

**Wednesday
8 February 2017**

**Volume 621
No. 108**



**HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES**
(HANSARD)

Wednesday 8 February 2017

House of Commons

Wednesday 8 February 2017

The House met at half-past Eleven o'clock

PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

BUSINESS BEFORE QUESTIONS

MIDDLE LEVEL BILL (*By Order*)

Second Reading opposed and deferred until Wednesday 22 February (Standing Order No. 20).

Oral Answers to Questions

CABINET OFFICE AND THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER

The Minister for the Cabinet Office was asked—

Electoral Fraud

1. **Neil Parish** (Tiverton and Honiton) (Con): Whether he plans to implement the proposals made in the “Securing the ballot” review of electoral fraud. [908661]

Mr Speaker: I call Minister Robin Walker.

The Parliamentary Secretary, Cabinet Office (Chris Skidmore): Indeed, Chris Skidmore.

Mr Speaker: I do beg the hon. Gentleman’s pardon. There is a minor likeness.

Chris Skidmore: It is a mistake commonly made.

The Government published on 27 December their response to the review of electoral fraud by my right hon. Friend the Member for Brentwood and Ongar (Sir Eric Pickles). The response sets out clearly the action that the Government intend to take on each recommendation and proposes a comprehensive programme for reforming our electoral system and making our democracy more secure.

Mr Speaker: I am not sure which of the two of you is the more offended, but my apologies to the both of you.

Neil Parish: In December 2008, I was an election observer in Bangladesh. Because of previous voter fraud, photographs were taken of 80 million people, and people were clearly identifiable from those photographs when they went to vote. Have the Government considered doing that? A democracy needs as many people to vote as possible, but we do not want identity fraud when people vote.

Chris Skidmore: My hon. Friend makes a good point about international comparisons. Many countries, including Canada, Brazil and Austria, already require photographic ID to vote at polling stations, and such a scheme was introduced in Northern Ireland in 2003. The Government are taking forward pilots to look at electoral identification in the 2018 local government elections, and we are willing to test various forms of identification—photographic and non-photographic—to ensure above all that no one is disenfranchised.

12. [908672] **Nick Smith** (Blaenau Gwent) (Lab): The Government’s talk of voter fraud is a smokescreen for voter suppression.

Stephen Pound (Ealing North) (Lab): Just as in America.

Nick Smith: Yes. They are putting obstacles between people and the polling booth instead of working to boost our democracy. If voter fraud is such a problem, will the Minister tell the House how many voter fraud convictions there were last year?

Chris Skidmore: I am surprised by the hon. Gentleman for somehow claiming that this is a smokescreen. It was a Labour Government that introduced photographic ID in Northern Ireland in 2003. The Electoral Commission and all other electoral administrators have called for ID in polling stations, and we will test its use rigorously in the pilots. There were 481 cases of voter fraud reported to the Electoral Commission, and 184 additional cases were reported to the police. Above all, this is about perception. The Electoral Commission reported last year that 30% of the population believe that voter fraud is an issue in their local area, and we are determined to tackle that perception.

Sir Eric Pickles (Brentwood and Ongar) (Con): The organisations that the Minister just referred to and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe have warned that our voting system is peculiarly vulnerable to identity theft. There is no evidence of voter suppression in the countries that the Minister listed. Does he think that those who talk of conspiracy theories are at grave risk of becoming apologists for electoral fraud?

Chris Skidmore: We are determined to ensure that we have a clear and secure democracy in which voters can have confidence. We have 46.5 million people on the electoral register, and turnout increased from 26.3 million in 2001 to 30.8 million in 2015. We want to ensure that we have voter participation, but if the public perceive that fraud is an issue, that perception can be as damaging as cases of fraud.

Margaret Ferrier (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (SNP): Has the Minister made any equality impact assessment of the recommendation to ban the use of any language other than English or Welsh in polling stations?

Chris Skidmore: The issue of language in polling stations is an important part of the package of measures in our response to my right hon. Friend’s report. If electoral administrators are to do their job and be confident that no one is being put under undue pressure or influence when voting, it is important that we look at

the question of language. At the same time, the Government's announcements will be thorough and based on correct analysis, and we will be going through due process to ensure that all the impact assessments are correct.

Voter Identification Measures

2. **Sir Simon Burns** (Chelmsford) (Con): What his policy is on proposals to pilot voter identification measures in polling stations. [908662]

3. **Justin Tomlinson** (North Swindon) (Con): What his policy is on proposals to pilot voter identification measures in polling stations. [908663]

5. **Henry Smith** (Crawley) (Con): What his policy is on proposals to pilot voter identification measures in polling stations. [908665]

The Parliamentary Secretary, Cabinet Office (Chris Skidmore): In our response to the review of electoral fraud by my right hon. Friend the Member for Brentwood and Ongar (Sir Eric Pickles), we outlined our intention to run several pilot schemes in a number of local authority areas in 2018, the purpose of which is to test the impact on elections of asking electors to present identification before voting.

Sir Simon Burns: Does my hon. Friend agree that voting is one of a citizen's most important duties, and that introducing proof of ID would bring voting into line with other everyday transactions such as getting a mortgage or renting a car?

Chris Skidmore: I entirely agree with my right hon. Friend. When it comes to voting, there cannot be a more important transaction someone can make over five years than to democratically elect their Member of Parliament or councillor. It is right that that process is respected and that, as for so many other transactions in the modern world, we bring it up to date. It is not acceptable for someone simply to turn up at the voting booth, point out their name and claim that as their identity. That does not happen anywhere else. It is time to bring our democracy up to date.

Justin Tomlinson: Voter fraud is unacceptable, and I welcome any measure to secure democracy. Swindon Borough Council has repeatedly been commended for good election practice, so will the Minister consider us for future pilots?

Chris Skidmore: I thank my hon. Friend for his question. We have had a great deal of interest in the pilot process from local authorities. We are currently conducting a review to decide exactly what form those pilots will take—as I said, some will involve photographic ID and some will involve non-photographic ID. We are determined to ensure that interested local authorities can come forward in good time so that they can participate in a pilot project. On Monday, I addressed the Association of Electoral Administrators at its annual conference in Brighton, and I was struck by the fact that more than 50% of electoral administrators supported the introduction of ID in polling stations.

Henry Smith: My hon. Friend the Minister is absolutely right that voter identification is common practice in many sophisticated democracies around the world. What best practice have the Government been taking from those other countries?

Chris Skidmore: My hon. Friend is entirely right. We expect that by introducing the pilot schemes, we will provide invaluable learning for strengthening our electoral system, but we also want to learn from international comparisons with countries such as Canada, Austria and Brazil, which require voter identification. As I have stated, voters in Northern Ireland have had to present identification since 1985, and photographic identification since 2003. Further information is available in the Electoral Commission's report "Electoral fraud in the UK". We will consider the international comparisons going forward.

Tommy Sheppard (Edinburgh East) (SNP): The Government are deluding themselves if they think that personation is the main challenge to the integrity of our democratic system. The main challenge to its integrity and credibility is the fact that millions of our fellow citizens who are entitled to vote do not do so. Would it not be better for the Government to spend time and money on pilot projects designed to increase participation, such as a radical overhaul of how we teach democratic rights in schools; on pursuing online voting; and, most of all, on automatic voter registration, so that the ability to vote is not something people have to apply for?

Chris Skidmore: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for raising democratic participation. As I have stated, we now have a record 46.5 million people on the electoral register and turnout at elections is at a record level. Nevertheless, we can and must do more. The ideas of a clear and secure democracy and looking at voter identification pilots are just part of a package of measures. We also have another crucial strand: ensuring that every voice matters. In spring, I will set out our democratic engagement strategy, which will include further pilots of schemes to use civil society groups to encourage voter registration.

Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP): Will the Minister give an assurance that the issue of postal and proxy vote applications, which can also be subject to abuse, will be kept under review, in terms of the accurate identification of the person who is supposed to be applying for such votes?

Chris Skidmore: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for raising that issue. When we published our response to the report of my right hon. Friend the Member for Brentwood and Ongar, the top line was obviously ID in polling stations, but there was also an entire package of measures, including looking again at postal vote fraud, banning the harvesting of postal votes by political parties, and limiting the number of postal vote packs that can be handled by family members to two. I entirely take the hon. Gentleman's point, and we will continue to review those matters.

Cat Smith (Lancaster and Fleetwood) (Lab): The Electoral Commission tells us that 3.5 million genuine, legitimate electors do not have the valid photo-identification

that would be required in the trials, and risk being denied their votes. Blackburn with Darwen Council recently passed a motion to oppose the trial there, Pendle has called for a rethink, and Burnley is considering a similar motion. When will the Minister abandon his tatty copy of the Republican party's playbook on voter suppression and listen to the sensible voice of the good folk of Lancashire?

Chris Skidmore: The hon. Lady mentioned the Electoral Commission, but she omitted to say that it has stated that it welcomes the

“full and considered response from the Government and the announcement of its intention to pilot measures to increase security at polling stations.”

The Electoral Commission is indeed in favour of introducing photographic ID for elections. When it comes to the pilots, we want evidence-based policy making, which is why we will have pilots that look at photographic ID and pilots that look at non-photographic ID. When it comes to ensuring that people will be able to vote, I am not going to be denying anyone that franchise. We are protecting those communities that are most vulnerable in casting their votes in a secret ballot. We must protect against undue influence, and I am surprised that the hon. Lady does not take the matter seriously, as the Electoral Commission does.

Public Procurement Guidelines

4. **Mary Glendon** (North Tyneside) (Lab): What discretion local authorities have within his Department's guidelines on public procurement. [908664]

The Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (Ben Gummer): The Public Contracts Regulations 2015, which govern the conduct of public procurement in the UK, apply in full to all public sector organisations, including local authorities.

Mary Glendon: Will the Minister confirm that it is perfectly legal for local authorities to be able to set their own procurement rules, taking into account additional factors, such as the suppliers' human rights record and the environmental impact?

Ben Gummer: Local authorities must comply with European Union law, which is enshrined in the public contracts regulations. The Government provide guidance on how those regulations should be applied, and I encourage local authorities to take that guidance into account when they are framing their procurement policies.

8. [908668] **Andrew Bingham** (High Peak) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend tell me roughly how many people he has on his departmental staff who have run a small business and who can, therefore, understand the needs and requirements of small businesses when they seek to procure public sector contracts and come up against this continual wall of bureaucracy?

Ben Gummer: My enormous departmental team of two comprises one person who has run several small businesses and another who is a sole trader. That is a 100% fulfilment on my hon. Friend's request. We also have a small and medium-sized enterprise ambassador, Emma Jones, who works with the council to ensure that

we do precisely what he wishes, which is to sensitise the civil service and procurement officials to the needs of small and medium-sized enterprises.

Michael Fabricant (Lichfield) (Con): Before he quit, a friend of mine empowered Waitrose managers—*[Interruption.]* I will not name him. He empowered Waitrose managers to go out and procure local product. Can we not give similar encouragement to bodies such as county and district councils?

Ben Gummer: I commend everything that my hon. Friend's friend has done in his previous role, and I know that he will bring that expertise, in due course, to the people of the west midlands. Although councils and all public bodies cannot choose according to geographical criteria, what they can and must do is take into account the social value of their procurement policies, which is why there is considerable latitude for them to have a similar approach to the one that his friend conducted at Waitrose.

Andrew Gwynne (Denton and Reddish) (Lab): Ministers have talked a great deal about linking apprenticeships to public procurement contracts, which is a sensible use of public funds to meet both the skills agenda and to help to narrow inequality in society. However, the Government's own Social Mobility Commission confirmed last week that only 10% of new apprenticeships are taken up by those from low-income families. Given the Cabinet Office's unique place to promote this agenda, what is the Minister doing to tackle this unacceptable situation?

Ben Gummer: The hon. Gentleman raises a completely just point. The whole purpose behind our apprenticeship programme is to give opportunities to people who would not otherwise have them. That is why the 3 million target that we have across the economy is so important. The public sector will contribute a significant proportion of that, and I am responsible for the civil service component. We are doing very well on the civil service apprenticeship numbers. Two weeks ago, we launched a set of standards that will apply to some of the civil service apprenticeships. I hope that, in time, we will be able to fulfil exactly the aspiration that we both have in ensuring that that helps social mobility.

Voter Identification Trial

6. **Nick Thomas-Symonds** (Torfaen) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the implications for his policies of the Electoral Commission's finding on the number of people unable to vote if Government plans to trial the use of identification in polling stations were rolled out nationally. [908666]

The Parliamentary Secretary, Cabinet Office (Chris Skidmore): The Government have outlined a variety of photographic and non-photographic types of identification that could feature in our pilot schemes, which will test rigorously the impact of ID on all aspects of elections, including turnout. I note that, in its 2016 report on Northern Ireland, the Electoral Commission said that less than 1% of voters were affected by photo ID, which

is why we want to look at photo ID and non-photo ID to ensure that no disenfranchisement is taking place in our pilots.

Nick Thomas-Symonds: The Electoral Commission reported in 2016 that 3.5 million electors have no appropriate form of photographic ID. Why is it that the Government are ignoring recommendations to have a voluntary voter card, which would allow those 3.5 million people to vote?

Chris Skidmore: The hon. Gentleman is a fine historian who, like me, believes in looking at the facts and in evidence-based policy making. That is why we have constructed the pilots to ensure that there is photographic identification and non-photographic identification. If there happens to be anyone who has no form of identification, we will make provision for them. Rolling out the electoral ID card across the country would be tremendously expensive and we have no plans to do so.

Civil Service Headcount

7. **Louise Haigh** (Sheffield, Heeley) (Lab): What change there has been in the civil service headcount in the last 12 months. [908667]

The Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (Ben Gummer): Workforce planning is primarily the responsibility of each individual Department, but the civil service headcount reduced by 3,390, or 0.8%, over the past year.

Louise Haigh: I thank the Minister for that answer. Will he commit to publishing an assessment of all resources moved over to Brexit priorities and what work streams have been cut as a result?

Ben Gummer: The hon. Lady will understand that we have worked hard since July to ensure that we have the proper resources in place so that our exit from the European Union is effective and efficient. The public versions of the single departmental plans will have the outlines that she is seeking.

Mr Alan Mak (Havant) (Con): As my right hon. Friend continues to modernise the civil service headcount, will he ensure that the apprenticeship strategy for the civil service continues to lead to a more diverse and skilled workforce to serve our communities?

Ben Gummer: I can assure my hon. Friend of precisely that and, as he will know, my predecessor started a programme of understanding better the social and economic make-up of the civil service so that we can have a far more targeted approach to ensuring diversity and social equality in our civil service.

Efficiency Savings

9. **Robert Courts** (Witney) (Con): What steps he is taking to support Government Departments to deliver efficiency savings. [908669]

The Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (Ben Gummer): Together with Her Majesty's Treasury, and as part of our joint efficiency review, we are seeking to find savings of £15 billion to £20 billion by 2020. We have achieved £3.3 billion in the past year.

Robert Courts: As a councillor on West Oxfordshire District Council, I have seen how the commissioning of services from one provider by different public sector bodies can drive down costs, providing high-quality services at very low cost. Does my right hon. Friend agree that there are lessons to be learned for all sectors of government and that programmes such as One Public Estate are an excellent example of how collaborative working can help the public sector to deliver more for less?

Ben Gummer: I thank my hon. Friend for that question and he is right to point out One Public Estate, which is a Cabinet Office programme ensuring cross-working and efficiency savings as a result. Many of the lessons we can learn are from local government, and it is important that we all learn from each other as regards sharing services and cutting costs.

Mrs Theresa Villiers (Chipping Barnet) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend introduce reforms so that different parts of the public sector can share data more easily, which will significantly improve efficiency?

Ben Gummer: The Digital Economy Bill, which is passing through both Houses at the moment, does precisely that.

Digital Technologies

10. **Jo Churchill** (Bury St Edmunds) (Con): What steps his Department is taking to use digital technologies to improve public services. [908670]

The Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (Ben Gummer): We are committed to improving public services through technology to transform the relationship between citizen and state. We are doing so through the use of tools such as Verify.

Jo Churchill: I thank my right hon. Friend for that answer. Will he reassure the House that the Government are doing everything they can to ensure that people can access public services online, particularly hard-to-reach groups such as those in my rural constituency of Bury St Edmunds?

Ben Gummer: The Government Digital Service has a specific programme to ensure that there is full access to Government digital services for all groups. Of course, by ensuring that we have good broadband connections in constituencies such as my hon. Friend's we will enable people to access those services online in rural areas.

Topical Questions

T1. [908676] **Joan Ryan** (Enfield North) (Lab): If he will make a statement on his departmental responsibilities.

The Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (Ben Gummer): The Cabinet Office is the centre of Government. The Department is responsible for delivering a democracy that works for everyone, supporting the design and delivery of Government policy and driving efficiencies and reforms to make government work better.

Joan Ryan: Will the Minister provide an update on any progress in the Prime Minister's audit to tackle racial disparities? As so much is already known about the devastating consequences of these disparities, should not the Government be getting on with doing a great deal more about them now rather than waiting for an audit?

Ben Gummer: I find the right hon. Lady's comments surprising. It was this Government and this Prime Minister who commissioned the racial disparity audit. When the right hon. Lady was in power, her party had 13 years to do that, but did not. I am proud of what the Prime Minister has done. We have committed to publishing the audit in the next few months, and the right hon. Lady will be excited by the possibilities it presents to make things better for everyone in the country.

T2. [908677] **David Warburton** (Somerton and Frome) (Con): Safetech Engineering in Frome offers superb expertise in nuclear safety and cyber-security, but to get security clearance and bid for work at Hinkley C or the Ministry of Defence, it needs to be a list X company. The only way to get that status is to be sponsored by another list X company or the MOD. Does the Minister's Department have plans to let business escape from that circularity and access the markets it needs?

Ben Gummer: Although list X is the responsibility of the MOD and the Secretary of State will have heard that question, I have a responsibility for small and medium-sized enterprises in public procurement. I shall certainly take forward my hon. Friend's concerns and ensure that they are represented.

Ian Lavery (Wansbeck) (Lab): Since 2010, more than 100,000 civil service jobs have gone. With 300 new recruits and funding of £42.7 million for the Brexit Department, is the Minister really serious about the fact that the UK is properly prepared to enter the most complex negotiations for generations? The reality is that it is an absolute shambles.

Ben Gummer: I have full confidence not only in that, but in the civil service and the remarkable people who inhabit the Departments across our state.

T3. [908678] **Henry Smith** (Crawley) (Con): Last week, I met the chief constable of Sussex police about a number of issues, including electoral fraud. What steps are the Government taking to ensure that police forces around the country engage with returning officers and local authorities to combat voter fraud?

The Parliamentary Secretary, Cabinet Office (Chris Skidmore): I thank my hon. Friend for his commitment to and interest in combating voter fraud, and for taking those measures. I addressed a conference of the National Police Chiefs Council and the Electoral Commission last Friday, setting out why it is important that the police take the issue of voter fraud seriously. There have been cases where convictions have not been followed through. That is wrong and I hope that the issue will be addressed.

T4. [908679] **Nic Dakin** (Scunthorpe) (Lab): When will the Government publish departmental performance in respect of their commitment to deliver ever higher levels of UK steel content in their procurement policy?

Ben Gummer: The hon. Gentleman knows that it was this Government who established a far more rigorous understanding of steel content in public procurement policy. I will update the House in due course to give hon. Members an idea of the progress we are making.

T5. [908680] **Nigel Huddleston** (Mid Worcestershire) (Con): I applaud the Government's efforts to give more contracts to small and medium-sized enterprises, and the use of technology such as the Contracts Finder website. Will the Minister tell me how many businesses are signed up to the Contracts Finder process, and how I can get more businesses in Worcestershire to sign up?

Ben Gummer: As of yesterday, 15,745 companies were registered with Contracts Finder, 59% of which were small and medium-sized enterprises. My hon. Friend could encourage his local businesses to sign up. It is very easy to do so, and the best he can do is to tell them that.

T7. [908682] **Jason McCartney** (Colne Valley) (Con): Will the Minister enhance and strengthen the northern powerhouse by ensuring that small and medium-sized enterprises in Yorkshire can take full advantage of public procurement contracts?

Ben Gummer: In the measures I have described today, I shall.

T8. [908683] **Sir Simon Burns** (Chelmsford) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend accept that although we are told that it is good to talk, Departments are making it infinitely more difficult for Members to contact private offices on behalf of their constituents due to inaccuracies and the withdrawal of the central register of private office numbers? Will the Minister tell us when the practice of putting communal numbers in the register will be stopped, and the individual numbers of Ministers' private offices will be restored as they were, so that we can have proper communications between Ministers' offices and Members on behalf of our constituents' needs?

Ben Gummer: I owe Members an apology for this. It is true that some of the telephone numbers in the directory were inaccurate and some were general numbers. The revision is being made quarterly—the next one is in March—and I have instructed all Departments to provide private office numbers, as Members rightly expect.

PRIME MINISTER

The Prime Minister was asked—

Engagements

Q1. [908646] **Toby Perkins** (Chesterfield) (Lab): If she will list her official engagements for Wednesday 8 February.

The Prime Minister (Mrs Theresa May): This morning, I had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. In addition to my duties in this House, I shall have further such meetings later today.

Toby Perkins: The Government chose to launch the pupil premium at Spire Junior School in Chesterfield, where 70% of pupils receive free school meals. The headteacher, Dave Shaw, was going to run the great north run for a cancer charity. However, the Prime Minister's new schools funding formula means that Spire Junior School now faces the biggest cuts in all of Derbyshire. Running for cash is now the only alternative to sacking staff. Will she go to the finish line and tell Dave Shaw how this is a fairer funding formula?

The Prime Minister: I am pleased to say that, in the local authority that covers the hon. Gentleman's constituency, we have seen an increase of over 17,000 children at good or outstanding schools since 2010. That is down to Government changes and the hard work of teachers and other staff in the schools. For a very long time, it has been the general view—I have campaigned on this for a long time—that we need to see a fairer funding formula for schools. What the Government have brought forward is a consultation on a fairer funding formula. We will look at the results of that fairer funding formula and will bring forward our firm proposals in due course.

Q2. [908647] Johnny Mercer (Plymouth, Moor View) (Con): Over the last 12 months, as a member of the Defence Committee, I have had the opportunity to look into the Iraq Historic Allegations Team and how we as a country more broadly deal with historical allegations against our servicemen and women. This has been a deeply disturbing experience not only for those of us who have served, but for many Members across the House. I know that the Prime Minister gets this, but will she commit to redouble her and her Government's efforts to get a grip on this historical allegations process so that never again will our servicemen and women be exposed to the likes of Phil Shiner?

The Prime Minister: I am sure the whole House will want to join me in praising the bravery and commitment of all those who serve in our armed forces. I thank my hon. Friend for the work that he is doing on the Defence Committee, because, of course, he brings personal expertise to that work. Those who serve on the frontline deserve our support when they get home, and I can assure him of the Government's commitment to that. All troops facing allegations receive legal aid from the Government, with the guarantee that it will not be claimed back. In relation to IHAT, which he specifically referred to, we are committed to reducing its case load to a small number of credible cases as quickly as possible. On the action that has been taken in relation to the individual he has referred to, I think it is absolutely appalling when people try to make a business out of chasing after our brave troops.

Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Lab): Nine out of 10 NHS trusts say their hospitals have been at unsafe levels of overcrowding. One in six accident and emergency units in England is set to be closed or downgraded. Could the Prime Minister please explain how closing A&E departments will tackle overcrowding and ever-growing waiting lists?

The Prime Minister: First, I extend my thanks and, I am sure, those of the whole House to the hard-working staff in the NHS, who do a great job day in and day out treating patients. Yes, we recognise there are heavy

pressures on the NHS. That is why, this year, we are funding the NHS at £1.3 billion more than the Labour party promised at the last election. The right hon. Gentleman refers specifically to accident and emergency. What is our response in accident and emergency? We see 600 more A&E consultants, 1,500 more A&E doctors and 2,000 more paramedics. It is not about standing up, making a soundbite and asking a question; it is about delivering results, and that is what this Conservative Government are doing.

Jeremy Corbyn: Congratulating A&E staff is one thing; paying them properly is another. I hope the Prime Minister managed to see the BBC report on the Royal Blackburn A&E department, which showed that people had to wait up to 13 hours and 52 minutes to be seen. A major cause of the pressure on A&Es is the £4.6 billion cut in the social care budget since 2010. Earlier this week, Liverpool's very esteemed adult social care director, Samih Kalakeche, resigned, saying:

"Frankly I can't see social services surviving after two years. That's the absolute maximum... people are suffering, and we are really only seeing the tip of the iceberg."

What advice do the Government have for the people of Liverpool in this situation?

The Prime Minister: The right hon.—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. It is bad enough when Members who are within the curtilage of the Chamber shout; those who are not absolutely should not do so. It is a discourtesy to the House of Commons—nothing more, nothing less. Please do not do it.

The Prime Minister: The right hon. Gentleman referred at an early stage of his question to Blackburn. I am happy to say that compared to 2010 there are 129 more hospital doctors and 413 more nurses in Blackburn's East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust. He then went on to talk about waiting times. Waiting times can be an issue. Where is it that you wait a week longer for pneumonia treatment, a week longer for heart disease treatment, seven weeks longer for cataract treatment, 11 weeks longer for hernia treatment, and 21 weeks longer for a hip operation? It is not in England—it is in Wales. Who is in power in Wales? Labour.

Jeremy Corbyn: My question was about the comments from Samih Kalakeche in Liverpool and why the people of Liverpool are having to suffer these great cuts. Liverpool has asked to meet the Government on four occasions.

The crisis is so bad that until yesterday David Hodge, the Conservative leader of Surrey County Council, planned to hold a referendum for a 15% increase in council tax. At the last minute, it was called off. Can the Prime Minister tell the House whether or not a special deal was done for Surrey?

The Prime Minister: The decision as to whether or not to hold a referendum in Surrey is entirely a matter for the local authority in Surrey—Surrey County Council.

The right hon. Gentleman raised the issue of social care, which we have had exchanges on across this Dispatch Box before. As I have said before, we do need to find a long-term, sustainable solution for social care in this country. I recognise the short-term pressures. That is

why we have enabled local authorities to put more money into social care. We have provided more money. Over the next two years, £900 million more will be available for social care. But we also need to look at ensuring that good practice is spread across the whole country. We can look at places such as Barnsley, North Tyneside, St Helens and Rutland. Towards the end of last year, there were virtually no delayed discharges attributable to social care in those councils. But we also need to look long term. That is why the Cabinet Office is driving a review, with the relevant Departments, to find a sustainable solution, which the Labour party ducked for far too long.

Jeremy Corbyn: My question was whether there had been a special deal done for Surrey. The leader said that they had had many conversations with the Government. We know they have, because I have been leaked copies of texts sent by the Tory leader, David Hodge, intended for somebody called “Nick” who works for Ministers in the Department for Communities and Local Government. One of the texts reads:

“I am advised that DCLG officials have been working on a solution and you will be contacting me to agree a memorandum of understanding.”

Will the Government now publish this memorandum of understanding, and while they are about it, will all councils be offered the same deal?

The Prime Minister: What we have given all councils is the opportunity to raise a 3% precept on council tax, to go into social care. The right hon. Gentleman talks about understanding. What the Labour party fails to understand—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. There is far too much noise. Mr Pound, calm yourself—you are supposed to be a senior statesman—and Mr Rotheram, you should reserve your shouting for the stands at Anfield.

The Prime Minister: As I say, all councils have the opportunity to raise the 3% precept, to put that funding into the provision of social care. What the Labour party fails to understand is that this is not just a question of looking at money; it is a question of looking at spreading best practice and finding a sustainable solution. I have to say to the right hon. Gentleman that if we look at social care provision across the entire country, we will see that the last thing that social care providers need is another one of Labour’s bouncing cheques.

Jeremy Corbyn: I wonder if this has anything to do with the fact that the Chancellor and the Health Secretary both represent Surrey constituencies.

There was a second text from the Surrey County Council leader to “Nick”. It says:

“The numbers you indicated are the numbers I understand are acceptable for me to accept and call off the R”.

I have been reading a bit of John le Carré and apparently “R” means “referendum”—it is very subtle, all this. He goes on to say in his text to “Nick”:

“If it is possible for that info to be sent to myself I can then revert back soonest, really want to kill this off”.

So, how much did the Government offer Surrey to “kill this off”, and is the same sweetheart deal on offer to every council facing the social care crisis created by this Government?

The Prime Minister: I have made clear to the right hon. Gentleman what has been made available to every council, which is the ability to raise the precept. I have to say to him—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. As colleagues know, I never mind how long Prime Minister’s questions take. The questions and the answers must be heard.

The Prime Minister: The right hon. Gentleman comes to the Dispatch Box making all sorts of claims. Yet again, what we get from Labour is alternative facts; what it really needs is an alternative leader.

Jeremy Corbyn: My question was, what deal was offered to Surrey that got it to call off a referendum, and will the same deal be offered to every other council going through a social care crisis?

Hospital wards are overcrowded, a million people are not getting the care they need, and family members, mostly women, are having to give up work to care for loved ones. Every day that the Prime Minister fails to act, this crisis gets worse. Will she finally come clean and provide local authorities with the funding they need to fund social care properly, so that our often elderly and vulnerable people can be treated with the support and dignity that they deserve in a civilised society?

The Prime Minister: The deal that is on offer to all councils is the one that I have already set out. Let me be very clear with the right hon. Gentleman. As ever, he stands up and consistently asks for more spending, more money, more funding. What he always fails to recognise is that you can spend money on social care and the national health service only if you have a strong economy to deliver the wealth that you need. There is a fundamental difference between us. When I talk—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. I am sorry, but there is still too much noise in the Chamber. People observing our proceedings, both here and outside, want the questions heard and the answers heard, and they will be.

The Prime Minister: There is a difference between us. When I talk about half a trillion pounds, it is about the money we will be spending on the NHS this Parliament. When Labour Members talk about half a trillion pounds, it is about the money they want to borrow: Conservatives investing in the NHS; Labour bankrupting Britain.

Q4. [908649] **Scott Mann** (North Cornwall) (Con): Significant challenges face this great nation of ours, Prime Minister, one of which is tackling mental health, particularly for young people. The pressures of juggling school life and family life, and of staying safe and feeling valued online, are more difficult than ever. Will the Prime Minister meet me and my team to discuss the mental health app we have been working on and developing to give young people a toolbox to help them in their times of crisis?

The Prime Minister: I am very interested to hear of the important work my hon. Friend is doing in that important area. As he knows, I think we need to put more of a focus on mental health and make progress. I am pleased to say that something like 1,400 more people are accessing mental health services every day. That is an advance, but more needs to be done. We are putting more money—£68 million—into improving mental healthcare through digital innovation, which sounds as if it fits right into what he is looking at. There will be a focus on that with children's and young people's mental health in mind. He might want to look out for the Department of Health and Department for Education joint Green Paper on that, which they will publish in October.

Angus Robertson (Moray) (SNP): Last night, parliamentarians from across the Chamber and across the parties voted overwhelmingly against the UK Government's Brexit plans—in the Scottish Parliament. If the United Kingdom is a partnership of equals, will the Prime Minister compromise like the Scottish Government and reach a negotiated agreement before invoking article 50, or will she just carry on regardless?

The Prime Minister: As the right hon. Gentleman knows, when the UK Government negotiate, we will negotiate as the Government for the whole United Kingdom. We have put in place the Joint Ministerial Committee arrangements through various committees, which enable us to work closely with the devolved Administrations to identify the particular issues they want represented as we put our views together. We have said that we will intensify the discussions within that JMC arrangement, and that is exactly what we will be doing.

Angus Robertson: When the Prime Minister was in Edinburgh on 15 July last year, she pledged that she would not trigger article 50 until she had an agreed UK-wide approach. Given that the Scottish Parliament has voted overwhelmingly against her approach, and that all bar one MP representing a Scottish constituency in the House of Commons has voted against her approach, she does not have an agreed UK-wide approach. As the Prime Minister knows, a lot of people in Scotland watch Prime Minister's questions. Will she tell those viewers in Scotland whether she intends to keep her word to Scotland or not?

The Prime Minister: We are ensuring that we are working closely with the Scottish Government, and indeed with the other devolved Administrations, as we take this matter forward. I would just remind the right hon. Gentleman of two things. First, the Supreme Court was very clear that the Scottish Parliament does not have a veto on the triggering of article 50—the European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill, which is going through the House, obviously gives the power to the Government to trigger article 50. I would also remind him of this point, because he constantly refers to the interests of Scotland inside the European Union: an independent Scotland would not be in the European Union.

Q5. [908650] Jake Berry (Rossendale and Darwen) (Con): The people of Rossendale and Darwen warmly welcome the Government's housing White Paper. Will my right

hon. Friend confirm that, when it comes to providing more security for renters, building more affordable homes and helping people to buy their own home, this party—the Conservative party—is fixing our broken housing market?

The Prime Minister: I am happy to agree with my hon. Friend. Our broken housing market is one of the greatest barriers to progress in Britain today, and the excellent housing White Paper brought out by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government sets out the steps we will take to fix it. My hon. Friend is right: it is the Conservatives in government who will support local authorities to deliver more of the right homes in the right places, to encourage faster build-out of developments—I am sure everybody recognises the problem of planning permissions that are given and then not built out—and to create the conditions for a more competitive and diverse housing market. We are calling for action and we are setting out the responsibilities of all parties in building the homes that Britain needs.

Q3. [908648] Patrick Grady (Glasgow North) (SNP): Does the Prime Minister agree that in a 21st-century Parliament the rules should not enable any Member to speak for 58 minutes in a three-hour debate? Does she agree that the rules of the House should be changed to prevent filibustering and ensure that Members on both sides of the House get a fair share of the time available?

The Prime Minister: I find that a rather curious question from the hon. Gentleman. As it happens, last night I was out of the House between the two votes. I switched on the BBC parliamentary channel and I saw the hon. Gentleman speaking. I turned over to something else. I switched back to the parliamentary channel and he was still speaking. I switched over to something else. I switched back and he was still speaking. He is the last person to complain about filibustering in this House. *[Interruption.]*

Mr Speaker: Order. Mr Docherty-Hughes, you seem to be in a state of permanent over-excitement. Calm yourself, man. Take some sort of medicament and it will soothe you. We must hear Mrs Villiers.

Q6. [908651] Mrs Theresa Villiers (Chipping Barnet) (Con): As we prepare in this House to take back control over our laws on agriculture, will the Prime Minister agree to use Brexit as an opportunity to strengthen, not weaken, the rules that safeguard the welfare of animals?

The Prime Minister: My right hon. Friend raises an important point that is, I know, of concern to many people in the House and outside. We should be proud that in the UK we have some of the highest animal welfare standards in the world—indeed, one of the highest scores for animal protection in the world. Leaving the EU will not change that. I can assure her that we are committed to maintaining and, where possible, improving standards of welfare in the UK, while ensuring of course that our industry is not put at a competitive disadvantage.

Q15. [908660] Gavin Newlands (Paisley and Renfrewshire North) (SNP): Last week, the Russian Duma shamefully decriminalised domestic violence committed against women

and children. Given the Prime Minister's new global Britain approach, I trust that the Government will encourage Russia to rethink that regressive approach, which trivialises domestic violence. Does she agree that ratifying the Istanbul convention would send a message to Russia and the world about the priority that should be placed on ending gender-based violence?

The Prime Minister: I am proud that in this country we have strengthened the law on domestic violence and violence against women and girls. We see this as a retrograde step by the Russian Government. Repealing existing legislation sends out the wrong message on what is a global problem. We have joined others in the Council of Europe and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe in criticising that decision.

Q7. [908652] **Iain Stewart** (Milton Keynes South) (Con): Each year, the NHS reportedly spends £80 million more than it needs to on prescriptions for basic painkillers that can be sourced much more cheaply, but at the same time secondary breast cancer patients face being denied life-extending drugs such as Kadcyla by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Will my right hon. Friend review that poor allocation of resources and give breast cancer sufferers the hope that they deserve?

The Prime Minister: This is obviously a very important issue that my hon. Friend has raised. I understand that on the point of basic medication it is not the fact that the NHS pays more for basic painkillers than on the high street: in fact, its prices are lower. In the case of Kadcyla and similar drugs, it is right that difficult decisions are made on the basis of clinical evidence. I understand that NICE is undertaking a comprehensive assessment before making a final recommendation, and in the meantime Kadcyla is still available to patients.

Tom Elliott (Fermanagh and South Tyrone) (UUP): Last month, Sir Anthony Hart published his report on historical institutional abuse in Northern Ireland. Given the uncertain political situation with the Northern Ireland political institutions, if the Executive is not up and running within a month, will the Prime Minister commit to implementing the report in full?

The Prime Minister: This was obviously an important review. We have our own inquiry into historical child abuse in England and Wales. I recognise the hon. Gentleman's point about looking ahead to the future. The elections in Northern Ireland will take place on 2 March. There will then be a limited period for an Executive to be put together. I fervently hope an Executive can be put together to maintain the devolved institutions, and I encourage all parties to work very hard to ensure that. I do not want the benefits of progress to be undone, but I am sure, looking ahead, that whatever is necessary will be done to ensure that the findings of the report are taken into account and acted on.

Q8. [908653] **James Morris** (Halesowen and Rowley Regis) (Con): The Prime Minister has been crystal clear on her negotiating objectives as we prepare to leave the European Union. Does she agree that regions like the west midlands, part of which I represent, need a voice in the negotiations to ensure we take the opportunities presented by Brexit

to raise investment in education, skills and infrastructure and to ensure that her vision of a global Britain represents the interests of all the regions of England, as well as the broader United Kingdom?

The Prime Minister: I agree with my hon. Friend. When we negotiate as a United Kingdom, we will be negotiating for the whole of the United Kingdom and taking account of all parts of the United Kingdom. We have a real ambition to make the west midlands an engine for growth. That is about growing the region's economy and more jobs. Money has been put into growth deal funding and, for example, the Birmingham rail hub. The west midlands will of course be getting a strong voice nationally with a directly elected Mayor in May. I believe Andy Street, with both local expertise and business experience, will be a very good Mayor for the west midlands.

Mr Ronnie Campbell (Blyth Valley) (Lab) *rose—*

Mr Speaker: I welcome the hon. Gentleman back again to the Chamber.

Mr Campbell: I'm looking pretty slim as well, Mr Speaker!

I had five months of NHS treatment at the Newcastle Royal Victoria infirmary under the auspices of Professor Griffin, a marvellous surgeon. Seeing as I might have come out with palliative care, I think he has just about saved my life. That is the best side of the NHS. The service I received was absolutely wonderful, but there is a flip side. What we have today is what are called "corridor nurses", who look after patients on trolleys in corridors. Quite honestly, Prime Minister, that is not the way we want the health service to be run. We want it to be run in the way it saved me. Get your purse open and give them the money they want.

The Prime Minister: As Mr Speaker said, I welcome the hon. Gentleman back to his place in the Chamber. I commend the surgeon and all those in the national health service who treated him and enabled him to be here today and continue his duties. There are, as we know, surgeons, doctors, nurses and other staff up and down the NHS day in, day out saving lives. We should commend them for all they do. The north-east is a very good example of some of the really good practice in the NHS. I want to see that good practice spread across the NHS in the whole country.

Q9. [908654] **Dr Sarah Wollaston** (Totnes) (Con): I am not alone in hearing from families long-settled here in Britain who are deeply worried that they could be separated after we leave the European Union. I know the Prime Minister will not want that to happen. Will she reassure all our constituents today that those who were born elsewhere in the European Union but settled here in the UK, married or in partnerships with British citizens will have the right to remain?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend obviously raises an issue that is of concern all across this House. As she says, it is of concern to many individuals outside the House who want reassurance about their future. As I have said, I want to be able to give, and I expect to be able to give, that reassurance, but I want to see the same

reassurance for UK citizens living in the EU. What I can say to her is that when I trigger article 50, I intend to make it clear that I want this to be a priority for an early stage of the negotiations, so we can address this issue and give reassurance to the people concerned.

Dawn Butler (Brent Central) (Lab): Just two weeks ago, Quamari Serunkuma-Barnes, 15 years old, left school, was stabbed four times and died. Three days earlier, Djodjo Nsaka, 19 years old, was stabbed to death in Wembley. Just a few months earlier, two of my young constituents, James Owusu-Ajyekum, 22 years old, and Oliver Tetlow, 27 years old, were killed in what the police say was a case of mistaken identity. Next week, I am meeting the deputy Mayor of London to discuss this and other issues. Will the Prime Minister meet me, fellow MPs and my borough commander to talk about this issue and the Sycamore project, which we would like rolled out in London and beyond?

The Prime Minister: First, may I send the condolences of the whole House to the families and friends of all those the hon. Lady refers to who were brutally stabbed and attacked in knife attacks? This is obviously an important issue, particularly in London, and we want it addressed. A lot of good work has been done. I am not aware of the Sycamore project, but I would be happy to hear more details of it.

Q10. [908655] **James Berry** (Kingston and Surbiton) (Con): From medics at Kingston hospital to researchers at Kingston University and the staff at growing electronics businesses such as Genuine Solutions, Kingston's workforce is enriched by highly skilled workers from abroad, so will my right hon. Friend confirm that, after we leave the EU, we will continue to welcome highly skilled workers from the EU and beyond?

The Prime Minister: We have been very clear that we want to bring the net migration numbers down, but we also want to ensure that the brightest and the best are still welcome here in the UK. That is why people want to see the UK Government making decisions about people coming here from the EU. We are clear, however, as I said in my Lancaster House speech, that there will still be immigration from the EU into the UK. We want to ensure that the brightest and the best can come here.

Liz Kendall (Leicester West) (Lab): Yesterday, the Brexit Minister claimed that Parliament would have a meaningful vote on the final EU deal. Will the Prime Minister confirm that, under her plans, Parliament will either have to accept what the Government offer or fall back on World Trade Organisation rules and that, in the event of no deal, there will be no vote at all? In reality, is this not just a case of take it or leave it? It is not a meaningful concession; it is a con.

The Prime Minister: We have been clear on this, but I am happy to reiterate what the Minister said yesterday. We have looked at this matter. I said in my Lancaster House speech that there would be a vote on the final deal, but there were a number of questions about what exactly that meant. We will bring forward a motion; the motion will be on the final agreement; it will be for approval by both Houses of Parliament; it will be before the final agreement is concluded, and we expect—I know that this has been an issue for several right hon.

and hon. Members—and intend that that will happen before the European Parliament debates and votes on the final agreement.

Q11. [908656] **Mr Graham Brady** (Altrincham and Sale West) (Con): The Prime Minister knows that Trafford schools are the best in the country, but they are also in one of £40's worst-funded areas. Perversely, the draft funding formula would actually cut funding to Trafford schools, not increase it. When she reviews the draft proposals, will she please look for a new formula that guarantees that all the worst-funded areas see an increase in funding, not a cut?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend raises an important matter that is on the minds of a number of right hon. and hon. Friends. As I said earlier, the current system of funding is unfair, not transparent and out of date. I want a system that supports our aspiration to ensure that every child has a good school place. In looking at these reforms, I can assure my hon. Friend that we want to get this right, which is why we are consulting and why we will look closely at the responses to the consultation.

Caroline Flint (Don Valley) (Lab): Npower has announced a 9.8% increase on dual fuel bills, which even the former boss of Npower, Paul Massara, has described as "shocking". EDF has announced an 8.4% electricity hike, and it is reported that British Gas is preparing its 11 million customers for a 9% increase. Ofgem has moved to protect those who are on prepayment meters with a cap on their energy bills, so why does the Prime Minister not demand similar protection for the majority of customers, who are being ripped off, as the Competition and Markets Authority has said, to the sum of £1.4 billion a year?

The Prime Minister: The right hon. Lady may have missed the fact that we have said that where we think markets are not working, we will look at any measures that are needed—and the energy market is one of those we are looking at the moment.

Q12. [908657] **Karl McCartney** (Lincoln) (Con): In the spirit of neutrality, Speaker, the Prime Minister's Lancaster House speech last month was a rallying call to put the divisions of the referendum behind us and to unite behind a bold vision for a stronger, fairer more global Britain. Does my right hon. Friend agree with me that this is a vision that every Member should support, because the more united we are, the stronger our negotiating hand will be—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order, I apologise for interrupting, but the hon. Gentleman must be heard.

Karl McCartney: Thank you, Speaker.

Finally, does my right hon. Friend share my surprise that certain Opposition Front Benchers have not learned that disagreeing with their current party leader can cause headaches?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend is absolutely right, and I think all of us and everybody in the country wants to unite behind the Government's work to ensure that we get the best possible deal for the United Kingdom as we leave the European Union, and I believe that we

can get a deal that will be in the interests of both the UK and the EU. I had hoped that I would be able to welcome the shadow Home Secretary to the Front Bench in time for the vote that is going to take place later tonight. Perhaps Labour Members are starting to realise that their only real headache is their leader.

Owen Smith (Pontypridd) (Lab): Does the Prime Minister agree with the director general of the World Trade Organisation that if Britain were to leave the EU on WTO terms, it would cost £9 billion in lost trade each year?

The Prime Minister: What we want to do is to ensure that we negotiate a deal with the European Union that enables us to have the best possible deal in trading with and operating within the European Union single market in goods and services. I believe that is possible precisely because, as I have just said in response to my hon. Friend the Member for Lincoln (Karl McCartney), such a deal would be good not just for us, but for the EU as well.

Q13. [908658] **Julian Sturdy** (York Outer) (Con): The Prime Minister rightly argues for true parity of esteem between mental and physical health, but parents in York have been told that their children must wait up to a year for an assessment by child and adolescent mental health services. The Department of Health does not currently record these figures, so will my right hon. Friend consider making the monitoring of CAMHS waiting times a requirement?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend raises an important point. As I set out a few weeks ago, the Government will be reviewing the operation of CAMHS across the country, because I recognise some of the concerns that hon. Members have raised about it. We want to ensure that children and young people have easy access to mental health at the right time, because of the evidence that a significant proportion of mental health problems that arise later in life actually start in childhood and adolescence. We have made more money available to support transformation in children's and young people's mental health, but the shadow Health Secretary—sorry, I mean the Health Secretary is on—[*Interruption.*] The hon. Gentleman is in his place, as well. I hope the shadow Health Secretary will agree with me that we need to review CAMHS and ensure that we give the right to support to children, young people and adolescents with mental health problems. We will look at the issue that my hon. Friend has raised.

Sue Hayman (Workington) (Lab): Many hon. Members have recently made the long journey up to west Cumbria for the Copeland by-election, and will all have experienced the parlous state of our roads and our local railways. In fact, it has taken a by-election for Transport Ministers to look seriously at, and show any real interest in, the situation. Is the Prime Minister planning a trip herself, so that she, too, can experience why we need proper investment from this Government in the transport infrastructure in west Cumbria?

The Prime Minister: The Government are putting more money into infrastructure throughout the country. The Labour party had 13 years in which to improve transport in west Cumbria, and did not do anything about it.

Q14. [908659] **Chris Green** (Bolton West) (Con): I recently visited the headquarters of Woodall Nicholson, a world-class coachbuilding company based in my constituency, and heard about its exciting plans for the future. Will my right hon. Friend join me in emphasising the importance of skills and manufacturing to our economy, especially as we look to leave the European Union?

The Prime Minister: I thank my hon. Friend for drawing our attention to the example of Woodall Nicholson. We are pleased to hear that it has those good plans for the future. As we leave the EU, we will be doing so from a position of strength, and my hon. Friend is right to say that skills and manufacturing are important parts of our economy for the future. That is why, in the industrial strategy, we are looking into how we can develop the excellence that we have in the United Kingdom to ensure that we have a prosperous, growing economy for the future.

Ms Angela Eagle (Wallasey) (Lab): Last week, the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) pointed out that the Prime Minister's aspiration to achieve barrier-free, tariff-free trade with the single market, getting all the benefits but paying none of the costs, was akin to disappearing down the rabbit hole to Wonderland. I think that the Prime Minister makes a very interesting choice for Alice, but if she does not manage to achieve that high ambition, will she produce an analysis of what trading on the basis of WTO rules would mean for our economy, so that we, too, can make a proper choice?

The Prime Minister: I commend my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) for the significant service that he has given to the House and his constituents over the years. He and I have worked well over a number of years—although I should add that, when I was Home Secretary, I used to say, “I locked 'em up and he let 'em out.”

The Government believe that it is possible, within the two-year time frame, to secure agreement not just on our withdrawal from the European Union, but on the trade arrangements that will ensure that we have a strong strategic partnership with the European Union in the future.

Sir Eric Pickles (Brentwood and Ongar) (Con): When my right hon. Friend met Mr Netanyahu earlier this week, did she impress on him that a lasting peace settlement can only be secured if young Palestinians and young Israelis can look forward to a job, a share in prosperity and a life without fear? Does she agree that that can only be achieved through face-to-face negotiations, and will she join the Israeli Prime Minister in pressing the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority to engage in such negotiations?

The Prime Minister: My right hon. Friend has made an important point. We continue, as a Conservative Government, to believe that the two-state solution is the right one. It means a viable Palestinian state, but also a safe and secure Israel. Of course, it is for the parties to negotiate: obviously, there are others in the international arena who are doing their work to facilitate an agreement in the middle east, but ultimately it is for the two parties to agree on a way forward.

Sexual Offences (Amendment)

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

12.44 pm

Liz Saville Roberts (Dwyfor Meirionnydd) (PC): I beg to move,

That leave be given to bring in a Bill to make provision for the circumstances in which the sexual history of a victim of rape or attempted rape may be introduced at a trial; to prohibit in certain circumstances the disclosure by the police of a victim's identity to an alleged perpetrator of a serious sexual crime; to extend the range of serious offences which may be referred to the Court of Appeal on the grounds of undue leniency of the sentence; to amend the requirements for ground rules hearings; to make provision for the issuing in certain circumstances of guidance on safeguarding to schools; to make provision for training about serious sexual offences; to place a duty on the Secretary of State to provide guidelines for the courts in dealing with cases of serious sexual offences; to require the Secretary of State to report annually on the operation of the Act; and for connected purposes.

I appreciate that today's business is calling so I will not take 10 minutes of the House's time. I therefore hope that Government Ministers will agree to meet me and others to discuss in detail how the matters raised might be resolved.

The Bill was drafted following discussions with senior North Wales Police officers and the force's Amethyst sexual support centre and also victims' support groups in Wales. The subject has been the focus of wide consultation by Harry Fletcher and Claire Waxman of Voice4Victims, who have collected a dossier of victims' harrowing experiences.

Currently, victims of sexual abuse face the possibility of being humiliated and their credibility undermined by defence lawyers asking questions about their sexual partners, clothing and appearance. Clause 1 of this Bill would prevent such intrusive and damaging questioning, and replicate the law that protects victims in Australia, Canada and most of the United States. This rape shield ensures that a complainant's irrelevant sexual history in relation to the issue of consent is not wrongfully used as an indicator of the victim's truthfulness. This rape shield is a necessary legal guard against the twin myths peddled by some defence teams: first, that a woman who has sex with one man is more likely to consent to have sex with another; and that the evidence of a promiscuous woman is less credible.

A recent high-profile case in Wales has no doubt had an impact on victims' confidence to come forward. Dame Vera Baird QC, Northumbria's police and crime commissioner, has said: "The case is likely to encourage other defendants who claim consent to try to call evidence of their complainants' sexual behaviour with other men." She also said: "Fear that complainants will be accused of sexual behaviour with other men has historically been a major deterrent to women reporting rape."

Fear to report is compounded by the failure to prosecute. During 2015-16, there were 35,798 complaints of rape to the police, but just 2,689—7.5%—resulted in convictions. Some 90% of rape victims are female, and 10% are male.

Ivy, a rape victim, was told at a ground rules hearing that her sexual history would not be used, but in court she faced questions and allegations that she was promiscuous. There was no judicial intervention.

Emma was followed by a stranger who attacked and tried to rape her. Her screams were met with the threat that she stop or be killed. Fortunately, two off-duty

police officers heard her screams. The trial fixated on why Emma chose to wear a red dress on that summer evening.

Last year, 36% of rape trials overseen by the Northumbria court observers panel included questioning about prior sexual conduct of the complainant. In over 10% of these trials, in disregard of the present rules, applications were made on the morning of the trial, or after it had started, to allow such questioning. The humiliation of victims of sexual assault by reference to matters irrelevant to the case cannot be allowed to continue. The present law—section 41 of the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999—was intended to do this, but it is no longer serving its original purpose effectively.

The second major step forward in this Bill would be to stop the disclosure of the name of a victim of rape or attempted rape to an alleged perpetrator by the police. This happened in Máire's case. She was terrified that her attacker would find her via social media. She changed her name, moved house and withdrew from the electoral register. Another victim told Voice4Victims: "I am scared every day that he might find me. I would have been much safer had I not reported." Máire was correctly told by the police that there was neither policy nor legislation on disclosure of a victim's name when the parties were strangers; it is left to officer discretion. This clause would rightly ensure that names are not given by the police unless a Crown court judge makes an order on application from the suspect.

Clause 5 would require the Secretary of State to ensure that pupils are safeguarded in schools when there has been a serious sexual assault on one pupil by another. It follows a referral to Voice4Victims on Christmas eve. A teenage girl was raped by a fellow student at a party. He was arrested, charged and then bailed with a condition of no contact with the girl. To the family's shock, and the victim's distress, on returning to school she was placed in the same class as the attacker.

The Bill would also allow the Attorney General to refer unduly lenient sentences for stalking and coercive control to the Court of Appeal, introduce safeguards for rape victims in ground rule hearings and provide for guidance for criminal justice and educational staff. These much needed reforms will have limited impact, unless they are accompanied by proper training. The Secretary of State will therefore have a duty to publish and implement a strategy to provide high-quality training and advice for all relevant staff.

The provisions in the Bill are all based on the distressing experiences of victims of serious sexual crimes. These measures will help to restore victims' faith in the criminal justice system and allow the criminal justice system to function more effectively. Who could argue that victims of rape should be re-victimised by the very system through which they seek redress? I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered,

That Liz Saville Roberts, Jess Phillips, Dr Sarah Wollaston, Sir Edward Garnier, Mr Graham Allen, Carolyn Harris, Tracy Brabin, Alison Thewliss, Ms Margaret Ritchie, Tim Loughton, Dr Eilidh Whiteford and Mr Alistair Carmichael present the Bill.

Liz Saville Roberts accordingly presented the Bill.

Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time on Friday 24 March, and to be printed (Bill 137).

European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill

[2ND ALLOCATED DAY]

*Further considered in Committee (Progress reported,
7 February)*

[ELEANOR LAING *in the Chair*]

12.53 pm

Kit Malthouse (North West Hampshire) (Con): On a point of order, Mrs Laing. I spent a lot of time last night studying the large number of amendments that have been tabled for today, and I have to confess that I am concerned as to the admissibility of a large number of them. It is my understanding that amendments are not admissible—out of order—if they are vague or unintelligible without further amendment. As an example, I would like to bring to your attention some of the terms in new clause 2, the lead new clause in the debate. It appears to be very vague, implying that

“the Prime Minister shall give an undertaking to have regard to the public interest”

in a list of various—

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order. I understand the point that the hon. Gentleman is making, but the matter that he is raising is a matter for debate. Some of the new clauses and amendments that were tabled were considered to be in order and have therefore been selected for debate. Some were not in order, and were therefore ineligible for selection for debate. That is not a matter of opinion; it is a matter of fact. I can assure the hon. Gentleman, although I have no obligation so to do, that the matter has been very carefully considered. New clause 2 is perfectly in order. He might well disagree with the points raised in it—indeed, I would expect him to—and I would expect him to make his disagreement known to the House in due course. For the moment, however, I can assure him and the House that new clause 2 is perfectly in order and that it will be debated.

Kit Malthouse *rose*—

The First Deputy Chairman: Further to that point of order? I am sure that the hon. Gentleman would not wish to question the judgment of the Chair.

Kit Malthouse: I am just asking for an explanation—

The First Deputy Chairman: No; the hon. Gentleman will resume his seat, please. [*Interruption.*] I thank hon. Members, but I am perfectly capable of dealing with this matter. It is not in order for the hon. Gentleman to ask for an explanation. That would be to question the judgment of the Chair, which is—I should carefully say—a matter up with which I will not put. We will debate new clause 2, which will be moved by Mr Paul Blomfield.

New Clause 2

CONDUCT OF NEGOTIATIONS

“Before giving any notification under Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, the Prime Minister shall give an undertaking to have regard to the public interest during negotiations in—

- (a) maintaining a stable and sustainable economy,
- (b) preserving peace in Northern Ireland,

- (c) having trading arrangements with the European Union for goods and services that are free of tariff and non-tariff barriers and further regulatory burdens,
- (d) co-operation with the European Union in education, research and science, environment protection, and preventing and detecting serious and organised crime and terrorist activity,
- (e) maintaining all existing social, economic, consumer and workers’ rights.”—(*Paul Blomfield.*)

This new clause sets out statutory objectives that the Government must have regard to whilst carrying out negotiations under article 50.

Brought up, and read the First time.

Paul Blomfield (Sheffield Central) (Lab): I beg to move, That the clause be read a Second time.

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): With this it will be convenient to discuss the following:

New clause 7—*Conduct of negotiations—anti-tax haven—*

“(1) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the public interest in maintaining all existing EU tax avoidance and evasion legislation.

(2) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of Crown must comply with the European Union Code of Conduct on Business Taxation.”

This new clause sets out the government’s commitment to observe the Code of Conduct on business taxation to prevent excessive tax competition and lays out the statutory objectives that the Government must have regard to EU tax avoidance and evasion whilst carrying out negotiations under article 50.

New clause 11—*Tariff-free trade in goods and services—*

“In the event of the exercise of the power in Section 1, Her Majesty’s Government shall seek a new Treaty between the United Kingdom and the European Union on tariff-free trade in goods and services.”

This new clause would ensure that, in the event of the exercise of the power in Section 1, Her Majesty’s Government shall seek a new Treaty between the United Kingdom and the European Union on tariff-free trade in goods and services rather than withdraw from the European Union with no alternative objective.

New clause 13—*Transitional arrangements—*

“Her Majesty’s Government shall seek a transitional trading agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union as part of the negotiations following notification under section 1.”

This new clause would make it an objective for HM Government to secure a transitional approach towards new trading relationships with the EU Member States following the end of the Article 50 notification and negotiation period.

New clause 15—*Visa-free travel—*

“On the exercise of the power in section 1, Her Majesty’s Government shall endeavour to maintain the visa policy in operation at the date of the coming into force of this Act in relation to citizens of member states of the European Union and the United Kingdom.”

This new clause would seek to ensure that HM Government has the objective of maintaining the visa policy in operation at the date of the coming into force of this Act in relation to citizens of member states of the European Union and the United Kingdom.

New clause 21—*Trading rights—financial services—*

“On the exercise of the power in section 1, Her Majesty’s Government shall make it an objective to secure the trading rights for UK-based financial services companies that exist by virtue of the UK’s membership of the European Union as of the day on which this Act comes into force.”

[The First Deputy Chairman]

This new clause would seek to ensure that Her Majesty's Government endeavours to preserve the existing trading rights for UK-based financial services companies as currently exist.

New clause 55—Conduct of negotiations—

“Before giving any notification under Article 50(2) of the treaty on European Union, the Prime Minister must undertake to have regard to the public interest during negotiations in—

- (a) maintaining and advancing manufacturing industry,
- (b) securing the interests of all the regions in England,
- (c) delivering existing climate change commitments,
- (d) maintaining the common travel area with the Republic of Ireland.”

This new clause sets out statutory objectives to which the Government must have regard whilst carrying out negotiations under Article 50.

New clause 70—Relationship with Europe—

“Before the Prime Minister can exercise the power in section 1, the Prime Minister must commit to negotiating a deal that allows free trade and cooperation between Wales and all European countries.”

This new clause requires the Prime Minister to commit to implementing the Leave Campaign's pledge to negotiate deal that allows free trade and cooperation between Wales and all European countries before exercising the powers outlined in section 1.

New clause 76—Framework for transfer of data—

“In the event of exercise of the power in section 1, Her Majesty's Government shall promote a framework for the transfer of data between the UK and the EU to underpin continued trade in services.”

This new clause would make it the policy of Her Majesty's Government to promote a framework for cross-border data flows to safeguard the UK services economy and its trade with European markets.

New clause 77—Trade in goods and services—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of retaining full participation in the making of all rules affecting trade in goods and services in the European Union.”

This new clause would require HM Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation on agreeing all rules affecting trade in goods and services in the European Union.

New clause 78—Europol—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Police Office (Europol) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Police Office (Europol).

New clause 79—European Chemicals Agency—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA).

New clause 80—European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to

participate in the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).

New clause 81—Community Plant Variety Office—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO).

New clause 82—European Medicines Agency—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Medicines Agency (EMA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Medicines Agency (EMA).

New clause 83—European Agency for Health and Safety at Work—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work (EU-OSHA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work (EU-OSHA).

New clause 84—European Aviation Safety Agency—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).

New clause 85—European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop).

New clause 86—European Police College—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Police College (Cepol) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty's Government to negotiate to continue the UK's participation in the European Police College (Cepol).

New clause 87—*European Environment Agency*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Environment Agency (EEA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Environment Agency (EEA).

New clause 88—*European Food Safety Authority*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).

New clause 89—*European Investment Bank*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Investment Bank (EIB) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Investment Bank (EIB).

New clause 90—*Eurojust*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in Eurojust on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in Eurojust.

New clause 91—*European Maritime Safety Agency*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA).

New clause 92—*European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA).

New clause 93—*European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA).

New clause 94—*European Satellite Centre*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Satellite Centre (EUSC) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Satellite Centre (EUSC).

New clause 95—*Protected designation of origin scheme*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the protected designation of origin (PDO) scheme on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the protected designation of origin (PDO) scheme.

New clause 96—*Protected geographical indication scheme*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the protected geographical indication (PGI) scheme on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the protected geographical indication (PGI) scheme.

New clause 97—*Traditional specialities guaranteed scheme*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the traditional specialities guaranteed (TSG) scheme on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the traditional specialities guaranteed (TSG) scheme.

New clause 100—*Equality and women’s rights*—

“Before issuing any notification under Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union the Prime Minister shall give an undertaking to have regard to the public interest during negotiations for the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union in—

- (a) maintaining employment rights and protections derived from EU legislation,
- (b) ensuring that EU co-operation to end violence against women and girls, to tackle female genital mutilation and to end human trafficking will continue unaffected,
- (c) the desirability of continuing to recognise restraining orders placed on abusive partners in EU Member States in the UK and restraining orders placed on abusive partners in the UK across the EU, and
- (d) establishing a cross-departmental working group to assess and make recommendations for developing legislation on equality and access to justice.”

New clause 104—*Agricultural Sector—Trade Deals*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to, and shall include, the agricultural sector in any new trade settlement with the European Union.”

[The First Deputy Chairman]

New clause 163—*Consultation with representatives of English regions*—

“(1) Before the Prime Minister issues any notification under Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, the Secretary of State shall set out a strategy for consultation with representatives of the English regions, including those without directly elected Mayors, on the UK’s priorities in negotiations for the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union.

(2) The Secretary of State shall nominate representatives for the purposes of subsection (1).”

This new clause would require the Government to designate representatives from English regions and set out a strategy for consulting them on the UK’s priorities in negotiations on withdrawal from the EU.

New clause 166—*Rights and opportunities of young people*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must seek to ensure that the rights and opportunities of people aged under 25 in the United Kingdom are maintained on the same terms as on the day on which Royal Assent is given to this Act, including—

- (a) retaining the ability to work and travel visa-free in the EU,
- (b) retaining the ability to study in other EU member states on the same terms as on the day on which Royal Assent is given to this Act, and
- (c) retaining the ability to participate in EU programmes designed to provide opportunities to young people, including programmes to facilitate studying in other EU member states.”

This new clause would ensure that the Government must seek to protect the rights and opportunities currently enjoyed by young UK nationals so that they should not become worse off than their European counterparts.

New clause 170—*EHIC scheme*—

“(1) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC) scheme on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union”.

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC) scheme.

New clause 172—*Erasmus+ Programme—report*

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the Erasmus+ Programme on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union”.

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the Erasmus+ Programme.

New clause 174—*European Research Area (ERA)*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Research Area (ERA) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union”.

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Research Area (ERA).

New clause 178—*European Arrest Warrant*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to

participate in the European Arrest Warrant on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union”.

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in the European Arrest Warrant.

New clause 181—*Trade agreements*—

“(1) In the course of negotiations with the European Union on the UK’s withdrawal from the Union, Her Majesty’s Government must have regard to the value of UK membership of the EU Customs Union in maintaining tariff and barrier-free trade with the EU.

(2) Before exercising the power to notify under section 1 of this Act, the Prime Minister should lay before Parliament an assessment of the value of UK membership of the EU Customs Union in maintaining ongoing tariff and barrier-free trade with the EU.”

New clause 183—*Membership of the single market including EU-wide reform of freedom of movement*—

“(1) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must seek to—

- (a) secure reforms of provisions governing the free movement of persons between EU member states in such a way as to allow for greater controls over movement of people for member states and to enable the UK to retain full membership of the European single market, or
- (b) maintain the highest possible level of integration with the European single market.”

