that they so generously granted in the last Budget.

We know that the money is there to help struggling families, if we can only find the will. Poverty is a political choice, and time and time again this Government have chosen giveaways for the rich and scraps for the rest of us. Inflation is being driven by corporate greed creating record profits for the super-rich. The Government would like us to believe that there is no money to meet basic needs and support struggling families, but the reality is that it is just being hoarded by the 1%.

We are seeing the biggest drop in spending power in 70 years. Total spending on public services is set to be 12% lower in 2027-28 than in 2010, yet the wealth of UK billionaires has more than trebled since the Tories have been in government. With skyrocketing rent and energy bills eating into people's pay packets, disposable income is being squeezed more and more. The record rise in food prices is pushing millions more into food insecurity.

There is a simple fix for this: enhanced workers' rights to ensure that work pays enough to live and raise a family. That way, we can ensure that not a single child in this country goes hungry, and no child gets left behind. The evidence is there for all to see. Punishing families for having more than two children does not push parents back into work; it only drives more children into poverty. Tory austerity cuts were nothing less than an ideological drive to rig the economy in favour of the few at the expense of the many, and children in my constituency and across the country are now paying the price. The impact of growing up in poverty can be lifelong. We cannot wait for a new Labour Government to provide these children with a future; this Government must listen now and lift the two-child cap.

This debate is not the first time that I and many of my colleagues here in Westminster Hall today have raised these issues in this House over the years. We know the tired and misleading lines parroted by the Government, pointing to a rise in employment and a drop in absolute poverty over the course of their leadership of the country, so before the Minister gives his reply, I want him to consider the bleak reality of this situation. Work is no longer a route out of poverty. The Tories have undermined workers' rights and trashed the very concept of work, to the extent that seven out of 10 children living in poverty in this country are in working families. Just let that statistic sink in for a minute: over two thirds of the children who live in poverty in the fifth richest country in the world are struggling because their parents' wages are not enough to live on and raise a family.

In response to my question to the Prime Minister last month about the two-child benefit cap, the Prime Minister responded in his usual manner, by claiming that his Government had lifted 400,000 children out of absolute

[Kim Johnson]

poverty since 2010. I am sure that Members in this Chamber would all agree that, on the face of it, that sounds like a really great achievement and one worth celebrating. However, as the Prime Minister and his Government well know, that statistic is misleading and does not take into account the impact of inflation, which is an approach that can only be described as being grotesquely out of touch during a cost of living crisis, when we see security tags put on basic necessities such as nappies and baby milk.

Economists and organisations such as the Institute for Fiscal Studies use “relative poverty” as a much more accurate measure of the reality of the trajectory in poverty, and this measure clearly shows the deepening trend in child poverty that we see every day in our constituencies. I ask the Minister not to take us for fools today. We are here because we know the desperate reality facing so many of our constituents. We are here to demand better for them. We will not continue to go round in circles debating meaningless numbers while the Government continue to bury their head in the sand and ignore the struggles of the people they were elected to represent.

I thank the Minister again for responding to this debate and the arguments that we have made, and I hope that he can feel the strength of feeling in this Chamber today about the facts of poverty.

4.17 pm

**The Minister for Employment (Guy Opperman):** It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard, and I congratulate the hon. Member for Liverpool, Riverside (Kim Johnson) on securing the debate and on the passionate way that she put her argument today. That passion cannot be doubted in any way whatsoever and due respect is due to her for that.

The Government believe that the best way to support people’s living standards is through work, better skills and higher wages. I regret to say that I will rely on an answer similar to the one that the Prime Minister gave to the hon. Lady at Prime Minister’s questions. Whether she agrees or disagrees with that answer, I hope that she will bear with me as I give it.

In 2021-22, children living in a household in which all the adults were in work were five times less likely to be in absolute poverty after housing costs than children living in workless households. We believe that we have made progress. In 2021-22, there were 1.7 million fewer people in absolute poverty after housing costs than there were in 2009-10, including, as has been made clear, 400,000 fewer children. There are also nearly 1 million fewer workless households now than there were in 2010.

Following the review of the benefit cap levels by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions in November 2022, those levels were increased by 10.1% from April 2023. Let us not forget that households can still receive benefits from the taxpayer up to the equivalent of a salary of £26,500 nationally or £31,300 in London, allowing for London weighting. Also, we uprated the national living wage by 9.7%, increasing our support for both those who are in work and those who are out of work, as well as uprating all benefits by 10.1% in April. That is the largest cash increase ever to the national living wage, which is now up to £10.42 an hour, providing extra support for workers.

Clearly, there are over 1 million vacancies across the UK and our focus is firmly on supporting people into work and helping them to progress in work. That approach is based on clear evidence about the importance of parental employment, particularly where it is full time, in substantially reducing the risks of child poverty.

**Nadia Whittome** (Nottingham East) (Lab): Is the Minister aware of the recent study by the London School of Economics, published last month, that found that the two-child benefit cap policy has not increased employment levels? We can only conclude from that that even on its own terms, the policy is failing while hundreds of thousands of families have been pushed into poverty.

**Guy Opperman:** As I think I have made clear, I do not accept the arguments about poverty. I am not aware of the specific LSE paper that the hon. Lady mentions, but I would make the simple point that in this country we have never given more welfare support or paid higher figures for pensioner support or disability support. Without a shadow of a doubt, there has been massive cost of living support, as I will outline, to the most vulnerable.

**Ian Lavery:** The Minister makes the case for how good this Government have been on benefits, support and work funds. Minister, that is 4.2 million children living in poverty. He cannot be happy with that; he has to admit it is far too high. Secondly, does the Minister think kids sitting round the tea table at night are worried about whether they are in abject poverty, absolute poverty or relative poverty? If you have an empty belly, you have an empty belly, and this Government should be totally ashamed of themselves because of the high statistics and figures that are rising week in, week out.

**Guy Opperman:** With respect, I do not accept that the figures are rising week in, week out. The simple point is surely this: over the past two years, the taxpayer has contributed £94 billion of support to vulnerable households, and that support is ongoing. For example, the energy price guarantee will remain in place as a safety net and a support for households until March 2024. The cost of living payment, which I can go into more detail on, features a further £150 payment to 6 million people, over and above existing benefits, which have gone up by 10%. Over £900 will go to 8 million households on means-tested benefits over the course of the year. The first £301 payment to those on means-tested benefits was made in April.

For pensioners, an additional £300 on top of the winter fuel payment is being paid to over 8 million pensioner households. Such a degree of support has never been provided before, and whatever people’s views are of this Government—positive or otherwise—they have stepped in to the tune of £94 billion with cost of living support over the past two years. As I say, the first £301 payment was recently issued to local people up and down the country.

**Kim Johnson:** Will the Minister give way?

**Guy Opperman:** I will for the last time—I am attempting to answer some of the points.



**Kim Johnson:** Although I appreciate that £94 billion has been issued to the most vulnerable, we are in a crisis. Energy, rent and food are spiralling, so the money people have in their pockets is not going far enough. Does the Minister agree?

**Guy Opperman:** The Government have stepped forward and provided £94 billion of support, worth on average approximately £3,300 per household, because they wish to address those particular problems. We are trying to help individuals on an ongoing basis for that reason.

I will try to make some progress. The hon. Member for Liverpool, Riverside made much of the question of tax. She will know that the richest 1% pay a massive proportion of UK tax and effectively have never paid as much as they presently do. Changes to taxable thresholds were a coalition policy, to be fair to the Liberal Democrats. When we started in government in 2010, low earners paid tax on low earnings as well as trying to take their money home. The taxable thresholds have risen repeatedly so that low earners no longer pay tax in that way; in other words, we have a very progressive policy that assists people who are struggling. Between 2016 and 2023, the number of couples in employment with children increased by 713,000, which is a 3.4% increase in the employment rate for that groups. In the circumstances outlined, child benefit continues to be paid for all children in eligible families, with an additional amount for any qualifying disabled child or qualifying disabled young person also payable regardless of the number of children in the household.

