

**Tuesday
12 June 2018**

**Volume 642
No. 151**



**HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES**

(HANSARD)

Tuesday 12 June 2018

House of Commons

Tuesday 12 June 2018

The House met at half-past Eleven o'clock

PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Oral Answers to Questions

BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

The Secretary of State was asked—

Economic Growth and Emissions

1. **Julian Knight** (Solihull) (Con): What steps he is taking to support economic growth while decreasing emissions. [905777]

8. **Colin Clark** (Gordon) (Con): What steps he is taking to support economic growth while decreasing emissions. [905786]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): My hon Friends and the House will agree that we should be proud of the UK's progress in cutting emissions while driving economic growth. Since 1990, we have reduced our greenhouse gas emissions by over 40% while growing the economy by over two thirds—the best performance per capita in the G7. And we will, as part of our modern industrial strategy, continue to exploit the opportunities for future growth across the UK through our clean growth grand challenge.

Julian Knight: As we rightly move towards eliminating the internal combustion engine in all new cars from 2040, does the Minister agree that, in the short to medium term, it is important to jobs and growth that we recognise the role of clean diesel engines such as those in the cars that roll off the production in my local car plant?

Claire Perry: My hon. Friend rightly champions the incredible employer in his constituency. He knows that we are right to move towards eliminating internal combustion engines from our roads, but we must do it in a managed way and ensure that we preserve those jobs and particularly the investment in clean diesel during the transition to zero-emission vehicles. I know that there have been announcements today of job losses in his constituency, which will be concerning. However, they are part of the manufacturing plan that has been announced.

Colin Clark: The oil and gas industry plays an active role in protecting the environment and reducing emissions. Does the Minister share my shock that the shadow Chancellor advised Cambridge University to divest itself

of oil and gas investments when that industry supports 300,000 jobs in the UK? Does she agree that the industry is playing its part, and that 300,000 UK jobs are worth protecting despite the Opposition's—

Mr Speaker: Order. I say very gently that the Minister will want to focus on the policy of the Government. Her view about the policy of the Opposition is neither here nor there. With experience, I know the hon. Gentleman will realise that those questions are disorderly.

Claire Perry: The Government's policy is to support a sector that employs 300,000 people and contributes £21 billion to the UK economy. We recognise that the vital oil and gas industry has an integral role to play as we transition to a low-carbon economy, which is why we are investing in technologies such as carbon capture, usage and storage, and exploring how things such as our world-leading submersible technologies can work to support oil and gas.

Albert Owen (Ynys Môn) (Lab): The Minister will be aware of the potential of the marine energy sector in terms of both UK economic growth and reducing emissions. Will she assure me that projects such as Minesto and Morlais in my constituency will not be crowded out by the funding mechanism in place now, which favours offshore wind?

Claire Perry: The hon. Gentleman knows that we have set out £557 million to support all renewable technologies over the next few years. We want to make sure that we decarbonise at the right price for taxpayers and bill payers, which is one reason why the mechanism will continue.

Chris Elmore (Ogmore) (Lab): One way in which the Government could invest in economic growth while decreasing emissions would be to invest in the Swansea Bay tidal lagoon project. They have flip-flopped over the past 10 days, with leaks about when the announcement will or will not be made. May I press the Minister? Can she please tell us when she will deliver that major economic investment for Wales?

Claire Perry: Having grown up on one side of the Bristol channel and seen the second-highest tidal range in the world on an almost daily basis, I will take no lessons on the value of tidal and marine technology. As guardians of public money, it is absolutely right that we make investments that deliver the right decarbonisation and the right value for the taxpayer. The hon. Gentleman should not rely on leaks and assume that they are Government information. That announcement will come in due course and the House will be the first to know.

David T. C. Davies (Monmouth) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that the recent announcement of support for Wylfa underpins the Government's commitment not only to reducing emissions, but to economic growth, not least in Wales?

Claire Perry: My hon. Friend is right. I should clarify that we are entering commercial negotiations—a deal needs to be done—but we should make a virtue of the fact that we have one of the most diversified energy

supplies in the world and one of the lowest-carbon energy supplies. We have also managed to get ourselves off coal, which other countries long to do.

Rebecca Long Bailey (Salford and Eccles) (Lab): The Government's shambolic policy on the solar and onshore wind sectors in recent years has meant that significant economic growth and decarbonisation opportunities have been lost. For example, we have seen dramatic feed-in tariff subsidy cuts; business and VAT rate hikes; and obstruction to clean power auctions. Sadly, as we have heard today, there are reports that the Swansea Bay tidal lagoon, the world's first tidal lagoon, which would create thousands of jobs and local supply chains and use 100,000 tonnes of majority British steel, is potentially on the Secretary of State's hit list. Will the Minister buck that trend today and confirm when the decision will be made, and outline what support she will give to solar and onshore wind?

Claire Perry: I remain bemused by the hon. Lady's ability to seize a disaster out of a triumph. We have delivered more renewable energy than we ever thought possible, at a price that is unimaginable—*[Interruption.]* I know the Opposition Front Benchers do not give a stuff about consumer bills, as they have made that totally obvious, but we care about decarbonisation at the right price for the consumer.

Rebecca Long Bailey: I think we touched a nerve there. The Minister is living in a parallel universe to me, because in the first quarter of 2018 the deployment of new solar slowed to its lowest level since 2010, and next year onshore wind installation is expected to be at its lowest level since before 2008. But it gets worse: last November, the industrial strategy was published, yet seven months on progress has been slow, with business becoming increasingly frustrated. The industrial strategy council has not yet been appointed, no strategy for reaching the research and development target has been published and dozens of sectors are waiting for responses to their sector deals. So does the Minister accept, as some key business leaders do, that perhaps her Government's chaos over Brexit and the apparent inability even to concentrate on an industrial strategy are undermining British business and indeed our growth?

Claire Perry: The previous point still stands. We are incredibly proud of our industrial strategy, with its groundbreaking opportunities to link up government and businesses for the first time. I go back to the point on the hon. Lady's questions about solar: the thing about offshore wind is that we lead—*[Interruption.]* Again, if they could all stop chuntering, Mr Speaker—God almighty. We lead the world in terms of the installed capacity, and we have created tens of thousands of jobs. I know the Opposition Front Benchers, as per the first question, do not give a stuff about jobs, let alone consumer bills, but the point is that—

Mr Speaker: Order. Minister, please resume your seat. I am most grateful to you, but I am afraid dilation is not in order today. We have a lot to get through and not much time in which to do so. We have to make progress. We need short questions and short answers.

Energy Generation and Consumption: Kettering

2. **Mr Philip Hollobone** (Kettering) (Con): What estimate he has made of the amount of electricity (a) generated and (b) consumed annually in the borough of Kettering. [905778]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): The last time I talked about dilation, I was in labour. However, in Kettering—

Mr Speaker: Order. What is required is a brief answer and a brief question—no dilation.

Claire Perry: In 2016, at least 150 GWh were generated in Kettering, mostly from renewables; this is enough generation to power 38,000 homes. In 2016, 405 GWh of electricity were consumed in the Kettering local authority area.

Mr Hollobone: It is great news that Kettering is one of the greenest boroughs in the country, but we do have a very large number of wind turbines in the borough. What are the Government doing to encourage offshore wind turbines, rather than onshore ones?

Claire Perry: We have maintained, and will continue to maintain, our manifesto commitment that says that no more large-scale onshore wind development is right in England. That should reassure my hon. Friend and his constituents.

Stephen Kerr (Stirling) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: No. This question was purely about Kettering—both the question and the answer—so we must move on.

Food and Drink Sector: South-west

3. **Scott Mann** (North Cornwall) (Con): What recent assessment he has made of trends in the level of business investment in the food and drink sector in the south-west. [905779]

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Greg Clark): Food and drink grown and made in Cornwall is exported and enjoyed around the world. My hon. Friend, both as chairman of the all-party group on dairy and as North Cornwall's MP, will welcome the £75 million investment by Dairy Crest in its Davidstow creamery, announced two weeks ago, to expand its cheese production by nearly 50%. We are working closely with the industry to ensure that companies continue to invest and grow, right across the UK.

Scott Mann: I am grateful to the Secretary of State for that answer, and I do welcome Dairy Crest's recent announcement. The food and drink sector is flourishing right across the south-west, particularly in North Cornwall. We have some fantastic brands, including Tarquin's Gin, Kernow Chocolate, Sharp's brewery and Buttermilk fudge, to name but a few. Many of these small and medium-sized firms are looking to export for the first time. What discussions is his Department having with the Department for International Trade to expand some of these opportunities for those firms?

Greg Clark: We know that there is huge demand for these products. For example, one reason behind the expansion of the creamery is the increasing appetite in China for cheese produced in Cornwall. My hon. Friend mentioned Sharp's brewery, and the investment in the facility at Rock now means that 340,000 pints of Doom Bar a day can be produced there. I hope some of those will leave these shores and be enjoyed around the world.

Luke Pollard (Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport) (Lab/Co-op): Controversially, Britain's earliest pasty recipe comes from Plymouth rather than Cornwall. It dates from 1510 and was found in Plymouth borough's accounts. Pasties are a key part of both Plymouth and Cornwall's identity. What discussions has the Minister had to ensure that the name "Cornish pasties" is protected after we leave the EU, preventing anyone else around the world from forging pasties, whether Cornish or from Plymouth?

Greg Clark: Anyone who has enjoyed pasties in Cornwall or—dare I say?—Plymouth will attest to their unique qualities. We have products across the United Kingdom that are associated with the places where they are manufactured. It is an association of quality, and we will ensure that they continue to be protected as part of our negotiations.

Automotive Industry

4. **Colleen Fletcher** (Coventry North East) (Lab): What steps he is taking to support the automotive industry. [905781]

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Greg Clark): The automotive sector is one of our great success stories, and our recently published automotive sector deal, as part of the industrial strategy, sets out how we will continue to support it in future. The partnership continues to deliver results. In April, Vauxhall announced an investment of over £100 million in its Luton plant to build the next generation of Vivaro vans. Last month, the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, the sector body, reported that UK van production had increased by almost a fifth compared with last year.

Colleen Fletcher: Jaguar Land Rover is one of Coventry's biggest employers. Recently, JLR revealed its intention to make Coventry the heart of its large-scale battery and electric vehicle production plans. This is welcome news for my city. With that in mind, what support can the Minister offer to Jaguar Land Rover to ensure that Coventry becomes the centre for large-scale battery and electric vehicle production?

Greg Clark: I am grateful for the hon. Lady's question and I completely agree with her praise and support for that very important employer. JLR's expansion plans and its plans to make electric vehicles in Coventry are reinforced by the Faraday challenge, which is part of the industrial strategy, and the national battery manufacturing development facility is based at Warwick University's campus there to support that company and many others besides.

Andrew Selous (South West Bedfordshire) (Con): Does the Secretary of State agree that it would be a cruel irony if Volkswagen, the author of the emissions cheating

scandal, were to make large pay-outs in Germany and the United States, which would help those countries to boost their electric vehicle capacity, but made no similar pay-out to help the United Kingdom move ahead in this area?

Greg Clark: My hon. Friend is right that the consequences have to be borne by the companies that cheated the system. We need to make the transition to ultra low emission vehicles to make sure that we lead the world in this area. Just a few weeks ago, Toyota announced a big investment in the future of mobility here in the UK, based on the commitments that we are making as part of our industrial strategy.

21. [905800] **Matt Western** (Warwick and Leamington) (Lab): Scrappage schemes have been used in the past to assist businesses and industries in a transition. Has the Minister costed a support package to scrap old diesel vehicles and assist in a managed transition to renewable/alternative energy vehicles?

Greg Clark: The hon. Gentleman is right that we need to see a managed change. Earlier, my right hon. Friend the Minister for Energy and Clean Growth pointed out that the next generation of diesel can play a big part in not only reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but improving air quality. We will shortly be setting out our proposals on how we make the important transition to zero emissions across our vehicle fleet.

Lucy Allan (Telford) (Con): Hundreds of jobs in my constituency rely on the Jaguar Land Rover supply chain. Will the Secretary of State tell the House what he is doing to help car manufacturers to deal with the uncertainty of Brexit and the fall in demand for diesel vehicles?

Greg Clark: I will. My hon. Friend is right to comment on the supply chain. A big part of the automotive sector deal, which we concluded with the sector, is to boost the proportion of components that are sourced in the UK. This is a joint commitment that we make, as part of the industrial strategy, but she is also right to draw attention to the importance of our continued ability to trade with the rest of the European Union, free of tariffs and with low friction, so that we can maintain the just-in-time model, which is so crucial to our automotive sector.

Sir Vince Cable (Twickenham) (LD): Following the loss of the Discovery model to Slovakia, which was a decision at least partly influenced by Brexit, what steps is the Minister taking to head off the risk to Jaguar Land Rover's exports to China where the rules of origin will conflict with the interests of the company in the event that we lose the customs union and we no longer have sufficient UK content in the cars?

Greg Clark: The right hon. Gentleman is wrong about the decision that was made. In fact, it is a decision to prepare Solihull for the next generation of the Range Rover and the Range Rover Sport. JLR described that as a huge investment and a technology upgrade in Solihull, so I hope he will welcome that. He knows that the importance of making sure that we are able to

continue to trade—this includes recognising rules of origin not just with the European Union, but around the world—is vital for this company.

Mark Pawsey (Rugby) (Con): Many intending to purchase new cars are unsure what type of engine to opt for, partly as a consequence of Government taxation policies. That is having a serious effect on the British motor manufacturing industry. Will the Secretary of State confirm that there remains a future for clean diesel?

Greg Clark: I will indeed. We are not the only country that is seeing a fall in the sales of diesel. As I and my right hon. Friend the Minister of State have said, clean diesel and the new generations of diesel engines have a very important role to play in the transition to ultra low emission vehicles.

Laura Pidcock (North West Durham) (Lab): Contrary to what the Secretary of State has said, over the past six months nearly 2,000 job losses have been announced in the UK's automotive sector. This week in the media we have seen speculation about thousands of further redundancies caused by a combination of factors, including worries about possible consequences of a no-deal Brexit and the absence of the customs union. May I press the Secretary of State to set out how the Government will work with business, industry bodies and trade unions to ensure security of the automotive industry and those employed in it both in the immediate future and beyond UK's exit from the EU?

Greg Clark: We work very closely with the industry with great success. Engine production in this country was up over 17% last year, reaching 1 million engines. That is a record. Never in the history of the British motor industry were more engines produced than last year. Over the past year, the net number of jobs that are being created—note the word “created”—in the automotive sector in this country is 9,000. We have a very good record of working closely with the industry to support an industry that is not only very successful today, but will continue to flourish in the future.

Energy Bills

5. **Antoinette Sandbach (Eddisbury) (Con):** What steps he is taking to support vulnerable consumers with their energy bills. [905782]

20. **John Lamont (Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk) (Con):** What steps he is taking to tackle rising energy prices. [905799]

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Greg Clark): The Government are committed to helping energy consumers. We have brought forward the price cap Bill, and more than 2 million low-income households receive £140 a year through the warm home discount.