This new clause would ensure that the Government must seek to negotiate EU-wide reforms to freedom of movement in the single market to enable the Government to seek to retain membership of the single market or as close to membership as possible.

New clause 185—*Euratom*—

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of continuing to participate in the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) on the same basis as any other member state of the European Union.”

This new clause would require Her Majesty’s Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation in Euratom.

New clause 193—*Conduct of negotiations*—

“() Before giving any notification under Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, the Prime Minister shall give an undertaking to have regard to public interest during negotiations in maintaining the United Kingdom’s membership of the European Convention on Human Rights and the European Court of Human Rights.”

Amendment 22, in clause 1, page 1, line 2, leave out “may” and insert “shall”

Amendment 23, page 1, line 2, after “notify” insert “by 31 March 2017”

Amendment 7, page 1, line 3, at end insert—

“if it is the intention of Her Majesty’s Government to continue to participate in EU Common Foreign and Security Policy”

This amendment would ensure that the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union would not affect the intention of Her Majesty’s Government to continue to participate in EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

Amendment 8, page 1, line 3, at end insert—

“but not before 1st November 2017”

This amendment would ensure that any notification of intention to withdraw from the EU cannot be made before 1st November 2017.

Amendment 9, page 1, line 3, at end insert—

“and shall make it an objective for the United Kingdom to remain a member of the European Single Market.”

This amendment would ensure that the policy of HM Government shall be to negotiate the United Kingdom's continued membership of the European Single Market.

Amendment 29, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“after consultation with the Government of Gibraltar.”

Amendment 30, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“and its institutions with the exception of the European Defence Agency.”

Amendment 31, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“and its institutions with the exception of Euratom.”

Amendment 32, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“and its institutions with the exception of Europol.”

Amendment 33, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“and its institutions with the exception of the European Space Agency.”

Amendment 34, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“with the exception of the Common Foreign and Security Policy.”

Amendment 42, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“The power to make this notification shall not include an intention to withdraw the United Kingdom from membership or participation of the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).”

Amendment 54, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“(1A) The Prime Minister may not notify under subsection (1) until the Chief Minister of Gibraltar has notified Her Majesty's Government that Gibraltar consents to the process for the withdrawal of the UK from the European Union.”

Amendment 89, page 1, line 3, at end insert—
“(1A) The Prime Minister may not notify under subsection (1) the intention to withdraw the United Kingdom from membership of, and participation in, the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), until replacement treaties with other EU Member States and relevant third countries have been agreed.”

Amendment 35, page 1, line 5, at end insert—

“(3) This section does not apply to Gibraltar.”

Amendment 38, page 1, line 5, at end insert—

“(3) Before the Prime Minister issues a notification under this section, Her Majesty's Government has a duty to lay before both Houses of Parliament a White Paper identifying new oversight, accountability and enforcement mechanisms replacing the role of the European Commission and the European Court of Justice to ensure an equivalent level of compliance with EU-derived environmental regulation upon withdrawal from the European Union.”

This amendment would ensure that the UK judicial system is prepared and ready to effectively perform the enforcement duties currently undertaken by institutions of the EU with regards to environmental regulation.

Clause 1 stand part.

Clause 2 stand part.

New clause 12—*International trade*—

“Her Majesty's Government shall endeavour to incorporate into UK regulation the international trade policies that apply to the UK as a consequence of its membership of the European Union and European Customs Union on the date of the exercise of the power in section 1.”

This new clause would make it the policy of HM Government to endeavour to “grandfather” existing trade policies currently applicable to the UK by virtue of UK membership of the EU Customs Union.

New clause 32—*Social Chapter rights—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of Social Chapter rights.”

New clause 34—*Free trade—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of tariff and barrier-free trade with EU member states.”

New clause 35—*Environmental standards—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of environmental standards.”

New clause 36—*Climate change—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to how this will deliver UK and EU climate change commitments.”

New clause 37—*Research and Development—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of international collaboration on research and development by universities and other institutions.”

New clause 38—*Common travel area—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of the common travel area with the Republic of Ireland.”

New clause 39—*Crime and security—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of international collaboration on tackling crime and strengthening security.”

New clause 40—*Economic and financial stability—draft framework*—

“Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must set out a draft framework for the future relationship with the European Union which includes reference to the maintenance of economic and financial stability.”

New clause 50—*Commencement*—

“This Act shall not come into effect before Parliament has sat for one month following the first General Election that takes place after 31 March. 2017.”

New clause 133—*Commencement*—

“This Act does not come into force until the Prime Minister has certified that it is the policy of Her Majesty's Government that on leaving the European Union the United Kingdom should as soon as possible accede to the European Economic Area Agreement as a non-EU party.”

New clause 141—*Extent*—

“This Act extends to the whole of the United Kingdom and to Gibraltar.”

New clause 186—*Report on future participation in Euratom*—

“Within 30 days of the Prime Minister exercising the power under section (1), a Minister of State shall publish a report on the United Kingdom's intended future participation in and engagement with the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), and shall lay a copy of the report before each House of Parliament.”

This new clause would seek a report from Her Majesty's Government on the UK's participation in and engagement with Euratom, following the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.

[The First Deputy Chairman]

New clause 192—*Nuclear Collaboration*—

“(1) Nothing in this Act shall affect the UK’s membership of the European Atomic Agency Community (Euratom).

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, Her Majesty’s Government shall treat the process of leaving Euratom as separate to that of leaving the European Union.”

Paul Blomfield: I rise to speak to new clause 2 and the other new clauses that stand in my name and those of my hon. and right hon. Friends, which have been judged to be in order. Over the past two days, we have had a series of important debates, primarily on the process that we face over the long period ahead. Today, we move on to new clauses and amendments on the substance of the Government’s negotiations. The debate on process was important precisely because it is about enabling the people of this country, through this elected Parliament, to hold the Government to account on the issues that matter to them: their jobs; the conditions under which our businesses operate; how we keep our country safe and secure; how we protect our environment for future generations; and how we ensure that we remain at the cutting edge of science and research and that we have an economy that is able to fund our NHS and all the services that are vital for our social fabric.

In the foreword to the White Paper, the Prime Minister claims that

“the country is coming together”,

but we are not there yet, and those portraying anyone with a different approach to Brexit as attempting to frustrate the will of the people—as some have done over recent days—does not help. Today, however, we can take an important step, because new clause 2 addresses many of the concerns not only of the 48% but of many of the 52%—those who voted to come out but did not vote to lose out. It is, in fact, a manifesto for the 100%. It puts at the front of the Government’s objectives a duty to maintain a stable and sustainable economy through having trading arrangements with the European Union for goods and services that are free of tariff and with non-tariff barriers. We on this side of the House have been clear that, in the negotiations, it is the economy and jobs that should come first, but the Government have decided otherwise. They are taking a reckless gamble with people’s jobs and living standards by walking away from the single market and the customs union.

Mr Peter Bone (Wellingborough) (Con): The shadow Minister is making his case very clearly. As I understand it, Labour’s position is that the economy should be at the heart of the negotiations and that if, for instance, we could not get rid of free movement, so be it, because the economy is more important.

Paul Blomfield: No, that is not what I said. I said that the economy should be at the heart of our negotiations, that the advantages of the single market are significant, as the then Prime Minister pointed out before 23 June, and that we should have reasonable management of migration through the application of fair rules.

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): Does the hon. Gentleman accept that both sides of the House completely agree that we want the maximum possible access to the single market for our exporters and that we will offer

the single market the maximum possible access to our market? Does he further accept that we therefore do not need to argue about that? The answer to whether we get that or get most favoured nation status through the WTO lies not here in Parliament, but the hands of the other 27 EU member states.

Paul Blomfield: I am sorry, but the right hon. Gentleman is wrong—and not for the first time. We have made it clear that the economy comes first, but the Prime Minister has said that her red lines are the European Court of Justice and immigration.

Mr Jim Cunningham (Coventry South) (Lab): My hon. Friend takes a big interest in science and technology and universities, so does he agree that it is important for Coventry and the west midlands economy that we get a proper agreement in relation to the single market? Does he also agree that the Government have guaranteed resources only up to 2020 should we pull out?

Paul Blomfield: That is an important point, and my hon. Friend will note that it is highlighted in new clause 2.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Paul Blomfield: I will try to make some progress.

Mr Iain Duncan Smith (Chingford and Woodford Green) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: As it is the right hon. Gentleman, I will.

Mr Duncan Smith: I do not want to delay the hon. Gentleman, but I listened carefully to what he said about his new clause. He said, when pressed, that the Labour party’s view was that control of migration—sustainable through whatever arrangements—was important. However, I note that new clause 2 is missing any reference whatsoever to that being an important matter. Whether it is as important as the economy or of secondary importance, it will remain an important issue when the balance of negotiation comes down. What is his position? Why has he left migration control out of the new clause, which is currently unbalanced and makes no sense?

Paul Blomfield: The right hon. Gentleman misrepresents my observations, but then I know that the leave campaign strongly supported alternative facts. Moving on to his specific point—[*Interruption.*]

Anna Soubry (Broxtowe) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: As it is you.

Anna Soubry: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for giving way. This point is rather important: will he confirm whether the Labour party no longer supports the principle of free movement—yes or no?

Paul Blomfield: We have said time and again that we believe in the reasonable management of migration through the application of fair rules, and I will talk about that specific issue if hon. and right hon. Members will give me the opportunity.

Mike Gapes (Ilford South) (Lab/Co-op): Will my hon. Friend give way?

Paul Blomfield: I have probably been a little unbalanced, so I should give way to somebody on my side of the House.

Mike Gapes: I am grateful. Will my hon. Friend confirm that the easiest way to cut migration would be to crash the economy?

Paul Blomfield: My hon. Friend should wait and hear what I am about to say on migration.

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green): Will the hon. Gentleman give way to someone from my part of the House?

Paul Blomfield: Not just yet. I should make some progress because I am conscious of the many amendments and the many people who want to speak.

The Opposition accept that concerns about migration were a significant factor in the referendum—probably a critical factor. The right hon. Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Mr Duncan Smith) is not paying attention at the moment, but leave campaigners talked it up relentlessly—[*Interruption.*] He is still not listening. The Prime Minister has also talked up migration, both as Prime Minister and in her previous job. That created huge expectations, which the White Paper then begins to talk down. The Home Secretary told the Home Affairs Committee last week that she had not been consulted on that part of the White Paper. This is one of the main red lines defining the Government's approach and the Minister responsible was not consulted—it is absolutely extraordinary.

For months, echoing the leave campaign, the Government have talked about control, but they have had control over non-EEA migration for six years and the White Paper reveals the facts: no significant change since 2010.

Caroline Lucas: Will the hon. Gentleman accept that free movement has massively benefited our economy, both economically and socially? While Governments may have failed to ensure that those benefits have been shared equally, we should not sacrifice our economy to anti-immigration ideology. Securing the continued free movement of people should therefore be a priority in the UK negotiations.

Paul Blomfield: Indeed, the White Paper points out the benefits of migration.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Paul Blomfield: I want to make some progress.

Mr Mark Harper (Forest of Dean) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way on non-EEA migration?

Paul Blomfield: I think the right hon. Gentleman has had more than his fair share of speaking time.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Paul Blomfield: Let me continue. There has been no real change to non-EEA migration since 2010, for good reasons. When the Government start to disaggregate the EEA numbers, what will they find? Doctors, nurses, academics, care workers, students, and those bringing key skills to business and industry. On lower-skill jobs, Ministers have already made it clear to employers that agricultural workers will still be free to come.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Paul Blomfield: I will make some progress. As my hon. Friend the Member for Ilford South (Mike Gapes) pointed out, the only real way to reduce numbers substantially is to crash the economy; that may be the effect of the Government's negotiations, but assuming that that is not their plan, they need to come clean to the British people. As the right hon. Member for Meriden (Dame Caroline Spelman) argued last week, and as the right hon. Member for Preseli Pembrokeshire (Stephen Crabb) argued over the weekend, they need to come clean about this red line. What is their plan? If taking control of immigration defines this Government's approach to Brexit, the Minister needs to make the Government's intentions clear in his closing remarks.

Mr Adrian Bailey (West Bromwich West) (Lab/Co-op): Does my hon. Friend agree that UK trade delegations to China and India have made it clear that any trade deal with those countries will almost certainly involve a relaxation of the visa regime, so all we are doing is displacing migration, not cutting it?

Paul Blomfield: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. I think the Prime Minister was quite shocked to discover, when she went to India seeking a trade deal, that one of the first things that the Indian Government wanted to put on the table was access to our labour markets and for students. My hon. Friend was right to cite other countries, but he missed Australia off his list. Australia is much heralded as a future trading partner, but it also wants to make the movement of people part of any settlement.

Dr Eilidh Whiteford (Banff and Buchan) (SNP): The hon. Gentleman makes an important point about the value of migrant workers and others who come here. Does he recognise that local jobs, particularly in rural areas, are anchored by people's ability to move here? Our public services and local businesses, and the jobs of the indigenous population, also depend on the freedom of movement, which is such an important part of our single market membership.

Paul Blomfield: I thank the hon. Lady; she is absolutely right. That is one reason why the Government's White Paper is so much more nuanced, caveated and realistic than some of the rhetoric that we have heard.

Mr Harper: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: As I said, the right hon. Gentleman has had lots of time during Committee of the whole House. I want to move on to a different topic, and I am sure that he will want to get in later. [*Interruption.*]

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order. Mr Blomfield rightly wishes to speed up his introduction of the new clause; Members will be pleased about that when we come to the end of this debate and they find that they have had a chance to speak.

Paul Blomfield: Thank you, Mrs Laing.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): On that point, will my hon. Friend give way?

Paul Blomfield: Probably not, after Mrs Laing's words.

Our approach is different: it is to put the economy and the jobs of British people first, and to get the right trading relationship with the EU. There may be lots of graphs in the White Paper, but there is little clarity about the Government's ambitions. However, the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union was much clearer when he told the House a couple of weeks ago:

"What we have come up with...is the idea of a comprehensive free trade agreement and a comprehensive customs agreement that will deliver the exact same benefits as we have"—[*Official Report*, 24 January 2017; Vol. 620, c. 169.]

I am delighted that the Secretary of State has just joined us. He is promising us the exact same benefits that we have inside the single market. That is a benchmark that he has set for the negotiations—a benchmark against which we will measure his success. To help him, in a positive and collaborative spirit, we have tried to embed that in new clause 2, because livelihoods depend on it.

Ms Angela Eagle (Wallasey) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend agree that trying to get exactly the same access to the single market without paying any of the costs is like disappearing down the rabbit hole into Alice's Wonderland? It is important that we have an assessment of what World Trade Organisation rules would cost, if we had to fall back on them.

Paul Blomfield: My hon. Friend makes an important point, and that is precisely why we have been pushing for proper economic assessments.

I acknowledge that that negotiation target is ambitious, but it is the one the Secretary of State has set, and against which his performance will be measured. It is all very well to speculate on trade deals that might or might not come to pass. The White Paper may tell us that the United States is

"interested in an early trade agreement with the UK", but there is no indication of how "America first" protectionism will give better market access for UK-manufactured goods. Given the uncertainty, the Government need to do all they can to secure the jobs that depend on trade with our biggest and closet partner: the European Union.

Dr Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (Con): I am listening carefully to the hon. Gentleman. Why does he think that the European Union would not seek a free trade arrangement with the United Kingdom, given our balance of trade with the EU?

Paul Blomfield: I am sure that the European Union will be interested in securing the trade agreement that we seek, but the question is whether the Government can secure it on the ambitious terms that the Secretary of State has himself set.

Mr Harper: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: No. I have made it clear that the right hon. Gentleman has had plenty of floor time. I shall press on.

On the trade deal, it really did not help for the Prime Minister to threaten our friends and neighbours with turning this country into an offshore tax haven if she did not get her way. [*Interruption.*] Government Members may not like it, but that was the clear threat. It was not a threat against the European Union; it was a threat against the British people. Those voting to leave the EU did so on the understanding that the NHS would receive more money, but that will not be possible if we slash taxes, and this House should not allow that. That is the purpose of new clause 7.

Mr Harper rose—

Paul Blomfield: I will make progress, because I am mindful of Mrs Laing's comments.

New clause 7 should command support across the House. The Government have been working with our partners in the OECD on efforts to avoid a race to the bottom on corporation tax, and new clause 7 endorses that work, while new clause 2 would commit the Government to

"maintaining all existing social, economic, consumer and workers' rights",

as well as to continuing to collaborate on environmental protection. The Government have paid lip service to those things, but they should understand people's scepticism about their intentions, because although the White Paper boasts of increasing enforcement budgets for compliance with the national minimum wage, it fails to mention the appallingly low numbers of prosecutions for non-payment of the national minimum wage, or the rife abuse in the care sector, of which the Government are perfectly aware, but on which they have failed to act.

1.15 pm

On one of the biggest issues we face, climate change, there is just one small paragraph, which says:

"We want to take this opportunity to develop over time a comprehensive approach to improving our environment in a way that is fit for our specific needs."

What is it about our air and our seas, and the impact of our carbon emissions on the planet, that is specific—so specific that addressing it cannot be done better through continued collaboration with the European Union?

Sir Oliver Letwin (West Dorset) (Con): I have been listening to the hon. Gentleman with great interest for around 20 minutes. What does what he is saying have to do with article 50?

Paul Blomfield: I guess the right hon. Gentleman has spotted that triggering article 50 will signal our departure from the European Union; he can intervene if I have got that wrong. [*Interruption.*] The right hon. Member for Forest of Dean (Mr Harper) is not going to get a chance. Our departure puts at risk the many benefits—

Mr Harper rose—

Paul Blomfield: Mrs Laing?

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order. The former Chief Whip, the right hon. Member for Forest of Dean, knows

better than anyone how business is conducted in this Chamber, and he knows what happens to people who do not do what they are meant to.

Mr Bone: Tell us, please.

The First Deputy Chairman: Mr Bone asks me to tell the House; there is no need.

Paul Blomfield: Thank you, Mrs Laing. To continue my point, our departure will clearly have implications for the many environmental, employment and consumer rights that have been won over the past 43 years.

Rachael Maskell: Does my hon. Friend agree that the fact that the Government have been dragged to court on three occasions for failing on the air quality targets set by the EU, and have been negotiating behind the scenes to drop the European standards, means that it is really important that we discuss environmental protections as part of the negotiations?

Paul Blomfield: I do indeed, which is why environmental protection is embedded in new clause 2, which also—

Kit Malthouse: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: No; I shall try to make progress. I think Members will acknowledge that I have been fairly generous with my time.

New clause 2 would also make co-operation with the European Union on education, research and science, environmental protection, and the prevention and detection of serious and organised crime and terrorist activity, guiding negotiating principles in the negotiations. The Prime Minister talks the talk on research and science, but will she really commit? There is lots to talk about, but I shall take just one example, which is the basis of new clause 192. Tucked away in the explanatory notes is the revelation that the Bill will trigger our exit from Euratom—the European Atomic Energy Community. Whatever else can be claimed of their intentions, and much has been, I am pretty confident that on 23 June the British people did not vote against our leading role on nuclear energy, safety and research. It certainly was not on the ballot paper.

Euratom was established by a distinct treaty, and it would fly in the face of common sense to throw away membership of an organisation that brings such unequivocal benefit, yet the White Paper is as ambiguous on the Government's intention as the Secretary of State was last week; it talks simply of "leaving Euratom".

Lilian Greenwood (Nottingham South) (Lab): My hon. Friend makes a compelling argument about that aspect of scientific research. I do not know whether he attended yesterday's event held by the all-party group on medical research, which is looking at the impact of Brexit on life sciences. If he did, he will know that it was made absolutely clear that we need to maintain the closest possible ties with the EU in relation to Horizon 2020 funding, collaboration and the free movement of people. Does he not agree that the Government need to listen if we are to preserve our wonderful scientific research base in this country?

Paul Blomfield: I absolutely do. I was not at that meeting yesterday, but I was at a meeting of medical research charities and other stakeholders in the field of medical research on Monday, at which they made precisely that point. Indeed, they mentioned that we needed to ensure that we had the right relationship, starting, ideally, with membership of the European Medicines Agency.

John Howell (Henley) (Con): I thank the shadow Minister for so generously giving way. He probably knows that the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy is in my constituency. People there told me how concerned they were about this issue, but they decided that the amendments to the Bill were not helpful. They said that it was much better to deal with Ministers directly, and to put pressure on the Treasury to achieve their objectives.

Paul Blomfield: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his point. A very effective way of applying pressure to save that Joint European Torus centre, which is a hugely important facility, is by agreeing to new clause 192.

Albert Owen (Ynys Môn) (Lab): The shadow Minister makes a very important point. These hugely important research projects in nuclear and nuclear build have long lead-in times. My concern is that if we trigger notice to leave Euratom, no agreement will be put in place at the end of the two-year period. That could seriously delay those projects and impact on future investment in this country. Does he agree that, at the very least, we need a transitional arrangement, if not continuing membership?

Paul Blomfield: Yes, I do agree; my hon. Friend makes a very important point. I press Ministers to give greater clarity on their intentions, because the Secretary of State has so far been ambiguous.

James Heappey (Wells) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: No, I will not. I should respond to Mrs Laing's appeal for us to make progress.

It has been suggested that the Government's reservations about Euratom stem from the fact that the European Court of Justice is the regulatory body for the treaty. If that is so, their obsessional opposition to the Court of Justice leads them to want to rip up our membership of an organisation on which 21% of UK electricity generation relies and that supports a critical industry providing 78,000 jobs; that number is projected to rise to 110,000 by 2021. That membership led to us hosting the biggest nuclear fusion programme in the world in Culham.

Mr David Nuttall (Bury North) (Con) *rose—*

Paul Blomfield: I will not give way, because I wish to make progress.

The organisation also helps to ensure nuclear safety. Before the Secretary of State leaves the Chamber, let me tell him that it would be helpful for the Government to explain their intentions. I will give way to him or to the Minister of State, Department for Exiting the European Union, because the people in this country deserve to know what is happening in relation to Euratom; people voting in Copeland in a couple of weeks' time want to know, as their jobs are on the line. I give the Secretary of

[Paul Blomfield]

State or indeed the Minister the opportunity to intervene on me to make an unambiguous statement that it is the Government's intention to remain in Euratom.

Kit Malthouse rose—

James Heapey rose—

Paul Blomfield: I was providing the opportunity to those who can make a useful commitment. Their silence says everything.

Kit Malthouse: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Paul Blomfield: No, I will not.

Clearly, there is much more to be said about our future relationship. There are many more people who wish to speak and many more amendments to be moved. I will draw my remarks to a close—[*Interruption.*] It is disappointing for me, too.

Richard Fuller (Bedford) (Con) rose—

Kit Malthouse rose—

Paul Blomfield: I will draw my remarks to a close.

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order. The Committee must allow the shadow Minister to draw his remarks to a close, or no one else will have an opportunity to speak, and it will not be my fault.

Paul Blomfield: Thank you, Mrs Laing. I draw my remarks to a close with the simple point that our new clauses provide a basis for bringing people together around plans that address the concerns of the 100%; supporting them would be a good first step.

John Redwood: I find myself in agreement with new clause 2, which makes perfectly sensible statements about what our negotiating aims should be. I have even better news for the Opposition Front-Bench team: it is a statement of the White Paper policy. Of course we wish to maintain a stable, sustainable, profitable and growing economy, which we have done ever since the Brexit vote. Of course we wish to preserve the peace in Northern Ireland, to have excellent trading arrangements with the European Union for goods and services free of tariff, to have lots of co-operative activities with EU member states and institutions in education, research and science and so forth, and to maintain the important rights and legal protections enshrined in European law. As I understand it, the Government have made it crystal clear in the White Paper and in many statements and answers to questions and responses to debates from the Front Bench that all those things are fundamental to the negotiating aims of the Government.

Having excited the Opposition with my agreement, I need to explain why I will not vote for this new clause. I have two main reasons, which I briefly wish to develop. First, I am happy to accept the promise and the statement of our Front-Bench team, and I advise the Opposition to do the same. Secondly, although the words do not explicitly say, "This is what has to be delivered", the fact that it is embedded in legislation implies that all these things must be delivered, and some of them are not in

the gift of this Government or this Parliament. I return to the point that the Opposition never seem to grasp: we are all united in the aim of ensuring tariff-free trade, but it will be decided by the other 27 members, not by this Parliament or by Ministers.

Mr Harper: Given that the list in new clause 2 exactly matches some of the things in the White Paper, it is pointless. Is it not interesting that the two areas it does not mention are immigration and strengthening the United Kingdom? Those omissions are very significant.

John Redwood: That is a very powerful point. I could add others. It is a great pity that it does not mention the opportunity to have a decent fishing policy. It certainly does not talk about having a sensible immigration policy. The Opposition still do not understand that we have to remove the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice if this Parliament is to be free to have a fishing policy that helps to restore the fishing grounds of Scotland and England, and to have a policy that makes sensible provision for people of skills, talent and interest to come into our country, but that ensures that we can have some limit on the numbers.

Mr Angus Brendan MacNeil (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP): I heard the right hon. Gentleman's wish list at the beginning of his speech. Has he grasped the fact that that wish list is actually encapsulated in two words: single market?

John Redwood: No, it clearly is not. The hon. Gentleman has not been listening to what I have been saying. The whole point about the single market is that it does not allow us to have a sensible fishing policy or a sensible borders policy, which are two notable omissions from the list, which, fortunately, were not absent from the White Paper or from the Government's thinking.

Joanna Cherry (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would like to reconsider what he just said. He said the whole point about the single market is that it does not allow us to have a sensible fishing policy, but Norway is in the single market in the European economic area, but not in the common fisheries policy. It controls its own fisheries policy, which he would know if he had read this excellent document, "Scotland's Place in Europe".

John Redwood: Well, why have we not had a sensible fishing policy for the past 40 years? It is because we have been a full member of the EU and its single market. What is agreed across this House—even by some members of the Scottish National party—is that we want maximum tariff-free, barrier-free access to the internal market. However, what is not on offer from the other 27 members is for us to stay in the single market, but not to comply with all the other things with which we have to comply as a member of the EU. There is no separate thing called the single market; it is a series of laws that go over all sorts of boundaries and barriers. If we withdraw from the EU, we withdraw from the single market.

Alex Salmond (Gordon) (SNP): The right hon. Gentleman's example was of fishing policy, so does he agree as a point of fact that Norway is in the single market but pursues its own independent fishing policy? Yes or no?

John Redwood: I agree that Norway decided to sacrifice control of her borders to get certain other things from a different kind of relationship with the EU, but we do not wish to join the EEA because we do not wish to sacrifice control over our borders. That is straightforward.

1.30 pm

Helen Goodman (Bishop Auckland) (Lab): The right hon. Gentleman is absolutely wrong. Norway was part of the Nordic free movement area with Sweden, Finland and Denmark way before the European Union was even invented.

John Redwood: Norway is now part of a freedom of movement area far bigger than that, and that was part of its deal. It also has to pay in a lot of money that British voters clearly do not wish to pay, so why would we want to do that?

Mr Steve Baker (Wycombe) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that if Opposition Members are serious about the flourishing of our economy, 80% of which is services, they should accept that we need to be able to do trade deals on services, which means that we have to leave the EEA so that we can negotiate about regulation?

John Redwood: That is quite right, and they also ignore the whole of the rest of the world. It so happens that we have a profitable, balanced trade with the rest of the world. We are often in surplus with the rest of the world overall and we are in massive deficit in goods with the EU alone. There is much more scope for growth in our trade with the rest of the world than there is with the EU, partly because the rest of the world is growing much faster overall than the EU and partly because we have the chance to have a much bigger proportion of the market there than we have, whereas we obviously have quite an advanced trade with the EU that is probably in decline because of the obvious economic problems in the euro area.

Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP): Does the right hon. Gentleman note that although the shadow Minister made no mention of the importance of controlling immigration, his new clause 2 mentions “preserving peace in Northern Ireland”, although he never mentioned one word of it? Does the right hon. Gentleman accept that the shadow Minister perhaps understands that Brexit has no implications for peace in Northern Ireland? It is not a cause of increased terrorism. Indeed, the terrorists never fought to stay in the EU; they fought to get out of Britain.

John Redwood: The hon. Gentleman has made his own point, and we all wish Northern Ireland well.

Mr Kenneth Clarke (Rushcliffe) (Con): First, let me congratulate my right hon. Friend on recognising that there is nothing in new clause 2 that is remotely objectionable to either leavers or remainers as an objective for the country in the forthcoming negotiations. If tariff-free access to the single market is desirable, does he accept that access to any market is not possible without accepting obedience of that market’s regulations? Otherwise, there are regulatory barriers. We need some

sort of dispute procedure. If we start to reject the European Court of Justice and say that all the regulations must be British and that we are free to alter them when we feel like it, we are not pursuing the objectives in new clause 2 with which my right hon. Friend expresses complete agreement.

John Redwood: Of course there is a dispute resolution procedure when we enter a free trade agreement or any other trade arrangement. There is a very clear one in the WTO. We will register the best deal we can get with the EU under our WTO membership and it will be governed by normal WTO resolution procedures, with which we have no problem. The problem with the ECJ is that it presumes to strike down the wishes of the British people and good statute law made by this House of Commons on a wide range of issues, which means that we are no longer sovereign all the time we are in it.

Mr Bailey: The right hon. Gentleman argues that our membership of the EU inhibits our ability to trade with the expanding economies of the rest of the world. If so, will he explain why Germany exports nearly four times as much as we do to China and exceeds our exports to both India and Brazil, the other fast-growing economies, and why France also exports more to China and Brazil than we do? What is it that they do in the EU that we will do when we come out?

John Redwood: It is quite obvious that Germany will export more at the early stages of development in an emerging market economy, because it tends to export capital equipment of the kind that is needed to industrialise, which is what China bought in the last decade. Now that China is a much richer country, she is going to have a massive expansion of services and that is where we have a strong relative advantage, in that if we have the right kind of arrangement with China we will accelerate the growth of our exports, which China will now want, more rapidly. The hon. Gentleman must understand that the EU imposes massive and, I think, dangerous barriers against the emerging market world for their agricultural produce. The kind of deals we can offer to an emerging market country, saying that we will buy their much cheaper food by taking the tariff barriers off their food products in return for much better access to their service and industrial goods markets where we have products that they might like to buy—[*Interruption.*] I hear my right hon. Friend the Member for Wantage (Mr Vaizey) express a worry about British farmers, and British farmers, would, of course, have a subsidy regime based on environmental factors, in the main, which we would want to continue.

Jonathan Edwards (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (PC): What impact does the right hon. Gentleman think that that would have on Welsh agriculture and the rural economy in Wales?

John Redwood: I just explained that it should boost it. I am sure that more market opportunities will open up for Welsh farmers, but we will also debate in this House how to have a proper support regime. I hope that it will be a support regime that not only rewards environmental objectives but is friendly to promoting the greater efficiencies that can come from more farm mechanisation and enlargement, which will be an important part of our

[John Redwood]

journey to try to eliminate some of the massive deficit we run in food with the rest of the EU, while being more decent to the emerging world—the poor countries of the world to which we deliberately deny access to our markets.

Angela Smith (Penistone and Stocksbridge) (Lab): May I take it from what the right hon. Gentleman has just said that in any free trade deal with New Zealand he will continue to ensure that sheep farmers in this country are not sacrificed in the interests of getting good access to the New Zealand market for our financial services?

John Redwood: I am sure that that would be a very appropriate part of the discussions our country holds with New Zealand and Australia. I broadly take the view—I thought Labour was now of this view—that getting rid of tariffs was a good idea. Labour has spent all of the past six months saying how we must not have tariffs on our trade with Europe, but now I discover it wants tariffs on trade with everywhere else in the world. It is arguing a large contradiction.

Dr Murrison: My right hon. Friend is making a very powerful case. Does he not agree that it is truly remarkable that Germany makes three times as much money on coffee as developing countries because of tariffs and that we are noticing a problem with out-of-season fruit and vegetables in our supermarkets, in part because of the pressures applied to producers in north Africa? It is no good colleagues on the Opposition Benches having a go at those who are concerned about international development assistance if they are prepared to tolerate such tariff barriers, which act against the interests of developing countries.

John Redwood: I think that we have teased out something very important in this debate. The Opposition want no barriers against ferocious competition from agriculture on the continent, which has undoubtedly damaged an awful lot of Welsh, Scottish and English farms, but they want maximum tariff barriers to trade with the rest of the world so that we still have to buy dear food. That does not seem to be an appealing package.

Kit Malthouse: My right hon. Friend might be interested to know that just last week I visited Randall Parker Foods in my constituency, a company that slaughters and processes several hundred thousand Welsh lambs every year and that is salivating at the chance of opening up the US market, in particular, where Welsh lamb is under-represented and where there is huge potential for us to export more than we do.

John Redwood: Like my hon. Friend, I think that there are some great English, Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish agricultural products, and that with the right tariff system with the rest of the world we could do considerably better with our quality products.

Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con): I congratulate my right hon. Friend on his great speech, but I want to ask him one question that goes to the merits of the new clause. It says that the Prime Minister “shall give an undertaking”, which is clearly a mandatory requirement under statute, and which itself calls for judicial review if somebody decides to do that. However, in all my time in

this place, I have never seen a clause proposing the preserving of peace in Northern Ireland as a matter of public interest and of judicial review. It is unbelievably unworkable and completely contrary to all the assumptions that one might rely on for a decent provision.

John Redwood: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for drawing me back to my central point. He kindly said that I have made a good speech, but I have just responded to everybody else making their own speeches and riding their own hobby horses. I hope they have enjoyed giving those hobby horses a good ride.

To summarise my brief case, the aims of the new clause are fine. They happen to be agreed by the Government. However, it is disappointing that the Opposition have left out some important aims that matter to the British people: taking back control of our borders and laws, and dealing with the problem of the Court immediately spring to mind, but there are many others. They leave out, as they always do, the huge opportunities to have so many policies in areas such as fishing and farming that would be better for the industry and for consumers. They have now revealed a fundamental contradiction in wanting completely tariff-free trade in Europe, but massive tariff barriers everywhere else, and do not really seem to think through the logic.

My conclusion is that there is nothing wrong with the aims. We need the extra aims that the Government have rightly spelled out. It would be quite silly to incorporate negotiating aims in legislation. I believe in the Government's good faith. We are mercifully united in wanting tariff-free, barrier-free trade with the rest of Europe. It is not in the gift of this House, let alone the gift of Ministers, to deliver that, but if people on the continent are sensible they will want that because they get a lot more out of this trade than we do. They must understand that the most favoured nation tariffs are low or non-existent on the things we sell to them, but can be quite penal on the things they have been particularly successful at selling to us. The aims are a great idea, but it is silly to put them into law.

Joanna Cherry: This group of amendments is about the UK's priorities for the negotiations on withdrawal from the European Union. I will talk about Scotland's priorities. The Scottish National party has tabled amendment 54 and new clause 141 on the situation of Gibraltar, in which we deal with the fact that the Bill has omitted to include Gibraltar in its remit, which is rather curious given the great love and affection that Government Members have for Gibraltar.

Those of us who are members of the Exiting the European Union Committee were very impressed by the evidence given to us a couple of weeks ago by the Chief Minister of Gibraltar, Fabian Picardo. He emphasised that Gibraltar's main concern is to preserve its sovereignty and connection with the United Kingdom. Unlike some of us, he is very happy to be part of the red, white and blue Brexit that the Prime Minister talks about. It is important to take Gibraltar's concerns into account.

Mike Gapes: Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: The hon. Gentleman, to whom I will give way in a moment, has a long and admirable commitment to the people of Gibraltar and their interests. He has also tabled amendments on the matter, including

amendment 29, which I am sure he will tell us about in detail in due course. It would put upon the British Government a requirement to consult Gibraltar before triggering article 50.

Mike Gapes: I will not make a speech now, as I hope to be called later. I just want to emphasise that there is an important need to protect the interests of Gibraltar. As the hon. and learned Lady said, the Bill does not refer to Gibraltar, but it was specifically mentioned in an amendment when the legislation to hold the referendum was agreed. The people of Gibraltar voted in the referendum. Surely the Bill should be amended to reflect the need for Gibraltar's interests also to be considered.

Joanna Cherry: Absolutely. I have with me a letter from the Deputy Chief Minister of Gibraltar, who says that he

"can confirm that the clause on the application of the Article 50 Bill to Gibraltar would be politically useful to us here. It would also follow on logically from the original consent that we already gave to the extension of the actual UK referendum Act to Gibraltar."

I will come back to that in more detail in a moment.

Mr MacNeil: Before my hon. and learned Friend moves on, I think it is important to back up the hon. Member for Ilford South (Mike Gapes). Gibraltar's connection to the United Kingdom and being British should be reflected in this House. I have visited Gibraltar, and hon. Members should think seriously about supporting his amendment because it would send a signal to Gibraltar that it is respected here, and by Members on both sides of the House. Please listen to the hon. Gentleman.

1.45 pm

Joanna Cherry: Indeed. I totally agree with my hon. Friend. The Deputy Chief Minister of Gibraltar also said in his letter:

"I understand that this amendment mirrors a number of others which have also been tabled seeking to make clear its application"—

that is the application of the Act—

"to Gibraltar in the same way. This would strengthen Gibraltar's case to be mentioned in the Article 50 letter."

Of course, Scotland shares with Gibraltar a desire to be mentioned in the article 50 letter.

The big priority for Scotland is that the British Government take into account the Scottish Government's request for a differentiated deal for Scotland. We tabled new clause 145, which would require the British Government to commit to such a differentiated deal before triggering article 50. That amendment has been held over until today, but we will not push it to a vote because we are prepared to give the UK Government one last chance to respond to the document "Scotland's Place in Europe", which was laid before the British Government before Christmas, some seven weeks ago.

Karl McCartney (Lincoln) (Con): Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: I will when I have finished my point. No formal response to "Scotland's Place in Europe" has yet been received. The hon. Member for Lincoln (Karl McCartney) is a member of the Exiting the European

Union Committee, as I am. We heard detailed evidence about the document this morning from the Scottish Government Minister responsible for negotiations with the United Kingdom. It is a far more detailed document in its proposals than anything the British Government have been prepared to produce so far.

Karl McCartney: I thank my hon. and learned Friend for giving way; as a fellow member of the Brexit Select Committee, I hope that she would treat me as a friend, rather than as just an hon. Member sitting on the opposite side of the House. I do not disagree with her when it comes to Gibraltar and maybe even Scotland, but we are acting on behalf of the whole UK. If there were to be a list in the article 50 letter, are there any other places, such as the Isle of Man or Jersey, that she would like to see included on it? Would she like to see a long list of places?

Joanna Cherry: The hon. Gentleman is obviously not aware that the arrangements that apply to the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands are rather different than those that apply to Scotland, because they are not in the European Union. Perhaps he would like to read "Scotland's Place in Europe", which would explain that to him. Some differentiated agreements do, in fact, exist within the wider UK and Crown dependencies. Gibraltar is in the European Union, but not in the customs union. I will return to the matter of Gibraltar in due course.

Alex Salmond: My hon. and learned Friend will remember this direct quotation from *The Daily Telegraph*:

"Theresa May has indicated that...she said she will not trigger the formal process for leaving the EU until there is an agreed 'UK approach' backed by Scotland."

Surely Government Members do not intend the Prime Minister to break her word of 15 July last year.

Joanna Cherry: I am sure that Government Members would be loth to encourage the Prime Minister to break her word—[*Interruption.*] Conservative Members are shouting, "No veto." We are not asking for a veto. This document is a compromise whereby Scotland could remain in the single market while the rest of the UK exits it. Perhaps hon. Gentlemen on the Government Benches who are shaking their heads and mumbling about vetoes would like to get their iPads out and look up the difference between a veto and a compromise; it is rather a radical difference.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Joanna Cherry: I will make some progress and then I will take some more interventions, perhaps from people who have not yet spoken.

The Scottish Government have made a proposal, and we are waiting for it to be taken seriously. The signs that the compromise put forward by Scotland will be taken seriously by the Government and, indeed, by this House have not been promising so far this week. Not a single amendment to the Bill has been accepted, despite the numerous amendments tabled by all sorts of different groups of Members, many with significant cross-party support. Even yesterday, when the Government were forced into announcing a significant concession, they were extraordinarily reluctant to commit that concession to writing. We all know that it is because they do not want to amend the Act: they have fought tooth and nail

[Joanna Cherry]

through the courts and in this House to avoid the sort of scrutiny that those of them who seek to leave the European Union have been trumpeting for years. They tell us how fantastic this wonderful, sovereign mother of Parliaments is, but we are berated for having the effrontery to attempt to amend a Bill. It is preposterous.

Mr Harper: Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: No, I will not give way. We heard ample from the right hon. Gentleman the other day.

This Bill is being railroaded through this House with scant regard for democratic process. Here is an example: on Monday, when we were debating the proposals that concerned the devolved Administrations, including Scotland, only one of my hon. Friends got to speak. When I attempted to double that tally, I was told to sit down, shut up and know my place. I do not mind being insulted and affronted in this House, but what people need to remember is that it is not just me; it is the people who elected me who are being insulted and affronted when I am prevented from speaking about proposals on which my name appears.

Government Members are extraordinarily relaxed about the effect this sort of thing has on Scottish public opinion. I do not know whether they take the *Herald* newspaper—it is rather difficult to get hold of in the House of Commons—but if they do, they will see that today's headline is "Support for independence surges on hard Brexit vow".

Michael Tomlinson (Mid Dorset and North Poole) (Con): Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: No, I will not.

Backing for a yes vote in another independence referendum has risen to 49% on the back of the hard Brexit vow, and that is when no referendum is even on the table and we are still seeking our reasonable compromise. Hon. Members should make no mistake—it gives me great pleasure to say this—that the barracking by Government Members and the preventing of SNP MPs from speaking in this House play right into our hands and result in headlines saying that support for independence is surging.

Mr Harper: On a point of order, Mrs Laing. On Monday, I spoke about the amendments on devolution arrangements. I seem to remember that I took many interventions, including from the hon. and learned Lady. She was not, therefore, prevented from speaking; indeed, I seem to remember that the person in the Chair at the time—[*Interruption.*]

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order.

Mr Harper: Opposition Members should let me finish making my point of order to the Chair. The person who was in the Chair made great efforts to facilitate the hon. and learned Lady's speech, but there was then a kerfuffle when she objected to the amount of time she got. How can we put the record straight about the fact that she had a fair opportunity on Monday?

The First Deputy Chairman: The right hon. Gentleman does not need to put the record straight, because it is a matter of record. I have myself looked in *Hansard*, and by the simple use of my arithmetical powers, I have worked out how many people managed to speak, for how long they spoke and what contributions they made. Now, the hon. and learned Lady is asserting that she was prevented from speaking. Because there was a time limit on the debate and the hon. and learned Lady came quite late in the debate, there was not an awful lot of time left in which she could speak. But I think that, in saying that she was prevented from speaking, the hon. and learned Lady is making a rhetorical point rather than an arithmetical point, because her contribution to the debate has been considerable. She will note that she has been given the opportunity very early in today's proceedings to speak, and I look forward to hearing her speak to the amendments to which she has put her name, and that is what we should stick to.

Joanna Cherry: I am very grateful, Mrs Laing, for your clarification. Indeed, I am speaking early today, because I am leading for the third party in this House, and it is my right to speak early in the debate.

Mr Harper *rose*—

Joanna Cherry: The right hon. Gentleman is terribly anxious to make an intervention. In order to put him out of his misery, I would very much like to hear what he has to say now.

Mr Harper: I am very grateful to the hon. and learned Lady. She was waxing lyrical about the importance her party places on Gibraltar, but when I was listening to the evidence from the Chief Minister of Gibraltar, he was rather more committed to the continuance of the United Kingdom than the Scottish National party, which does not seem to be committed to it.

Joanna Cherry: That is called democracy. The people of Gibraltar vote for parties that wish to remain part of the United Kingdom; the people of Scotland vote for parties that wish to be independent—that is a statement of fact. I am very happy to endorse Gibraltar's right to self-determination—just as I am happy to endorse Scotland's, or indeed any nation's, right to self-determination.

Mr MacNeil: Just on a point of clarity, it should be understood by both sides that Gibraltar is not in the United Kingdom. Gibraltar does not want to be in the United Kingdom. It wants an association with Britain, which is very different. The United Kingdom dates only from December 1922. Britain is little bitty older than that. Gibraltar does not have a Member in this Parliament because it is not in the United Kingdom. It has an association with the United Kingdom. It is independent of the United Kingdom. That is something I would quite like for Scotland: British, but not in the UK.

Joanna Cherry: I am very grateful to my hon. Friend, who, like the hon. Member for Ilford South (Mike Gapes), has a long association with Gibraltar, for clarifying the situation for those who appeared not to be aware of it.

John Redwood: Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: I will not at the moment, thank you.

I will come back to Gibraltar in a moment, but I want to continue on the subject of Scotland's priority in these negotiations. The document I am holding—"Scotland's Place in Europe"—puts forward a highly considered and detailed case to the British Government. As I said, we are still waiting for any kind of considered or detailed response. This morning, the Exiting the European Union Committee heard evidence from a number of Scottish legal experts, in addition to the Minister, Mike Russell. We were told by Professor Nicola McEwen that the proposals in this document are credible and merit examination.

What the Scottish Government are asking for from the British Government is no more than the British Government are asking for from the other 27 member states of the European Union, and that is for there to be consideration in negotiations of our position, and our position is somewhat less substantial than the position the British Government want to put forward in Europe.

Seema Malhotra (Feltham and Heston) (Lab/Co-op): Will the hon. and learned Lady give way?

Joanna Cherry: I am going to make a little progress, and then I will give way.

The Scottish Government are looking for a response to this document, and that is why we are not going to push new clause 145, which has been held over to today for a vote. A meeting is taking place this afternoon of the Joint Ministerial Committee, and we are still prepared for the time being to put faith in the promise the Prime Minister made, which my right hon. Friend the Member for Gordon (Alex Salmond) has just reminded us of, about Scotland's wishes being taken into account. However, Members of this House should make no mistake: we will expect the Prime Minister to deliver on that promise. We will expect—just as Gibraltar does—to have our position put forward in the article 50 letter. If that does not happen, and the Prime Minister breaks her promise, we will hold another independence referendum, and on the back of the *Herald* headline, things are looking pretty good for that at the moment—we are at nearly 50%, and not a single word has been uttered yet in the campaign for a second independence referendum.

John Redwood *rose*—

Seema Malhotra *rose*—

Joanna Cherry: I will not give way to the right hon. Gentleman for the time being, but the hon. Lady was going to raise a point.

Seema Malhotra: The hon. and learned Lady referenced the evidence session we had this morning with her colleague from the Scottish Parliament. Does she agree, however, that there were a number of unanswered questions in the Committee, including on what regulations Scotland may be subject to if it were in the European economic area; what the impact might be on the trade relationship with the rest of the UK; what the controls at the border might be, and what they might need to look like if Scotland had free movement but the rest of the UK did not; and what payment might need to be made by Scotland, including how much that would be and where it would come from? There was some confusion over those points.

Joanna Cherry: I do not agree with the hon. Lady. The transcript will be available shortly, and when hon. Members read it they will see that my colleague who is a Minister in the Scottish Government repeatedly told Members that the answers to the questions they were asking were in this document. It was rather surprising that one member of the Committee admitted that he had not read the document but berated the Scottish Minister for not having answered questions that are answered in the document he has not read. I hope that the British Government are studying this document, as there is perhaps quite a lot to learn from it.

2 pm

John Redwood: The hon. and learned Lady very touchingly says that her document is a compromise document. Do not she and her party understand that a compromise document is one on which she and I agree, and I do not agree with it?

Joanna Cherry: I have got some news for the right hon. Gentleman: when the United Kingdom Government go to negotiate with EU's 27 member states about exiting the EU, they will be looking for a compromise. At the moment, the UK Government are looking for things that the EU member states are not willing to give, but that is not preventing them from going into a negotiation—that is how negotiations work.

I urge the right hon. Gentleman to read this document. If he had read it, he would know—I had to correct him on this earlier—that although Norway is in the single market, it is not in the common fisheries policy. What Scotland is looking for in this compromise document is an arrangement similar to that of Norway. I visited Oslo recently. The Norwegians seem to be doing pretty well on the back of that arrangement—it looks as though they have a prosperous and successful economy.

Alex Salmond: If the right hon. Gentleman had made the same pledge as the Prime Minister made, I would expect him, as a right hon. Member, to have kept to it. I saw the evidence this morning, and I heard the Scottish Parliament Minister, Mr Russell, give the example of Liechtenstein and Switzerland. Liechtenstein is in the European economic area; Switzerland is not. They have a frictionless border—let us put it that way—just like the border the Prime Minister promises for Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

Joanna Cherry: Indeed.

Many of the questions that hon. Members in this House raise with the Scottish Government and with the Scottish National party about how these matters might be managed are answered in this document, which is the product of research and consultation that has been going on in the many months since the Brexit vote. While the British Government have been going round in circles trying to decide whether they want to be in the single market or in the customs union, the Scottish Government have been looking at a considered compromise and answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves whereby the majority of the people of Scotland wish to remain part of the EU but the rest of the UK wishes to exit.

Dr Eilidh Whiteford: A few minutes ago, my hon. and learned Friend made a really important point about Norway and the benefits that could accrue particularly

[Dr Eilidh Whiteford]

to my constituency from a Norwegian-style deal that would help our fishing interests, but also protect the interests of our fish processors and all the people who depend on export markets, most of which are in the EU at the present time.

Joanna Cherry: Indeed. It is no secret that of the minority of people in Scotland who voted to leave the EU, a significant proportion was made up of people working in the fishing industry, including fishermen, because, as we heard earlier, they have received such a bad deal over the years as a result of inept negotiations by the British Government on the common fisheries policy—negotiations that Scottish Government Ministers have been kept out of. The great advantage of this compromise proposal for fishermen is that, while coming out of the common fisheries policy, they would still have access to the single market. When I was in Norway, I saw a presentation about how the Norwegian fishing industry is progressing on the back of such an arrangement, and, believe you me, it is doing significantly better than the Scottish fishing industry.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Joanna Cherry: I give way to the Chairman of the Committee on Exiting the European Union.

Hilary Benn (Leeds Central) (Lab): Is not the fundamental difficulty with the document's proposal about the possibility of Scotland remaining in the single market the fact that there is absolutely no evidence that I have seen thus far—perhaps the hon. and learned Lady has—that any one of the other 27 member states, never mind the British Government's view, has indicated that it would consent to such an arrangement, given that all the other parallels, the Faroes aside, relate to countries, which is not the case in relation to this proposal?

Joanna Cherry: I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for raising this issue, because it highlights the reason I am labouring this point. For Scotland to get the compromise deal that we are proposing, the United Kingdom Government first need to accept it as something they would then put forward to the other 27 member states. The other 27 member states are waiting for the United Kingdom to put its money where its mouth is and come to the table and negotiate. They need us to put our own house in order before we do that. [Interruption.] Government Members may not like it, but the Prime Minister made a promise to involve Scotland in the negotiations and to look at all the options for Scotland. We are withholding our right to force our amendment to a vote today in the hope that the Prime Minister will be as good as her word. People in Scotland are watching and waiting.

This document has widespread support. It has the merit of uniting leavers and remainers because it has a compromise that appeals to both sides.

Geraint Davies (Swansea West) (Lab/Co-op): Does the hon. and learned Lady agree that in the event that Scotland was in the single market and England, Wales and Northern Ireland were not, industry would move from England and Wales to Scotland to have tariff-free

access to the single market? Similarly, industry would move from Northern Ireland to southern Ireland, ripping open the peace process, which, although it was denied earlier, will indeed be ripped open.

Joanna Cherry: The SNP's position on the peace process has been made very clear in this House: we would wish to do everything to support it.

Moreover, we do not wish the rest of the UK to suffer as a result of coming out of the single market. That is why the principal suggestion in this document is that the whole United Kingdom should remain in the single market. I am terribly sorry on behalf of Members representing English and Welsh constituencies that the Prime Minister has now ruled that off the table, but I am sure those Members will understand why we, representing Scotland, must try to see whether we can get a compromise deal for Scotland.

Mark Durkan (Foyle) (SDLP): Does the hon. and learned Lady recognise that if the Government did accept that they could negotiate a separate place for Scotland within the single market, that could equally read across in respect of Northern Ireland, and would be particularly compatible in terms of the strand 2 arrangements and upholding the Good Friday agreement? In many important ways, it would go to the heart of upholding the peace, not upsetting any basis for it.

Joanna Cherry: Indeed. As usual, the hon. Gentleman makes his point with great force and great clarity. The difficulty is that in the Committee on Exiting the European Union this morning we heard from experts who have been observing the process of so-called negotiations between the British Government and the devolved nations in the Joint Ministerial Committee that these negotiations lack transparency and have not really made any significant progress. That is a matter of regret not just for Scotland, but for Northern Ireland and for Wales.

Dr Whiteford: Is my hon. and learned Friend as surprised as I am, given the apparent suggestion that it would be to Scotland's economic advantage to be in the single market, that we are debating leaving the EU in the first place? Surely what is good for Scotland would be good for the whole UK in this respect.

Joanna Cherry: Indeed. We made it clear in this document that we felt it would be to the advantage of the whole United Kingdom to remain in the single market. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister, in what my right hon. Friend the Member for Gordon has described as a very foolish negotiating tactic, has ruled that out from the outset.

Charlie Elphicke (Dover) (Con) *rose*—

Joanna Cherry: I am going to make a bit of progress because I am conscious that a lot of other people are wishing to speak, and, as I said, I want to move on to deal with our amendments on the topic of Gibraltar.

As the hon. Member for Ilford South pointed out, Gibraltar was covered by the European Union Referendum Act 2015. Section 12(1) of the Act extended to the United Kingdom and Gibraltar. There was an overwhelming vote in Gibraltar to remain. When Fabian

Picardo, the Chief Minister of Gibraltar, gave evidence to the Committee on Exiting the European Union, he explained that Gibraltar already has a differential agreement whereby it is in the EU but not in the customs union. This has been working well for the people of Gibraltar. They would like to be involved in a Brexit deal that guaranteed continued access to the single market. They do not want to be forgotten. In the letter I quoted earlier, the Gibraltarian Government support these amendments to get Gibraltar brought within the ambit of the Bill so that Gibraltar's interests can be taken into account in the triggering of article 50.

Will the Minister tell us why Gibraltar was omitted from the Bill? Was it, God forbid, an oversight—if so, the Government now have the opportunity to correct that, with the assistance of the SNP—or was it a deliberate omission of Gibraltar from the ambit of the Bill? If it was a deliberate omission, how does that sit with assurances that the British Government have been giving to Gibraltar that its interests will be protected?

The hon. Member for Ilford South will speak with greater knowledge than I can about Gibraltar. The purpose of the amendments is to ensure that Gibraltar is not forgotten. We feel that there may have been an oversight, so we are attempting to provide assistance. However, if there has not been an oversight and the omission is deliberate, we need to know why and hon. Members need to consider whether it is appropriate to rectify the situation.

A number of other amendments would ameliorate the Bill. The hon. Member for Sheffield Central (Paul Blomfield) spoke ably from the Front Bench about new clause 2 and other amendments. I find new clause 2 to be slightly disappointing, because it does not enumerate the interests of Scotland as a particular consideration to be taken into account. We are not going to push new clause 145 to a vote, because we are hopeful that today's Joint Ministerial Committee might have a fruitful outcome.

Mr MacNeil: I am grateful to my hon. and learned Friend for taking Scotland into account. I hope that the promise made by the Prime Minister on 15 July will have greater gravity than that made by the previous Prime Minister on 10 September 2014, when David Cameron said on “Channel 4 News” that if Scotland voted to remain in the UK, all forms of devolution were there and all were possible. Yet when it came to the Scotland Bill—by this time, my hon. and learned Friend was a Member of Parliament—none of the amendments were taken, showing that none of the forms of devolution were there and none were possible. We have had one broken promise by the previous Prime Minister; let us hope that this Prime Minister can keep her word.

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): Order. I give the hon. Gentleman a lot of leeway, but it is this Bill that we are discussing right now. We cannot go on to previous Prime Ministers and previous Bills. I am sure that the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry), whose legal expertise is among the best in the House, will find a way of saying what she wants to say.

Joanna Cherry: I am bringing my remarks to a conclusion, Mrs Laing, because I am conscious that others wish to speak. I want to make it clear that the

SNP broadly welcomes many of the amendments, including new clause 100, which would secure women's rights and equality. We believe that the EU is about more than just a single trading market; it is also about the social ties that bind us and the social protections that it guarantees.

Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP): On equality and protection, does my hon. and learned Friend agree that what we have seen since we were elected to this place does not fill us with any hope that this Government, when they have their great power grab, will uphold the protections that the EU has brought? We will fight for our citizens' rights.

Joanna Cherry: I agree with my hon. Friend. That concern is shared by Members of many parties in this House. We support any amendments that would underline the social aspects of the EU. For example, new clause 166 centres on the rights of young people, who benefit so much from the important ability to live, work, travel and study across Europe. Of course, the SNP fought for 16 and 17-year-olds to get the vote in the referendum, but that was not to be. Perhaps the result would have been different if it had been allowed.

Later today, we will vote on amendments carried over from earlier in the week, including the SNP's new clause 27, which would protect the rights of EU nationals. I think that the widely shared view in the House is that we ought not to trigger article 50 until we have given EU nationals living in the United Kingdom some assurance on their rights. Furthermore, the Exiting the European Union Committee has received evidence from representatives not only of EU nationals in the UK, but, perhaps more importantly for some Members, of UK nationals living abroad. The witnesses felt that a unilateral declaration of good will from the British Government—who, after all, caused the problem by holding the referendum and allowing the leave vote to happen—to guarantee the rights of EU nationals in the United Kingdom would be met by a reciprocal undertaking from other member states, as opposed to using individual human beings as bargaining chips. *[Interruption.]* If the right hon. Member for Hitchin and Harpenden (Mr Lilley) wants to intervene I will be happy to take that intervention, but he obviously does not; he just wants to shout at me from a sedentary position.

Finally, before Second Reading, I raised a point of order about the Secretary of State's statement on section 19(1)(a) of the Human Rights Act 1998. He said that, in his view,

“the provisions of the... Bill are compatible with the Convention rights”.

I am not usually in the habit of giving out free legal advice, but I am happy to do so on this occasion. If the Bill proceeds and we trigger article 50 without taking any steps to protect the rights of EU nationals living in the UK, the British Government could find themselves facing a challenge—and possibly claims—under the Human Rights Act on the Bill's compatibility with articles 8 and 14 of the European convention on human rights. I know that many Government Members do not have any great affection for the ECHR, but when we exit the EU we will still be signatories to the convention and the British courts will still be bound by it. I offer the Government a helpful word of warning: if they want to

[Joanna Cherry]

save taxpayers' money, they might want to think carefully about addressing that issue before they are met with a slew of legal claims.

2.15 pm

Carol Monaghan (Glasgow North West) (SNP): EU-national workers in science and research are key to research and industry in our society. We should be begging those world-class researchers to stay. We should be bending over backwards instead of using them as bargaining chips, because we are damaging good will and how they feel valued in our society.

Joanna Cherry: Indeed. My hon. Friend takes great interest in teaching, research and science, which was her own field before she came to Parliament. Many Scottish universities, including Herriot-Watt and Napier in my constituency, are extremely concerned about the brain drain that could occur as a result of the failure to reassure EU nationals living in the UK about their rights. With that, I repeat my support for the SNP's amendment 54 and new clause 141 in relation to Gibraltar.

Mr Edward Vaizey (Wantage) (Con): I am grateful for the chance to speak briefly. It is a great pleasure to follow the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry), whom I gather felt that she had not previously had the opportunity to put her points. She has taken about 10% of the time allocated to debate this group of amendments, so I hope that she feels that she has now had the opportunity to make her case, and she did so extremely eloquently.

I want to cover a few bases. [Interruption.] There is a lot of noise coming from the Opposition Benches; it is quite hard to think or speak, but I will plough on. I feel extremely strongly about the rights of EU citizens living in the United Kingdom. I had a meeting in my constituency on Friday, in which I discussed Brexit with about 150 people, including a lot of people from different EU countries, because there are a great many scientific research and high-tech international companies based in my constituency.

These are people who contribute. I note that people love to talk about the economic contribution made by citizens from Europe, but I also deeply value their social contribution. They are incredible people who not only provide world-class expertise to many businesses and science, but make a huge contribution to the communities in my constituency. They are obviously devastated by what has happened and they seek reassurance from the Government.

I am not going to support any particular amendments, because I think that would mess up the Bill and that they would not necessarily achieve what they seek to achieve. I am also deeply reassured by the Home Secretary's letter, which was circulated earlier, and by the Prime Minister's repeated comments about how she is going to make it an absolute priority to get clarity on the rights of EU citizens.

Helen Goodman *rose*—

Mr Vaizey: I give way to a former Treasury official.

Helen Goodman: The right hon. Gentleman said that there was a letter from the Home Secretary. Was it a letter for Conservative Members only? Now that he has

referred to it in the House, is it not appropriate to put it on the Table or in the Library for all hon. Members to see?

Mr Vaizey: I may have made a faux pas. It was addressed "Dear Colleague", and may have just been sent to me. It might be private correspondence between me and the Home Secretary, for me to circulate to my European constituents, who are among the most talented Europeans living in this country.

Helen Goodman: On a point of order, Mrs Laing. Is it appropriate for an hon. Member to refer to a document that is not available to the whole House?

The First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Mrs Eleanor Laing): I believe it is appropriate for an hon. Member to refer to whichever document he or she might care to quote. It would be a matter for the right hon. Member for Wantage (Mr Vaizey) whether he makes any more of the immediate quotation he wishes to use from any particular correspondence. We all have private correspondence.

Alex Salmond: Further to that point of order, Mrs Laing. Would I be in order to say that the custom and practice is that a ministerial letter about a debate should be circulated to Members and placed in the Library?

The First Deputy Chairman: The right hon. Gentleman is absolutely right, as ever—[Interruption]—or as often. If a letter or any document was produced by a Government Minister in his or her capacity as a Government Minister that was intended for the information of the whole House, it would indeed have to be placed in the Library or the Vote Office, or distributed on the Benches. Hypothetically, if there is a letter—I do not know whether there is or not—addressed privately to an hon. Member, it is a matter for the hon. Member.

Mr Vaizey: I am already in enough trouble with my Whips, Mrs Laing, so I suppose another faux pas will not get me to a much better place. I have only been in the House for 11 years, so I am still learning the ropes.

Mr Harper: My right hon. Friend has been here only as long as I have, so we are clearly both still learning the ropes. I wanted to assist him. The Prime Minister has been clear on the record that she intends to take a very generous approach. To go back to the point made by the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry), part of the roadblock is that some EU member states will not negotiate with us until we have triggered article 50. In fact, the quicker we get the Bill on the statute book and get article 50 triggered, the quicker we can get that arrangement in place and reassure EU nationals in Britain and British citizens overseas.

Mr Vaizey: That is an excellent point. A difficult road lies ahead and we will have to make some pretty unsavoury compromises. They are understandable compromises, but we should make no mistake that the mood of the House among many colleagues who supported Brexit is to move as quickly as possible to provide reassurance to European citizens in this country. I wanted to use this opportunity, before I got mired in a procedural quagmire

and moved closer to the Chief Whip's tarantula, to make it as clear as possible that I stand four-square behind European Union citizens living in this country and their contribution.

Ms Tasmina Ahmed-Sheikh (Ochil and South Perthshire) (SNP): We have heard much talk in the House, particularly from the Prime Minister, about the idea of global leadership. Will the right hon. Gentleman explain precisely his definition of global leadership if it does not mean being a leader and standing up for EU nationals living in this country?

Mr Vaizey: The hon. Lady makes an interesting point and allows me to segue to the next issue, which is Britain's global leadership in free trade.

Hon. Members who were lucky enough to hear me speak on Second Reading know that the constant talk of free trade treaties is driving me round the bend. As a Minister, I took part in the state visit from President Xi, and as a Member of Parliament I was in Westminster Hall to hear the address from President Obama—I know I should not stray on to the subject of presidential addresses in Westminster Hall, which is a dangerous road to go down—and I fail to understand those who cite the lack of British influence that has existed while we have been members of the European Union. Heads of State and Presidents from countries all over the world are only too happy to come and visit.

I am a loyal Conservative Member, but the point made about Germany's trade with China was well made. People refer constantly to free trade treaties. I hope we will be able to negotiate them within a matter of days of leaving the European Union, but it strikes me that people are unaware of what happens in the real world if they think that our farmers, who are the best example, will simply sign up without a murmur to free trade treaties with countries such as the United States, which has very different welfare standards from ours. I understand the arguments of those who support free trade with, for example, developing nations, and I understand people who say that we should open our markets to them and support our farmers in different ways, but our farmers will have severe concerns. We also have to wonder whether developing nations have the same welfare standards as us.