Universal credit offers additional help with eligible childcare costs and is also available regardless of the total number of children in the household. We believe we have a balanced system that provides strong work incentives and support for those who need it—all benefits have been uprated by more than 10%—while ensuring

fairness to the taxpayer and the many working families who not only pay the bills we are talking about but do not see their incomes rise when they have more children.

The Government believe the policy to support a maximum of two children is a proportionate way to achieve these objectives. Similarly, the benefit cap provides both a strong work incentive and fairness for hard-working tax-paying households. It encourages people to move into work wherever possible. The work incentive introduced by the Government will also support people to move into work and increase their earnings, which will significantly increase the likelihood of a household not being affected by the cap. Universal credit households with earnings of £722 a month are also exempt from the cap.

I finish on a couple of key points. Clearly, there is a massive amount of cost of living support. However, I respectfully say that universal credit should be lauded and supported. I do not believe it is Labour party policy to scrap the two-child policy, but whatever happens there is no question that the legacy system that could not in any way cope with variable earnings and allow people to progress in work has been rightly replaced by universal credit, which allows people to work while also being constantly supported and in a position wherein they are never worse off under universal credit.

In conclusion, I welcome the contribution of the hon. Member for Liverpool, Riverside to the debate and I share her concern that children should be supported by the social security system. I respectfully suggest that there is ample evidence showing that that is the case. We are very much of the view that—whether it is through the 10% benefits increase, the £94 billion of support to vulnerable households, the uprating of the national living wage or the work of jobcentres up and down the country to support in-work progression—there is support out there.

*Question put and agreed to.*

## Antisocial Behaviour and Off-road Bikes

4.30 pm

**Matt Vickers** (Stockton South) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered antisocial behaviour and off-road bikes.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I bring forward this debate out of frustration for residents across my constituency whose lives are being made a misery by antisocial behaviour and off-road bikes. The issue has been raised time and again; I make no apology for dragging people to the Chamber to debate the issue once more in the hope that we can find a way forward. I have raised the issue numerous times with my local police force, my local police and crime commissioner, the local council and Government Ministers. From the looks of the turn out in the Chamber—despite the challenges with today's schedule—the issue appears to affect people right across the country.

In my constituency of Stockton South, antisocial behaviour with off-road bikes manifests itself in areas across the patch. There is, however, a constant flow of problems in some of our most beautiful and scenic spaces, including green spaces in Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby, the Six Fields in Hartburn, Preston park and a beautiful and previously peaceful walkway that connects Bishop Garth and Elm Tree and Fairfield, which has recently come to resemble a racetrack—and there is little care for anyone who gets in the way. The issue also plagues our urban areas, housing estates and main roads across Thornaby, Ingleby Barwick and others.

The nature of incidents, nuisances and crime involving the misuse of dirt bikes, quads, electric bikes and scooters varies, but in all instances has huge consequences. Let me share a couple of examples of the impact that those bikes and the youths that misuse them have on my residents. I have heard from a pensioner who lives with her husband in a beautiful bungalow backing on to a field, previously filled with birdsong and nature. She and her disabled husband now spend most evenings listening to the roar of the bikes flying around that field, and the cuts and walkways surrounding it, at all hours. They have had vehicles come through their fence as well as mud and grit churned up on their property and they fear leaving their home at night for risk of being hit. They dare not confront the nasty and unruly youngsters who ride the bikes.

I have heard stories of young families looking to enjoy some of Stockton's beautiful green spaces, only to be intimidated by youngsters on bikes, in broad daylight, driving at speed and ridiculously close in an effort to intentionally scare, harass and intimidate them. We have now got to a point where some of those youngsters feel that they are above the law, and to be honest, it appears that they are. Each weekend, balaclava-clad feral teenagers drive down normal residential streets creating fear and havoc, with no regard for the lives of people around them. It is simply unacceptable and it cannot go on.

**Alexander Stafford** (Rother Valley) (Con): I thank my hon. Friend for securing this important debate on off-road bikes. Such antisocial behaviour not only disrupts the lives of my constituents but damages livelihoods and farmland, creating absolute misery for people who live in areas where the off-road bikers go. Does he agree

with me that the police need to take those people for what they are, which is proper criminals, rather than mere nuisances, and use every power available to stop the menaces that terrorise residents in Rother Valley and across the country?

**Matt Vickers:** My hon. Friend is entirely right. We need to look at what the law is and how we can empower our police to tackle something that makes so many people's lives a misery. Just yesterday in Stockton, three people were hurt in incidents involving off-road and electric bikes, including a three-year-old on his way home from school who was hospitalised after being hit by an electric bike.

**Margaret Ferrier** (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (Ind): Throughout the UK there is pressure on police to come up with innovative ways to stamp out the antisocial use of off-road bikes. Those methods include seizing vehicles, tenancy enforcement action and SmartTag spray. Does the hon. Member believe that other enforcement measures should also be pursued so as to not add more pressure on overstretched forces?

**Matt Vickers:** I agree entirely with the hon. Member. Sometimes it is about the best use of the resources available to us. Actually, across the country it is clear that we need to learn lessons and put best practice to use to tackle the horrendous situation. I cannot comment on the details of the youngster who was hurt yesterday, but it illustrates the horrendous consequences those bikes can have when allowed to ride roughshod across our communities.

I ask the Government to get a grip on this growing issue. We cannot wait for someone else to lose their life; too many people in my community are already losing their quality of life. In the past year, the number of reports to my local police has gone up by about 40%. Local police, led by our police and crime commissioner, Steve Turner, have been making innovative efforts to identify the whereabouts of these bikes and seize them. The force has developed an online reporting tool and has made use of drones. In April and May this year, Cleveland police seized 180 bikes as part of Operation Endurance—yes, 180 bikes were taken off our streets—but we still saw last night's incident, and I am sure we will see many more.

In advance of the debate, I have had conversations with police officers and officers from my local council about what more the Government can do to support them in getting a grip on the issue. We need to find a balance with those who use these bikes legitimately, but the pendulum has swung too far. We need a real change to bring this misery to an end.

**Robbie Moore** (Keighley) (Con): I thank my hon. Friend for securing this important debate. We are all sick to the back teeth of people causing havoc. In the Worth valley in my constituency and across Ilkley moor, I see people going off road on bikes and being a real menace. It is good that the Government are taking action by putting out a section 59 notice in certain pilot areas such as Darlington, but does my hon. Friend agree that we need to go further? When the bikes are seized, they should be taken away and crushed so that those individuals cannot buy them back at a later date. That will be a proper deterrent and will ensure that off-road biking does not cause havoc for our constituents.

**Matt Vickers:** My hon. Friend is entirely correct: we need to go further and faster, because this is an absolute plague on communities across the country. I ask the Government to look again at regulating and licensing the sale of these bikes—off-road bikes, quads, electronic bikes and scooters—and the petrol used in them. I ask them to look at what we can do to make it easier for the police to seize the bikes by looking at any threshold for evidence of misuse. The Government need to deliver tougher sanctions and consequences for those found to misuse bikes, and perhaps in some cases for their parents too. As I said, 180 bikes have been seized, but there is little to prevent the owners from buying back their bike or another one, which can cost just a couple of hundred pounds.

**Peter Gibson (Darlington) (Con):** What consideration has my hon. Friend given to further measures that the industry, the Department for Transport and the Home Office can introduce? Compelling the installation of immobilisers in these vehicles, compulsory registration and compulsory insurance would go a long way to tackle the problem.

**Matt Vickers:** My hon. Friend is entirely right. My ask is for the Government to find a national strategy to look at good practice and end this horrible situation. They should look at what we can do on licensing and in public spaces. We need more guidance for local authorities that are putting in place measures to impede motorbikes in public spaces. In my constituency, a barrier was removed in Bishopsgarth to allow disabled access to a walkway, and the result has been hordes of youngsters on off-road bikes tearing up and down. Bikes have even been used to deal drugs in that space. The local authority is looking at alternative measures, but the lessons should be learned once and shared across public bodies.