Antoinette Sandbach: Does the Secretary of State agree that a wide-reaching energy efficiency programme would help vulnerable customers in Eddisbury and elsewhere, as well as helping the UK meet its climate change targets?

Greg Clark: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. One of the missions that the Prime Minister announced as part of our grand challenges in the industrial strategy is to reduce by 50% the energy consumption of homes built in the future. That has an important impact not only on our greenhouse gas emissions, but on the bills that people face.

John Lamont: With recent rises in fuel costs, many motorists in the Scottish borders feel like they have been taken for a ride. What steps are the Government taking to try to reduce the impact of higher taxation on fuel, and what analysis has the Department carried out on the allegations of rocket and feather pricing on petrol and diesel sales at the pump?

Greg Clark: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for the question. It is a very important market. Obviously, recent oil price rises have had an impact at the petrol pumps. It is important that prices are competitive and not, as he implies, subject to rising quickly and then taking a long time to decline. The Office of Fair Trading last looked at this in 2013, but I expect its successor, the Competition and Markets Authority, under Andrew Tyrie, a noted consumer champion, to keep this under close review.

Rachel Reeves (Leeds West) (Lab): Up to 200,000 customers do not benefit from the warm homes discount because they get their energy from smaller energy suppliers. Is it not time to extend the warm homes discount, especially since energy bills are going up and we are trying to crack down on rip-off tariffs?

Greg Clark: The hon. Lady, Chair of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, makes a very important point. We are reviewing whether the threshold for exclusion is appropriate; I know that she will welcome that.

Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP): Some 169 households in my constituency have been affected by the mis-selling of insulation and solar panels by HELMS. This company was accredited by the Government under the old green deal scheme, so what will the Government do to compensate these people—often vulnerable pensioners—and how will they prevent such mis-selling from happening under the new green deal scheme?

Greg Clark: As with any other supplier, consumer protection rights are in place and available. I would be very happy to meet the hon. Lady to discuss this particular case and see whether we can help.

Stephen Kerr (Stirling) (Con): Vulnerable customers can benefit from the use of smart meters. Will the Secretary of State update the House on how many SMETS 2 meters have now been installed and are connected to the Data Communications Company?

Greg Clark: I can tell my hon. Friend that 1,000 new SMETS 2 meters have already been installed. That is a significant milestone because it represents the beginning of the roll-out of the next generation of meters.

Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP): As businesses look to expand their market share in the wider evolving world market beyond the EU ahead of next year, what priority are the Government giving to maintaining and trying to reduce energy bills to create employment and prosperity right across the United Kingdom?

Greg Clark: The hon. Gentleman makes an extremely important point. We have commissioned Professor Dieter Helm to look at how we can reduce the costs of our energy system for businesses and consumers. One of the advantages of the strategy that we have pursued is that we have brought down the costs of offshore wind—a major contribution—by targeting and investing substantially in it at a rate, as my right hon. Friend the Minister for Energy and Clean Growth said earlier, which has resulted in a reduction beyond what anyone expected even a couple of years ago.

Sustainable Electricity Generation

6. **Dr Rupa Huq** (Ealing Central and Acton) (Lab): What steps he is taking to encourage investment in environmentally sustainable electricity generation.

[905783]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): Since 2010, we have seen a large increase in renewables deployment and investment, with more than £52 billion invested, and indeed it is paying off. In 2017, more than half our energy generation came from low-carbon sources. As prices tumble, we can buy more with the same amount of money, which is why we are making £557 million available for further contracts for difference. We have started negotiations with Hitachi to bring forward the country's second new nuclear plant, which my hon. Friend the Member for Monmouth (David T. C. Davies) mentioned.

Dr Huq: The Minister talks a good talk, but rooftop solar panel take-up is at a seven-year low. In my seat, Alternergy has gone from topping the Fintech 100 to an 80% drop in business since the end of the feed-in tariff was announced in 2012. What assurances does the Minister have for such firms after the scheme closes next year?

Claire Perry: It is right that we look at how we can deliver subsidy-free energy using schemes such as the feed-in tariff that have been wildly successful. I will shortly be launching a call for evidence so that we can come up with a good replacement for the feed-in tariff scheme.

Sir Desmond Swayne (New Forest West) (Con): What was the principal driver in the reduction of the price of new offshore wind?

Claire Perry: There were two things. First was the world-leading contract structure that we set up with our auctions; I pay tribute to that very good coalition policy. The second thing was the enormous deployment globally and the reduction in price of the various components. It has been a great British success story.

Barry Gardiner (Brent North) (Lab): In 2015, the then Secretary of State said that 2018 would be the year for the UK to ratchet up our Paris climate commitments and our progress towards sustainable generation, but in the past three years the Government have capped support for low-carbon energy and destroyed 12,000 solar jobs. Clean energy investment, which fell by 10% in 2016, fell by a further 56% in 2017 to its lowest level in a decade. How about the Minister comes down off cloud complacency and finally gives investors certainty about the renewables industry, starting with a date for the consultation on the post feed-in tariff framework?

Claire Perry: I think that the question in all that preamble was, "What is the date?" As I said, we will be announcing that soon.

Drew Hendry (Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey) (SNP): Globally, the nuclear power market is declining rapidly while the low-carbon power of offshore wind and battery storage becomes more affordable. How can the UK Government justify taking a reported £5 billion direct stake, and a further guarantee of £9 billion, in the nuclear white elephant that is Hitachi Wylfa Newydd?

Claire Perry: As I have said repeatedly, we have entered into negotiations. I have to tell the hon. Gentleman that one of the saddest things I saw at the conference of the parties in Bonn this year was the barge-loads of dirty brown coal sailing down the Ruhr because countries like Germany have made an ideological choice about their energy supply rather than focusing on what keeps the lights on, costs down and carbon falling.

Drew Hendry: The Minister said earlier that she "gave a stuff" about household budgets, yet Tory dogma is set to saddle consumers with nuclear energy costing about £80 per megawatt-hour compared with under £60 for offshore wind. Is it not time that the UK Government stopped living in the past, scrapped this nuclear project and put households, who bear the brunt of costs, front of mind?

Claire Perry: The hon. Gentleman cites numbers that have no relevance to the negotiations. We have to keep bills down, and we have to make sure that the lights are on, that we have a secure energy supply and that we decarbonise. We think nuclear is very much part of that mix.

Feed-in Tariff Scheme

7. **Mr Paul Sweeney** (Glasgow North East) (Lab/Co-op): What his policy is on supporting small and medium-sized renewable power generators after the closure of the feed-in tariff scheme.

[905785]

16. **Tim Farron** (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): What the timetable is for the publication of the Government's consultation on the feed-in tariff scheme.

[905795]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): The feed-in tariff scheme was launched in 2010 and now delivers £1.5 billion-worth of support a year for low-carbon generation. It has been really successful,

and over 6 GW of it has been deployed—2.5% of UK electricity consumption. We want to see how we can deploy it at a subsidy-free level, as that is where prices are going. I will launch a call for evidence on the future of small-scale generation soon.

Mr Sweeney: Although I was delighted to hear that the world-leading small wind turbine manufacturer in my constituency, Gaia-Wind, was saved from liquidation this week by an overseas buyer, the unnecessary uncertainty that the Government have created around the future of small-scale renewable energy persists. So will the Minister put investors and companies at ease and make a cast-iron promise to bring forward the consultation on future support before the summer recess?

Claire Perry: I am really glad that, as the hon. Gentleman says, it looks as though at least some of the jobs at the company in his constituency have been saved. With these schemes, we always have to think about what is value for money and what is the right thing to do in terms of energy security and supply. I will not make cast-iron guarantees, but I can promise him that it will happen soon.

Tim Farron: Ben Dyson at Lakes Renewables Ltd in Kendal, which focuses on solar power, has seen a 50% reduction in his work due to the impending closure of the scheme. He has kept going by diversifying, but many other firms have gone to the wall. Ben urgently needs policy clarity from next March, and to see business rates on commercial rooftop solar abolished. What steps will the Minister take to ensure that these rates are abolished and that the growth of small green businesses such as Ben's is encouraged?

Claire Perry: I met representatives of the various trade associations to discuss this really important point. It will be considered separately from the consultation. However, I invite the hon. Gentleman and his constituent to make any representations; I would be keen to receive them.

High Street Businesses

9. **Maria Caulfield** (Lewes) (Con): What steps he is taking to support high street businesses. [905787]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Andrew Griffiths): The retail sector is an important part of our economy and our industrial strategy, as are the 3 million jobs employed in it. In March, I established the Retail Sector Council so that retailers can work together with the Government to develop policies to support the sector. Last week, the Secretary of State and I held a roundtable in Downing Street with retailers to establish how to tackle the challenges facing the sector.

Maria Caulfield: As more retailers struggle to survive on our high streets, what discussions has the Minister had with Treasury colleagues to move business rates away from a property-type tax so that high-street retailers can compete on a level playing field with online businesses?

Andrew Griffiths: As my hon. Friend will know, in April 2017, retailers saw a 6% reduction before inflation in their business rates, with £3.6 billion of transitional relief. We are doing what we can to support businesses.

The Retail Sector Council will be looking at a range of issues, including business rates. The Government are determined to ensure that the taxation system is up to date and fit for purpose.

Toby Perkins (Chesterfield) (Lab): One of the areas on the high street that is particularly struggling is that of our important pubs. I would be interested to hear the Minister's view on the extent to which pub-owning businesses and tenants enjoy confidence in the Pubs Code Adjudicator—and if they do not, what steps the Government are taking to put that right.

Andrew Griffiths: As the hon. Gentleman will know, I take a particular interest in the health of public houses up and down the country. He will know that this Government set up the Pubs Code Adjudicator to ensure that landlords and tenants across the country got a fair deal. It is still early days, but the adjudicator is getting on and making decisions. I know that the Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, my hon. Friend the Member for Watford (Richard Harrington), is in close discussions with the adjudicator to ensure that he is getting the job done.

Sir Patrick McLoughlin (Derbyshire Dales) (Con): Do the Government feel that there is a level playing field between internet providers and businesses on the high street?

Andrew Griffiths: I congratulate my right hon. Friend on his election to the Select Committee; I am sure he will do a great job in standing up for British business. He highlights a key issue, which is the transition from traditional bricks and mortar to online. Last year alone, we saw a 9% increase in online retail. Clearly, that is a challenge for Government and business. That is why we are looking at the business rates structure and also at what we can do to help business to transition during this difficult period.

Laura Smith (Crewe and Nantwich) (Lab): The British Retail Consortium has estimated that up to one third of retail jobs could disappear by 2025 as a fundamental transformation of the market occurs. Does the Minister agree that providing retail workers with the opportunity to upskill and reskill is critical to avoiding mass job losses over the next decade?

Andrew Griffiths: I absolutely agree that it is important to ensure that our workforce are properly skilled, which is why that is an important part of our modern industrial strategy, but I am less pessimistic than she is. Retail employment has been stable at about 3 million. Yes, those jobs are changing, but retail sales totalled some £362 billion last year, and jobs are being created in the retail sector.

Bill Esterson (Sefton Central) (Lab): Last week, House of Fraser announced that 6,000 jobs were at risk. Yesterday, another 5,000 jobs went at Poundworld. Since the start of the year, tens of thousands of retail workers have lost their jobs. Some 3.9 million people work in our retail sector. They, their employers and anyone who cares about our high streets want a retail sector deal, so when are the Government going to publish the strategy? More to the point, will it have any meaningful action?

Andrew Griffiths: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his question. Yesterday, I spoke to the chief executives of both House of Fraser and Poundworld to properly understand the challenges that those businesses face and what Government can do to support them. The hon. Gentleman talks about a sector deal. I politely point out that it was this Government who had to take action to bring together the Retail Sector Council, a forum in which to develop policies. While the Labour party sits by and watches, this Government are getting on and working with the retail sector to protect those jobs.

Sirius Minerals Polyhalite Project

10. **Mr Robert Goodwill** (Scarborough and Whitby) (Con): If he will make an assessment of the potential contribution of the Sirius Minerals polyhalite project to the industrial strategy. [905788]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Richard Harrington): The Sirius Minerals polyhalite project has the potential to create 1,000 skilled jobs at the mine near Whitby and on Teesside, with many more jobs in their supply chains. That is an important type of business that will benefit from our industrial strategy, creating skilled jobs in the north of England.

Mr Goodwill: I am sure the Minister is aware of the recent Quod report, which shows the long-term economic benefits of this investment. The polyhalite fertiliser mining project does not only bring the 1,000 jobs that the Minister mentioned but is the largest single investment in the north. Product will be exported to the world through Teesport, growing the local economy by almost 20% and adding £2.3 billion to the economy. Does the Minister agree that that is precisely the kind of project that the Government should be getting behind as part of the modern industrial strategy?

Richard Harrington: I agree with my right hon. Friend. This is a very important project for him, as the Member of Parliament for Whitby. It is an important developing business, and I agree that it is exactly the kind of business that would benefit from our industrial strategy.

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): I worked for some years in the chemical industry, so let us talk in real terms. We are talking about potash, and as one of the biggest reserves of potash in Europe, this business is seriously important. On a day like today, when we face the ruination of Brexit, when my local engineering companies are desperate about losing their markets in Europe and when Ministers are resigning, it is vital that we use this resource to compensate for the disaster in the rest of the economy.

Richard Harrington: I agree with the hon. Gentleman; this potash project is very exciting and very good for the UK. It is exactly the kind of business that he would want in his area, and it will help businesses throughout the United Kingdom.

Science, Technology and Innovation Investment

11. **Julian Sturdy** (York Outer) (Con): What steps he is taking to invest in science, technology and innovation throughout the UK. [905789]

18. **Vicky Ford** (Chelmsford) (Con): What steps he is taking to invest in science, technology and innovation throughout the UK. [905797]

The Minister for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation (Mr Sam Gyimah): When it comes to science, research and innovation, this Government are putting their money where their mouth is. We are investing an additional £7 billion in research and development funding by 2022—the biggest ever increase in public funding. Our ambition is to increase the UK's R&D spend to 2.4% of GDP by 2027, which will be an additional £80 billion over the next decade to help us to dominate the new industries of the future.

Julian Sturdy: The industrial strategy's commitment to supporting new innovation and investment in science and technology for food production was much welcomed, especially in areas such as North Yorkshire. Will the Minister update the House on what the Government are doing to deliver on these ambitions so that we can fully realise the sector's potential as a source of high-skill jobs and growing exports?

Mr Gyimah: My hon. Friend is right to mention agri-tech. As he is aware, we set out in the industrial sector that agri-tech is one of the six priority areas for the artificial intelligence and data economy grand challenge. On progress in what we are doing, we have announced a £90 million transforming food production challenge, which will continue to bring together the UK's world-class agri-food sector with expertise in robotics, AI and data science.