Sir Nicholas Soames (Mid Sussex) (Con): I entirely agree and support my right hon. Friend on his first point. On his second point, does he agree that many hon. Members, while wishing the very best, worry that those deals and transactions will take a long time to fulfil, particularly in the case of the farmers, and that there is therefore the great danger of being in limbo-land?

Mr Vaizey: That worries me, and I thank my right hon. Friend for making the point.

This is obviously a remoan. I know it is a remoan. I am a remainer just getting things off my chest. It is probably not very constructive, but it strikes me as bizarre that we have given up extraordinary influence over a market of 500 million people to sail off to negotiate free trade deals that will not be without controversy.

Mr Peter Lilley (Hitchin and Harpenden) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Vaizey: I see a former Trade and Industry Minister who will correct me.

Mr Lilley: I would not dream of correcting my right hon. Friend, but I would ask him this question. When it appeared that we were going to stay in the EU, was he concerned about the terms of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership and what that would have done to British farmers? Was he concerned about the trade agreement with the Canadians, of which we have today voted to take note? Was he concerned about those things, or is he concerned only when it feeds his remaining remoan tendencies?

Mr Vaizey: I did not accept the argument that TTIP would undermine our NHS, and I did not receive any representations from my farmers about its impact on them. I was concerned about the French introducing cultural protections, but felt that we were getting close to a free trade agreement thanks to the negotiating power of the European Union.

Kit Malthouse: Further to the intervention from my right hon. Friend the Member for Hitchin and Harpenden (Mr Lilley), I wonder whether the logical extension of the argument of my right hon. Friend the Member for Wantage (Mr Vaizey) is that we should withdraw from the World Trade Organisation. For example, is it fair that the textile workers of Leicester were exposed through our WTO membership to the textile industry in China, which has largely meant a transfer of that industry to that country?

Mr Vaizey: My argument is simply that it will be very difficult to negotiate the free trade agreements that people talk about. It is a very unconstructive and unhelpful argument and will not take us very far. It is more therapy on my part because I feel so frustrated that the tone of the debate since the referendum has been so awful and unpleasant; that we forget that 48% of the country voted to stay in the European Union; and that we are unable to build a consensus on the way forward. The remain part of the House and the country has, by and large, accepted that the referendum result is clear and decisive, and that it will take us out of the EU. We want to work extremely constructively to make that happen, despite my earlier remarks. We are urging all sides to have a realistic assessment of how difficult it will be so that we can work together in the national interest.

Melanie Onn (Great Grimsby) (Lab): The right hon. Gentleman is being generous with his time. I agree with his point about trying to reach consensus for the sake of the country. Is he as concerned as I am about the protectionism of other countries and the dangers it presents in international trade? After a change of leadership in Nigeria, the Nigerians, on a whim, wrote a list of imports that they would no longer accept, which cut off all existing trade with UK companies, including one in my constituency that exported to Nigeria.

Mr Vaizey: I agree with the hon. Lady and that example reinforces my belief that free trade deals will not be easy to negotiate.

What I am really saying, I suppose, is that my constituents who voted to remain—especially those who come from other European countries—have a great deal of anxiety and want a realisation that we cannot wave a magic

[Mr Vaizey]

wand but that this will need hard pounding. I stand foursquare with the Government on ensuring that we get the best deal possible.

Mr Baker *rose—*

Mr Vaizey: I give way to one of the great experts on the implications of leave.

2.30 pm

Mr Baker: I want to cheer my right hon. Friend up a little and apologise to him as I may have inadvertently failed to invite him to meet the Legatum Institute special trade commissioners who visited Parliament on Monday. The Mexican trade commissioner, who was one of the original North American Free Trade Agreement negotiators, explained to us the danger that NAFTA may need a major renegotiation under President Trump. With talk of the need to get the substance right and then get it through three Parliaments, it sounded as if it would take a terribly long time, but they think it can be concluded by October 2018. The experience of actual trade negotiators who have negotiated such agreements is that they can be done quickly.

Mr Vaizey: I will visit my hon. Friend's constituency in April, so we can discuss the matter at length as I turn his leave association into a remain one. I know the Legatum Institute well because the chap who has become flavour of the month for his knowledge of trade deals, Shanker Singham, was at school with me, which automatically makes him a dangerous member of the liberal metropolitan elite. It is important that we are aware that one of the Brexiteers' great champions is a member of the dangerous liberal metropolitan elite—

John Nicolson (East Dunbartonshire) (SNP) *rose—*

Mr Vaizey: Talking of which, I will take an intervention from my very old friend and former BBC presenter.

John Nicolson: Does the right hon. Gentleman agree that the danger is that we will be caught between a rock and a hard place? If our farmers lower their standards to compete with American imports under free trade, those standards may then be too low for the foodstuffs to be admitted to the European Union. It would be a difficult place to be.

Mr Vaizey: That is just one of many factors we must take into account.

I have tested the patience of the Committee with my wisecracks, and I now want to talk about my main, very serious issue—the withdrawal from Euratom, which will directly affect my constituency. My hon. Friend the Member for Henley (John Howell), who is no longer in his place, represents the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy, where the main research into nuclear fusion—the holy grail of sustainable energy—takes place. In 2014 we signed an almost €300 million contract to run the Joint European Torus on that site until 2018. We are now negotiating to take the programme forward. The JET, based in Oxfordshire, accounts for a quarter of the European fusion programme budget. Other money comes

from ITER, the global fusion project. It will take place in France but still provides financial support for British projects including, for example, €40 million of remote handling equipment awarded to the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority—based in Oxfordshire—as part of a wider consortium.

Coming out of Euratom would present some difficult issues, including a requirement to conclude new bilateral co-operation agreements with the United States and approximately 20 other countries to maintain our access to intellectual property and nuclear technologies; removing the requirement for the UK to comply with Euratom's safety regimes, which would prevent other countries from collaborating with us; and further potential delays and cost increases to the nuclear new build programme. I am extremely unhappy that the Bill will take us out of Euratom—and I was also unhappy that I had no warning of that—but I am grateful to Ministers, some of whom are in their places, for their reactions on this issue. I have been able to have discussions with Ministers from the Departments for Exiting the European Union and for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. I am grateful to the Minister for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation, my hon. Friend the Member for Orpington (Joseph Johnson), who has personally met the Culham chief executive, and to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy who has also spoken to the chief executive. I am also delighted that the Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, my hon. Friend the Member for Hereford and South Herefordshire (Jesse Norman), is due to visit Culham. Every effort is being made to ensure that at its all-staff meeting tomorrow proper reassurances can be given.

Mr MacNeil: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that all the conversations he has had are equal to the €300 million subsidy for Oxfordshire?

Mr Vaizey: As far as I understand it, that subsidy is not going away, and certainly shortly after the referendum the Science Minister guaranteed science funding up to 2020. I am sure that we will find some way to be a member of Euratom and to benefit, because British—and European—scientists working in Culham are vital to that project.

Charlie Elphicke: It is welcome to hear that Ministers have been so heavily engaged with my right hon. Friend following the concerns he raised on Second Reading. Does he agree that Euratom is so closely linked with the European Union that it would be difficult for the United Kingdom to continue to be a member of Euratom while leaving the European Union?

Mr Vaizey: I will answer by saying that I agree that that is the Government's position. I also understand that the Government will act to minimise any further legal challenge to the Bill. I reiterate that I cannot fault Ministers for their response since I raised the issue on Second Reading, in terms of engaging personally with me and with Culham.

I do not know whether I am walking into a point of order quagmire, but I hope that Ministers will publish a document that will explain their strategy for taking forward Euratom as soon as they are able to do so. The

key point is that the Government have no intention of walking away from Euratom because they somehow disagree with the principle of Euratom's existence or the work that it does. It may sound trite when talking about people's futures, but this is a technical withdrawal and I have been impressed by the energy of Ministers in engaging on this issue.

Sue Hayman (Workington) (Lab): A constituent of mine who is an employee of the National Nuclear Laboratory has told me he is concerned that an exit from Euratom would impair his ability to collaborate with leading scientists and engineers across Europe, to the detriment of science and technology in this country. Does the right hon. Gentleman agree with that point?

Mr Vaizey: The hon. Lady makes exactly the point about why people are concerned. As I hope I have made clear, Ministers are putting in a great deal of energy—I am full of terrible puns today—to ensuring that the implications of our technical withdrawal from Euratom are minimised, and that we can restore our de facto membership in the coming months.

Alex Salmond: The right hon. Gentleman is making a considered speech, as I would expect, but has he considered the possibility that if the Bill passes unamended, his position and point of influence will pass with it? It might be better to have something in writing in the Bill, rather than all these warm words, cups of tea and assurances.

Mr Vaizey: I hear what the right hon. Gentleman says, but I have known the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy for many years and shared many warm cups of tea with him, so I accept his warm words. I fully expect him to be in his post for several years to take this forward.

Kit Malthouse: My right hon. Friend is concerned about Euratom. Has he considered the alternative? Given that in the last funding round Euratom had to fight very hard to try to maintain its funding, a position it is unlikely to be able to maintain in future, and the fact that the largest single contributors to Horizon 2020, the Germans, have taken the decision to phase out their civil nuclear programme all together, is he not concerned that over the next couple of decades continued membership of Euratom might expose us to diminishing research funding? Exit from the EU could provide us with the opportunity to partner bilaterally with other countries, as we do already with India and South Korea, and therefore expose ourselves to a wider pool of research.

Mr Vaizey: My hon. Friend makes an interesting point. In fact, in answering him I may slightly contradict my earlier rant. I have significant concerns that our exit from the EU could potentially damage British science because of our close collaboration with the EU, but some scientists in my constituency have pointed out that there is a danger of our becoming too inward-looking in only seeking European scientific collaboration. Whatever one thinks of other issues, China is certainly becoming a much more important player in scientific research. There may be a silver lining to the withdrawal from Euratom.

My hon. Friend is also right to point out that securing funding for nuclear fusion is no easy task. In some respects, nuclear fusion is always the gold at the end of the rainbow. Nevertheless, it is extremely important research and I support it 100%, both in general and for the impact it has on my constituency.

I have taken so long that Mrs Laing has turned into Mr Howarth. Having made a gentle jibe earlier at the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West, I see that I have taken up an inordinate amount of the Committee's time, so I will sit down. I simply reiterate that I stand foursquare behind EU citizens living in our country. Please do not keep banging on about how easy free trade is going to be and please secure our nuclear relationships as far as possible.

The Temporary Chair (Mr George Howarth) I now have to announce the results of today's seven deferred Divisions. On the motion relating to trade unions and education, the Ayes were 327 and the Noes were 264, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to trade unions and transport, the Ayes were 328 and the Noes were 263, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to trade unions and health, the Ayes were 323 and the Noes were 263, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to trade unions and border security, the Ayes were 323 and the Noes were 263, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to trade unions and fire, the Ayes were 323 and the Noes were 262, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to trade union political funds, the Ayes were 322 and the Noes were 254, so the Question was agreed to.

On the motion relating to the comprehensive economic trade agreement between the EU and Canada, the Ayes were 409 and the Noes were 126, so the Question was agreed to.

[The Division lists are published at the end of today's debates.]

Mike Gapes: It is a great pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Howarth. I do not want to go on for too long, but nine amendments in my name have been selected, though I will not speak to all of them. Amendment 31 relates to the implications of leaving Euratom. I agree very strongly with the concerns expressed by the right hon. Member for Wantage (Mr Vaizey). He also talked about the implications of the decision to leave the European Union for British citizens overseas. I declare an interest as the honorary president of Labour International, which represents the interests of Labour party members who live in other countries, many of whom were able to vote in the referendum. However, those living in the EU for longer than 15 years did not have a vote in the referendum, even though many still have very close connections to this country.

Mr Ben Bradshaw (Exeter) (Lab): Disgraceful.

Mike Gapes: It was a disgrace. We are not dealing with that issue in this debate, but I wish to place on the record the messages of concern I have been sent by

[Mike Gapes]

people living in other EU countries. They remain very worried about their access to healthcare, education services and support in the communities they live in, whether they are in Spain, France, Bulgaria, Greece or one of many other countries. This issue should have been resolved already, but the Government have chosen to use these people as a bargaining chip, to use the Government's own words. Frankly, that is unacceptable.

2.45 pm

Mr John Baron (Basildon and Billericay) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Mike Gapes: Yes, I am happy to give way to my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr Baron: I thank the hon. Gentleman. I have raised the issue of the importance of guaranteeing the rights of EU citizens living here, perhaps unilaterally, and I have received assurances from the Prime Minister that this will be top of her list in the negotiations. Also, does the hon. Gentleman not accept in good faith that the issue could be resolved very easily if the EU reciprocated our intention of guaranteeing those rights? The issue could be put aside very quickly if the EU guaranteed the rights of British citizens living in the EU.

Mike Gapes: The hon. Gentleman has been around long enough to know that the negotiation will start after article 50 has been triggered. The reality is that the British Government could have provided reassurance to families in this country—perhaps families with one British and one French parent, whose children are born in this country—who are uncertain about their long-term future if a family member has retained citizenship of another EU country. Frankly, in the interests of those families in this country, the issue should be resolved today, not delayed until the negotiation. That is in our own interests as a country of values, high morals, justice and fairness.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mike Gapes: I need to make progress. [Interruption.]

The Temporary Chairman (Mr George Howarth) Order. The hon. Gentleman is indicating that he does not intend to give way—certainly not at this stage. I do not think it is conducive to the good order of the business of the Committee if people keep pressing. I am sure that he will signal if, at some point, he wants to give way.

Mike Gapes: Thank you, Mr Howarth. I referred to my nine amendments, two of which are minor and drafting amendments. Amendment 23 states that we should, “by 31 March 2017”, notify the country's intention to leave the EU. I was surprised at the lack of a date in the Bill, given the Prime Minister's commitment to triggering article 50 by 31 March. I would have thought all Government Members would be prepared to support the amendment, given that it is entirely in line with what the Prime Minister said. For some reason, however, it does not seem to be acceptable to them; I do not know why. Perhaps a Minister could explain that later.

I mentioned amendment 31, on Euratom. Amendment 30 refers to the European Defence Agency. Defence co-operation within the European Union is vital. There is a large number of major defence projects with a components arrangement, whereby parts from one country are assembled in another. For many years, there have been such collaborative arrangements. Frankly, the British defence industry is unable to compete without international involvement. Some companies have moved offshore, in the sense that they have moved across the Atlantic, while others in this country are joint collaborative arrangements. Thales, originally a French company, is now very much a British defence manufacturer. For many reasons, if our defence industry is to be competitive and provide jobs for tens of thousands of highly skilled people in this country, we have to keep that defence industrial base, but that will be possible only through joint collaboration; otherwise, European manufacturers will be swept aside by the United States or other parts of the world. We have seen that already in the way that industries have shifted to Asia.

Anybody who wants to see the whole manufacturing process of a motor vehicle has to go to South Korea, where they press the steel, have the paint shops and engine plants, and fit out the vehicles. When I was a young man in the 1960s, I went on a school visit to Ford Dagenham. I was struck by the noise and the smell of paint. I was 17 years old. I had never been in a place like it. At that point, I realised that making cars was a massive, complex process. The only time I have seen a place like it subsequently was when I went to Hyundai motors in Korea, where I saw the sheets of steel to be pressed. When I more recently visited the Ford Dagenham plant, which is not far from my constituency, all I saw were men in white coats walking around, adjusting things in a complex process, with lots of robots and diesel engines. That is the contrast. We need to think about this. When we leave the EU, we have to make sure that our manufacturing industry, and within that, the defence sector, is maintained and strengthened.

Kit Malthouse *rose*—

Mike Gapes: I will give way briefly. I will not take too many interventions, though, because I am conscious that other people wish to speak.

Kit Malthouse: The hon. Gentleman makes an interesting point, but will he accept that our membership of the EU has seen a transfer of industries and factories from the UK to eastern Europe and others parts of the EU? Not least of those is Cadbury, which transferred manufacturing to other parts of the EU.

Mike Gapes: The hon. Gentleman will find that globalisation and the expansion of the wealth of the world, led by regional trading blocs such as the EU, have led to a significant change in the types of industries located in particular countries. Hundreds of millions of people have been taken out of poverty because of industrialisation in China. The same thing is happening in Vietnam, the Philippines and India. Globalisation is affecting everyone. He refers to eastern Europe. Yes, the days when the polluting Trabi cars were being made in the German Democratic Republic, and when Škoda vehicles were regarded as a joke, have gone.

There is now high-quality manufacturing in many countries throughout Europe, but they often have integrated supply chains, which is why Ford Dagenham makes diesel engines for cars also manufactured in Belgium, Spain and other European countries. That is the nature of modern capitalism and the global world. The danger in our leaving the EU is that we could make those industries in this country less successful and put tens of thousands of jobs at risk.

Mr Baron: I have good news for the hon. Gentleman: courtesy of our leaving the EU, sterling has fallen and manufacturing in this country is having a field day, as he can see from the export orders and factory output orders. Does he agree that that has been a boon to the manufacturing industry, particularly in the north?

Mike Gapes: Sterling has indeed fallen. As a result, foreign holidays and Marmite are more expensive and chocolate bars are getting smaller. There are all kinds of consequences coming through.

Several hon. Members *rose—*

Mike Gapes: I want to make some progress. I referred to my nine amendments. Amendment 34 relates to the common foreign and security policy. The EU does not do enough on defence. It needs to do far more, particularly, as President Donald Tusk pointed out, given the dangers from outside the EU—from Daesh terrorism, Russia and its territorial grabs in eastern Europe, and the uncertainties surrounding the other Donald, President Donald Trump, and the future of NATO. We all need to recognise that Britain, with France, is the backbone of the European pillar of NATO. The co-operation on the common foreign, security and defence policy that we have established so far needs to be sustained, whether or not we are in the EU.

It would be very foolish if, on leaving the EU, we weaken defence co-operation arrangements that date back to the Saint-Malo agreement with France, or the co-operation with our EU partners, which is limited but nevertheless important, on common peacekeeping, security and policing missions; we make a big contribution there. Some people have said that that could be used as an asset in the bargaining process, but that is the wrong approach. Regardless of what happens to agriculture or on financial contributions, it is in our national defence and security interest to have excellent relations with our neighbours—our French, Dutch and German neighbours—on the defence and security of this country. If we do the opposite, we will cut off our nose to spite our face, and that is not very sensible.

Liam Byrne (Birmingham, Hodge Hill) (Lab): My hon. Friend is making an excellent speech. Does he agree that we should go further? Now that we are leaving the federal project, we have an opportunity to create a confederal project, in which we strengthen co-operation on defence, social rights, science, international development and climate change. The Prime Minister says that we might be leaving the EU, but we are not leaving Europe. In that case, let us see the plan for strengthening our relationships across a host of areas of work across the continent.

Mike Gapes: My right hon. Friend makes a very good point, and I hope that he gets a chance to enlarge on it when he makes his contribution.

I wish to highlight two of my other amendments. Amendment 29, to which the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry) referred, and amendment 35 both relate to Gibraltar. Anybody who, like me, has seen the occasional attempts by the authorities in Madrid to cause trouble in Gibraltar will know that there might suddenly be hundreds of vehicles and dozens of people queueing at the border between Gibraltar and Spain, the special police sent down from Madrid at a moment's notice having imposed a rigorous check on everyone going to Gibraltar. A few hours later, there will be no queue—and then it can come back again.

Between 10,000 and 14,000 people living in southern Spain, in Andalusia, travel across the border each day to work in Gibraltar. Gibraltar has a population of about 32,000 people, many of whom are children. There is an economic base there now that cannot be sustained simply by employing residents of Gibraltar. Also, there is not enough land to house the number of workers it needs, so it is dependent on 10,000 or more workers crossing daily to work in Gibraltar—about 40% of the total workforce in the Gibraltar economy.

3 pm

Mr MacNeil: The hon. Gentleman makes a powerful point about Gibraltar, which I understand. I want to take him back to the words of the right hon. Member for Wantage (Mr Vaizey), who spoke just before him and said that he was afraid that an amendment would mess up the Bill. I fail to see how the addition, at the end of clause 1, page 1, line 3, of the words

“after consultation with the Government of Gibraltar”

could possibly mess up the Bill. Amendment 29 is a sensible amendment that the whole House should support, and that Gibraltar wants us to agree to.

Mike Gapes: The hon. Gentleman must be a mind reader, because I was just coming to that point. When the Government proposed the European Union Referendum Bill in 2015, after the general election, they did not initially include any wording relating to Gibraltar. That came in only because of the strenuous efforts of a number of Conservative Back Benchers, including my parliamentary neighbour the hon. Member for Romford (Andrew Rosindell), who is very active on the British overseas territories all-party group, and of Labour and other MPs who were concerned to ensure that Gibraltar was referred to in the Bill, and that Gibraltar's citizens, even though they are not part of the United Kingdom but are part of the European Union and can vote in elections to the European Parliament, had a vote in the referendum. It is therefore strange, is it not, that although the Bill to set up the referendum, which triggered this process of leaving the European Union, explicitly mentions Gibraltar and the right of Gibraltarians to vote, there is no reference to Gibraltar at all in the Bill to trigger article 50?

I understand that one day after the referendum on 24 June 2015, the then Foreign Minister of Spain, who is fortunately no longer that Minister, as a result of which I gather things are a little bit smoother, made very inflammatory remarks about how Spain would “have Gibraltar” because of the referendum result. As the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West said, when the Chief Minister of Gibraltar, Fabian

[Mike Gapes]

Picardo, spoke before the Brexit Committee, which looked into this issue on 25 January, he made it absolutely clear that Gibraltar had not just voted overwhelmingly to remain, but had voted by an even bigger margin—by 98%, as opposed to 93%—to be British.

The self-determination of Gibraltar is important. Culturally, the people of Gibraltar include people with Spanish, Italian, Moroccan, Genoese, British and many other roots. These people were British; they are British; they will remain British. That is not in question. As I said earlier, however, the day-to-day relationship between Gibraltar and Spain can, at the whim of some official or politician in Madrid, be made difficult. The people who suffer most from that are trade unionists, and workers in the Andalusia region who are working in Gibraltar. I have met them here in the House of Commons.

Interestingly, the socialist-led local authorities in the south of Spain want excellent relations between Andalusia and Gibraltar. While we are in the EU, our Government can ensure that there is no funny business and that no silly things emerge from some draft document produced somewhere about territorial waters, environmental issues, flights and trade matters. As soon as we leave the EU, however, we no longer have the ability to argue that case and block it if a particular Government in Madrid decide to up the ante to make life more difficult for Gibraltar.

Given the importance of this issue, it is surely necessary that the people of Gibraltar are, through their elected government in Gibraltar, made aware of these matters as we leave the EU. Surely, then, to be consistent with what the Bill said when we voted here to have a referendum, Gibraltar should also be mentioned in the current Bill. That is why I shall press my amendment 29 to the vote. I hope that Members of all parties, particularly those who have an interest in the British overseas territories and who believe strongly and firmly that Gibraltar should remain British, will consult their consciences and their own voting history and beliefs, and support this amendment.

Finally, I must say that it is unfortunate that so many Members wish to speak and that there is so little time for them. This whole process has been a disgrace; setting aside just three days for the Committee stage is an absolute disgrace. Clearly, we have seen complicity and collusion—

Mr Bradshaw: A stitch-up.

Mike Gapes: A stitch-up, as my right hon. Friend says, which John Smith certainly did not agree to. When I first entered this House in 1992, I had many happy hours and late nights debating the Maastricht treaty. I can recall—some of the faces on the other side of the Chamber are still there—taking interventions from seven or eight Conservative Members late at night on that issue. For that Bill, we had five, six or seven—*[Interruption.]*—eight times as much time as we have today.

Mr Bradshaw: Does that not make it even more important for the House of Lords to take its time to consider everything that we have not been able to discuss here, and indeed much of what we have?

Mike Gapes: I do not wish to give advice to the other place, because it is possible to get into trouble if we do that. I simply say that it is fortunate for democracy and accountability that there is an opportunity for the other place to give more consideration and time to these matters, without being subjected to programme motions in the same way as we are.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to these amendments. I shall support new clause 2 and a number of other amendments, but particularly my amendment 29.

Kit Malthouse: It is a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for Ilford South (Mike Gapes), and more particularly to hear the intervention from the right hon. Member for Birmingham, Hodge Hill (Liam Byrne). That is the spirit; that is what we want to see; that is what we want for the future.

May I first offer an apology, Mr Howarth, to the previous incumbent of the Chair for having the temerity to challenge the opening of the debate. The infallibility of the Chair has been on display in this House over the last three or four days, and I was mistaken to think that I should join the chorus of doubts about the Chair's decisions.

I have listened very carefully to the debate over the last two and a half days, both within the Chamber and while sitting in my office watching the television. Sadly, what I have heard is, broadly speaking, a three-day ululation by those who voted to remain about what is to come. We seem to have lost sight of the fact that, as far as I can see, we are trying to make the law in this Chamber, rather than debating the merits or otherwise of the decision that was made by the people on 23 June. That has resulted in some very poor drafting of amendments and new clauses, a huge number of which have been tabled to this very simple Bill.

I want to expand on my earlier point of order, and to explain why I cannot support the vast majority of the new clauses and amendments. Let me deal first with those tabled in the name of the Leader of the Opposition and various other Labour Members, including the hon. Member for Nottingham East (Chris Leslie). They constitute a large shopping list of things that Members would like the Prime Minister to take into account, but there are a number of omissions. Other Members have included some of the missing provisions, but they have also missed one or two. For instance, they seem to have forgotten to compel the Prime Minister to breathe or keep her eyes open.

When we add up the list of things that Members are demanding that the Prime Minister take into account during her negotiations and discussions with our European friends, we see that her scope would become extremely limited if we were to pass any of these new clauses. My main objection to them relates to their vagueness. New clause 2, for instance, contains plenty of material that gave me reason for thought. It states that “the Prime Minister shall give an undertaking”.

To whom should she give that undertaking? Should she give it to her husband, or to the House? It is very imprecise. It also does not specify the form of the undertaking. Should it be written on the back of an envelope? We are writing legislation in this House, and it is incumbent on us to be precise. I raised the point of order about the new clauses being vague and therefore out of order because that is exactly what they are.

Geraint Davies: On a point of order, Mr Howarth. The hon. Gentleman made a point of order saying that the new clauses were out of order, and was ruled out of order. Now he is saying that his point of order was in order, so I suggest that he is out of order.

The Temporary Chairman (Mr George Howarth): The hon. Gentleman's point of order, although very entertaining, was not a point of order.

Kit Malthouse: Thank you, Mr Howarth. The previous occupant of the Chair corrected me, and said that my point of order was a matter for debate in the Chamber and not, in fact, a point of order. Debating it is therefore exactly what I am attempting to do.

Mr MacNeil: The hon. Gentleman said that he could not support the "vast majority" of the new clauses and amendments, which presumably means that he can support some of them. I wonder whether he is able to support amendment 29, which was tabled by Labour Members but is backed by the SNP, and which would insert the words

"after consultation with the Government of Gibraltar".

It is quite simple. Will the hon. Gentleman stand with the people of Gibraltar, or will he not?

Kit Malthouse: The hon. Gentleman is quite right. I did say "the vast majority". I should not have said that until I had managed to read them all, but I must confess that even my enormous stamina started to wane at one in the morning when I was two-thirds of the way through them. I have not read them all, which is why I am sitting here listening, so I shall have to mull over that decision over the next few hours.

As I was saying, we do not know what the form of the undertaking is to be, we do not know to whom it is to be made, and, critically, we do not know what the sanction is. If the Prime Minister says "Do you know what? No", what are we to do? Are we to send her to the Tower? Is she not to participate in the elections?

3.15 pm

Mr Harper: According to my reading of the new clause, the sanction is that until the Prime Minister has given the undertaking, she cannot proceed with giving notice under article 50, which I suspect is the intention of those who tabled the new clause. These new clauses are festooned with mechanisms for not giving notice under article 50, which is the entire purpose of the Bill.

Kit Malthouse: I think that my right hon. Friend is being quite generous. As far as I can see, the huge number of new clauses and amendments is designed purely to waste time and to delay, and to send political signals rather than trying to achieve anything. The hon. Member for Ilford South complained about the programme motion. If the opponents of the Bill, or those who wish to amend it, had collaborated and focused on three or four critical changes that they wanted to see, rather than throwing a lot of flak in the air and causing all these problems, they might have made some progress.

Dr Murrison: My hon. Friend is making a number of extremely good points, but is not vagueness the virtue as far as the drafters of the new clauses and amendments

are concerned? If passed, they would turn a simple one-page Bill into an absolute monster that would be subject to a lawyers' beanfeast and would be judiciable at every turn, thus kicking the Bill into the long grass.

Kit Malthouse: I agree, although the word I would use is "simplicity". With simplicity comes clarity, and we need clarity from the Prime Minister, as she enters the negotiations, about the motivations of the House and its support for her.

My other reason for objecting to new clause 2 is that it abrogates to the Prime Minister decisions that will rightly become the decisions of the House in the future. Paragraph (e) states that the Prime Minister should have regard to

"maintaining all existing social, economic, consumer and workers' rights."

Apart from anything else, I am not sure what my social or economic rights are. They are undefined in the Bill. But, in future, those decisions will presumably become decisions of the House. If there are to be any changes in those rights, undefined as they are, they will have to be the subject of primary legislation.

Caroline Lucas: I do wish that the hon. Gentleman would inform himself before making his points. We already know from the White Paper that the Government have said that it will be possible for plenty of these measures to be reformed in secondary legislation. In other words, it will not be subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The hon. Gentleman may not care about his own economic, social and environmental rights, but Opposition Members have constituents who do care. We are trying to do our job properly; it is a pity that the hon. Gentleman is not.

Kit Malthouse: I am sure that the hon. Lady did not mean to be rude—

Caroline Lucas: I did. [*Laughter.*]

Kit Malthouse: Perhaps she did. I admit that I am a relative newcomer to the House, but, as I understand it, even secondary legislation can be forced into debate on the Floor of the House by the Opposition parties. They can table motions, and there can be Back-Bench debates. All sorts of scrutiny of secondary legislation is possible. Indeed, there are ways in which the Opposition can strike down such legislation once it is before the House, if they wish to do so. It is not as if we were without powers in such circumstances.

Mr Harper: May I help my hon. Friend and, in particular, the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas)? It is made clear in the White Paper—an undertaking that the Prime Minister has already given to the House—that any significant policy changes will be underpinned by primary legislation, which means that the House can be given a full opportunity to debate them. It is also clear that secondary legislation, under the great repeal Bill, will be used only to address deficiencies in the preserved law, which will relate to the fact that we will not, for example, be able to use EU institutions. I think that that is very clear, and preserves the rights and privileges of the House to protect our constituents.

Kit Malthouse: My right hon. Friend is quite right.

Mr Lilley: Is my hon. Friend not puzzled about why the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas) and others now want to be able to vote on and control legislation on whole swathes of which, for the last 40 years, they have been content to have no vote—no vote before negotiations, no vote during negotiations, no vote at the end of negotiations—and no power to destroy an EU regulation even if every Member voted against it.

Kit Malthouse: My right hon. Friend has neatly drawn attention to the fundamental paradox that sits at the base of all remainder arguments.

When we come to new clause 77, I think we have reached what I would call peak nonsense. The new clause, tabled by the hon. Member for Nottingham East, states:

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of retaining full participation in the making of all rules affecting trade in goods and services in the European Union.”

That effectively means remaining members of the Commission, members of the Parliament, and members of the Council of Ministers, or else not leaving the EU. As far as I can see, that is indeed peak nonsense. Yet again, we see bad legislation and bad law.

Chris Leslie: The hon. Gentleman should perhaps take another look at new clause 77. It makes the point about the need for the UK to retain its role around the table as a rule maker in our tariff arrangements for trade. There are some serious issues to do with our position in the customs union and so forth, and I suggest that Britain should retain its role around the table. Does the hon. Gentleman disagree?

Kit Malthouse: No, that is not what it says. If the hon. Member reads the Member’s explanatory statement to the amendment he will see that it says:

“This new clause would require HM Government to negotiate to continue the UK’s participation on agreeing all rules affecting trade in goods and services in the European Union.”

My understanding is that those rules are made by the Commission and agreed by the Council of Ministers and the Parliament, so we would have to stay around all those tables.

Tom Tugendhat (Tonbridge and Malling) (Con): Should we pass this new clause, will the Act of Parliament therefore be binding on the other 27 members, who will therefore, because we willed it, be forced to accept our presence at their table, despite our having left all the organisations that we have left? Does my hon. Friend think that this is in any way enforceable? If not, is it not slightly fallacious even to debate it?

Kit Malthouse: My hon. Friend rightly points out that, as with all of these amendments, even if this does not happen, there is nothing to be done. There is no sanction; there would just be a shrug of the shoulders, and we would have to turn our back and ask the hon. Member for Nottingham East what we are supposed to do next if we cannot manage to comply with his amendment. It really is nonsense. I know the hon. Gentleman has ambitions within his party, but he will have to do a little bit better than produce stuff like this.

Again, new clause 179 on protecting current levels of funding states:

“In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the desirability of protecting current funding from the European Union.”

Funding to whom? Which funding? All funding? The funding that we send? The funding that comes back? Defence spend? Funding to us, or funding to other countries? The vagueness of these new clauses is extraordinary.

Again, new clause 183 on membership of the single market including EU-wide reform of freedom of movement states:

“secure reforms of provisions governing the free movement of persons between EU member states in such a way as to allow for greater controls over movement of people for member states”.

That is all very vague, as is

“maintain the highest possible level of integration with the European single market.”

What does that mean? What is the highest possible level of integration? Perhaps that means membership.

Sir Oliver Letwin: I think my hon. Friend is being a little uncharitable. He seems to be assuming that these new clauses are without purpose, but, as was recently pointed out, they have a very definite purpose: were they to be passed, it would be impossible for the Government to proceed with article 50. It would be in the courts certainly for years, possibly for decades, and maybe even for centuries. A very conscious policy of great intelligence is being followed here. My hon. Friend is underestimating the ingenuity of the Opposition.

Kit Malthouse: My right hon. Friend may well be right. Perhaps I am—

The Temporary Chair (Mr George Howarth): Order. While the hon. Gentleman is perfectly entitled to debate the quality or otherwise of any amendments or new clauses, he needs to acknowledge that the Chair has deemed all of them to be within scope. So whatever the purpose or otherwise behind them, they are within the scope of the Bill.

Kit Malthouse: I am grateful to you for that direction, Mr Howarth, but the previous incumbent of the Chair told me that that was a matter for debate on the Floor of the House, and that we were allowed to debate the merit—

The Temporary Chair: Order. And that is exactly what I have just said.

Kit Malthouse: Anyway, I have come to the end of my peroration on that particular point and I have a couple of other points.

Quite a lot of these amendments are unenforceable and nonsensical and cannot be supported. I will listen to the rest of the debate and discover whether there are any substantive ones in this potpourri that has been thrown up in the air, as my right hon. Friend the Member for West Dorset (Sir Oliver Letwin) says, to try to fog the issue or create legal difficulties in the future. But for the moment I am afraid I am not able to support the vast majority of them, although I have not read every single one yet.

I wish to make two further points. First, I want to reiterate what I said earlier about Euratom and the nuclear industry. The nuclear industry is of course incredibly important not just to the UK, but to the rest of the world. The UK is a serious nuclear power; there is serious, deep research going on here into the future of nuclear fission and fusion. But we have to recognise that things are changing in the EU nuclear research landscape, and be aware of those decisions, and take them into account when we consider our future association with Euratom.

There is now only one serious nuclear power in the EU, which is France. Germany has taken the decision to withdraw completely from the civil nuclear programme. Belgium is the only other country with a significant number of reactors, but France, with 58 reactors, is the only country truly putting effort into nuclear research, and of course we are fortunate in this country in having a bilateral nuclear collaboration agreement with France.

Angela Smith: Sheffield's Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre is the heart of nuclear technology research in this country. The hon. Gentleman ought to think again about his statement.

Kit Malthouse: I am not quite sure what the hon. Lady thinks I said. I said there were broadly two serious nuclear powers in the EU at the moment, the UK and France, and that we are fortunate in having a bilateral agreement signed in 2010 with the French to deepen and widen our collaboration on nuclear research. Our exit from Euratom, which looks like it is going to happen, will not affect that at all. Those bilateral relations and that research will continue. In particular, our participation in the Jules Horowitz Reactor project in southern France can continue, not least because there are a number of non-EU members in that fantastic materials testing programme at the moment.

Mrs Theresa Villiers (Chipping Barnet) (Con): I wonder whether my hon. Friend shares my concern. I think that the threat to the UK nuclear industry is not this Bill but the fact that the Leader of the Opposition wants to shut down the nuclear industry in this country, including, of course, Sellafield.

Kit Malthouse: That is a very good point, which will no doubt be taken into account by the good voters of Copeland in the next couple of weeks.

Albert Owen: I am glad the hon. Gentleman mentioned the good voters of Copeland, because they will be looking after the nuclear workers whose pensions are under threat from his Government.

The agreement between France and Britain comes under the umbrella of Euratom, and the people who know—the academics and the industry—are lobbying us to maintain that link.

Kit Malthouse: I am not sure the hon. Gentleman is right legally; my understanding is that it is an intergovernmental treaty between the two countries and will not necessarily be affected.

We have bilateral treaties with lots of other countries. Just before Christmas, we signed yet another agreement with the Japanese to deepen our research into the civil

nuclear programmes. We also have bilateral arrangements with India and South Korea. These are really where the innovations are happening in nuclear research, so the idea that somehow by coming out of Euratom we are going to close ourselves off from the rest of the world is totally untrue. If anything, it might free us to do more work across the rest of the globe in developing what I think is going to be the future of British energy.

Finally, I want to say a few words on EU nationals. As Front Benchers will know, I have expressed my doubts about the Government's approach to this matter over the past few months, and I am firmly of the belief that we should give those people some reassurance. However, I am willing to give the Prime Minister the space she needs in the negotiations to ensure that she can secure the fate of British nationals overseas. On the basis that the question of EU nationals will come back to the House—as will so many other things—and require primary legislation if their status is to change, I will be voting with the Government on this new clause, as I know many others will for the same reason.

Mr MacNeil: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Kit Malthouse: No, I must finish now.

I therefore encourage Members to look at these new clauses and amendments and decide whether we would be putting good, enforceable law on to the statute book by accepting them. I suggest that, in most cases, we would not, so I urge Members to vote with the Government.

Caroline Flint (Don Valley) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your stewardship, Mr Howarth. I listened carefully to the contribution from the hon. Member for North West Hampshire (Kit Malthouse). I believe that it is part of our job in the House of Commons to raise questions about important decisions that affect all our lives and, through the use of amendments and other means, to open up the discussion and seek answers from the Government of the day. That is important in the debates that we will have today and in the future. The Government have refused on numerous occasions to accept contributions from those on my own Front Bench and others, but they have then gone away and thought about the issues and decided, "Maybe there's something in that." We seem to be pushing at the Government, although they do not want to accept some of the amendments, some of which I have put my name to. Part of the purpose of having these debates in the public arena is to hold the Government to account and make them look again at the important subjects that are being raised at the moment and that will, I have no doubt, be raised in the next two years and beyond.

3.30 pm

I was delighted to read in the White Paper that one of the Prime Minister's 12 objectives was to enhance employees' rights and maintain EU protections. On page 32, the graph suggests that we will have 14 weeks' statutory paid holiday. I wonder whether she will keep to that suggestion. Some amendments on the protection of workers' rights tabled by my hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham East (Chris Leslie) were not selected, but we will take heart from the suggestion in the White Paper and perhaps hold the Prime Minister to account on that particular issue.

I want to challenge the Government on a number of aspects of this important process, and I do so as an MP who believes that the decision is made. Whatever the falsehoods, exaggerations or unpleasantnesses that surfaced in the referendum, none of those invalidates the UK's decision. The House should make it clear that we respect the outcome of 23 June. I commend the approach of Labour Front Benchers on those matters, and I commend the work of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Holborn and St Pancras (Keir Starmer) in particular, because it is thanks to his efforts that the Government have accepted a number of Labour's demands.

The Government have accepted our essential demand for a vote in the House prior to withdrawal. There will be lots of debate about what that should mean, but it has been a concession. The Government have also accepted that that vote has to include our proposed relationship with the EU after we leave. They have accepted that the vote must take place on a draft withdrawal agreement, and that it will do so before the European Parliament or Council decides on that draft agreement. In accepting those Labour arguments, the Government are asserting that the UK Parliament does not play second fiddle to our colleagues in the European Parliament, and that this House asserts some measure of control over the withdrawal process. It is really important that this is not seen as a debate only for the Prime Minister and her Ministers, and that everyone in the House is able to air their views and influence the discussions.

Geraint Davies: Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Caroline Flint: I will make a bit of progress, then I might take a few interventions.

In the Prime Minister's Lancaster House speech, she pledged that the UK would keep workers' rights after Brexit. She also pledged to avoid a cliff edge by seeking a period of stability after we leave, while our trading arrangements with the EU single market are sorted out. She pledged to seek good access to the single market with no extra tariffs or bureaucracy. There might be some disagreements on my own side of the House about what all that should look like, but none of us should be in any doubt about the importance of our trading arrangements—not only for exports, but for imports.

This is not just about our cities; it is about places such as Doncaster and the other towns and communities around the country in which these arrangements are vital for jobs. When I did a survey of my constituents after the referendum campaign, I asked them what my three priorities should be. Jobs and investment came first. Tackling immigration came second. The £350 million a week that was apparently going to come back to the NHS came third. We heard about that in yesterday's debate. I am not sure what I can do about that last one, but the first two are certainly going to get my full attention.

I believe that we have to look at freedom of movement. I have been saying for many years that immigration has not been attended to, by my party or by others, in the way that it should have been. The Prime Minister has said that she wants the negotiations to guarantee that EU workers currently living here can stay. I agree with that. Many of my constituents have particular issues about freedom of movement and they want them to receive attention in a way that they have not done

before. However, the Prime Minister could lead her MPs through the Lobby today and vote to guarantee the rights of EU nationals here. As others have said, she could make it clear that they will not be used as a bargaining chip and could end their uncertainty. Likewise, we also want to safeguard the rights of Brits living in Europe, and by adopting a positive approach today we would make it more likely that Brits living in the EU were treated fairly.

Mr MacNeil: The right hon. Lady touches on EU nationals. It has been misunderstood several times in this House, not just today, that Europe should make the first step. Which European state did those people mean? Should it be Bulgaria, Sweden, Portugal or wherever? The reality is that the UK is making a move with Brexit, so the UK should be leading and showing good will to the citizens of all European countries. We are talking not about two places—the UK and the EU—but about the UK and 27 other places.

Caroline Flint: The tone of the debate as we move forward is crucial not only to how we in this country work together for the best deal, but to how we are perceived in the other 27 member states. Something will have to be done about EU nationals living here and Brits living in the other member states. That is a fact. There will have to be a deal. There are those on the Government Benches—remain voters and leave voters—who cannot understand why the Prime Minister is not stepping up and making a decision to make that clear.

Several hon. Members rose—

Caroline Flint: I am going to make progress.

I also want us to be open to EU students. I understand the concern in parts of our country—maybe not so much in London, but certainly in Scotland and the north of England—about the continuing brain drain from our communities that is hindering our ability to grow our economy. My constituents do not have much of a problem with that, just like they do not have much of a problem with having the ability to travel for their two weeks in the sun maybe once a year, which will be important for Doncaster Sheffield airport in my constituency. However, they do know that we have to think about some rules to manage migration, because the net benefits of migration, of which there are many, have not been shared equally across the country. In some communities in some towns, the rate of change with people coming in, particularly from eastern Europe, has had economic and social effects—with no blame accorded to those individuals. When a factory finds, perhaps over a matter of weeks or even overnight, that the number of people from eastern Europe outweighs the number of people from the local community, it cannot be denied that that creates worries, problems and pressure on services.

The debate over the next few years cannot be just about migration from the EU. Over the past seven years, the Tory Government's policies on migration and immigration have failed. The Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union is not here, but I remember when he caused a by-election on the basis of getting rid of ID cards. I supported ID cards then and I support them today. In the world in which we live, and given identity fraud, crime and needing to know who should

have access to what, they could have been part of the solution to some of the problems we have seen since he caused that by-election.

Dr Murrison: I have been following the right hon. Lady's remarks with great interest. She has reiterated the shadow Minister's abandonment of her party's long-standing principled commitment to free movement. Given that she wants the House to control migration in the future, how would that be possible without leaving the EU?

Caroline Flint: We have failed to raise that issue under successive Governments and influence how the change should happen, and I believe that discussions are happening across the other 27 member states about what freedom of movement has meant for them. Unfortunately, we have not attended to that issue for too long. As a result of not doing so, when David Cameron tried to negotiate a deal, he did not leave enough time to broaden the scope for some real reform, so we hurtled into a referendum of his choosing on the date that he set and the consequences are there for all to see.

Liam Byrne: Mr right hon. Friend is making a brilliant and honest speech. When I was the Immigration Minister in 2007, it was clear to me that there could have been a consensus throughout Europe on the reform of free movement. If only the Labour party had pursued it then, when we were in government—indeed, if only the Conservative party had pursued it with care and forensic detail when they came to office in 2010—the Government would not have been forced to offer a bargain-basement deal to the British people when the Prime Minister's back was against the wall.

The Temporary Chair (Mr George Howarth): Order. I do not want to stifle interventions, but it occurs to me that some people who are intervening and are still hoping to speak will have nothing left to say by the time they get to speak.

Caroline Flint: I absolutely agree with that statement by my right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Hodge Hill (Liam Byrne). We should be having a more grown-up discussion about the mistakes that have been made and how we navigate what is for us all uncharted territory. A little humbleness in all that would not go amiss.

Sir Oliver Letwin *rose—*

Caroline Flint: I will be two seconds. *[Interruption.]* Okay, I give way to the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir Oliver Letwin: I am most grateful to the right hon. Lady, who is making a very serious speech. Does she agree that as part of the grown-up discussion to which she refers, Members on both sides of the House need to have the courage to explain that migration of many kinds is beneficial to our economy and our society, in a way that we have not done so far?

Caroline Flint: I totally agree with that, but perhaps part of the problem is that often we talked about that a lot, to the exclusion of sometimes talking about the ways in which communities were feeling that it was not working for them. That is part of the problem. We in politics all know that we create white noise, but how

much of it actually gets through to the public? Let us remember that every single region in England, outside of London, voted to leave. If we avoid these important issues, we do so at our peril. For me, the biggest danger is that we let the extremes of the far right occupy ground that allows them to influence the debate, and I hope none of us would want that.

I wish to make some progress and address briefly some of the amendments and new clauses that are important for both sides of the House to consider. Whether or not they are passed tonight, we will see, but I hope that their content and some of the contributions that are made will be taken seriously by Ministers and given some attention when they respond.

It is important, and in the UK's interest, that we present ourselves not as a nation retreating from a successful international union, but as a nation that remains determined to uphold that union's best values. New clause 7 speaks to that aim, as it would commit the Government, in advance of any negotiations, to having regard to the legislation shared throughout the EU on preventing and tackling tax avoidance and evasion—a matter to which I have given considerable time over the past few years.

In September last year, the UK put itself at the forefront of the international debate on public country-by-country reporting. Our stance should be, as it was then, that the best and biggest international companies with any substantial presence in the UK should have no fear of openness, and no fear of publishing where they do business and pay taxes. In that spirit, the UK should pledge, ahead of the negotiations, to comply with the EU code of conduct on business taxation. We should do so not because we are required to, but because we want to uphold the standards on which, in many ways, the UK has been leading. It is unfortunate that some of the Prime Minister's comments seem to rail against some of the positive efforts that have been made to tackle tax evasion and avoidance and some of the issues relating to tax havens. It would be a huge step backwards if we were seen to step away from something important and on which we could be leading the world.

New clause 100 is a modest provision on equality and women's rights, yet its values reach to the core of what modern Britain should be about. It is modest because it simply asks that during negotiations the Government have regard to the public interest in maintaining employment rights and co-operation against trafficking, domestic violence and female genital mutilation. It suggests a cross-departmental—it could be cross-party, if we want—working group to recommend appropriate legislation on equality and access to justice. The values are clear: it asks only for what we already have, but it also asks the House to embrace the things we value and to make it clear that none of them will be sacrificed during our departure from EU membership.

New clause 163 is about consultation with the English regions. We have heard much in this Chamber about the importance of a meaningful dialogue with the devolved Administrations, and I endorse that approach. I have argued publicly that the best way forward is for the Government to acknowledge that we are in uncharted waters, and that the Prime Minister should be seeking cross-party agreement and having regular meetings with other party leaders. I should not need to remind her that, like me, her Government argued to remain.

[Caroline Flint]

The decision of the British people on 23 June was an instruction not just to the Prime Minister and a handful of Ministers, but to all of us in this House.

3.45 pm

In that spirit, I urge the Government to adopt new clause 163 and consult the English regions. As a Yorkshire MP, I hope that I do not need to remind Ministers that Yorkshire has a population greater than Scotland. We had a gross value added economic output of £110 billion in 2015, just £17 billion less than Scotland, so I call on the Government not to overlook the English regions.

Finally, I urge Ministers to clarify our future relationship with the European Atomic Energy Community, which has already been mentioned in this debate. We all know that that is such an important sector, and it is a sector that should grow in the UK not only because of the nuclear energy that we create here, but because of the potential export market that it provides.

New clauses 185 and 192 and amendment 89 all seek to ensure that the Government take this matter very seriously. There is an onus on Ministers urgently to clarify whether, on leaving the EU, the UK will forfeit membership of Euratom. In the meantime, I put to the Minister the request from the Nuclear Industry Association to convene a specific working group to ensure that no omissions are made in the framing of regulations to replace the provisions of this treaty.

Albert Owen: My right hon. Friend is right to press the Minister, because we have had some very thin talk on this important matter. The industry wants this working party, and it wants Government to give some clear assurances. I make my appeal to the Minister, through my right hon. Friend, to do that tonight. I am sure that he is listening.

The Minister of State, Department for Exiting the European Union (Mr David Jones) *indicated assent.*

Caroline Flint: I absolutely agree with my hon. Friend.

As a remain campaigner, I saw many positive benefits from our membership of the European Union. I am determined that this House will respect the referendum outcome and seek the best for my constituents from our new relationship.

Some in the Prime Minister's Cabinet talk as though Brexit will be nothing but boundless prosperity. Some remainers talk as though Britain is hurtling off a cliff and they are all doom and gloom. The reality is likely to be something in between. After a long and sometimes difficult marriage, we are getting a divorce. During that process, we need to leave behind some of the false promises and distortions of the referendum campaign. Dramatic false claims only damage trust. We need to replace the rhetoric with honest discussion and honest endeavour to achieve the best outcomes from the path that our country has chosen. That is how we rebuild trust and secure a deal that most leave and most remain voters can accept. That is the way I will be approaching the discussions in the months ahead.

Mr Baker: In rising to support the Government, I wish to consider new clause 2, and amendments 5 and 42 and new clause 185 relating to Euratom.

I am enormously encouraged by today's debate not least because I take new clause 2, as my right hon. Friend the Member for Wokingham (John Redwood) explained, as an endorsement of the Government's position. I look forward to a very full aye Lobby on Third Reading. Paragraph (e) talks about

"maintaining all existing social, economic, consumer and workers' rights".

That is something to which the Prime Minister is committed. Along with other Members, I look forward to seeing her succeed in guaranteeing reciprocal rights as soon as possible. I think we know from the press why that has not been done already. It is because the German Chancellor and various figures within the EU institutions have stood in the Prime Minister's way. We know, from what we have read in the press, that the Prime Minister has a clear framework for guaranteeing reciprocal rights and she has sought to deliver it, but, because our negotiating partners have insisted on no negotiation before notification, she has not made progress on it. None the less, I have full confidence in her intent and in the solidity of her work, and I will certainly vote with the Government tonight.

Of course, looking at the character of this sheaf of amendments, I think many right hon. and hon. Members have indicated why they have been tabled. They are undoubtedly meant to draw within the jurisdiction of the courts a wide range of issues that would keep us mired in the courts for ever, putting off the inevitable day of leaving. I think it is far better to be strong, confident and committed and to act with a constructive and positive spirit to take us out of the EU successfully.

With that in mind, having dramatically curtailed my remarks on the new clause in the light of what colleagues have said, I want to turn to Euratom. What is it? It is a legal framework for civil nuclear power generation, radioactive waste management, arrangements for nuclear safeguards and movement of and trade in nuclear materials.

The first point I want to address is the suggestion that this issue was not on the ballot paper. I suppose that if we had put all the issues that are of concern to hon. Members on the ballot paper, it would have been very long indeed. The question on the ballot paper was perfectly adequate and if the fault can be laid at anyone's door for Euratom's not being discussed in the course of the campaign, it lies with the pro-EU Britain Stronger in Europe campaign.

The Euratom treaty is a separate treaty, signed in 1957 by the founding members of the EU. The UK joined it at the same time as it entered the EEC, and the European Communities Act 1972 gives effect to that treaty as well as to the EEC treaty. Section 3(2) of the European Union (Amendment) Act 2008 makes it clear that any Act that refers to the European Union includes a reference to the European Atomic Energy Community. It is absolutely clear that conferring on my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister the power to notify that we are leaving the European Union gives her the power to take us out of Euratom.

That leaves a couple of questions. The first is whether the Government are seized of the importance of nuclear safeguards, which are an extremely important issue for the House. My experience of working with nuclear systems is, I admit, distant and limited. I joined the Royal Air Force at a time when we still had tactical

nuclear weapons and I was trained to certify aircraft nuclear weapons electrical installations. I must say that it was neither rocket science nor magic; it was about using the finest components to the highest quality standards. From my experience of that work, I would say that I have complete confidence in British scientists and engineers to do everything necessary to ensure that safeguards continue.

I particularly observe that we will continue to be part of Euratom throughout the negotiation period. Since Euratom brings into effect in Europe the provisions made by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and since we will continue to be members of that agency, we can expect not only to continue to comply with Euratom but to continue as members and put in place appropriate arrangements as we move forward.

In addition to the points made by my hon. Friend the Member for North West Hampshire (Kit Malthouse) about the French bilateral, I point out that the Trident system is evidence that we can collaborate on nuclear issues outside the framework of Euratom. I know from experience that anything to do with a nuclear system focuses the mind like nothing else, and I know that my right hon. and hon. Friends on the Front Bench are seized of the issues and will prioritise this point.

Albert Owen: The hon. Gentleman says that Euratom was not on the ballot paper, and he is right, but it was not even mentioned by the Government until they produced the Bill. If it was such a big and obvious issue, why did the Government not raise this important point while the European Union Referendum Bill was going through this House, or at another opportunity? Secondly, and finally, he talks about the two years. Is he suggesting that if there is no agreement after two years, there should be a transitional period, or we will lose our place in the world?

Mr Baker: I thought that I had explained that carefully, but I will say it again. Section 3(2) of the European Union (Amendment) Act 2008 makes it clear that any Act that refers to the European Union includes a reference to the European Atomic Agency Community. It is very clear that Euratom was included in the scope of the referendum. On the hon. Gentleman's point about the transition, the Government will make it a priority, as I have just explained at some length, and I have absolute confidence that those on my Front Bench are apprised of the importance of the issue and will take it extremely seriously. We will continue as a member of the agency. In the highly unlikely situation that no deal were reached, I expect that we would continue to maintain nuclear safety under the auspices of the international agency.

James Berry (Kingston and Surbiton) (Con): Does my hon. Friend agree that Euratom, much like Europol, is one of those organisations from which the other EU member states would have absolutely no interest in excluding the UK and that, therefore, a quick agreement is likely?

Mr Baker: That is an important point. About half of Business for Britain's 1,000-page "Change, or go" report went through, section by section, all the areas on which we currently co-operate with other nation states through the European Union and its agencies. In each case, it explained that there were bases on which we could

co-operate internationally. During the Prüm debate, I made a point particularly in relation to Europol: in a globalised world of cheap, fast air travel, and the internet making just about everywhere milliseconds away, we need global co-operation on police, judicial and security matters. We need to escape the mindset that the only way to do that is through the hierarchical arrangements of the European Union. I hope that my hon. Friend the Member for Kingston and Surbiton (James Berry) will not mind if I dilate slightly on his point.

I remember being told back in 2010 by Members across the House, particularly by the then leader of the Liberal Democrats, that politics was changing and that we were seeing a realignment of politics. I thought of Ronald Reagan's words on choice:

"Up to the maximum of individual freedom consistent with law and order, or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism".

That reorientation of politics is happening.

The availability of the internet and air travel means that the old hierarchical structures that were necessary for communication in the absence of the internet are no longer appropriate for the world in which we live. It is quite right that we should seek, as my hon. Friend the Member for Kingston and Surbiton suggests, to co-operate on a global basis on all these issues under new arrangements that allow us to act with far greater agility.

Sue Hayman: The hon. Gentleman talks about international and global relations. If it is so straightforward, why is the Nuclear Industry Association saying,

"Given the international nature of the nuclear industry the biggest risk in leaving Euratom is an interruption to normal trade both in the European Union and overseas."?

Mr Baker: On that point, I am grateful that my hon. Friend the Member for Henley (John Howell) is back in his place. He devastated all those arguments in a straightforward intervention by making the point that the Joint European Torus project over at Culham does not want these amendments. That is not to say that people do not want collaboration; of course we all want that. However, the question today is whether these amendments should be made. The clear answer coming from Culham—I am grateful that my hon. Friend the Member for Henley is indicating assent—is that the amendments should not be made.

John Howell: My hon. Friend's point is absolutely clear. The management at Culham do want to co-operate, and they want a much larger project. We should do that not by making amendments, but by having discussions with Ministers.

Mr Baker: Indeed. In emphasising how committed the Government are to the issue, it might well assist the Committee to return to the Secretary of State's comments on Second Reading, where he pointed out:

"The Bill also gives the Prime Minister the power to start the process to leave Euratom...This is because, although Euratom was established in a treaty separate from the EU agreements and treaties, it uses the same institutions as the European Union, including the European Court of Justice."

He went on, in response to an intervention, to say

"Euratom passes to its constituent countries the regulations, rules and supervision that it inherits, as it were, from the International Atomic Energy Agency, of which we are still a member. When we come to negotiate with the European Union on this matter, if it is

[Mr Baker]

not possible to come to a conclusion involving some sort of relationship with Euratom, we will no doubt be able to reach one with the International Atomic Energy Agency".—[*Official Report*, 31 January 2017; Vol. 620, c. 819-20.]

The point I am making is that this is a crucial issue and the Government understand that. We are fully committed to making progress on nuclear matters in research, development, implementation, safety and global collaboration, but we need to leave Euratom as we leave the European Union. The Government are entitled to do so, and it is quite right that the Bill stands as it is as the Government move forward. I will certainly be voting for the Bill as it stands. The amendments are unnecessary and counterproductive. I commend all the Ministers' work on Euratom.

Jess Phillips (Birmingham, Yardley) (Lab): I feel the need to say that I will be brief and then just talk for as long as possible, just because I would not like to revert to type. I wish to speak specifically to new clause 100, which is principally in the name of my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Camberwell and Peckham (Ms Harman). I would like to start by saying how grateful she and I are to the 64 colleagues who have added their names in support of it. That shows the real strength of feeling and concern in the House on this issue. It has already been mentioned by some of my hon. Friends, and I shall go into it in more detail.

4 pm

Despite the assurances we have had from Ministers and the Prime Minister herself, very real concerns remain about the potential impact of leaving the European Union on women's rights and about the Government's intention of defending them. The new clause addresses that in four key areas. The first is employment rights and protections derived from EU legislation.

We know that the rights of part-time workers and pregnant women at work, as well as—we have seen many different cases about this—the right to equal pay for work of equal value, derived from the EU. The Government's White Paper argues that we have more generous maternity leave systems here in the UK than are required at EU level, and that is absolutely correct—yes, we do. What I would say to the people in this room about that is, "You are very welcome," because it was the Labour Government that introduced those things. Specifically, it was my right hon. and learned Friend and other women who sit in this Chamber with me today who fought for those rights.

At the moment, we have something that is better than what exists in the EU, but we have seen in many of the different global changes in the past few days—I was going to say months—how easily women's rights can be undone when our global alliances begin to fail.

Caroline Lucas: I certainly pay tribute to the role that Labour has played in those rights. Does the hon. Lady agree, though, that the EU does actually take us further in some respects—for example, on equal pay for work of equal value? Would she also agree that the real risk here is that when that EU legislation becomes UK domestic legislation, it can be unpicked through secondary legislation, and what we have heard is absolutely no reassurance on that?

Jess Phillips: Absolutely. I agree entirely, and I will talk a little about what the EU has done that goes beyond UK legislation.

Mr Harper: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Jess Phillips: I will give way—perhaps—shortly.

The rise of pregnancy discrimination in the past few years because of changes in UK legislation means that women's rights definitely need to be protected and considered, and I would be very happy if we had external protection.

The rights of part-time workers are crucial for women. That includes pension rights and equal treatment at work for part-time workers. Some 75% of part-time workers are women, and 42% of women work part time. Equal pay for work of equal value is crucial for women. The issue derives from the speech therapist case brought to the European Court of Justice in 1993. It is a very live issue, because low-paid women in the UK are today fighting equal value pay cases against Asda and Reading Council—this is still going on today.

The Government's White Paper touches on this. I am just going to make a minor segue: because my favourite moment in the White Paper was the bit where it said that Britain does have sovereignty but it has not always felt like it. That reminded me of my children saying, "I know you love him more than me. I know you love me too, but it hasn't always felt like it." We really made Britain look like a petulant teen. Anyway, back to women's rights.

The White Paper says:

"The Government is committed to strengthening rights when it is the right choice for UK workers and will continue to seek out opportunities to enhance protections."

What exactly does "the right choice" mean? When do the Ministers in front of me think that strengthening workers' rights is not the right choice?

I remind the Committee that it is not long since we had the red tape challenge. The Equality Act 2010 was included in the red tape challenge in 2012, so the very rights to which the Government now say they are committed they have previously considered to be red tape. The Prime Minister herself was the then Minister who led that review. When Ministers wonder why we doubt the sincerity of their commitment, I say to them that I have read the White Paper very carefully. Much like the Government Front-Benchers going out to the European Union as part of the Brexit team, there is not a single mention of a woman, nor equality, anywhere in the White Paper.

Mr Harper: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Jess Phillips: I think it is time for a woman's voice to fill this Chamber for now. I believe that the right hon. Gentleman has had his say.

Seema Malhotra: Will my hon. Friend give way?

Jess Phillips: I absolutely will give way. [*Laughter.*]

Seema Malhotra: My hon. Friend is making a characteristically powerful and passionate, and humorous, speech. Would it not be fair to approach the wording in the White Paper with some caution, bearing in mind that prominent leave campaigners argued that leaving the EU would be an opportunity to cut EU social and employment protections?

Jess Phillips: Absolutely. My hon. Friend makes a very good point, unfortunately. The thing that we might get, as the leave campaign said, is a squashing of workers' rights; the thing that we will not get is £350 million going into the NHS. If only there was a level of consistency in what we have been promised.

Mims Davies (Eastleigh) (Con): I have always enjoyed working on the Women and Equalities Committee, which has been incredibly harmonious, listening to both men's and women's voices. I understand the spirit of new clause 100, but I find it faintly objectionable—I know who I am addressing this to in using that phraseology—to criticise our Prime Minister in talking about women's rights and equalities, because she has led the way on tackling female genital mutilation, making sure that workers in particular areas have better life chances, and tackling coercive control. May I implore the hon. Lady to believe that Conservative Members, particularly our Prime Minister, do believe in the rights of those both male and female?

Jess Phillips: I have absolutely no doubt that some Conservative Members care about women's rights, but I have lots of evidence to suggest that some absolutely do not, and need, frankly, a good, strong talking to by our Prime Minister. It is because I know how committed the Prime Minister has been to dealing with issues of violence against women like FGM, and cross-border issues to do with FGM, that I cannot understand why she would whip her party not to vote for this.

When Ministers are at the negotiating table thinking about the competitiveness of the UK economy, what will be high on their list? Will it be how to ensure that we protect and enhance workers' rights or women's rights—I think we can see the answer on the Government Front Bench—or will it be to undercut our EU neighbours by becoming a low-regulation, low-tax economy? The esteemed High Court justice Dame Laura Cox has said:

“Some of the basic rights that we now take for granted—pregnancy and maternity rights, part-time workers' rights, equal pay for work of equal value—are all at risk if the UK becomes a low regulation economy.”

Is that the true destination of these negotiations? Can the Minister give us an assurance that powers in the great—or otherwise—repeal Bill will not be used to remove any equality and employment rights at a later date? Will the rights of part-time workers, pregnant women at work and women fighting for equal pay really be safe with them, whatever happens?

Charlie Elphicke: The hon. Lady is making a passionate case, but it is not really for this Bill; rather, it is for the great repeal Bill, which will come in due course.

Jess Phillips: I acknowledge the hon. Gentleman's assertion, but I am being asked to vote on something tonight and I want to be certain that people like me and people who live in my constituency are going to be protected. At the moment, I do not feel confident about that.