**Margaret Ferrier:** Reports in the media highlight that food delivery drivers on e-bikes are causing a nuisance in city centres. They sometimes drive on pavements, and that puts locals off journeying into town. Does the hon. Gentleman agree that that related issue also requires urgent intervention?

**Matt Vickers:** The hon. Lady is entirely right. For all the reasons that hon. Members have raised and that I have outlined, we need a national strategy for dealing with these vehicles so that we can share learning and best practice, and empower our local authorities and the police to get a grip on this issue.

People across Stockton are sick of the misery, harm and distress caused by a small few mindless youths misusing vehicles. All too often, my constituents are unable to see the work authorities are doing to tackle the issue.

**Kim Leadbeater (Batley and Spen) (Lab):** The hon. Gentleman is making an excellent speech, and I agree with pretty much every word of it. It certainly applies to my constituents in Batley and Spen. Does he agree that there is a correlation between antisocial behaviour with off-road bikes and the cuts to our police forces over the past decade?

**Matt Vickers:** Resource is part of it, and part of it is about learning the lessons and making the best use of the resource. In my part of the world, there are 267 more

police officers on our streets, and we are feeling the impact of that, but I fear that, due to the frustrations of the public, someone will try to take the law into their own hands, stand up to these yobs and find themselves on the wrong side of the law. I urge the Minister to ensure that the law is on the side of the many law-abiding citizens in my constituency, who want to be free to go about their lives without the fear of feral yobs on bikes.

4.40 pm

**Navendu Mishra (Stockport) (Lab):** It is a pleasure to serve under your chairship, Mr Pritchard. I congratulate the hon. Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers) on securing the debate. People who are less familiar with Stockport often confuse it with Stockton, so it is interesting to be in this debate and to thank the hon. Member for securing it.

Moving on to more serious matters, I think the hon. Gentleman mentioned he has 264 more police officers on the street recently. Is the Minister aware of how many we have lost since 2010, when the austerity agenda came in? The Government have cut the grant to my local force, Greater Manchester police, by £215 million since 2010. As a direct result, we have 2,000 fewer police officers on our streets, and 1,000 fewer support officers. I am grateful to everyone at Greater Manchester police for the difficult job they do in challenging circumstances. I also want to highlight the important job done by police support officers.

My office receives a large amount of correspondence about antisocial behaviour and illegal off-road bikes. The issue seems more pronounced in the summer months. I have often seen and reported illegal off-road bikes in my constituency to the police. They cause a lot of problems for residents. People who live on their own, are elderly or have health or mobility issues feel quite threatened in their own homes, due to antisocial behaviour and illegal off-road bikes. It is sad to say that my office receives a lot of letters, emails and phone calls—the figure for the last few weeks is around 250 pieces of correspondence about antisocial behaviour, and around 40 about illegal off-road bikes. I meet the police regularly to get updates, and I hold regular resident meetings to talk about these matters and learn the fundamental issues from residents.

It is all well and good for the Government to talk about what they are going to do, but they have significantly cut police funding in the last 13 years—although the solution cannot just be more police on the street; there has to be a well-rounded solution.

**Peter Gibson:** I am interested in the point the hon. Gentleman is making, but does he acknowledge that we now have more officers in our police forces nationwide than ever before?

**Navendu Mishra:** I thank the hon. Member for his intervention. He is making an important point, but I wonder whether he has compared the rise in police officers with the rise in population, and the complexity of crime. It is not just about more men and women in police uniforms on the street; it is also about the type of work they do.

I have been in the constituency with officers who tell me that they have to do more and more in less and less time. The types of crime being committed can be extremely



[Navendu Mishra]

complex and time-consuming. A few months ago, an officer told me about the impact of the workload on her mental health. We have to be realistic about the nature of crime, the amount and complexity of crime, and the understaffing. All those issues have to be addressed. It might be fair to say that there are more police officers now than ever, but the population has also gone up, and the nature and complexity of crime have also changed.

**Alexander Stafford:** We are talking about the complexity of crime. Off-road bikes, antisocial behaviour and auto-crime are complex crimes. Does the hon. Gentleman agree that we need bespoke solutions to deal with that? In South Yorkshire, we have an off-road bike team that does an amazing job, but there is only a handful of them doing that. Does he agree that some of those extra officers need to go into more off-road bike teams, with their own quad bikes, to tackle the people who are riding their own bikes? We need to have the right officers doing the right jobs to deal with this particular type of crime.

**Navendu Mishra:** Absolutely. The hon. Gentleman makes a fair point. We have a dedicated team in Greater Manchester police that deals with illegal off-road bike crime. I wish there were more officers on that team, of course. We have had several issues with Greater Manchester police over the last few years. I cannot comment on South Yorkshire police; I am not an expert on South Yorkshire.

The force, under new leadership in the last couple of years, has done a lot of good work. As I said earlier, I want to thank officers in Greater Manchester police, but the reality is that they are still underfunded and could do a lot more. It seems to me that the Government do not have that on their list of priorities. Living in one's own home and being threatened by antisocial behaviour and illegal off-road bikes, with people wearing full face coverings, might be low intensity, but it can be serious for people.

I will make a couple of concluding points. There are high levels of antisocial behaviour in Stockport and across Britain. My local council has seen a 30% cut to its settlement funding. I do not think we would have seen such high levels of crime if the local council funding had not been cut and if Greater Manchester police's funding—police funding in general—had not been cut. The solution cannot just be talking about putting more and more police officers on the street. We have to talk about youth clubs and what we offer these young people. We have to talk about support services and all those issues.

Finally, more generally in the north-west, between 2015 and 2022 there was a 41% fall in the number of neighbourhood police. The figures are staggering. I hope the Minister will address these important issues, particularly the complexity of the problem and the workload for police officers. We have seen crime go up, but prosecutions, cautions and community penalties have all gone down. That is a fact. Too often, when people report crimes or antisocial behaviour, they feel that absolutely nothing is done. That seems to be what many people feel, not just in Stockport but across Greater Manchester and England. It has to be addressed.

4.46 pm

**Peter Gibson (Darlington) (Con):** It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I want to begin my congratulating my neighbour, my hon. Friend the Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers), on securing this important debate. He knows, as do I, that antisocial behaviour and the fear of it is of great concern to our constituents. It is a blight on our society, imprisoning people in their homes, making them fearful of venturing out, and turning parts of our community into perceived no-go areas. That cannot be right in a civilised society.

Off-road bikes have long been a cause for concern in Darlington. Having raised this matter a number of times in the House before, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the issue again today. Off-road bikes and quad bikes are the vehicle of choice for those in my community who want to tear-arse around our estates and parks, creating noise pollution, posing an intimidating danger to pedestrians and making life grim for those who live nearby. Parents are fearful of the danger to their children. Pedestrians are fearful of being knocked over. The all-pervading drone of the engines can make parts of our community feel inhospitable. We must do more to rid our communities of this problem.

I praise Durham constabulary's Operation Endurance, which is focused on tackling this scourge and has had an appreciable impact on tackling this form of antisocial behaviour. Since February last year, section 59 warning signs have been erected to notify offenders of the new powers. Anyone now seen riding an off-road bike, quad or 4x4 in Darlington will have their vehicle seized straightaway by the police, if they can catch them. Durham constabulary has issued a number of fixed penalty notices, speeding tickets and barring notices. We have seen a significant number of illegal quads and off-road bikes seized. These actions are working. They are removing the ability of offenders to offend and acting as a deterrent by demonstrating real consequences to those involved, but we need even more action.