Vicky Ford: In Chelmsford, we are making the sensors that will go on the Sentinel satellites, which will provide a step change in how we monitor our planet's environment from space. Many European countries have national space programmes and are members of the European Space Agency. Will the UK have a national space programme and contribute to the European Space Agency going forward?

Mr Gyimah: I can answer categorically: the UK will continue to be a member of the independent European Space Agency—currently, for every £1 we invest, we get £10 back—and Innovate UK is looking at a national space programme with the UK Space Agency. In addition, we are looking at a space sector deal to boost the work in our thriving space sector.

Mr Alistair Carmichael (Orkney and Shetland) (LD): Some of the most exciting and innovative work in engineering at the moment is being done on the development of renewable energy from wave and tidal stream power. The sector itself has come up with a proposal for innovation in power purchase agreements. Will the Minister, or perhaps some of his colleagues, agree to meet me with a delegation from the sector to discuss how it can contribute to the Government's industrial strategy?

Mr Gyimah: Absolutely. I am glad the right hon. Gentleman mentions the industrial strategy, and I would be delighted to meet him.

Lucy Powell (Manchester Central) (Lab/Co-op) *rose*—

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): No mention of Galileo—not one word.

Mr Speaker: Order. The hon. Gentleman does not need to keep banging on about Galileo from a sedentary position. We want to hear the views of the hon. Lady, but we have heard the hon. Gentleman chuntering and we may hear him on his feet in due course.

Lucy Powell: When looking at investment in science and innovation across the UK, will the Government do what has not been done in recent years, and make sure that the north gets its fair share?

Mr Gyimah: The hon. Lady mentions the Strength in Places fund—it is actually a big part of our industrial strategy—which is designed to ensure that research and development does not just benefit the so-called golden triangle, but benefits all parts of the UK in terms of jobs and growth.

Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP): Even though telecoms are reserved to Westminster, the UK Government are contributing just £21 million to the Scottish Government's programme to provide superfast broadband to everyone in Scotland. What representations will the Minister therefore make to the Chancellor about matching the Scottish Government's whopping £600 million contribution?

Mr Gyimah: It is for the Scottish Government to make their own budget representations, but as we have always said, we are committed to the roll-out of superfast broadband across the UK. Some 95% of the country has superfast broadband, thanks to the work of this Government.

Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab): Science is a great British success story, supporting jobs and growth across the country. With Europe's funding for UK science down a fifth, more than 6,000 engineers and scientists denied visas in this year alone and universities reporting that Brexit chaos is freezing them out of Europe's new £90 billion science fund, UK science risks crashing down to earth. Does the Minister accept that his threat to spend the entire UK science budget on duplicating Galileo because the Government have bungled negotiations on this £9 billion UK-EU collaboration is final proof that his science strategy is lost in space?

Mr Gyimah: As I said, we have the biggest increase in science and innovation in this country for 40 years. As for the UK-EU science collaboration, the EU Commissioner himself said:

"It is very important for the UK and it is very important for the EU to have a relationship in science and innovation. We've had this relationship for so long".

On Galileo, negotiations are under way and we have made it very clear not only that it benefits the UK but that EU member states stand to lose skills and other important issues without the UK's involvement.

Gas Sector: Scotland

12. **Alan Brown** (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP): What steps he is taking to support the oil and gas sector in Scotland. [905790]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): This Government have provided unprecedented levels of support to help this incredibly important sector—that is something on which we do agree. The Government announced the transferable tax allowance, the sector's No. 1 ask; established the Oil and Gas Authority; invested in the Aberdeen city deal, including the excellent £90 million Oil and Gas Technology Centre, which I was pleased to visit; and put together a fiscal package worth £2.3 billion. It is working, with 16 new final investment decisions this year.

Alan Brown: That all sounds very good, but the reality is that in 2016 the Budget measures on support for the oil and gas industry were only a third of the measures on inheritance tax. The measure on transferable tax history has been delayed further, so when will that come forward? Why can the Government find billions and billions of pounds for nuclear but not for the oil and gas sector?

Claire Perry: The hon. Gentleman and I usually talk about the sector in very positive terms. We have delivered the things that the sector has asked for and it is working. It is fantastic to see investment happening in the North sea basin. The fact that the sector has gone through a time of building resilience given the oil price decline means that it is now starting to invest and grow again.

British Steel

13. **Mrs Madeleine Moon** (Bridgend) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the capability of British steel manufacturers to produce high-grade steel for new markets. [905791]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Richard Harrington): In December 2017, we published Government-commissioned independent research that identified high-value market opportunities for UK steel producers worth up to £3.8 billion a year by 2030

Mrs Moon: The national shipbuilding strategy sought to improve UK prosperity through shipbuilding. The MOD fleet solid support ships contract is worth more than £1 billion. What steps will the Government be taking to ensure that British steel manufacturers are ready to bid for that contract?

Richard Harrington: As the hon. Lady will know, because I met her the week before last, I am very conscious that Tata is in Port Talbot in her constituency. I promise that I will do everything in my power to ensure that Tata and other British steel companies, all of whom I meet regularly, are poised to act on these contracts.

Carbon Capture and Storage Taskforce

14. **John Grogan** (Keighley) (Lab): What the timetable is for his receipt of the report of the carbon capture usage and storage cost challenge taskforce; and if he will make a statement. [905793]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): I am delighted to answer this question and continue the conversation about carbon capture and

storage that the hon. Gentleman and I were having last night. We are determined to deploy cost-effective carbon capture and storage at scale and in a way that helps to decarbonise both generation and industry. That is why we have asked the taskforce, the best minds in the country, and our CCUS council to convene. I am looking forward to receiving their report and acting on it very soon.

John Grogan: Does the Minister agree that the development of carbon capture and storage is crucial for much of British manufacturing and for the use of gas during the transition, and will she encourage innovation not just in technology but in finance, with both the Government and the fossil fuel sector contributing?

Claire Perry: The hon. Gentleman might have been reading one of the report's recommendations. He is absolutely right. We must deliver this in a way that is cost-effective and supports further innovation. I am confident that, with the taskforce's help, we will have very good recommendations and ideas to move forward with.

Industrial Strategy

15. **Ms Marie Rimmer** (St Helens South and Whiston) (Lab): What progress he has made on developing (a) sector deals and (b) local industrial strategies as part of the industrial strategy. [905794]

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Greg Clark): Our modern industrial strategy will boost productivity and earning power across the UK. We have announced four sector deals in areas including life sciences, the creative industries, the automotive sector and artificial intelligence. More will come in the weeks ahead. I am encouraged by the work of the mayoral combined authorities and local enterprise partnerships in developing local industrial strategies.

Ms Rimmer: I and my Front Bench colleagues have been informed that dozens of sectors have put forward proposals for a sector deal, including the steel industry, but have had little or no engagement from the Government. Will the Secretary of State confirm how many proposals for sector deals he has received and to how many he has formally responded?

Greg Clark: I am delighted to report that we have had a huge interest from sectors right across the country, including the steel sector. The Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, my hon. Friend the Member for Watford (Richard Harrington) and I have had substantial discussions with the steel industry and we look forward to developing that deal in the weeks and months ahead.

Martin Vickers (Cleethorpes) (Con): What progress is being made on the Greater Grimsby town deal?

Greg Clark: I know this deal is close to my hon. Friend's heart and that of his constituency neighbour. I have made a commitment to come to Cleethorpes and, I dare say, Grimsby to help with that negotiation. I look forward to doing so soon.

Several hon. Members *rose—*

Mr Speaker: We can take Question 19, if it is brief.

Tidal Lagoons

19. **Sir Edward Davey** (Kingston and Surbiton) (LD): What the Government's policy is on tidal lagoons. [905798]

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): The right hon. Gentleman knows, more than many in the House, the need to invest in innovative technologies, while maintaining a focus on value for money. We have rightly looked at this project with very serious scrutiny. There are some very attractive things about it, but it has to pass the value for money test. When that decision is made, the House will be the first to know.

Sir Edward Davey: Does the Minister accept that nuclear and offshore wind needed pathfinder projects, first-of-a-kind projects, to prove the technology and the economics and to get the cost down. Why can tidal lagoons not have such a pathfinder project, just as Charles Hendry recommended?

Claire Perry: Partly because of the right hon. Gentleman's great policy decisions, we have had a world-leading advance in offshore wind in terms of the cost at which we can deploy it. He is right to say that we have to consider the whole life cycle of technologies and that is exactly what we have been doing in considering tidal technology.

Mr Speaker: The right hon. Gentleman has been given the accolade of being the source of world leadership in a particular field. I trust, therefore, that he will be gratified with his efforts today.

Topical Questions

T1. [905802] **Diana Johnson** (Kingston upon Hull North) (Lab): If he will make a statement on his departmental responsibilities.

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Greg Clark): Since our last departmental questions, we have taken further steps to implement our industrial strategy. In early May, we launched UK Research and Innovation, with a budget of £6 billion a year, to drive forward our growing investment in research and development. The Prime Minister announced four missions that our grand challenges will achieve, including to save 20,000 lives a year through artificial intelligence-assisted cancer diagnosis. We have launched sector deals in AI, convened the first ever Retail Sector Council and launched a major programme to drive productivity in smaller companies. On the 150th anniversary of the creation of the TUC, from the party that established the royal commission that decriminalised trade unions, that brought in widows pensions and holiday entitlements, that created the national living wage—in other words, Mr Speaker, the true workers' party—we wish the TUC a very happy birthday.

Diana Johnson: Of course, I say to the Secretary of State that the Labour party was founded by the trade unions.

My question is about retail. In Hull, retail employs 12,000 people. Hull's House of Fraser store is going to close, with the loss of 207 jobs. Hull has three Poundworld stores that are under threat and there are also concerns

about Hull's Marks and Spencer store, which may be one of the 60 unidentified branches closing by 2022. After the Comet collapse, which cost taxpayers some £45 million, what is the Minister going to do to assist shop workers and protect taxpayers?

Greg Clark: The hon. Lady will concede that the efforts and engagement through the city of culture year between the Government and Hull were very substantial and very effective. I am familiar with the House of Fraser store in Hull. I know what an important part it plays in the life of the town centre. I understand that the council is confident that such a prime site, which I know well, will be taken up. I will work closely with the council to make sure, through the sector council, it has all the help it needs.

T4. [905805] **Michael Tomlinson** (Mid Dorset and North Poole) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend update the House on what he is doing to support vulnerable people in Mid Dorset and North Poole with their energy bills?

The Minister for Energy and Clean Growth (Claire Perry): Of course, the whole House will shortly be able to pass the price cap Bill, which will assist all consumers with the cost of energy, and this comes on top of the prepayment meter and vulnerable consumers price caps that are in place. We are determined to continue supporting vulnerable consumers through such things as the warm home discount, winter fuel payments and repurposing the very large energy company obligation scheme to tackle fuel poverty.

T2. [905803] **Thangam Debbonaire** (Bristol West) (Lab): Will the Secretary of State please think of the 150,000 homes that it would power, the thousands of jobs that it would create, the supply chain business that it would support in Wales and the west, and the climate change that it would tackle, and get off the fence and announce Government support for Swansea Bay tidal lagoon today?

Claire Perry: I have always admired the hon. Lady's passion. Again, as I have said multiple times, we absolutely are very keen to scrutinise this deal. It has to deliver the low-carbon energy we all want and the jobs we all want at a price that is affordable for the consumers we all represent.

T5. [905806] **Luke Graham** (Ochil and South Perthshire) (Con): Following my Adjournment debate on 4 June, what steps has my right hon. Friend been able to take to progress geothermal energy in Clackmannanshire?

Claire Perry: Those who missed the Clackmannanshire energy project Adjournment debate missed a massive treat: it was a very enjoyable, informative debate. We are very supportive of the project. My officials are working closely to explore funding opportunities, and I commend my hon. Friend for his continued leadership in this important area.

T3. [905804] **Jamie Stone** (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD): Last night, I had the pleasure of travelling on the sleeper from Inverness to Euston, and with me on the sleeper was a consignment of delicious highland shellfish products. What are the Government

doing to assist the transportation of fresh highland food products to markets in the south and, indeed, overseas?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Richard Harrington): As you may well be aware, Mr Speaker, highland products are absolutely excellent and should well be distributed to all parts of the UK. The Government's policy, with the industrial strategy to develop business by helping with research and development and through keeping fuel prices low, without the troughs and peaks that the Secretary of State mentioned, will help significantly.

T8. [905809] **Michelle Donelan** (Chippenham) (Con): Each year, I organise the Wiltshire Festival of Engineering, and this October's event is set to reach thousands of young children. What will the Department be organising for this year's Year of Engineering?

The Minister for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation (Mr Sam Gyimah): The Festival of Engineering is particularly important for students because we want to encourage and inspire people to take engineering subjects and follow engineering careers. A lot of activity is planned and I will be delighted to share this with my hon. Friend.

T6. [905807] **Lucy Powell** (Manchester Central) (Lab/Co-op): With Government support for the third runway at Heathrow coming on top of Crossrail 2, is this not yet another example of infrastructure spending going to the south-east of England? Will the Secretary of State now up the ante and make sure that we get the infrastructure spend to realise the northern powerhouse?

Greg Clark: We are getting on with major infrastructure investments that would be good for the whole United Kingdom and that the previous Government did not take.

T9. [905810] **Richard Graham** (Gloucester) (Con): Like all good films, I hope that a Government response to the Hendry review is "Coming Soon", but meanwhile, will the Minister share with us whether she agrees that the opportunities for marine energy, whether tidal stream, tidal lagoon or waves, are enormous? Does she agree that they deserve more support and encouragement to develop this fantastically innovative source of additional low-carbon, domestically produced energy?

Claire Perry: I must pay tribute to my hon. Friend's brilliant chairmanship of the all-party group on this technology area. He is absolutely right: we do think that water power has incredible potential. That is why the Government have invested over £100 million since 2010 in investigating various forms of the technology and why we are keen to continue to pursue opportunities, but they have to be at the right price for consumers.

T7. [905808] **Mr Virendra Sharma** (Ealing, Southall) (Lab): What assurances has the Minister received that the British steel industry can supply Heathrow expansion sufficiently?

Richard Harrington: As I hope the hon. Gentleman is aware, I meet the steel industry regularly, and I am very interested to meet him to hear his views on the subject. I

can assure him that everything that can possibly be done to deal with tariffs is being done. I had a meeting with all the chief executives of the steel business. I went to Brussels last week and met the director general of trade, as well as other CEOs and European colleagues.

Huw Merriman (Bexhill and Battle) (Con): High street businesses lose out when banks close, pensioners lose banking services, and post offices are also facing challenging times. What can be done to make sure that the main high street banks provide their services at least in a host post office that acts as a hub?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Andrew Griffiths): My hon. Friend, who makes some important points, will know that the Government have invested £2 billion in the post office network to ensure that across the country, in communities where retail banks are closing, the Post Office can step up and allow his constituents and businesses, among others, to access both personal and business banking in their local post office. That is good for the post offices and for our communities.