Mr Harper: May I give the hon. Lady some help?

Jess Phillips: No. To clarify, a lot of Members are waiting to speak. The right hon. Gentleman has been

on his feet for many minutes during this debate, and I think it is time for someone else to have a chance to speak.

My second concern, which has been touched on, is the issue of violence against women and girls. The new clause would not only defend women's rights at work, but protect those women escaping domestic violence and FGM and those trafficked across the EU and the UK. In 2010, up to 900 schoolgirls across the city of Birmingham were at risk of FGM, with the key risk ages being at birth, four to six years old and during puberty. One in five children in Birmingham will have experienced or seen domestic violence before they reach adulthood. At least 300 forced marriages of women take place in the west midlands every year. When Ministers are at the negotiating table, who will be in their minds? Will it be the women in my constituency experiencing FGM and those fleeing their violent partners and using services such as Birmingham and Solihull Women's Aid?

In Birmingham, four women have been murdered in the past year, with another woman found dead in my constituency only last week. The European protection order ensures that women who have suffered domestic violence are protected from the perpetrators if they travel or move anywhere in the EU. Predictions about the consequences of Brexit for policing measures will depend on the outcome of the negotiations.

On 4 February 2016, history was made in the Hammersmith specialist domestic abuse court when the first European protection order in England and Wales was imposed. In this case the survivor had returned to Sweden. A restraining order and an EPO were granted so that she is protected in the UK as well as in Sweden. It is generally accepted that the UK will want to continue with certain parts of EU policing, justice and co-operation, and it is essential that the UK is able to opt into the EPO agreement following Brexit. The White Paper notably neglects to mention any of this. It does not mention FGM, domestic violence or, indeed, any areas in which the Government will continue to work with European partners on the issue of violence against women.

In the area of crime, only organised crime and terrorism are mentioned. Although they are incredibly serious things, no Member will be able to find as many constituents who are as affected by those two crimes as are affected by what I am talking about. Will ending violence against women and girls and, in particular, the UK's continued use of the EPO be a priority for the Government during and after the Brexit negotiations?

Finally—this is not a penultimate “finally”—the new clause would achieve what the Prime Minister says she wants to achieve, which is to make the UK a fairer place and to not only protect workers' rights but build on them. Those were her words.

There are many gaps in our equalities legislation, and there is a need to make our legislative framework fit for the 21st century. Sections 14 and 106 have been there since the Act was passed but have not been commenced. Will the Minister undertake to establish a cross-departmental and cross-party—I put myself on the line by saying that I will come and help—working group to assess and make recommendations on developing legislation on equality and access to justice? My challenge to the Government is this: will they take the opportunity that Brexit gives us and make the UK the best place to be a woman, or will it be one of the worst?

4.15 pm

Suella Fernandes: I am pleased to follow the hon. Member for Birmingham, Yardley (Jess Phillips), who speaks with passion about her cause and argues for women with much persuasion. I gently point out that only when the Labour party can claim to have elected its second lady Prime Minister can it preach to Conservatives on how to support women. I rise to speak against the entirety of the proposals tabled by Opposition Members, but particularly against the references to trade with the European Union and the rest of the world in new clauses 2, 11, 77 and 181.

I have two key points, the first of which is on trade. I am struck by the premise in the wording of, for example, new clause 181 on trade agreements, which calls on the Government to

“have regard to the value of UK membership of the EU Customs Union in maintaining tariff and barrier-free trade with the EU.”

The new clause is wrong for several reasons. It is totally misguided, and a misreading of what the British people voted for on 23 June. If we

“have regard to the value”

of the customs union, we are missing the point. Where is the call to have regard to the costs of UK membership of the EU customs union? Why does the new clause not refer to the reasons why Britain must leave the customs union, and what we stand to gain? There is simply no point to Brexit and no meaning to the result of the referendum if we do not leave the EU customs union.

Where is the acknowledgment of the restrictions and costs of the common commercial policy inherent in our membership of the EU customs union? The new clause and all those containing that reference to trade are one-sided, prejudge, and lack any objectivity or impartiality. Where is the reference to, or acknowledgment of, the simple fact that Britain can set her own rules on trade policy, and forge new and dynamic agreements with the rest of the world, only if she leaves the EU customs union? Where is the reference to the gains we stand to make by striking new trade deals with the rest of the world? The Legatum Institute special trade commission estimates a 50% increase in global world products over 15 years.

I am concerned that there is no impact assessment of the damaging effect of the EU's trade agreements on developing countries, or of the common external tariff, which binds members of the customs union.

Yvette Cooper (Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford) (Lab): The hon. Lady is commenting on a proposal that is in my name and the name of three other Select Committee Chairs. Is she aware of the evidence given to the Home Affairs Committee by a series of hauliers, ports and so on? They said that if their goods from the EU were subject to the type of customs checks to which goods from outside the EU are subject, there could be delays of between one and three days.

Suella Fernandes: The right hon. Lady needs to do her research before she makes points like that. If she had attended the meeting I had with experienced trade negotiators just two days ago—they are part of the special trade commission and have led trade deals on behalf of other countries—she would know that they say that the rules to which she refers are already part of

free trade agreements around the world. The problems she highlights are being blown out of all proportion, given the reality of what we stand to gain from leaving the customs union.

Mr Baker: My hon. Friend makes her point with typical force. At our last Treasury Committee meeting, we heard from the director of customs at Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, who pointed out repeatedly that 96% of customs clearance, where required, takes place electronically within a few seconds and requires no intervention.

Suella Fernandes: That is exactly the point that needs to be made. Where is the amendment making that point?

Charlie Elphicke: My hon. Friend is making a typically powerful case. As the Member of Parliament who represents Dover and Deal, where this issue will have the greatest impact, I have put together a group to look at it. It is perfectly possible to build a frictionless border, using the latest technology. The Opposition want it to fail; we will make it succeed.

Suella Fernandes: I could not agree more with the point that my hon. Friend makes.

Helen Goodman: The hon. Lady says that we are not interested in an unbiased assessment. Had she been here yesterday, she would have seen new clause 43, which sought an even-handed impact assessment. Why cannot she read the amendment paper before making her wild assertions?

Suella Fernandes: We can all see that the amendments are an attempt to pull the wool over the British people's eyes and fob us all off, and I will have nothing whatever to do with them.

EU protectionism has placed farmers and workers in developing countries at a disadvantage when exporting to the EU, because of the common external tariff. Why should British consumers be denied cheaper sugar, wheat or tomatoes from developing nations to protect less efficient farmers in northern Europe? That is the effect of the common external tariff, and the effect on our consumers of our membership of the EU customs union.

Chris Green: Does my hon. Friend share my concern that it is perverse that the external tariffs impoverish third-world nations, and that we then hand money over through the Department for International Development to try to raise their standards?

Suella Fernandes: The absurdity of the current position is astonishing. We will be able to remedy that injustice only by leaving the customs union, taking control of our trade policy, having trade deals on a fairer basis and being real promoters of fair trade for those countries.

Angela Smith: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Suella Fernandes: I will not, because I have taken quite a few interventions and I want to make progress.

Business for Britain has estimated the cost to British consumers of the damage done by the common commercial policy and the customs union at some £500 per household. The amendments do not reflect the absurdity of the

current position. British companies such as JCB are no more able to sell their machinery tariff-free from India to the UK than Tata can from the UK to India. Since 1973, Britain's trade has pivoted from being global to being European, and that has all been negotiated on our behalf by the European Trade Commissioner. Why is there no amendment recognising the influence to be regained by Britain resuming its own seat at the World Trade Organisation? Why is there no reference to the fact that EU trade policy has wrecked the ports of Glasgow and Liverpool, which are on the "wrong" side of the country, and denied us any chance of determining our own trade policy? That is a reflection of the one-sided prejudice in, and misguided nature of, the amendments.

The amendments fail to point out that in 2015, the UK's deficit in trade in goods and services with the EU was £69 billion, while the surplus with non-EU countries was £30 billion. Why is there no amendment asking for an impact assessment on the gains from trading more widely and more freely with the rest of the world, building on our surplus with countries outside the EU? The amendments do not reflect the fact that Britain is losing out now because of our membership of the customs union, and they miss the fact that we have more to gain by leaving. They omit those salient features because Opposition Members do not want to be honest about the fact that the EU still does not have any agreements with major nations such as Brazil, the USA or China, and that we have more to gain from increasing our exports to the rest of the world than by remaining a member of the customs union.

My second-to-last point is on EU nationals. I consider the Prime Minister's position appropriate in the circumstances: she will guarantee the position of approximately 3.5 million EU nationals as soon as possible once the negotiations have started. I want to ensure that this issue is put in perspective. Of the 3.5 million EU nationals currently residing in the UK, approximately 64% already have the right to stay here, 8% are children with an EU national parent and therefore have a right to reside here, and 12% will have accrued their five years permanent residency by 2018. This means that 84% already have a secure immigration status in this country. We are talking about a minority of people.

Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con): Let us be practical. We cannot even deport convicted criminals. The truth is that not a single EU national will ever be deported.

Suella Fernandes: I agree wholeheartedly. That course of action would go against any idea of natural justice, legitimate expectation and the rule of law.

Stephen Gethins (North East Fife) (SNP): If that is the case and we have certainty for EU nationals, will the hon. Lady join us in voting for new clause 27 tonight?

Suella Fernandes: I will not be voting with the Opposition. I am very content with the Government's position on EU nationals.

Simon Hoare (North Dorset) (Con): Does my hon. Friend share my concern and disappointment that while EU Governments could have sorted this out already,

some have put the brakes on and have refused to do so? We should be putting pressure on them to sort out this very important issue much, much earlier, and outside the renegotiation process.

Suella Fernandes: I could not agree more. I see my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Dorset and North Poole (Michael Tomlinson) is in his place; I recall the letter he sent to Donald Tusk on this very issue.

Michael Tomlinson: Was my hon. Friend not as disappointed as I was by the response to that letter, which signally failed to grasp the nettle? This could all have been resolved before Christmas, on 15 December. The answer then was no; it should have been yes.

Suella Fernandes: That reflects the wisdom of the current position. We must safeguard the rights of UK nationals abroad before making any move on this issue.

I was involved, with the right hon. Member for Birmingham, Edgbaston (Ms Stuart) and the hon. Member for Stretford and Urmston (Kate Green), in a cross-party study with the think-tank British Future. We made suggestions to the Government on how to regularise and deal practically with the legal position of the 3.5 million EU nationals in this country. There will be issues for the Government to deal with. For example, what should the cut-off date be? Our report recommended that the date after which the new rules should apply be the date when article 50 is triggered, at which point a legitimate expectation will have arisen in respect of new arrivals to the country. We felt that that struck the right balance between fairness and pragmatism.

4.30 pm

We also recommended that EU nationals who already qualified for permanent residency by virtue of their five years' residency in the UK be offered permanent residency under the current rules, and that EU nationals who did not meet the five-year criterion be granted a transitional period, in accordance with the old rules. Again, that would safeguard their legitimate expectation. We also made recommendations on the practical ways in which the Home Office could deal with the considerable number of applications and the paperwork. Home Office officials will have over 1 million cases to deal with, so we recommend that the local authority nationality checking services be given first-line responsibility for processing and approving applications for permanent residency.

I shall conclude—[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear!"]—as hon. Members will be pleased to hear. The majority of constituents in Fareham voted to leave the EU. They chose to do that because they wanted to re-empower themselves, free up our country and take back control. These amendments are an attempt to pull the wool over their eyes and fob off Parliament. They aim only to delay and frustrate, and I will have nothing to do with them; it would be an insult to my voters in Fareham and to the British people, and a dereliction of my duty as a representative in this place, if I did.

Several hon. Members rose—

The Temporary Chair (Sir Roger Gale): Order. I am holding in my hand a list of Members who wish to speak; it stretches from here to Brussels. There are

[Sir Roger Gale]

21 Members who wish to participate, so a degree of self-restraint in terms of the length of speeches and interventions would be helpful. Several hon. Members on both sides of the House have spoken already in the course of these three days. It is only fair, therefore, that I try to give some preference to those who have not been able to contribute at all.

Caroline Lucas: I am pleased to follow the hon. Member for Fareham (Suella Fernandes), not least because I would like to disagree with several of the points she made—I am sure she will not find that surprising. She says that she finds the Prime Minister's attitude to EU nationals "appropriate". I find it deeply inappropriate, and so do the EU nationals themselves, who simply want certainty about their future in this country. The Prime Minister's refusal to guarantee that now, when she has the ability to do so, is cruel and, frankly, immoral. We are talking about people's lives, which are not commodities to be traded in some wider bargain. The Prime Minister could and should guarantee to people who have made their lives here in good faith that of course they can stay. The idea that it is appropriate to do otherwise is out of order.

Tom Brake (Carshalton and Wallington) (LD): Is the hon. Lady aware, as I am, of EU nationals holding senior positions in UK institutions already leaving the country and of EU nationals being interviewed for senior positions but asking searching questions about what Brexit means for them and their families?

Caroline Lucas: I completely agree. I was talking to the vice-chancellor of one of the universities in my constituency the other day and hearing that already staff were wondering about their future and whether it was worth leaving. Some of them feel unwanted, despite having made a massive contribution to our society and communities. That is why, again, I think that the Government's attitude is incredibly irresponsible.

I want to talk in particular about my amendment 38 on the environment. I am so pleased that we have at least a few moments to talk about the impact of Brexit on our wider environment and on sustainability. So many of us have been trying to raise these issues for a long time, because they are massively significant, and I know that the Chair of the Environmental Audit Committee was waiting hopefully yesterday to make some interventions, based on some of the evidence that we heard in that Committee about the environmental impacts of Brexit. They are deeply worrying, and I would particularly like to focus on the issue of the monitoring and enforcement of environmental legislation once we leave the EU.

Mary Creagh (Wakefield) (Lab) *rose*—

Caroline Lucas: I am happy to give way to the Chair of the Environmental Audit Committee.

Mary Creagh: Does the hon. Lady share my disappointment that, as a result of last night's filibuster by the Scottish National party, it has not been possible to share in this Committee debate the work done by the Environmental Audit Committee on both the benefits and the potential risks to the natural environment of

leaving the EU and on our new inquiry into chemicals regulation, which affects every single aspect of our manufactured and exported goods?

Caroline Lucas: I am not going to pick out any one particular party for filibustering. I am afraid that it is an epidemic that affects this whole place, and I would love to see it end. I do, however, want to talk about precisely that kind of evidence that the Environmental Audit Committee heard.

One almost believes that it is precisely the complexity demonstrated when evidence is given about the environmental impacts of Brexit that explains why Conservative Members do not want to hear about it. Such complexity underlines to them the fact that this Brexit process is not going to be done and dusted in two years. The idea that we will have a whole new trade agreement in two years is cloud cuckoo land; anybody with any knowledge of this issue would certainly say that now.

James Heappey: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Caroline Lucas: No, not at the moment; I want to make a bit more progress.

As many Members have noted over the last few days, the protections currently guaranteed by our membership of the EU—whether it be on the environment, workers' rights or food safety—rely on an established and robust system of monitoring and enforcement provided by EU institutions and agencies. Perhaps the most important part of this system has been precisely the strong pressure to implement the law within a specified timescale.

The incentive to adhere to the law arises from the monitoring and enforcement role of the EU agencies. The Commission acts as the guardian of the law and responds to legitimate complaints; serious breaches are referred to the European Court of Justice; and sanctions can follow, including fines of many hundreds of millions of pounds. It is exactly that enforcement mechanism that we are going to lose as a result of Brexit. Although the Government talk about moving across lots of this legislation in the great repeal Bill, the enforcement processes and the agencies that make sure that this stuff gets done do not get automatically transferred.

James Heappey: The hon. Lady and I share an enthusiasm for the greater deployment of renewables within our energy mix, so does she agree with me that one of the protections that the EU also affords is the protection of the German solar photovoltaic manufacturing sector, which is inflating prices for PV cells in the UK because the EU has put in place the minimum import price on those cells from China?

Caroline Lucas: I do not support that decision, but the idea that we should go down the road of leaving the EU, with all the problems that are going to arise, which would cause much greater damage to the environment, simply because we do not agree with one or two key decisions really is the definition of someone throwing their toys out of the pram. That is not a sensible way forward.

Mary Creagh: Is the hon. Lady as concerned as I am that when we leave the single market and the customs union, the birds and habitats directive, which protects

migratory species and Britain's special places for special wildlife, will cease to apply in this country, affecting all environmental impact assessments? Is she also concerned that air pollution standards that are currently set and enforced by the European Union could be downgraded?

Caroline Lucas: I absolutely share the hon. Lady's concerns. On the air pollution issue, we have seen very recently that it was precisely the threat of EU sanctions that eventually got this Government moving when it came to dealing with the problem. Without the extra sanction at the EU level, they simply would not have taken the necessary action. I think that absolutely makes the point.

John McNally (Falkirk) (SNP): Since its establishment, the European Chemicals Agency has built up a staff of over 600. Together with the EU Directorate-General for the environment in the UK, it has become the natural home of chemical risk assessment in Europe. Does the hon. Lady agree and share my concern that the UK does not have the resources—financial or human—to create its own regulatory agency in chemicals?

Caroline Lucas: The hon. Gentleman is a fellow member of the Environmental Audit Committee, and just this week he and I heard experts give evidence about the impact on our chemicals industry of leaving the EU, and, in particular, of losing membership of the REACH directive. This country has not the capacity or the resource simply to step in and take that over.

Mary Creagh: Our Committee heard yesterday from industry representatives that British chemical manufacturers could pay up to €300 million, and have already paid about €130 million, to register chemicals with the REACH database and the European Chemicals Agency. Those sunk costs, which must be incurred by 2018, could be lost to UK industry as a result of the duplication of setting up a UK-based chemicals agency. Does the hon. Lady share my concern about that?

Caroline Lucas *rose*—

The Temporary Chairman (Sir Roger Gale): Order. I do not know what more I have to say. I gave an indication that I wanted to enable as many Members possible to speak. A significant number of Members have not spoken at all during the three days of this debate, and that is hard on some Members who have tabled new clauses or amendments and wish to speak. I want to try to give a fair crack of the whip to those who have not spoken at all, but long interventions and long speeches do not help that process.

Caroline Lucas: I apologise, Sir Roger. I know that my hon. Friend the Member for Wakefield (Mary Creagh)—who chairs the Environmental Audit Committee—tried to make some of these points for hours yesterday, but I will confine myself to saying that I agree with what she has said. I think that the impact on our chemical industry has been massively underestimated. Given that it is our second largest manufacturing export and given that at least 50% of those exports go to the EU, the impact on the sector will be massive.

If the Government are serious in their ambition to be the first Government to leave the environment in a better condition than they found it in, Ministers must now explain to us in detail how the legislative system for monitoring and enforcement will be replaced. I find it astonishing that they expect us to vote for the Bill without being given any idea of what the present complex, robust and unique system of legal enforcement might look like when we leave.

In evidence given to the Environment Audit Committee, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds made the important point that the European Court of Justice operates on a slightly broader basis than the Supreme Court in the UK, which must follow narrower due process. It is therefore possible that great swathes of environmental protections, once transferred to UK statute, will in effect become redundant owing to the absence of monitoring and enforcement by the European Commission and the European Court of Justice. That loss of an effective judicial system will come at a time when UK regulators, tasked with monitoring compliance with environmental legislation, have had their own budgets slashed. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has a third of the staff that it had 10 years ago. Furthermore, because the great repeal Bill will not carry over the jurisprudence from the European Court of Justice, we seem to be set to lose the important case law which, for the past 40 years, has proved so effective in protecting the UK environment.

Rachael Maskell: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Caroline Lucas: At risk.

Rachael Maskell: We are also in danger of losing access to the European Environment Agency, which brings such expertise to the advancing of environmental legislation.

Caroline Lucas: I agree, and the same applies to the European Food Safety Agency. Some of the new clauses draw attention to the fact that we still need to have access to those bodies. It strikes me as completely baffling that the hon. Member for Fareham can somehow think it insulting to her constituents for us to be talking about such vitally important new clauses.

This is not only an issue of law relating directly to wildlife and nature. As it stands, the Government's push for an extreme Brexit opens the way for changes in key environmental policies relating to air, water, waste, food and much more, all of which will have an impact, direct or indirect, on UK biodiversity and our natural environment. For all those reasons, I think that new clauses which are intended to protect our environment, and which ask for that protection to be guaranteed before article 50 is triggered, make good sense.

I will end my speech in just 30 seconds, Sir Roger. Let me simply say that I particularly support new clause 100, about which the hon. Member for Birmingham, Yardley (Jess Phillips) spoke so passionately and eloquently. In recent weeks we have heard repeated and welcome assurances from Ministers that workers' and women's rights will be protected. If that is the case, let us get the new clause into the Bill. Let us ensure that this will not be rolled back through secondary legislation.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

The Temporary Chair (Sir Roger Gale): Order. I have no power whatsoever to impose a time limit, but six minutes per person will allow nine more Members to speak.

Charlie Elphicke: I propose to sit down at 4.50 pm, because it is important that we get as many Members in as possible, and it is also important to give an example to the hon. Member for Glasgow North (Patrick Grady), who, sadly, is not in his seat today, so he can understand that courtesy to the House and to other speakers—and to the hon. Member for Wakefield (Mary Creagh), who waited so patiently yesterday—is actually quite important. Good manners are something we should never forget in this place, even if the Scottish National party is not always acquainted with those manners.

4.45 pm

Turning to new clause 2, my concern—other than the fact that I do not agree with its proposals—is that it does not include as a priority the fact that we should leave the internal market. We should leave it for two key reasons. First, we cannot carry on writing out cheques for billions of pounds to Brussels. That was a very clear instruction from the referendum and it should be honoured. Secondly, as the right hon. Member for Don Valley (Caroline Flint) alluded to in her principled and considered speech, not enough has been done on the matter of immigration and unchecked migration from Europe—freedom of movement, as it is called. It is a great concern to our constituents and it must end, and it cannot end unless we leave the internal market, so that must be our priority. We must leave the internal market so that we can save our money and also so that we can control our borders.

That is difficult for the metropolitan elite of the SNP and the metropolitan elite who run the Labour party these days, who are completely divorced from how people in the regions of England and Wales and elsewhere feel. They feel very deeply about controlling our borders and controlling migration. They feel very deeply about that in my constituency of Dover. *[Interruption.]* I am being challenged: it is being said that I was not a leaver, and that is true. I made the case for remain because I was concerned about our border at Dover, but the decision has been made and we need to honour it, understand why it happened and implement it as quickly as possible, with a clean Brexit and a clean Bill to do so.

Lady Hermon (North Down) (Ind): I thank the hon. Gentleman for his graciousness in allowing me to intervene. He and many of his colleagues have claimed that the decision to leave the EU will mean we can take back control of our borders. Can he gently and slowly explain to those of us in Northern Ireland how he is going to take back control of the border, which stretches for about 300 miles, between the Republic of Ireland, which remains within the EU, and Northern Ireland, part of the UK and which therefore will be coming out of the EU? How do we retain control of that?

Charlie Elphicke: I thank the hon. Lady for making a very important point. The common travel area must be maintained. We have a strong history of that between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, and the Prime Minister has set it out as a key priority for her. *[Interruption.]* The hon. Lady's intervention brings me neatly to the next issue: the customs union. *[Interruption.]* I am answering the hon. Lady's question.

Mr Harper: Will my hon. Friend give way on that?

Charlie Elphicke: I give way.

Mr Harper: There are sedentary interventions asking my hon. Friend how we might do that. Let me give a constructive suggestion. Because of the common travel area and the rights of Irish citizens in the United Kingdom, which are also reciprocal, it seems to me that there is no need to have checks on people movements across the border, and from the conversations we had earlier about the fact that most customs checks can be done electronically, it seems to me that we can perfectly well maintain a soft border and the prosperity of both parts of the island of Ireland when we leave the EU.

Charlie Elphicke: I thank my right hon. Friend for that intervention.

I want briefly in the last minute available to me—

Lady Hermon *rose*—

Charlie Elphicke: I cannot take an intervention as I need to let others get in.

In the last minute, I want to touch on the issue of the customs union. It is clear in the decision that we want to enter trade agreements elsewhere in the world that we must leave the customs union. Opposition parties say that will all be a terrible disaster; in fact, as always, they hope it will be a complete disaster. But, on this side of the House, Members like me have been putting together industry groups to look at how it can be done, listening to what HMRC says, listening to how checks can be put in place, and listening to how we can construct a frictionless border that will work for Britain and work for Europe. It is in the interests of both—

Stephen Gethins: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Charlie Elphicke: No, not at the moment.

It is in the interests of Britain and the European Union that we construct a frictionless border, and that is why I am also in discussions with the authorities in Calais. It is in the interests of Britain and France, of Dover and Calais, and of the United Kingdom and the European Union that we ensure that this works. We need to embrace electronic bills of lading, risk-based checking and audits in workplaces. We need to treat the border as a tax point rather than as a hard place with border posts. That is a further answer to the hon. Member for North Down (Lady Hermon). That is how we can ensure that we continue to have frictionless trade even if we have to leave the customs union. On that note, and given your injunction, Sir Roger, I shall conclude my remarks so that others may speak.

Catherine McKinnell (Newcastle upon Tyne North) (Lab): I rise to speak to new clause 163, which stands in my name and would require the Government to publish a strategy for properly consulting the English regions, including those without directly elected mayors. We are getting ever closer to the Prime Minister's self-imposed 31 March deadline for invoking article 50, but a question that I put to the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union on 17 January remains unanswered.

To remind the House—and the Secretary of State, who is in his place—I asked him what discussions he had held with key stakeholders in the north-east about

the effects of leaving the single market, given that 58% of our region's exports go to the EU. I received an entirely unsatisfactory response to that question, and I remain concerned that the Government have ruled out membership of the single market before negotiations have even begun and without properly consulting those parts of the country likely to be most affected by this move.

Even more worrying is the fact that, despite the publication of the Government's White Paper last week, we are still no closer to knowing what role representatives from all the regions of England, including the north-east, will play in informing the Government's negotiating strategy and objectives. Instead, we have been provided with this entirely meaningless statement:

"In seeking such a future, we will look to secure the specific interests of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland as well as those of all parts of England."

Peter Dowd (Bootle) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend agree that comments from Members such as the hon. Member for Fareham (Suella Fernandes) about the port of Liverpool, which is in my constituency, having been in some decline are complete nonsense? The port is doing more tonnage than it has ever done, and it has recently had £350 million of investment. Conservative Members do not realise the good that the regions do for the economy.

Catherine McKinnell: I am pleased that I took that intervention. My hon. Friend makes a strong case for why the Government's "we know best" approach to the Brexit negotiations just will not wash with the British public. Furthermore, the word "region" appears just four times in the White Paper, and three of those references are in the footnotes.

The Government claim that around 150 stakeholder engagement events have taken place to help to inform the Government's understanding of the key issues ahead of the negotiations, but I would be interested to know when, where and with whom those meetings were held. We know that the Secretary of State made a vague commitment in the House to

"get all the mayors of the north to come and have a meeting in York"—[*Official Report*, 17 January 2017; Vol. 619, c. 802.]

but of course that cannot happen until after the mayoral elections have been held in May. I appreciate the sentiment behind the offer, but it is wholly inadequate. What will happen to those regions, including the north-east, that will not have an elected mayor after May and will therefore be excluded from that meeting? Surely, if the English regions are to have a truly meaningful input to this process, those discussions must start before May, given that the UK's negotiations with the EU will already have commenced, and given the incredibly tight two-year timescale for achieving a deal that does not damage jobs and our economy.

We are repeatedly told that Brexit was about taking back control. We now know that that means an unelected Prime Minister who has sought every means possible to avoid scrutiny of her approach ploughing ahead with a hard Brexit, regardless of the consequences for different parts of the country. I am not convinced that people voted for that. I am not convinced that this Whitehall-knows-best approach will get the best deal for everybody up and down the country.

The only way for the Government to secure the best possible deal for all the regions—the north-east in particular—which have so much to lose from a bad deal, is to engage properly with those on the ground about what we need. That is why I am supporting new clause 163, which would compel the Government to ensure that that proper consultation took place.

Mrs Flick Drummond (Portsmouth South) (Con): Sir Roger, you will be pleased to know that I have never spoken for more than four minutes in the Chamber—I have never had the opportunity—and I do not intend to start now.

I agree with the intention and emotion behind many of the amendments tabled by hon. Members from across the House, but I do not support them simply because I do not want the Prime Minister's hands to be tied throughout the negotiations. I campaigned fiercely to stay in the EU as I passionately believed that it was in Britain's interests to do so, and I have not changed my mind. I agree with everything my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) said last week and that, in addition to the economic implications, we will lose a tremendous amount of influence. However, there is one difference between me and him: I voted for the referendum and I have to accept the result. It may have been advisory, but the public, including those in Portsmouth South, voted to come out of the EU, and I respect that. I will be monitoring the negotiations closely, and I am pleased with yesterday's reassurance that there will be a vote in good time on the final deal. It may be that we will get a very good deal, and that is why I cannot support new clause 2, which is too limiting.

I understand new clause 100, which was eloquently introduced by my hon. Friend—I will call her that—the Member for Birmingham, Yardley (Jess Phillips), but I hope that those who added their name to it will agree that the matter is already being addressed through the Women and Equalities Committee; the Modern Slavery Act 2015, brought in by this Prime Minister; and the Government's work on domestic violence. We can be assured that what new clause 100 would address will be included in those things. I assure the Opposition that there are enough strong women on the Government Benches, led by a female Prime Minister—[*Interruption.*] There are strong women in the Opposition, too. Equality and women's rights are well understood by the Government, and I am sure that there will be cross-party collaboration.

We have already received many assurances from the Prime Minister about EU and UK nationals, so I hope that we will get a firm agreement shortly. The sooner we get on with the negotiations, the better it will be for everyone. This could be a great opportunity for this country, but I will not support any deal that is not better for the UK. That would be a dereliction of duty. However, I have every confidence in the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union—that they will have taken into account the views of people such as me and the intentions behind many of the amendments tabled for debate today. I am confident that the deal will be great for us and for our European friends and neighbours.

Dame Rosie Winterton (Doncaster Central) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Roger. I add my support to new clauses 163 and 193, tabled by

[*Dame Rosie Winterton*]

my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle upon Tyne North (Catherine McKinnell) and my right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Hodge Hill (Liam Byrne). My hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle upon Tyne North made an excellent speech about why the Government should accept the new clauses, but I want to add something else.

At a meeting of the Yorkshire and northern Lincolnshire all-party parliamentary group yesterday, we heard from representatives from the four LEPs, from industry, from the creative industries and from universities, and we agreed to analyse what Brexit means for Yorkshire and the Humber. We agreed on a cross-party basis to submit that analysis to Ministers so that we can analyse not only what leaving the European Union would mean, but what we want to see from the negotiations. As my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle upon Tyne North said, the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union talked about a meeting with mayors in York; that is a very vague promise, and we need to put some meat on its bones.

5 pm

We heard yesterday that the LEPs have a ministerial champion, which is terrific news, I am sure. Apparently, that champion is the Minister for Climate Change and Industry. I suggest that the Minister of State, Department for Exiting the European Union, the right hon. Member for Clwyd West (Mr Jones), asks the LEP champion to draw together the proposals from all the regions—I know that there will be right hon. and hon. Members who would be happy to go back to their regions to see whether a similar plan could be put forward for them all—and then convene the MPs and representatives from the regions, so that we would be on an equal footing with Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and London and really have an input into the process. I urge the Minister to look carefully at that proposal.

I turn to new clause 193, tabled by my right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Hodge Hill. You are, Sir Roger, the leader of the UK delegation to the Council of Europe. I am sure Members will be aware of the different media reports on the Government's view of the European convention on human rights, so I hope that the Minister will accept the new clause to dispel, once and for all, any doubts about the Government's view of the Council of Europe and the convention. The Prime Minister said that we need to be a good neighbour to other European countries; accepting the new clause would be a way to illustrate that. We must not vacate such global platforms and we need to continue to have a voice in Europe, so I hope the Minister will accept the proposals I have outlined.

James Heapey: I, too, will try to be brief. Like many colleagues, I voted to remain, but I was clear at the time that I would be bound by the result in both my constituency and the country. The result in the Wells constituency was that we should leave, as it was in the country at large, so that is what we must do.

I am baffled by the number of amendments that have been tabled to the Bill, not because they lack value or do not make good points about our extraction from the EU—they obviously do—but because, as the shadow

Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, the hon. and learned Member for Holborn and St Pancras (Keir Starmer), rightly said on Second Reading, primary legislation will follow the triggering of article 50, and both Houses of Parliament will have an important role in scrutinising that legislation and what we do in the negotiations. I certainly intend to play a full part in that scrutiny, as I know will Opposition Members.

Earlier, we were discussing the impact of free trade agreements, particularly on our farmers. It stands to reason that when free trade agreements are introduced, they, too, will be scrutinised by the House, so the interests of the farmers and food producers in our constituencies can be brought to bear then to ensure that the deals are in their interests.

I associate myself with the comments made by so many colleagues about the rights of EU nationals to remain in the UK. In Somerset, people from elsewhere in the EU play a huge part in our local economy, particularly in our tourism, farming, and food and drink manufacturing industries. It is inconceivable to me that they would ever have their right to be here taken away.

On Euratom, Hinkley Points A and B are in the neighbouring constituency to mine, and we will soon be the neighbour of Hinkley Point C, too. It is clear to me that the UK nuclear industry has a world-class reputation for having the very highest regulatory standards. Those standards have been developed within the Euratom framework, but we should be clear that the United States, Japan and China also operate within that framework, without being members of the European Union. I fully expect that we will do the same when we have left Euratom by virtue of our leaving the European Union.

Those who have expressed any doubt that the Government will seek to continue to maintain the highest safety standards in our nuclear industry are perhaps not giving them the credit that they deserve. We have always set those standards, and we will always do so whether or not we are in the EU and Euratom. As for the willingness of other nations in Euratom to want to continue to co-operate with us, I am certain that they will. The French Government are very heavily invested in EDF, and it is inconceivable that they will not want their operations here in the UK to remain a part of the common regulatory framework across the European continent.

The Government have rightly committed to working with the industry and with all the nuclear research bodies in the country to make sure that they fully understand what the priorities of that sector are within the UK, so that those needs can be met with whatever it is that we put in place once we have left Euratom.

The UK's nuclear industry is the gold standard globally. Many countries want their technologies to be employed here so that they can have the tick to say that their technologies have been approved for operation in the UK. It is apparent to me, therefore, that, as we put in place regulatory standards in the future, we will want to maintain that high standard and our great reputation around the world. Crucially, this House of Commons will have an important role in that.

My final point on energy policy generally is to encourage the Government to clarify that they see a clear distinction between the EU single market and the EU single internal

energy market. From the perspective of security of supply, of cost and of decarbonisation, it is in our interests—

Helen Goodman: The hon. Gentleman is making a very good point now. In fact, it is exactly the point that I would have made had I been called. He is absolutely right. Does he agree that, if we leave the single energy market and lose the interconnectors, we will need higher baseload capacity, which will cost more, and electricity prices will shoot up?

James Heappey: I absolutely agree that, from an energy perspective, the interconnection of the UK and the European mainland is hugely important, but my point is that that is not a part of the EU single market. The EU's internal energy market is a separate entity. I invite the Government to clarify that they recognise that and that their commitment to leaving the European single market, which I fully understand, is distinct from a continued enthusiasm for the internal energy market, which is an entirely separate thing and hugely to our benefit.

The will of my constituents and our country is clear: we have been instructed to leave. It is not what I voted for, but it is what we will do now. The process starts with this binary decision of whether or not to trigger article 50. The Bill, without amendment, does exactly that. As we go forward, the role of this House and our responsibilities to our constituents are clear: we must engage fully in scrutinising all the legislation that comes forward as a result of the negotiations. Those who have suggested that to not amend the Bill now is somehow an abdication of our responsibility to our constituents are just wrong. Our responsibility as a House is to be bound by the result of the referendum to trigger article 50 and then to bring all of our expertise together in scrutinising the legislation that follows, as we do on all other legislation.

Liam Byrne: It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Roger. I want to speak to new clause 193, which is in my name and the names of my hon. and right hon. Friends. I tabled it in the hope that the Minister would take it on board. I want to give the Government a chance this afternoon to set out their pro-European credentials.

As my right hon. Friend the Member for Doncaster Central (Dame Rosie Winterton) so eloquently put it, the Prime Minister has said that, yes, we may be leaving the European Union, but that we intend to be good European neighbours. New clause 193 is an opportunity for the Government to set out how we, in this country, will remain determined to stay a member of one of the most important European clubs, the European club that we helped to found—the Council of Europe, the European convention on human rights and the European Court of Human Rights.

We moved the new clause because one of the most significant consequences of this divorce from Europe is that we will leave the European Court of Justice. Indeed, an important part of the leave campaign's argument was that we must escape from the tutelage of these terrible European judges and that only British judges are good enough for us—unless, of course, they happen to want to give this Parliament a chance to debate this Bill, in which case they instantly become enemies of the people.

This idea that foreign judges are anathema to this place is, of course, complete fiction. This very afternoon, the Government have solicited our support for CETA—the comprehensive economic trade agreement—replete with the new investor state dispute mechanism, a new court populated not with British judges but with foreign judges. The idea that foreign judges are about to be removed or extracted from the body politic in this country is nonsense, and that is why I think we must argue that one of the most important tribunals that oversees the law in this country should remain in place. That court is the European Court of Human Rights.

Tom Tugendhat: The right hon. Gentleman makes a fundamental point about our sympathy not only with our European partners but with our common European heritage, stemming straight out of Judeo-Christian theology through the Enlightenment and various schools at Paris and the Sorbonne, into the concept of rights that has emerged. Those rights were not simply created by the Council of Europe, as he seems to be claiming, but rather by British judges over several hundred years—admittedly taken from French and other traditions—and were re-imposed on Europe in the aftermath of the second world war. Although that heritage is important, as he rightly claims, would it not also be appropriate to recognise that some of those judges today are Moldovan and Russian and have been rather more prone to look for dictatorial abuse than to guarantee rights?

Liam Byrne: There is a reason why Russia has had its credentials suspended by the Council of Europe, and that is that it is not prepared to honour the great European Magna Carta that British civil servants helped to draw up under Churchill's inspiration in the years after the second world war.

The Conservative manifesto—

Mr David Jones *rose*—

Liam Byrne: I will give way in a moment, as I want to put a specific question to the Minister.

The Conservative manifesto is not well read on the Government Benches; we study it forensically and in detail. In 2010, the manifesto said that the Conservatives would introduce a British Bill of Rights, replace the Human Rights Act and ensure that the European Court of Human Rights was no longer binding over the UK Supreme Court, ensuring that the European Court of Human Rights could no longer change British laws. That position was repeated in the 2015 manifesto. I hope that the Minister can say that that plan is now in the bin.

Mr Jones: I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for giving way. I have resisted intervening throughout the course of the debate, but I think I can help him to this extent: I do not know whether he was present during the wind-ups on Second Reading, but I informed the House that the Government have no plans to withdraw from the European convention on human rights.

Liam Byrne: The Minister is good to put that on the record, but the fact is that there are plans—plans were set out in the Conservative manifesto in 2010 and in 2015, and the draft British Bill of Rights that is circulating in the Ministry of Justice contains similar plans. That is why in August 2016 the Justice Secretary told the House

[Liam Byrne]

that a British Bill of Rights would be introduced, and the House wants categorically to know whether that British Bill of Rights will have the implication and result of taking us out of the European Court of Human Rights. That is the point that I want the Minister to put beyond doubt by accepting new clause 193.

Mr Dominic Raab (Esher and Walton) (Con): May I give the right hon. Gentleman some reassurance on two points? First, having served as the Minister responsible for human rights, I can say that it was never in the Conservative plans for a Bill of Rights to pull out of the European convention on human rights. I made that clear monthly at Justice questions. Secondly, precisely because the Council of Europe is completely independent of the EU, this is an entirely meaningless amendment.

Liam Byrne: It is absolutely not. It is essential if the Prime Minister is to be good to her word that we will remain committed to the European club that we helped to create.

Mr Kenneth Clarke: Let me help to set the right hon. Gentleman's mind at rest. I am sure that I have heard the Prime Minister say publicly—I think, during her leadership campaign—that she was abandoning plans to leave the European convention on human rights because she accepted that she could not win a parliamentary majority for such a proposal.

Liam Byrne: I am grateful to the right hon. and learned Gentleman for that point, but I would like the question put beyond doubt by asking the Minister to accept new clause 193, which would give us a degree of assurance. The right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) is perfectly prepared to vote against his own Whip in order to seek cast-iron reassurances, and I seek the same level of reassurance this afternoon.

It was back in September 1946 that Winston Churchill went to Zurich and proposed the Council of Europe as a first step towards recreating the European family whose breakdown led to the tragedy of the second world war. In the face of rising risks and threats, those old words are still wise words to guide us.

5.15 pm

Mims Davies: It is a great pleasure to speak in this Committee of the whole House on the European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill. I fully support the Government as they enact the will of the people shown in the European Union referendum, and welcome the White Paper.

Taking them at face value, I agree with some of the new clauses; they look benign and fairly honourable. The problem is that it is illogical to try to muddle the negotiations into the middle of this withdrawal Bill as if it were a Christmas tree Bill. I shall speak briefly about some of my constituents' concerns, and set out my own view on new clause 2. I will not be supporting it because although it seems agreeable and benign, it does not mention migration. The Prime Minister spoke today about the priority she will place on the UK's need for highly skilled workers from the EU throughout the negotiation process. The new clause fails to deal with that.

Anyone who has been part of any negotiation, particularly in the private sector, will be only too aware

of the importance of not having our hands tied behind our back as we go into the process. Revealing our complete negotiation strategy at the start seems somewhat absurd. The aim of the Opposition's new clause is simply to fudge the issues by suggesting that they care more about the negotiating principles than the Government do. The Prime Minister laid out guiding principles in her Lancaster House speech. My constituents on both sides of the referendum debate appreciated that speech and welcomed those principles. Many people are simply asking us politicians to get on with it.

I welcome all the contributions from speakers across the Committee over the past few days. The debate has been fascinating, and it has been important to be a part of it. Inevitably, the fine details will be part of the key negotiations to enact the will of the people in the coming months and years. Local businesses have spoken to me about the need to move forward. They are having to make key decisions about their staffing and arrangements, and wish that politicians would do exactly the same.

One of the issues I have found most surprising during the Committee stage is the attempt by some to suggest that various leave campaigns' proposals were some kind of direct manifesto that the Government ought to follow to the letter. The Government are seeking to enact the will of the people, and to negotiate a strong and appropriate deal. We are in a post-referendum phase, but despite having been in Committee over the past few days—it feels like weeks—it appears that that is something the Liberal Democrats are gleefully unaware of. These are likely to be the most complex negotiations that the country will ever enter into, and the effects will be far ranging. Free trade treaties have been referred to a great deal, with separate sectors needing separate discussions and focus points. It is absolutely right that they should be separate from the Bill.

Taking anything but the smartest approach to this issue would be letting down our constituents, so I will not be supporting these weak attempts to dilute the Bill. Instead, I will be putting my trust in the Prime Minister and the work she will do in the national interest. As I said earlier, I find it objectionable that new clause 100 suggests that the Prime Minister and Government Members would somehow put women's rights back because of this Bill—our Prime Minister, who did so much on this issue as Home Secretary, when she was committed to working against FGM, dealing with coercive control and fighting the gender pay gap. It is absolutely wrong to say that, in areas such as women trafficking, the Government and the Prime Minister will somehow just roll over and that these issues will not be a highlight of what we seek to achieve in leaving the EU.

Many of my constituents have rightly asked me about the rights of EU citizens working in this country. I totally agree with the right hon. Member for Don Valley (Caroline Flint) about the tone of the debate on this: it is very frightening and nerve-racking for constituents, and we are keen to protect all our constituents. No one in this Chamber is in any doubt about the huge contribution that EU citizens make to our economy, our society, our culture, our tourism industry and our national life, but in planning for free movement, issues around homes, doctors and pressures on NHS services have been very difficult to manage.

I was reminded at the recent local enterprise partnership conference that EU students make a positive contribution to my area, and particularly in Eastleigh as they come

and go through Southampton airport. However, I would expect this House to have the same view of the contribution that our citizens make in other EU countries, so we need to make sure that we take a balanced approach.

All Members of this House do great casework in their constituencies. Often, we are dealing with international and EU citizens with immigration and homelessness issues, which are complicated and difficult. I therefore do not understand why there is a feeling that Conservative Members are somehow going to forget the work they do for people who may be married intercontinentally and who may have issues we need to resolve. In some cases, I have helped to get passports so that members of families can go to funerals, and I have helped with other issues that people needed help with. Ultimately, these people have complicated and difficult lives too.

In terms of the Bill, I believe we all understand that we need a mutual recognition of the work UK citizens do abroad and the work EU citizens do here. We also need recognition of all that Members of Parliament do to help to resolve the issues that affect all our communities. I do not believe that that will somehow change because of this Bill and that we will forget what we have to do for our constituents.

The Prime Minister was very clear today at Prime Minister's questions about her intention at a priority first stage to look after all our citizens at home and abroad. I fully support her in the work she does, and I believe we will eventually get a deal that is right for the UK—a UK that is open and strong and that looks to the future. I will support the Bill, and I go back to my previous point: it is a notification of withdrawal—it is not about negotiations.

Sue Hayman: I would like to speak to new clause 192, to which I have added my name, about Euratom. A number of Conservative Members have spoken with great knowledge about the nuclear industry today, and as chair of the all-party group on nuclear energy I invite them all to join us and to come to our meetings to share their knowledge.

The nuclear industry is critical to my constituency in west Cumbria. Because of that, I have probably had an unusual inbox compared with most hon. Members, in that I have had a large number of direct emails from concerned constituents about the proposed withdrawal from the Euratom treaty. Those constituents are particularly concerned because of the significant negative impact that withdrawal could have on the nuclear industry in the UK. They believe it unnecessary and ill-considered, and are concerned that it will create great disruption in the nuclear industry at a time when we really need to be pressing forward with our nuclear new build programme.

Euratom has had a significant role in establishing its members' credibility and acceptability in the wider global nuclear community. A constituent has contacted me to say that he believes that exiting will have a significant impact on the cost and the duration of decommissioning, which is of course very important in west Cumbria because of Sellafield. They also believe that the nuclear new build programme at Moorside will be impacted. EDF Energy, which is building the Hinkley Point C project, has said that it believes that ideally the UK should stay in the treaty, as it provides a framework for complying with international standards for handling nuclear materials.

On the issue of safety and materials, another constituent, who worked for very many years as a radiation protection adviser, has been in touch to share his concerns. He has wide experience of applying regulatory controls in workplaces including hospitals, the oil and gas industry, paper and plastics manufacturing, radiography, and the nuclear industry. He says that every one of these is considerably safer today as a result of Euratom—so this is not just about the nuclear industry directly. He goes on to say that he believes it is extremely short-sighted to remove the wealth of information and expertise that has resulted from our membership of Euratom.

James Heappey: The hon. Lady and I share a real enthusiasm for the nuclear industry and host it in or near our constituencies. How, specifically, will our withdrawal from Euratom lead to a diminishment of our expertise in how to regulate the nuclear industry?

Sue Hayman: I am talking about what constituents who actually work in the industry are telling me. To be honest, I would trust the judgment of my own constituents. In an intervention, I mentioned a constituent who works at the National Nuclear Laboratory, who says that leaving will impair his ability to collaborate with leading scientists and engineers across Europe, to the detriment of science and technology in this country. This is what my constituents are telling me. The hon. Gentleman can choose to disbelieve them—I do not. I trust my constituents.

I do not understand why, when we have conflicting legal opinion on why we have to leave, the Government are insisting so much that we have to. We need to make sure that a rapid exit does not do serious harm to our nuclear industry. We have so much to lose, with so little to gain. I therefore ask Members to support new clause 192.

Mr Lilley: For the sake of brevity, I will focus, if I may, on new clause 11, which is entitled “Tariff-free trade in goods and services”. Of course, there are no tariffs on services worldwide, so that should be fairly easy to achieve. I take it to mean tariff-free trade in goods and the minimum of barriers to services.

With regard to trade, there are only two realistic outcomes to the negotiations we will have: first, that we negotiate a free-trade agreement continuing tariff-free trade—more or less what we have at present—and secondly, that we move to trading on the basis of most favoured nation tariffs under WTO rules, which is basically what America, China, Japan and Russia, the four most successful countries exporting to the EU, do.

From what I have heard in this House and what I know of the Government's position, everybody would like us to negotiate continuing tariff-free trade with our European partners. We do not particularly need any clause in this Bill to try to achieve that. Moreover, it is very simple to negotiate. It is very easy to go from zero tariffs to zero tariffs—it can be done in an afternoon. It is not like negotiating the removal of tariffs, as the EU has had to do with Canada. Canada had 5,000 different tariffs, the EU had 12,500 different tariffs, and they had to trade off one against the other.

Tariff-free trade is very simple to negotiate. As far as barriers and services are concerned, if our regulatory systems began to diverge, all we would have to negotiate—after assessing whether or not the matter was serious—is

[Mr Lilley]

the normal dispute resolution procedure, because after the great repeal Bill we will start with identical regulatory arrangements.

5.30 pm

Tariff-free trade is also in the interests of the European Union. We are the biggest single market for the rest of the EU—bigger than the United States, with which it has laboriously been trying for years to negotiate the removal of tariffs. The EU also has a big surplus in trade with us, so it should not be difficult. It is very much in the EU's interests and it already has free-trade agreements with some 50 other countries that do not involve free movement of labour, paying a contribution or accepting European legislation. It has demonstrated that that is the sort of thing it can do with countries with which it wants free trade.

It might be the case that, within the EU, politics will trump economics. Although it is in its economic interests to continue tariff-free trade with us, the EU may feel it necessary to punish us in order to deter other countries from following our example and their voters from voting for Eurosceptic parties. This House has to acknowledge—few people seem willing to do so—that that will be the EU's choice. It will either decide to go along with continuing free trade, or it will say, “No. For political reasons, we can't accept that. We must trade on most favoured nation terms in future.” We cannot go back to it and say, “Sorry. You didn't give it to us the first time, but the House voted against, so can you give it to us the second time?” If it does not give it to us the first time, it will not give it to us at all.

We need to acknowledge that, although trading on most favoured nation terms is not as good as continuing free trade, it is the second best option and better than continuing with our previous arrangement. If Europe applies the common external tariff to us, most favoured nation tariffs would average 4%. The net contribution that we make to the EU annually is equivalent to 7% of the value of our exports. We are currently paying 7% to avoid a charge of 4%.

Clive Efford (Eltham) (Lab): How much do we get back?

Mr Lilley: The 7% is after taking account of everything we get back. If the hon. Gentleman wants to know, he should look up table 4.27 on page 159 of the Office for Budget Responsibility report, which spells out how much we will get back net when we leave, which is £13 billion—£250 million a week.

Kelvin Hopkins (Luton North) (Lab): Does the right hon. Gentleman agree that if a 4% tariff is imposed, it is possible that the pound will depreciate by the same amount, because we have our own currency?

Mr Lilley: It is already 15% more competitive than it was a year ago, which dwarfs the average of 4%. We can, of course, give processing relief—that is, remit tariffs—on components that are part of processing and manufacturing chains and that will be re-exported. We will get £12.3 billion of revenues, if we apply the common external tariff to imports from the EU, but our exporters will pay some £6.5 billion of tariffs on their exports to the EU, so we would have ample money to compensate

any exporters who were not sufficiently advantaged by a 15% devaluation, and still have billions of pounds to reduce general taxation. We can also, of course, negotiate free trade agreements with the rest of the world and slash unilaterally the tariffs that we currently charge on food, clothing and other things that we do not produce but that mean that our consumers have to pay higher prices to subsidise inefficient producers elsewhere in the EU, instead of importing from, say, the less-developed countries from which we should naturally be importing.

There are many other advantages, but as you have urged brevity, Ms Engel, I will not tell the Committee what they are but hold them back for a future occasion.

Albert Owen: It is always interesting to follow the right hon. Member for Hitchin and Harpenden (Mr Lilley). I will concentrate my brief remarks on Euratom. As the Minister and the Committee will know, its principal goals are the promotion of research and the dissemination of information; the establishment of safety standards; and facilitating investment. It also governs the supply of ore and nuclear fuels.

Euratom establishes a nuclear common market. The Eurosceptics always used to say, “We want to be in the common market,” yet their decision is to pull out of it. I believe that the Government want to retain the principal goals, and they stated on the publication of the Bill that we are leaving Euratom only because of legally binding arrangements, but that is debatable—I have seen conflicting legal advice—and cynics suggest that it is more to do with the European Court of Justice.

The Government say that they support Euratom and want us to continue both to co-operate and to have the highest standards. The hon. Member for Wells (James Heapey) is absolutely right that we are world leaders on nuclear standards, but in co-operation with other countries, which is why it is so important to keep Euratom, the umbrella body.

The purpose of new clause 192, which is supported by the industry and industry bodies, is to continue co-operation and have greater certainty. I have raised this matter with the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, who was very courteous. He said he had met the industry and was sure that we will be able to continue outside Euratom, but that is not what the industry in general believes. The hon. Member for Henley (John Howell) said that the management of the JET energy research programme in Oxfordshire did not want the proposal, but the workforce have lobbied me in great numbers through the union, saying that there are risks if we pull out.

Access to information and data sharing are important. We will be way behind if we pull out. Companies in the industry need to plan in advance; they need that certainty. Euratom deals with nuclear co-operation with the United States. It is ironic that although we are talking about coming out of Europe and trading with the United States, we need to be part of Euratom to get agreements to move fuels to the US, Japan, Canada and other countries. Renegotiating will take an awful long time.

Ideally, the Minister would retain the UK's membership of Euratom even if we left the European Union. If the Government proceed to give notice to withdraw, we must have an agreement on transitional arrangements. We must also have sufficient time to negotiate and

complete new arrangements with EU states and third countries such as the US, Japan and Canada. If in two years an agreement cannot be reached, the UK should remain a member. Our standing in the nuclear industry is at stake, as are jobs and our reputation as a major country in nuclear research. I hope that the Minister takes that on board.

Mr David Jones: I have listened to a large number of very important contributions this afternoon from right hon. and hon. Members, and a large number of proposals have been considered. I hope that the Committee will forgive me if I say that I prefer—

Chris Leslie (Nottingham East) (Lab/Co-op): Will the Minister give way before he says that he would prefer not to give way to anybody?

Mr Jones: I will give way once and no more.

Chris Leslie: Does the Minister agree that it is totally farcical that I have tabled 35 proposals but have been unable to speak to any of them? Does that not prove that the curtailing of the debate leaves Parliament unable to scrutinise withdrawal from the EU?

Mr Jones: I commend the hon. Gentleman for his enthusiasm and say that the House has voted for and adopted a programme motion.

Kate Hoey (Vauxhall) (Lab): The public watching need to know that this is not the right place for many of the amendments and new clauses to be debated. As my right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Edgbaston (Ms Stuart) has said, this is not the right Bill.

Mr Jones: That is what I was about to say. I would like to address all the amendments if I can, so I hope that the House will forgive me if I take no further interventions.

The amendments serve as a valuable reminder of the numerous important matters that will need to be considered and discussed throughout the process of negotiation. They seek to ensure that specific aspects of our future relationship with the European Union are prioritised by the Government. Let me take this opportunity to tell the House once again that we are committed to delivering the best possible deal for the whole of the United Kingdom. However, we can only set about delivering that deal after we have triggered article 50. It is not appropriate, therefore, to seek to tie the hands of the Government on individual policy areas at this stage; that could only serve to jeopardise our negotiating position.

I will do my best to respond to each of the amendments, given their broad scope, but for the avoidance of doubt, there is a common response to them all: elementally, this is a straightforward procedural Bill that serves only to give the Prime Minister the power to trigger article 50 and thereby respect the result of the referendum. As a consequence, these amendments are not for this Bill. Instead, they are for the many future debates that will take place in this House and the other place—

Chris Leslie: On a point of order, Ms Engel. The Minister said that the amendments were not for this

Bill. Will you remind the House that the Chair has ruled that all the amendments are within the scope of the Bill?

The Second Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means (Natascha Engel): The Chair's ruling has been mentioned time and again. The Content of amendments is a matter for debate.

Mr David Jones: Thank you, Ms Engel. The amendments will be debated at a later stage.

New clauses 2, 7, 100, 163 and 193, as well as amendments 32, 34, 40 and 55, would require the Prime Minister either to have regard to, or to set out in a report, a number of matters prior to triggering article 50. Those include, but are not limited to, the common travel area with the Republic of Ireland and the preservation of peace in Northern Ireland; tariff-free trade with the European Union; workers', women's, human, civil, social and political rights; climate change and environmental standards; and the British economy and economic model. The White Paper published last week sets out our strategic aims for the negotiations and covers many of the topics that hon. Members have addressed in these and other amendments.

With regard to the common travel area, for instance, we have already stressed that we are committed to working with both the Irish Government and the Northern Ireland Executive to recognise the unique economic, social and political context of the land border between the UK and Ireland. We have also made it clear that we are seeking a bold and comprehensive free trade agreement with the European Union that is as tariff-free and frictionless as possible.

On new clause 7, which concerns the preservation of EU tax avoidance measures, the Prime Minister has made it very clear that we will convert the *acquis* into British law, and that it will then be for the British Parliament to decide on any changes to that law, with appropriate scrutiny. Similarly, amendments 7, 9 and 38 to clause 1 and new clauses 16, 70 and 133 seek to require the Government to commit to a position on specific issues before triggering article 50. Amendment 7, for example, seeks to ensure that the UK continues to participate in EU common foreign and security policy after withdrawal from the European Union. A matter such as that cannot be resolved through unilateral action and, instead, must be clearly addressed through discussion with the other 27 member states of the EU. We have been clear that we want to see continued close co-operation on foreign and security policy with European partners, but those discussions can begin only after article 50 has been triggered.

New clause 16 is designed to ensure that the employment rights of those living or working in the UK will be unaffected by the Bill. The Government have made it clear that not only will there be no change to employment protections as a result of triggering article 50, but we will protect and enhance the rights people have at work.

5.45 pm

A further distinct set of amendments, new clause 141 and amendments 29, 35 and 54 to clause 1, seek to clarify the position of Gibraltar. This was addressed most notably by the hon. Member for Ilford South (Mike Gapes). The Government are clear that Gibraltar is covered by our proposed exit negotiations. We have

committed to fully involving Gibraltar as we prepare for the process of exiting the EU. We must seek a deal that works for Britain, and that deal must work for Gibraltar, too.

A number of amendments tabled by hon. Members raised issues relating to the negotiations. New clauses 11, 12, 21, 76, 77, 104 and 181 relate to our future trading relationship with the EU, and some seek carve-outs for specific areas of the UK economy, such as financial services or the agricultural sector. Again, the Government's position is clear: the Prime Minister has said that the UK will seek to strike a unique agreement with the European Union that gets the right deal for people at home, and the best deal for Britain abroad.

On new clause 13, the Prime Minister has said that we expect a phased process of implementation in which both the UK and the EU prepare for any new arrangements. This will not, however, be some form of unlimited transitional status; that would be unhelpful for both the UK and the EU. New clauses 15, 166 and 183 also address the UK's negotiating objectives, but focus on the right to free movement and matters concerning immigration. The precise nature of the deal will be a matter for the negotiations, but let me reassure the Committee that we are seeking a deal that will work for everyone in the UK.

Another set of amendments seeks to ensure that the UK retains its membership of specific European Union agencies. I will first address the issue of Euratom, since many hon. Members have made explicit reference to it, including in new clauses 185, 186 and 192, and in amendments 31, 42 and 89 to clause 1. I would like to explain why, as we trigger article 50, we will also commence the process of leaving Euratom. Although Euratom is a separate treaty-based organisation, it shares a common institutional framework with the EU, making the EU and Euratom uniquely legally joined. The Government's view is that it would not be possible for the UK to leave the EU and continue its current membership of Euratom. When article 50 is triggered, the UK will therefore leave Euratom as well as the EU. The Government's aim for this relationship is clear: to maintain the mutually successful civil nuclear co-operation with EU nations. Our exact relationship with Euratom, however, will be subject to negotiations with our EU partners. Those negotiations have not yet started, and cannot start until we have triggered article 50, but we will continue to engage closely with MPs, industry and stakeholders.

New clauses 78 to 97, 170, 172, 174 and 178, and amendments 30 and 32 to clause 1, refer to other specific agencies, bodies and schemes. We recognise the importance of these and stress that we do want close co-operation with our European partners in all these areas, but the Bill is not the place to ensure that; it is a matter for the negotiations. Our intention, as set out in the White Paper, is to leave the EU. It would be wrong to start negotiating our new relationship with our membership of one European body or another already predetermined, and it would be wrong to set out unilateral demands before negotiations have even begun. We recognise the importance of all of these agencies, bodies and schemes, but the nature of our membership of them will be a matter for negotiation with the EU.

Further amendments seek to specify the timing of the triggering of article 50. There are many reasons why the end of March deadline is extremely important. We need

to progress now. We have done a great deal of analysis and preparation, and the time is right to get on and serve the article 50 notice.

The issue of EU nationals was once again raised, having been debated earlier this week as well. I want to restate to the House that the Government fully recognise that the issue of EU nationals resident in the UK is an extremely important one that we wish to address as a matter of priority, just as we wish to address the issue of the rights of UK nationals resident in the EU. This, however, must be addressed after the negotiations have commenced.

Helen Goodman rose—

Mr Jones: No, I will not give way.

I am grateful for the contributions of Members to this Committee stage. The Bill respects the judgment of the Supreme Court. I urge right hon. and hon. Members to support both clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 gives the Prime Minister Parliament's authority to notify the European Council of the UK's intention to withdraw from the EU. It also makes it clear that this power applies notwithstanding the European Communities Act 1972; this is to address the Supreme Court's conclusions on the status of the 1972 Act. I urge all right hon. and hon. Members who have tabled amendments not to press them to a Division, so that we can make progress with the Bill, start the process of withdrawal and work to deliver a deal that respects the vote of the British people in the referendum.

Paul Blomfield: In the few seconds left to me, I want to say that we will not withdraw the new clause and we will hold the Government to account in respect of the Secretary of State's commitment to achieve a deal that provides for the exact same benefits as we enjoy from our current membership of the single market.

The issue of our membership of Euratom has caused concern among Members on both sides of the House, which the Minister failed to allay in his closing remarks. To clear up any doubts, such as those that the hon. Member for Wells (James Heapey) expressed, I remind the House that the Nuclear Industry Association has made it clear that we should not leave Euratom. It is not in the interests of the industry or people's jobs. They will watch how the House votes on new clause 192, and will judge the Government accordingly. I hope that Members will recognise that and vote for the new clause, and for all the other helpful amendments we have tabled.

Question put, That the clause be read a Second time.

The Committee divided: Ayes 291, Noes 336.

Division No. 152]

[5.52 pm]

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David
Arkless, Richard
Ashworth, Jonathan
Austin, Ian

Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Beckett, rh Margaret
Benn, rh Hilary
Berger, Luciana
Betts, Mr Clive
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta

Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Boswell, Philip
Brabin, Tracy
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crausby, Sir David
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Piero, Gloria
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Dowd, Peter
Dromey, Jack
Dugher, Michael
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Elliott, Tom
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Ferrier, Margaret
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Fiello, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Furniss, Gill
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Mr Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, rh Alan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham
Jones, Helen
Jones, Mr Kevan
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kinahan, Danny
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Leslie, Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan

Mactaggart, rh Fiona
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marris, Rob
Marsden, Gordon
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGarry, Natalie
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
McMahon, Jim
Meale, Sir Alan
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Morden, Jessica
Morris, Grahame M.
Mulholland, Greg
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Oswald, Kirsten
Owen, Albert
Paterson, Steven
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Pugh, John
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Marie
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rotheram, Steve
Ryan, rh Joan
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Shah, Naz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheerman, Mr Barry
Sheppard, Tommy
Sherriff, Paula
Shuker, Mr Gavin
Siddiq, Tulip
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Slaughter, Andy
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Spellar, rh Mr John
Starmer, Keir
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen
Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wishart, Pete
Woodcock, John
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:
Nic Dakin and
Nick Smith

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline

Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bottomley, Sir Peter
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colvile, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver

Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heapey, James
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris

Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David

Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond

Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Thomas, Derek
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Turner, Mr Andrew
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben

Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Wharton, James
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Jackie Doyle-Price and
Chris Heaton-Harris

Question accordingly negated.

6.5 pm

More than five hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings, the proceedings were interrupted (Programme Order, 1 February).

The Chair put forthwith the Questions necessary for the disposal of the business to be concluded at that time (Standing Order No. 83D).

New Clause 7

CONDUCT OF NEGOTIATIONS—ANTI-TAX HAVEN

‘(1) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of the Crown must have regard to the public interest in maintaining all existing EU tax avoidance and evasion legislation.