Durham constabulary and Darlington Borough Council have worked closely to tackle this problem over the past year, and I hope that the new Labour and Lib Dem coalition administration will continue to work with me and the police so that we can continue to make progress in this area. I will soon be meeting with Robert Potts, our police and crime commissioner candidate, to ensure that he is fully up to speed on this issue. He is laser-focused on the steps needed to go further in our community.

It is vital that local communities play their part in tackling the scourge if enforcement is to be successful. I repeat my message that every sight and every sound of off-road bikes should be reported, so that our police force can gather the intelligence it needs to eliminate the problem.

**Margaret Ferrier:** Many of those who are irresponsibly using off-road bikes do so on uninsured and unregistered vehicles. Does the hon. Member agree that the current legislation is not a sufficient deterrent to those perpetuating antisocial behaviour on road bikes and must be reviewed swiftly?

**Peter Gibson:** It is a pleasure to see the hon. Lady in the Chamber, and I wholeheartedly agree with her point. Insurance and registration are important matters, which I raised in my earlier intervention and will address further in my speech.

For my part, as the MP for Darlington, I have continued to share Durham Constabulary's messaging of reporting the problem to 999 if people feel they are in danger, or to the 101 service if the incident has passed. I could say much more about our Labour police and crime commissioner's ability to improve the response times for the 101 service, or the closure of our custody suite in Darlington, or the threat of the closure of Cockerton police station, but I will remain focused on the topic at hand.

In tackling this problem further, which I know is not limited to Darlington, I would ask the Minister to respond to the simple, practical and sensible suggestions that I outlined earlier. Compulsory insurance for off-road and quad bikes would dissuade the casual user from illegal use of bikes on the road. Compulsory registration of off-road bikes would make the identification of these vehicles much easier for law enforcement. Mandating manufacturers to install immobilisers on these vehicles would also help to reduce theft and the misuse of them by unauthorised riders. These points have been raised in discussion with Ministers in the past. I encourage Home Office, Transport and indeed Justice Ministers to work more closely on a package of measures to tackle the antisocial behaviour associated with off-road bikes.

A further point about off-road bikes is what happens after the vehicle is seized. Currently, the police recoup their recovery and storage costs for seized vehicles by auctioning them off in order to recover costs. That leads to a merry-go-round of offenders buying back vehicles. Our forces need a ringfenced pot of money to enable them to crush these vehicles and meet the costs of recovery.

But off-road bikes are not the only issue; we face many other types of antisocial behaviour in Darlington. The illegal and unacceptable fly-tipping in our alley ways by fly-by-night operators who will rock up in a transit van or flatbed truck is a real issue. They will offer to take a household's rubbish away for a tenner, avoiding the inconvenience of contacting the council or taking a trip to the tip. Having done shifts with Street Scene, Darlington Borough Council's environmental services department, I have seen first hand the impact of this issue on local residents and the town as a whole. Street Scene is continuing to work hard to tackle this scourge, with increased prosecution of those found to be fly-tipping, and with Street Scene responding speedily to incidents and taking a proactive approach to rooting out those responsible.

Finally, while our Government and constabularies are tackling antisocial behaviour, more can be done with cross-Government working to tackle issues and ringfence pots of money to support the steps we need to take to reduce these problems. I know the Minister will have listened closely to this debate, and I take this opportunity—as I did in the last debate on antisocial behaviour I attended—to invite him and others in his Department to Darlington to see first hand the problems we are experiencing and the actions and the further solutions we need to tackle antisocial behaviour in Darlington.

4.53 pm

**Kim Leadbeater** (Batley and Spen) (Lab): I thank the hon. Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers) for securing this important debate. In the two years that I have been a Member of this House, antisocial behaviour

and dangerous and inconsiderate driving have been perhaps the two biggest issues raised with me by constituents. Hardly a week goes by without people getting in touch about the risk to pedestrians and other road users, and the intimidating behaviour by what are, for the most part, teenagers and young men showing a total disregard for the safety of others.

I have held numerous meetings with the police, the council, the deputy mayor for policing and others to look for solutions to these problems—solutions that require a multi-agency approach. *[Interruption.]*

**Mark Pritchard (in the Chair):** Order. I will suspend the sitting for the Division, and we will carry on the debate when we return. I understand there will be a lot of votes back to back, but I ask colleagues, particularly the Minister—or a Minister—and the mover of the motion, to get back very quickly after the last vote.

4.54 pm

*Sitting suspended for Divisions in the House.*

8.31 pm

*On resuming—*

**Kim Leadbeater:** I will return in a moment to why trying to make progress towards those solutions is so frustrating for me and, more importantly, the residents affected. Just last week I held a roundtable on antisocial behaviour at my office in Heckmondwike, and later this week I will be holding another on road safety. I find such opportunities to get everyone together to address problems very powerful. Although we have made some progress locally, I will not pretend that there is not a much bigger piece of work to be done to get enforcement, and the political and cultural changes we need, to change behaviours and bear down on offenders.

The contributions of the various agencies involved are valuable in setting out what is being done and what more could be done if the resources were available. For me, the most important voices are those of the victims of this hugely disruptive and damaging antisocial behaviour, on whose lives it has a significant impact.

One man from the Fieldhead estate in Birstall told me how seriously his whole family has been impacted. He said:

“The estate is currently plagued with nuisance motorcycles and quad bikes. I have sent many photos and videos to the police and have called them numerous times. Three this week alone. It's not just the noise, that scares my children to tears, it's the fact that they ride them around at speeds in excess of 60-70 mph, wear no helmets, ride on the pavement and between the houses and have absolutely no consideration for other residents around, including children that are playing in the streets.

The bikers nearly hit my daughter as she was walking home. On another occasion one guy on a moped almost hit my step mother as she got out of her car. He was speeding and pulling a wheelie as he flew passed.

I am at the end of my tether with it. The police have little to no power and when they do remove the bikes from the riders, they have a different bike in a matter of days.”

A constituent from Gomersal described

“young lads on trial bikes who are riding round our area wearing balaclavas and no helmets. They have no regard for anybody on the road, footpaths or anybody crossing the roads.”

He added:

“I really do believe it is only a matter of time before these people kill somebody.”

[*Kim Leadbeater*]

I am pleased to say that, in response to the issues raised with me, the police have stepped up patrols, and a number of bikes have been seized. They really want to do more, but it will come as no surprise to hear that they simply do not have the resources or the manpower. John Robins, chief constable of West Yorkshire police, said just last week that the cuts mean that he simply cannot deliver what he wants to deliver as a professional police officer. Since 2010, West Yorkshire has seen cuts to its budget of £165 million and the loss of 2,000 officers. At the same time that police numbers have fallen, there have been cuts to child, youth and community services. Too often, the voluntary and private sectors have to step in to try and fill the void. I want to pay tribute to local charities and organisations that do a fantastic job providing activities for young people to give them a focus and help to keep out them of trouble. Jack Sunderland and his team at the Training Cave in Birstall encourage young people to put their time and energy into boxing, while BUMPY, also in Birstall, offers on and off-road motorbiking sessions and qualifications to young people and adults, including some of the most vulnerable, in a safe environment.

**The Minister for Crime, Policing and Fire (Chris Philp):**

The hon. Lady said a moment ago that police numbers in—was it South Yorkshire?

**Kim Leadbeater:** West Yorkshire.

**Chris Philp:** The hon. Lady said that police numbers in West Yorkshire had fallen. I gently say this: in March 2010, West Yorkshire had 5,856 police officers; in March this year, there were 6,160. Far from being cut, there are now 300 more officers than there were in 2010. I am sure that was inadvertent.

**Kim Leadbeater:** I am happy to be corrected if that is the case, but the deputy mayor for policing in West Yorkshire gave me those figures.

**Chris Philp:** Well, she is wrong.

**Kim Leadbeater:** I am happy to check and apologise if that is the case.

Going back to organisations in my constituency and across the country, Sustrans does a fantastic job of looking after the wonderful Spen Valley Greenway. However, like many charities, it is struggling for funding, and next year it will no longer be able to fund Rob Winslade, our dedicated warden. I am seriously worried about the impact that that will have on the greenway's safety.