T10. [905811] **Paula Sherriff** (Dewsbury) (Lab): Dewsbury town centre is a shadow of its former self and has the second highest rate of vacant units in the country. Will the Minister tell me exactly what the Government are doing to deal with the decline of high streets in northern towns such as mine?

Andrew Griffiths: The hon. Lady will know that the retail sector is particularly impacted on by changes in consumer behaviour. More people are shopping online, and that is a challenge for the sector. There is no silver bullet, but through the retail sector we are sitting alongside industry and trying to understand the challenges it faces, such as on business rates and how we adapt to ensure that we not only help the sector to make that transition, but protect the jobs of the 3 million people employed in the sector.

Stephen Kerr (Stirling) (Con): When will the Government respond to the joint report on Carillion by the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee and the Work and Pensions Committee?

Andrew Griffiths: I thank my hon. Friend for his question and thank the Select Committees for their work on Carillion. They did a truly remarkable job in holding the directors of Carillion to account and uncovering exactly what went on with the Carillion collapse. I think the report was issued on 16 May, and the Government have 60 days in which to respond, but I can assure him that we are doing all we can to meet the challenge.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. We have run out of time so we must have very brief questions. I think a sentence will suffice.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): Factory output has decreased, according to the papers today. Will the Minister outline what he can do to assist factory manufacturing and initiate a clear industrial strategy?

Greg Clark: As the hon. Gentleman knows, through the industrial strategy, which has been developed in close collaboration with the Engineering Employers

Federation, and through investment in research and development and skills, we are doing everything we can to take the opportunities arising.

James Cartlidge (South Suffolk) (Con): Given the success of auto-enrolment, will the Minister outline what steps the Department is taking to ensure that as the country saves more, we invest more in British industry?

Andrew Griffiths: The hon. Gentleman will know that through the industrial strategy we are doing all we can to support British business and make sure it gets the investment it needs, particularly through the British Business Bank, which is looking to release £20 billion of patient capital to give our businesses the rocket fuel they need to grow.

Mr Adrian Bailey (West Bromwich West) (Lab/Co-op): The decision by JLR to invest in electric vehicles is very welcome, but equally the decision to produce the Discovery model in Slovakia is profoundly worrying. Does the Secretary of State agree that it underlines the need for tariff-free access for both cars and components in the EU?

Greg Clark: I agree with what the hon. Gentleman said at the end—of course we need tariff-free access with a minimum of frictions to these important markets—but I disagree that this is not a sign of significant confidence. JLR is investing in the next generation of vehicles. I hope he will welcome that.

Melanie Onn (Great Grimsby) (Lab): What is the Secretary of State's No. 1 initiative to ensure that the Greater Grimsby town deal moves from theory to reality?

Greg Clark: As I said to my hon. Friend the Member for Cleethorpes (Martin Vickers), I will come and sit down with Grimsby and Cleethorpes leaders to negotiate it myself.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): There is clearly a crisis on our high street, so will the Minister ensure that business rates are fully addressed in this year's Budget?

Andrew Griffiths: I can assure the hon. Lady that, together with the retail industry, we are looking at business rates, their impact on businesses and our ability to ensure we have a fair taxation system.

Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North) (SNP): The industrial strategy challenge fund round closed in April, but the Government are not expected to make a decision until the tail end of this year. Can they speed up the process please?

Mr Gyimah: We are determined to speed up the process, and obviously we are investing more than ever before, but it is important that we take our time to make the right investments to benefit UK industry.

Fiona Onasanya (Peterborough) (Lab): Employees in my constituency have time limits imposed on their toilet breaks, which are insufficient. What assessment has the Department made of businesses adopting such practices?

Andrew Griffiths: The Department keeps a close eye on developments of this kind, and I assure the hon. Lady that the matter is firmly on our agenda. We want to ensure, through the Matthew Taylor review and the

work we are doing ourselves, that workers are treated fairly, receive the support that they need in business, and are fairly paid.

Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central) (SNP): One of the biggest missing links in the tackling of money laundering is the Government's own agency, Companies House. When will the Minister ensure that it is funded adequately and has enough staff to carry out proper checks on businesses?

Andrew Griffiths: I assure the hon. Lady that we are seeking to ensure that Companies House is fit for purpose. As she will know, in 2016-17 it brought some 3,182 prosecutions. Companies House is very attuned to the challenges that it faces, particularly in relation to money laundering. That is why we are introducing, for instance, measures relating to Scottish limited partnerships, which I am sure the hon. Lady will welcome.

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): I know that the Secretary of State is an honourable man. He is the Business Secretary. If we have a hard Brexit, British business will be devastated. Will he join us today in voting to keep us in the single market?

Greg Clark: I work night and day to make sure that British and international businesses continue to invest in this country, and they have shown a willingness to do so. We want to be the best location not only for trade with Europe but for trade around the world, and that will form part of our negotiations.

Stewart Malcolm McDonald (Glasgow South) (SNP): What support can my constituents, who are among the 5,000 set to lose their jobs at Poundworld, expect from the Government?

Andrew Griffiths: As the hon. Gentleman will know, I spoke to the chief executive of Poundworld yesterday to try to understand the challenges that it faces. Through the official receiver, the special manager is seeking to do everything possible to rescue the business, and they are hopeful that there are buyers out there for at least part of it. We in the Government have pledged to do all that we can to ensure that the business is rescued.

Points of Order

12.37 pm

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. May I seek your advice? Last Monday, following the oral statement on rail timetabling, I asked the Transport Secretary whether he would refuse any request by Arriva Northern to extend the immensely disruptive two-week suspension of the Lakes line in Cumbria. He replied:

“I am not prepared to accept more than the current two weeks and...I have been clear to Arriva that doing this over the long term is simply unacceptable”.—[*Official Report*, 4 June 2018; Vol. 642, c. 58.]

I was therefore horrified to learn on Friday that Arriva Northern had, in fact, extended the suspension by a further two weeks, to 2 July, and that a spokesperson for the Secretary of State’s Department had said that it did not object to the “operational decision”.

The Transport Secretary told the House that he would do one thing, and he has gone and done the complete opposite. What can you do, Mr Speaker, to compel him to appear before the House and explain himself and to ensure that commitments made by Ministers of the Crown in this House are actually fulfilled?

Mr Speaker: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for his point of order. I am not privy to the details of this matter, but my response to the hon. Gentleman, off the top of my head, is twofold.

If a Minister feels that he or she has been inaccurate in a statement to the House, it is incumbent upon, and open to, that Minister subsequently to correct the record. It may be that the Minister holds a view, and would offer an interpretation of the sequence of events, that differs from that of the hon. Gentleman. I do not, in all candour, know.

I would just add, without offering any judgment on the merits of the case—which it would not be right for me to do—that a less than 100% correlation between what is said at one time and what happens at another time is not entirely without precedent in our parliamentary history.

I feel that on this occasion—and he will take it in the right spirit—the hon. Gentleman was perhaps more interested in what he had to say to me than in anything that I might have to say to him, and he has been successful in his mission: it is on the record.

Chuka Umunna (Streatham) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Sir Winston Churchill said:

“The first duty of a member of Parliament is to do what he thinks in his faithful and disinterested judgement is right and necessary for the honour and safety of Great Britain. His second duty is to his constituents, of whom he is the representative but not the delegate.”

With that in mind, Mr Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the disgraceful front page of today’s *Daily Express*, which gives one “simple” warning to “our elected representatives”:

“ignore the will of the people at your peril.”

This is a threat, pure and simple, and an attempt to intimidate and threaten Members ahead of the votes on the Lords amendments today.

That paper is not the only protagonist. This gives licence to people to abuse and threaten Members of this House who exercise their judgment to do what they think is best for our country, as the Under-Secretary of State for Justice, the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), has done in resigning this morning. Already on social media, a UKIP supporter has called for him to be hung, drawn and quartered; and you will know, Mr Speaker, that just last week a gentleman was given a nine-week suspended jail sentence for sending threatening emails to the right hon. Members for Broxtowe (Anna Soubry) and for Loughborough (Nicky Morgan), my right hon. Friend the Member for Tottenham (Mr Lammy), my hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton South West (Eleanor Smith), the hon. Member for South Cambridgeshire (Heidi Allen) and other Members. What advice, Mr Speaker, would you give to Members in the face of such abuse and threats?

Mr Speaker: My advice, in so far as it is ever required, is: do as your conscience dictates. That is what Members of Parliament on any side of any argument are not merely entitled, but perhaps constitutionally obliged, to do. The freedom of speech that we enjoy in this place was hard-won and by all Members of whatever hue will I am sure be jealously, and rightly jealously, guarded.

I must say en passant to the hon. Gentleman that until he held up that copy of that paper I had not seen the headline or report to which he referred; I am not in the habit of reading this sort of material and it is a matter of no interest or concern to me whatsoever. All that is of interest and concern to me is that right hon. and hon. Members do what they believe to be right by their constituents, by their conscience and by their country.

Anna Soubry (Broxtowe) (Con): Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. Do you share my concern that to my knowledge at least one hon. Member on these Benches will today and tomorrow not vote in accordance with their conscience because of threats to their personal safety, to members of their parliamentary staff and to members of their family? Do you take that as a very serious threat to the democracy of this place, and if you do would you expect a senior member of Her Majesty’s Government to come forward and make it clear that this will not be tolerated by any party against any Member of Parliament?

Mr Speaker: I can only repeat what I have said: Members must speak and vote as they think fit. No Member of this House, whatever opinion he or she holds, should be threatened because of it. No Member should be subject to threats, and any Member subject to threats of a kind—

The Leader of the House of Commons (Andrea Leadsom) *rose—*

Mr Speaker: In a moment, I will of course come to the Leader of the House.

Any Member subject to threats of a kind that would be unlawful must take the appropriate action. As we know, there are lots of things that happen in politics whereby attempts to persuade people are made which

[Mr Speaker]

are perfectly legitimate and in which neither the Chair, nor I suspect the Leader of the House or any other Member, would seek to involve himself or herself. If the right hon. Member for Broxtowe (Anna Soubry) is suggesting that illegality is involved, Members know what course of action to follow. I would hope, and am confident, that today's and tomorrow's debates will take place in an atmosphere of mutual respect, in which opinions sincerely held will be robustly articulated. But no one in this place under any circumstance should be under threat.

If the Leader of the House still feels that anything needs to be added, she is welcome to attempt to do so.

Andrea Leadsom: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I should like to accept the invitation from my right hon. Friend the Member for Broxtowe (Anna Soubry) and to say on behalf of the Government that any threats of violence or intimidation are utterly unacceptable to the Government. The Government will absolutely uphold the right of every Member to do what they believe is the right thing to do.

Mr Speaker: I am most grateful to the Leader of the House. That is very clear, and it is on the record. I for one appreciate it and I rather imagine that it will be appreciated by other Members. If there are no further points of order—at any rate for now—we come to the ten-minute rule motion. [Interruption.] Order. I know that colleagues are eagerly anticipating the next business, but I am sure that they will want to accord a courteous hearing to the hon. Member for Congleton (Fiona Bruce) as she presents her ten-minute rule Bill.

Alcohol (Minimum Pricing) (England)

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

12.46 pm

Fiona Bruce (Congleton) (Con): I beg to move,

That leave be given to bring in a Bill to make provision about the minimum price at which alcohol may be sold from licensed premises in England; and for connected purposes.

I should like to begin by thanking the Government for the action that they have already taken on alcohol harm, including the duty increase on white ciders proposed by the Chancellor in his latest Budget, when he said:

“Excessive alcohol consumption by the most vulnerable people is all too often done through cheap, high-strength, low-quality products, especially so-called white ciders.”—[*Official Report*, 22 November 2017; Vol. 631, c. 1053.]

The Health Secretary recently announced £6 million of funding to support the children of alcoholics, stating:

“The consequences of alcohol abuse are devastating for those in the grip of an addiction”,

as well as for those around them. Alcohol harm affects not only those who drink but their families, children and colleagues, and wider society. Tackling this issue is a matter of social justice.

In England, more than 23,000 people die every year from alcohol-related causes, and many are from the poorest sections of society. The availability of cheap alcohol is a key driver of health inequalities, and it perpetuates deprivation. Of the 1 million alcohol-related hospital admissions last year, half were from the most deprived sections of society. Alcohol harm is the leading cause of death among 15 to 49-year-olds, and in 2015, it caused more years of life to be lost to our workforce than the 10 most common cancers combined. Alcohol harm is estimated to cost the NHS £3.5 billion a year, which equates to 117,000 nurses' salaries, and Public Health England has estimated that the problem of dependent drinking could be costing UK society as much as £52 billion a year.

There is no silver bullet to eradicate alcohol harm, but I do not accept that we have exhausted our options for reducing it. There are still a number of reasonable, targeted policies that would have a significant impact, socially, economically and fiscally, and not least by helping to boost productivity. One is minimum unit pricing. What is minimum unit pricing? MUP sets a minimum price, sometimes called a floor price, below which drink cannot be sold. It is based on the number of units of alcohol that a drink contains. For example, the floor price could be set at 50p per unit, as has been done in Scotland, where MUP was recently introduced. That would mean that the minimum price at which a pint could be sold would be £1.15.

Crucially, that would leave most drink prices untouched, including those in pubs, while increasing the price of the cheapest, strongest products, which are consumed by the most dependent and vulnerable drinkers and which cause the most harm. That should end the sale of irresponsibly discounted drinks in the off trade and, in so doing, provide some protection for local pubs. Moderate drinkers would barely notice the difference, as nearly all the alcohol they buy would be above the minimum price. Under a 50p MUP, moderate drinkers would spend just £2.25 extra a year, according to research

quoted by the Institute of Alcohol Studies and Alcohol Concern. MUP is not a tax, nor is it telling people how to live their lives. It is a policy aimed at discouraging consumption among those drinking at harmful levels, many of whom want desperately to reduce their drinking and are far more likely to purchase alcohol at less than 50p a unit than other drinkers.

MUP would have the limited, specific impact of helping

“those who are most vulnerable: the heaviest drinkers, the lowest socioeconomic groups and children.”

That is not my claim, but what was said in expert evidence to the Select Committees on Health and Social Care and on Home Affairs earlier this year by Professor Sir Ian Gilmore, chair of the Alcohol Health Alliance. Rosanna O'Connor, director of alcohol, drugs and tobacco at Public Health England, told those Committees that MUP is “exquisitely targeted” at people who are drinking the strongest, cheapest alcohol. That is a staggeringly small group of people. About 4% of the population drinks just under a third of the alcohol consumed in this country—about 2 million people. Again, to distinguish it from a tax, Professor Nick Sheron, academic clinical alcohol adviser to Public Health England, told the Committees that MUP

“is far more likely to be effective in reducing alcohol-related harm, because it does not put up the price of alcohol across the board, it does not increase the price of alcohol in pubs and clubs, and it is targeted at cheap alcohol.”