(2) In negotiating and concluding an agreement in accordance with Article 50(2) of the Treaty on European Union, Ministers of Crown must comply with the European Union Code of Conduct on Business Taxation.”—(Paul Blomfield)

This new clause sets out the Government’s commitment to observe the Code of Conduct on business taxation to prevent excessive tax competition and lays out the statutory objectives that the Government must have regard to EU tax avoidance and evasion whilst carrying out negotiations under article 50.

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The Committee divided: Ayes 289, Noes 336.

Division No. 153]

[6.6 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David
Arkless, Richard
Ashworth, Jonathan
Austin, Ian
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah

Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Beckett, rh Margaret
Benn, rh Hilary
Berger, Luciana
Betts, Mr Clive
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Boswell, Philip
Brabin, Tracy

Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Cherry, Joanna
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crausby, Sir David
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Piero, Gloria
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Dowd, Peter
Dromey, Jack
Dugher, Michael
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Ferrier, Margaret
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Flelo, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen

Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Furniss, Gill
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Mr Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, rh Alan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham
Jones, Helen
Jones, Mr Kevan
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Leslie, Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Mactaggart, rh Fiona
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marris, Rob

Marsden, Gordon
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGarry, Natalie
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
McMahon, Jim
Meale, Sir Alan
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Morden, Jessica
Morris, Grahame M.
Mulholland, Greg
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Oswald, Kirsten
Owen, Albert
Paterson, Steven
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Pugh, John
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Marie
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey

Rotheram, Steve
Ryan, rh Joan
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Shah, Naz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheerman, Mr Barry
Sheppard, Tommy
Sherriff, Paula
Shuker, Mr Gavin
Siddiq, Tulip
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Slaughter, Andy
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Spellar, rh Mr John
Starmer, Keir
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen
Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wishart, Pete
Woodcock, John
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:

Nic Dakin and
Nick Smith

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline

Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin

Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bottomley, Sir Peter
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartledge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colville, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael

Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heapey, James
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart

James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline

Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Thomas, Derek
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin

Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Tugendhat, Tom
Turner, Mr Andrew
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Wharton, James

Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Jackie Doyle-Price and
Chris Heaton-Harris

Question accordingly negated.

Clause 1

POWER TO NOTIFY WITHDRAWAL FROM THE EU

Amendment proposed: 29, page 1, line 3, at end insert

“after consultation with the Government of Gibraltar.”—(*Mike Gapes.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The Committee divided: Ayes 288, Noes 338.

Division No. 154]

[6.19 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David
Arkless, Richard
Ashworth, Jonathan
Austin, Ian
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Beckett, rh Margaret
Benn, rh Hilary
Berger, Luciana
Betts, Mr Clive
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Boswell, Philip
Brabin, Tracy
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Burden, Richard

Burton, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crausby, Sir David
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint

Day, Martyn
De Piero, Gloria
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Dowd, Peter
Dromey, Jack
Dugher, Michael
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Ferrier, Margaret
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Flello, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Furniss, Gill
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Mr Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, rh Alan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham
Jones, Helen
Jones, Mr Kevan
Jones, Susan Elan

Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Leslie, Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Mactaggart, rh Fiona
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Marris, Rob
Marsden, Gordon
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGarry, Natalie
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
McMahon, Jim
Meale, Sir Alan
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Morden, Jessica
Morris, Grahame M.
Mulholland, Greg
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Oswald, Kirsten
Owen, Albert
Paterson, Steven
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess

Phillipson, Bridget
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Pugh, John
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Marie
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rotheram, Steve
Ryan, rh Joan
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Shah, Naz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheerman, Mr Barry
Sheppard, Tommy
Sherriff, Paula
Shuker, Mr Gavin
Siddiq, Tulip
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Slaughter, Andy
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Spellar, rh Mr John
Starmer, Keir
Stephens, Chris

Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen
Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wishart, Pete
Woodcock, John
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Nic Dakin and
Nick Smith**

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham

Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colville, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen

Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dineneage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey
 M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr
 Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Marcus
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Mr Adam
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr
 Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Lumley, Karen
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott

Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syme, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggins, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim
Tellers for the Noes:
Jackie Doyle-Price and
Chris Heaton-Harris

Question accordingly negated.

Amendment proposed: 11, page 1, line 5, at end insert—

“(3) Before exercising the power under subsection (1), the Prime Minister must prepare and publish a report on the effect of the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the EU on national finances, including the impact on health spending.”—(*Mr Umunna.*)

This amendment calls for the Government to publish a report on the effect of EU withdrawal on the national finances, particularly health spending following claims in the referendum campaign that EU withdrawal would allow an additional £350 million per week to be spent on the National Health Service.

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The Committee divided: Ayes 288, Noes 337.

Division No. 155]

[6.32 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane	Cooper, rh Yvette
Abrahams, Debbie	Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina	Cowan, Ronnie
Alexander, Heidi	Coyle, Neil
Ali, Rushanara	Crausby, Sir David
Allen, Mr Graham	Crawley, Angela
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena	Creagh, Mary
Anderson, Mr David	Creasy, Stella
Arkless, Richard	Cruddas, Jon
Ashworth, Jonathan	Cryer, John
Austin, Ian	Cummins, Judith
Bailey, Mr Adrian	Cunningham, Alex
Bardell, Hannah	Cunningham, Mr Jim
Barron, rh Sir Kevin	Danczuk, Simon
Beckett, rh Margaret	David, Wayne
Benn, rh Hilary	Davies, Geraint
Berger, Luciana	Day, Martyn
Betts, Mr Clive	De Piero, Gloria
Black, Mhairi	Debbonaire, Thangam
Blackford, Ian	Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Blackman, Kirsty	Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta	Doughty, Stephen
Blenkinsop, Tom	Dowd, Jim
Blomfield, Paul	Dowd, Peter
Boswell, Philip	Dromey, Jack
Brabin, Tracy	Dugher, Michael
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben	Durkan, Mark
Brake, rh Tom	Eagle, Ms Angela
Brennan, Kevin	Eagle, Maria
Brock, Deidre	Edwards, Jonathan
Brown, Alan	Efford, Clive
Brown, Lyn	Elliott, Julie
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas	Ellman, Mrs Louise
Bryant, Chris	Elmore, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen	Esterson, Bill
Burden, Richard	Evans, Chris
Burgon, Richard	Farrelly, Paul
Burnham, rh Andy	Farron, Tim
Butler, Dawn	Fellows, Marion
Byrne, rh Liam	Ferrier, Margaret
Cadbury, Ruth	Fitzpatrick, Jim
Cameron, Dr Lisa	Flelo, Robert
Campbell, rh Mr Alan	Fletcher, Colleen
Campbell, Mr Ronnie	Flint, rh Caroline
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair	Flynn, Paul
Champion, Sarah	Fovargue, Yvonne
Chapman, Douglas	Foxcroft, Vicky
Chapman, Jenny	Furniss, Gill
Cherry, Joanna	Gapes, Mike
Clegg, rh Mr Nick	Gardiner, Barry
Ciwyd, rh Ann	Gethins, Stephen
Coaker, Vernon	Gibson, Patricia
Coffey, Ann	Glendon, Mary
Cooper, Julie	Goodman, Helen
Cooper, Rosie	Grady, Patrick

Grant, Peter	McDonnell, rh John
Gray, Neil	McFadden, rh Mr Pat
Green, Kate	McGarry, Natalie
Greenwood, Lilian	McGinn, Conor
Greenwood, Margaret	McGovern, Alison
Griffith, Nia	McInnes, Liz
Gwynne, Andrew	McKinnell, Catherine
Haigh, Louise	McLaughlin, Anne
Hamilton, Fabian	McMahon, Jim
Hanson, rh Mr David	Meale, Sir Alan
Harman, rh Ms Harriet	Miliband, rh Edward
Harris, Carolyn	Monaghan, Carol
Hayes, Helen	Monaghan, Dr Paul
Hayman, Sue	Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Healey, rh John	Morden, Jessica
Hendrick, Mr Mark	Morris, Grahame M.
Hendry, Drew	Mulholland, Greg
Hepburn, Mr Stephen	Mullin, Roger
Hermon, Lady	Murray, Ian
Hillier, Meg	Nandy, Lisa
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon	Newlands, Gavin
Hollern, Kate	Nicolson, John
Hosie, Stewart	O'Hara, Brendan
Huq, Dr Rupa	Olney, Sarah
Hussain, Imran	Onn, Melanie
Jarvis, Dan	Onwurah, Chi
Johnson, rh Alan	Osamor, Kate
Johnson, Diana	Oswald, Kirsten
Jones, Gerald	Owen, Albert
Jones, Graham	Paterson, Steven
Jones, Helen	Pearce, Teresa
Jones, Mr Kevan	Pennycook, Matthew
Jones, Susan Elan	Perkins, Toby
Kane, Mike	Phillips, Jess
Keeley, Barbara	Phillipson, Bridget
Kendall, Liz	Pound, Stephen
Kerevan, George	Powell, Lucy
Kerr, Calum	Pugh, John
Kinnock, Stephen	Qureshi, Yasmin
Kyle, Peter	Rayner, Angela
Lamb, rh Norman	Reed, Mr Steve
Lammy, rh Mr David	Rees, Christina
Lavery, Ian	Reeves, Rachel
Law, Chris	Reynolds, Emma
Leslie, Chris	Reynolds, Jonathan
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma	Rimmer, Marie
Lewis, Clive	Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Lewis, Mr Ivan	Robertson, rh Angus
Long Bailey, Rebecca	Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Lucas, Caroline	Rotheram, Steve
Lucas, Ian C.	Ryan, rh Joan
Lynch, Holly	Salmond, rh Alex
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan	Saville Roberts, Liz
Mactaggart, rh Fiona	Shah, Naz
Madders, Justin	Sharma, Mr Virendra
Mahmood, Mr Khalid	Sheerman, Mr Barry
Mahmood, Shabana	Sheppard, Tommy
Malhotra, Seema	Sheriff, Paula
Mann, John	Shuker, Mr Gavin
Marris, Rob	Siddiq, Tulip
Marsden, Gordon	Skinner, Mr Dennis
Maskell, Rachael	Slaughter, Andy
Matheson, Christian	Smeeth, Ruth
Mc Nally, John	Smith, rh Mr Andrew
McCabe, Steve	Smith, Angela
McCaig, Callum	Smith, Cat
McCarthy, Kerry	Smith, Jeff
McDonagh, Siobhain	Smith, Owen
McDonald, Andy	Smyth, Karin
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm	Spellar, rh Mr John
McDonald, Stuart C.	Starmer, Keir
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair	Stephens, Chris

Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen
Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom

Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wishart, Pete
Woodcock, John
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Nic Dakin and
Nick Smith**

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher

Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colville, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin

Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heapey, James
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus

Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew

Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela

Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Chris Heaton-Harris and
Stephen Barclay

Murray, Ian
 Olney, Sarah
 Pugh, John
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Owen
 Stevens, Jo

Timms, rh Stephen
 West, Catherine
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:
Mr Alistair Carmichael and
Tom Brake

NOES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Baron, Mr John
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Bingham, Andrew
 Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Carswell, Mr Douglas
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colville, Oliver
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey

Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Marcus
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian

Question accordingly negated.

Amendment proposed: 43, page 1, line 5, at end insert—

‘(3) Before exercising the power under section 1, the Prime Minister must prepare and publish a report on the process for ratifying the United Kingdom’s new relationship with the European Union through a public referendum.’—(*Tim Farron.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The Committee divided: Ayes 33, Noes 340.

Division No. 156]

[6.44 pm

AYES

Alexander, Heidi
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brown, Lyn
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coffey, Ann
 Coyle, Neil
 Davies, Geraint
 Durkan, Mark
 Edwards, Jonathan

Farron, Tim
 Hayes, Helen
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lucas, Caroline
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Maskell, Rachael
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 Mulholland, Greg

Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hermon, Lady
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, John
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalf, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew

Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Thomas, Derek
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward

Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Turner, Mr Andrew
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Wharton, James
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Jackie Doyle-Price and
Stephen Barclay

Question accordingly negatived.

Amendment proposed: 86, page 1, line 5, at end insert—

“with the exception of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 and section 2 of the Ireland Act 1949, and subject to—

(a) the United Kingdom’s obligations under the Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Ireland of 10 April 1998, and

(b) preserving acquired rights in Northern Ireland under European Union law.”—(*Ms Ritchie.*)

This amendment requires the power to notify withdrawal to be exercised with regard to the constitutional, institutional and rights provisions of the Belfast Agreement.

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The Committee proceeded to a Division.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Lindsay Hoyle): I ask the Assistant Serjeant at Arms to investigate the delay in the Aye Lobby—there seems to be a slight blockage that she might be able to relieve.

The Committee having divided: Ayes 288, Noes 327.

Division No. 157]

[6.56 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi

Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David

Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Danczuk, Simon
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair

Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Jim
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter

Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahon, Jim
 Meale, Sir Alan
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Morris, Grahame M.
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin

Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Salmond, rh Alex
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughtier, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Starmer, Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Watson, Mr Tom
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:
 Owen Thompson and
 Jonathan Edwards

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colvile, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline

Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heapey, James
Heaton-Jones, Peter

Henderson, Gordon
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria

Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John

Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Thomas, Derek
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Turner, Mr Andrew
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward

Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Wharton, James
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Stephen Barclay and
Chris Heaton-Harris

Question accordingly negated.

Question put (single Question on successive provisions of the Bill), That clauses 1 and 2 stand part of the Bill.

The Committee proceeded to a Division.

The Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr Lindsay Hoyle):

I ask the Serjeant at Arms to investigate the delays in the Aye and No Lobbies.

The Committee having divided: Ayes 496, Noes 111.

Division No. 158]

[7.14 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Amess, Sir David
Anderson, Mr David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Ashworth, Jonathan
Atkins, Victoria
Austin, Iain
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Beckett, rh Margaret
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benn, rh Hilary
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Betts, Mr Clive
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blackwood, Nicola
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Brabin, Tracy
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David

Burt, rh Alistair
Byrne, rh Liam
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartledge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Jenny
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crausby, Sir David
Crouch, Tracey
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Dakin, Nic
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
De Piero, Gloria
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey
M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowd, Peter
Dowden, Oliver
Drax, Richard
Dromey, Jack
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Dugher, Michael
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Eagle, Ms Angela
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane

Ellman, Mrs Louise
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elmore, Chris
Elphicke, Charlie
Esterson, Bill
Eustice, George
Evans, Chris
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Flelo, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Foster, Kevin
Fovargue, Yvonne
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr
Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Furniss, Gill
Fysh, Marcus
Gardiner, Barry
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Greenwood, Margaret
Grieve, rh Sir Dominic
Griffith, Nia
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gwynne, Andrew
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Haigh, Louise
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hamilton, Fabian
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Carolyn
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon

Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Hayman, Sue
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Healey, rh John
 Heapey, James
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Mr Adam
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Hussain, Imran
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Jarvis, Dan
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Diana
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Lavery, Ian
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, rh Brandon

Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lumley, Karen
 Lynch, Holly
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Matheson, Christian
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCabe, Steve
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonnell, rh John
 McGinn, Conor
 McInnes, Liz
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McMahon, Jim
 McPartland, Stephen
 Meale, Sir Alan
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, Grahame
 M.
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Nandy, Lisa
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Onn, Melanie

Opperman, Guy
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Owen, Albert
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Pearce, Teresa
 Penning, rh Mike
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perkins, Toby
 Perry, Claire
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pow, Rebecca
 Powell, Lucy
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Rayner, Angela
 Redwood, rh John
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rotheram, Steve
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Sherriff, Paula
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Royston

Smyth, Karin
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Starmer, Keir
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Streeting, Wes
 Stride, Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syme, Mr Robert
 Tami, Mark
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds,
 Nick
 Thornberry, Emily
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Trickett, Jon
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Watson, Mr Tom
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Phil
 Wilson, Mr Rob

Wilson, Sammy
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, Mr Iain

Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Chris Heaton-Harris and
Jackie Doyle-Price

NOES

Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Arkless, Richard
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah
Berger, Luciana
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Boswell, Philip
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Buck, Ms Karen
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Chapman, Douglas
Cherry, Joanna
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Durkan, Mark
Edwards, Jonathan
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Farron, Tim
Ferrier, Margaret
Gapes, Mike
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Hayes, Helen
Hendry, Drew
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kyle, Peter

Lammy, rh Mr David
Law, Chris
Lucas, Caroline
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Maskell, Rachael
Mc Nally, John
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart
C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McGarry, Natalie
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onwurah, Chi
Oswald, Kirsten
Paterson, Steven
Pound, Stephen
Pugh, John
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheppard, Tommy
Siddiq, Tulip
Slaughter, Andy
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Thewliss, Alison
Thomson, Michelle
Timms, rh Stephen
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wishart, Pete
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Marion Fellows and
Owen Thompson

Question accordingly agreed to.

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

New Clause 57

EFFECT OF NOTIFICATION OF WITHDRAWAL

“Nothing in this Act shall affect the continuation of those residence rights enjoyed by EU citizens lawfully resident in the United Kingdom on 23 June 2016, under or by virtue of Directive 2004/38/EC, after the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the European Union.”—(*Ms Harman.*)

This savings new clause is designed to protect the residence rights of those EU citizens who were lawfully resident in the United Kingdom on the date of the EU referendum. It would ensure that those rights do not fall away automatically two years after notice of withdrawal has been given, if no agreement is reached with the EU. This new clause would implement a recommendation made in paragraph 53 by the Joint Committee on Human Rights in its report ‘The human rights implications of Brexit’.

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The Committee divided: Ayes 290, Noes 332.

Division No. 159]

[7.33 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David
Arkless, Richard
Ashworth, Jonathan
Austin, Ian
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Beckett, rh Margaret
Benn, rh Hilary
Berger, Luciana
Betts, Mr Clive
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Boswell, Philip
Brabin, Tracy
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Byrne, rh Liam
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crausby, Sir David
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Piero, Gloria
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Dowd, Peter
Dromey, Jack
Dugher, Michael
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Elliott, Tom
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Ferrier, Margaret

Fitzpatrick, Jim
Flelo, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Furniss, Gill
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Mr Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, rh Alan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham
Jones, Helen
Jones, Mr Kevan
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kinahan, Danny
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Leslie, Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Mactaggart, rh Fiona
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid

Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marsden, Gordon
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mathias, Dr Tania
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart
C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGarry, Natalie
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
McMahon, Jim
Meale, Sir Alan
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Morden, Jessica
Morris, Grahame
M.
Mulholland, Greg
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Oswald, Kirsten
Owen, Albert
Paterson, Steven
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Pugh, John
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Marie
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rotheram, Steve
Ryan, rh Joan
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Shah, Naz

Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheerman, Mr Barry
Sheppard, Tommy
Sherriff, Paula
Shuker, Mr Gavin
Siddiq, Tulip
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Slaughter, Andy
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Spellar, rh Mr John
Starmer, Keir
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen

Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame
Rosie
Wishart, Pete
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Nic Dakin and
Nick Smith**

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afrিয়ে, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory

Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colville, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan

Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Marcus
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Mr Adam
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Lumley, Karen
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Marris, Rob
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryl
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert

Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim
Tellers for the Noes:
Mark Spencer and
Steve Brine

Question accordingly negated.

New Clause 192

NUCLEAR COLLABORATION

“(1) Nothing in this Act shall affect the UK’s membership of the European Atomic Agency Community (Euratom).

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, Her Majesty’s Government shall treat the process of leaving Euratom as separate to that of leaving the European Union.”—(*Paul Blomfield.*)

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The Committee divided: Ayes 287, Noes 336.

Division No. 160]**[7.45 pm****AYES**

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Anderson, Mr David
Arkless, Richard
Ashworth, Jonathan
Austin, Ian
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Bardell, Hannah
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Beckett, rh Margaret
Benn, rh Hilary
Berger, Luciana
Betts, Mr Clive
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Boswell, Philip
Brabin, Tracy
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Byrne, rh Liam
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crausby, Sir David
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim

Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Piero, Gloria
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Dowd, Peter
Dromey, Jack
Dugher, Michael
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Ferrier, Margaret
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Fleelo, Robert
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Furniss, Gill
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Glindon, Mary
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hanson, rh Mr David
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Mr Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran

Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, rh Alan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham
Jones, Helen
Jones, Mr Kevan
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Leslie, Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Mactaggart, rh Fiona
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marris, Rob
Marsden, Gordon
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGarry, Natalie
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
McMahon, Jim
Meale, Sir Alan
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Morden, Jessica
Morris, Grahame M.
Mulholland, Greg
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onn, Melanie

Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Oswald, Kirsten
Owen, Albert
Paterson, Steven
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Pugh, John
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Marie
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rotheram, Steve
Ryan, rh Joan
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Shah, Naz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheerman, Mr Barry
Sheppard, Tommy
Sherriff, Paula
Shuker, Mr Gavin
Siddiq, Tulip
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Slaughter, Andy
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Spellar, rh Mr John
Starmer, Keir
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Streeting, Wes
Tami, Mark
Thewliss, Alison
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thompson, Owen
Thomson, Michelle
Thornberry, Emily
Timms, rh Stephen
Trickett, Jon
Turley, Anna
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Watson, Mr Tom
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel

Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wilson, Phil
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wishart, Pete

Woodcock, John
Wright, Mr Iain
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:
Nick Smith and
Nic Dakin

NOES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colville, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron

Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam

Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Mr Adam
Hopkins, Kelvin
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Lumley, Karen
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David

Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant

Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Thomas, Derek
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig

Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Turner, Mr Andrew
Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Wharton, James
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wragg, William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:

Mark Spencer and
Jackie Doyle-Price

Question accordingly negatived.

The Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair.

Bill reported, without amendment (Standing Order No. 83D(6)).

Alex Salmond: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Government's refusal to accept a single amendment means there will be no Report stage. The programme motion means there is no debate on Third Reading. I am informed by the Library that the last time that combination happened was the Defence of the Realm Act 1914, which was about the first world war. For this to happen on any Bill would be an abuse; for it to happen on this Bill is an outrage. What is it about the procedures of this place that allows a Bill of this constitutional significance to be railroaded through in this disgraceful fashion?

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Lindsay Hoyle): The House agreed to a programme motion, and that is what has been adhered to. What I would say is that the point is on the record; you have certainly pointed out the last time this happened. There are other channels where I think that conversation ought to go and to be taken up, but I thank you for that.

Mr Jacob Rees-Mogg (North East Somerset) (Con): On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. This House has nobly represented the will of the British people in a referendum, and that is why the Bill has passed as it has.

Mr Deputy Speaker: May I just say to the hon. Gentleman, who is a constitutional expert, that he will recognise that that is also definitely not a point of order?

8.1pm

More than seven hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings, the proceedings were interrupted (Programme Order, 1 February).

The Deputy Speaker put forthwith the Question necessary for the disposal of the business to be concluded at that time (Standing Order No. 83E), That the Bill be now read the Third time.

The House divided: Ayes 494, Noes 122.

Division No. 161]

[8.1 pm

AYES

Abbott, Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Anderson, Mr David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Ashworth, Jonathan
Atkins, Victoria
Austin, Ian
Bacon, Mr Richard
Bailey, Mr Adrian
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barron, rh Sir Kevin
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Beckett, rh Margaret
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benn, rh Hilary
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Betts, Mr Clive
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blenkinsop, Tom
Blomfield, Paul
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Brabin, Tracy
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burden, Richard
Burgon, Richard
Burnham, rh Andy
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair

Byrne, rh Liam
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carmichael, Neil
Carswell, Mr Douglas
Cartledge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Jenny
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colvile, Oliver
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crausby, Sir David
Crouch, Tracey
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Dakin, Nic
Danczuk, Simon
David, Wayne
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
De Piero, Gloria
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowd, Peter
Dowden, Oliver

Drax, Richard
 Dromey, Jack
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Dugher, Michael
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Elliott, Julie
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elmore, Chris
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Esterson, Bill
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Chris
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Foster, Kevin
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Furniss, Gill
 Fysh, Marcus
 Gardiner, Barry
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffith, Nia
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Haigh, Louise
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hamilton, Fabian

Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Carolyn
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Hayman, Sue
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Healey, rh John
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Mr Adam
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Hussain, Imran
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Jarvis, Dan
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Diana
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian

Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Lavery, Ian
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lumley, Karen
 Lynch, Holly
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Matheson, Christian
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCabe, Steve
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McInnes, Liz
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McMahan, Jim
 McPartland, Stephen
 Meale, Sir Alan
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, Grahame M.
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David

Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Nandy, Lisa
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Onn, Melanie
 Opperman, Guy
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Owen, Albert
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Pearce, Teresa
 Penning, rh Mike
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perkins, Toby
 Perry, Claire
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pow, Rebecca
 Powell, Lucy
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Rayner, Angela
 Redwood, rh John
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rotheram, Steve
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Sherriff, Paula
 Simpson, David

Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Skinner, Mr Dennis
Smeeth, Ruth
Smith, rh Mr Andrew
Smith, Cat
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, Julian
Smith, Nick
Smith, Royston
Smyth, Karin
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Solloway, Amanda
Soubry, rh Anna
Spellar, rh Mr John
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Starmer, Keir
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Streeter, Mr Gary
Streeter, Wes
Stride, Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Mr Robert
Tami, Mark
Thomas, Derek
Thomas, Mr Gareth
Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Thornberry, Emily
Throup, Maggie
Timpson, Edward
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie

Trickett, Jon
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Turley, Anna
Turner, Mr Andrew
Turner, Karl
Twigg, Derek
Twigg, Stephen
Tyrrie, rh Mr Andrew
Umunna, Mr Chuka
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vaz, rh Keith
Vaz, Valerie
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watkinson, Dame Angela
Watson, Mr Tom
Wharton, James
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Heather
White, Chris
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williams, Craig
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, Phil
Wilson, Mr Rob
Wilson, Sammy
Winnick, Mr David
Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Woodcock, John
Wragg, William
Wright, Mr Iain
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jackie Doyle-Price and
Mark Spencer

NOES

Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
Alexander, Heidi
Ali, Rushanara
Allen, Mr Graham
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Arkless, Richard
Bardell, Hannah
Berger, Luciana
Black, Mhairi
Blackford, Iain
Blackman, Kirsty
Boswell, Philip
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
Brake, rh Tom
Brennan, Kevin
Brock, Deidre
Brown, Alan
Brown, Lyn
Bryant, Chris
Buck, Ms Karen
Butler, Dawn
Cadbury, Ruth

Cameron, Dr Lisa
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Chapman, Douglas
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clegg, rh Mr Nick
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coffey, Ann
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
Debbonaire, Thangam
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Donaldson, Stuart Blair
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Jim
Durkan, Mark
Eagle, Maria

Edwards, Jonathan
Ellman, Mrs Louise
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Ferrier, Margaret
Foxcroft, Vicky
Gapes, Mike
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Hayes, Helen
Hendry, Drew
Hermon, Lady
Hillier, Meg
Hosie, Stewart
Huq, Dr Rupa
Kerevan, George
Kerr, Calum
Kyle, Peter
Lammy, rh Mr David
Law, Chris
Lewis, Clive
Lucas, Caroline
MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
Maskell, Rachael
Mc Nally, John
McCaig, Callum
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
McGarry, Natalie
McGovern, Alison
McKinnell, Catherine
McLaughlin, Anne
Monaghan, Carol
Monaghan, Dr Paul

Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Mullin, Roger
Murray, Iain
Newlands, Gavin
Nicolson, John
O'Hara, Brendan
Olney, Sarah
Onwurah, Chi
Oswald, Kirsten
Paterson, Steven
Pound, Stephen
Pugh, John
Ritchie, Ms Margaret
Robertson, rh Angus
Salmond, rh Alex
Saville Roberts, Liz
Sharma, Mr Virendra
Sheppard, Tommy
Siddiq, Tulip
Slaughter, Andy
Smith, Jeff
Smith, Owen
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo
Thewliss, Alison
Thomson, Michelle
Timms, rh Stephen
Weir, Mike
West, Catherine
Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Whitehead, Dr Alan
Whitford, Dr Philippa
Williams, Hywel
Williams, Mr Mark
Wilson, Corri
Wishart, Pete
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Marion Fellows and
Owen Thompson

Question accordingly agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Lindsay Hoyle): Order. Ms Gibson, it is very good to hear the choir. I personally do not mind singing, but I certainly cannot allow it in the Chamber, because before we know it we could hear other tunes, and I do not want to get into that—and some of those on that side of the Chamber have not quite got the voice that they might have on the other. I do not want a sing-off within the Chamber. It is very good of you, and much appreciated, but if we could just leave it for a little while: it has been a very tense week already, and I do not need any extra. Thank you.

Business without Debate

DELEGATED LEGISLATION

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 118(6)).

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND MARKETS

That the draft Investment Bank (Amendment of Definition) and Special Administration (Amendment) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 16 January, be approved.—(*Guy Opperman.*)

Question agreed to.

EUROPEAN UNION DOCUMENTS

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 119(11)),

STEEL: PRESERVING SUSTAINABLE JOBS AND GROWTH IN EUROPE

That this House takes note of European Union Document No. 7195/16, a Communication from the Commission on Steel: Preserving sustainable jobs and growth in Europe; and notes the action taken by the Government to secure a sustainable and competitive future for the steel industry in the United Kingdom.—
(Guy Opperman.)

Question agreed to.

PETITIONS

Closure of Maryhill Jobcentre

8.19 pm

Patrick Grady (Glasgow North) (SNP): The petition states:

The petition of residents of Glasgow North,

Declares that the Department for Work and Pensions' plan to close Maryhill Jobcentre and half of all Jobcentre Plus offices in Glasgow is morally outrageous; express our concerns that the city is being used as the testing ground for more devastating cuts across the UK; further that the proposals to close eight of the 16 Jobcentre offices across Glasgow, will impact on tens of thousands of people in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, Employment Support Allowance and Universal Credit; further that the UK Government has already indicated that 20% of the Jobcentre estate will see closures, and Glasgow has been handpicked to take a disproportionate hit of 50% closures; further that it will result in the poorest communities not being serviced by a Jobcentre and make it even harder for those seeking employment to get support; further that thousands of people could also have to travel further at additional cost to attend their appointments; further that the UK Government have brought forward these proposals without carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment and without consulting the Scottish Government; and further that any Jobcentre closures in Glasgow will see one of the most deprived parts of the UK starved of a vital service that should be available in communities; impacting both on Scottish workers at these centres and also those most disadvantaged in need of benefits.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to halt any moves to close Maryhill Jobcentre, or at the very least carry out an Equality Impact Assessment immediately prior to a full public consultation across Scotland.

And the petitioners remain, etc.

[P002005]

Close of Bridgeton Jobcentre

Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central) (SNP): The petition states:

Following is the full text of the petition:

[The petition of residents of Glasgow Central,

Declares that the Department for Work and Pensions' plan to close Bridgeton Jobcentre and half of all Jobcentre Plus offices in Glasgow is morally outrageous; express our concerns that the city is being used as the testing ground for more devastating cuts across the UK; further that the proposals to close eight of the 16 Jobcentre offices across Glasgow, will impact on tens of thousands of people in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, Employment Support Allowance and Universal Credit; further that the UK Government has already indicated that 20% of the Jobcentre estate will see closures, and Glasgow has been handpicked to take a disproportionate hit of 50% closures; further that it will result in the poorest communities not being serviced by a Jobcentre and make it even harder for

those seeking employment to get support; further that thousands of people could also have to travel further at additional cost to attend their appointments; further that the UK Government have brought forward these proposals without carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment and without consulting the Scottish Government; and further that any Jobcentre closures in Glasgow will see one of the most deprived parts of the UK starved of a vital service that should be available in communities; impacting both on Scottish workers at these centres and also those most disadvantaged in need of benefits.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to halt any moves to close Bridgeton Jobcentre, or at the very least carry out an Equality Impact Assessment immediately prior to a full public consultation across Scotland.

And the petitioners remain, etc.]

[P002006]

Closure of Anniesland Jobcentre

Carol Monaghan (Glasgow North West) (SNP): The petition states:

Following is the full text of the petition:

[The petition of residents of Glasgow North West,

Declares that the Department for Work and Pensions' plan to close Anniesland Jobcentre and half of all Jobcentre Plus offices in Glasgow is morally outrageous; express our concerns that the city is being used as the testing ground for more devastating cuts across the UK; further that the proposals to close eight of the 16 Jobcentre offices across Glasgow, will impact on tens of thousands of people in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, Employment Support Allowance and Universal Credit; further that the UK Government has already indicated that 20% of the Jobcentre estate will see closures, and Glasgow has been handpicked to take a disproportionate hit of 50% closures; further that it will result in the poorest communities not being serviced by a Jobcentre and make it even harder for those seeking employment to get support; further that thousands of people could also have to travel further at additional cost to attend their appointments; further that the UK Government have brought forward these proposals without carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment and without consulting the Scottish Government; and further that any Jobcentre closures in Glasgow will see one of the most deprived parts of the UK starved of a vital service that should be available in communities; impacting both on Scottish workers at these centres and also those most disadvantaged in need of benefits.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to halt any moves to close Anniesland Jobcentre, or at the very least carry out an Equality Impact Assessment immediately prior to a full public consultation across Scotland.

And the petitioners remain, etc.]

[P002008]

Closure of Jobcentres in Parkhead and Easterhouse

Natalie McGarry (Glasgow East) (Ind): The petition states:

Following is the full text of the petition:

[The petition of residents of Glasgow East,

Declares that the Department for Work and Pensions' plan to close Parkhead and Easterhouse Jobcentres and half of all Jobcentre Plus offices in Glasgow is morally outrageous; express our concerns that the city is being

used as the testing ground for more devastating cuts across the UK; further that the proposals to close eight of the 16 Jobcentre offices across Glasgow, will impact on tens of thousands of people in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, Employment Support Allowance and Universal Credit; further that the UK Government has already indicated that 20% of the Jobcentre estate will see closures, and Glasgow has been handpicked to take a disproportionate hit of 50% closures; further that it will result in the poorest communities not being serviced by a Jobcentre and make it even harder for those seeking employment to get support; further that thousands of people could also have to travel further at additional cost to attend their appointments; further that the UK Government have brought forward these proposals without carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment and without consulting the Scottish Government; and further that any Jobcentre closures in Glasgow will see one of the most deprived parts of the UK starved of a vital service that should be available in communities; impacting both on Scottish workers at these centres and also those most disadvantaged in need of benefits.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to halt any moves to close Parkhead and Easterhouse Jobcentres, or at the very least carry out an Equality Impact Assessment immediately prior to a full public consultation across Scotland.

And the petitioners remain, etc.]

[P002007]

Closure of Castlemilk and Langside Jobcentres

Stewart Malcolm McDonald (Glasgow South) (SNP): In similar terms to the petitions lodged by my colleagues, the constituents of Glasgow wish to petition that the Department for Work and Pensions halt the sham of a proposal to close half the city's jobcentres, including the two in my constituency in Castlemilk and Langside. They should get a grip of themselves and get back round the table.

Following is the full text of the petition:

[The petition of residents of Glasgow South,

Declares that the Department for Work and Pensions' plan to close Castlemilk and Langside Jobcentres and half of all Jobcentre Plus offices in Glasgow is morally outrageous; express our concerns that the city is being used as the testing ground for more devastating cuts across the UK; further that the proposals to close eight of the 16 Jobcentre offices across Glasgow, will impact on tens of thousands of people in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance, Employment Support Allowance and Universal Credit; further that the UK Government has already indicated that 20% of the Jobcentre estate will see closures, and Glasgow has been handpicked to take a disproportionate hit of 50% closures; further that it will result in the poorest communities not being serviced by a Jobcentre and make it even harder for those seeking employment to get support; further that thousands of people could also have to travel further at additional cost to attend their

appointments; further that the UK Government have brought forward these proposals without carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment and without consulting the Scottish Government; and further that any Jobcentre closures in Glasgow will see one of the most deprived parts of the UK starved of a vital service that should be available in communities; impacting both on Scottish workers at these centres and also those most disadvantaged in need of benefits.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to halt any moves to close Castlemilk and Langside Jobcentres, or at the very least carry out an Equality Impact Assessment immediately prior to a full public consultation across Scotland.

And the petitioners remain, etc.]

[P002012]

Construction of an A36-46 link road, east of Bath

Ben Howlett (Bath) (Con): I am grateful to be able to present a petition to the House tonight on the construction of an A36-46 link road, east of Bath. I present the petition on behalf of residents of Bath and the wider north-east Somerset area. The petition has attracted 2,846 signatures from the concerned residents. I thank all of those who have signed the petition in support of the link road.

Following is the full text of the petition:

[The petition of residents of Bath and the wider North East Somerset Area,

Declares that transport networks in Bath need improvement to reduce congestion in the area; further that a link road between the A36 and A46 should be built; further that an A36-46 link road would provide economic benefit to Bath; further that it would improve transportation links; and further that it would reduce congestion and air pollution.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges the Government to work with Bath and North East Somerset Council and Highways England to bring this long discussed and much needed project of building an A36-46 link road to fruition.

And the petitioners remain, etc.]

[P002010]

Post office in Westcliffe, Scunthorpe

Nic Dakin (Scunthorpe) (Lab): Post offices are very important and are at the heart of communities. The proposals to close the post office on the Westcliff Estate in my constituency are greatly opposed by local residents.

The petition states:

The petition of residents of Scunthorpe County,

Declares that residents are opposed to the closure of the Post Office branch on the Westcliff Estate in Scunthorpe.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urges North Lincolnshire Council to work with residents of the Westcliff Estate in Scunthorpe to try and stop the closure of the Post Office.

And the petitioners remain, etc.

[P002009]

Educational Attainment: Oldham

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(Guy Opperman.)

8.26 pm

Jim McMahon (Oldham West and Royton) (Lab): It feels odd to have an Adjournment debate on such an historic day for our country. I suspect we are in for a long period of scrutiny, review and challenge. It is also a very important day for me personally, as it is my son's 15th birthday. He was the reason I came into politics and he amazes me every day.

"Oldham kids can be the best in the world and they can aim as high as they want." That was the message from Baroness Estelle Morris on the launch of the Oldham Education and Skills Commission. For many years, we saw the fragmentation of education, with a diminishing role for the local education authority. In part, that led to a deferral of responsibility for education in academies and free schools at local level. The commission reviewed this in great detail and the message was simple: for education to be the best it must become everybody's business. Regardless of the type of school they attend, they are our children, our future and our collective responsibility. Even with a complex system of education, there was a collective desire to see standards in Oldham improve. The town needed a joined-up plan—not many different plans that might conflict with each other, but a single vision for what the future could be. Critically, this included early years, primary, secondary, further and higher education, as well as lifelong learning.

When others talk about Oldham they do not always present an accurate picture of our education system. There are some problems, and we acknowledge them in an honest and open way, but there are also reasons to be proud of what has been achieved. Since 2012, Oldham has seen a positive improvement in the proportion of pupils reaching the expected standard—up from 51% to 76%. We accept fully that there is room for improvement, but it should be recognised that progress has been made. The number of primary schools judged good or outstanding has increased from 80% to 95% in just three years. Our secondary schools must do much better, but we should acknowledge that they too have seen an improvement, with the percentage of schools judged good or outstanding increasing from 22% to 62%.

I pay tribute to parents, students, teachers, governors and the local authority for the great strides that have been made, but I am unrelenting in my ambition for that positive experience to be available to all young people in Oldham, not just the lucky ones. All our young people must be given the best possible start in life, a life which will be better but more complicated than ever before. The world is more complicated than ever before. It will be challenging for them to be in an ultra-competitive environment. They will have to be the best they can be.

The Oldham Education and Skills Commission proposed 19 recommendations that would form the foundation of the vision for a "self-improving education system". It also brought forward two local performance indicators, which sought to meet the ambition for all young people to get on in life and do well. The first was that all national performance indicators be met at the national average or beyond by 2020. The second was that all

Oldham education providers be judged as "good" or "outstanding" by Ofsted by 2020. I am sure the Minister would concur with that ambition. The commission outlined its vision in detail in a report published in 2016, and I know that the Minister has taken the time to read it. I greatly appreciate the time he spent doing that and meeting me and my hon. Friend the Member for Oldham East and Saddleworth (Debbie Abrahams). We discussed in that meeting how we could work together on this.

The Minister will be aware that the Government have selected Oldham, along with five other towns, to be an opportunity area for social inclusion, meaning that it will share the £60 million that has been allocated. I want to be fair and balanced, because education in Oldham is so important that I am not willing to create artificial political dividing lines, if we can work together positively. However, as you would expect, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will be challenging those concerned where I think a decision has been made that runs counter to the interests of young people in Oldham. I hope that with that mature relationship we can work across parties to achieve our aim.

For Oldham to do well in a sustained way, it must have the strongest possible foundations on which to build. That means clear leadership, adequate resourcing and collective responsibility—and of course that goes beyond individual schools.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I know that this debate is about Oldham, but this issue applies across the whole of the United Kingdom. Does the hon. Gentleman agree that educational attainment must incorporate not simply grades in academic subjects, but vocational skills, such as mechanics and joinery, and that schools must support those skills of a practical nature so that, whatever their vocation in life, young people are prepared?

Jim McMahon: I absolutely concur. I was an apprentice myself. It gave me the chance of a career and options that I did not have when I was going through the schools system. For a lot of working class kids in particular, a technical vocation means that they can live a decent life with a well-paid job.

As we are clear in our vision for what the town can be, we must also be clear about what our town should not be. Over the last two weeks alone, we have seen the removal of a free school sponsor and, this week, the closure of the university technical college. Every school and college will see a cut to its core budget, and in many places the facilities are simply not fit for modern learning, let alone an inspiring environment fit for our young people. We are left hanging while we wait for the delayed area based review, which has left many colleges in the area not knowing what the future will be. We have not had a meaningful discussion about the future and introduction of new independent faith schools for the town either. We are also left with many unanswered questions about the failure of the Collective Spirit free school and the closure of the £9 million UTC, where not a single child gained the required GCSE results.

I commend the inclusive approach from the regional schools commissioner, but the sheer scale of the challenge is huge and the resources limited. As Vicky Beer moves on to pastures new, there is concern about whether the new commissioner will make the same effort to reach out to local MPs.

There are still many unanswered questions about the financial practices at the Collective Spirit free school, and they need to be answered, not just for sake of the school and the town, but because it might expose more fundamental weaknesses in the academy and free schools system. For a period, the school's director was also the sole director of a trading company that provided services to that school and another one in Manchester. Collectively, it invoiced for £500,000 of services. Rules from the Department for Education and the Education Funding Agency allow connected party transactions, providing they are provided at cost.

The problem is that, providing the contractor can prove that every penny invoiced was spent, the EFA seems happy to sign it off as within scope. It does not account, however, for where the money eventually goes. For example, a school could trade to a company behind which another company with the same directors is invoicing to get the money out the door. Technically, that meets the criteria—that these limited trading companies should offer an at-cost provision—but it does not tell us how £500,000 of public money has been spent by a relatively small school.

We have asked the questions. I submitted a dossier to the regional schools commissioner last year. That came to me as a result of the bravery of whistleblowers—people who were involved in the school and were concerned about the financial practices going on there and wanted to expose them. I understand that the EFA carried out a review, but it has not been made public, and there is nothing on the website to say what the conclusion was. The public have no way of knowing, either from the EFA, the school website or Companies House which individuals and which companies benefited from those contracts.

No breakdown has been provided, and I suspect that that problem is not limited to this school alone; it is potentially a much wider problem. So today, along with my hon. Friend the Member for Manchester Central (Lucy Powell), I have written to the National Audit Office in order to provide confidence that the money invoiced into those trading companies was spent on the education of the young people attending the school. When I mention a breakdown, I do not mean just a breakdown of service headings provided at the school; what we want to know is whether invoices can be provided that demonstrate that those services were provided, whether the invoices related to another company and whether connected parties were involved.

My question is this: in the interests of getting the best deal for taxpayers, will the Minister lend his support to ensuring that this review is carried out in a full and meaningful way, and that its results will be published so that the public can make up their own minds? That will lead to one of two things. Either it will prove that the whistleblowers were right and that financial practices were taking place that were not in the interests of the young people at the school; or it will prove that everything was above board, the school adhered to the rules and the money was spent appropriately. It will provide the opportunity to set the record straight, irrespective of what the result of the review turns out to be.

We have talked about the Education and Skills Commission, the issue of the Collective Spirit free school and the information that is still outstanding, so let us now move on quickly to the university technical

college. This was a flagship college, with £9 million of public money spent on it. Oldham college gifted land to enable it to happen. I absolutely agree with the principle of wanting to look at things differently and try out new ideas. However, it is not acceptable that the young people who were students there have left school without the required qualifications, thus not achieving their full potential. Again, therefore, I ask the Minister for his support to make sure that if young people have been let down and have not reached their full potential—I must say that the local authorities have been extremely supportive in this matter—they are supported to re-sit their exams.

I also ask the Minister formally to sign up to the efforts and recommendations of the Oldham Education and Skills Commission. That is necessary because there is a danger, as we have seen with the free school and the UTC, of the opportunity area becoming a one-size-fits-all, centrally dictated model that is imposed on Oldham because it shows up as an area that needs intervention. If that happens out of context, and not in line with the Education and Skills Commission findings, it will really be a missed opportunity that will not reflect the significant work that has already taken place, and it will not ensure that the money already provided is used to best effect.

My strong view is that the teaching professionals, the parents, the students and the local authority can, by working together, regardless of the structure of the schools involved, genuinely transform educational outcomes for young people in Oldham, provided that they do so as part of a single plan, instead of through contradictory plans.

I also ask for the area-based review of education to be concluded and, importantly, that a democratic vote takes place in each of the local authorities involved. There is concern that the pressure is coming from central Government, and that the decision will be made by the combined authority before the mayoral elections. At the moment, the combined authority is not a directly elected body, and it is important that those who are elected by their communities have a say on the area-based review, especially if it means fundamental changes to Oldham College.

I ask that current funding arrangements, the review and the consultation take into account areas of high deprivation, particular areas with high in-migration and where a high number of youngsters and parents have English as a second language. We know that that requires additional support. I ask, too, that the former UTC building be transferred to Oldham College, to support the ageing campus on Rochdale Road and benefit Oldham College students. It cost a significant amount of public money, and could still be used to benefit Oldham children. I think that Oldham College is best placed to provide education from that building.

We should not allow a UTC to fail, thus preventing children from realising their potential, without fully understanding the reasons for that failure. I ask the Government to review the project and publish the lessons that could be learned, in order to ensure that the same thing does not happen again. I repeat my call for a review of the performance of Collective Spirit free school, and of the due diligence that was exercised in the selection of the sponsor. However, it is even more important for the financial concerns expressed by whistleblowers to be addressed in a public report.

[Jim McMahon]

Finally—a word that Members may be pleased to hear—I ask the Minister to consider the devolution of education to Greater Manchester. The move away from local education authorities has been detrimental to education standards in my town. When there is local control, people know where to go to get answers if schools are not performing well, and when they come together and support each other, it is like a family relationship. We are not seeing that now. What we are seeing is a fragmentation of education, which I do not believe is in the interests of the people of Oldham.

Devolution to Greater Manchester would provide a potential framework for a compromise—not a return to a local education authority arrangement that the Government clearly do not support, but a new model involving a combined authority with a directly elected Mayor. My view is really quite simple. If we trust the combined authority and the new Mayor from May onwards to get on with running the health service and social care, justice, policing, fire, transport and housing, we ought to trust them to get on with sorting out the education system in Greater Manchester. If we could do that, we could team and ladle skills across Greater Manchester, so that areas in need of that support and capacity at local level could realise their full potential.

What I have said is not intended to be an overt criticism of the Government, although there may be differences between us. I want the Minister to take on board that there are local Members of Parliament who care passionately about Oldham and want to invest time and education to ensure that it can be the best that it can be, while also recognising that we may have to meet in the middle.

8.42 pm

The Minister for School Standards (Mr Nick Gibb): I congratulate the hon. Member for Oldham West and Royton (Jim McMahon) on securing the debate. I agree with him about the historic nature of today. Let me also offer my congratulations to his son on turning 15.

As the Prime Minister has said, the Government want to create a true meritocracy in this country, and there is no more important place to start than education. I was pleased to meet the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues in the Oldham area, when we were able to discuss how we could work together to raise education standards in the town, and also to discuss the Oldham Education and Skills Commission. I enjoyed reading its report.

According to the Government's policy for school improvement, a high-performing education system must be driven by the best school leaders. Teachers and senior leaders should be free to innovate and improve standards in their own schools, driven by a genuine sense of responsibility to share knowledge with their peers, and swift and fearless in challenging failure wherever they find it. In turn, the Government have an important role to play in helping the best teachers and headteachers to lead the system.

Teaching practice, and what is taught in the classroom, should be determined solely by evidence. The Government, school leaders and teachers share responsibility for seeking to learn from those who teach in the best

schools in England, and in higher performing systems internationally. One example is the Government's reforms of primary education, and particularly the much needed drive to improve early literacy through systematic synthetic phonics and the essentials—spelling, punctuation and grammar. Another is the adoption of the south-east Asian “mastery” approach to maths teaching, with its emphasis on fluency in mental and written calculation and its refusal to allow any pupil to fall behind.

Those are critical education reforms, and they share an important characteristic with our third principle. A high-performing education system must provide opportunities for all pupils to achieve their potential, and no children should enter education with the odds already stacked against them simply because of who their family are or where they are growing up. Despite all the evidence on what makes a difference, our society remains unequal. The effects of this inequality are evident in the social mobility index, published last year by the Social Mobility Commission. Its indicators illustrated the daunting barriers faced by children in Oldham and other areas identified as coldspots for social mobility. The Government's selection of Oldham and 11 other coldspots as opportunity areas represents an important commitment to those children.

We are making significant investments in each opportunity area, through new funding and access to additional support from the Department's existing improvement programmes. This expenditure will, in line with our principles, be determined through rigorous assessment of specific barriers to social mobility and be based on evidence of what works in education. Our approach to removing these barriers must involve working with all schools and local partners who share our goal, with the support of the most effective system leaders. I am therefore very grateful to the hon. Gentleman for the foundations he and his colleagues have laid in Oldham, and for this opportunity to confirm the Government's commitment to Oldham and the other opportunity areas, and to discuss with the House our approach to improving education across the country.

The reforms of the last six years show that professional autonomy combined with strong accountability is delivering improvement in our education system. Academy leaders benefit from that autonomy. The latest data show that 10 of the 26 academies in Oldham have been inspected since they opened. All those with more than one inspection since opening have maintained or improved their Ofsted grades.

We want to see good schools choosing academy status as a positive choice, and we expect academies and academy sponsors to play their part in Oldham and the other opportunity areas. We know that strong sponsors with commitment, drive and the right resources can drive up standards in a school. The recent report by Sir Nick Weller on education standards in the north endorsed the role of strong sponsors and strong partnerships. There is, however, despite improvement across academy and maintained schools in Oldham, a clear need for further improvement, particularly at secondary level.

We have seen how being a multi-academy trust can provide opportunities to bring together educational expertise and develop and trial innovative new approaches. We will want to support new and existing MATs to

develop in Oldham, and ensure that knowledge and approaches developed in those MATs are shared across Oldham's schools, to drive up performance.

A school-led system is, of course, not just one in which headteachers can drive up standards in their own school, but also one that enables them to support each other, and challenge each other to improve. Oldham now has six teaching schools. All were selected because of their strong leadership and their commitment to helping partner schools in Oldham develop knowledgeable teachers and excellent teaching practices. There are also nine national leaders of education working with schools in Oldham—leaders such as Julie Hollis, headteacher of Oldham's Blue Coat academy, a teaching school and an outstanding school with very high EBacc attainment figures.

Julie, her team, and the many other national leaders of education, senior leaders of education and national leaders of governance in Oldham and across the country are our system leaders. One of the reasons we can be confident that the opportunity areas will be successful is that we can already look with pride to their record of achievement, and their continuing appetite to support and drive improvement across the system.

We must, however, acknowledge the stark reality that, despite the hard work and achievements of our headteachers and system leaders, children growing up in Oldham and other opportunity areas are still less likely to attend an outstanding school, or to gain the qualifications they need to progress to higher education, training or the best jobs. They are still being left behind, and they start falling behind even before they start school. There can be no argument with the hon. Gentleman's own clear and damning judgment: in his introduction to the Oldham Education and Skills Commission's report, he stated that this

"Unfulfilled talent is criminal. It wastes...public money and blights families and communities."

We are, therefore, as one in our recognition of the need to act, and in our commitment to supporting improvements.

As the hon. Gentleman mentioned, we have already announced new funding for the opportunity areas, and

have confirmed that additional support will be made available through national improvement programmes, such as the new teaching and leadership innovation fund. Also, £1 million from the careers and enterprise investment fund will go towards improving the quality of advice and guidance given to pupils in opportunity areas. Together, these extra Government resources, combined with the local commitment embodied by the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues, will make the difference that we all want to see in Oldham.

I shall refer to the issues that the hon. Gentleman raised during the debate. The academy trust has agreed with the regional schools commissioner that the Collective Spirit free school and Manchester Creative Studio School should join new multi-academy trusts. Our priority is to ensure that pupils receive high-quality education, and we are working with the trusts to ensure that there are swift improvements. I will ensure that the hon. Gentleman's concerns about conflicts of interest in the trust are investigated.

The closure of Greater Manchester University Technical College was not a decision that was taken lightly. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that our priority is the education and welfare of the UTC's pupils. We are working closely with local schools and colleges to ensure that significant support from the local authority enables pupils to continue and progress in their studies. I am grateful to the new Greater Manchester UTC trustees who have stepped in to ensure that this happens, and that action is taken in the best interests of the pupils and their parents.

In conclusion, the hon. Gentleman is right to highlight the challenges in Oldham. I hope that I have assured him and the House that we share his commitment to tackling those challenges. We look forward to working with him and other Members in the area, and with local partners, to transform educational attainment in Oldham.

Question put and agreed to.

8.51 pm

House adjourned.

Deferred Divisions

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Important Public Services (Education) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 327, Noes 264.

Division No. 145]

AYES

Adams, Nigel
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Allen, Heidi
Amess, Sir David
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Barwell, Gavin
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Berry, James
Bingham, Andrew
Blackman, Bob
Blackwood, Nicola
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Borwick, Victoria
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Mr Graham
Brazier, Sir Julian
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burns, Conor
Burns, rh Sir Simon
Burrowes, Mr David
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Carmichael, Neil
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chope, Mr Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Colvile, Oliver
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen

Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Byron
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinenage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Elliott, Tom
Ellis, Michael
Ellison, Jane
Ellwood, Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Graham
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Fernandes, Suella
Field, rh Mark
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Marcus
Gale, Sir Roger
Garnier, rh Sir Edward
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Nusrat
Gibb, rh Mr Nick
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian

Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gummer, rh Ben
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, rh Mr Philip
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harrington, Richard
Harris, Rebecca
Hart, Simon
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Hermon, Lady
Hinds, Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Hopkins, Kris
Howarth, Sir Gerald
Howell, John
Howlett, Ben
Huddleston, Nigel
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, Mr Nick
Jackson, Mr Stewart
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Jenkyns, Andrea
Jenrick, Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnson, Joseph
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Mr Marcus
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kennedy, Seema
Kinahan, Danny
Kirby, Simon
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lancaster, Mark
Latham, Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Leslie, Charlotte
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Jonathan
Loughton, Tim

Mackinlay, Craig
Mackintosh, David
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Mr Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Mathias, Dr Tania
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Mordaunt, Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mowat, David
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, Caroline
Norman, Jesse
Nuttall, Mr David
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Osborne, rh Mr George
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, Claire
Philp, Chris
Pickles, rh Sir Eric
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Daniel
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Mr Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant

Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig

Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly

MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth

Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan

Shuker, Mr Gavin	Trickett, Jon
Skinner, Mr Dennis	Turley, Anna
Slaughter, Andy	Turner, Karl
Smith, rh Mr Andrew	Twigg, Derek
Smith, Angela	Twigg, Stephen
Smith, Cat	Umunna, Mr Chuka
Smith, Jeff	Vaz, rh Keith
Smith, Nick	Vaz, Valerie
Smith, Owen	Weir, Mike
Smyth, Karin	West, Catherine
Spellar, rh Mr John	Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
Stephens, Chris	Whitehead, Dr Alan
Stevens, Jo	Whitford, Dr Philippa
Streeting, Wes	Williams, Hywel
Stringer, Graham	Williams, Mr Mark
Stuart, rh Ms Gisela	Wilson, Corri
Tami, Mark	Wilson, Phil
Thewliss, Alison	Winnick, Mr David
Thomas, Mr Gareth	Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
Thomas-Symonds, Nick	Wishart, Pete
Thompson, Owen	Woodcock, John
Thomson, Michelle	Wright, Mr Iain
Thornberry, Emily	Zeichner, Daniel
Timms, rh Stephen	

Question accordingly agreed to.

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Important Public Services (Transport) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 328, Noes 263.

Division No. 146]

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Buckland, Robert
Afriyie, Adam	Burns, Conor
Aldous, Peter	Burns, rh Sir Simon
Allan, Lucy	Burrowes, Mr David
Allen, Heidi	Burt, rh Alistair
Amess, Sir David	Cairns, rh Alun
Andrew, Stuart	Campbell, Mr Gregory
Ansell, Caroline	Carmichael, Neil
Argar, Edward	Cartlidge, James
Atkins, Victoria	Cash, Sir William
Baker, Mr Steve	Caulfield, Maria
Baldwin, Harriett	Chalk, Alex
Barclay, Stephen	Chope, Mr Christopher
Baron, Mr John	Churchill, Jo
Barwell, Gavin	Clark, rh Greg
Bebb, Guto	Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Bellingham, Sir Henry	Cleverly, James
Benyon, Richard	Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
Beresford, Sir Paul	Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Berry, Jake	Collins, Damian
Berry, James	Colville, Oliver
Bingham, Andrew	Costa, Alberto
Blackman, Bob	Courts, Robert
Blackwood, Nicola	Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Blunt, Crispin	Crabb, rh Stephen
Boles, Nick	Crouch, Tracey
Bone, Mr Peter	Davies, Byron
Borwick, Victoria	Davies, Chris
Bradley, rh Karen	Davies, David T. C.
Brady, Mr Graham	Davies, Glyn
Brazier, Sir Julian	Davies, Dr James
Bridgen, Andrew	Davies, Mims
Brine, Steve	Davis, rh Mr David
Brokenshire, rh James	Dinenage, Caroline
Bruce, Fiona	Djanogly, Mr Jonathan

Dodds, rh Mr Nigel	Hermon, Lady
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hillier, Meg
Donelan, Michelle	Hinds, Damian
Dorries, Nadine	Hoare, Simon
Double, Steve	Hollingbery, George
Dowden, Oliver	Hollinrake, Kevin
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Hollobone, Mr Philip
Drax, Richard	Hopkins, Kris
Drummond, Mrs Flick	Howarth, Sir Gerald
Duddridge, James	Howell, John
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Howlett, Ben
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Huddleston, Nigel
Dunne, Mr Philip	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Elliott, Tom	Hurd, Mr Nick
Ellis, Michael	Jackson, Mr Stewart
Ellison, Jane	James, Margot
Ellwood, Mr Tobias	Javid, rh Sajid
Elphicke, Charlie	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Eustice, George	Jenkin, Mr Bernard
Evans, Graham	Jenkyns, Andrea
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jenrick, Robert
Evennett, rh David	Johnson, rh Boris
Fabricant, Michael	Johnson, Dr Caroline
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Johnson, Gareth
Fernandes, Suella	Johnson, Joseph
Field, rh Mark	Jones, Andrew
Foster, Kevin	Jones, rh Mr David
Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, Mr Marcus
Francois, rh Mr Mark	Kawczynski, Daniel
Frazer, Lucy	Kennedy, Seema
Freeman, George	Kinahan, Danny
Freer, Mike	Kirby, Simon
Fuller, Richard	Knight, rh Sir Greg
Fysh, Marcus	Knight, Julian
Gale, Sir Roger	Kwarteng, Kwasi
Garnier, rh Sir Edward	Lancaster, Mark
Garnier, Mark	Latham, Pauline
Gauke, rh Mr David	Leadsom, rh Andrea
Ghani, Nusrat	Lee, Dr Phillip
Gibb, rh Mr Nick	Lefroy, Jeremy
Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl	Leigh, Sir Edward
Glen, John	Leslie, Charlotte
Goodwill, Mr Robert	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Gove, rh Michael	Lewis, rh Brandon
Graham, Richard	Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Grant, Mrs Helen	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Gray, James	Lidington, rh Mr David
Grayling, rh Chris	Lilley, rh Mr Peter
Green, Chris	Lopresti, Jack
Green, rh Damian	Lord, Jonathan
Greening, rh Justine	Loughton, Tim
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic	Loughlin, Craig
Griffiths, Andrew	Mackintosh, David
Gummer, rh Ben	Main, Mrs Anne
Gyimah, Mr Sam	Mak, Mr Alan
Halfon, rh Robert	Malthouse, Kit
Hall, Luke	Mann, Scott
Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Mathias, Dr Tania
Hammond, Stephen	May, rh Mrs Theresa
Hancock, rh Matt	Maynard, Paul
Hands, rh Greg	McCartney, Jason
Harper, rh Mr Mark	McCartney, Karl
Harrington, Richard	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
Harris, Rebecca	McPartland, Stephen
Hart, Simon	Menzies, Mark
Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan	Mercer, Johnny
Hayes, rh Mr John	Merriman, Huw
Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Metcalfe, Stephen
Heapey, James	Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Heaton-Harris, Chris	Milling, Amanda
Heaton-Jones, Peter	Mills, Nigel
Henderson, Gordon	Milton, rh Anne

Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry

Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin

Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom

Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia

Glendon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie

McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy

Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colville, Oliver
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael

Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hermon, Lady
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkins, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David

Question accordingly agreed to.

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Important Public Services (Health) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 323, Noes 263.

Division No. 147]

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Baker, Mr Steve

Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Bingham, Andrew

Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris

Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen

Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggins, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin

Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint

Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana

Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Kane, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess

Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Important Public Services (Border Security) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 323, Noes 263.

Division No. 148]**AYES**

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Bingham, Andrew
 Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colville, Oliver
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron

Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert

Question accordingly agreed to.

Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hermon, Lady
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott

Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston

Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom

Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah

Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret

Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon

Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen

Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek

Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

Question accordingly agreed to.

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Important Public Services (Fire) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 323, Noes 262.

Division No. 149]

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Bingham, Andrew
 Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair

Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colville, Oliver
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinanage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James

Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hermon, Lady
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy

Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah

Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew

Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom

Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brake, rh Tom
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie

Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clegg, rh Mr Nick
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mulholland, Greg
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin

Nicolson, John
 Olney, Sarah
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Pugh, John
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff

Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Mr Mark
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

Question accordingly agreed to.

TRADE UNIONS

That the draft Trade Union Act 2016 (Political Funds) (Transition Period) Regulations 2017, which were laid before this House on 5 December 2016, be approved.

The House divided: Ayes 322, Noes 254.

Division No. 150]

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Bingham, Andrew
 Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert

Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colvile, Oliver
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dineneage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey
 M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr
 Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Mark
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark

Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hermon, Lady
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkins, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip

Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence

Robinson, Gavin
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Stride, Mel
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wragg, William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Alexander, Heidi
 Ali, Rushanara
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blomfield, Paul
 Boswell, Philip
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burden, Richard
 Burgon, Richard
 Burnham, rh Andy
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Jenny
 Cherry, Joanna
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crausby, Sir David
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dugher, Michael
 Durkan, Mark
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Mrs Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Ffello, Robert
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendrick, Mr Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Kendall, Liz
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Leslie, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan

Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marris, Rob
 Marsden, Gordon
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGarry, Natalie
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Morden, Jessica
 Mullin, Roger
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rotheram, Steve
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Streeting, Wes
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Thornberry, Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Corri
 Wilson, Phil
 Winnick, Mr David
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Zeichner, Daniel

*Question accordingly agreed to.*COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC TRADE AGREEMENT
(CETA) BETWEEN THE EU AND CANADA

That this House has considered European Union Documents No. 10968/16 and Addenda 1 to 16, a Proposal for a Council Decision on the signing of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the European Union and its Member States, No. 10969/16 and Addenda 1 to 16, a Proposal for a Council Decision on the provisional application of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the European Union and its Member States, and No. 10970/16 and Addenda 1 to 16, a Proposal for a Council Decision on the conclusion of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the European Union and its Member States.

The House divided: Ayes 409, Noes 126.