There are many other groups in Batley and Spen, as in all our constituencies, which do similar excellent work. They are keen to be part of the solution to tackling the problems of antisocial behaviour and specifically off-road bikes. However, the truth is that without a systematic, Government-led strategy to properly resource and fund our police force and to provide a proper range of community services, including sport and physical activity provision for young people, we will continue to have the kind of problems we have discussed today. Leadership at a political level is required, with the aim of helping as many people as possible to feel fit, healthy and fulfilled, and of building communities that everybody can feel proud of and want to protect.

We need a shift in culture, but that will not happen by itself. I recently proposed a health and wellbeing strategy that would bring together all Departments of Government alongside local authorities, charities and voluntary organisations, as well as the private sector, to help produce a happier, healthier and safer nation. It will not happen overnight, but the current Government are not doing anywhere near enough to make that happen. I finish by thanking everyone in my constituency and across the country for their fantastic work on this important agenda.

8.37 pm

**Ashley Dalton** (West Lancashire) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I congratulate the hon. Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers) on securing the debate and I thank him for it.

I have always been of the opinion that politics is local. The issues that we discuss here are of so much significance to our constituents because they affect them. Like others who have spoken, I have an inbox full of messages from constituents who are concerned about our focus today, which is an extremely damaging issue for our communities. In Skelmersdale, in my West Lancashire constituency, residents are contacting me to report bikes tearing up and down estates at all hours of the day and night, terrorising local people at speeds of up to 50 mph. Local residents report that they hear the bikes coming before they can see them, with the noise carrying on for hours at a time, three to four times a week.

Much more troubling is residents' concern about their safety as a result of that behaviour. My constituents are telling their children not to play out in the street—the place where they live—for fear of the bikes, and residents have described the activity in the local press as “an accident waiting to happen”,

yet they dare not report the issue to the police for fear of retaliatory crime.

A simple online search will bring up reports of residents who complain about being targeted with attacks on their properties and, in the worst instances, arson. Good, honest and hard-working people are having their lives blighted by the reckless and selfish actions of those on bikes. Also, as perpetrators come and go at all hours of the day, it is hard for the police to react when offences occur. Even if the police are quick enough to react, a potential chase through residential streets poses further danger to local residents. It has reached the point where Lancashire police are now working with the Labour West Lancashire Borough Council to impose public spaces protection orders to try to get to grips with the ongoing nuisance, yet more concerning is the link between off-road bikes and organised crime, such as the distribution of drugs, which bring with them a whole raft of other antisocial behaviours and yet more illegal activities.

Reports of such vehicles being used to ferry illegal substances around communities and distribute drugs are widespread. Evidence of the link between bikes and drugs has been found right across the country, from Stockton, which the hon. Member who led the debate represents, to Glasgow, Manchester, Preston and Leicester. In fact, the issue has become so problematic in Leicester that the east midlands special operations unit has been established and tasked to address the problem.



I am not suggesting that all off-road bike-users are dealing drugs, and nor am I saying that to eliminate the issue of antisocial behaviour and bike use would be a silver bullet in eradicating drug crime, but it would certainly help to address the issue and provide some respite for my constituents, who are suffering due to noise, fear and the risk to their safety. The impact of antisocial behaviour is so far reaching, and I hear about it so much from my constituents, that I felt compelled to raise it with the Lancashire police and crime commissioner, Andrew Snowden, when I met him yesterday.

New technologies offer alternative ways to begin to address the problem. West Midlands police and Hampshire police, for instance, have both used drones to identify offenders and get more accurate descriptions than local residents can offer. While the success of such an approach, like others, needs to be assessed before it is more widely considered, it might well take a fresh approach really to deal with the issue.

What concerns me most is the lack of accessible support to the victims of antisocial behaviour. Tackling the problem and dealing with the perpetrators are, understandably, often the focus of attention, but to be a victim of antisocial behaviour can be incredibly isolating and distressing. That is why I support calls from Opposition Front Benchers to focus more on neighbourhood policing, with an additional 3,000 officers and police community support officers who are rooted in communities.

At a time when confidence in the police is waning, having a regular, familiar police presence in our communities would go some distance to restore and rebuild trust, as well as acting as a deterrent against antisocial behaviours. For my constituents in West Lancashire, antisocial behaviour and the menace of off-road bikes is a daily torment. I am committed to working with the police and crime commissioner, local police, local councillors, colleagues in this House and, most importantly, the communities of West Lancashire to ensure that the issue is taken seriously, and that people can once again feel safe in their neighbourhoods.

**Mark Pritchard (in the Chair):** The debate will need to end at eight minutes past 9. If the Minister is so minded, he might allow the mover of the motion a couple of minutes to wind up. I call the shadow Minister.

8.42 pm

**Sarah Jones (Croydon Central) (Lab):** Thank you, Mr Pritchard; it is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship. I will probably not take all the time that we have—you might be pleased by that.

I congratulate the hon. Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers) on securing this important debate. I thought that he spoke a lot of sense. We have been here before, talking about this issue. He asked the Government to get a grip of the problem in his speech, which the Minister who is now present, the right hon. Member for Croydon South (Chris Philp), missed. I am sure that the Minister will respond to all the points that hon. Members made.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stockport (Navendu Mishra) is worried about the antisocial behaviour that will arise in the summer months, and the hon. Member for Darlington (Peter Gibson) raised similar issues. My hon. Friend the Member for Batley and Spen

(Kim Leadbeater) is so active in her community that she had an event last week on this issue and is having one next week, which shows her commitment to her constituents. My hon. Friend the Member for West Lancashire (Ashley Dalton) gave a harrowing story of how people feel when antisocial behaviour is rife, and how they think that they cannot report it because there will be reprisals. Such things are often completely hidden because those crimes never get to the point of the police being involved and are therefore not covered by the statistics.

In both this Chamber and the main Chamber, Ministers have described antisocial behaviour as low level, and the Government have not taken the issue seriously to any degree for a long time. It was only after Labour Front Benchers put forward tough antisocial behaviour plans earlier this year that the Government published their underwhelming and unambitious strategy, with lead responsibility transferred from the Home Office to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

We know there is huge underreporting of antisocial behaviour, but the latest stats are awful. There were 1 million incidents of antisocial behaviour last year—more than 2,700 every single day—but that is just the tip of the iceberg. We know that criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling has risen by 20%, and “arson not endangering life” is up by 21%. Over a third of people say they have personally experienced or witnessed antisocial behaviour in their local area, and 72%—nearly three quarters of the population—think that crime has gone up in the past few years.

There is a big problem with antisocial behaviour statistics, because the Government do not do proper data collection. The freedom of information requests that I have submitted show huge variety across the country in how antisocial behaviour is reported and dealt with, and data on the use of new powers is not centrally collected. The Government could choose to address that if they wanted to, but they do not, so will the Minister look again at how antisocial behaviour is recorded? Will he recognise the impact of antisocial behaviour?

Our colleagues have been debating the Victims and Prisoners Bill in Committee over the last couple of weeks, and one of the amendments put forward by Labour Front Benchers was designed to treat victims of antisocial behaviour as victims in law. The Government voted against that proposal, which is a real shame, because until we recognise the impact of antisocial behaviour and that it involves victims too, we will not start to get serious about dealing with the problem.

People across the country raise the issue of off-road bikes, which has a pernicious impact on communities. The vehicles are loud and driven at great speed, causing great danger to other people and to those riding them. They spray mud and dirt, upset communities and ruin green spaces. It is a problem in the north-east, which I visited with Joy Allen and Kim McGuinness, Labour’s excellent police and crime commissioners there. There are also real problems with stolen bikes, and the police are concerned that not enough is being done to help them attack that crime. It appears that off-road bikes are easy to steal, and police tell me their frustrations about the fact that claims on off-road bikes are paid out even if the key is in the ignition. It is quite a niche, technical issue, but if people can leave the key in the

[Sarah Jones]

ignition and get paid the insurance, it is quite easy for people to steal the bikes, which seems to happen in a lot of areas.