By affecting the affordability of the lowest-cost, often high-strength alcohol, the policy is well targeted at health outcomes, and the Government’s own evidence review, undertaken by Public Health England in 2016, stated that tackling affordability is

“the most effective and cost-effective approach to prevention”

and health improvement. Since then, Scotland has introduced MUP, the Republic of Ireland is preparing to legislate for it, and the Welsh Assembly’s Bill is currently at stage 3—its Report stage. Aside from the cross-border complications that will ensue if England is out of step with both Scotland and Wales, particularly across the more populated England-Wales border, and notwithstanding what the Government are saying about waiting to see how MUP impacts in Scotland a year or so hence, would it not be preferable, and indeed right, to prepare for action now? Hence, my Bill. Can it be right that England lags behind on this social justice issue?

The policy would disproportionately benefit the poorest, with evidence suggesting that 80% of the lives saved by MUP would come from the lowest-income groups. An MUP in England of 50p would save 525 lives, prevent 22,000 hospital admissions and lead to 36,500 fewer crimes every year. MUP is targeted well, because it does not adversely affect local community pubs. Indeed, research by the Institute of Alcohol Studies shows that publicans support MUP by a rate of two to one. The measure is widely supported not only by colleagues across all the major parties, but by doctors, the police, homelessness services, children’s charities and 51% of the public. The significant and tragic impact of alcohol harm is far too great for us to fail to act. This matter is urgent. Public Health England’s latest update, published in January this year, states:

“In recent years, many indicators of alcohol-related harm have increased.”

This Bill has support from across the House, and I urge the Government to give it serious consideration without delay.

As a postscript, I thank the Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, my hon. Friend the Member for Winchester (Steve Brine), for announcing just last month—after I applied for this motion—that he is commissioning a review of the evidence for MUP in England. No doubt that will form part of the current Home Office-led consultation on a new alcohol strategy, which I greatly welcome. I hope that that work will eventually lead to a Government Bill on MUP in England and that my Bill will therefore become unnecessary. In the meantime, I thank all colleagues who support my Bill here today.

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered,

That Fiona Bruce, Sir David Amess, Jack Brereton, Dr Lisa Cameron, Alex Cunningham, Sir Jeffrey Donaldson, Frank Field, Norman Lamb, Sir Edward Leigh, Jeremy Lefroy, Dr Philippa Whitford and Dr Sarah Wollaston present the Bill.

Fiona Bruce accordingly presented the Bill.

Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time on Friday 26 October and to be printed (Bill 223).

EUROPEAN UNION (WITHDRAWAL) BILL (PROGRAMME) (NO. 3)

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

That the following provisions shall apply to the European Union (Withdrawal) Bill for the purpose of supplementing the Orders of 11 September 2017 (European Union (Withdrawal) Bill (Programme)) and 16 January 2018 (European Union (Withdrawal) Bill (Programme) (No.2)):

Consideration of Lords Amendments

1. Proceedings on consideration of Lords Amendments shall be completed in two days.
2. The proceedings shall be taken in the order shown in the first column of the following Table.
3. The proceedings shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion at the times specified in the second column of the Table.

TABLE

Lords Amendments	Time for conclusion of proceedings
Amendments 110, 128, 37, 39, 125, 19, 52, 10, 43, 45, 20, 11 to 14, 18, 21 to 23, 44, 47, 102 to 107, 112, 113, 115 to 119, 121 to 124, 126, 127, 130 to 134, 136 to 140, 142 to 148, 150, 152, 154, 156 to 158, 171, and 172.	Three hours after the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments on the first day.
Amendments 25, 15 to 17, 26 to 31, 46, 48 to 50, 54 to 101, 108, 109, 111, 114, 120, 129, 135, 141, 149, 151, 153, 155, 162, 165, 169, and 173 to 196.	Six hours after the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments on the first day.
Amendments 51, 1, 2, 5, 53, 4, 3, 24, 32, 6 to 9, 33 to 36, 38, 40 to 42, 159 to 161, 163, 164, 166 to 168, and 170.	Six hours after the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments on the second day.

Subsequent stages

4. Any further Message from the Lords may be programmed.—(*Mr David Davis.*)

The House divided: Ayes 321, Noes 304.

Division No. 165]**[12.56 pm****AYES**

Adams, Nigel
Afolami, Bim
Afriyie, Adam
Aldous, Peter
Allen, Heidi
Argar, Edward
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Mr Richard
Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, Stephen
Baron, Mr John
Bebb, Guto
Bellingham, Sir Henry
Benyon, rh Richard
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, Jake
Blackman, Bob
Blunt, Crispin
Boles, Nick
Bone, Mr Peter
Bottomley, Sir Peter
Bowie, Andrew
Bradley, Ben
Bradley, rh Karen
Brady, Sir Graham
Braverman, Suella
Brereton, Jack
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Brokenshire, rh James
Bruce, Fiona
Buckland, Robert
Burghart, Alex
Burns, Conor
Burt, rh Alistair
Cairns, rh Alun
Campbell, Mr Gregory
Cartlidge, James
Cash, Sir William
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishti, Rehman
Chope, Sir Christopher
Churchill, Jo
Clark, Colin
Clark, rh Greg
Clarke, Mr Simon
Cleverly, James
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
Coffey, Dr Thérèse
Collins, Damian
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Cox, Mr Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crouch, Tracey
Davies, Chris
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Glyn
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Dinage, Caroline
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Docherty, Leo

Dodds, rh Nigel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Ms Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Duddridge, James
Duguid, David
Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Dunne, Mr Philip
Ellis, Michael
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Charlie
Eustice, George
Evans, Mr Nigel
Evennett, rh Sir David
Fabricant, Michael
Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Field, rh Frank
Field, rh Mark
Ford, Vicky
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazer, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fysh, Mr Marcus
Gale, Sir Roger
Garnier, Mark
Gauke, rh Mr David
Ghani, Ms Nusrat
Gibb, rh Nick
Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
Girvan, Paul
Glen, John
Goldsmith, Zac
Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Luke
Graham, Richard
Grant, Bill
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Greening, rh Justine
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Griffiths, Andrew
Gyimah, Mr Sam
Hair, Kirstene
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
Harrison, Trudy
Hart, Simon
Hayes, rh Mr John

Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Herbert, rh Nick
Hinds, rh Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hoey, Kate
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Adam
Howell, John
Huddleston, Nigel
Hughes, Eddie
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, rh Mr Nick
Jack, Mr Alister
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Sir 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
Keegan, Gillian
Kennedy, Seema
Kerr, Stephen
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lamont, John
Lancaster, rh Mark
Latham, Mrs Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewer, Andrew
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Little Pengelly, Emma
Lopez, Julia
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Mr Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Mackinlay, Craig
Macleane, Rachel
Main, Mrs Anne
Mak, Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Masterton, Paul
May, rh Mrs Theresa
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
McVey, rh Ms Esther
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen

Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Moore, Damien
Mordaunt, rh Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, rh Caroline
Norman, Jesse
O'Brien, Neil
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Pateron, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Sir Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, rh Claire
Philp, Chris
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Dan
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Ross, Douglas
Rowley, Lee
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Seely, Mr Bob
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok
Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, rh Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John

Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Stride, rh Mel
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Sir Robert
Thomas, Derek
Thomson, Ross
Throup, Maggie
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael
Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh

Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watling, Giles
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, rh Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wood, Mike
Wragg, Mr William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Paul Maynard and
Stuart Andrew

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ali, Rushanara
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Amesbury, Mike
Antoniazzi, Tonia
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, rh Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blomfield, Paul
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
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cable, rh Sir Vince
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Carden, Dan
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Charalambous, Bambos
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth

Clwyd, rh Ann
Coker, 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
Davey, rh Sir Edward
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Cordova, Marsha
De Piero, Gloria
Dent Coad, Emma
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Dodds, Anneliese
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Peter
Drew, Dr David
Dromey, Jack
Duffield, Rosie
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Dame Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Fitzpatrick, Jim

Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Frith, James
Furniss, Gill
Gaffney, Hugh
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
George, Ruth
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Gill, Preet Kaur
Glindon, Mary
Godsiff, Mr Roger
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Grogan, John
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hardy, Emma
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Sir Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hill, Mike
Hillier, Meg
Hobhouse, Wera
Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Howarth, rh Mr George
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jardine, Christine
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Darren
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham P.
Jones, Helen
Jones, rh Mr Kevan
Jones, Sarah
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Khan, Afzal
Killen, Ged
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Laird, Lesley
Lake, Ben
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Lee, Karen

Leslie, Mr Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Linden, David
Lloyd, Tony
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Angus Brendan
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marsden, Gordon
Martin, Sandy
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McMahon, Jim
McMorrin, Anna
Mearns, Ian
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Moran, Layla
Morden, Jessica
Morgan, Stephen
Morris, Grahame
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Norris, Alex
O'Hara, Brendan
O'Mara, Jared
Onasanya, Fiona
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Owen, Albert
Peacock, Stephanie
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pidcock, Laura
Platt, Jo
Pollard, Luke
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rashid, Faisal
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Ellie
Reeves, Rachel

Reynolds, Emma	Streeting, Wes
Reynolds, Jonathan	Sweeney, Mr Paul
Rimmer, Ms Marie	Swinson, Jo
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey	Tami, Mark
Rodda, Matt	Thewliss, Alison
Rowley, Danielle	Thomas, Gareth
Ruane, Chris	Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd	Thornberry, rh Emily
Ryan, rh Joan	Timms, rh Stephen
Saville Roberts, Liz	Trickett, Jon
Shah, Naz	Turley, Anna
Sharma, Mr Virendra	Twigg, Derek
Sheerman, Mr Barry	Twigg, Stephen
Sheppard, Tommy	Twist, Liz
Sherriff, Paula	Umunna, Chuka
Shuker, Mr Gavin	Vaz, rh Keith
Siddiq, Tulip	Vaz, Valerie
Skinner, Mr Dennis	Walker, Thelma
Slaughter, Andy	Watson, Tom
Smeeth, Ruth	West, Catherine
Smith, Angela	Western, Matt
Smith, Cat	Whitehead, Dr Alan
Smith, Eleanor	Whitfield, Martin
Smith, Laura	Whitford, Dr Philippa
Smith, Nick	Williams, Hywel
Smith, Owen	Williams, Dr Paul
Smyth, Karin	Williamson, Chris
Snell, Gareth	Wilson, Phil
Sobel, Alex	Wishart, Pete
Soubry, rh Anna	Woodcock, John
Spellar, rh John	Yasin, Mohammad
Starmer, rh Keir	Zeichner, Daniel
Stephens, Chris	Tellers for the Noes:
Stevens, Jo	Thangam Debbonaire and
Stone, Jamie	Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Tom Brake (Carshalton and Wallington) (LD): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. You will be aware that on today's Order Paper there is a Liberal Democrat amendment to extend from two to three days the debate on the Lords amendments. I understand the reasons why it has not been possible to vote on that amendment today. However, can you advise me on how in future it will be possible for this House to secure adequate time to debate critical amendments, take back control and avoid situations such as the one we are likely to face today where, by Government design, there will be no time at all to discuss critical Northern Ireland amendments and critical devolution amendments? [*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: First, I say to the right hon. Gentleman that a lot of these matters will still be able to be debated—whether they will be divided upon is another matter. Secondly, in response to those who were muttering from a sedentary position that he was eating into the time, let me say that simply as a matter of fact that is not correct. He is not eating into the time, for the simple reason that the Clerk has not yet read the Orders of the Day—we have not yet got to the start of the six hours. It is therefore quite wrong for people to say that the right hon. Gentleman is eating into the time—it is factually wrong and that is all there is to it.

Thirdly, I realise that the right hon. Gentleman regrets the course of events, but the passage of the programme motion has set in train a course of events and that is the reality of the matter. The only remedy would be for the House to divide upon fewer questions in the first group, but in relation to that I say simply two things to him and for the benefit of the House. First, on the merits of such a course of action—having fewer votes earlier—there would be different opinions in the House. Secondly, as he knows, such a remedy lies outside my hands.

European Union (Withdrawal) Bill

[1ST ALLOCATED DAY]

Consideration of Lords amendments

Mr Speaker: I must draw the House's attention to the fact that financial privilege is engaged by Lords amendments 3, 13, 18, 22, 72, 103 and 121 to 124.

Clause 1

REPEAL OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES ACT 1972

1.15 pm

The Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (Mr David Davis): I beg to move, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 110.

Mr Speaker: With this it will be convenient to discuss the following:

Lords amendment 128, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 37, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 39, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 125, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 19, amendment (a) thereto, Government motion to disagree, amendments (i) and (ii) to Government amendment (a) in lieu, and Government amendments (a) and (b) in lieu.

Lords amendment 52, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 10, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 43, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 45, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 20, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendments 11 to 14, 18, 21 to 23, 44, 47, 102 to 107, 112, 113, 115 to 119, 121 to 124, 126, 127, 130 to 134, 136 to 140, 142 to 148, 150, 152, 154, 156 to 158, 171 and 172.

Mr Davis: Let me start with the obiter dictum that there is a difference between eating into time and exhausting patience.

Over nine months, across both Houses, we have debated more than 1,000 non-Government amendments and hundreds of Government amendments to the Bill. Before us today are 196 Lords amendments—the outcome of hundreds of hours of debate in the other place. I beg your indulgence, Mr Speaker, in paying tribute to my ministerial team who have brought the Bill this far: my hon. Friends the Members for Wycombe (Mr Baker) and for Worcester (Mr Walker), my hon. and learned Friend the Member for South Swindon (Robert Buckland), my hon. Friend the Member for Esher and Walton (Dominic Raab) and my right hon. Friend the Member

for Aylesbury (Mr Lidington); and, in the other place, Baroness Evans, the Leader of the House of Lords, and her team—Lord Callanan, Lord Keen, Baroness Goldie, Lord Duncan and Lord Bourne. I extend the same thanks to Opposition Front Benchers.

It is worth at this early point remembering that the Bill has a simple, clear purpose: to ensure that the whole United Kingdom has a functioning statute book on the day we leave the European Union. That involves the considerable task of converting 40 years of EU law into United Kingdom law. This is an unprecedented task, carried out under a strict timetable.

The Government respect the constitutional role that the House of Lords has played in scrutinising the Bill and, whenever possible, we have listened to sensible suggestions to improve it. However, when amendments seek to—or inadvertently—undermine the essential purpose of the Bill, which is to provide for a smooth and orderly exit, or the referendum result, we must reject them. For example, on the interpretation of Court of Justice of the European Union case law, we have worked closely with former Law Lords such as Lord Hope, Lord Judge, Lord Browne, Lord Neuberger and Lord Thomas to develop a solution that has genuinely improved the Bill. Our other Lords amendments represent the outcome of similarly productive discussions. The role of the House of Lords is clear: to scrutinise legislation that comes from this House, not to recast it or repurpose it. Of course, it should not undermine decisions that were put before the British people in manifestos or in referendums.