Division No. 151]

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Amess, Sir David
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Barron, rh Sir Kevin
 Barwell, Gavin
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berger, Luciana
 Berry, Jake
 Berry, James
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Bingham, Andrew
 Blackman, Bob
 Blackwood, Nicola
 Blenkinsop, Tom
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Borwick, Victoria
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brady, Mr Graham
 Brazier, Sir Julian
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Bryant, Chris
 Buckland, Robert
 Burns, Conor
 Burns, rh Sir Simon
 Burrowes, Mr David
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carmichael, Neil
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chapman, Jenny
 Chope, Mr Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Geoffrey

Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Colville, Oliver
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Coyle, Neil
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crausby, Sir David
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon
 Dakin, Nic
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Byron
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Dodds, rh Mr Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowd, Peter
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Dugher, Michael
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Elliott, Julie
 Elliott, Tom
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellison, Jane
 Ellwood, Mr Tobias
 Elmore, Chris
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Chris
 Evans, Graham
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Fernandes, Suella
 Field, rh Mark
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Foster, Kevin
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy

Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Gapes, Mike
 Garnier, rh Sir Edward
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Mr Nick
 Gillan, rh Mrs Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Green, Kate
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gummer, rh Ben
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Haigh, Louise
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hammond, rh Mr Philip
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Hanson, rh Mr David
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harrington, Richard
 Harris, Carolyn
 Harris, Rebecca
 Hart, Simon
 Haselhurst, rh Sir Alan
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Hermon, Lady
 Hinds, Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Hopkins, Kris
 Howarth, Sir Gerald
 Howell, John
 Howlett, Ben
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, Mr Nick
 Jackson, Mr Stewart
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Mr Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, Robert
 Johnson, rh Alan
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth

Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Graham
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, Mr Kevan
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kane, Mike
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kendall, Liz
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kinahan, Danny
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kirby, Simon
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Kyle, Peter
 Lancaster, Mark
 Latham, Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Leslie, Charlotte
 Leslie, Chris
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Lilley, rh Mr Peter
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackintosh, David
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Mr Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott
 Matheson, Christian
 Mathias, Dr Tania
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McDonnell, Dr Alasdair
 McDonnell, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Mordaunt, Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David

Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mowat, David
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 Nuttall, Mr David
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Osborne, rh Mr George
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Mike
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perkins, Toby
 Perry, Claire
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Philp, Chris
 Pickles, rh Sir Eric
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Daniel
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Mr Dominic
 Rayner, Angela
 Redwood, rh John
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, Julian
 Smith, Owen

Smith, Royston
 Smyth, Karin
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Solloway, Amanda
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spellar, rh Mr John
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Streeter, Mr Gary
 Streeting, Wes
 Stride, Mel
 Stuart, rh Ms Gisela
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Mr Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thornberry, Emily
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Mr Andrew
 Tyrie, rh Mr Andrew
 Umunna, Mr Chuka
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Mrs Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watkinson, Dame Angela
 Wharton, James
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Heather
 White, Chris
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, Phil
 Wilson, Mr Rob
 Wilson, Sammy
 Winterton, rh Dame Rosie
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Woodcock, John
 Wragg, William
 Wright, Mr Iain
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

NOES

Abbott, Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ahmed-Sheikh, Ms Tasmina
 Anderson, Mr David
 Arkless, Richard
 Bardell, Hannah
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, Ian
 Boswell, Philip
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Cherry, Joanna
 Cooper, Rosie
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Crawley, Angela
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Piero, Gloria
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Donaldson, Stuart Blair
 Durkan, Mark
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Esterson, Bill
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Field, rh Frank
 Ffello, Robert
 Flynn, Paul
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Glendon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hillier, Meg
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Hosie, Stewart
 Hussain, Imran
 Jones, Gerald
 Kerevan, George
 Kerr, Calum
 Lavery, Ian

Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 MacNeil, Mr Angus Brendan
 Mactaggart, rh Fiona
 Madders, Justin
 Marris, Rob
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCaig, Callum
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McGarry, Natalie
 McInnes, Liz
 McLaughlin, Anne
 Mearns, Ian
 Monaghan, Carol
 Monaghan, Dr Paul
 Mullin, Roger
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nicolson, John
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Albert
 Paterson, Steven
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rees, Christina
 Rimmer, Marie
 Ritchie, Ms Margaret
 Robertson, rh Angus
 Rotheram, Steve
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Smith, rh Mr Andrew
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Stephens, Chris
 Stringer, Graham
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Mr Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Michelle
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Weir, Mike
 West, Catherine
 Whiteford, Dr Eilidh
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Corri
 Wishart, Pete
 Zeichner, Daniel

Question accordingly agreed to.

Westminster Hall

Wednesday 8 February 2017

[MRS CHERYL GILLAN *in the Chair*]

Low-Cost housing

9.30 am

John Penrose (Weston-super-Mare) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered low cost housing.

It is good to have you looking after us this morning, Mrs Gillan. It is also good to see the departmental Whip in her place—she is a fully-fledged Minister in her own right anyway. As a former Whip, I feel it is always good to see a Whip temporarily released from the office's vow of omerta and allowed to show their knowledge of the area they cover for the Whips Office.

Housing, whether rent or mortgage payments, is probably the single biggest monthly bill that most of us face and because we have not, as a country, built enough new houses for decades, no matter who has been in Government, the costs have been getting steadily steeper. The result is less living space, longer commutes, less cash left over at the end of each month for other things and, overall, a lower quality of life for all of us. We need to increase the number of new homes that are built and yesterday's welcome White Paper contains some important steps towards that goal. Most important, from my point of view, were the ideas to make it easier to build up, not out, in urban areas—greater housing density, in the jargon.

Anyone walking around most British town centres, passing train stations or high street shops, should look upwards. The chances are that they will mostly see fresh air—skyline. British towns and cities are some of the most low-rise in Europe, which seems bonkers for a country that is also one of the most crowded. Much of this is self-inflicted. For many Brits taller buildings create instant mental images of 1960s brutalist concrete tower blocks on sink estates—the backdrops for gritty dramas of social decay from left-wing film auteurs. This mental trope has had some real-world consequences for the country too because it means that we are, as a society, instinctively resistant to anyone who proposes building upwards. So let me sing a fierce anthem of praise for taller buildings—not necessarily brutalist tower blocks, although they have their admirers, but for elegant, well-proportioned apartment blocks and terraces where the design stands the test of time.

Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP): I thank the hon. Gentleman for giving way and apologise for interrupting him as he gets to the chorus of his eloquent speech. He talks about the need to build upwards. Does he agree—he has alluded to the '60s-style connotations that building upwards has for many people—that we need to have planning forethought in terms of what buildings will be like in 20 or 30 years' time so that we do not repeat the mistakes of the 1950s and 1960s?

John Penrose: That is absolutely right. There are some people who, from a purely aesthetic point of view, love brutalist concrete architecture and rather more who dislike it a lot. For most of the rest of us, one of the crucial tests is not merely the aesthetics but whether this stuff remains liveable, not only in the first few years after it is built but over many generations. Another is whether it is therefore acceptable to the rest of the community. It is not just a question of what somewhere is like to live in as a location; it also has an impact on other people as they walk past.

As the hon. Gentleman said, it depends on how the design stands the test of time. There are places such as four or five-storey Regency terraces and Victorian town houses, which people still want to live in and walk past a century or two after they were built, or their slightly taller and more modern equivalents, which provide trendy new city centre living space for young professionals or well-designed retirement homes for older folk. We do not need to be scared of these buildings. One of the densest urban areas in Britain is Kensington and Chelsea, which is hardly a byword for inner-city decay. Elegant continental cities such as Paris and Madrid are far denser than almost anywhere in Britain too.

Dr Rupa Huq (Ealing Central and Acton) (Lab): I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for giving way; he is giving a very powerful speech so I am loth to interrupt him. He mentioned the international comparisons and Kensington and Chelsea, but I think he is missing the suburbs. I represent a suburban seat. He said that housing is the single biggest bill, but it is also the single biggest issue in surgeries. I had a candidate stand against me as a “no to tall buildings” person. His slogan was, “We want to be living in Acton, not in Manhattan.” Has the hon. Gentleman had similar experiences as a constituency MP? People just do not like these buildings; they crowd out light and are not in keeping with the suburban landscape.

Mrs Cheryl Gillan (in the Chair): Order. May I remind Members that interventions are supposed to be short and not too discursive?

John Penrose: The hon. Lady just gave a classic example of this instinctive British fear. I have discovered that in general if people see a beautiful building that is well-designed and moderately, but not too enormously, tall—Manhattan being an example of where things are incredibly tall—many of those concerns are greatly reduced. The taller something is the more impact it has on everybody else for miles and miles around and therefore the greater care we have to take. There is a middle ground that I will talk about in a minute, which will provide us with a great deal of building and housing opportunity to reduce the cost of housing without having to make everywhere look like Manhattan, if I can put it that way.

The hon. Lady's intervention leads me to say that we need to throw off these mental shackles—these 50-year-old emotional architectural scars—and instead count the blessings of building up, not out.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I thank the hon. Gentleman for bringing forward this important issue of how we better utilise our space. He will know—I am sure this is the case in his constituency, as it is in mine—that people have the opportunity to live above

[Jim Shannon]

shops. That is a special scheme brought in by local councils and local departments and is a way of utilising the space that is there. Does he agree that that is one method for addressing the issue of low-cost housing?

John Penrose: That is a very good example—a classic example—of the kind of thing we need to look at. Many British high streets are two storeys, or perhaps three storeys, tall. Not only are those upper storeys lightly used, and in some cases unused, but there are two or three further storeys of fresh air above them that could be developed into housing as well. The crucial point that was made yesterday in the White Paper, but has been more broadly accepted for years, is that the only way to bring down the overall cost of housing in this country is by increasing the supply. We have to make sure that more of this stuff is built and finding those right, convenient locations near social and physical infrastructure is crucial. I will expand on that point a little more in a minute, but the hon. Gentleman has touched on a particularly good example.

I was about to number the blessings of building up, not out and I shall now carry on doing so. First, it will attract much needed new investment to regenerate and save tired or rundown town and city centres, bringing fresh life, a broader mix of businesses and longer trading hours to high streets that—as the hon. Member for Strangford (Jim Shannon) mentioned—are suffering under the twin attack of out-of-town shopping centres and online retailers.

Secondly, building up, not out could help break the stranglehold of large house building firms over the number of new homes that are built. Those firms tend to focus on larger sites, whether greenfield or in towns, and rarely pick up smaller plots where an individual bungalow or two-storey shop could be redeveloped into four or even eight smart new apartments on the same site. By releasing lots of overlooked smaller urban plots we can create a fast-growing cadre of insurgent new developers, adding much needed new capacity and competition to the sector and its supply chains and speeding up the too comfortable, cosily slow rate at which the big firms currently convert their land banks and planning permissions into completed homes.

Thirdly, building up, not out will reduce urban sprawl by cutting the pressure from builders to concrete over green fields and green belts at the edges of towns and villages across the country. Given the strain and pressure on our green spaces, they should be our last building resort, not our first. Fourthly, it will cut commuting by allowing people to live closer to work, shops and other community hubs from libraries to GP surgeries. The reductions in emissions, and the effects on both our quality of life and the wider environment, will be very significant indeed.

Finally, building up, not out would release huge numbers of new urban house building sites to solve the housing shortage. As the Secretary of State said yesterday in his new White Paper, the only way to make homes more affordable for everybody is to build a lot more of them. Whether we are talking about renting or buying, the basic laws of price and demand mean that the prices will never stabilise, much less fall, unless the supply of housing increases dramatically.

Dr Daniel Poulter (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate. He is making very good points, and I agree with him about the Government's welcome White Paper yesterday on improving the housing supply. Does he agree that one of the challenges can sometimes be the fairly entrenched, long-held concerns that people raise locally about higher properties? Incentives are needed in the system to encourage local authorities to give planning consents if we are going to overcome some of the problems.

John Penrose: I agree with my hon. Friend for two reasons. When taller buildings excite the kind of Manhattan-ish concerns that we just heard about from the hon. Member for Ealing Central and Acton (Dr Huq), there clearly has to be careful consideration and community buy-in, because they have such a profound, wide-scale impact on local views and local infrastructure. Smaller and more modest proposals—I will talk about those in more detail in a minute—are much more absorbable and go much more with the grain of local things, so they may well not need a huge number of extra permissions and incentives, beyond the fact that they provide an opportunity for individual landowners to make a contribution and perhaps to increase the value of their particular site. I will expand on that, and perhaps if my hon. Friend the Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) is not completely convinced, he will intervene later.

David Simpson (Upper Bann) (DUP): I congratulate the hon. Gentleman on obtaining the debate. I am glad to hear that he is talking about building up rather than out, given that in the past we have built on the green belt, destroying our environment. Does he agree that no matter what form of building there is, it is vital that the infrastructure is correct, because we have faced major problems in our cities from flooding over the past few years?

John Penrose: I absolutely agree. One advantage of building up rather than out in existing urban environments is that an awful lot of infrastructure is in place anyway. Less brand-new infrastructure needs to be constructed as a result. Other problems come from building in urban environments—for example, existing infrastructure may be put under strain and need to be expanded in some way—but flood defences are a good example of where the effects are perfectly scalable. When a flood defence wall has been built, an awful lot more can be built behind it. The flood defence wall does not need to be upgraded just because more has been built behind it, even though it may need to be upgraded when it wears out in 50 years' time. I thank the hon. Gentleman for that very good example.

As I was saying, prices will never stabilise, still less fall, unless the supply of housing increases dramatically. Cheaper homes are one of the cheapest, simplest, most effective ways of raising living standards for everyone and, by making our available cash go further, of improving the country's economic productivity.

In the 1970s and '80s, our towns and cities were places without an economic purpose. Their industrial manufacturing centres were dead, social problems multiplied as jobs dried up and people left in droves. But now,

urban living in towns and cities is fashionable again, because, even in our highly connected, distance-defying online world, it turns out that there is huge value in people clustering together. Ideas flow more freely; skills and knowledge too. Firms in similar sectors create clusters that feed off their neighbours' energy, hire each other's staff and drive each other on. Building up, not out helps those things to happen more easily, so more wealth can be created. It is greener and cheaper, and it makes us richer and improves our quality of life, so clearly, the idea's time has come.

To their eternal credit, I think the Government get that. The new White Paper has much to say about developing smaller sites of half a hectare or less, and subdividing large sites so that smaller developers can get in on the act as well. Local development orders and area-wide design codes, which streamline planning permission if people want to build particular pre-approved types or styles of property in a specified area, make a strong showing too. There is a range of new permitted development rights, which allow everyone from hospitals to brownfield site owners to build without all the red tape, heartache and uncertainty of getting planning permission.

Dr Huq: From a design point of view, I completely get the hon. Gentleman's argument, but how would he inject affordability? The rate in London has been at up to 80% of market rates, and units in high-rise buildings in my constituency seem to be bought off-plan by people at property fairs in Singapore and by Russian oligarchs—the lights are always off—so how would he make that link and build affordability in?

John Penrose: The hon. Lady tempts me into a slightly wider area of discussion than the one I was focusing on. However, my broad point at least is that we will not be able to make all housing more affordable, whether that is for those on lower or middle incomes, unless we dramatically increase the supply of new homes of whatever tenure—whether we are talking about homes for rent or for buying. Only by doing that over the longer term will we manage to reduce the cost of housing for everybody at all income levels. The hon. Lady might like to propose some additional measures and, if so, I am sure that she will make some remarks later to turbo-charge some other opportunities for those on lower incomes as well. However, as a starting point and a fundamental, we are kidding ourselves if we think we can get away without increasing the overall level of new homes that are being created in the first place.

Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP): I congratulate the hon. Gentleman on securing the debate. One aspect concerns me slightly about the London model: is there not a risk that people being allowed to build upwards will lead to the creation of single town houses that have become much larger, therefore creating half-a-million-pound houses rather than low-cost housing, which is the thrust of the argument?

John Penrose: If demand is unsatisfied in any part of the housing market—whether at the top or bottom end—that will spill across. If people are looking for a particular size of house—if their family is growing and they need a three-bedroom house as opposed to a two-bedroom house—and they cannot find one, the

demand will spill over into other areas of the housing market. Demand will drive up price, no matter what, and that will knock on through to other areas of the housing market. The hon. Gentleman is right that there are hotspots in the housing market—geographically and in terms of kinds and sizes of house and tenures—where this problem is particularly acute, but we cannot afford to be that choosy. We need to build an awful lot more of all kinds of houses if we are to reduce prices. Some of the hotspots may well apply to people on lower incomes and, at that point, we should be doing something about it, but that should not be to the exclusion of everything else; otherwise the knock-on effects will still be felt throughout the tenure range.

With what I have said in mind, I would like to take up the offer in the White Paper and make a formal submission to the consultation that the Minister launched yesterday. I want to make a concrete proposal—please forgive the pun—for a new permitted development right to add to the suite that the Government suggested. The right would allow small-scale additions to town and city centre properties when the final result is still below the treeline or other buildings in the same block. Converting existing shops or offices would still require planning permission, but building new apartments within those height limits above them, or above existing housing, would not. It would not apply to substantial new buildings or major developments, nor to listed heritage buildings or conservation zones.

That measure is safe, sensible and proportionate and should not scare anyone—certainly not those worried about Manhattan-style buildings. It would offer a little piece of freedom from the cold and clammy hand of bureaucracy: a chance for every householder to help solve the nation's housing problems by extending the size, and value, of their property by adding extra bedrooms or perhaps an entire apartment on top of what is there already. It would provide an opportunity for energy and ideas to have their head, without being diverted, amended or discouraged by official objections, rooted in the very British fear of any building that is taller than two storeys high.

Without the measure, officialdom will be too slow to change. They will not be forced to look upwards, and will carry on thinking the same way as they have for the last 50 years. We need change immediately, not at some distant future time. Without a shock—a stimulus—and some creative development yeast, the White Paper's dough will never rise. Many valuable town and city centre sites will continue to be ignored.

The new permitted development right could be that stimulus—that little piece of freedom. It could be a creative spark that lights the blue touch paper of Britain's stodgy, slow-paced, cosily comfortable housing market so that it takes off like a rocket. It would improve our economy and our quality of life, make our homes more affordable and reduce development pressure on greenfield and green belt sites. I hope the Minister will agree.

9.50 am

Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mrs Gillan. As a Back Bencher, it is certainly unusual for me to be second in the speaking order.

[Alan Brown]

I congratulate the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare (John Penrose) on securing the debate. He has campaigned on this issue and raised it in Parliament before, so it is clearly something that he is keen to see progress. I agree in principle with much of what he said about ensuring vibrancy in main streets at night. If that can be done by building upwards above shops, that is a good thing, but in the long run we really need to be careful. I have already touched on my concerns that the proposal might open the door for the construction of large town houses without delivering low-cost housing, which is the thrust of this debate. I am also slightly concerned that there may be a rush by too many people to do it. We need to ensure that the right controls are in place, including building standards and building controls, and that the processes can be inspected. Clearly some low-rise buildings were only ever designed to be low-rise buildings, even though they may be adjacent to higher buildings.

John Penrose: Just to clarify, nothing in the proposals that I have made today would affect building control or building regulations. Clearly we would need all the usual checks to ensure that buildings will stay up and be safe once they have been constructed.

Alan Brown: I fully accept that. I know that is the premise; I am just saying that we need to ensure that the resources are there to keep an eye on things. We have heard stories about properties in London getting built in the rear of gardens and so on, which is done without planning consent or building standards consent. It is a question of ensuring that procedures are properly followed. Foundations need to be checked and may need to be strengthened, and buildings that are structurally tied to adjoining buildings need proper structural design. I recognise the hon. Gentleman's good point about controls, listed buildings and exemptions, and I agree that a controlled method of allowing building up can work.

Let me return to low-cost housing, which is the title of this debate. We need to do more to make low-cost housing available. I welcome the UK Government's White Paper, but neither I nor my party think it goes far enough. As was raised yesterday, the elephant in the room for low-cost housing is the right-to-buy model. In the long run, the extended right-to-buy model for social housing will eat into the availability of low-cost housing. Subsidies from the public sector to allow people to buy properties use money that could otherwise be going directly into stimulating housing growth or be put towards brownfield development. Members have raised concerns about building outwards and eating into the green belt. Clearly brownfield regeneration is a good thing, especially in the urban environment. The money being taken out of the system for right to buy could be put to better use, either directly for building new social housing or for stimulating new brownfield development.

By ending right to buy, the Scottish Government have protected 15,500 properties that would otherwise have been sold from stock. Quite often, houses that are sold end up in the buy-to-let market, which pushes rents up because social rents are always cheaper than private rents, and that has an impact on the housing benefit bill. Again, that means more money from the public purse that could otherwise be going towards housing.

The Scottish Government are making a record investment in council house building. I request that the UK Government consider going back to that model and funding the construction of public housing. Because there is no right to buy for housing in Scotland, housing associations have more confidence to build housing. They can also get subsidies from the Scottish Government. The Scottish Government delivered 30,000 affordable homes in the last Parliament and have a target of 50,000 for this Parliament.

I recognise that the White Paper targets affordable homes, but the argument goes full circle: for the UK Government to deliver affordable homes, they need to put public money to the best possible use, not subsidise the purchase of properties for people who already have one and who do not need a discount to become a homeowner. I know that a lot of people have aspirations to become homeowners, but the No. 1 thing is to ensure that there are enough homes for everybody. We can look to further drive home ownership once there are enough homes for everybody, but once that happens the market will even out and we will not see the continued push on prices.

The hon. Gentleman said that there would be controls on listed buildings. My other concern is that we would need tight controls on the aesthetics of buildings to ensure that they blended in with the surrounding environment. Where there are permitted development rights rather than planning controls, there still need to be tight guidelines.

John Penrose: May I press the hon. Gentleman a little on that point? I take his point with respect to areas that have a homogeneous architectural style and that therefore have conservation of one kind or another, but not areas that have no such homogeneous style and no conservation control or anything like it. Most British cities are a hotch-potch of things built over several centuries, and that is fine. I am concerned that he is trying to create a sort of clammy bureaucratic control where historically there has been none and everyone has been happy with the outcome.

Alan Brown: I take the hon. Gentleman's point. Perhaps, as always, the truth is somewhere in the middle. However, I would have real concerns if people were just able to throw up these buildings. There could be real issues with the materials used, with long-term maintenance and with the aesthetics of buildings. For instance, if people use the wrong materials for wood fascias and do not maintain them, they become a real eyesore in the long run. I am just putting that out there; I think those issues should be considered within permitted development rights. Local areas might not have a completely homogeneous style; as he says, cities may have developed as a hotch-potch, but that is not always an attractive look, and if we do not watch out, it can become even less attractive. Clearly that is not the desire behind the hon. Gentleman's proposal, but I conclude by congratulating him on advancing it.

9.58 am

Ruth Cadbury (Brentford and Isleworth) (Lab): It is an honour to serve under you again, Ms Gillan. I thank the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare (John Penrose) for securing the debate.

I wondered whether there had been a mix-up by the Chairman of Ways and Means, who decides on these debates, but knowing him and understanding the process as I now do, I know that that is not possible. Hon. Members may have attended this debate and people may have watched it in anticipation of a debate on low-cost housing, perhaps hoping to hear some more detail about the White Paper that the Government released yesterday or some more meat put on the bones of the essential topic of low-cost housing. Instead, this debate has been about a small proposal to tweak the planning system.

I will address the proposal from the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare in a moment, but first I will address low-cost housing, which is the topic of the debate and is what I expected to be speaking on. Of course the overall supply of housing—which the hon. Gentleman states it is the intention of his policy to address—is important, because we have a shortage of housing in this country, as the Secretary of State said yesterday. In a pure supply and demand curve, one expects more supply to mean lower cost, and the obverse—shortage of supply—means higher cost, which is exactly what has happened in the open market; so housing becomes more and more unaffordable for more and more people.

That has happened in the last seven years. Under David Cameron, the UK built fewer homes than under any peacetime Prime Minister since 1923. The number of home-owning households rose by a million under the 1997 to 2010 Government, but it has fallen by 200,000 since 2010, and this shortage has meant that the price of buying has risen and risen, putting homes out of the reach of even well-paid young people. Members here today may have watched “Newsnight” last night, in which there were reasonably well-paid young professionals who could not get on the housing ladder. In my constituency in west London, working people earning reasonable salaries cannot even afford to rent, and if they can just about pay more than 50% of their income on rent, they have no money left to save up for a deposit. The market is not delivering affordable homes to rent or to buy, except in some economically deprived areas, where there are more homes than there are people who want to live in them.

In most of England, because house prices have risen, more and more people need some kind of subsidised low-cost housing. Since 2010, however, Government funding for all types of affordable housing—there were eight definitions of affordable housing in the White Paper—has been withdrawn, except for one, which is for first-time buyers. The level of new affordable house building has still managed to hit a 24-year low. The number of shared ownership homes and other low-cost home ownership homes being built annually has fallen by 66% since 2010, to just 7,540 homes a year, meaning that 34,170 fewer affordable homes have been built since 2010 than in the last six years of the last Labour Government. The hon. Member for Kilmarnock and Loudoun (Alan Brown) clearly described the problems—and the potential solutions—of delivering truly affordable low-cost housing.

For social rented housing, official statistics show that the number of social rented homes that were started in 2009-10 was almost 40,000, but in 2015-16 the number

of social rented homes being delivered was less than 1,000—a fall of 98% and the lowest figure since records began.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Wentworth and Dearne (John Healey) said yesterday in the main Chamber that private house builders, housing associations and councils need to fire on all cylinders to build the homes that we need, and councils need to be allowed to build homes again to meet the needs of local people. At the moment, they are not allowed to do that.

Dr Huq: I am grateful to my hon. Friend and constituency neighbour for giving way. I agree with what she is saying, that this “Pile ’em high, sell ’em cheap and leave it to market forces” solution does not sound like it is enough. When it is left to market forces, in a place such as Ealing, people seem to use these high-rise homes that are going up as a very expensive piggybank; they are not even living in them. Obviously we need more social housing to counteract all this.

Ruth Cadbury: My hon. Friend and constituency neighbour is absolutely right. I have experienced that in my own constituency. We still have newly built homes that are never let, because they are seen as nothing more than an investment, and many of them are very high in price.

As I have said, the latest affordable housing statistics have fallen to their lowest levels in 24 years. Of course I welcome any credible initiatives to provide low-cost housing, but where is the evidence that this well-meaning initiative to extend permitted development rights, which the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare has discussed today, will actually deliver low-cost housing?

Between February and April in 2016, the Government consulted jointly with the Mayor of London on proposals to deliver more homes in London by allowing a limited number of additional storeys on existing buildings through a permitted development right, local development orders or development plan policies, which is exactly what the hon. Gentleman is seeking. That was part of the Government’s commitment to explore how more homes could be built on brownfield land, in order to reduce the pressure on greenfield or metropolitan open land. The Government summary of the responses that they received to that proposal says:

“More than half of those were not supportive of the proposal, with a one-size-fits-all permitted development right approach considered unworkable. While it was noted that it could support town centres and deliver more homes, it was recognised that the complex prior approval that would be required to protect neighbours and the character and amenity of an area would result in a permitted development right that is no less onerous than a planning application.”

Specifically, a couple of the consultees—the Planning Officers Society and Historic England—did not support the proposals. I am well aware that the British Property Federation welcomed them.

John Penrose: I just wish to clarify something for the hon. Lady. I have read the document she is quoting and learned of the concerns surrounding the proposed permitted development right, which has been consulted on already, but my proposal is different. It starts from the same place, but is designed to avoid the criticisms that were levelled, which she has rightly pointed out. I have endeavoured to modify my proposal in a way that will allow it to sidestep those issues.

Ruth Cadbury: I thank the hon. Gentleman for that clarification. Nevertheless, with any consideration of extending permitted development rights, there are always unintended consequences. That is why the Planning Officers Society, Historic England and other organisations did not see the merit of, and therefore did not make the case for, extending them. In fact, it was not only permitted development rights that were considered, but other methods.

As I say, the British Property Federation welcomed the proposal for an extension to permitted development rights, but even the BPF said that

“it is unlikely to deliver a significant amount of new homes”,

which, as the hon. Gentleman said in his speech, is one of his key aims.

What are the reasons to retain the status quo, which is what I am suggesting? Proposals to develop upwards can go through the planning application process. What is wrong with that? A planning application provides notification, consultation, transparency and accountability, whereas extending permitted development rights does not. If any proposal to build higher makes sense in a town or village centre; if it works with neighbouring buildings; if the space standards and design provide good quality housing in which people will thrive, it should be granted planning permission. However, to deny a community or a parish council the ability to comment, to deny planning officers the ability to negotiate improvements to a proposal, and to deny locally elected councillors the opportunity to determine the application would just open the gates to unpopular, unwanted and possibly bad developments.

If a local council makes a bad planning decision—possibly in the face of fierce local opposition to an application—there is always the opportunity to appeal to the impartial Planning Inspectorate. Nobody denies that enabling more homes to be built in a town or village centre is a good thing for the life and vibrancy of that place.

Dr Poulter: I certainly agree with the hon. Lady's sentiment. However, is it not very difficult for the types of people my hon. Friend the Member for Weston-super-Mare (John Penrose) has spoken about today—people who want to carry out small extensions or build small buildings—to bring the sorts of planning appeals that she just talked about? Sometimes bad decisions are made because around the time of elections, planning issues can become very contentious in local authorities.

Ruth Cadbury: Having been a councillor myself for many, many years, I am well aware of that pressure, which is why we have the appeals system—it is why we have that check and balance. Let us remember that one can only get away with refusing a planning application if the refusal is made on good planning grounds. Officers are there to advise councillors, and if councillors ignore officers, the application will go to appeal, and, if it is a good application that was refused for the wrong reasons, the Planning Inspectorate will overturn the refusal and the application will be granted.

The planning system is there for a reason. It is there to protect communities and ensure good development. It ensures that there are appropriate facilities, amenities, space standards, parking provision and so on. When permitted development rights are extended, a lot of that

is lost. I am sure that the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare does not want to see a load of high-rise buildings going up that do not meet basic standards and do not provide a basic quality of life for the people living in those dwellings and in surrounding dwellings.

John Penrose: I repeat that I am not proposing huge high-rise dwellings at all; I am proposing things that can be built up to the height of the local treeline, for example, which is four or five storeys at the most. I gently say to the hon. Lady that if the planning system works so bleedin' brilliantly, we would have four or five-storey developments in market towns and seaside towns around the country, but we do not. I doubt very strongly that that is because communities everywhere have roundly decided that they cannot live with anything taller than two storeys. I suspect that it is because there is a chilling effect. People are being discouraged from putting such applications in because of officialdom knocking them back all the time.

Ruth Cadbury: With the greatest respect to the hon. Gentleman, I believe he was in the same meeting as me last week, where we talked about converting empty space above flats into residential. In that interesting and informative roundtable, we heard that there is a whole host of barriers to converting empty space above shops, and the same applies to the proposal to increase heights. The planning system was not suggested as the main barrier. There are other barriers, such as structural ones, security ones, issues of funding and whether it is worth the cost. Except in very high-price property areas, such as those that my hon. Friend the Member for Ealing Central and Acton (Dr Huq) and I represent, it is just not worth landowners' while to do it. There is a range of barriers.

No one denies that enabling more homes in town centres is a good thing for the life and vibrancy of those town centres. I wholeheartedly agree with that sentiment, but the hon. Member for Weston-super-Mare could do better than blaming the planning system for the lack of delivery. The planning system can deliver what he wants now. He has brought no evidence that this little tweak of the planning system will deliver more housing, let alone more affordable housing. He has made circumstantial links between more supply, of which the proposal would provide a tiny amount, and a crashing fall in housing prices. There is no evidence.

We have seen problems when permitted development rights are extended, such as with the coalition Government's policy, which has now been enshrined permanently, of allowing employment space to be converted into residential without planning permission. In Hounslow—I represent half of the borough—we have seen poor-quality housing, poor space standards, inadequate parking and issues with everything from refuse disposal to access. That policy is not providing good-quality housing or affordable housing.

The other extension of permitted development rights that was enacted under the coalition Government allowed homeowners to extend the rear of their homes by 6 metres, rather than the 3 metres it had been previously. Those developments have a massive impact on the neighbours. That is why we have to be careful about extending permitted development rights, and the Opposition do not support such extensions.

Building can be done at height with good design, but there is no reason why that cannot be done through the normal, transparent and accountable planning application process. In the years I was a planning committee member—some of those were as chair—we granted many applications for increasing the height of buildings and homes or for building new higher ones. We refused some terrible applications. The system allows for that to happen. We have a massive housing shortage in west London, but the prices are high enough that it is worth the developers' while. We saw the applications; we approved the good ones and refused the bad ones. The market in west London is doing exactly what the hon. Gentleman desires.

John Penrose: I thank the hon. Lady for giving way yet again. She is being very generous and kind. I gently say to her that the London economic microclimate is not typical of the rest of Britain. I am rather reassured by some of the things she has said about what is happening in parts of London and how these things are being handled, but I do not think those incentives, processes or habits of mind among councils and council officials are broadly spread across the country.

Ruth Cadbury: In which case, the hon. Gentleman is effectively admitting that it is not the planning system that is the problem, but the state of the property market and other barriers to development. The market in west London is doing exactly what he wants, and I suggest he looks elsewhere for the cause of the problem and, therefore, for the solution.

The hon. Gentleman wants beautiful buildings; that is why a planning system is needed. He is proposing a solution that removes local oversight, but there is no evidence it will work and it could create unintended consequences. Furthermore, his proposal does not address the subject of the debate: low-cost housing. I am almost inclined to dissent when the Question is put at the end of the debate as to whether we have considered low-cost housing, but I will leave that for then.

10.16 am

Jackie Doyle-Price (Thurrock) (Con): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mrs Gillan. It is a great pleasure to respond to the debate introduced by my hon. Friend the Member for Weston-super-Mare (John Penrose). He has been fortuitous in securing this debate on low-cost housing the day after the White Paper was published, but he is rather disadvantaged by the fact that the Minister responsible is so busy selling the White Paper that he has to put up with a reply from me, but I will endeavour to answer the points he has raised.

The tone of the debate has frankly been a bit miserable, in truth. My hon. Friend has come forward with a proposal to expand the supply of housing. We all know that supply is the biggest challenge in delivering low-cost housing. Houses have become less and less affordable because we have not been building enough houses, period. We need to look at what we can do to unlock a bigger supply of houses, and that is what the White Paper is all about. I could happily trade statistics with Opposition Members, but the reality is that we have not been building enough housing in this country for decades. There are many reasons for that. Some of them are to

do with planning, public opinion, finance and land prices, but what is clear is that our housing market is broken, and I do not think we should be ruling anything out in fixing it, because we have a real problem in terms of fairness for everyone in society being able to live in a decent home that they can afford. We in Government and as politicians should be seeking to deliver that.

That is where my hon. Friend has it in a nutshell, in coming forward with a proposal that could unlock substantially more housing. Listening to him and the reaction to his remarks from Members highlighted a massive cultural prejudice against building up, rather than building out, and there is a reason for that, which he alluded to in his remarks. We were very badly let down in the '60s. That was the zenith of building up, not out, but we built buildings that were ugly and unpleasant, and they became unpleasant places to live. That is in people's minds when they start thinking about high-rise housing and development. I have it in my constituency. We are on the border of London, so we have a substantial need for new houses. We have a substantial amount of brownfield land and green belt. Members will not be surprised to hear that we get a lot more planning applications for housing on green-belt sites, because we all know that it is cheaper to build there. We are also on the river, and if there is one place where high-rise developments would work, it is on the river.

My hon. Friend the Member for Grantham and Stamford (Nick Boles)—I think we were all impressed by his courage in turning up for the vote yesterday—came to my constituency when he was housing Minister. He did me no favours because he described one of my riverfront housing developments as pig ugly. It was a four-storey housing development on the river, and people want to live on the river, but his point was that if the planners had been a little more adventurous, we could have built something higher and more beautiful. When one visits places such as Greenwich in south-east London, one can see that they have shown imagination. They have opened up the river and created nice places to live, so I very much welcome my hon. Friend's interest in this.

To give my hon. Friend the Member for Weston-super-Mare some comfort, the White Paper sets out clearly the importance of high-density brownfield development, which is a part of his proposal. We propose changes to national policy to make it clear that local plans and individual development proposals should encourage building up where acceptable. We also propose to make better use of public land. The Department would welcome my hon. Friend's response to the White Paper so that we can take this forward. It is incumbent on all of us, and it is very easy. We all react to our postbags—Mr Grumpy always complains about the planning application that is proposed—but we have a role now, because this is such an important issue, to sell what will really deliver more housing, so I encourage my hon. Friend to make his submission as robust and as forthright as he wishes.

The Government welcome the opportunity to discuss low-cost housing in its wider sense. The hon. Member for Brentford and Isleworth (Ruth Cadbury) made some excellent points, but we need to recognise that the problem has been in the making for decades and the issues are complex. We do not say that the White Paper has all the answers or all the solutions. There is no silver bullet. If there was, the previous Labour Government

[Jackie Doyle-Price]

would have delivered it, as would we in the last Parliament. Let us get real here. This is a serious problem, and unless we have a grown-up discussion about it, we will not solve it and we will let down future generations.

Dr Huq: There is some stuff in the White Paper that was nicked out of the Ed Miliband playbook—we are pleased to see that there will be a ban on letting fees—but it could have been a little more aggressive on the “Use it or lose it” idea. I apologise, Mrs Gillan; I should have said my right hon. Friend the Member for Doncaster North (Edward Miliband). In Ealing we have a site, which my 12-year-old remembers as a building site for most of his life—it was a cinema—that is going to be rebuilt for residential use, but it has been land-banked for the best part of a decade. What does the White Paper say about that, and how can we be more aggressive with developers who simply sit on land while the value goes up?

Jackie Doyle-Price: The hon. Lady has hit on a major structural problem that is inhibiting the ability to supply. There are many examples of what she talks about. Some developers are bringing forward a supply of housing and others are sitting on the land.

The White Paper on housing that we published yesterday advocates shortening timescales for the implementation of planning permissions where appropriate. That is very much on our agenda. We are considering legislative changes to simplify and speed up completion notices, which will encourage developers to build out or face losing the site. I am a big fan of naming and shaming. Transparency is an effective tool. Sunlight is the best disinfectant. Where we have developers clearly engaging in predatory behaviour and exploiting the marketplace, we should be prepared to name and shame them. Every one of us in this room has a voice. Where we see bad behaviour by developers, let us shout out about it, because we have to deliver more houses. It is that simple.

I trust that hon. Members have had the opportunity to digest some of the housing White Paper, if not all of it, and I hope that they will engage with the debate. I want to make it incredibly clear how committed the Government are to grappling with this problem. We want to make sure that all hard-working families have the housing that they need at a price they can afford. The root cause of the problem is that demand outstrips supply. Only by increasing supply substantially will we stop the increasing spiralling of house prices and rents.

Alan Brown: If all options are on the table in the White Paper, will the Government reconsider the right to buy and extended the discount? Have the Government put a cost against how much money has been paid out in the extended right-to-buy scheme and how many properties might have been delivered had the money gone directly to house building?

Jackie Doyle-Price: The hon. Gentleman will not be surprised to hear that I disagree with his point about right to buy. We are firmly committed to it. We want to encourage the aspiration for everyone to own their own home. We want to enable that, and right to buy is very

much a part of it. He made very thoughtful remarks in his earlier contribution, and we have answers. We are firmly committed to making sure that, for every additional home sold, another social home will be provided—nationally. There is a rolling three-year deadline for councils to deliver the affordable homes to replace right to buy. We must also remember that when someone exercises their right to buy, the house is not removed from the stock. They still have a housing need. Again, the issue comes back to making sure that we increase the supply of houses.

Perhaps I can give the hon. Gentleman a little more comfort. It was said by the hon. Member for Brentford and Isleworth that councils were not building more homes. Actually, they are. Some councils are showing considerable imagination in unlocking new homes. They are establishing local housing companies and we are encouraging them to do that. We see local councils as part of the partnership to help to increase supply.

Ruth Cadbury: I am sorry if the hon. Lady feels that I said councils are not building new homes. They are building new homes, but they are having to use other resources now that there is no Government funding. They could build an awful lot more if they could be released from the borrowing cap. My own council is building about 400 new council homes. The problem is that councils are losing their own stock at a faster rate through the right to buy than they can build new council homes. They are building them using capital funds that could also be used for other infrastructure such as schools and so on.

Jackie Doyle-Price: I am not sure I entirely accept that. Certainly local authorities have the powers to borrow using their general power of competence, and they have established local housing companies to do that. There is an obligation to replace one for one, following the right to buy being exercised. Ultimately, we see local authorities as a partner in delivering more housing. That is the message I want to press home today.

Our broken housing market is one of the greatest barriers to progress in Britain today. If we are really serious about building a fairer society for everyone, we need to tackle that. We need to fix this to make sure that housing is more affordable. As has been mentioned, many people spend significant amounts of their income on rent or mortgage payments. Building more homes will slow the rise in housing costs so that many more families will be able to afford to buy a home or enjoy the benefits of lower rents.

To summarise and put what the housing White Paper proposes in context, first, we will insist that every area has an up-to-date plan, because development is about far more than just building homes. This is where the challenge is for local authorities. The planning process and building a vision of where new homes will be built and what the future will be for a local economy is so important. It is about getting community buy-in. It will help to tackle some of the cultural prejudices that we discussed earlier in the debate. If communities have ownership of a local plan for their local area, they will get the attractive homes that they want and need. My challenge is for local authorities to step up and deliver. We are all aware that there are far too many local

authorities that have not risen to the challenge of identifying where houses are needed. There are still too many councils that do not have a local plan, and they need to show leadership and deliver.

Secondly, and as the hon. Member for Ealing Central and Acton (Dr Huq) noted, we need to ensure that homes are built quickly once planning permission is granted. We will make sure that the planning system is much more open and accessible. We will improve the co-ordination of public investment infrastructure to encourage that, and we will support timely connections to utilities to tackle unnecessary delays, but the real issue is developers. We will give councils and developers the tools they need to build more swiftly and we will expect them to use them. I suspect that this is an issue that we will look at as reactions to the White Paper unfold and we consider whether there is a need for further legislative change.

We will also diversify the market. We want to bring new players in to the supply of housing. We need to give support to small and medium-sized builders and custom builders and to champion modern methods of construction to support new investment to build to rent. Those measures could be transformational. The idea of institutional investment that builds property estates or residential blocks that are specifically for rent, which people can rent for a long time, could transform the housing market and make renting much more affordable.

The White Paper also sets out how we will support housing associations to build more and explores options to encourage local authorities to build again. As I have said, we will also encourage further institutional investment in the private rented sector. Finally, because we recognise that building the homes we need takes time, we will also take more steps now to improve safeguards in the private rented sector. Hon. Members who represent constituencies in London will be particularly concerned about that.

We have seen the need to do more to prevent homelessness. I am very pleased that the Government have committed to fully funding the Homelessness Reduction Bill introduced by my hon. Friend the Member for Harrow East (Bob Blackman). We will provide £61 million to local government to meet the costs of the new burdens associated with that Bill over the course of the spending review period.

We could easily trade statistics, but I do not think there is any value in playing the blame game about where we are now. We need to look at how we fix it. Everybody has a role to play in that—including the former Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Member for Doncaster North (Edward Miliband), who the hon. Member for Ealing Central and Acton mentioned. The Government are very clear that fixing the problem is a real priority.

We have already delivered 313,000 affordable homes in England since 2010. The affordable homes programme alone delivered 193,000 affordable homes, exceeding expectations by 23,000. At the autumn statement, the Chancellor announced the expansion of the affordable homes programme with an additional £1.4 billion, which increased the overall budget to £7.1 billion. That is a significant investment from the Government in tackling the problem. The expanded programme also allows a wider range of products to help people on the pathway

to home ownership and to continue to provide support for those who need it. Those products include shared ownership, rent to buy and affordable rent.

Opening up the programme in that way will help to meet the housing needs of a wider range of people in different circumstances and at different stages in their lives. We have to recognise that there are different problems in different areas of the country, but also different problems hitting people at different stages of their lives. We need to make sure that we have a solution for all of those.

Affordable rent was a policy introduced to get more bang for our buck in providing social rent models. It allows rent to be set at 80% of market rents so that we can unlock more supply. Those tenants will still benefit from a sub-market rent. This is a particular issue in London, where the affordable rent can be set even lower.

Home ownership, however, continues to be the aspiration for most people, which is why we have looked at the Help to Buy products, right to buy and shared ownership. Shared ownership offers a route through the part-buy/part-rent model to enable people to get on the housing ladder sooner than if they were saving for a deposit. Purchasers buy a minimum 20% share in the new-build property at market value, pay a controlled rent on the remainder and may continue to buy further shares until the property is owned outright. We will continue to use that tool to expand home ownership. Since 2010, around 45,000 new shared ownership schemes have been delivered and we will continue to deliver more.

Help to Buy has already helped more than 200,000 households to buy a home, including through the equity loan scheme, which has benefited 100,000 households—81% of whom were first-time buyers. We have also committed £8.6 billion for the Help to Buy equity loan scheme to 2021, to ensure that it continues to support homebuyers and stimulate supply. We recognise the need to create certainty for prospective homeowners so we will work with the sector to deliver that.

I come back to the issue of the planning regime and how we can speed up its ability to help to deliver the volume of supply. My hon. Friend the Member for Weston-super-Mare is quite right to look at tools for how we can do that. He highlighted the importance of increasing brownfield development and building to higher densities to deliver more homes. If widely adopted, that could reduce the need for green-belt development. What excites me about the idea is the ability to regenerate our high streets. I am sure I am not alone, given the way that retail is moving today, in seeing some of my high streets really struggling. The idea that we could create a new, mixed-use high street, rather than a retail-dependent one—one where people can live above the shops or behind the shops in new high-rise developments and be able to go downstairs and visit cafes and restaurants—is quite an exciting concept, which would particularly appeal to the younger generations coming through. There is massive potential, and I encourage my hon. Friend to carry on trying to open people's eyes to the potential of this initiative.

The Department has been engaging with my hon. Friend on his work and has taken up his proposals. We consulted last February on proposals to allow limited upward extensions in London, no higher than the height of an adjoining roofline. Following that consultation,

[Jackie Doyle-Price]

we recognise that there is potential to deliver more homes nationally, not just in London, through a change to national planning policy to support upward extensions in suitable locations. As set out in the housing White Paper, we propose to amend the national planning policy framework to make it clear that local plans and individual development proposals should address the particular scope for higher-density housing in urban locations where buildings can be extended upwards by using the airspace above them.

In the White Paper, we have committed to reviewing the nationally described space standards, because of feedback from the sector that in certain places, space standards make it hard to use land efficiently and stop cheaper houses being built, which more people now want to rent or buy, such as Pocket Homes. We have to recognise the limitations. When we write planning law, we write it at a given time, in a given set of circumstances. When the world changes, we need to be prepared to be fleet of foot in dealing with new opportunities to address the issues we face. However, this is not a race to the bottom, and Government are clear that in assessing the options we will be looking for a solution that combines greater local housing choice with good quality and with decent places to live.

As I have set out, in the past few years we have seen over 300,000 affordable homes built in England. We now need to go much, much further and meet our obligation to build many more houses, of the type people want to live in, in the places they want to live and at a price they can afford. Doing that will give those growing up in society today more chance to enjoy the same opportunities as their parents and grandparents. I am struck by the fact that this is the first time that the future generation will be less well-off than their parents, when for many decades we have been used to high living standards. It is firmly my view that the price of housing is central to that.

We will ensure that the housing market is as fair for those who do not own their own home as it is for those who do, and we will continue to look at what is happening in the private rented sector. All that is a vital part of our plan for a stronger, fairer Britain, and a critical step along the road to fulfilling the Government's mission to make Britain a country that works for everyone.

10.39 am

John Penrose: I would like to extend my thanks to everybody who participated in this debate, in particular my hon. Friend the Minister—and Whip—for responding so constructively and helpfully. As she said, the timing of this debate was slightly fortuitous. As everyone here will appreciate, when we put in for debates we have little control over precisely when our names will come up, so I had no idea that it would take place 24 hours after the publication of the housing White Paper.

As the Minister said, I have been campaigning on this issue for some time, so this is at least partially a celebration

of victory, because I am pleased to say that the Government have listened. There is a great deal in the White Paper about building up, not out, and it contains some very welcome steps. The Government deserve full credit for taking some major steps in the right direction. Therefore, my modest proposal, as the hon. Member for Brentford and Isleworth (Ruth Cadbury) called it, is a final flourish or a final capstone—a residual step to ensure that it is done well and fully, rather than only partially. I think I am very close to the summit of achieving what we need to do, and I want to take this final step. This is, at least in part, a celebration of victory as much as a request for further activity.

I want to pick up on the Minister's comments about there being a slightly miserable tone to the debate. She is absolutely right that there is no silver bullet to this problem, but it is perhaps a little reductive to say that because one particular proposal—in this case, my final step—does not solve all the complicated, deep-rooted and long-lasting housing problems that this country faces, it should therefore be opposed. If we let the best be the enemy of the good, we will get nowhere. This is a far broader issue than we can possibly cover in one debate, but I am pleased to say that we will make some progress.

I will finish on this point, which I direct to the Labour party and the hon. Member for Brentford and Isleworth in particular. My hon. Friend the Minister said there was a cultural divide over tall buildings, but I think that in this Chamber there has been a cultural divide over the approach to regulation, too. I accept that the planning permission and planning regulation process plays an important role in preventing substandard building and inappropriate large-scale building—the hon. Member for Brentford and Isleworth was right to point all those things out. However, when it comes to regulating our fellow citizens in a free society, the burden of proof is on us to show why what we are doing to take away their freedoms is right, not on them to explain why they should have them back. Therefore, if I have a modest suggestion for an extension of those freedoms—a rolling back that will not impact on the broader points that the planning system is rightly geared to prevent abuses of—then it is up to us to justify why that should not happen. The burden of proof should be on us.

Ruth Cadbury *rose—*

Mrs Cheryl Gillan (in the Chair): Can I check that the hon. Gentleman is not giving way?

John Penrose: I have finished my remarks.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House has considered low cost housing.

10.43 am

Sitting suspended.

Unauthorised Overdrafts

11 am

Rachel Reeves (Leeds West) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered fees and charges on unauthorised overdrafts.

Overdrafts are one of the most widely used credit products in the market. Almost three in 10 people in the UK with personal current accounts have been overdrawn in the past year. Overdrafts can be a flexible form of borrowing, and most people use theirs for only a couple of months in the year. However, a significant minority of people—around 10%—are much more frequent users and regularly go overdrawn for nine months or more each year. There are also people who regularly go over their overdraft limit and are hit by exorbitant and disproportionate charges. The major banks make more than £1 billion per year from charges on unauthorised overdrafts—the majority, according to the head of the Competition and Markets Authority, from financially vulnerable customers.

StepChange Debt Charity estimates that 1.7 million people in the UK are trapped in an overdraft cycle and consistently use overdrafts to meet essential and emergency costs. For many vulnerable customers who are already struggling, regularly having to go into an overdraft or over an overdraft limit can lead to and exacerbate financial difficulties. Many hard-working families live constantly on their overdrafts, and those in chronic financial difficulties often face impossible choices between meeting the costs of essential bills and going further overdrawn or over their overdraft limit. Those people can struggle to get out of their overdrafts, as fees and interest build up over time and make it increasingly difficult to get out of the red. Those households are also more likely to be on the edge of their overdrafts, and if they go over, they face substantial and punitive charges that push them into difficulties. If people do not have the means to get out of their unarranged overdrafts, that can lead to persistent charges, which make it successively harder for them to avoid financial difficulties each month.

Last year, StepChange surveyed its clients with overdraft debt to explore their experiences of overdraft charges. It found that people with overdraft debt who contact the charity regularly go into the red. On average, those people had been in an unarranged overdraft for 11 of the past 12 months. Almost two thirds—62%—of the people StepChange helps with overdraft debt regularly exceed their arranged overdraft limit as they struggle to make ends meet; they did so on average in five of the past 12 months. Borrowers face average charges of £45 a time for slipping into an unauthorised overdraft. That adds up to a massive £225 a year of unauthorised overdraft charges on average.

Yvonne Fovargue (Makerfield) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend agree that the cap on payday lending has actually worked quite well and stopped unaffordable charges, so in its review of high-cost credit, the Financial Conduct Authority should look at introducing a similar cap on overdraft charges and more affordable ways of paying down debt?

Rachel Reeves: My hon. Friend has done a lot of work in this area, both as a Member of Parliament and before she came to this place, and she is absolutely right. I will come on to the difference between caps on overdraft charges and those on payday lending.

Research published today by Which? found that consumers needing as little as £100 could be charged up to £156 more by some major high street banks than the Financial Conduct Authority allows payday loan companies to charge when lending the same amount for the same period. For example, Which? compared the cost of borrowing £100 for 30 days and found that some high street banks' unarranged overdraft charges were as much as seven and a half times higher than the maximum charge of £24 on a payday loan for the same period. And because bank overdraft charges apply to monthly billing periods, not the number of days money is borrowed for, consumers who need £100 could pay up to £180 in fees if they borrow over two calendar months from their high street bank in the form of an unarranged overdraft.

Gloria De Piero (Ashfield) (Lab): A constituent of mine was made redundant and wanted to get back on his feet, so he set up a small business—a soft play area for kids, which was essentially a cash business. For every direct debit he paid, he had to pay 40p. For every automated debit and every internet payment, he had to pay 40p. Every time a payment was made to his account, the charge was 22p, and for every £100 paid to his account, he was charged 66p. Those are obscene amounts for what is essentially a cash business. I thank my hon. Friend for allowing me to put that on the record.

Rachel Reeves: I thank my hon. Friend for speaking on behalf of her constituent. We have all experienced people in our patches being ripped off by banks. Frankly, that is not what people expect. They expect to be able to trust their high street bank to give them a good deal and treat them fairly, yet in my hon. Friend's constituent's case, that just is not happening.

Yasmin Qureshi (Bolton South East) (Lab): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing this excellent debate. She talked about the Which? report. She will be aware that NatWest customers face fees of £180 for exceeding their limit by £100 for 30 days, and that Lloyds and Santander demand £160. That is completely uncalled for.

Mrs Cheryl Gillan (in the Chair): Order. I remind Members that interventions need to be very short and punchy, particularly when we have only half an hour.

Rachel Reeves: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. We have a situation where people can be charged £5 or more per day by many high street banks for going just a few pence overdrawn. Those charges rack up very quickly. The issue is that they are totally disproportionate to the offence. Going just a few pence over an overdraft limit in one month could mean £100 of charges, and as she says, the charge for doing so over two calendar months is potentially £180.

It is simply not acceptable that banks are making large profits at the expense of pushing the most financially vulnerable people deeper into debt spirals. My hon. Friend the Member for Ashfield (Gloria de Piero) gave one example, and StepChange has told me about two other cases. The first is of a 42-year-old man who racked up overdraft charges after losing his job. Interest on his overdraft and persistent charges for going over his limit meant that on average, £80 a month was added to his debt. Over a year, his overdraft debt increased by more than £1,000 because of interest and unauthorised

[Rachel Reeves]

overdraft charges. The second case is of a 38-year-old woman who faced spiralling overdraft debt after getting divorced. The increased burden of managing financial commitments on her own meant that she slipped into an unplanned overdraft by £90. That led to a cycle in which she was constantly in and out of an unarranged overdraft, and her overdraft debt increased to £1,000 due to interest and charges.

Those people, like so many others, were already in difficulty and trying to manage their debt from day to day. The banks should have a responsibility to help them manage their finances and help them out of their cycle of debt rather than sending them deeper into crisis with extortionate charges. The banks know that those customers are financially vulnerable and struggling, yet they do nothing to help—in fact, they do the exact opposite by making it harder for them to get a grip of their finances.

Chris Evans (Islwyn) (Lab/Co-op): I thank my hon. Friend for securing this timely debate. Does she agree that it is sometimes in the banks' interest to allow customers to run massive overdrafts so that they can push them on to even higher personal loans and other products, which they might not need and might not be right for them in the circumstances?

Rachel Reeves: I agree. What really worries me is that most of the £1 billion that is made every year from unauthorised charges is made on the backs of those who are most financially vulnerable. It is a bitter irony that it is now a better deal for some people who need short-term credit to go to a payday lender rather than their high street bank. Most of us regard banks as more reputable and fairer to customers, yet for many people that is just not the case.

Huge progress has been made on the charges faced by people who access finance through payday lenders, as my hon. Friend the Member for Makerfield (Yvonne Fovargue) mentioned, with the introduction of a cap following great work by my hon. Friend the Member for Walthamstow (Stella Creasy), so why are banks still allowed to get away with these unfair practices? There was some hope last year that this problem would be addressed when the Competition and Markets Authority undertook a review of the retail banking market. The CMA recognised the issue and the inquiry's chair subsequently told the Treasury Committee that unauthorised overdrafts are

"the biggest single problem in the personal banking market".

The CMA published its review of retail banking on 9 August, but frankly its conclusions and proposals were a missed opportunity. It found that overdraft users make up almost half of those with personal current accounts and that many find it hard to keep on top of their arranged or unarranged overdrafts. It acknowledged that failing to do so can be costly, since overdraft users can accumulate high costs from the complicated mix of interest, fees and charges.

The review goes on to say that overdraft users, like other personal current account customers, have very low switching rates, which is particularly striking given that they often have the most to gain from switching. One reason for that is that overdraft users can be uncertain about whether they will be able to obtain an

overdraft facility from a different bank or when such a facility would be made available to them and are therefore worried about moving accounts. Anyway, none of the major high street banks has a great offer for customers who are financially vulnerable.

When it came to remedies, the CMA's proposals, quite frankly, fell well short of the mark. Some measures will go some way to addressing problems for some people, but not for those who most need support. One proposal says that customers need to be given clear notice when they are going overdrawn and that banks will be required to notify customers when they are going into an unarranged overdraft. Customers also need to be given the opportunity to avoid incurring charges, and the alerts that banks will be required to provide will inform them of a grace period during which they have an opportunity to avoid charges by paying more money into their account.

Critically, the CMA fell short of proposing an independently set maximum cap on the charges on overdrafts, as we have with payday loans. Instead, the report said that banks will be required to set their own ceilings on their unarranged overdraft charges in the form of a monthly maximum charge. However, most banks already have that. The problem is not that banks do not have a maximum charge—they do, and it might be £5 a day or £90 a month—but that the maximum charge is much too high.

The major four high street banks, which make up 77% of the current account market, already set their own caps on charges, and those charges can be up to £100 a month. The CMA's proposals represent little more than business as usual for those banks. Competition in this section of the market is weak, and in the past few years it has got weaker still with the merger of many of our high street banks. Heavy unarranged overdraft users are the least likely to switch banks accounts. Banks make more than £1 billion from unarranged overdraft charges and, given the substantial revenues they generate, there is little financial incentive to lower existing charges.

Ultimately, the proposals in the CMA report might take small steps towards helping some, but for the majority of people who are already struggling and do not have the means to prevent unauthorised overdrafts even if they are alerted to them, they will do little, if anything, to help. The monthly maximum cap as proposed by the CMA will likely do nothing to stop the deepening of a person's debt crisis, with punitive and disproportionate charges.

I do not want to deny the banks the right to charge for the services they provide, but I do want some fairness and proportionality. It is not fair to charge £5 a day or £90 a month for being a few pence over an overdraft limit, and it is not fair to whack charges on customers who are struggling with debt, in the knowledge that the charges will make their problems worse, not better. Banks need to take some responsibility for their customers.

As the Competition and Markets Authority admitted at a meeting of the Treasury Committee, the measures proposed in the report are geared at everybody and not in particular those who are financially vulnerable, for whom no direct action is proposed. When I asked whether the banks were taking advantage of financially vulnerable customers, it conceded that those customers who are least likely to switch are a "captive audience" for the banks and their excessive charges.

Ultimately, the Competition and Markets Authority report was a huge opportunity finally to put an end to what it calls “uncomfortably high” charges and to address what it said was the

“biggest single problem in the personal banking market”.

However, the opportunity was squandered. In effect, it passed the buck by asking the Financial Conduct Authority to respond to the recommendations. Peter Vicary-Smith, the chief executive of Which?, said to the Treasury Committee that the Competition and Markets Authority had left the heavy lifting and the difficult decisions for the Financial Conduct Authority to make. In response to that buck-passing, the new chief executive of the Financial Conduct Authority, Andrew Bailey, has made the welcome decision to include this issue in its ongoing review of high-cost short-term credit, which will report later this year.

The Financial Conduct Authority needs to do more to tackle the detriment caused by persistent overdraft use. I have been pleased by the focus that the FCA has placed on this issue so far, picking up where unfortunately the CMA left off. StepChange Debt Charity says that the review

“should include looking at what more can be done by lenders to support people who are trapped in an overdraft cycle and give them better and more affordable ways of paying back their debts.”

Yasmin Qureshi: Does my hon. Friend consider that what the banks are doing is insidious, bearing in mind that they and the Government can borrow at very low rates of interest?

Rachel Reeves: My hon. Friend is right. The bank rate is so low and banks are being given access to money at such low rates from the Bank of England. The problem is that they are not passing that on to their customers, and certainly not to those who most need it. The banks should be doing much more to ensure that those low interest rates are passed on, because that would give the whole economy a boost as well as helping those people who most need it.

I have been calling on and will continue to urge the Financial Conduct Authority to look at setting a cap for banks on unauthorised overdrafts as has already been done for payday lenders. It must look at such lending by banks in exactly the same way and not shy away from setting a cap for banks, too.

I also urge the Government to take action, because while the Financial Conduct Authority undertakes its review, every single day more financially vulnerable customers are being exploited and more and more are being pushed further into a cycle of debt. That is simply not acceptable. The justification for a cap in these markets has been made with the introduction of a cap in the payday lending market, and those are two different sources for the same short-term credit for people who need it immediately. They can either go to a payday lender or go into an unarranged overdraft. Whichever option they decide on to meet their short-term needs, they should not be exploited. The Government recognised that for payday lending and now need to recognise that on unarranged overdraft charges.

Frankly, it is a disgrace that the banks are charging more than payday lenders for short-term lending and getting away with it, so the Government should take

action. That is why I am calling on the Minister and the Government to legislate for a cap on overdraft fees and charges, as they have already done for payday lending through the Financial Services (Banking Reform) Act 2013. That would allow the FCA to implement such a cap without delay and without the risk of the banks taking the matter to the courts.

It is not right that the banks are making huge profits at the expense of the most vulnerable. Anything less than an independently set cap on overdraft charges will not be enough. I urge the Minister and the Government to act now, and I ask that as a first step the Minister will agree to meet me and representatives of Which? and StepChange to discuss this issue further so that we can ensure that all customers are afforded the protection they deserve.

11.18 am

The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Simon Kirby): What a pleasure it is to serve under your chairmanship, Mrs Gillan. I thank the hon. Member for Leeds West (Rachel Reeves) for securing this important debate on an issue that we share a keen interest in. I am here to listen and, hopefully, to be helpful.

It is clear that we all share a commitment to ensuring that people across our society can rely on the financial services that they need to manage their money effectively, securely and confidently. We want an economy that works for everyone. For most people, the bedrock of that is a transactional bank account that enables them to manage their personal finances on a day-to-day basis. Access to credit, including the use of an overdraft facility, is an important part of that.

For that reason, the Government are committed to doing two things. First, we will support and encourage competition among financial services providers, not only so that people have more choice over who they bank with, but because we know that more competition inevitably means better options on offer for customers, who can then vote with their feet. Secondly, we want to make sure that British customers are supported in the important financial decisions they make.

The hon. Members who have spoken have expressed the same aims, and I want to discuss the key issues that have been raised. I thank the hon. Members for Ashfield (Gloria De Piero), for Makerfield (Yvonne Fovargue), for Bolton South East (Yasmin Qureshi) and for Islwyn (Chris Evans) for making some thoughtful points, sharing their constituents' stories and making some more general observations. I am sure that the FCA, which is reviewing high-cost credit, will listen carefully to the debate.

The hon. Member for Leeds West rightly discussed the Competition and Markets Authority. A key question is how to ensure that there is competition. That is why we set up the CMA in the first place as a single stronger and independent competition regulator. It is the CMA's role to review the market, assess how effectively competition is working and, where appropriate, propose remedies to address any issues. Hon. Members have referred to the CMA's retail banking market investigation, which was published last summer. I am aware of the variety of opinions on that. It represented a thorough analysis of how competition is working in retail banking, including the role of both unarranged and arranged overdrafts.

[Simon Kirby]

The CMA concluded that the retail banking market is not working well for overdraft users. To tackle that, it is imposing remedies to improve overdraft transparency, including setting a monthly maximum charge for unarranged overdraft charges. It also looked closely at whether a hard cap on overdraft fees was necessary on competition grounds, and reached the conclusion that it was not. However, as hon. Members may know, it also recommended that the FCA should assess the ongoing effectiveness of the monthly maximum charge and consider whether other measures, including the introduction of rules, could be taken to enhance its effectiveness further.

The hon. Members for Leeds West and for Makerfield mentioned the action of the Financial Conduct Authority. It is true that the FCA has an important role to play in relation to overdrafts. It is worth pointing out, of course, that it has a much broader set of statutory objectives in relation to financial services, duties, powers and tools than the CMA. It has the power to cap the cost of all forms of consumer credit if that is deemed necessary and proportionate to tackle risks to consumers.

Rachel Reeves: I thank the Minister for his response to the substantive points that I and my hon. Friends have made. Does he think it is inconsistent that the Government have set a monthly maximum charge for payday lenders, but not for high street banks in relation to unarranged overdraft charges? If he does, is it time for the Government to act by setting a monthly maximum charge for unarranged overdrafts as well?