We have seen examples of good work. Simon Foster, the West Midlands police and crime commissioner, has funded three additional off-road bikes for the police—they now have six—and he is increasing the number of trained off-road officers in Northumbria. Kim McGuinness has had great success in clamping down on stolen motorbikes, including by using overhead drones.

**Kim Leadbeater:** In Batley and Spen, police officers have received the off-road bike training that they need to chase perpetrators, but I was informed recently that officers are now being told that if we want to get more of them trained, they will have to pay for their own licences, which seems wrong. I wonder whether the Minister could look into that and get back to us.

**Sarah Jones:** I thank my hon. Friend for her helpful intervention. I am sure the Minister will address that in his speech.

If the people are good enough to put their trust in us, the next Labour Government will put 13,000 extra neighbourhood police and PCSOs on our streets as part of our neighbourhood policing guarantee.

**Chris Philp:** I hear this 13,000 number a lot. Will the hon. Lady clarify whether that is a redesignation of 13,000 existing police officers, or new police officers in addition to those currently employed?

**Sarah Jones:** I am sure that the Minister could read our press releases, which explain where the funding will come from, but there will be 3,000 new police officers, 3,000 from the uplift, and the rest will be PCSOs and specials. But the point of our policy—it will not just be about neighbourhood policing—is that we need to have police on our streets, where people can see them. Given that half of all our PCSOs across the country and large numbers of police staff have been cut, officers who should be in our neighbourhoods are now answering phones, dealing with back-office functions and not doing the things that we need them to do.

**Peter Gibson:** I am all in favour of extra police on the streets, and I welcome the 168 extra officers we have in County Durham, but our Labour police and crime commissioner has closed the custody suite in Darlington, thereby stockpiling millions of pounds and starving the force of officers we could have had in previous years, and in effect turning our officers into taxi drivers to take people to a brand new £20 million custody suite in the centre of a gigantic county. That is a Labour decision in my county.

**Sarah Jones:** I understand where the hon. Gentleman is coming from. No one wants anything to close. Indeed, it is a great shame that nearly 700 police stations have been closed under this Government. What does that do to a community? Sixty were closed by the previous Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, when he was Mayor of London. Extraordinary figures.

Labour will crack down on repeat offenders with our new respect orders. We will introduce new town centre patrols and a mandatory antisocial lead for every neighbourhood. We will bring in fixed-penalty cleaning notices and tough penalties for fly-tippers. We will establish clean-up squads in which offenders will clear up the litter, fly-tipping and vandalism that they have caused.

I do not want to go on too long. I ask the Minister to go back to his colleagues about not including antisocial victims in the Bill. Will he look again at recording the data on antisocial behaviour, because the picture is hard to see? What are his views on off-road bikes and does he think we should be going further in helping the police to tackle that problem? Does he support Labour's new respect orders? And does he support our policy to put more police in our neighbourhoods and on our streets.

Antisocial behaviour is a difficult thing to measure. Our job as politicians is not to find a stat that can prove our point, but to try to make people's lives better. It is undoubtedly the case that many people's lives are blighted by antisocial behaviour, and it is undoubtedly the case that we can do more. I hope that the Minister responds in that frame.

8.52 pm

**The Minister for Crime, Policing and Fire (Chris Philp):**

It is a pleasure, as always, to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Pritchard. I find myself in the Chamber slightly unexpectedly—you will have noticed that a younger and better-looking Minister has appeared than the one who was here at the beginning—[*Interruption.*] I hear some sceptical gasps rippling around the room. My right hon. Friend the Minister for Security is making a speech somewhere far less august than this. I have therefore come to conclude the debate. The matter is part of my portfolio, so it is probably appropriate that I am here in any event.

I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Stockton South (Matt Vickers) on securing the debate on this extremely important topic, which is a Government priority and always has been. We have heard some commentary about resourcing, and it is important that the police have the resources that they need to keep the public safe from antisocial behaviour and crime more widely. To put the record straight on police funding, therefore, the police settlement for the current financial year is £17.2 billion. That is higher than it has ever been at any time in history. Police and crime commissioners specifically, who fund frontline policing in our constituencies, have £550 million—more than half a billion pounds—more this year, compared with last year.

Let me take a moment to comment on police numbers. I am sure that what the hon. Member for Batley and Spen (Kim Leadbeater) said about the police in her county was inaccurate only inadvertently, because her county has record numbers. In fact, England and Wales as a whole have record numbers. To be precise, as of 31 March, we now have 149,472 police officers in England and Wales. That is more than we have ever had at any time in this country's history, and it is about 3,500 more than in March 2010, when there were 146,030 police officers. These are record police numbers.

We also heard a little about crime recording, data, peak crime and whether crime is going up or down. Perceptions of crime are sometimes different from the

actual figures, however. There are two sets of crime figures, which apply to any criminal activity, including ASB. There is the crime survey for England and Wales, which is a large-scale survey recognised by the Office for National Statistics as being the only accurate measure of crime over the long term, and there is police recorded crime, which is when people report things to the police. That is a function of people's propensity to report to the police and how good a job the police do in recording the crime. Until about five years ago, the police did not always do a particularly good job. The inspectorate has clamped down in the last few years, and the police are now much better at recording everything that is reported to them. It is for that reason that the ONS says that the crime survey is considered the most accurate measure of long-term crime trends.

In that context, I have some figures on changes in crime since 2010—I pick that date arbitrarily, of course. Criminal damage is down by 65%, and vehicle theft is down by 42%. On antisocial behaviour, the shadow Minister, the hon. Member for Croydon Central (Sarah Jones), mentioned that according to the crime survey, which she has obviously seen, 35% of people had experienced antisocial behaviour in the year ending September 2022. What she neglected to mention is that that was a substantial decrease of 12% when compared with the last year before covid.

On police recorded crime, which has its limitations, the hon. Member for Croydon Central said that 1.1 million ASB offences were recorded by the police. Again, she forgot to mention—no doubt for reasons of time and space—that that this is a 21% reduction since before the pandemic.

**Kim Leadbeater:** I know the Minister likes his statistics, and I have always admired his ability to get those statistics out there, but will he not take on board the point made by my hon. Friend the Member for Croydon Central (Sarah Jones) about the reluctance of people to report antisocial behaviour? Sadly, I know from my own experience in Batley and Spen that there is a feeling that nothing will be done so there is not any point in reporting it. That creates more statistics, but they are not visible to us.

**Chris Philp:** What the hon. Lady is saying is that there is limitation in the police recorded crime figures. That is why the crime survey is considered the authoritative source of data. It does not rely on the public reporting a particular offence; it is essentially a public opinion poll on an enormous scale. The methodology has been the same over many years, which is why the crime survey figures are considered the most reliable.

I was going on to say that even though those ASB figures are going down, whether measured by the crime survey or by police recorded crime, this is a serious issue, as the hon. Lady and Government Members have said. People feel that more needs to be done and that there is too much ASB, and the Government agree with that assessment. That is why, just a few weeks ago, the Government launched their antisocial behaviour action plan, which included £160 million of new additional funding.

Among other things, that extra funding pays for antisocial behaviour hotspot patrols, which will target areas of particular antisocial behaviour. Those hotspots could be in town centres, but they could also be in areas

where there is quad biking or trail biking going on. That is being piloted in 10 force areas. I think Lancashire is one of those. I was in Chorley, in Mr Speaker's constituency, last week, out and about with the very first ASB hotspot patrol in Lancashire. There are going to be 14 other hotspot patrols in Lancashire as it rolls out, as well as in 10 other force areas. In April of next year, every single police force in the country—all 43 of them—will have ASB hotspot patrols funded with over £1 million per force.