The House of Commons' improvements to the Bill span a number of areas, ranging from narrowing the types of deficiencies that can be corrected using the delegated powers in the Bill to bolstering the rights of individuals by extending the ability to bring certain challenges under the general principles to three months after exit day. I will address in turn the main issues covered by this group on which the House of Lords has asked this House to think again but where their lordships' approach has either undermined the essential purpose of the Bill, or attempted to overrule well-considered amendments from this House.

The first such area is the sifting system proposed in this House by my hon. Friend the Member for Broxbourne (Mr Walker), the Chairman of our Procedure Committee. The proposal was that a committee would consider instruments subject to the negative procedure that were brought forward under the main powers in the Bill, and could recommend that they be subject to the affirmative procedure instead. This unanimous recommendation of the cross-party Procedure Committee was clearly born out of careful and detailed consideration by that Committee, and the Government were happy to accept it. My hon. Friend's amendments were agreed by this House following an extensive debate.

What we have back from the other place—Lords amendments 110 and 128—is both an imposition on our procedures by the other place and a threat to the workability of the whole process of correcting the statute book. This is for two important reasons. First, a binding recommendation following the sifting process is not a recommendation at all—it is an instruction to the Government that would mark a significant departure from established procedures for handling secondary legislation. It is equally unacceptable, as the Chair of the Procedure Committee has noted, for the opinion of

[Mr David Davis]

a Committee of the unelected House to govern procedure in this place. The Commons Procedure Committee's proposals have teeth. As my hon. Friend the Member for Broxbourne said in December:

“The political cost to my Front-Bench colleagues of going against a sifting committee recommendation would be significant. The committee will have to give a reason why it is in disagreement, the Minister will be summoned to explain his or her Department's position, and it will be flagged up on the Order Paper if a particular SI has not been agreed between the sifting committee and the Government. That will result in a significant political cost”.—[*Official Report*, 12 December 2017; Vol. 633, c. 266.]

He was right.

Secondly, although I understand concern about the pace at which committees will be required to operate, an extra five sitting days, as the Lords propose, would risk taking the process for a negative statutory instrument into what might well be its fifth or sixth calendar week. That would seriously jeopardise our ability to deliver a functioning statute book in time. For our part, the Government are poised to do everything we can to support the speedy work of the sifting committees. On a slightly wider point, I understand that the House of Lords wants to improve the Bill in various ways. Some of its changes can individually seem sensible and proportionate when seen in isolation, but the cumulative effect of those changes could sometimes make it impossible to deliver the smooth and orderly exit we want.

I turn now to the question of exit day. After considering the issue at length, this House accepted amendments tabled by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Dorset (Sir Oliver Letwin) that set exit day in the Bill, but allowed that time to be altered in the unlikely event that the exit date under article 50 differed from that written into the Bill. That is a sensible approach. It provides certainty about our exit day, but it also incorporates the terms of article 50. Let us remember that exit day will be determined by international law rather than by this House.

We discussed this issue at length when we considered the Bill that became the European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Act 2017. Their lordships have suggested that this House abandons the conclusions of the lengthy and considered debates that we have already had on this issue by returning the Bill in broadly the same state in which it was first introduced. I accept the helpful scrutiny of the Lords on many aspects of the Bill, but this House has already reached a sensible position, which commanded a significant majority, and we propose to adhere to this House's original decision on this matter.

At the heart of the Bill are the delegated powers that are essential for the United Kingdom's orderly departure from the European Union. Those powers will ensure that the statute book continues to function as we leave the European Union. As we have consistently said, we do not take the powers lightly, which was why, in addition to the changes approved by this House, we made further amendments in the Lords. When using the principal powers in the Bill, Ministers must now give their good reasons for the changes they are making, exactly as the Lords Constitution Committee recommended. We have introduced further safeguards by preventing the powers in the Bill from being used to establish public authorities. We have also removed the international

obligations power from the Bill entirely, as it has become clear that there are better and more effective ways to ensure that the Government's international obligations continue to be met than through the use of that power.

That means that the approach before us is substantially different from what we first introduced, while still protecting the core purpose of the Bill. This reflects the fact that the Government have listened to the views of Parliament throughout the Bill's passage, but we cannot accept Lords amendments 10, 43 and 45, which replace “appropriate” as a reason for using the powers to “necessary”. This House has accepted the premise of the Government's approach to delivering a functioning statute book—specifically, that we will preserve and incorporate EU law, and then make the appropriate corrections via secondary legislation. Given the scale of the task and the speed necessary, that could never have been done through primary legislation, but at every turn we have sought to ensure proper parliamentary scrutiny.

Given that that fundamental premise has been supported, there needs to be sufficient flexibility for Ministers to propose changes that might not be strictly considered necessary, but that everyone here would think appropriate. “Necessary” is not a synonym for sensible, logical or proper; it means something that it is essential to do.

Joanna Cherry (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): Does the Secretary of State recall that on page 21 of the original White Paper on the great repeal Bill, the Government pledged to make changes to retained EU law by delegated legislation only “where necessary”? Does he accept that if this House does not accept the Lords amendments, the Government will be breaking the pledge that they made in their original White Paper?

Mr Davis: With great respect, the hon. and learned Lady is a lawyer, and she knows that the words in an Act of Parliament matter, and matter very precisely, rather more than an individual word—[*Interruption.*] They matter very precisely. Let me explain why.

As I said, “necessary” is not a synonym for sensible, logical or proper. In many cases, changes such as correcting inconsistencies, changing terminology, removing redundant provisions, or improving clarity and accessibility could be left unmade, even if the consequences were perverse. That is not the best outcome for businesses or individuals across the United Kingdom. I do not believe that their lordships intended to constrain our ability to change the names of documents such as European aviation documentation. Nor do I think that they intended to require us to use cumbersome terms such as “national regulatory authorities of member states”, and then to have to designate our national regulators underneath that. That would be an inefficient way of making Ofcom the regulator for our open-access internet legislation, for example. This will be UK law, applied only in the UK. It would be confusing to businesses and individuals to keep laws that suggest otherwise, but such changes, while appropriate, might fail the “necessary” test.

Mr Dominic Grieve (Beaconsfield) (Con): I understand the point that my right hon. Friend is making, but I have to say that I am not sure that I agree with him. I think that all the examples that he has given would meet the necessity test without any difficulty at all. Where the

necessity test provides a higher bar is that if it were thought that a Minister was using powers to change legislation in a way that was not necessary, he would be prevented from doing so. My right hon. Friend cites examples, but I just do not think that the test would be a problem for a Minister at all.

Mr Davis: My right hon. and learned Friend, as I have known for a long time, is a very good lawyer, but I am afraid that other lawyers disagree quite seriously.

The Lords amendments effectively increase the risk of judicial review. What that does—*[Interruption]*. This is an incredibly serious point, because that process asks judges to make a policy decision that this House should be making by saying yes or no to a statutory instrument. It really is as simple as that.

Mr Kenneth Clarke (Rushcliffe) (Con): I am rather sorry that my right hon. Friend is so distrustful of judges on what are essentially procedural or constitutional matters, but could he define “appropriate” to me? It is one of those vague words that I suspect means “if the Minister feels that he or she wants to, one way or the other”. A decision could almost certainly not be challenged by judicial review, because the word is so wide and vague that there is no conceivable argument that could be raised to challenge the Minister’s opinion. We cannot take powers in that way meaning that the Government are able to legislate on matters that will be important to some individuals entirely at a Minister’s uncontrolled discretion.

Mr Davis: I hear my right hon. and learned Friend—and old friend, because we are still capable of having a dinner for two hours and not talking about Europe throughout it; in fact he paid, and it was lunch.

The simple fact is that we are not just leaving this to a single word. As I said earlier, the House of Lords Constitution Committee looked at the matter, in the context of this Bill and the sanctions Bill, and said that we should require the Minister to give “good reasons”—that was the test—which is what we have proposed in our amendment.

Ms Angela Eagle (Wallasey) (Lab): Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Davis: If the hon. Lady will forgive me, I will make a little progress, because I am quite sure that my next section will provoke quite a lot more interventions than the last one.

Let me turn to Lords amendment 19 and parliamentary approval of the outcome of the negotiations. This is the Hailsham amendment, which Lord Bilimoria described in the other House as the “no Brexit” amendment. What it amounts to is an unconstitutional shift that risks undermining our negotiations with the European Union. It enables Parliament to dictate to the Government their course of action in international negotiations. *[Interruption.]* Labour Members ask what is wrong with that. Well, I will read them a quote from Professor Vernon Bogdanor, who is not exactly a well-known leaver, but he is a constitutional expert. He described this at the weekend as “a constitutional absurdity” that “would weaken the position of Britain’s negotiators.”

I agree with him that this is not practical, not desirable and not appropriate.

1.30 pm

Chuka Umunna (Streatham) (Lab) rose—

Mr Davis: I give way to the hon. Gentleman who has campaigned long on this issue.

Chuka Umunna: I am very grateful to the Secretary of State for giving way. What the Lords amendment seeks to do is to reassert parliamentary sovereignty such that this House approves and gets to vote on every scenario that can be conceived of in terms of the way that we withdraw from the European Union. On the Secretary of State’s amendment, may I ask him a factual question? I am not asking him whether or not he thinks we will be in a situation where there is no deal. I am simply asking him this: is it not the case that his amendment to Lords amendment 19 gives his Government a passport to take this country out of the European Union with no deal, with this House having had no say on it whatsoever?

Mr Davis: I start by saying to the hon. Gentleman that I respect his point of view. He has the honesty to say that he would like us to stay in the European Union irrespective of the referendum result. Although I disagree with it, it is honest position to take. But what he describes as giving the Government the right to take us out of the European Union under, frankly, any circumstances was article 50, which was passed by this House and the other House by a very large majority, so I am afraid that he is not right in that respect.

Wes Streeting (Ilford North) (Lab) rose—

Mr Davis: I will give way in a moment.

It is accepted practice that Governments negotiate treaties, and this was the case for the European Communities Act 1972, the Lisbon treaty, the Nice treaty, the Amsterdam treaty and the Maastricht treaty. I do not remember any argument over Parliament undertaking those treaties from people who today argue that this amendment is appropriate.

Frank Field (Birkenhead) (Lab) rose—

Mr Davis: I give way to the right hon. Gentleman. I do hope the Whip’s Office was not responsible for his injury.

Frank Field: I hope that our Whip’s Office is kinder than the Government’s Whip’s Office will be in getting this measure through.

Mr Speaker, I hope to catch your eye in a moment to talk about what the effects on the Labour vote will be in those constituencies that voted to leave, but on this crucial issue, is it not true that if we pass what the Lords want us to do, we, as Aneurin Bevan said, will be sending our negotiators back naked into the negotiating room? The European Union will know that the Government are beaten and that it can then impose any terms whatsoever on them.

Mr Davis: The right hon. Gentleman makes a very good point. It is certainly the case that the European Commission reads every newspaper in Britain, particularly the *Financial Times* and *The Times*. It reads them all, but, more surprisingly, it believes them. The simple

[Mr David Davis]

truth is that it looks at any option that it thinks the British political system will throw up, which will allow it to get a negotiating advantage. Let us remember, too, that most, if not all, of the 27 would much rather that we did not leave—full stop. If it sees an opportunity to create that outcome, that is what it will do.

Wes Streeting *rose*—

Mr Davis: I want to make a little progress, and then I will give way again.

Furthermore, the Lords amendment sets deadlines that would simply allow the other side to use time against us, as it has already tried to do. What we have proposed in lieu is an amendment that builds on commitments that I first set out to the House in a statement on 13 December last year. The amendment provides that the withdrawal agreement cannot be ratified unless both the agreement and the future framework have been approved by a motion of this House. It also prevents the agreement from being ratified unless an Act of Parliament has been passed to implement it. This is all before the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 as well. Therefore, this is in addition to the Government's commitment to introduce the withdrawal agreement and implementation Bill if Parliament votes in favour of a final deal.

Angus Brendan MacNeil (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP): I am very grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for giving way. It is not clear what the choices are on a meaningful vote. Is a meaningful vote going to be between the deal that might be struck with the European Union on the current status quo, or a deal struck with the European Union and the World Trade Organisation? We need to know that.

Mr Davis: People keep using the phrase “meaningful vote”. What it conceals in some cases, and I suspect that that is the case for the hon. Gentleman, is that they want to reverse the result of the referendum, and nothing we do will be organised to allow reversal of the result of the referendum.

Stephen Hammond (Wimbledon) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Mr Davis: I will give way in a moment.

The Government have also made provisions to allow the vote to happen in this House before the European Parliament votes on the deal, as long as it is practical. This follows the spirit of the Lords amendment, but our proposal has some significant differences. First, we have attached a deadline to the Lords' consideration of a motion on the final deal. It is not right that the Lords could have a veto on the deal simply by filibustering or refusing to consider the motion. Anyone who suggests that this is unlikely should consider that it was a concern raised by their lordships' themselves in debate.

Stephen Gethins (North East Fife) (SNP): Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Davis: Not for the moment, no.

Secondly, we have removed Parliament's power to give binding negotiating directions to the Government. As I have said, this would represent a profound constitutional shift in terms of which branch of the state holds the right to act in the international sphere. I turn again to Vernon Bogdanor, who said:

“Parliament's role is to scrutinise legislation and policy; 650 MPs, still less 800 peers, cannot themselves negotiate.”

Mr Jacob Rees-Mogg (North East Somerset) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Davis: I will give way in a moment.

Instead, we have provided that, in the event that Parliament rejects the deal put to it, the Government will be legally obliged to make a statement on their proposed next steps in relation to article 50 negotiations within 28 days of that rejection. This House would of course then have plenty of tools at its disposal to respond, but I am as confident as ever that we will secure an agreement that this House will want to support.

Stephen Hammond: I think that everybody in this House would accept my right hon. Friend's proposition that we cannot bind the negotiations, but clearly the point of concern, which he is getting to now, is this: if there were no deal, does the amendment in lieu cover that circumstance? If it does not, how does he propose to deal with that?

Mr Davis: If there were no deal for some reason other than the House rejecting it—it is incredibly, almost implausibly, unlikely, but let us imagine that the Government decided that they would not have a deal at all—we would of course do the same thing and come back and make a statement to the House, and the House would then have the right to respond.

Mr Grieve: I am grateful to my right hon. Friend for giving way. I recognise some of the problems that he has and why the Government came forward with their amendment in lieu, and some of the deficiencies that can be identified in the Lords amendment. But the simple fact is that the Government have not made provision for no deal, and there is a way of doing it. The amendment that I have tabled provides a mechanism for doing that. One of the key issues for me at the end of this afternoon will be whether we make some progress on having a proper structure to address no deal. I do not think that this Bill can finish its course and get Royal Assent until we have that.