Simon Kirby: I understand the point that the hon. Lady is making. What I think is appropriate is for the Government to listen carefully to what the FCA comes up with later in the year, and to act in consumers' best interests. I am sure we both agree on that. There is clearly an inconsistency; otherwise we would not be having this debate.

The Government welcome the fact that the FCA is looking closely at what action might be necessary on overdrafts, considering the twin objectives of enhancing competition and protecting customers. That is why, in the light of the CMA's recommendations last November, the FCA launched a consultation on high-cost credit, including high-cost, short-term credit—payday loans—and overdrafts. The FCA's call for contributions remains open for another week—until next Wednesday, 15 February. I encourage those watching or listening to the debate, or reading it afterwards, to contribute to that, so that the FCA will be fully informed of the variety of opinion.

Today's debate is timely, in view of that. It has—and I thank the hon. Member for Leeds West for this—attracted quite a lot of press interest; the subject is obviously of interest out in the real world. I am certain that hon. Members' views will be heard clearly.

Rachel Reeves: I get the idea that the Minister is wrapping up. At the end of my speech, I asked whether he would meet me and representatives of Which? and StepChange. I hope that he will accept that invitation and that the meeting can be arranged soon.

Simon Kirby: I am not quite ready to wrap up yet; I have a few things to say that I am sure the hon. Lady will be pleased to hear. I should be delighted to meet her and representatives of Which? at an appropriate point—the most constructive time, when we can make the most difference. Obviously, while the FCA is considering the matter and the consultation is still open, the appropriate time may not be next week, but I should be delighted to work with her to come up with a solution that benefits everyone.

I think it is safe to say that the Government will be working alongside the FCA to understand the issues in the market. We will continue to do so, to ensure that it has all the appropriate tools at its disposal to take action where problems are identified. We have heard about some of the issues that people face when taking on overdrafts or other forms of high-cost credit. I can reassure hon. Members that the Government will closely monitor the work of the FCA in looking at that area. I am sure that the views expressed by hon. Members this morning will be taken into consideration as the regulator carries out its work.

We in the Government will also continue our efforts, complementing the work of the FCA. We have taken steps to encourage competition, to support credit unions and to improve financial education. The Government will, through that comprehensive approach, continue to take steps to make sure that British customers have quality choices, good information and strong protection.

It may be helpful if I say, in closing, that the CMA is not the final word in competition. There are important areas outside the scope of its work and the Government will keep a keen eye on the entire area. The Government will take the necessary action to ensure that our banking sector is not only the most competitive and innovative in the world, but fair.

Question put and agreed to.

11.28 am

Sitting suspended.

National Shipbuilding Strategy

[MR NIGEL EVANS *in the Chair*]

2.30 pm

Douglas Chapman (Dunfermline and West Fife) (SNP): I beg to move,

That this House has considered the National Shipbuilding Strategy.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Evans. I stand before you with the sense that we have been here before, and indeed we have. It is déjà vu on a grand scale, because at Defence questions, during Westminster Hall debates, in answers to urgent questions and in ministerial statements, the Government have had the chance to put at rest the minds of the various parties interested in the shipbuilding strategy. Yet again, we find ourselves hoping that the Minister will give us something more than the usual scorn sometimes reserved for SNP Members.

Any time I tire of waiting for answers, I simply remind myself that many people have been waiting much longer, whether they be the men and women who serve us in the Royal Navy or those in the yards on the Clyde and at Rosyth. That is not to mention the average taxpayer, who demands nothing more from the Government than that their money is well spent on equipment that actually works and the assurance that the Government are doing their utmost to fulfil their most basic duty—defending our homeland.

In 2021, it will be two decades since HMS St Albans slipped from Yarrow on the Clyde and became the last-of-class Type 23 frigate, meaning that the state that has always prided itself on being a maritime power will not have built a single frigate for the best part of 20 years. Furthermore, as the first-of-class Type 23, HMS Norfolk, left that same shipyard in 1990, it found that the mission for which it had been specifically designed had all but ended. It is quite incredible that in 2017, we are still unable to see a signed contract to begin the replacement of the Type 23s, which are a cold war platform. No one I have spoken to through my work on the Select Committee on Defence, whether fellow members, academics, shipbuilders, trade unionists or even civil servants, sees that as an acceptable way forward, yet here we are.

Its cold war mission may have ended, but the Type 23 has certainly done all that was asked of it, and more. Let us not forget that the range of tasks the Royal Navy has undertaken in the post-cold war era has dramatically increased, yet paradoxically, as the senior service's task list is increasing, the number of frigates and destroyers available to it has sunk to an historic low. It is that paradox that I hope the Minister will help me with today. Although the Ministry of Defence has long been able to exploit the convoluted and confusing history of the Type 26s and Type 31s, there is no way to hide its failings. I will make it easy for the Government by posing three straightforward questions that I hope they will take in good faith and respond to appropriately.

First, and most simply, when will we see the national shipbuilding strategy? Secondly, the MOD has made much of 2017 being the year of the Navy, but 2023 is a much more appropriate choice, as that is when the MOD completes the purchase of 24 F-35B planes to fly from the carriers, and when HMS Queen Elizabeth

becomes fully operational. Will the Minister reassure us that the Royal Navy will be able to form a fully functioning carrier group with Type 26s, Type 45s and the requisite Royal Fleet Auxiliary Service ships? Thirdly, on a related note, various media outlets have reported in recent days on the bandwidth problems in the procurement budget, which were highlighted in a National Audit Office report. So far as the equipment plan is concerned, how will the shipbuilding strategy ensure that surface naval ships are prioritised in procurement decisions?

When the Government committed to the national shipbuilding strategy as part of the 2015 strategic defence and security review, many of us thought we were reaching the end of a long journey with respect to the modernisation of the Royal Navy. How wrong we were. Early studies of what in 1994 was called the “future surface combatant” certainly thought outside the box. A whole range of options were considered, including a radical trimaran hull design. After a decade, the FSC had become the “sustained surface combatant capability”, which had as many as three designs. It was not a concept that would survive the financial crash. Indeed, by 2009, it was possible for my friend the right hon. Member for New Forest East (Dr Lewis), who chairs the Defence Committee, to call for a future surface combatant that was as “cheap as chips”. How did we get from as “cheap as chips” to building £1 billion frigates in less than a decade?

I contend that the blame lies squarely at the door of the MOD. One thing has become clear from the numerous conversations I have had with both management and unions at BAE Systems: it is a global company with a world-class workforce that is able to turn its hand to whatever design and specification is provided by the MOD. Up to this point, it has done that. Quite simply, the MOD's unerring ability to change horses midstream has added to the cost, timescales and uncertainty of the ongoing naval procurement programme.

That continued after the shipbuilding strategy announcement in 2015. The initial reassurances we were given were replaced with disquiet last spring, when no contract for the Type 26s was signed. When *The Guardian* broke the story in April about potential job losses at the Clyde yards, there was a crushing realisation that, yes, it had happened again. Any hope that a refreshed team in the main building over the summer would lead to clarity on the Type 26 or the shipbuilding strategy did not last long. When the Minister repeatedly assured us in the Chamber that we would see a strategy by the autumn statement, we knew she was using alternative facts. When my colleagues and I on the Defence Committee released a report that concluded

“it is now time for the MoD to deliver on its promises”,

I imagine we already knew that it had no intention of doing so—although I am interested to know if that report played any part in delaying the strategy, or if Ministers simply chose not to tell Parliament of their intentions.

It was not entirely clear, when Sir John Parker's independent report was announced, whether informing Parliament was part of the original strategy. When the report was finalised, we thought that it would be the formal strategy going forward. There is plenty to agree with in Sir John's report. Many of its findings chime with my experiences of MOD procurement, namely that there was a

“vicious cycle of fewer and much more expensive ships being ordered late and entering service years later than first planned”,

[*Douglas Chapman*]

and:

“The Government must drive cultural and governance changes in Defence that inject genuine pace into the procurement process with a clear grip over requirements, cost and time.”

However, we are now getting to a stage at which the report, far from being too little, too late, is too much, much too late. It will once more allow Ministers to take us around the houses and hope that we forget that they are running out of time to fulfil previous promises made to the House, the Royal Navy and the men and women on the Clyde.

While there is

“no precedent for building two ‘first of class’ RN frigates in one location in the UK”,

there appears to be no real alternative to the Clyde, as I am sure we will hear from my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow South West (Chris Stephens). Let us get on with signing the Type 26 contract and ensure that the Type 31 is ready to go as soon as possible.

Mr Kevan Jones (North Durham) (Lab): Can the hon. Gentleman shed any light on what the Type 31 is? There have been generalised views of what it will do and what it will be, but I understand that there are no plans and no actual specification. Is the Type 31 not one of those pipedreams that seems to be put out there to reassure the industry, when actually there is a lot of work to be done not only to design it, but to find out where it fits into the broader naval strategy?

Douglas Chapman: The hon. Gentleman makes a good point. We are constantly told that the Type 31s are also for the export market. I have asked parliamentary questions on whether the Government could provide details of their homework on what that export market might look like. I am afraid that, to date, there are no answers. We need to make progress with the information we have, which is why we are questioning the Minister today.

Anyone who has taken an interest in this matter will know that BAE Systems has two possible designs. It is important that we get on with picking one, so that we can ensure—to follow up on the hon. Gentleman’s point—that we have an exportable product that we can take to market. However, we are falling behind. The Franco-Italian Aquitaine class frigates are already in service with La Royale and have been exported to Egypt and Morocco, so we are already missing the export boat with regard to the Type 31s.

Martin Docherty-Hughes (West Dunbartonshire) (SNP): My hon. Friend should also note the Danish Absalon class frigates, which have proved to be very versatile, reliable and affordable ships for a valuable ally’s navy.

Douglas Chapman: Of course. That just makes the point that while the Government sit back, dither and try to work out what the strategy might be, we have great examples of other countries—small countries—that are able to export their own products into the markets that they want to serve.

Quite simply, we have been waiting for the future surface combatant, be it the Type 26 or the Type 31, since 1994. Sir John’s report may seek a “sea change” in naval procurement, but the fact is that we had a defence industry

strategy in 2005, a 15-year terms of business agreement signed by BAE Systems in 2009 and a consolidated shipbuilding plan for the Clyde, with support from the Government and the trade unions, in 2013. How on earth has it taken the Government so long to get to a strategy? Why do they still not have one by 2017? Surely that is a damning indictment of their competence to run the country. Again, I plead with the Minister: let us get on with it.

My second question for the Minister is about ensuring that when HMS Queen Elizabeth enters service, it will do so with a carrier group worthy of a next-generation Navy. Those carriers—the largest ships ever built for the Royal Navy—are being built on time and on budget in my constituency by the superb workforce in Rosyth. It would be a great disappointment to those workers, those men and women—

Mr Stephen Hepburn (Jarrow) (Lab): I congratulate the hon. Gentleman on securing this debate on a very important issue. He mentions the aircraft carriers. Let me respectfully advise the Minister that shipbuilding and ship repairs are still very much alive on the Tyne and that my local yard, A&P Tyne, has played a key role in getting those ships on time, within budget and with excellent quality. In the light of John Parker’s report, which identified that commercial yards have a great role to play in supporting traditional naval yards in providing the MOD’s requirements, I ask the Minister to ensure that when any lucrative contracts come forward in the future, commercial yards such as A&P are taken into consideration, bearing in mind their record.

Douglas Chapman: I thank the hon. Gentleman. That is a bit of a non-question for me, but I am sure the Minister will be happy to add it to her extensive list of questions already put.

The ships in Rosyth are the biggest that the Royal Navy has ever built, and various people have been involved in building them from day one and bringing the parts from all areas of the UK to Rosyth, but we must ensure that when those ships sail down the Forth, they are adequately protected. At the moment, I struggle to see how that battle group will fit together.

As I said, although 2017 may be the year of the Navy, 2023 will be far more significant, because in 2023 we will know whether the strategy has done what it set out to do in the first place. By 2023, the initial tranche of 24 F-35Bs should be in place to fly operations from the carriers, and the first Type 26 should be entering service to replace HMS Argyll, which will be the first Type 23 to leave service.

The Defence Committee highlighted the question of the carrier group in our November report and I hope we will press the Minister further on it, but quite simply the Government are running out of time to uphold their end of the bargain. Quite honestly, I am not holding my breath.

I expect many right hon. and hon. Members will talk today about the state of the Navy, but going over some of the history again might be worthwhile. At the time of the infamous Nott report, the Royal Navy had 60 frigates and destroyers, and even by the end of the Falklands conflict, it still had 50. In the 1998 strategic defence review, long after the cold war had ended, a fleet of 32 ships was constructed. However, the Government now crow about their commitment to 19 frigates and destroyers.

Even as we move to an era of fewer and more powerful ships, 19 is still too low a number and has seen the UK fail in many of its commitments to its allies. I am not alone in finding it unacceptable that the UK has often been unable to provide a ship for NATO's standing maritime groups; that we had to miss the recent anniversary celebrations of the New Zealand navy because a suitable ship was not available; and that offshore patrol vessels are having to fill in on tasks relating to the fleet ready escort and the Royal Navy's presence in the Caribbean.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: My hon. Friend makes a good point about the 75th-anniversary celebrations for the royal navy of New Zealand. In November, our allies the United States, Canada and Australia sent ships to the international naval review—even Tonga and the Cook Islands sent ships to the naval review—but the United Kingdom Navy sent nothing. That is not exactly the best start to a brave Brexit diplomatic offensive, is it?

Douglas Chapman: Again, I cannot help but agree with my hon. Friend. He makes a very valid and good point, but if our backs were to the wall and we needed to provide ships for NATO, that would be a much more serious commitment that the UK would have to make. If we do not have enough ships to fulfil those commitments, that is even more concerning.

I said that the current fleet was 19 in number. Two ships, HMS Diamond and HMS Lancaster, are being used as training ships, so that reduces the number from 19 to 17 usable frigates and destroyers.

I hope that the Minister will break the habit of a lifetime today and actually give us the answers to the questions that we have asked. Quite simply, the Royal Navy and the carrier programme demand that. It starts with a contract for the Type 26 programme being signed, so let me reintroduce an old slogan: "We want eight and we won't wait!" If we were to add anything to that, it would be that we cannot afford to wait any longer.

I hope that the Minister can also answer my last question. How can we ensure that surface shipbuilding does not suffer as a result of the proliferation of big-ticket items going through the order book over the next decade? The headline from Monday's *Financial Times* says it all: "Spiralling cost of UK defence projects signals hard choices". I raised this issue at the most recent Defence questions. With the years 2020 to 2023 being the most critical in the equipment procurement plan, I fear what Professor Malcolm Chalmers of the Royal United Services Institute highlighted in the *FT* article:

"the historic response at MoD has simply been to push programmes to the right and allow service dates to slip."

That story followed last month's excellent National Audit Office report, which highlighted, among other things, that the "headroom" used to account for any potential overspend had already been spent. The report stated that

"any further capability requirements during the lifetime of the Plan period will have to be met through a reprioritisation".

I know that all those situations put the Minister in a really difficult position, but the clear questions that I must ask again are these. When will we see the national shipbuilding strategy? Can the Minister assure us that, by 2023, the Royal Navy will be able to form a fully functioning carrier group, with Type 26s, Type 45s and the requisite Royal Fleet Auxiliary ships? Finally, how

will the shipbuilding strategy ensure that surface naval ships are prioritised in future procurement decisions? Let us hope that today we get some answers and that 2017 does become the year of the Navy, not the year that the Navy wants to forget.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr Nigel Evans (in the Chair): Order. I remind everyone that the winding-up speeches will start at half-past 3. That should give Members an idea of how much time they have to speak.

2.48 pm

Mr Kevan Jones (North Durham) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Evans. I congratulate the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) on securing this very important debate. He raises some very interesting points. Certainly I have been trying to get answers to them through parliamentary questions, but we are getting the usual stonewalling from the Ministry of Defence, which has become a habit in recent times.

The important thing is to ask this question: what is the status of Sir John Parker's report? It was announced in the 2016 Budget, which stated:

"The government has appointed Sir John Parker to lead the national ship building strategy, which was confirmed in the Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015."

It also stated that the report would be published in the autumn of 2016, which in MOD-speak means anytime between December and the following June. The press release stated that it was a Treasury-led, not a MOD-led review. That is important. It was announced by the right hon. Member for Tatton (Mr Osborne) when he visited Portsmouth naval base.

The report was published, strangely, not as a Government report but as Sir John Parker's own report. The jungle drums in the MOD tell me that there was a bit of concern about whether the Secretary of State would put his name to this report, and he decided not to. That has left the report in limbo in terms of what influence and status it will have in the forward thinking about not only our naval shipbuilding strategy, but our wider industrial strategy.

I am also concerned about how this matter fits into broader defence industrial strategy. I asked the Minister on 12 January when we would publish a defence industrial strategy, only to be told that there are no plans to publish a separate defence industrial strategy, but that the national shipbuilding strategy—Sir John Parker's report—would be added into a broader cross-Government piece of work on industrial strategy. That is important because we have basically abandoned having a separate industrial policy and strategy in this country. That is important because of the jobs that are relied upon and the important capabilities that we need in this country. The Government seem to have just mashed that into the rest of wider industrial policy.

A basic question needs to be asked about shipbuilding: do we want sovereign capability to produce complex warships in this country—yes or no? It is a very simple question that the Government need to answer to give reassurance about the future of the jobs—which the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife raised—and the technical expertise. The problem is that people look at a warship and think that the bulk of the cost and

[Mr Kevan Jones]

expertise has been met on the outside. It has not. The main value and technology in it are the skills that go into designing it and into systems integration. Our supply chain goes way beyond the Clyde—there is a national footprint of companies in leading-edge technologies. We need to ask whether we want those skills in this country or whether we will just buy from abroad.

When I was first involved in shipbuilding in the late 1980s, the then Government competed at different yards. We had Swan Hunter, Yarrow and Cammell Laird around the country and the Government used to compete contracts between them. At the end of the day, it was pork barrel politics as to who got the contract and that ultimately meant that Swan Hunter closed. Clearly, the strategy after that was to concentrate complex warship building in one yard. That made absolute sense. That one yard is on the Clyde, whether we like it or not. There is no other way of doing it.

The concern I have about Sir John Parker's report—there are some points in it that I agree with—is that it is a bit naive. It has looked at building the carriers, which are on a huge scale in terms of block modular build, and then more or less said that we can start building Type 26s and others in a modular format. Well, I am sorry but I do not think we can—no disrespect to my hon. Friend the Member for Jarrow (Mr Hepburn). These ships are on a different scale. We need one yard to do the integration—the actual build. The idea that we are going to build them around the country to try to get some competition goes back to an argument we had in the late 1990s. I come back to the basic question of whether we actually want complex warship building in this country.

The issue is not just the capability. There is naivety among some people who think that they can order these ships like ordering their next car. They decide what colour they want, go to the showroom and say, "I will have a blue one and we will have a yellow one next year." That is not how this happens. These are very complex warships and pieces of defence equipment. We need to retain not only the technological capability but the skill base in the yards and in industry, and we need a drumbeat of work going through to ensure that we do that. A classic example of when we got that wrong is when the Conservative Government in the 1990s took us out of submarine building. That led to all the problems we had trying to regenerate the capacity in Barrow for the Astute programme. Unless we keep that drumbeat going, we will get into a situation whereby we cannot rely on the fact that when we need a complex warship, there is one there to be delivered. We cannot turn these skills and capabilities on and off like a tap when they are needed.

Carol Monaghan (Glasgow North West) (SNP): One of the real dangers is exactly what the hon. Gentleman describes. As the yards in Glasgow await the commencement of the Type 26 project, engineers—highly skilled workers who can work in many different fields—will not wait around forever.

Mr Jones: The hon. Lady makes a very good point. The issue is not just about generating the skills in the first place—the key investment that companies need to make in apprenticeships and other things. This is now

an international market. There are perhaps engineers working on the Clyde who, if there is no work, will move elsewhere in the world. In some cases, they will not come back to the industry. We found that with the Astute programme; nuclear engineers left and trying to get them back, or regenerating those skills and expertise, was very difficult.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: The hon. Gentleman is making an excellent point. Critically, the Canadian suppliers were actually in Glasgow the other week looking for such people to take to north America.

Mr Jones: Again, the hon. Gentleman makes a very good point. This is an international market and these skills are very sought after. This comes back to my point that if we want this capability in the UK, we have to nurture and protect it and the only way to do that is by having a throughput of work.

The hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife raised the issue of the Type 26. The delay is adding to that uncertainty. The wider piece really concerns me. To give the impression that we are going to have that drumbeat of work, we have had the Type 31 inserted into the programme. I have studied in detail to try to find out what the Type 31 actually is; no one has been able to tell me yet. It is a bit like the mythical unicorn—everybody thinks it exists, but no one has ever seen one. If the MOD can say that there is a budget line for it, it should please identify that—in the current procurement there is no budget line for it at all in the programme.

Chris Stephens (Glasgow South West) (SNP): Was the hon. Gentleman concerned, as I was, to read in an article in *The Daily Telegraph* a suggestion from a Ministry of Defence source that there is no budget for Type 31s and that they might not even happen?

Mr Jones: As people know, I am a bit of an anorak on this subject and I actually study the MOD accounts, but I still cannot find where this budget line is. Another point that has never been answered is what this ship will actually be used for. I am not sure where it fits into any naval strategy. Will it be able to meet, for example, Britain's NATO capabilities? Will it have capability to fulfil those roles? If it has not got the air defence capability, it will not. The other thing that people have completely missed is that this is about not just building the ship, but running it afterwards. We all know that there is a crisis in recruitment and manpower in the Royal Navy. Again, where is the budget line for not only building but running this generation of ships?

The hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife makes a very important point. The Government say that the great thing about the ships is that they are exportable; I am sorry, but we are bit behind the game on this. He rightly identifies at least two other nations that have product out there.

There is another point about strategy. This is about not only skills but the defence of our country, because if we have the gap between the Type 23s going out and the Type 26s coming in, there will also be a gap in the nation's capability. I understand that there is an ongoing extension programme for some Type 23s, but we need clarity, because if there is a gap, we will not be able to protect the carrier groups or some of our other capabilities.

That leads me to the wider piece about the Government's strategy in this area. The Prime Minister argues that she is battling for Britain and that Britain is the key market, but we have a situation in which the Ministry of Defence, obviously leant on heavily by the Treasury, is happy to have multimillion-pound contracts with the United States—the Apache and P-8 contracts, to name just two—with no commitment whatever that proportionate workshare will come back to the UK economy. I asked the Minister a written question about the Apaches, and I think Boeing said that 5% of the programme's value will come back into our supply chain. That point is important not just for the number of jobs, but to keep the capability that we need in this country. I cannot imagine for one minute the United States doing something similar, even before President Trump took office, and things will get even worse now. Exporting highly paid jobs and capability from this country is inexcusable. I do not want to see the same thing happening in shipbuilding, so that we will perhaps just buy ships off the shelf from the United States or anywhere else.

A few weeks ago I asked the Minister in a parliamentary question what she was doing to monitor whether Boeing, for example, would put enough jobs into the economy. She fudged the answer, saying, "We don't monitor this area." I am sorry, but that is inexcusable. What really irritates me is that if a British company sold a piece of defence kit to the United States of America, there is no way that we would not have to give guarantees about workshare and jobs in the United States. My fear is that without joined-up thinking on shipbuilding, if we are not careful, a time will come when the Treasury says, "Isn't it cheaper just to buy these from abroad—from the United States or somewhere else?" We would then lose not only the sovereign capability that is so important to this country, but the skill base and jobs that come with that.

I come to my final point. It is about time that the Ministry of Defence fessed up that it has a huge problem, which is only partly of the MOD's making, because this is actually a Treasury issue. The National Audit Office report is clear about the procurement budget. The Ministry of Defence is falling into an old habit—as a former Minister in the Ministry of Defence, I know this is easy to do—of just pushing the budget sideways, which is what has happened with the defence budget. However, there are other pressures on the day-to-day in-service budgets. Ships are being laid up, for example, because the cash is not available to run in-service services. In addition, there is a huge black hole—it was highlighted in the NAO report—that the MOD has to deal with. We are not talking about separate money; it will have to find £8 billion over the next 10 years for the defence estate. All that falls within the defence budget, so if does not come out of one place, it will come out of another.

The Government need to be honest about where they are with the equipment budget. The Opposition got lectures from the incoming coalition Government about how frugal they would be, in terms of ensuring that they did not over-commit on defence, but they are clearly doing that now. The shipbuilding strategy needs to be published soon. If we are going to answer yes to the question, "Do we want a sovereign capability for shipbuilding in this country?", we will have to put the money behind it and ensure that the work is of a nature that allows the industry to develop its skills and retain that capability.

3.4 pm

Chris Stephens (Glasgow South West) (SNP): It is a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for North Durham (Mr Jones) and to have listened to his technical expertise in this area. I very much appreciated his speech and particularly his support for the Clyde shipyards. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) on securing the debate, and it is always a pleasure to see you in the Chair, Mr Evans.

I shall start, as the hon. Member for North Durham did, with the extraordinary process regarding the strategy. He is not the only one who thought that Sir John Parker's report would be the national shipbuilding strategy; I and other hon. Members of the House did too, as did trade unions and the defence industry.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: The Minister said that a signed copy would be sent to my hon. Friend the Member for Argyll and Bute (Brendan O'Hara), but we are still waiting for it. Clearly that means that the actual statement has not been produced.

Chris Stephens: I remember that exchange, and there was clearly confusion about the report. I also find it extraordinary that although Sir John Parker's report was sent to the Ministry of Defence on 3 November 2016, this is the first opportunity that hon. Members have had to discuss it in detail. In November or December, there should have been a debate, or a series of debates, on the report, so that hon. Members could give their views on it and feed into the process. I shall come to that later.

I was very concerned when it was pointed out to me that on 2 January in *The Daily Telegraph*—not necessarily a newspaper that I subscribe to—MOD sources were not only saying that there is no budget for the Type 31, but that it will not happen and the plan will not be realised. We need to go back to the former Prime Minister's announcement on the Clyde in my constituency in 2014, when he promised that 13 Type 26 frigates would be built on the Clyde. We were then told that there would be eight Type 26 frigates and five general-purpose frigates. As the hon. Member for North Durham outlined, we do not know exactly what that capability is, but we were told, "It's okay; relax, because eight plus five equals 13." We are still awaiting the final sign-off, not only for the eight Type 26 frigates but for the five general-purpose frigates. I hope that the Minister will tell us, if there is indeed a budget for Type 31 frigates, what it is and what the procurement timetable is for Type 26 and Type 31 frigates.

Douglas Chapman: If what my hon. Friend is saying is anywhere near the truth and the Type 31s will not exist, what does that say about the drumbeat for Govan and Scotstoun?

Chris Stephens: I would be very concerned about that, and I will come to the effects of that later. Sir John Parker's report is an honest attempt to end the "feast and famine" procurement processes by the Ministry of Defence that have often plagued the shipbuilding industry. If any other public services carried out procurement processes in the way that the Ministry of Defence does, there would be uproar in the streets—imagine if it was equipment for the health service or education, and so on.

[Chris Stephens]

I am pleased that Sir John Parker's report also recognises the capability and skills of shipyard workers on the Clyde—in my constituency, in the Govan shipyard, and in Scotstoun, in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow North West (Carol Monaghan)—working on digital technology adapted from the automotive sector and with new working practices that have increased productivity. It is an honour and a privilege to represent them in this Parliament. The shipyard workers are also supported by trade unions and are represented at shop-floor level by representatives who have campaigned tenaciously over the years to ensure that future work is secured. Any announcements that come from the Government are a victory for them more than anyone else. However, as someone who had family members in Yarrow who were made redundant under a Tory Government, I always view such commitments from this Government with suspicion when it comes to shipbuilding.

Sir John Parker's report also recognises that the Royal Fleet Auxiliary ships should be assembled in the UK. It really is a nonsense that that work has been farmed out elsewhere. I would hope that Rosyth, to cite one example, would have that opportunity. Failure to ensure that Royal Fleet Auxiliary ships are built in the UK will make the report fall at the first hurdle. An award to a UK yard for Royal Fleet Auxiliary ships would demonstrate that the Government are serious about ensuring that an export model can be achieved and that investment in technology can be kept.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: My hon. Friend is talking about Type 31s, but given the fact that the Secretary of State and also the leader of the Conservative party in the Scottish Parliament have said that there will be work on the 13 Type 26s, where is that guarantee from the Government?

Chris Stephens: I hope we will get that today. I hope the Minister will give us that commitment.

There is one fatal flaw, however, in Sir John Parker's report, which needs to be tackled. His assumption that there is no precedent for building different first-class naval ships concurrently is wrong. In the 1990s, Yarrow shipyards were building and constructing Royal Navy ships as well as exporting ships to Malaysia. This precedent was envisaged by the Clyde shipyard taskforce in 2002, chaired by the then Scottish Executive Minister, Wendy Alexander, and the former Scottish Office Minister, Brian Wilson, which ensured that the Govan shipyard was responsible for the steelworks and that Scotstoun was to become the centre for excellence.

There is therefore reason to argue that Govan could construct the Type 26 frigates and Scotstoun could develop the new Type 31 frigate, using the specialist design capability to ensure that it could be exported to other countries. Such technical expertise to carry out the work is already there on the Clyde, but it will require investment. MOD pressure not to invest in the frigate factory—promises that led to the demolition of the covered berth and module hall at Scotstoun—has meant that we still have a constrained capacity and that the full potential for shipbuilding on the Clyde has not yet been realised. I want to hear from the Government about progressive plans with respect to shipyard reconstruction

to unlock significant long-term advances and savings for the industry so that it can win more orders, not only here but from overseas.

Sacrifices have been made by shipyard workers on the Clyde. Let us not forget that to get to where we are now, workers on the Clyde took redundancy to ensure that the rest would be kept and that they would be match-fit to build the 13 Type 26 frigates. I hope that today the Minister will confirm procurement processes for the Type 26 and Type 31 frigates. The trade unions have said that failure to ensure that the Clyde leads on the general-purpose frigates would be a betrayal.

3.13 pm

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): It is a pleasure to speak in this debate, Mr Evans. I am conscious of the time and will make sure that we all get a chance to participate.

I thank the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) for bringing the issue forward today. He spoke very well, as he always does. He has been an advocate for shipbuilding across the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, where we are all better together, as I often say, Mr Evans—I am sure that in this case you would probably say, "Yes, you're probably right on that." [Laughter.] I digress slightly, Mr Evans; I apologise for doing so.

This is an issue that I have given much thought to and had much discussion about, having just come off the Select Committee on Defence. I am pleased to see my hon. Friend the Member for Belfast East (Gavin Robinson) here. He took over my position on the Defence Committee and is already much involved in the issues. It is good to see him here and involved in the work on that Committee.

We have what is undoubtedly the finest Navy in the world. That is a recognised fact. That is no surprise, given that we are a small group of islands. At one stage we were described as the empire on whom the sun never set, as we controlled so much of the world. Our Navy was a major reason for that and our Navy retains a major role in the strength of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland today.

A strong army needs a strong fleet, and this is where the national shipbuilding strategy must play its part in the process. These are the facts: the Ministry of Defence is in the middle of an ambitious recapitalisation programme for its naval surface fleet. The Government plan to spend some £19 billion over the next decade on surface ships for the Royal Navy and Royal Fleet Auxiliary.

The Royal Navy designates a class of frigates and destroyers as a Type. The Navy has a fleet of 13 frigates, all Type 23s, which will begin to leave service from 2023 onwards. Hon. Members who have spoken so far have expressed concern—it is my concern as well—about the delays and the timescale, and about the quantity and numbers as well. We look to the Minister today for a response that can put our minds at ease and allay our fears.

Plans to replace the fleet changed significantly in 2015, when the Government dropped proposals to replace it on a one-to-one basis with the yet-to-be-built Type 26 frigates. Only eight Type 26 frigates will be ordered, and a new class of general-purpose frigate, unofficially known

as the Type 31s, will be developed. We spoke on the topic of the Type 26 in October, and my stance today is as it was then, when I said:

“It is my desire...to see the new British fleet built in Britain. As we have said, we are marching to the steady drumbeat of orders, and that must be the way we move.”—[*Official Report*, 18 October 2016; Vol. 615, c. 308WH.]

Hon. Members have suggested that although the drumbeat of orders is on paper, we need to have it confirmed and the timescale needs to be in place.

BAE Systems is the prime industry partner for naval warships and submarines. I welcome the Government's confirmation that the steel is to be cut on the Type 26 in summer 2017, although as the hon. Member for North Durham (Mr Jones) said earlier, summer can develop into autumn—or indeed winter, whatever the case may be. The work will be at BAE's two remaining shipyards, both located on the Clyde. Again, I can say it is within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I welcome the commitment, but the Government have not gone far enough and there is much uncertainty about what the highly anticipated report will bring.

I read an interesting report—Members have referred to it—on a website called Save the Royal Navy. Its opinion on the Parker report states:

“On 29th November Sir John Parker's report to inform the UK National Shipbuilding Strategy...was published. Commissioned by the Treasury, exasperated with decades of continual delays and cost increases to warship construction, the report is concise and written in clear layman's language. The 34 recommendations are eminently sensible and the report has generated at least temporarily, a warm and fuzzy feeling of consensus and optimism.”

That is a positive response looking towards the future. However, that report goes on to say:

“Amongst independent observers there is cynicism about whether any of the recommendations of the report will be implemented at all. Most of the issues highlighted have long been known but nothing has been done for years. By commissioning the report, the Treasury has at least created a roadmap to escape the current shipbuilding malaise which will be difficult to ignore.”

Perhaps the Minister will respond to that. The report continues:

“It is now up to government to properly fund, endorse and enforce the recommendations when it formulates and implements the actual shipbuilding strategy next year. Should those in power be bold enough to do so, it would go a long way to reviving the RN and have great benefits to UK industry.”

This is exactly the phrase we want to see:

“It is now up to government to properly fund, endorse”

and fulfil the recommendations—and, I would say, their obligations as well. That is why we are here this afternoon. These are matters of national importance and we need to impress upon our Ministers, particularly the Minister who is here, the importance of implementing the review and incorporating the recommendations for shipbuilding for our Navy.

We do not always get full details from the Library, but on this occasion we have oodles of information, which has been very helpful to inform our speeches. One thing that has not been mentioned is the issue of logistics ships. We have heard much about frigates, but I want to mention logistics ships on the record, because—the Minister will know this—it seems that South Korea is going to build them, and I want to know: why are we

not building them here? I mean no disrespect to South Korea—it has a lot to do and is very expert in what it does—but I would like our people to have the opportunity.

There has been a suggestion that conversions from commercial shipping might be the right solution. If it is the solution, let it happen at home, using our own shipbuilding expertise. We have shipbuilders throughout the UK and they must benefit from Government contracts. A Ministry of Defence principle ensuring that only home firms get the work is a must. It is important to entire communities that rely on the work and the money. More importantly, however, we do not ask for ships to be built only to save jobs; we need those ships for the security of the nation. Sometimes that point is lost in the debate. We are thinking about the security of the nation, to make sure that we are okay. We have a duty and responsibility. I should like to say that I have every confidence—provided that the Minister gives a good response today. We must impress on her how vital it is to have a strong, fully functioning Navy. That can happen only with proper frigates and the right types of ships.

I implore the Minister to set our minds at ease and ensure that the report takes into consideration all that has been said, in the valuable contributions made by all Members to the debate. Certain things cannot be scaled back, and one of those is our defence capability. The Navy is an essential component of that, which must be recognised in the forthcoming national shipbuilding strategy. I thank the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife for setting the scene, and all other hon. Members who have spoken. We look to the Minister for the response that we need.

3.21 pm

Steven Paterson (Stirling) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Evans. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) on securing this important debate. The timing could not be better, given the revelations about the cost of UK defence projects in all forces, not only the Navy. I want to raise two points. The first is about our priorities. They are set in the national security strategies and should flow into the strategic defence and security review and the Government's priorities in this area. The second is the effect of the recent National Audit Office report on procurement for large defence projects and the affordability of the national shipbuilding strategy that we anticipate.

The national security strategy and the SDSR should inform the procurement process and, because of that, the national shipbuilding strategy. However, there seems to be a logical inconsistency in how that is applied. In paragraph 75 of the SDSR, the Ministry of Defence is quoted as saying that the document will

“determine priorities for investment to ensure that the UK has a full suite of capabilities with which to respond to defence and security threats”.

Page 67 identifies the three tiers of domestic and overseas risks, grading them as tier 1, 2 or 3 threats,

“based on a judgement of the combination of both likelihood and impact.”

Taking that at face value, the National Security Council has identified terrorism, international military conflict, cyber, public health, major natural hazards and instability overseas as the tier 1 threats facing the UK. That exercise having been undertaken, one would have thought the

[*Steven Paterson*]

resources would follow the perceived threats and their perceived likelihood, but that does not seem to be the approach followed by the Ministry of Defence, particularly in the present case.

Douglas Chapman: Does my hon. Friend feel that the amount of resource going into the Dreadnought programme is skewing all other budgets and making the Minister's job of preserving our surface ship fleet much more difficult?

Steven Paterson: Yes, I think that is a concern that many of us have—that the priorities identified in the risk assessment done for the document I have quoted are not being followed in Government spending. Perhaps that is why there has been delay after delay in the project.

Mr Kevan Jones: Does the hon. Gentleman also recognise that the Dreadnought programme is putting money into the Scottish economy? A success story in that regard is that Babcock is doing the missile tubes at Rosyth.

Steven Paterson: If we are going to take the SDSR process seriously and look at the assessment of what we need for the defence of the country, we must deal with tier 1 threats first—that is why they are tier 1 threats. Clearly, if we are to meet the threats identified, the shipbuilding programme is essential.

As my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow South West (Chris Stephens) noted, the Government promised that 13 Type 26 frigates would be built on the Clyde, then revised that substantially, to eight, with five multi-purpose frigates. At paragraph 90 of its report on the 2% level of spending by the Government, the Defence Committee correctly identifies the risk to the Type 31 programme:

“Should...the ‘concept study’ to investigate the potential for a new class of lighter, flexible general purpose frigate be unsuccessful, we wish to be informed at the earliest opportunity of the MoD’s contingency plans to deliver the extra ships to satisfy the total originally promised.”

The Government's response to those concerns merely indicates a willingness to keep the Committee informed. We are looking for some more concrete answers from the Minister today. Furthermore, we still await confirmation that the frigates will be built on the Clyde. Should that not occur, it will be a betrayal of the Clyde workers, as my hon. Friend said. They would be entitled to feel betrayed; it would threaten the yards' capacity to deliver complex warships in the future and would undermine the UK's ability to meet the challenges identified in its own national security strategy and the SDSR.

My second concern is that the shipbuilding strategy will not be affordable. I am concerned that there will be further backtracking on the commitments. It is fine to have a strategy, with many large new procurement projects, but if there is no money to actualise the strategy, what is the point in the exercise? According to the National Audit Office's report “The Equipment Plan 2016 to 2026”—which the hon. Member for North Durham (Mr Jones), among others, has already alluded to—the price of the plan has ballooned by 20%,

to £82 billion, in a single year. That means that the Department has allocated all headroom previously set aside in the plan, removing all the flexibility to accommodate additional capability requirements. That is why we need reassurance today.

Given that the Type 26 project started at a projected cost of £343 million per hull, according to the 2015 major projects report, and is now £1 billion per hull, according to oral evidence to the Defence Committee, the MOD does not have, and never has had, a proven track record of acquiring big-ticket items on time and on budget. Rather than dealing with those pressures in the past, it has pushed the programmes further down the list and allowed service dates to slip, exactly as has been described today.

Mr Jones: Does the hon. Gentleman agree that there is added pressure on the defence budget because of Brexit, in terms of the value of the dollar, which is made worse when we procure large-ticket items from the United States?

Steven Paterson: The hon. Gentleman must have read my mind, because I am coming on to say that point 18 of the NAO report summary states:

“Changes in foreign exchange rates, such as those that happened after the EU referendum, can pose a significant risk to the Plan's affordability in the future. As at 10 January 2017, the pound was 21.4% below the exchange rate with the US dollar and 4.2% below the exchange rate for the euro used in the Department's planning assumptions. Approximately £18.6 billion of the Plan is denominated in US dollars and £2.6 billion in euros over 10 years.”

That will have a major impact.

I understand that the Department has a certain amount of protection against foreign exchange rates in arranging its finances, but does it not worry the Minister that such a large amount of the plan is predicated on foreign exchange rates, with the Government appearing to be gambling that the rate will not go up further? Given the Government position that economists cannot be trusted, which is what many current Ministers said during the recent referendum—and going by even a cursory look at the financial predictions before Brexit—can we really have any confidence that the envisaged programme can be afforded? That is why we need reassurance today.

The shipbuilding strategy is long overdue and, given the current state of the Department's books, it is badly needed to provide clarity for those working in shipbuilding and those monitoring our national defence readiness going forward.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: My hon. Friend will correct me if I am wrong but, to take F-35s as an example, they are 85% built in the United States, and therefore bought in dollars. That is critical when we reflect on the impact of the fall in the pound compared with the dollar.

Steven Paterson: Absolutely. That illustrates the point very well. I hope that the Minister will reassure us today about the Type 26 programme and the Type 31 programme, about the ships being built on the Clyde as promised, and on the affordability of the shipbuilding strategy that the Government will hopefully soon present. Finally, I hope that by the end of the debate we shall know with certainty when the overdue shipbuilding strategy will be published.

3.29 pm

Brendan O'Hara (Argyll and Bute) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Evans. I sincerely thank my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) for securing this important debate.

I am pleased to see that all the constituent parts of the United Kingdom are represented here today, but I have to ask: with the honourable exceptions of the Minister and the hon. Member for Bury St Edmunds (Jo Churchill), where are all the Government Members? On the day we debated the royal yacht *Britannia*, one could not get one's nose through the door for Government Members wishing to contribute. Yet here we are, discussing the national shipbuilding strategy, and apart from the honourable exceptions I mentioned, not a single Government Member is here to take part or even listen.

I commend my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife; as always, he has hit the nail on the head. I join him in seeking an assurance from the Ministry of Defence that it will be able to form the functioning carrier group that he mentioned. I also join him in seeking a cast-iron guarantee that the building of surface ships will not suffer as the big-ticket items begin to come on to the books over the next decade or so. I look forward to the Minister addressing those questions.

I recognise the contribution of my hon. Friend the Member for Stirling (Steven Paterson), who questioned—rightly, in the light of the National Audit Office report—how the Government intend to pay for this equipment, given that we have been told that there is no headroom whatever, the contingency funds have gone and the costs are ballooning.

I commend the tenacity of my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow South West (Chris Stephens), who has been a tireless campaigner on behalf of the shipbuilders of his constituency and of workers the length and breadth of the country. I hope the Minister was listening carefully when he articulated the fears of workers on the Clyde at Scotstoun and Govan.

The hon. Member for North Durham (Mr Jones) was correct to refer to the status of Sir John Parker's report. We were told that the strategy would be delivered; then, after it was not delivered, we were told that Sir John Parker's report was merely for information. I would like to know when that was decided—I will return to that point in a moment. The hon. Gentleman also raised the vital question of the status of the Type 31s. I hope that the Minister will clarify the exact role that the Type 31s will play. Will she give cast-iron guarantees that they will actually happen?

My hon. Friends the Members for West Dunbartonshire (Martin Docherty-Hughes), and for Glasgow North West (Carol Monaghan) raised an incredibly important point: the delays and uncertainty caused by holding back the national shipbuilding strategy are in danger of producing a skills flight from Scotland, particularly from the Clyde. As we have heard, Canadian shipbuilders are already advertising locally in and around Glasgow, promising jobs in Halifax, Nova Scotia. That is deeply worrying.

The contributions from Scottish National party Members can be summed up with a single question: when will the Government finally publish the national shipbuilding strategy? As so many of us have said, it has been much

discussed in this House. It has been talked about, promised and threatened; as my hon. Friend the Member for West Dunbartonshire said, we were even told on one occasion that it had actually been published, only for it to disappear again. The hon. Member for North Durham described the national shipbuilding strategy as a unicorn, and in many ways he is right. However, I tend to look at it as the Maris Crane or the Mrs Mainwaring of UK politics—a central character in a long-running series who is much talked about and around whom entire storylines may be based, but who is never, ever seen. Sadly, while Maris Crane or Mrs Mainwaring are cleverly constructed comedic devices, the national shipbuilding strategy is descending into farce.

I look forward to the Minister's attempt to use smoke and mirrors to explain why the House and the people whose livelihoods depend on the report are still waiting for it in February 2017, when it was promised many times that it would be here before the autumn statement. My first memory of the national shipbuilding strategy being promised goes back to 12 September, when the Minister said that it would be delivered in November. In an answer to my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow South West on 18 October, she repeated that

"the national shipbuilding strategy will report by the autumn statement."—[*Official Report*, 18 October 2016; Vol. 615, c. 318WH.]

There were no caveats, qualifications or stipulations—nothing to suggest that that would not happen. It was a clear and unequivocal promise that the strategy—not a report that would inform the strategy, but the strategy itself—would be delivered before the autumn statement.

The Minister then told me at Defence questions on 7 November that

"the national shipbuilding strategy...will be announced nearer to the autumn statement...I am sure that there will be great news for shipbuilding across Scotland and the whole of the UK."—[*Official Report*, 7 November 2016; Vol. 616, c. 1237.]

How would we know? We have never seen the strategy. It has not appeared.

We were given false hope on 12 December when I asked the Minister directly why the national shipbuilding strategy had not appeared, despite all the promises. She told me that I was

"complaining about the lack of publication of a report that has been published".—[*Official Report*, 12 December 2016; Vol. 618, c. 485.]

She even offered to send me a signed copy of it. Needless to say, signing, gift-wrapping and sending something that did not actually exist proved a step too far, even for the not inconsiderable skills of the Minister.

Wayne David (Caerphilly) (Lab): Has the hon. Gentleman received a copy of it?

Brendan O'Hara: Sadly, it is a will-o'-the-wisp—it does not exist. Perhaps it will come when Brigadoon next appears.

The rest of the country and I remain without the national shipbuilding strategy, signed or unsigned. Five months after the first recorded promise that it would be delivered, we are still waiting. I fully concur with my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife that our frustration at being led a merry dance by the Government over the shipbuilding strategy must be as nothing compared with the frustration of the shipbuilding workers and the servicemen and women of the Royal Navy who depend on the strategy for their livelihoods.

[*Brendan O'Hara*]

We may poke fun at the Minister, but let us never forget that we are dealing with people's lives and people's jobs. Those people deserve respect, and when their Government say that something will appear on a given date, they should be able to trust that it will.

The Minister has a lot to address in her reply, but I ask her to address the following questions in particular. When will we see the national shipbuilding strategy? Will there be a full carrier group capability in 2023, as my hon. Friend the Member for Dunfermline and West Fife asked? Can she guarantee that surface shipbuilding will not be squeezed as the cost of Trident soars, the economy shrinks and the pound loses value? What is the status of the Type 31 frigates, as the hon. Member for North Durham asked? Can the Minister guarantee that they will be built? Will she give a timetable for the construction of the Type 26, as she has been asked? Is she aware of the levels of concern that have been caused by these delays, and will she act accordingly?

There is so much about the national shipbuilding strategy that needs to be discussed. At the risk of repeating myself, I am sorry that so few Government Members are here to listen to this vital national debate. I look forward to the Minister's reply.

3.39 pm

Wayne David (Caerphilly) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Evans. I congratulate the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) on securing this debate; it is on a very important subject and, as has been said, it has given us a first opportunity to discuss Sir John Parker's important report.

I welcome the contributions of Scottish National party colleagues, the hon. Member for Strangford (Jim Shannon) and my hon. Friend the Member for North Durham (Mr Jones), who showed his expertise in this area. However, it is a great shame—a crying shame—that there are no Conservative Members of Parliament present, apart from the Minister and, rather belatedly, somebody else who I think has come in for another debate. It is a great shame that we have not had a full Chamber and that we have not all been able to debate collectively what is a fundamentally important issue for this country.

I will focus my comments on the situation regarding the strategy from the Ministry of Defence. My starting point, of course, is what the Government themselves declared in 2015 in their strategic defence and security review. They said that they were committed to maintaining a fleet of 19 frigates and destroyers, and that they intended to complement that force with a new class of lighter and flexible general purpose frigates. At that time, they correctly made the link between the need to develop our national security and the promotion of our domestic prosperity. The Government proudly announced then that a new national shipbuilding strategy

“will lay the foundations for a modern and efficient sector capable of meeting the country's future defence and security needs.”

In the Budget of 2016, the Government proudly announced that they had appointed the eminent Sir John Parker to lead and write a national shipbuilding strategy, and it was promised that a report would be prepared and presented to this House in 2016.

However, there has been genuine confusion and I hope that the Minister will take this opportunity to clarify the situation. On 29 November 2016, we had a report from Sir John Parker, but it was not, as we had been promised, the Government's national shipbuilding strategy. Many people thought that it was—some Ministers thought that it was—but it was not. Instead, we had an “independent report” on the UK's national shipbuilding strategy from Sir John Parker.

My questions are quite simple. How did that metamorphosis take place; why did it take place; why is there confusion; what contact was there between the different Departments; and who is taking the lead on this issue? Those are very important questions about something as fundamental as the strategy for our future warships, which is not an issue that can be lightly dismissed. I echo what other Members have said: we would all like answers from the Minister about what on earth has happened and what on earth is going on.

Of course, Sir John's report is very radical and extremely scathing about how things work, or rather do not work, within the Ministry of Defence regarding Royal Navy programmes. The report has a very interesting, informative and worrying chart about the length of time it takes for projects to develop to fruition. For example, Sir John points out that it was in 1967 that the conceptual start of the Type 21 frigates began and they were delivered nine years later. As for the Type 23 frigates, the conceptual start date was in 1978, but it took 17 years for that project to come to fruition. Goodness knows how long it will take for the Type 26 frigates.

Sir John asks why there have been such long delays. Why has this process taken such a long period of time? In some ways, the demands upon the frigates have changed. The world has changed and defence requirements have changed, but there is still that laborious project time before us. Why has that happened?

Chris Stephens: Does the hon. Gentleman agree that these delays not only impact on the Royal Navy but on the local economy in Scotland? He may be aware of the GMB report on Scottish shipbuilding and the value of shipbuilding to the Scottish economy.

Wayne David: Indeed, I fully support those points. The situation is very worrying for all concerned, not least the people who are employed in the shipbuilding industry and the local communities from which they are drawn.

Sir John gives a number of reasons why the long delays have occurred. He makes 11 points. I will not go through all of them, but will just pick out some of the reasons he suggests. He says that there has been

“A lack of assured Capital budget per RN ship series, subject to annual arbitrary change, with accumulative negative impact on time and cost with accompanying increased risk of obsolescence”.

That is very worrying. He also says that there have been

“Poor linkages across the ‘Total Enterprise’ including industrial capability and capacity”.

He goes on to say:

“Senior decision-makers have, previously, been engaged too late in the process and not always with high quality information and costing data”.

He adds:

“The MOD has lost expertise in both design and project contract management”.

He says that there has been

“Inadequate evaluation of risk contingency in each project”.

Those are some of the damning reasons why Sir John says there have been delays. I suggest that they are an indictment of the MOD, which really must sort things out once and for all regarding its procurement and governance strategy for warships.

Once the strategy has been written by the Government, when will it be published? I will not ask for the exact day or week, but will it be published in March, April, May, or whenever? We would like some sort of indication. Once it is published, we would like to know what sort of consultation there will be and how long it will last. I ask that because we want to have a full debate on every dot and comma of that important policy document.

I recognise that the Minister will not say very much about what might or might not be in that report. Nevertheless, I have a number of questions for her. First, will the Government sort out, once and for all, their procurement and governance systems for warship construction in this country? There really ought to be a masterplan that should be reviewed at each SDSR, and as part of that approach there should be a partnership with both the industry and the trade unions. As Sir John has suggested, a shipyard trade union representative ought to be appointed to attend regular meetings, to enhance the transparency and efficiency of the processes that are under way.

Secondly, will the Government commit to working with their industry partners and trade unions to enhance the training and educational capabilities and facilities, so that there is the correct mix of skills and competence, particularly with regard to the new digital systems that are coming on stream?

Thirdly, will the Government commit to having a small but highly specialised virtual innovation centre to force through, among other things, advances in design, new materials and productivity improvements? As Sir John has argued, such an innovation centre is necessary if we are to oversee the new “global competitiveness plans”, which I believe the Government want to see being created.

Finally, will the Government commit to placing a greater emphasis on the exporting of British-built ships, as well as British project management, design, equipment and sub-systems? Will they not only engage in general rhetoric, but commit to specifics, as part of a great national effort to ensure not just that British-built ships are used for British defence, but that the expertise in this country is sold for the benefit of navies throughout the world?

I look forward to hearing the Minister’s response to my questions.

3.49 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence (Harriett Baldwin): In the short time available to me—I want to leave a bit of time for the hon. Member for Dunfermline and West Fife (Douglas Chapman) to say a few more words at the end of the debate—I will attempt to answer all the questions that hon. Members have put this afternoon, to the extent that I can.

The 2015 strategic defence and security review set out a clear plan for the Royal Navy. For the first time in a generation, we are growing our Royal Navy, and this major programme of investment will increase our nation’s

power and reach. There seems to have been quite a lot of discussion in the debate about the exact timings for various different documents. We made it clear in the Budget last year—I will quote the exact wording—that:

“The government has appointed Sir John Parker to lead the national ship building strategy, which was confirmed in the Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015. He will report by Autumn Statement 2016.”

In the end, it was 29 November. My office assures me that a copy of the report was sent to the hon. Member for Argyll and Bute (Brendan O’Hara). I am happy to take bids on whether it has been suitably autographed. If he has not received it, he should have, by this stage.

Brendan O’Hara: Will the Minister give way?

Harriett Baldwin: I will, if he has not received a copy.

Brendan O’Hara: I have not received a copy. I look forward to a signed copy; it would be far more valuable. If what she is now saying is right, why did she say on no fewer than four occasions that the national shipbuilding strategy will be delivered by the autumn statement? It was unequivocal.

Harriett Baldwin: It is about the distinction between the report and the Government’s publication of the national shipbuilding strategy. A range of people raised this issue, so I make it clear that we are considering Sir John’s recommendations, and we will provide a full response, which will be what we can all call the national shipbuilding strategy. It will be published in spring 2017. I am sure Members will appreciate that I cannot be more precise than that in terms of a specific date.

Chris Stephens rose—

Gavin Robinson (Belfast East) (DUP) rose—

Kirsten Oswald (East Renfrewshire) (SNP) rose—

Harriett Baldwin: If Members want to take up my time, I will give way.

Chris Stephens: Will the Minister outline the process? A few Members have mentioned that, including the hon. Member for Caerphilly (Wayne David). Once the Government publish the national shipbuilding strategy and its response to Sir John Parker, what is the process? Who feeds into that response?

Harriett Baldwin: I will be talking a little more about that in my speech.

Gavin Robinson: In previous engagements at the Defence Select Committee, the Minister has indicated her willingness to travel throughout the United Kingdom to see the other opportunities that are available. Given that the largest dry dock and the second largest dry dock in the United Kingdom are in my constituency at Harland and Wolff, I look forward not only to the Minister visiting, but to formulating plans that can feed in to her final report and considerations.

Harriett Baldwin: I thank the hon. Gentleman for an obviously irresistible invitation. I hope I will be able to take him up on it in the not-so-distant future.

[*Harriett Baldwin*]

For the record, I say to the hon. Member for Jarrow (Mr Hepburn) that I am in Newcastle tomorrow. I look forward to meeting a range of manufacturers. I will not specifically be meeting A&P Tyne on this occasion, but I met A&P in Falmouth only last week.

In the SDSR we announced our plans for a naval programme of investment. We are investing in two new aircraft carriers, which are currently being completed at Rosyth. We are investing in new submarines to be based in Scotland at Faslane. We have announced our plans for frigates. We are building five new offshore patrol vessels on the Clyde at the moment. We have ordered new aircraft, including the maritime patrol aircraft, the P-8, which will be based at Lossiemouth. Scotland is clearly doing well out of defence, and the UK is doing well in defence with Scotland, and 2017 is the start of a new era of maritime power, projecting the UK's influence globally and delivering security at home. I do not have time in this debate to list all the different ships we have deployed across the world's oceans.

I know the appetite of Members for publications. They will have all read the 2016 equipment plan, which we published last month. It laid out the plans in more detail and announced that the total amount that will be spent on the procurement and support of surface ships and submarines over the next decade amounts to some £63 billion. It is all part of the continued modernisation of the Royal Navy in the coming years, which will be underpinned by our national shipbuilding strategy. It is very much our intention that the strategy will be a radical, fundamental reappraisal of shipbuilding in the UK, with the aim of placing UK naval shipbuilding on a sustainable long-term footing. It will set the foundations for a modern, efficient and competitive sector, capable of meeting the country's future defence and security needs.

Mr Kevan Jones: Can the Minister point out in the Budget where the budget line is for the Type 31?

Harriett Baldwin: The hon. Gentleman will have read the equipment plan. I do not have the exact quote here, but clearly we have a very ambitious equipment plan. We are expecting to spend some £63 billion on ships, support and submarines.

I want to convey to Sir John Parker the thanks of all Members who have spoken today for his excellent report. He is clearly a highly respected expert. Importantly, he has taken an independent approach to the report. He has had a high level of engagement with stakeholders. Members asked about his engagement. He has visited all key industry leaders and all the companies across the UK that design and build ships, including in Northern Ireland. He has visited small and medium-sized businesses in the supply chain. Industry stakeholders were engaged at all levels. He brought strong strategic direction and guidance to the work, for which we are immensely grateful. He also met trade bodies, trade unions, Ministers, civilian and military officials and, indeed, the hon. Members for Glasgow North West (Carol Monaghan) and for Glasgow South West (Chris Stephens). He has been thoroughly engaged with everyone.

I have not got much time left, so I will speak very briefly about exports, which a range of Members raised.

The report makes an important recommendation about exports. We have already started that work, working closely with the Defence and Security Organisation in the Department for International Trade. Members can expect to hear more about that in the coming weeks and months.

The Type 26 programme is a key element of our investment plans. To meet our needs, we require eight to replace the eight anti-submarine-focused Type 23 frigates. Members will be aware that the Defence Secretary announced in November last year that, assuming successful completion of the negotiations, we expect to sign a contract for the first batch of the eight planned Type 26s and cut steel on the first ship this summer. That would give BAE Systems on the Clyde work until the early to mid-2030s. Commercial contract negotiations are intense and ongoing, so I cannot make any more information available to the House today. The investment will sustain shipbuilding skills at the shipyards on the Clyde and continue to provide opportunities in the wider supply chain around the UK. The ships will provide an anti-submarine warfare capability, which is essential for the protection of our nuclear deterrent. SNP Members had a bit of a political pop at me, but they would do well to remember what I have just said. Their two political obsessions—Scottish independence and ending our continuous at-sea nuclear deterrent—would be two of the worst things that could befall the Scottish shipbuilding industry.

Briefly on the Type 31e, Sir John recommended that a new class of lighter general purpose frigate should be given priority. He was clear that it should be designed to be exportable, but capable of incorporating the needs of the Royal Navy. A lot of work is under way on that in the MOD. It is in the pre-concept phase, and further information will be made available in the national shipbuilding strategy.

In summary, the MOD is working with colleagues across Government and with industry to examine Sir John Parker's report and its recommendations in full. I recognise that Members value the shipbuilding jobs in their constituencies, and I assure them that the Government are committed to an industrial strategy that will increase economic growth across the country and refresh our defence industrial policy.

3.59 pm

Douglas Chapman: I opened the debate by talking about déjà vu, but the debate has been déjà vu writ large. I asked when we could expect an announcement on the national shipbuilding strategy. There was no reply from the Minister. We asked how the carrier group will be secured when it is at sea. There was no reply from the Minister. We asked whether surface ships would be prioritised in the budget, and again, there was no commitment from the Minister. What we did discuss was whether a signature was on a document. What we really need to see is her signature on contracts to ensure that jobs on the Clyde are safe and secure for the years to come.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House has considered the national shipbuilding strategy.

Construction Industry: Blacklisting

[SIR ALAN MEALE *in the Chair*]

4 pm

Mr Chuka Umunna (Streatham) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered blacklisting in the construction industry.

This debate relates to a secretive, insidious and shoddy practice that has brought shame on our construction industry. As shadow Secretary of State for Business, I initiated a lengthy debate in the main Chamber on the issue in January 2013. I return to it publicly today because it is my strong view that those who were responsible for it have yet to be properly held to account for their actions and the matter has fallen off the radar in this place. My intention is to put it firmly back on the national agenda.

Chris Stephens (Glasgow South West) (SNP): Does the hon. Gentleman support early-day motion 47, which calls for a full public inquiry into the blacklisting practice in the construction industry?

Mr Umunna: The hon. Gentleman must be telepathic because he pre-empts what I will come on to. I will address that issue later.

First, it is important to state that although the issue has brought shame on the construction sector, there is still much to be proud of in the sector—look at the Olympic Park venues, Heathrow Terminal 5 and the new buildings that we see springing up around us on time and on budget in so many different communities. Let us also never forget why the sector is the success it is: primarily because of its construction workers. They build the offices and factories we work in. They build the homes in which we live. As a nation, we owe them a huge debt of gratitude, particularly when we consider those who have lost their lives working on construction sites in this country.

There is also a dark side to the sector—anyone who has worked in it knows this only too well—that leads to good people being subject to the most terrible injustices. As a result, lives have been ruined, families have been torn apart and many have been forced out of the industry.

What am I talking about? What is blacklisting? For the record, it involves systematically compiling information on workers, which is then used by employers or recruiters to discriminate against them, not because of their ability to do the job, but because they have raised health and safety issues or been active trade union members. It has meant that people cannot find work and therefore cannot support their families—they cannot put food on their children's plates—and the result is all the stress and upheaval that come with that.

Gloria De Piero (Ashfield) (Lab): My hon. Friend talks about many lives being ruined by the blacklisting of workers. Does he agree that it is time we put on record the work that the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians, Unite and the GMB have done in securing settlements for the workers who were treated so badly?

Mr Umunna: I completely agree with my hon. Friend. She, too, must be telepathic. Not only am I a member of Unite and the GMB, and proud to be so, but UCATT,

which is now part of Unite, is headquartered in the centre of the universe: my constituency. The work that the unions have done is so important. I practised for almost a decade as an employment law solicitor before being elected by my constituents and I have seen injustice in the workplace, but I have never seen injustice on this scale.

The extent of the blacklisting activity in the construction sector was exposed for all to see following the raid in 2009 by the Information Commissioner's Office on the shadowy and secretive organisation called the Consulting Association. Further details emerged in the last Parliament, during an excellent and extensive inquiry into blacklisting carried out by the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs. My hon. Friend the Member for Ashfield (Gloria De Piero) mentioned the work of the unions, and a lot of the evidence provided to that Select Committee was provided by those trade unions, which also worked with the ICO, as well as by the blacklisting support group.

The Consulting Association was born out of a right-wing organisation called the Economic League, which was set up in 1919 to promote free enterprise and to fight left-wing thinking, to which it objected. That included Members of this House. The former Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, had information collected on him. The league, which blacklisted more than 10,000 people, was wound up in 1993, but its construction sector member companies wanted to continue this unforgivable practice and its activities, so the Consulting Association was born.

According to the Information Commissioner, 44 construction companies made up the hall of shame that was the membership of the Consulting Association at the time of the 2009 raid, including five companies in the Amec group, Amey Construction Ltd, six Balfour Beatty companies, BAM Construction Ltd, Carillion plc, Kier Ltd, Laing O'Rourke Services Ltd, Morgan Est and Morgan Ashurst, which are now known as Morgan Sindall, Sir Robert McAlpine Ltd, Skanska UK plc, Taylor Woodrow Construction, and VINCI plc—to name just a few of the companies listed. In 2009, half of the 20 biggest construction companies were all named as being involved in the association.

Chris Elmore (Ogmore) (Lab/Co-op): Skanska has a base in Pencoed in my constituency. It blacklisted more than 111 workers or families. Will my hon. Friend join me in condemning that company for its actions? I echo any statement that he makes calling for a public inquiry, which I fully support.

Mr Umunna: I completely endorse my hon. Friend's comments. Let us put what the Consulting Association was doing into context. It did not just maintain lists and files on thousands of construction workers; the material that it collected included personal information, such as information on workers' private relationships, in addition to whether they had raised health and safety issues, their trade union activities and so on.

It is worth reflecting on this: member companies were charged a £3,000 annual fee to be part of the Consulting Association and then had to pay £2.20 on top of that for each blacklist check on a construction worker. For the cost of £2.20, the association would be able to dictate whether a worker got a job and whether they could put food on the table that week. Worse still,

[Mr Umunna]

taxpayers' money was being used to inflict that misery on people. Blacklisting checks were carried out on workers on publicly funded projects, ranging from airport runways, the Jubilee line, the millennium dome, hospitals, schools, roads and Portcullis House on the parliamentary estate—I could go on.