We are also funding immediate justice, where those people caught perpetrating antisocial behaviour, including on quad bikes and trail bikes, will within 48 hours be made to do some kind of restorative activity—it could be cleaning graffiti or cleaning up the streets—in branded, high-vis jackets, to make clear to the public and the perpetrators that there are consequences when people commit ASB. Again, there are 10 pilot forces, and by April next year every single police force in the country will have about £1 million each to deliver immediate justice.

The plan has a lot of other elements. It strengthens the provisions in the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. There will also be a statutory instrument shortly to ban nitrous oxide, which is a driver of ASB and a serious matter.

**Sarah Jones:** Out of interest, where has the consultation on nitrous oxide got to? The Minister said that the Government are banning it, but have they gone through the process of consultation?

**Chris Philp:** There are a couple of stages. The first was to consult the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs. We commissioned it back in the autumn and it reported in March. It actually advised us not to ban nitrous oxide, but, unusually, we decided to ban it anyway. It is about the fourth time a Government have disregarded its advice. The last Labour Government disregarded it a couple of times, and this Government have disregarded it a couple of times because we thought it was that serious. In a Westminster Hall debate a few months ago, both Conservative and Labour Members raised concerns about nitrous oxide being a driver of antisocial behaviour. It is genuinely the case that that Westminster Hall debate prompted us to get this done. I know that sometimes these debates are not hugely well attended, but they do lead to change, and that is an example of a Westminster Hall debate actually leading to a substantive change.

Having decided to ban nitrous oxide, we consulted on how to go about doing that with the ACMD and others, and we spoke to various stakeholders. We will create some exemptions for legitimate commercial use, because it is genuinely used for catering purposes and semiconductor manufacture. Clearly, if it is being used for a legitimate commercial, technical or scientific purpose, possession is lawful, but personal consumption and supply for the purpose of commercial consumption will be banned under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. There is a lot in that antisocial behaviour action plan. The Government are taking this seriously. There is money behind it, and we are determined to clamp down on it.

Off-road bikes, trail bikes and so on are obviously a scourge. We heard hon. Members earlier and more recently talk about that. The police already have powers



[Chris Philp]

to deal with this, particularly under section 59 of the Police Reform Act 2002, which confers a power to seize off-road bikes and vehicles if they are used in an antisocial manner. The definition of an antisocial manner is quite broad, but it could include, for example, using the vehicle in a careless and inconsiderate manner contrary to the Road Traffic Act 1988 or in a manner that causes alarm, distress or annoyance to members of the public.

**Peter Gibson:** I warmly welcome section 59 notices, which my constituency has benefited from. I am sorry that the Minister was not here at the start of the debate, and I understand the reasons for that. However, I raised a number of issues in my speech in respect of the things that the Department for Transport and the Home Office could do, working in conjunction with industry to ensure that vehicles are registered, insured, capable of being tracked and traced, and fitted with immobilisers. Much more can be done by Departments working together to tackle this problem. I do not disagree with the support for section 59 notices—they are tremendously useful—but we have to catch offenders first.

**Chris Philp:** I agree with that sentiment. With these record police numbers, the resources are available to do more on enforcement. On my hon. Friend's point about registration, insurance and tracking, I will ensure that we take a careful look at that with the DFT.

**Peter Gibson:** I have raised this multiple times in multiple meetings with both the Home Office and the Department for Transport. It just feels as though we need to get some real will behind solving the problem.

**Chris Philp:** As I have just said, I will take a careful look at it. We obviously need to make sure that any regulation is proportionate. This is the first time that my hon. Friend has raised this with me, as far as I am aware, but now that he has done so, I am happy to take it away.

In relation to immobilisers, we have a private Member's Bill going through Parliament that, certainly for quad bikes, requires immobilisers to be fitted. That was done with the purpose in mind of deterring and preventing theft from agricultural premises in particular. It may also mean that there are fewer stolen quad bikes in circulation that might then be used in a way that is antisocial, so that could be an unexpected or unintended side benefit.

**Peter Gibson:** The fitting of immobilisers is incredibly beneficial to the agricultural industry, which experiences the thefts. Those bikes then appear on the streets of my town, causing terror, so fitting immobilisers kills two birds with one stone.

**Chris Philp:** Exactly. That legislation is going through Parliament now with full Government and Opposition support.

Wider antisocial behaviour legislation, much of which derives from the 2014 Act, can also be used in this context. An Opposition Member mentioned the use of public space protection orders as a tool. Community protection notices would be another option. I think the hon. Member for West Lancashire (Ashley Dalton) mentioned that West Lancashire Borough Council is working with Lancashire police on this. I strongly encourage joint working between local authorities and the police on public space protection orders, community protection notices and other similar devices to eradicate this scourge. Again, through the ASB action plan we are intending to make it easier to use those various mechanisms.

I am grateful again to my hon. Friend the Member for Stockton South for securing this debate. It is a very important topic. The Government are committed to working to fix this problem, and I look forward to co-operating and collaborating with Members on both sides to ensure that our constituents' communities are kept safe and free of antisocial behaviour.

9.5 pm

**Matt Vickers:** I thank the Minister for his comments. We obviously welcome the 267 extra police, the hotspot policing and all the other measures that are coming through. However, if the Minister had been here earlier—it has been a record long Westminster Hall debate this evening—he would have noticed that there were Members present from across the House, despite what we knew would happen with the timetable, and that there are very strong opinions on the issue from all corners of the country. Members felt very strongly about the increasing misery caused by off-road bikes.

This is not something that the police are dealing with as they always have. In my part of the world the problem has hugely increased, with 40% more reports in the last year and 180 bikes seized in May and April. Still these youngsters are going to be riding around on bikes causing absolute misery. I have put the case to the Minister again, and I hope he will engage with and continue the dialogue about what we can do specifically to tackle those quad bikes, off-road bikes, electronic bikes and scooters.

*Question put and agreed to.*

*Resolved,*

That this House has considered antisocial behaviour and off-road bikes.

9.6 pm

*Sitting adjourned.*

# Written Statements

*Tuesday 11 July 2023*

## BUSINESS AND TRADE

### Companies House Public Targets 2023-24

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business and Trade (Kevin Hollinrake):** I have set Companies House the following targets for the year 2023-24:

Remove in excess of 16,000 pieces of information relating to identity details and/or addresses used without permission, in order to minimise the risk of records kept by the registrars creating a false or misleading impression to members of the public.

Register of Overseas Entities: Issue financial penalties for non-compliance in cases that we have identified and prioritised.

Ninety-seven per cent of companies on the register have filed an up-to-date confirmation statement.

Digital services are available for a minimum of 99.5% of the time.

Eighty per cent of customers satisfied with Companies House.

Increase the resource in the operations and intelligence teams by up to 241 new posts to enable legislative reform.

Manage expenditure within budgetary limits and utilise central Government funding.

[HCWS926]

## CABINET OFFICE

### National Security and Investment Act 2021

**The Deputy Prime Minister (Oliver Dowden):** I am today laying before Parliament the annual report covering the operation of the National Security and Investment Act 2021 (NSI Act) for the period 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023. A copy of the report will also be published on [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk). My actions today fulfil the requirements under section 61 of the NSI Act for this year.

We promised to deliver a regime that is as business friendly as possible while protecting our national security. This annual report demonstrates that we are succeeding in that mission. The vast majority of businesses in the UK had zero interaction with this screening process during the last financial year, nor any need to do so. Of those who did, we have made the system as fast, predictable and transparent as possible.

Of the notifications that I and previous decision makers reviewed, we cleared the vast majority—92.8%—within a rapid 30 working days. We met statutory deadlines for all notifications that were reviewed in this period, called in 65 acquisitions for scrutiny, and ultimately made proportionate interventions through 15 final orders to protect national security.