Mr Davis: I thank my right hon. and learned Friend for his view on this. He sort of expressed it in an amendment that he tabled late last night, so I only saw it this morning. I have not really had a lot of time—*[Interruption.]* Well, this is an interesting demonstration of the Labour party's perception of how easy it is to make constitutional law on the fly. Its own voters will come to a view on that.

Let me say this with respect to my right hon. and learned Friend's proposed amendment—as he knows, I am always open to have a conversation with him on this although he seems to have fallen foul of my telephone security system—I always want to keep three principles in mind. First, we must never do anything that undermines

the Government's negotiating position, or encourages delays in the negotiations. That is very, very important. Secondly, we cannot change the fundamental constitutional structure, which makes the Government responsible for international relations and international treaties.

Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend allow me?

Mr Davis: In a moment.

We cannot do that. This constitutional structure has stood for hundreds of years and many thousands of treaties. As I said earlier, nobody suggested for a moment that the House of Commons should negotiate the Maastricht treaty, the Lisbon treaty, or one or two other controversial treaties that came before the House. We cannot change that structure now, on this basis.

Wes Streeting: Will the Secretary of State give way?

Mr Davis: Not for the moment.

Thirdly, we must—under all circumstances—respect the result of the referendum. That is what this House voted for when it voted on article 50. I am very happy to talk to my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) again in the next day or two, and we can discuss how we can meet his concerns in that time, within those principles.

Sir Edward Leigh: Is not the kernel of the problem that all the amendments tabled by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) and others make no deal more likely, because they give every incentive to the European Commission not to agree to a deal? The amendments would bind the Government and we would end up with the worst possible result. Therefore, they should be resisted.

Mr Davis: My hon. Friend goes to the heart of the problem, which is that we have to consider that anything passed in this House and the other House will have a very serious effect on the negotiating strategy of the other side. I hope that this House will recognise that the Government have taken a fair and positive approach to the new clause, retaining those elements that are sensible and viable, while removing those elements that are practically and constitutionally untenable. These constitutional and practical concerns also apply to Lords amendment 20, on a mandate for negotiations on the future relationship. The Government cannot demonstrate the flexibility necessary for a successful negotiation if their hands are tied mid-way through that process. That will do nothing but guarantee a bad deal for Britain. It is for the Government to set the direction during the negotiation. That is the key point.

I do not need to remind the House about the importance of this legislation. The purpose of this Bill is to maintain a functioning and effective statute book when leaving the European Union—a statute book that people and business can rely on. That is what our approach will deliver.

Matthew Pennycook (Greenwich and Woolwich) (Lab): May I start by paying tribute to their lordships for the diligent and considered manner in which they so thoroughly scrutinised the Bill? In particular, I pay tribute to Labour

colleagues in the other place for the extensive effort they put into securing many of the cross-party amendments that we are debating today.

This Bill began life as a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation. Many of its original flaws stem, I suspect, from the fact that at the time it was being drafted, the Government had yet to fully work through precisely how withdrawal would have to take place. Indeed, some of us still remember the Secretary of State's glib dismissal of the need for any transitional arrangements after 29 March next year, and the misplaced magnanimity with which he made it clear that he would only consider granting transitional arrangements to "be kind" to the EU. But as with so many aspects of the Brexit process—even if not yet in every respect—reality has slowly caught up with the Government, just as the very real deficiencies in this Bill have now been subject to thorough scrutiny in the other place.

If anything has vindicated the Opposition's decision to vote against this legislation on Second Reading, it is the succession of defeats that the Bill has faced in both Houses, as well as the scores of amendments that the Government themselves have had to table. That said, after successive defeats in the other place and the latest round of concessions from Ministers, some of the worst aspects of the Bill have been ameliorated.

As we only have three hours of debate on the first group of amendments, I intend to touch only briefly on most of the Lords amendments towards the end of my remarks, and focus instead on what we believe to be the critical issue in this first group. That is the issue of what form parliamentary approval of the withdrawal agreement should take. Many of the amendments passed in the other place are of great significance in terms of their constitutional implications and how they might shape what is left of the Brexit process. It is deeply disappointing that the programme motion only allocates 12 hours to debate them.

Graham Stringer (Blackley and Broughton) (Lab): Rather than praising the Lords for the number of amendments they have passed, would it not be more in line with Labour party philosophy and views to say that they have gone way beyond their constitutional remit in trying to overturn not only the decision of the electorate but the decisions of both the Labour party and Conservative party manifestos, which together received 82% to 84% of the vote at the last general election?

Matthew Pennycook: I respect my hon. Friend's argument and his long-held views, but I have to fundamentally disagree. None of their lordships' amendments seeks to frustrate the Brexit process in any way or to allow this House to overturn the referendum result.

1.45 pm

Wes Streeting: I am very grateful to my hon. Friend for giving way, and pay tribute to the work that our Front-Bench Brexit team in this House and in the Lords have done to improve the Bill. The Secretary of State was not courageous enough to take my intervention, so may I ask my hon. Friend what does more to harm the Prime Minister's hand at the negotiating table—the principle of parliamentary consent; the Foreign Secretary making damaging, unguarded remarks at a private dinner; the Brexit Secretary playing the hokey cokey about whether he is going to stay in the Government; or the

[*Wes Streeting*]

spectacle of Ministers resigning because their own Government are too intransigent to listen to the constructive and sensible direction on Brexit that many of us would like them to pursue?

Matthew Pennycook: My hon. Friend makes a good point. There is nothing more damaging. As the Secretary of State himself said, the EU monitors with great interest developments in this House and what is said across the country. It sees the open warfare and disagreement in the Cabinet and the Foreign Secretary continually undermining the Prime Minister's approach.

Frank Field: Will my hon. Friend give way?

Emma Reynolds (Wolverhampton North East) (Lab): Will my hon. Friend give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I am just going to make some progress.

Lords amendment 19 is of critical importance. In many ways, it is the most important amendment that we will consider over the 12 hours allotted. Before I explain why and set out the reasons why we agree with Lords amendment 19 and disagree with the Government's amendment (a) in lieu, it is worth taking a little time to remind the House how we arrived at this point.

As hon. Members may recall, before 7 February last year Parliament was to be given absolutely no role in approving the final terms of the UK's exit from the EU, because there was no commitment from the Government to a parliamentary vote of any kind. Under pressure, the then Minister, the right hon. Member for Clwyd West (Mr Jones), came to the Dispatch Box during the Committee stage of the European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Bill with a concession—a vote on a motion in this House and the other place on the article 50 deal, including the framework for a future relationship. We welcomed that concession, but we were clear that it did not provide for a meaningful vote, merely a vote on a non-binding motion and one that would essentially take the form of “take it or leave it”—accept the final draft withdrawal agreement, even if it is found wanting, or accept that the UK will walk away without a deal, triggering the hardest of departures from the EU.

Frank Field: Will my hon. Friend give way?

Emma Reynolds: Will my hon. Friend give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I will.

Frank Field: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for giving way.

Mr Speaker: Order. No discourtesy intended to the right hon. Gentleman, but I think that the hon. Member for Greenwich and Woolwich (Matthew Pennycook) had the hon. Member for Wolverhampton North East (Emma Reynolds) in mind.

Emma Reynolds: Is it not the case that some of the staunchest Brexiteers, including the Secretary of State himself, have always defended parliamentary sovereignty, but when it comes to a meaningful vote on the deal, they seem to ignore it?

Matthew Pennycook: That is absolutely right, and I thank my hon. Friend for that point.

Frank Field: Some people in this House have been quite clear that they want to prevent Brexit. Others disguise that fact with the very careful construction of terms. In the Lords, where there are no constituencies to vote Members out—sadly—people have been more honest. Surely my hon. Friend was wrong to say that there was nobody in the Lords who was saying that this was actually a “stop Brexit” vote; we have already heard a quotation. The aim was to prevent Brexit; the Lords have no responsibility to anybody and they said that that was their aim.

Matthew Pennycook: I have to disagree with my right hon. Friend's point. I did not say that there were no lordships that do not intend to block Brexit, just as there are hon. Members in this House for whom that is the intention. But the aim of the Lords amendments, as they are designated, is not to frustrate Brexit. There is no majority in this House for overturning the referendum result, as my right hon. Friend well knows. It is disingenuous to say that that is the aim of this amendment.

Mr Speaker: Order. I know that the hon. Gentleman is not accusing any individual Member of being disingenuous—[*Interruption.*] I need it to be clear that that is not the case. Would the hon. Gentleman be good enough just to confirm that he is not making any such suggestion?

Matthew Pennycook: I am happy to clarify that.

Mr Speaker: That is good enough. The hon. Gentleman may continue.

Matthew Pennycook: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

As I was saying, the choice that faces us under the Government's amendment is between the draft withdrawal agreement, even if it is found wanting, and the hardest of departures—the most disorderly exit. Let us remind ourselves of what that would mean: legal chaos, significant damage to our economy, the erection of a hard border in Northern Ireland and serious harm to Britain's standing in the world. That is why in Committee we tabled new clause 66, which would have guaranteed both Houses a vote on the motion on the terms of withdrawal—and, just as critically, a vote in the event that no such agreement is reached.

Angus Brendan MacNeil: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I am going to make a bit of progress.

However, we also recognised in Committee stage that there were other requirements needed to ensure that Parliament has a meaningful vote, one of which is the need for a vote on a statute. That is why we supported amendment 7 in the name of the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) and other hon. Members—an amendment that ultimately passed in this House by 309 votes to 305. That amendment took a slightly different approach in that it was quite deliberately

aimed at restricting the use of, and limiting the potential abuse of, the extensive and wide clause 9 power in the Bill as it then stood.

Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con): Would the hon. Gentleman care to reflect on the fact that the decision to transfer the vote to the people was done quite deliberately and voluntarily by this House by six to one, as a sovereign Act of Parliament? Any attempt to reverse that is in defiance of the decision that was taken by Act of Parliament.

Matthew Pennycook: The hon. Gentleman makes the same point as many others have done, and I have dealt with it in saying that their lordships' amendment is not about overturning the referendum result. [*Interruption.*] No, it is not—not at all. It is about giving Parliament a say in shaping the direction under one scenario that could well occur.

Angus Brendan MacNeil: Would it not be one of the most supreme ironies of this entire Brexit debacle if, at the end of it, the European Parliament has a meaningful vote and 27 member states have a meaningful vote, but the state that is leaving—and leaving in a state—does not have a meaningful vote?

Matthew Pennycook: The hon. Gentleman makes a good point. The Commission cannot approve the deal on the European Union side until the European Parliament has given its consent, and if it does not give its consent, the Commission cannot move on and ratify.

Ms Angela Eagle: My hon. Friend is making the points about a meaningful vote with a great deal of power. Does he agree that if we get to a stage—which I suspect some Eurosceptics want—where we are approaching a disorderly, no-deal, hardest-of-hard Brexits, this House has a right not to be given a *fait accompli* of a deal that is inadequate, or no deal at all? Is that not what this battle to have a meaningful vote on the deal is actually all about?

Matthew Pennycook: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. That is the choice that faces every hon. Member in the Chamber today when we come to vote on Lords amendment 19.

Philip Davies (Shipley) (Con) *rose*—

Richard Graham (Gloucester) (Con) *rose*—

Matthew Pennycook: I am going to make some progress.

I want to return to amendment 7 in the name of the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield. As I said, that amendment took a very different approach that was about restricting the clause 9 power. That amendment having been passed, the Government cannot now give the final withdrawal agreement domestic legal effect without first gaining parliamentary approval in primary legislation for the planned EU withdrawal and implementation Bill. But what his amendment 7 did not do, consciously and deliberately—I remember him saying so at the time—was deal with a scenario in which Parliament does not approve the draft withdrawal agreement. That scenario, I would argue, cannot be ruled out given how badly this Government are handling the negotiations and the limited time they have left before agreement must be reached.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Matthew Pennycook: I am going to make some more progress.

With their new clause, their lordships have developed the right hon. and learned Gentleman's amendment 7 in its guarantee of a statutory vote and made explicit provision for what would happen if Parliament were not to approve the deal when it is put before us later this year. In those circumstances, under the provisions of their lordships' amendment, it would be for Parliament, by resolution of this House—the Government having found time for that resolution—and subject to consideration in the other place, to give direction to the Government about how then to proceed. It is not about Parliament taking over the negotiations or about stripping Ministers of their authority to make decisions.

Richard Graham: The hon. Gentleman said earlier that no Lords amendment is intended to frustrate the result of the referendum, but amendment 19 says very clearly that Her Majesty's Government

“must follow any direction in relation to the negotiations...approved by a resolution of the House of Commons, and...subject to...a motion in the House of Lords.”

That is entirely transferring responsibility for the aims and the detail of everything we negotiate to Parliament and away from the Government. Can he name any precedent for that in the whole history of this nation?

Matthew Pennycook: If such a scenario were to occur—this is the important point; I take head on what the hon. Gentleman has said—it would be for Parliament, although we are talking about any unknown number of hypothetical situations at that point, to direct the Government by resolution. Is he saying that Parliament would come forward and support a resolution to overturn the referendum result? There is no way that that could happen. He knows that there is no majority for that in this House.

Richard Graham *rose*—

Matthew Pennycook: No, I am going to make some progress.

The aim of this amendment is to establish a clear process, with appropriate deadlines, by which Parliament can approve the outcome of the article 50 negotiations, and to provide clarity on what should happen if a majority of hon. Members in this House come to the conclusion that the final deal the Government return with is not good enough for the country.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Matthew Pennycook: I am not giving way; I will make some progress.

The amendment is about ensuring that in a scenario where this House rejects the withdrawal agreement, Parliament does not then simply become a passive spectator to what happens next but instead secures a decisive role in actively shaping how the Executive then proceed.

Gareth Snell (Stoke-on-Trent Central) (Lab/Co-op): My hon. Friend has said that supporting this amendment would not necessarily lead to a resolution of this House saying that we wish to maintain membership of the

[Gareth Snell]

European Union. Can he explain, for the purposes of clarity, what safeguards are in place to prevent such a thing from happening, given that we cannot bind Parliaments and that, as such, if we vote for this amendment, we could resolve to tell the Government that re-entry is the point of the negotiation?

Matthew Pennycook: My hon. Friend is dealing in hypotheticals. Under that scenario, it might be the case that an hon. Member tries to bring forward a resolution, and that the Government provide time, but does he believe, realistically, that such a resolution could pass and would command a majority in this House? It would not.

This is not about frustrating Brexit. Ministers know full well that there is no majority for that in this place, and it is disingenuous, as I said, to argue as much. Lords amendment 19 is about trusting this sovereign House of Commons to do what is right for the country.

Joan Ryan (Enfield North) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend agree that it is Government's job to bring forward policy and Parliament's job—the Commons, in particular—to legislate? It seems to me that far from taking back control or establishing sovereignty, the Government appear to want to deny Parliament its fundamental role as legislator.