In addition to the blacklist checks, David Clancy, the Information Commissioner's investigations manager, who carried out the raid in 2009 and is himself a former police officer, gave evidence to the Scottish Affairs Committee that he believed that some of the information held by the association would have come from the police or security services, because of the nature of that information. I mentioned the private information that was collected—for example, one file features an in-depth analysis of an individual's home circumstances and what his neighbours thought about him. I have seen some of those records, and it is clear that they contained information based on the surveillance of individuals away from construction sites. It is improbable that such information came exclusively from the construction firms themselves.

What about the legal protections for construction workers and the system of redress for victims? Although it was and remains unlawful to refuse employment on the grounds of trade union membership alone, at the time of the 2009 raid on the Consultancy Association there was not a specific prohibition on blacklisting. Following the raid and the emergence of the blacklist, the Labour Government acted to outlaw blacklisting and introduced the Employment Relations Act 1999 (Blacklists) Regulations 2010, which allow individuals to bring civil claims against those found guilty of blacklisting in employment tribunals. If successful, that can lead to compensation of between £5,000 and £65,300. However, the regulations were not retrospective, and there is no criminal sanction. In truth, I believe the Labour Government should have acted much earlier, because that was too late for many victims.

Perhaps more shocking still is the fact that the firms that set up the association and supplied the information to and accessed the blacklist were neither charged with any offence nor ordered to pay compensation to the workers. To date, not one director of any of those companies has been brought to book for what happened. That is an outrage.

In October 2013—shortly after we had the debate on this issue in the main Chamber—a number of construction firms announced that they intended to establish a compensation scheme for workers who had been blacklisted. On the surface, such a move should be welcome, but there are many problems with the Construction Workers Compensation Scheme. It was brought together without reaching prior agreement with the trade unions—which, as I said, have been absolutely critical in all this—and it provides inadequate compensation. Applicants to the scheme are required to waive any future legal claims, and the companies involved do not have to admit liability or give an apology as part of the process. In fact, the workers were able to get a public apology only by dragging the construction firms kicking and screaming through the courts. I again pay tribute to the Blacklist Support Group, some of whose members are here today, which secured an apology from the firms involved in the

Consulting Association in the High Court, although many victims feel that the apology was half-hearted and insincere.

Serious questions remain about the role of the police services in the collection and passing of information to the Economic League and the Consulting Association. I know that the undercover policing inquiry chaired by Sir Christopher Pitchford has said that blacklisting is potentially a matter within its scope. That is welcome, but not enough. It should be within the scope of that inquiry. There are many unanswered questions, and we cannot let this matter go.

What am I asking for from the Minister? Let me deal with the law first. As cases have progressed through the courts, it has become apparent that the blacklisting regulations need to be strengthened. For example, the extent to which it is possible for those who are not employed in the strict sense of the word but are self-employed to bring claims under the regulations if they have been refused work is unclear. That is important, because we know that full self-employment is an endemic problem and is rampant in the construction sector. Claims can be brought in employment tribunals or county courts, but the cap on compensation in a tribunal is £65,300. There is no cap in a county court, but to bring a claim in a county court there are added risks for a potential claimant because of the costs involved, and they need more resources. It is easier to do it in an employment tribunal, as there are not the costs consequences, but the claim has to be brought within three months of the alleged unlawful conduct, and sometimes people who have been blacklisted do not realise it for some time.

The upshot of all that is that the only legal remedy for some is a complaint to the European Court of Human Rights, based on the right to privacy in article 8 and the freedom of association in article 11. For all those reasons—I could go on, but I will not go back to being a lawyer and bore people—the Secretary of State needs to carry out a review of the law in this area to look at how it might be tightened up.

The second issue is public procurement. I want the Government to adopt the Scottish Affairs Committee's recommendation that all UK Government agencies and devolved Governments must require firms that have been involved in blacklisting to demonstrate how they have "self-cleaned", as the Committee put it, before being allowed to tender for future public contracts. Those that have not done so should not be allowed to tender. The Welsh Government have introduced that measure, and I think it should be introduced across the whole of the UK.

There are lots of unanswered questions. Pitchford does not pick up on all of them, and nor do the cases we have seen. Were the intelligence services involved? We need a full public inquiry into this issue because people have not seen justice and we do not know exactly what happened. We cannot allow a climate of fear to hang over our construction sites. No worker on any building or in any other workplace up and down this land should hesitate before reporting an unsafe site or a dangerous working situation. The bottom line is this: if people do not report their concerns and do not highlight dangers, people could lose their lives, so this issue is very serious indeed. I look forward to hearing what the Minister has to say.

4.16 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Margot James): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Alan. I congratulate the hon. Member for Streatham (Mr Umunna) on securing this debate and on speaking with such knowledge and passion about this terrible blight—this terrible indictment of companies in the construction sector, particularly during the 1990s.

I share the hon. Gentleman's view that the blacklisting of trade union members and activists is an indefensible practice. What I have heard today really horrified me. However, I think we have an appropriate legislative framework for dealing with any further attempts at blacklisting, which is why we are not in favour of a public inquiry at the moment. Such an inquiry would perhaps have had an effect 20 years ago, and I regret very much that one was not held then.

The Information Commissioner intends to undertake a call for evidence later this year to develop her understanding of the underlying issues, building on her office's observations from its extensive investigations into blacklisting complaints. In an area where there have been many allegations, that is an important step forward in establishing a true picture of the level of blacklisting that may or may not take place now.

Following the 2009 investigation of the Consulting Association—a case that Members are all too familiar with, thanks to the hon. Gentleman—the Government strengthened the legal protections in this area. The Employment Relations Act 1999 (Blacklists) Regulations 2010, which the hon. Gentleman referred to, make it unlawful for an individual or organisation to compile, sell, use or supply a blacklist of trade union members or those who have taken part in trade union activities. Individuals can enforce the rights contained in the regulations through employment tribunals or the county court, as the hon. Gentleman said.

I am not aware of any evidence that the blacklists regulations are not doing their job, but should any new information come to light to suggest otherwise, we will certainly consider it.

Chris Stephens: In July 2016, the Minister told me in a written answer that the Information Commissioner was investigating some allegations of blacklisting. She committed to consider any further action that might need to be taken as a result. Will she give me an update, please?

Margot James: There is no further update. The Information Commissioner's Office is undertaking such inquiries and when it reports to me I will consider the contents of what has been found.

The Information Commissioner's Office is an independent regulatory body that was set up to investigate breaches of the Data Protection Act 1998. It has the power to take enforcement action, including searching premises and issuing enforcement notices and fines. Since April 2010, it has also had the power to issue a civil monetary penalty of up to £500,000 for serious breaches of the Act. That is a significant deterrent and a vast improvement on the previous rules, which allowed a maximum penalty of only £5,000. Data protection law is undergoing reform as a result of the general data protection regulation,

which is to take effect on 25 May 2018. The powers of the Information Commissioner's Office to impose fines will substantially increase as a result.

In 2009, the Information Commissioner's Office established a fast-track helpline for those who thought that they might have been affected by the Consulting Association case. I congratulate the trade unions mentioned by the hon. Member for Ashfield (Gloria De Piero), which campaigned for and won compensation, and the Blacklist Support Group, members of whom are in the Public Gallery today, on their work on this matter.

When the Information Commissioner's Office considered that a person might appear on the Consulting Association list, they were asked to provide further documentation. It has continued to run that service and to respond to written requests for information. To date, the helpline has received and responded to about 5,700 calls and 3,000 written requests. The nature of blacklisting is that it is secretive and discriminatory, however, and it can be difficult for individuals to know whether they have been affected by the practice. If people suspect that they have been blacklisted, they can report their concerns to the Information Commissioner's Office, which will provide advice on how an individual may choose to take the matter further. The Information Commissioner has also attempted proactively to contact individuals who might have been affected, although that is only possible where up-to-date contact details are available.

Mr Umunna: The Minister is coughing so I will intervene to allow her to take a swig of water. While she is doing so, I will ask three questions. First, on a public inquiry, I understand what she says about the history, but the fact that events happened in the past has not stopped other big public inquiries, such as those into Bloody Sunday and Hillsborough. Will she explain why that should stand in the way of a public inquiry into blacklisting? Secondly, does she accept that it is difficult for the self-employed to use the legislative framework?

Finally, will she answer this point that has been made to me by people in the sector: there is a feeling that the Leveson inquiry into media behaviour came about in part because powerful, important people were subject to an abuse of media power and that, because we are talking about construction workers, the Government and the establishment are not taking the blacklisting matter as seriously. What does she say to people with that view?

Margot James: I will come back to the hon. Gentleman's third question in a minute. On the second question, the self-employed are covered by the legislation. I accept that it may be more difficult for them to exercise any powers, but they are covered by the Data Protection Act. A self-employed individual may make a complaint to the Information Commissioner's Office.

On the more vexed question asked by the hon. Gentleman, there have been public inquiries in the past to do with people without power who have been affected by dreadful instances. That we are talking about a group of workers who are traditionally not very powerful and perhaps do not earn huge amounts of money has nothing to do with the matter. Personally, I think that such individuals are more entitled to protection and safeguarding than the wealthy and powerful.

[Margot James]

The compensation on offer is, absolutely, for serious amounts of money. The Information Commissioner's Office has taken action, and approximately £100 million has been extracted from the industry for a compensation scheme and to satisfy the results of court actions. The matters we are discussing are being taken very seriously.

Mr Alistair Carmichael (Orkney and Shetland) (LD): On the question of a public inquiry, is not the point that much of the information that has come into the public domain has done so in an utterly random way? That is why there is a need for a powerful and systematic examination of whatever evidence might be out there.

Margot James: We are now in a position where compensation and redress are available, and there is an absolute law against anything similar happening again. For the time being, we are not considering a public inquiry because action was taken back in 2010, as I mentioned. The Information Commissioner has also now announced a call for evidence. Pending the outcome of that, we will consider the framework and whether it is still appropriate. For now, no public inquiry is under consideration, but we will see what happens after the Information Commissioner's call for evidence and its subsequent report.

I encourage anyone who thinks that they might have been blacklisted by the awful Consulting Association and who has not already done so to get in touch with the Information Commissioner's Office through its helpline. Furthermore, the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 prohibits an employer from refusing employment because someone is a union member, so that is illegal. Individuals who believe that they have been discriminated against can, as I said, bring a claim at an employment tribunal. Dismissal for such a reason would automatically be unfair.

I understand the desire for the blacklists regulations to be applied retrospectively, but in 2010 the Government decided that that was not appropriate. The compensation package is available, blacklisting is now against the law and the Government's response to the consultation was clear about a new, specific criminal sanction not being proportionate. The Government will ensure that any allegations of blacklisting are investigated by the appropriate authorities.

Chris Stephens: Will the Minister say something about potential changes to procurement, as was asked for by the hon. Member for Streatham (Mr Umunna)? Are the Government minded to look at the procurement rules in that regard?

Margot James: We already have procurement rules that allow the Government not to enter into a contract with a company found guilty of a criminal offence or found wanting in ethical standards. It may well be that blacklisting can be shoehorned into that. Certainly, any company guilty of a criminal offence would not be considered for a public contract under the public contracting guidelines.

I think that I have answered the other points, so if there are no further interventions, I will sit down.

Question put and agreed to.

Private Renting: Homeless and Vulnerable People

4.29 pm

Richard Benyon (Newbury) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered private renting solutions for homeless and vulnerable people.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Alan. I refer hon. Members to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests. I will talk about the housing problems around the country, but of course every area is different, and I concede that some of the ideas and statistics that I apply to my arguments may help the situation differently in different parts of the country.

The private rented sector is an increasingly important route out of homelessness. When renting works for homeless people, it can be life changing. It is often a huge step towards finding a job, reconnecting with family and rebuilding lives.

Siobhain McDonagh (Mitcham and Morden) (Lab): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the single biggest reason for homelessness in the UK, particularly in London, is eviction from assured shorthold tenancies in the private rented sector?

Richard Benyon: I am well aware that the hon. Lady and her colleagues frequently deal with cases in which people were made homeless for precisely that reason, which is an increasing problem. I will come on to talk about some of those issues, and I hope that the Minister can add some flesh to the bones of the White Paper that was published yesterday and the work that he is doing on tenure with the private rented sector.

Finding a home in the private rented sector can be difficult, and we all know that despite the Government's welcome move to ban letting agent fees, up-front costs often act as a barrier for people trying to access the private rented sector. Research by Crisis shows that 16% of landlords report increasing the deposit when renting to homeless people, 12% increase the rent required in advance and 15% increase the contractual rent.

By way of example, I want to pay tribute to a constituent of mine, Adrian Smith, who runs Swift Logistics in Newbury. He discovered that one of his temporary agency workers had collapsed due to epilepsy, because he was finding it difficult to manage his medication as he was homeless and living in a tent. Adrian stepped in, gave him a clean uniform, offered him a permanent position and talked to him about his situation—things that I am sure he would do for any of his employees who were going through a rough patch. Adrian then started to look for accommodation for that employee. There was very little affordable accommodation in Newbury that suited that individual, and anything that Adrian found was made impossible because once the landlord or his agent discovered that the prospective tenant had debt problems—he had a county court judgment against him—they demanded six months' rent up front. We can see the vicious circle here. I see some of the ideas put forward by organisations such as Crisis, which I will come on to talk about, as possible solutions to such cases.

Daniel Kawczynski (Shrewsbury and Atcham) (Con): My hon. Friend will come on to talk about various organisations that help people with homelessness. Shrewsbury Homes for All in my constituency does a good job of trying to help homeless people. Does he agree that the Government ought to do more to help such organisations?

Richard Benyon: Unless we are extremely hard-hearted, we are all moved not only by the huddled figures in doorways and the cases that come to us of people who are either homeless or likely to be homeless but by organisations in our constituencies such as the one my hon. Friend mentions. It is when those organisations work with local authorities and a Government and all point in the same direction that we can get real solutions to this problem, and I am sure that that happens in his constituency.

The Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research found that 55% of landlords said they were unwilling to let to tenants in receipt of housing benefit, and even more—82%—were unwilling to rent to homeless people. The majority of local authorities agree that it has become more difficult for single homeless people to access private rented accommodation.

Neil Gray (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP): I pay tribute to the hon. Gentleman for securing the debate. Does he acknowledge that the number of private landlords who turn away housing benefit claimants is partly to do with cuts to housing benefit and the fact that it is more of a struggle for tenants to pay the difference to their landlords?

Richard Benyon: It is for a multitude of reasons, but the hon. Gentleman is right that that factor has contributed in certain areas. I applaud private landlords who take housing benefit tenants. Not all of them do, and they need to be supported in trying to do so. I recognise that that is part of the problem, and some of the solutions that I will talk about go precisely to that point.

Mr David Burrowes (Enfield, Southgate) (Con): The all-party parliamentary group on refugees has found that landlords increasingly are not taking another category of people: newly recognised refugees. They are unable to provide sufficient documentation to prove their status and struggle to get a deposit and first month's rent in the 28-day move-on period to ensure that they get the tenancy that they deserve.

Richard Benyon: Many local authorities are doing noble work in trying to provide accommodation for the refugees—particularly the Syrian refugees—who we have taken in. I pay tribute to my hon. Friend's local authority for doing its best. However, there will be several problems at the next stage, because we want those people to be assimilated into our society, get work and be able to function like any other person. We want to ensure that we have systems in place to allow them to transition from the support that they get at the moment. I have direct experience of that in several areas, and I am keen to talk to him about trying to find longer-term solutions to the issue.

The problem that we are talking about is coupled with the capping of local housing allowance and the shortage of available accommodation at the shared accommodation rate. Those burdens can result in people ending up on the street. However, I believe that there

are ways of making the private rented sector work for vulnerable people, and innovative solutions are being delivered every day. Homeless and vulnerable people are being helped and guided into the rental market and, most importantly, given the tools and support that they need to sustain lengthy tenancies. Creative change in the market has the potential to improve not only access but standards in the private rented sector.

Stephen Timms (East Ham) (Lab): On standards, does the hon. Gentleman agree that there is potentially an important role for private rented sector licensing schemes, such as the one in my borough of Newham, in helping to tackle the minority of landlords whose accommodation is below standard?

Richard Benyon: I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman, whom I respect greatly for his understanding of this problem, says that it exists among a minority of private rented sector landlords. One could have got the impression from yesterday's statement that nearly every private landlord was a rogue who managed substandard accommodation. As he says, that is far from the truth. I entirely accept that in many cases, local solutions are better suited, but the Government should be given credit for really trying to move things on through a variety of measures, which are sometimes extremely burdensome to landlords but seek to raise the standard of accommodation and improve the way that landlords treat their tenants.

Evidence shows that when a vulnerable person is in secure and safe rented accommodation, they can leave their homelessness behind them and make a fresh start. That also makes good economic sense, which I hope will be a theme of the debate. If we get this right, there will be an entirely virtuous circle. Both the Residential Landlords Association and the National Landlords Association believe that, with the right support, financial risks can be reduced and letting to vulnerable people can be a viable business model. Even if hon. Members forget everything else that I say today, I hope that that will resonate with them. By changing perceptions, we can truly make the private rented sector work for all.

Siobhain McDonagh: How does the hon. Gentleman feel that the private rented sector will become a viable alternative for vulnerable tenants when rental claims under universal credit are taking an estimated nine weeks—in reality, it is three months in my part of south London—to be assessed?

Richard Benyon: I recognise that that is a problem. If the hon. Lady will allow me, I will come on to talk about that. If I do not, I am sure she will intervene again. I very much want to talk about the variety of different factors that influence homelessness.

I want to tell the Minister about two potential solutions that may be of help. A lot of work on this has been done by the homelessness charity Crisis, which I cannot praise enough. It is totally focused on outcomes, working with us, whatever side of the House we sit on, to try to find solutions that work. There is nothing particularly new in the two schemes I am proposing, and they will be familiar to some. The first is a help to rent scheme and the second is a national rent deposit guarantee scheme.

[Richard Benyon]

WPI Economics developed a model to assess the cost-benefits of the services over a three-year period and identified that £31 million would be required per annum over that period. That would be made up of £6.7 million for the rent deposit guarantee scheme and £24.1 million for a help to rent project. In a time of cash-strapped Treasury forecasts, I want to show—if the Treasury is listening—that this makes economic sense, because it will reduce the cost of the burden of homelessness that sits on the taxpayer.

From 2010 to 2014, Crisis, with funding from the Department for Communities and Local Government, ran the private rented sector access development programme, which funded specific help to rent schemes across the country, which helped homeless and vulnerable people access affordable and secure accommodation in the private rented sector. I have seen that work in my constituency in a different scheme run by the Two Saints hostel in Newbury, which moves people from the wayfarer beds and being the huddled figures in the doorway I described earlier through to supported accommodation and then on to independent living. That works only because all the complex problems that we know exist in homelessness, particularly in rough sleeping—mental illness, relationship breakdown and alcohol and drug abuse—are dealt with throughout the process, which allows a sustainable solution to each individual's problems.

Dr Daniel Poulter (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate. I agree with many of the points he has made. However, those people with chronic and enduring mental ill health find it very difficult to access any suitable social housing accommodation, particularly in big cities. That group has been let down badly by the private sector and I am not sure whether the solutions he is proposing will change that, given that those people are often going in and out of mental health hospitals. What thoughts does he have on helping that particularly vulnerable group?

Richard Benyon: Mental health problems can cause homelessness and homelessness can cause mental health problems. In this place we think of things only in silos. We have a very good Minister here from one Department, but if we really are to deal with this problem we ought to have a whole range of Ministers from the Department of Health, the Ministry of Defence and people from all the organisations who care for people sitting down on the equivalent of the Treasury Bench here so that we can do so in a much more cohesive way.

The schemes I have been talking about matched tenants with landlords and provided financial guarantees for deposits and rent, with ongoing support for both parties. They provided the landlord with a deposit and insurance throughout the tenancy were problems to arise. They also offered the tenant training in budgeting and help to gain and sustain employment. During the programme, more than 8,000 tenancies were created with a 90% sustainment rate, which is an incredible achievement.

Another person we should have here is an Education Minister. One statistic I find fascinating is from the Centre for Social Justice, which showed that while the national average of educational attainment is that 60% achieve

five A* to C grades at GCSE, the figure is only 27% among those who have to move more than three times during their secondary school education. We can therefore see the knock-on problems caused by people having to move frequently, and that sustainability in one home is so important.

The schemes also saved the Government money. In just three months of operation, 92 schemes saved almost £14,000 in non-housing costs. The schemes created homes for those who need them most and helped some of the most vulnerable navigate a complex market. With the security of a home and the floating support from a help to rent scheme, a vulnerable person is less likely to need assistance from other services. That is a point that my hon. Friend the Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) will appreciate. Schemes varying in geography and specialisms still exist, yet without the funding they need they are unable to deliver all the services they would like to the number of people who need them. By working with landlords, such schemes have the potential to unlock the supply of private rented sector properties, which could particularly benefit areas where housing demand is highest. Local authorities could also incentivise good practice through the schemes as well as eliminate bad practice through enforcement policies.

Crisis is also calling for the second project I want to touch on: a national rent deposit guarantee scheme. To reduce up-front costs, help to rent schemes often offer bonds or guarantees to landlords in place of deposits, which cover certain types of costs that the landlord may incur at the end of a tenancy including damages and, in some cases, rent arrears. That was the case in the example from my constituency that I outlined earlier, where private sector landlords were demanding six months' rent in advance. That means that vital funds are tied up in admin costs and reserves in case those guarantees are called in rather than in going into funding the support that helps vulnerable tenants sustain their tenancies. If the Government established a national rent deposit guarantee scheme, that would provide help to rent projects with greater financial security, with landlords safe in the knowledge that their property is protected and that the help to rent projects are providing the right support to help tenants maintain rent.

Crisis has found claims on bonds by existing schemes to be relatively low, within the 15% to 20% margin. That is one of the reasons why the schemes are attractive to the private sector trade bodies. It seems only fair that, along with help to buy, there is a similar scheme to help those who are just about managing and for whom purchasing a home is just not realistic. Crucially, both the Residential Landlords Association and the National Landlords Association support those asks of the Government.

Currently, schemes attract landlords through the development of a suite of services to mitigate the risks associated with letting to a vulnerable or homeless person or family. We could, and should, actively encourage more landlords to view working with those schemes as an effective business model. The moral argument aside, there are fiscal incentives to working with such schemes. For example, a targeted intervention by a scheme and a national rent deposit guarantee reduces the financial risks for landlords. Also, clients using the access support who have a history of homelessness are much more

likely to be deemed vulnerable under universal credit and therefore they should be offered universal credit direct payments for a limited period, which landlords may welcome. I think that goes a little of the way to addressing the concerns of the hon. Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh).

Help to rent schemes give landlords a layer of security that they do not currently receive from letting agents or the local authority. Such interventions could significantly increase the landlord's confidence to let to this vulnerable sector or to those in housing need, and that could be part of an agreed longer-term tenancy. Among landlords with experience of letting to homeless people, 59% said they would consider letting to homeless households only if that were backed by such interventions. I therefore believe that the rationale for Government is clear to see. These policies are cost-effective schemes that will provide stability in the private rented sector for the most vulnerable, helping to prevent and tackle homelessness. Investment in the private rented sector access support would build on the Government's recent announcement for homelessness prevention trailblazers and the Prime Minister's welcome commitment to put prevention at the heart of a new approach.

Government investment has the potential to reduce spending on temporary accommodation and the costs of rough sleeping. This would allow cash-strapped local authorities, such as mine in West Berkshire, to allocate more of their homelessness budget in a more targeted way—for example, West Berkshire Council continuing to support the mental health triage service, which is doing great work. Independent analysis commissioned by Crisis estimates that if access were available to all households approaching their local authority for homelessness assistance, some 32,000 people could receive support annually. The model assumed that if 60% of people leave temporary accommodation as a result of the scheme being available, savings amounting to between £175 million and £595 million could be realised from one year of the scheme.

Investing in the private rented sector access support fits with the Government's wider agenda on universal credit and homelessness prevention. I was pleased to support the Bill promoted by my hon. Friend the Member for Harrow East (Bob Blackman) and will continue to do so. It will make a difference. My worry is that unless parallel schemes, such as those I have outlined, are introduced and accompany a review of the impact of the freeze on local housing allowances in certain areas, we could get into the mad situation where inadvertent actions by the Government create one problem on the one hand that my hon. Friend's Bill has to solve on the other. I am pleased that the Prime Minister has made housing a priority in her wish to lead a Government that help those people left behind who have not benefited from recent economic growth. The White Paper is an important indication of that intent. I suggest to the Minister that here are two possible schemes that would work and put the private rental sector at the heart of achieving the Government's ambitions.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Sir Alan Meale (in the Chair): Order. I intend to call the Front-Bench speakers at 5.10 pm so there is not much time left and a number of Members have indicated

that they want to be called. If you could look at the clock and try to be as sparing as possible in your own contributions, that would help the general debate.

4.52 pm

Siobhain McDonagh (Mitcham and Morden) (Lab): I congratulate the hon. Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) on securing this debate. I am here because I am full of rage. I am full of rage at the number of homeless families I see on a weekly basis who do nothing worse than work for their living and raise their children and who find themselves homeless because of a lack of security of tenure in the private sector. It is about time that MPs from all parties address the issue as it is, rather than as they might like it to be. Our constituents—the people out there—look incredulously at us as we seem to consider that, somehow, things are okay. They are not okay.

When I had a proper job, before I entered this House almost 20 years ago, I worked in the homelessness and housing association sector. Today, I see things in my suburban constituency that I never thought possible. The major reason for homelessness in my constituency—and, I am sure, in others in London—is mature families being evicted from assured shorthold tenancies in the private sector. These are not tenants who have been there a short while, abused the property or not paid their rent. In my experience—I am willing to share with any hon. Member the 147 cases that I have seen since 1 September that fall into this category—they are families with children at the top of primary school and the middle of secondary school. They are simply being evicted because the landlords can get more rent from somebody else and can realise the value of their assets. Neither of those things makes them bad individuals, but it makes for a very bad housing situation for someone to find themselves in.

There are consequences to this. I sit there and I go through the process. I say, "They'll issue you with a section 21, then they'll go off to the county court, then they'll get a possession order and then you must wait for a bailiff's warrant. You will get 10 days' notice of the bailiff's warrant, and when that comes, the council will put you in temporary accommodation in Luton." We live in south-west London. Some of the people I have talked to did not know that a place called Luton existed, but they will soon find out. I am sure that Luton is a fine place, but if someone works in south-west London and their children go to school in south-west London, it is not the place where they want to live.

Mr Burrowes: I have had similar experiences in my constituency surgery. Does the hon. Lady hope that the ambition, not least behind the Homelessness Reduction Bill, to deal with this matter might be realised? Sadly, responsibility is sometimes triggered only once the bailiff notices have been served. There is also the issue of the inappropriate placements in Luton. The ambition needs to be fulfilled by the housing White Paper—by ensuring that there is sufficient supply, but also that prevention duties are in place that actually mean something for the 147 families to whom she refers.

Siobhain McDonagh: I have a controversial view on the prevention of homelessness Bill. I believe that it is a sticking plaster and does not resolve the problem. It simply puts more demand on local authorities, which

[*Siobhain McDonagh*]

cannot cope with what they have at the moment. At the heart of the matter is supply. At the heart of it is control, whether that is control over how much rent people have to pay, some control over landlords who are not prepared to maintain their properties or some control in terms of security of tenure. Unless those things are addressed, and addressed in numbers, the problem will not be resolved.

What are we doing to the children who find themselves in this position, who find themselves moving year on year, or six months on six months? These are kids who do well at school and want to be ambitious at school, but who never know or never experience the simple security of living in the same place for a reasonable length of time. That is life for people in my constituency, and the scary thing is that it is life for an ever growing proportion of people, not just people in poor, low-paid work—

Dr Poulter: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Siobhain McDonagh: I will not.

Increasingly, that is life for people in middle-class jobs who simply cannot get on the housing ladder and cannot rent something that is in any way affordable.

When the White Paper was presented to the House yesterday, the Minister talked of families for whom rent is 50% of their income. I regularly see working families whose rent is 200% of their family income. We have a crisis. I realise that everyone wants to speak and I do not want to prevent anyone from speaking. It is about time that we stopped pussyfooting around. We have to build homes that people can afford. Anything else does not address the issue.

4.57 pm

Oliver Colvile (Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport) (Con): I will try to limit my remarks, because I am acutely aware that the right hon. Member for East Ham (Stephen Timms) wants to speak.

I have been very interested in this issue since I was at school in the constituency of the father of my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) in the 1970s. I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate. I did a lot of work talking to some people who were living in very damp accommodation. It was very important that we got them moved and got the house condemned as well. If we can actually sort out some of the homelessness issues, it is very important to ensure that people move into properties that are dry and acceptable, rather than, frankly, in an appallingly bad state.

When I was living in London full time, apart from making visits down to my constituency in Plymouth, I went to church at the Savoy chapel, which is in the heart of London, and the chaplain told an horrendous story about how, if someone is homeless, they feel dirty, no one talks to them and everything is all very difficult indeed. We have to take some action to try to deal with that.

My constituency of Plymouth, Sutton is an inner-city seat. It is south of the A38, running from the River Plym to the River Tamar, and has a significant level of deprivation, as evidenced by the 11 or 12-year life expectancy difference

between the north-east of the constituency and the south-west, around Devonport. That is a very big issue, and we have to do something about it, and it is not helped by people being homeless. I am delighted that we have a hostel in my patch, where a lot of the homeless end up going, but I am appalled that the national health service has decided to close one of the GP surgeries in my constituency that deals with homeless people who live in that kind of hostel accommodation.

Dr Poulter: I was particularly distressed to read about that in my hon. Friend's local paper because I think I opened that GP surgery for him. However, the point is that hostels are not the answer to the problem, particularly for vulnerable people with mental illness, because they need to be properly housed, and they are not being properly housed due to a lack of housing supply, particularly in the social sector. Hostels must not be—and are not—the answer.

Oliver Colvile: I thank my hon. Friend for that intervention. However, it is better for someone to be living in dry conditions than on the streets, and I think that is important.

Graham Jones (Hyndburn) (Lab): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Oliver Colvile: I will not, because I am acutely aware that the right hon. Member for East Ham also wants to speak and it would be wrong of me not to leave him enough time.

On Christmas day, I spent the morning visiting several places that were providing lunch for the homeless. They included Hamoaze House, the Shekinah Mission, Stoke Damerel church and Davie hall in north Plymouth, where a number of events were being held for the homeless and I was able to hear for myself what was going on. It is very important that we provide the homeless not only with accommodation, but with access to GP surgeries. I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) for all the work that he did in opening that GP surgery. I feel real frustration that NHS England has decided to try and close it.

Next week I will be doing a surgery at the food bank, because it is important that people should use my offices to try to make sure we can sort out their benefits too. Without further ado, I am going to shut up, because I want to make sure that the right hon. Member for East Ham can speak as well. Next time, however, we need longer to debate this issue.

5.2 pm

Stephen Timms (East Ham) (Lab): I am grateful to the hon. Member for Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport (Oliver Colvile) for his considerateness.

My hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh) is right that the problem is growing. In 2001, 17% of the residents in my borough—Newham in east London—lived in the private rented sector, whereas today almost half do. That rapid growth is continuing and has led to problems. Regulation in this area is weak. The hon. Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon), whom I congratulate on securing the debate, was absolutely right to make the point that the great

majority of landlords do a perfectly good job and provide decent accommodation, but a minority do not. The private rented sector has a number of virtues, as we have rightly been reminded. However, when there are problems, vulnerable people suffer disproportionately. They frequently do not know what their rights are and get a very bad deal, which was why my local authority—it was the first in the country to do so—introduced borough-wide private rented sector licensing in 2013.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I, too, congratulate the hon. Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) on securing the debate. I will make a few quick points. There is hesitancy among private landlords about renting out property to homeless people. They want long-term tenants; however, the most important thing is the benefit system. If things are not in place when people have to reapply for housing benefit, they then have to be reassessed and can fall behind. Landlords in many places worry about that, as do tenants in particular.

Stephen Timms: The hon. Gentleman is right about that. My hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden made the point that universal credit is making the problem worse because of the long delays before any payment is made.

I want to make a point to the Minister about the Newham private rented sector licensing scheme, which will end in December. The London borough of Newham is asking Ministers to allow the scheme to be extended for another five years. I would ask him to look sympathetically at that proposal and allow the scheme to go forward.

Graham Jones: My right hon. Friend makes a powerful point. Will he comment on two points relevant to that? Landlord licensing deals with antisocial behaviour and other conditions, but not stock condition. Stock condition in the north is poor, and conditions in landlord licensing should be allowed to deal with that. If the Government were on people's side, they would allow licensing conditions to include elements to do with stock condition.

Furthermore, as my right hon. Friend said, the private rented sector has grown, but it has also grown into former social housing, which existed to help poor people to rent. I find, as I am sure do many other Members, that former council housing is being offered in the private rented sector at twice the rent of properties currently in the stock. That should be stopped.

Stephen Timms: I am grateful to my hon. Friend. In the Newham scheme, licence holders are bound by conditions, as he described, to prevent overcrowding and deal with antisocial behaviour, and to make sure that properties are well managed and safe. He is right to say that wider stock issues are outside the scope of the scheme.

Perhaps I can give an example from my constituency of what has happened. In Waterloo Road there is a typical terraced house with three rooms on the first floor and two on the ground floor. All five were being used for people to sleep in. In the main bedroom upstairs, which by ordinary standards is appropriate for a couple to sleep in, four single, unrelated people were sleeping. There were six others staying elsewhere in the house. That was 10 people in total, no doubt with a

number of cars between them and, as my hon. Friend the Member for Hyndburn (Graham Jones) pointed out, there were antisocial behaviour problems for the neighbours as well as grim conditions for those living in the house. Because the scheme was in place, the local authority was able to intervene. There was a fine of more than £8,000 and the position was brought under control.

Altogether, licences have been issued for 38,880 private sector properties in the borough and there have been 1,000 prosecutions since the scheme was introduced. Just 28 landlords have been banned for failing to meet the borough's "fit and proper" test, in relation to 230 properties. The places where enforcement action is necessary are a small proportion of the total, but the fact that it is possible for the council to intervene in serious, problem cases is an important help to vulnerable people and others living in the borough. For that reason as well, I would particularly ask the Minister to respond sympathetically to the approach that I think he has already received—at least informally—requesting that the scheme should be extended for a further five years after it ends in December.

5.7 pm

Neil Gray (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP): It is a pleasure to take part in the debate with you in the Chair, Sir Alan. I congratulate the hon. Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) on securing the debate. I thought his speech was an honest assessment of the country's current situation. It was refreshing and followed on from the honest title of the White Paper presented yesterday: I remind hon. Members that that is based on the situation in England.

The hon. Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh) made a passionate speech and touched on short-term tenancies and tenancy insecurity, and on the building of homes. What she said is right: it is the only way we shall get around the housing supply problems we face across these isles. I understand what the hon. Member for Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport (Oliver Colvile) was saying about hostels, but we must surely be capable of providing something more secure and dignified to homeless people in this day and age. The constituency example outlined by the right hon. Member for East Ham (Stephen Timms) reminds me of looking at census data from Victorian times. It is shocking and highlights the desperate situation that people find themselves in, particularly in London. Action must be taken on that.

The private rented sector has a clear role to play in assisting those experiencing or facing the prospect of homelessness. However, the problems it creates are also well known: affordability, landlords' reluctance to rent to housing benefit recipients, a lack of security of tenure, poor quality housing and a lack of support for vulnerable people. All these make what is a potential source of vital support for homeless and vulnerable people more difficult for them to obtain.

The focus on seeking private rented solutions for homeless and vulnerable people presents challenges. Although there has been a growth in the private rented sector, changes to housing benefit entitlement since 2010 mean that it is more difficult for housing benefit claimants to cover the full amount of rent due, as I said in an earlier intervention. That is especially so for young people, who are seeing their support cut away. In the

[Neil Gray]

light of all of the UK-wide issues caused by the Government's social security policies, I believe that the effective approach being taken in Scotland should be commended and articulated.

All local authorities in Scotland have a duty towards all unintentionally homeless households, regardless of whether they are classed as being in priority need. That is one reason why, in April 2016, Crisis recorded that Scotland has been on a "marked downward path" for the past five years in relation to homelessness. That downward path can be seen in the Scottish Government's statistics from 2016, which indicate that 81% of unintentionally homeless households in Scotland that had an outcome between April and September of that year secured settled accommodation—not only in social housing but in private rented tenancies as well.

Mr Burrowes: I welcome what the hon. Gentleman says about that progress, but I was in Edinburgh over the weekend and I was particularly shocked by the level of street homelessness. I am a London MP and have sadly seen an increase in that on our streets in London, but in Edinburgh it was extremely significant.

Neil Gray: I would not for a minute even begin to suggest that we have all the answers in Scotland, nor that, just because the evidence from organisations such as Crisis suggests that things are going the right way, we cannot do more. Clearly, more can be done. I live near Edinburgh and know the situation there very well, which is a smaller version of what we see here in London. That is why some of the Scottish Government's interventions, which I will touch on, are directed at that.

If private rented accommodation is to be a viable solution for homeless people, it is clearly imperative that protections are put in place to ensure that it is secure and affordable and provides an acceptable standard of living conditions. I will focus on some of the measures introduced in Scotland in the past decade that help to address some of those issues. In 2006, Scotland was the first part of the UK to introduce a mandatory landlord registration scheme, which we touched on earlier, in terms of licensing. The local authority must be satisfied that the owner of the property and the agent are fit and proper persons to let the residential property before registering them.

Commencement of the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016 will remove the "no fault" grounds for repossession, and should mean that there is no risk of a retaliatory eviction in Scotland. When commenced, that Act will also introduce a new type of tenancy for the private rented sector in Scotland to replace short assured and assured tenancies for all future lets. The new tenancy will be known as a "private residential tenancy", which will be open ended and will not have a "no fault" ground for possession equivalent to the current notice that can be given under section 33 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1988.

Finally, the 2016 Act will allow local authorities to implement rent caps in designated areas—"rent pressure zones"; one such zone is in Edinburgh—where there are excessive rent increases. Applications must be made to Scottish Ministers, who will then lay regulations before the Scottish Parliament. Tenants unhappy with the proposed rent increase will also be able to refer a case to

a rent officer for adjudication. Each of those rules and pieces of legislation help in different ways to ensure that the private rented sector is up to standard when used as an option for homeless and vulnerable people. There is clearly no point in placing homeless people in privately rented accommodation when it will only lead to an unaffordable rent, unacceptable standard of housing or an insecure tenure.

Sir Alan Meale (in the Chair): Mr Jones, you have literally one minute. I am allowing you to speak only because I did not see your indication that you wanted to do so.

5.14 pm

Graham Jones (Hyndburn) (Lab): Thank you, Sir Alan. I quickly say to the Minister that there should be a slight review of landlord licensing to include the stock condition of individual properties, because that is not in the legislation. One issue that we need to tackle is sofa sleeping—the hidden homelessness. We talk about building new housing being the answer. It largely is, but not in my area; we have plenty of empty properties because of a lack of skills and a poor economy. We have to address skills in the economy if we want to get people into housing. The houses are there.

Finally, I want to raise housing benefit for under-21s. The cuts will start in April, but the Government have still not been clear what they will be or where they will apply. That affects supported housing. I know youngsters in Crossroads in Accrington, which is a fantastic resource. They are really vulnerable 16 to 19-year-olds from troubled families, who have tried to find a way for themselves. The situation they are in is not their fault. They rely on housing benefit. Even if housing benefit is not cut, Crossroads may close because Lancashire County Council may pull the funding. Local authority cuts may undermine supported housing even if housing benefit for under-21s is protected. I ask the Minister to clarify what he is going to do about housing benefit for under-21s to prevent further homelessness.

5.15 pm

Andy Slaughter (Hammersmith) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship this afternoon, Sir Alan. I thank the hon. Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) for raising this important subject. I will say a little more at the end of my speech about his specific proposals, which are worth while and which I commend to the Government—we will see what the Minister says about them.

However, I hope the hon. Gentleman will not mind if I take my cue more from the contribution of my hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh), who spoke with extraordinary passion and knowledge. I have known her long enough to know that she is one of the most assiduous constituency MPs in the House and that she speaks from absolute experience. I am sure that her experiences have been shared by all London Members, including my right hon. Friend the Member for East Ham (Stephen Timms), and increasingly by other Members from around the country.

Let us start by making it clear where the problem started. It started, to a large extent, with the Localism Act 2011 and the permanent discharge of homelessness

responsibilities into the private rented sector, alongside lack of security for social housing and an almost complete cut of capital expenditure. Suddenly, the private rented sector was on the frontline, faced with problems that it was neither ready nor able to deal with.

In an intervention, the hon. Member for Airdrie and Shotts (Neil Gray) mentioned housing benefit cuts. We could add the benefit cap or the freeze on the local housing allowance, which the hon. Member for Newbury himself acknowledged. Those are among the reasons why, as my hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden said, more than 40% of homelessness cases are principally caused by the eviction of people on assured shorthold tenancies, largely because of landlords simply wanting higher rents or not wanting to deal with people who are on benefits. Those are the real problems.

There is also the problem of shared accommodation. In 2012, the shared accommodation rate for under-25s was extended to under-35s. In its briefing for this debate, Barnardo's asked that those who are leaving care be protected from that at least until the age of 25. The Minister may respond to that request, but it will still not resolve the principal problem.

The budget of the Supporting People programme for vulnerable people was cut by 45% between 2010 and 2015. These are huge sums. I appreciate that the hon. Member for Newbury is asking for relatively modest sums by comparison, but they will have relatively modest results.

Richard Benyon: Does the hon. Gentleman concede that there are some landlords in London—I speak with a little experience—who are in it for the long term? They want to build a relationship with their tenants and they have never evicted somebody at the end of their lease, because they want to continue that relationship. I want to work with Members on both sides of the House to create a longer-term offer to tenants so that they can have certainty, whether it is about the education of their children or about their own retirement. There are opportunities to work together to find solutions.

Andy Slaughter: Nobody denies that the majority of landlords are good landlords, but I ask the hon. Gentleman: why has rough sleeping more than doubled—it has gone up by 133% since 2010—and why is statutory homelessness increasing hugely? He mentioned that the White Paper might give some detail. I do not know whether he has had time to look at what the White Paper says about the private rented sector, but he will not get much detail from it. There are five paragraphs with three proposals, two of which are ideas pinched from us but watered down, and one of which the Secretary of State has already pooh-poohed.

On letting fees, which are an important issue, the White Paper states:

“We will consult early this year, ahead of bringing forward legislation as soon as Parliamentary time allows”.

I thought that we were going to get something rather more quickly than that. The White Paper also states:

“The Government will implement measures introduced in the Housing and Planning Act 2016, which will introduce banning orders to remove the worst landlords”.

Again, that is good, but I heard the Secretary of State say in the House yesterday that looking for greater restrictions to deny houses unfit for human habitation was “frivolous”. I think that was the word he used.

That does not show particularly good intentions. What on earth does it mean that we are simply going to encourage landlords to have longer tenancies? We need to legislate. We need longer tenancies if we are to stop the terrible curse of insecure accommodation.

The Homelessness Reduction Bill has the support of the Opposition, but we are waiting and taking our cue from local authorities, who know what they are talking about in this respect, on whether the funding will be adequate to the task. All the indications are that that will not be the case, despite the funding that the Minister announced. As my hon. Friend the Member for Mitcham and Morden said, we are just putting more burden on local authorities, which are already charged with the responsibility without having the resources to deal with the problem.

This is a real housing crisis. I appreciate the intention of the debate and the specific measures. We are blessed with some extremely good, very sophisticated organisations now. I have a lot of facilities from what used to be Broadway and is now St Mungo's Broadway in my constituency. It previously ran a scheme very much of this kind off its own bat. People went out and identified private sector accommodation, took vulnerable people and matched the landlord to the tenant. They gave that degree of support, as well as supporting people with deposits. That is an excellent thing to do and it is what the organisations do well, but it does need support and some funding.

I fear that we are not going to address the key issues. It is not just I who think that. Yesterday, at the launch of the White Paper, I did media with the former housing Minister, the right hon. Member for Welwyn Hatfield (Grant Shapps). I never thought that I would agree with him on any matters in relation to housing, but his view did not differ much from mine, which is that the Government proposals are a sticking plaster and a missed opportunity. I do not say that with any pleasure, because this is the biggest social problem of our age. It is a problem that has accumulated over time. It is extraordinarily difficult for everybody, but it is particularly difficult for vulnerable people, young people and people who are made homeless through no fault of their own.

I hope that we are going to hear something from the Minister today. I welcome the engagement of all parties, including the landlord organisations. *[Interruption.]* I do not particularly want to be heckled; I am taking half of my time, which I am entitled to do. If the hon. Member for Newbury thinks that I am dealing with “frivolous” issues, as the Secretary of State does, he is welcome to say that, but let us have some home truths about what the real problems of the housing crisis in this country are.

Sir Alan Meale (in the Chair): Minister, I know time is going to be very tight, but if you could leave a minute for Mr Benyon to wind up, I am sure Members would be appreciative.

5.23 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Mr Marcus Jones): I will do my best, Sir Alan. It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury (Richard Benyon) on securing this important debate. I know that tackling homelessness

[Mr Marcus Jones]

is a priority for him. It is certainly a priority for me and the Government. I say at the outset that nobody should find themselves without a roof over their head.

Yesterday, the Government's housing White Paper was published, which makes it clear that we are determined to make the private rented sector more affordable and secure for people. We have taken action to increase the supply of affordable and secure rented properties through the promotion of Build to Rent homes. That and other measures proposed in the White Paper will ensure that local authorities put more emphasis on planning for those rental schemes. We will certainly encourage the take-up of longer-term tenancies.

On the point made by my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury about securing private rented sector accommodation, as he set out in his speech, we have made a significant investment of £14 million from 2010 to 2016, working with Crisis, to develop a programme for single people to access private rented accommodation. More than 9,000 people were helped and 90% of those maintained a tenancy for more than six months.

My hon. Friend also mentioned the banning of letting agents' fees for tenants. As he knows, we have brought forward proposals on that in the White Paper. We will consult on those proposals before we bring the policy forward. We have also set up a private rented sector affordability and security working group. On that working group, we have Shelter, Crisis, Generation Rent and landlord and letting agent representatives, and it is in the process of finalising its report. We have asked those organisations to work with us to see how we can reduce the costs and barriers people face in accessing private rented accommodation.

Homelessness, as has been discussed, is not just a housing issue. I am proud that we are giving our full support as a Government to the Homelessness Reduction Bill, the private Member's Bill brought forward by my hon. Friend the Member for Harrow East (Bob Blackman). The Bill has benefited from the support of Members, many of whom are here today. My hon. Friend the Member for Newbury spoke passionately about the Bill on Second Reading. We are also bringing forward £50 million of homelessness prevention funding. That money has been awarded to 84 projects that will work across 225 local authority areas in England. A number of those projects include working with the private rented sector. We hope, through that funding, to support more than 1,000 private rented tenants and help those who are at risk of losing their tenancies.

Turning to some of the specific questions that have been asked, my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury mentioned the complexity of homelessness, particularly in terms of mental health. He rightly said that there should be a line of Ministers here to respond to the issues. In that spirit, I chair a ministerial working group that brings together various Departments and Ministers to see what more we can do to deal with the underlying issues that relate to homelessness. My hon. Friend will know that in the Homelessness Reduction Bill is a duty

to refer. That is an important first step in putting an obligation on public sector bodies to refer people who may be at risk of becoming homeless to the relevant local authority.

My hon. Friend mentioned schemes and the proposals from Crisis. We continue to discuss a number of issues with Crisis on an ongoing basis. He also mentioned giving areas the ability to get people into private rented tenancies and out of temporary accommodation. That was a very good point. We are devolving the temporary accommodation management fee, which we believe will help local authorities to move people out of temporary accommodation and into settled accommodation more quickly.

My hon. Friend the Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) mentioned the challenges with people who are not in the right place. They may be in a hostel and need to move on. He will be glad to know that the Government have committed £100 million to move-on accommodation. That will create places for up to 2,000 people to move on from hostel accommodation.

The hon. Member for Mitcham and Morden (Siobhain McDonagh) mentioned tenancies. The average tenancy is four years, but there are challenges in areas where affordability is an issue. The bottom line is that we need to significantly increase supply, and we are doing that in London, as she will know, by giving £3.15 billion to the Mayor to bring forward a significant number of affordable housing units.

To conclude, I will write to Members who have asked any other questions, in particular the right hon. Member for East Ham (Stephen Timms), who made a very good point about licensing schemes. I will leave it there, but we are absolutely committed to tackling this important issue. I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury for the debate, albeit a short one, although that was not his fault.

Sir Alan Meale (in the Chair): Mr Benyon, I understand that you have ceded your one minute to Mr Burrowes behind you.

5.29 pm

Richard Benyon: No, Sir Alan, I was conceding the time to the Minister, but if I may have the 30 seconds I would appreciate it.

There is an all-party group in this House called the all-party group for ending homelessness. Some people roll their eyes when we talk about ending homelessness, but it is only with such ambition that we can address the kind of outrage we all feel when we see someone who is homeless. I am grateful to the Minister for what he said. I hope he will work with Crisis, the Centre for Social Justice and other organisations to try to bring some of the ideas forward. Together, we can achieve a lasting solution.

5.30 pm

Motion lapsed, and sitting adjourned without Question put (Standing Order No. 10(14)).

Written Statements

Wednesday 8 February 2017

DEFENCE

Votes A Annual Estimate 2017-18

The Secretary of State for Defence (Sir Michael Fallon): The Ministry of Defence Votes A Estimate 2017-18, has been laid before the House today as HC968. This outlines the maximum numbers of personnel to be maintained for each service in the armed forces during Financial Year 2017-18.

[HCWS465]

HOME DEPARTMENT

Immigration

The Minister for Immigration (Mr Robert Goodwill): The Government take the welfare of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children extremely seriously, and the UK has a proud history of providing protection for those in need, including some of the most vulnerable children affected by the migration crisis. The Government's strategy is to support international efforts to find a comprehensive and sustainable solution to the refugee crisis; we must deal with its root causes, as well as respond to the consequences. That is why the UK has been at the forefront of the response to the events in Syria and the region, pledging over £2.3 billion in aid—our largest ever humanitarian response to a single crisis. We are also one of the few EU countries to meet our commitment to spending 0.7% of gross national income on overseas aid.

We have a comprehensive approach to tackling these issues both at home and overseas. By the end of this Parliament, we will have resettled 20,000 Syrian nationals through our Syrian vulnerable persons resettlement scheme and a further 3,000 of the most vulnerable children and their families from the middle east and north Africa region under the vulnerable children's resettlement scheme. We also received over 33,000 asylum claims in the UK last year.

The number of unaccompanied asylum-seeking and refugee children arriving in the UK has risen over the last few years, including in response to this Government's commitment to the transfer of hundreds of children from Calais and to address the humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable children. The UK has contributed significantly to hosting, supporting and protecting the most vulnerable children affected by the migration crisis. In the year ending September 2016, the UK granted asylum or another form of leave to over 8,000 children. This includes those who claimed asylum in the UK, those who were brought to the UK through our resettlement schemes, those transferred from within Europe, and those granted a refugee family reunion visa.

In 2016, we transferred over 900 unaccompanied asylum-seeking children to the UK from Europe. This included more than 750 from France as part of the UK's support for the Calais camp clearance. Over 200 of those children met the published criteria for section 67 of the Immigration Act. The remainder were transferred

under an accelerated process based on the family reunion criteria of the Dublin regulation. This was a one-off process, based on the principles of the Dublin framework but operated outside of it, and was implemented in response to the unique circumstances of the Calais camp clearance. All children not transferred to the UK are in the care of the French authorities.

The UK can be proud of its record of helping refugee children and I can today announce, in accordance with section 67 of the Immigration Act, that the Government will transfer the specified number of 350 children pursuant to that section, who reasonably meet the intention and spirit behind the provision. This number includes over 200 children already transferred under section 67 from France. It does not include children transferred to UK where they have close family here. We will announce in due course the basis on which further children will be transferred from Europe to the UK under section 67 of the Immigration Act to the specified number.

As required by the legislation, we have consulted with local authorities on their capacity to care for and support unaccompanied asylum-seeking children before arriving at this number. Local authorities told us they have capacity for around 400 unaccompanied asylum-seeking children until the end of this financial year. We estimate that at least 50 of the family reunion cases transferred from France as part of the Calais clearance will require a local authority placement in cases where the family reunion does not work out. We are grateful for the way in which local authorities have stepped up to provide places for those arriving and we will continue to work closely to address capacity needs.

The Government will continue to meet our obligations under the Dublin regulation and accept responsibility for processing asylum claims where the UK is determined to be the responsible member state, ensuring that it is in their best interests to come here. We are working closely with European partners to ensure the timely and efficient operation of the Dublin regulation.

Of the over 4,400 individuals resettled through the Syrian vulnerable persons resettlement scheme so far, around half are children and last year we welcomed the first families to the UK under the vulnerable children's resettlement scheme. We are fully committed to an effective response in the affected regions and to resettling the most vulnerable directly from those regions. Within Europe, the UK has also established a £10 million refugee children's fund to support the needs of vulnerable refugee and migrant children arriving in Europe. The fund includes targeted support to meet the specific needs of unaccompanied and separated children.

Here in the UK, we have launched the national transfer scheme to ensure a fairer distribution of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children across England and ease pressure on the children's services of those local authorities with large numbers of unaccompanied children. To implement the national transfer scheme the Home Office has established a dedicated team to process the transfer of children quickly while at the same time acting in accordance with the child's best interests. The Home Office also published detailed guidance for local authorities setting out the processes involved in transferring unaccompanied asylum-seeking children from one local authority to another, including the need to ensure that the scheme is driven by the welfare of the child.

As announced on 1 November, the Government will also deliver a safeguarding strategy for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. This will ensure the Government put in place a comprehensive safeguarding strategy for unaccompanied asylum-seeking and refugee children living in or being transferred or resettled to the UK.

To further support the transfer arrangements and underline our commitment to unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, the Government significantly increased the funding they provide to local authorities who look after unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. Local authorities now receive £41,610 per annum for each unaccompanied asylum-seeking child aged under 16 and £33,215 per annum for unaccompanied asylum-seeking child aged 16 and 17. This represents a 20% and 28% increase in funding respectively. In addition, the Government went further and also increased the funding they provide to local authorities for those young people who turn 18 and go on to attract leaving care support by 33%. These significant increases in Government funding will have a very positive impact on local authorities' ability to care for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children.

The Government have also announced the £140 million controlling migration fund in England, which is intended to cover a broad range of costs associated with migration. It cannot duplicate or top up unaccompanied asylum-seeking children rates, but it may support short-term costs not included in the mainstream unaccompanied asylum-seeking children grant and costs related to family reunion cases. This could include costs such as the safeguarding assessments, recruitment campaigns for social workers or support workers, specialist counselling or training on the specific needs of unaccompanied children. Additional funding has also been offered to strategic migration partnerships across the UK to help them bolster local structures and ensure they are equipped to deal with the diverse needs of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children.

The Government have taken significant steps to improve an already comprehensive approach to supporting asylum-seeking and refugee children. This latest announcement provides further evidence of the Government's commitment to playing its part in the global migration crisis. In addition to the tens of thousands of children in conflict regions and in Europe that are benefiting from UK aid and development assistance, we are providing protection to thousands of children in the UK each year.

The UK should be proud of its overall contribution.

[HCWS467]

JUSTICE

Foreign National Offenders and British National Offenders: Repatriation

The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Elizabeth Truss): A minute has been laid before Parliament regarding the Ministry of Justice's escorting of foreign national offenders and British national offenders and specifically in relation to incurring a contingent liability.

My Department is responsible for the transfer of foreign national offenders (FNOs) to their home countries and the repatriation of British national offenders (BNOs)

held overseas. This role was carried forward by the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) from the Home Office at the time the MOJ was established.

The escorting of FNOs continues to play an important part in reducing the number of Foreign Nationals who are held within our justice system.

Previously, the Home Office had provided Heathrow Airport Holdings Ltd (formerly BAA) with confirmation of HM Government's agreement to indemnify them against any claims in respect of damage or injury caused to third parties in the event that the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) were found to be negligent in the discharge of their duties. The National Offender Management Service was an Executive agency of the Home Office and was transferred to the Ministry of Justice at the same time as the Ministry was established.

The Ministry of Justice will continue to provide this assurance and I am updating the House on this new agreement. NOMS has prepared written assurance for Heathrow Airport Holdings Ltd and other third parties (e.g. airlines) which may be affected by our operations. This assurance covers the following amounts:

Up to £50 million for damage or injury per incident to third parties caused airside in the event of negligence of NOMS.

Up to £250 million to damage or injury to third parties per incident in the event of negligence by NOMS while on board an aeroplane.

Up to £10 million for personal accident and/or sickness for NOMS staff while on escorting duties.

The addition of a contingent liability to the accounts of a Government Department or agency is a standard approach that ensures full disclosure of all assets and liabilities and is in line with the rules laid out in the financial reporting manual.

The Treasury has approved the proposal in principle. If, during the period of 14 parliamentary sitting days beginning on the date on which the minute is laid before parliament, a Member signifies an objection by giving notice of a parliamentary question or by otherwise raising the matter in Parliament, final approval to proceed with incurring the liability will be withheld pending an examination of the objection, and the existing indemnities will continue.

[HCWS466]

Prisons and Probation

The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Elizabeth Truss): A new Executive agency of the Ministry of Justice, called Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, will replace the National Offender Management Service from 1 April 2017. The service will be responsible for the roll out of the Government's programme to improve the way we reform offenders to protect the public and tackle the unacceptable levels of reoffending. Michael Spurr will become the Chief Executive of the new HM Prison and Probation Service from 1 April 2017.

HM Prison and Probation Service will have full responsibility for all operations across prison and probation. The Ministry of Justice will take charge of commissioning services, future policy development and be accountable for setting standards and scrutinising prison and probation performance.

The creation of HM Prison and Probation Service will build a world-leading, specialist agency, dedicated to professionalising the prison and probation workforce, backed by an additional £100 million a year and 2,500 additional prison officers. The service will be a place that staff are proud to work, attracting the brightest and best talent to deliver modernised offender reform, strengthened security, counter-terrorism and intelligence capability.

In recognition of the vital work carried out by prison and probation staff, new schemes to improve promotion opportunities have been launched, including enhanced professional qualifications for probation officers, a new leadership programme, an apprenticeship scheme to launch in April and higher pay and recognition for specialist skilled officers dealing with complex issues such as counter-terrorism, suicide and self-harm support and assessment.

This forms part of our far-reaching organisational reforms to the system, which will make services more accountable to Ministers for delivery and performance.

This will be further supported by measures within the prison and courts Bill, which will create a new framework and clear system of accountability for prisons.

Probation services will also offer improved training and learning opportunities for offenders to ensure they do not return to a life of crime, working hand in glove with prisons to ensure a more integrated approach. We will set out more details later this spring.

A key priority of HM Prison and Probation Service will be to focus on the particular needs of offenders. To meet the needs of women offenders across the whole system, for the first time there will be a board director responsible for women across custody and community. Sonia Crozier, Director of Probation, will take on this responsibility (reporting directly to the CEO) from 1 April 2017. We set out also in December 2016 the Government's plans for the youth justice system, putting education and training at the heart of youth custody. We are working closely with the Youth Justice Board to review existing governance arrangements and will set out changes in due course.

[HCWS468]

Petition

Wednesday 8 February 2017

OBSERVATIONS

FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

Visa fees for Pilgrimage to Hajj and Umrah by Saudi Arabia

The petition of residents of Leicester East,

Declares that the Ministry of Hajj of Saudi Arabia has decided to increase the visa fees for foreign visitors to visit the country in order to complete the Islamic pilgrimage for a second time. Hajj is one the Pillars of Islam that every Muslim must complete once in their life time by visiting Mecca in Saudi Arabia. The increase in visa fees will cause hardship to many people who wish to perform this pilgrimage for a second time, which is sometimes carried out on behalf of a family member who is unable to carry out the pilgrimage due to ill health or age.

The petitioners therefore request that Her Majesty's Government makes representations to the Council of Ministers of Saudi Arabia which is chaired by the Crown Prince Mohammad Bin Naif to reconsider the decision to increase the visa fees.

And the petitioners remain, etc.—[*Presented by Keith Vaz, Official Report, 29 November 2016; Vol. 617, c. 1491.*]

[P001984]

Observations from the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Mr Tobias Ellwood):

In 2016, 18,500 British pilgrims performed the Hajj. The Hajj visa quota for UK pilgrims granted by the Saudi Arabian Government is generous—it is one of the highest per capita participation rates of non-Muslim majority countries. For 2017, the total is expected to rise to around 23,000 visas for British Muslims.

The Saudi Arabian authorities do not charge a fee for visas for first time pilgrims for Hajj or Umrah, which makes it possible for all Muslims to fulfil their religious duty to make one pilgrimage during their lifetime without payment of a visa fee.

Officials at the British Embassy in Riyadh have raised the issue of charges for second and subsequent Hajj pilgrimage visas with the Saudi Arabian Government. Our ability to persuade the Government to waive such charges is limited, as visa policy remains the prerogative of the host country in this as in all other cases. I can understand the frustration that your constituents must feel. The British Embassy has however been successful in negotiating reduced general visit visa fees for the holders of British passports; the Saudi Arabian Government have set these at a level which roughly matches UK charges for visas for the UK. This is substantially below the level applicable to the holders of most other kinds of passport.

Ministerial Correction

Wednesday 8 February 2017

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Occupied Palestine Territories

The following is an extract from Questions to the Secretary of State for International Development on 11 January 2017.

8. [908004] **Tommy Sheppard** (Edinburgh East) (SNP): Among the buildings that the Israeli authorities have demolished are community facilities, some of which have been funded and developed with money from the Minister's Department. I would welcome his statement, but I think that we need action rather than words. Has the time not come to send Mr Netanyahu the bill for the demolition of structures funded by the British taxpayer?

Rory Stewart: The British taxpayer has not funded any structures that have been demolished by the Israeli Government. The European Union has funded structures that have been demolished by the Israeli Government, but so far it has not decided to seek compensation. [Official Report, 11 January 2017, Vol. 619, c. 297.]

Letter of correction from Rory Stewart.

An error has been identified in the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Edinburgh East (Tommy Sheppard) during Questions to the Secretary of State for International Development.

The correct answer should have been:

Rory Stewart: The British taxpayer has not **directly** funded any structures **in recent years** that have been demolished by the Israeli Government. The European Union has funded structures that have been demolished by the Israeli Government, but so far it has not decided to seek compensation.

ORAL ANSWERS

Wednesday 8 February 2017

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
CABINET OFFICE AND THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER	409	CABINET OFFICE AND THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER—continued	
Civil Service Headcount.....	415	Voter Identification Measures	411
Digital Technologies	416	Voter Identification Trial.....	414
Efficiency Savings	415		
Electoral Fraud	409		
Public Procurement Guidelines	413	PRIME MINISTER	418
Topical Questions	416	Engagements.....	418

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Wednesday 8 February 2017

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
DEFENCE	9WS	JUSTICE	11WS
Votes A Annual Estimate 2017-18	9WS	Foreign National Offenders and British National Offenders: Repatriation.....	11WS
HOME DEPARTMENT	9WS	Prisons and Probation.....	12WS
Immigration	9WS		

PETITION

Wednesday 8 February 2017

	<i>Col. No.</i>	<i>Col. No.</i>
FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE	1P	
Visa fees for Pilgrimage to Hajj and Umrah by Saudi Arabia.....	1P	

MINISTERIAL CORRECTION

Wednesday 8 February 2017

	<i>Col. No.</i>
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	1MC
Occupied Palestine Territories.....	1MC

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
Wednesday 15 February 2017**

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

Wednesday 8 February 2017

Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 409] [see index inside back page]

Minister for the Cabinet Office
Prime Minister

Sexual Offences (Amendment) [Col. 431]

Motion for leave to bring in Bill—(Liz Saville Roberts)—agreed to
Bill presented, and read the First time

European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill [Col. 433]

Further considered in Committee; not amended, considered; read the Third time and passed

Petitions [Col. 571]

Educational Attainment: Oldham [Col. 575]

Debate on motion for Adjournment

Trade Unions [Col. 583]

Motions, on deferred Divisions, agreed to

Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement (CETA) Between the EU and Canada [Col. 608]

Motion, on a deferred Division, agreed to

Westminster Hall

Low-Cost housing [Col. 125WH]

Unauthorised Overdrafts [Col. 145WH]

National Shipbuilding Strategy [Col. 153WH]

Construction Industry: Blacklisting [Col. 177WH]

Private Renting: Homeless and Vulnerable People [Col. 184WH]

General Debates

Written Statements [Col. 9WS]

Petition [Col. 1P]

Observations

Ministerial Correction [Col. 1MC]

Written Answers to Questions [The written answers can now be found at <http://www.parliament.uk/writtenanswers>]