These statistics show that notifications, call-ins, final orders and final notifications were distributed across a wide range of different origins of investment, across a wide variety of sectors and from many different countries. Defence-related acquisitions featured prominently at call-in and final orders, but acquisitions across communications, energy, advanced materials and computing hardware sectors were also subject to final orders.

This demonstrates that risks can arise from a variety of sources and are judged case-by-case in accordance with the statement made under section 3 of the NSI Act.

I am personally committed to ensuring this process is as smooth and transparent as possible. So, in addition to fulfilling my section 61 obligations, this year's report includes further information not required by the NSI Act itself. For the first time, I include information on the geographic origins of investment. I hope this will help stakeholders' engagement with the NSI Act.

I am pleased to lay this NSI annual report in Parliament today and I look forward to continuing to update the House as appropriate over the coming years.

[HCWS925]

## TREASURY

### Financial Services Reforms

**The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Jeremy Hunt):** On 10 July 2023, I set out in a speech at Mansion House the Government's progress in delivering a financial services sector that is globally competitive, while retaining our commitment to high international standards.

Building on the Edinburgh reforms announced in December 2022, the Mansion House reforms will enable our financial services sector to unlock capital for our most promising industries and increase returns for savers, supporting growth across the wider economy.

First, I announced a series of measures to boost outcomes for savers and increase funding liquidity for high-growth companies through reforms to the UK's pension market.

Secondly, I set out ways the Government are incentivising companies to start and grow in the UK by strengthening our position as a listing destination.

Finally, I set out the Government's action to seize the opportunities of the future by reforming and simplifying our financial services rulebook to ensure we have the most growth-friendly regulation of any financial services centre.

These plans have the potential to increase retirement income by over a £1,000 a year over the course of a career and unlock up to £75 billion of additional investment from defined contribution and local government pensions.

The full list of the measures launched at Mansion House, along with supporting technical documents, can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/mansion-house-2023>.

[HCWS927]

## EDUCATION

### Key Stage 2 Attainment

**The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb):** The key stage 2 (KS2) statistics released today show an increase in this year's mathematics and writing attainment compared with 2022. More pupils met the expected standard in mathematics—73% in 2023, up from 71% in 2022—and writing—71% in 2023, up from 69% in 2022—than last year. The percentage of pupils meeting the expected

standard in all of reading, writing and mathematics—combined—at age 11 was 59% in 2023. This is unchanged from last year. The percentage of pupils meeting the expected standard in science has also risen—80% in 2023, up from 79% in 2022—and those meeting the expected standard in grammar, punctuation and spelling remains unchanged from 2022—72%.

While those meeting the expected standard in reading is down from 2022 from 75% to 73%, it remains higher compared with 2016—66%—and is in line with pre-pandemic standards—73% met the expected standard in reading in 2019. This stability compared with pre-pandemic results was also reflected in the Progress in international reading literacy study (PIRLS) results released in May. Despite the disruption of the pandemic, England's score remained stable, following significant improvements in 2011 and 2016, coming fourth out of the 43 countries that tested children of the same age. England's score of 558 was well above the international average of 520 and the European average of 524.

This is the second publication of KS2 attainment since the beginning of the pandemic, as there were no KS2 assessments taken in 2020 and 2021. Following the impact of the pandemic, it was expected that there may be lower levels of attainment while children caught up on lost learning. The progress that has been made in recovering from the pandemic is testament to the hard work of teachers and teaching assistants across the country.

The Government are determined to build on the significant progress that has been made over the past decade in raising standards in reading through the tried

and tested approach of phonics. It places great focus on ensuring early reading is taught well because children can only begin to articulate their thoughts in writing when they have a good grounding in early reading and spoken language. This is why today, we are announcing an updated version of our reading framework. This will provide teachers and school leaders with evidence-informed guidance on good practice in reading in primary schools and for those key stage 2 and secondary school pupils who still need support. We are also announcing today our intention to launch an evidence review of best practice in the teaching of writing. This will be a valuable resource for schools and will inform further research and guidance.

The Department also continues to invest in English hubs and Maths hubs. These programmes enable high-performing primary schools to spread their exemplary practice in the teaching of reading and mathematics across more primary schools. Furthermore, the Government are investing an extra £2 billion into our core schools funding this year and the year after, meaning school funding will be at its highest level in history next year, as measured by the IFS. This increase builds on our continued efforts to embed tutoring and provide targeted support for schools and children in need.

There will be a further statistical release in September setting out a more granular breakdown of the KS2 results and that will include statistics at regional and local authority levels and for pupil characteristics such as disadvantage.

[HCWS928]



# ORAL ANSWERS

Tuesday 11 July 2023

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
<b>HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE</b> .....	153	<b>HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE—continued</b>	
Brain Cancer Treatments .....	159	Mental Ill Health: West Yorkshire.....	160
Cancer Outcome Targets.....	154	NHS Dentists: North Shropshire .....	153
Care Settings: Family Visits .....	167	Pharmacy Services .....	157
Cervical Screening and Ovarian Cancer .....	155	Primary Care .....	163
City-centre GP Premises .....	157	Social Care Workforce .....	166
Coroners: Stillbirths .....	168	Topical Questions .....	168
Elective Care Waiting Times .....	153	Vaccine Development and Evaluation.....	164
Health Inequalities.....	162	Vaping: Young People .....	156
Hormone Replacement Therapy .....	165	Young People's Mental Health: Housing.....	164
International Health Regulations.....	167		

# WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Tuesday 11 July 2023

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
<b>BUSINESS AND TRADE</b> .....	5WS	<b>EDUCATION</b> .....	6WS
Companies House Public Targets 2023-24 .....	5WS	Key Stage 2 Attainment .....	6WS
<b>CABINET OFFICE</b> .....	5WS	<b>TREASURY</b> .....	6WS
National Security and Investment Act 2021 .....	5WS	Financial Services Reforms.....	6WS

No proofs can be supplied. Corrections that Members suggest for the Bound Volume should be clearly marked on a copy of the daily Hansard - not telephoned - and *must be received in the Editor's Room, House of Commons*,

**not later than  
Tuesday 18 July 2023**

STRICT ADHERENCE TO THIS ARRANGEMENT GREATLY FACILITATES THE  
PROMPT PUBLICATION OF BOUND VOLUMES

Members may obtain excerpts of their speeches from the Official Report (within one month from the date of publication), by applying to the Editor of the Official Report, House of Commons.

---

## **CONTENTS**

**Tuesday 11 July 2023**

**Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 153] [see index inside back page]**  
*Secretary of State for Health and Social Care*

**Financial Services Reforms [Col. 177]**  
*Statement—(Andrew Griffith)*

**Rural Crime (Strategy) [Col. 189]**  
*Bill presented, and read the First time*

**Bullying and Respect at Work [Col. 190]**  
*Motion for leave to bring in Bill—(Racheal Maskell)—agreed to*  
*Bill presented, and read the First time*

**Illegal Migration Bill [Col. 194]**  
*Programme motion (No. 2)—(Robert Langan)—agreed to*  
*Lords amendments considered*

**Royal Assent [Col. 212]**

**Illegal Migration Bill [Col. 213]**  
*Lords amendments considered*

**Adjournment (Summer, Conference and Christmas Recess) [Col. 323]**  
*Motion—(Rebecca Harris); Division deferred till tomorrow*

**Increasing Employment: Training [Col. 324]**  
*Debate on motion for Adjournment*

**Westminster Hall**  
**UN High-level Meetings in 2023 [Col. 29WH]**  
**Renewable Energy in the East of England [Col. 47WH]**  
**Business Banking Resolution Service [Col. 55WH]**  
**Two-child Benefit Cap and Child Poverty [Col. 67WH]**  
**Antisocial Behaviour and Off-road Bikes [Col. 75WH]**  
*General Debates*

**Written Statements [Col. 5WS]**

---