Matthew Pennycook: My right hon. Friend makes a good point.

Lords amendment 19 is about trusting this sovereign House of Commons to do what is right for the country should it come to pass that the Government bring back a deal that does not secure approval in this House.

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

Matthew Pennycook: I will not give way.

By contrast, the Government's amendment (a) in lieu of amendment 19 would guarantee precisely the opposite. It would ensure that in the event that this House does not approve the withdrawal agreement, Parliament would have almost no role whatsoever.

Mr Marcus Jones (Nuneaton) (Con) *rose—*

Matthew Pennycook: I am not going to give way at this point.

Yes, the amendment provides for a statutory guarantee of a vote before the withdrawal agreement is put on the statute book, but it removes from the Bill what their lordships deliberately chose to insert: provision for the legislature to constrain Ministers in deciding to crash us out of the EU without a deal should Parliament choose to reject the deal. What does the Government amendment offer in its place? It offers provision to send a Minister back to the House within 28 days with a statement—a statement!—as to how the Government intend to proceed: a commitment that does not go much beyond what was set out in the written ministerial statement that was hurriedly issued on 13 December in a last-ditch attempt to thwart the House in voting for the right hon. and learned Gentleman's amendment 7.

Andrew Bridgen (North West Leicestershire) (Con) *rose—*

Mr Marcus Jones *rose—*

Matthew Pennycook: I am not giving way; I will make some progress.

It almost beggars belief. The vast majority of Members of this House want the Government to succeed and to return with the best deal possible, but let us be clear about what it would mean were the House to decline to approve the deal they bring back. That would represent a catastrophic failure of the Government's Brexit policy and their handling of the negotiations. In such a scenario, are hon. Members really content for the sum of their role to be the chance to listen to a ministerial statement and attempt to catch the Speaker's eye to ask a question? That is what hon. Members will be giving their consent to if they vote for the Government's amendment in lieu today. It is the same "take it or leave it" vote that the Government offered last year, with a few extra baubles.

John Mann (Bassetlaw) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend understand that Labour voters in the midlands and the north, who voted in large numbers to leave the European Union and who are a little bemused at the arguments even among the Cabinet over how that is delivered, do not wish to see the negotiations carried out by 650 Members of Parliament and want to see Brexit got on with? If the Lords amendments are agreed to, how will we explain to those Labour voters that the unelected House of Lords can overturn both the Commons and the referendum?

2 pm

Matthew Pennycook: I will tell my hon. Friend how we will explain it to them. We will say that their lordships asked us to consider and vote on whether, in the event that a majority of Members of this House do not approve the deal, we should take control of the situation and shape how the Executive then proceed. I think they would support that.

Seema Malhotra (Feltham and Heston) (Lab/Co-op): Will my hon. Friend give way?

Andrew Bridgen: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I am going to make some progress.

There has been a considerable amount of debate over the past 16 months about what is meant by a "meaningful" vote. Any member of the public watching our proceedings today will struggle to understand how a vote on the draft withdrawal agreement that simply takes the form of "take it or leave it" could in any sense be genuinely meaningful. In reality, it would be anything but. It would be meaningless, not meaningful. It would be a Hobson's choice.

Simon Hoare (North Dorset) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I will give way one final time.

Simon Hoare: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for giving way. I put it to him gently that his proposition presupposes that the European Union would wish to re-engage in negotiations. Were there to be a meaningful vote and this House were to veto the deal, we would be

likely to crash out without a deal and not deliver the pragmatic common-sense Brexit that I think he and I would like to see.

Matthew Pennycook: I disagree with the hon. Gentleman. Crashing out of the European Union without a deal is exactly what this amendment is designed to prevent. *[Interruption.]* Yes, it is.

Kevin Hollinrake (Thirsk and Malton) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Sir Mike Penning (Hemel Hempstead) (Con): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I said that that was the last intervention; I am not giving way again.

I want to turn briefly to the amendment tabled yesterday evening by the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield. We welcome it as a significant improvement on the Government's amendment in lieu. His amendment is a clear acknowledgment that the Government's amendment is deficient, that there is a need to make provision for a scenario in which Parliament does not approve a motion on the withdrawal agreement and that this House may need to insist on a decisive role for Parliament in what we all acknowledge would be an unprecedented situation.

We recognise that the right hon. and learned Gentleman has, throughout this process, been at great pains to secure a consensus around how this complex legislation can be improved in the context of the many challenges that the Government face. In taking such an approach, his and his colleagues' intent has not been, as many have suggested and as is plastered across the front of many of the tabloids today, to sabotage the will of the people or betray their country. They are simply trying to secure what the vast majority of hon. Members of this House desire: a proper process codified in law that ensures that the right decisions are made at the right time and that Parliament has the tools to hold the Executive to account effectively on some of the most significant decisions any of us will be asked to take.

Albert Owen (Ynys Môn) (Lab): Will my hon. Friend give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I am not going to give way; I am going to conclude.

The question of what form parliamentary approval of the withdrawal agreement takes is one of the most significant decisions this House will have to take. To be meaningful, a vote cannot simply take the form of a binary "take it or leave it" choice. It must provide a means by which Parliament can indicate to the Government that it desires a re-examination of particular aspects of the draft withdrawal agreement or even a change of approach. Unless hon. Members insist on it, Parliament will not have a genuinely meaningful vote on the terms of our withdrawal, as this House insisted upon in December. That is why we must insist on it and why I urge hon. Members to agree with Lords amendment 19 when we go through the Division Lobby in a few hours.

I want briefly to turn to some of the other Lords amendments in this group, starting with Lords amendments 37, 39 and 125, with which we agree. We

remain of the view that amending the Bill to incorporate a specified exit day and time was an ill-conceived and unnecessary gimmick that unduly fetters the Government. Ministers are well aware, just as they were when they amended the Bill in Committee, that exit day for the purposes of the Bill is a very different matter from the actual date on which the UK will cease to be an EU member state, which is a settled matter and a legal certainty. Common sense dictates that we return to the situation before November in which there was a necessary degree of flexibility around exit day for the purposes of the Bill, although we agree with their lordships that it is Parliament, not Ministers, who would agree the various exit dates.

We agree with amendments 110 and 128, which we believe strengthen parliamentary scrutiny—for example, by ensuring that Ministers cannot overturn decisions made by the triage committee. We also agree with amendments 10, 43 and 45, which rightly circumscribe the scope of the sweeping delegated powers in the Bill. We debated that issue extensively in Committee, and we remain of the view that concerns about the subjectivity inherent in the word "appropriate" must be addressed. Lastly, we agree with amendments 20 and 52.

I know that many Members on both sides of the House wish to speak, so I have sought not to repeat or rebut every argument made about each of the Lords amendments in this group with which we agree, but simply to set out, with particular focus on Lords amendment 19, why we believe they must be retained.

Andrew Bridgen: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Matthew Pennycook: I am not going to give way at this stage.

The amendments in this group are, at their core, about what we, as hon. and right hon. Members, believe the role of Parliament should be in the Brexit process. They are about ensuring that Parliament plays an active role in shaping our country's future, rather than accepting that the House of Commons is to be little more than a spectator and a passive observer to one of the most important decisions that has faced our country in generations. They are about ensuring that the withdrawal agreement cannot be ratified unless we approve it and, in the event that we do not approve it, that the UK cannot crash out of the EU by ministerial fiat. They are ultimately about reasserting the primacy of the House of Commons, so that this House, should the situation arise, is able to do what is right for our country.

Mr Kenneth Clarke: Thank you for calling me, Mr Speaker. I will try to be as brief as I can. Everybody knows that that is an effort for me, but I really will try to be positively terse where I can, and I am afraid that if I give way at all, it will be very briefly. That is only right, because the programme motion we have just passed, which I voted against, allows just three hours for debate on this whole group. I am well aware that hundreds of Members will find it almost impossible to get in, and therefore if I abuse the privilege you have given me, Mr Speaker, I should cause a great deal of damage to the quality of the debate.

First, let me say that I have never known an issue of this importance to be taken in this way. I remember being in debates on the European Communities Bill

[*Mr Kenneth Clarke*]

back in 1972 and in debates all the way through Maastricht, when there were hours and hours of debate and repeated votes before the approval of this House was obtained. Nobody throughout would have dreamt of arguing that as part of the process, the House of Commons could be excluded and the Government could be given an absolute privilege to proceed. Such a suggestion would have been treated as a complete absurdity.

Sir William Cash: Will my right hon. and learned Friend give way?

Mr Clarke: I will not, I am afraid, because had the suggestion been put to my hon. Friend during the Maastricht debates that if the Government got defeated on a resolution, they could take it over on their own and let Parliament know in due course what was going to happen, I do not think he would have welcomed it. I understand that we are in a different position.

Sir Edward Leigh: You've got to give way to him now; you've mentioned him.

Mr Clarke: I thought my hon. Friend and I had debated this quite long enough for everybody already, but I will give way to him.

Sir William Cash: Will my right hon. and learned Friend explain whether he believes it is possible, with the meaningful vote, to manage to maintain the Brexit process? Does he not accept that the effect of the meaningful vote is actually to reverse the Brexit process, and furthermore, to use a certain expression, that it is completely failing to understand the nature of the amendments to suggest otherwise?

Mr Clarke: I am grateful my hon. Friend—he is a genuine personal friend, and always has been—and he has brought me to the point I was moving on to.

This debate is being dominated, as far as the Brexiteers are concerned, by the argument that the amendment on the meaningful vote—Lords amendment 19, as amended by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve)—is really an attempt to get around the referendum. For the past several months, I have found that I am told on practically every subject, when the details get a little difficult and the argument gets a little odd, “Ah, you're not accepting the will of the people.” I first faced that when I opposed our withdrawal from Euratom, and I still do not believe that the public voted for that.

For the avoidance of doubt, as I have repeatedly made clear, I was on the losing side in the referendum—much as I regret it—but after the majority on article 50, we are going to leave the European Union. I have not joined the campaigns to have a second referendum, and I hope I do not live to see another referendum on such an important subject in my lifetime. The fact is that the key decision was then taken, but I will not go back over the quality of the debate and the arguments put forward by the leading figures on both sides that then dominated the national media.

Once the decision was taken by this House, on invoking article 50, that we are leaving, hundreds and hundreds of detailed questions arose about what new arrangements

we are going to have for our relationships with the European Union on a huge range of subjects, some of which we have scarcely looked at at the moment, and for our relationships with the rest of the world, because all our trade agreements are based on the European Union as that is how we have entered into them for the past several decades.

The idea that the yes/no vote—leave or remain—on referendum day actually decided each and every issue that now arises, if I may say so to people for whom I actually have respect, is, frankly, intellectually lazy. It is a refusal to engage with what we are actually talking about. I realise that many of the public are exasperated. The prevailing mood among the public is, “What are they all doing, and why don't they get it over with?” I am sorry about that, but the fact is that leaving poses a lot of questions. I do not think that most members of the public feel that their vote decided the issues we are talking about today in relation to parliamentary scrutiny and control. I am only guessing, but if we had said, “Of course, if you vote leave, you are giving the Government the absolute right to do what they wish in the negotiations and come to whatever agreements they want,” I do not think it would have been easy for my right hon. and hon. Friends to get a majority for such a proposition.

Let me get on to what we are really talking about, because I have already taken longer than I wished. As I have said, any suggestion that Parliament should hand over absolute discretion to any Government to handle such things would have been treated with absolute outrage, not the usual cheers and counter-cheers, expressed to any Minister who dared to do so. It is said—the hon. Member for Bassetlaw (John Mann) is persuaded by this, but I do not agree with him—that the next argument we will face is, “Well, what you're saying is that the House of Commons should take over the negotiations.” Of course we are not. I quite agree that that is a ridiculous proposition.

The Lords amendment was proposed by my right hon. and learned Friend Lord Hailsham. As we are all aware, he and others gave a lot of thought to putting together a parliamentary process that would be practicable and workable; the drafting might be improved, but the Government could have done that if their lawyers thought it was worth while. My right hon. and learned Friend had in mind that a further resolution would be required, but this second resolution, after the proposed settlement had been rejected, would of course be moved by a Minister. The amendment tabled by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield makes that even clearer. The idea that we would have a mass meeting of 650 people to decide what resolution to put forward is not postulated in the Lords amendment, and nobody is suggesting that.

2.15 pm

Mr Mark Harper (Forest of Dean) (Con): Will my right hon. and learned Friend give way?

Mr Clarke: No, I have taken too long already. I apologise to my right hon. Friend.

The Government would of course be in a bit of a dilemma—I imagine we would all be even more excited than we have been for the past few days—but the fact is that they would have to go away and work out what

resolution to bring forward that would carry the House of Commons. I assume that would be a continuation of the negotiations, but the House would demand that its approval was sought for the next turn in the negotiations, and the directions in which they would go, to satisfy its objections. I regard that as a perfectly serious proposition.

The public debate on the whole question of Brexit has largely been ridiculous—not just in the *Daily Express*, but in many other areas—but in this place we actually need to take seriously what we are doing not only for the future prospects of generations of our citizens, but for the constitutional position of this House. We have already given up all kinds of things that I have always taken for granted. I have never known such a weak Parliament for allowing things to get through, ending with the latest timetable resolution, but to take the Government's amendment would be the ultimate in doing so.

With this amendment, the Government have had to accept the decision of the House when we successfully defeated them before Christmas. They have had to come back and set out a better process of parliamentary approval before ratification. The big question then is: what if the Government reject it and there is no deal? In the House of Lords, the Minister was quite clear in resisting the amendment: “Oh, this meaningful vote is going to be deal or no deal—take it or leave it.”

Andrew Bridgen: Yes.

Mr Clarke: “Yes,” says my hon. Friend behind me. That is what he wants.

Andrew Bridgen: Will my right hon. and learned Friend give way?

Mr Clarke: No, I will not give way.

It would be a yes/no vote. Members may not like the deal, but if they vote against it, all they will get is no deal. The result is that, whatever deal they come forward with, only a handful of my right hon. and hon. Friends would vote against it, because they do not want any deal at all, but they are an absolutely tiny minority in this House of Commons.

What do the Government say in their amendment that the House will be faced with? The amendment says that, within 28 days, a written statement will be produced. It will be one of the piles of written statements we have every day, and—dare I suggest it?—not every Member of Parliament usually bothers to go through those piles of written statements every day. *[Interruption.]* Well, obviously I am exceptionally negligent in not doing so. What is the written statement going to say? It could say, “Well, in that case, as there's no deal, we're leaving.” or, “Well, we're going to do this, and that's it—that's the end of the parliamentary process.” It might as well say, “O House of Commons, get lost!” This is a wholly inadequate response to the votes we will have had in Parliament.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Clarke: No, I want to make two more points. I will now be very brief, and I will not expound on all the points I would have expounded on.

The argument that we are undermining the Prime Minister's position in the negotiations is equally ridiculous. It is based on the proposition that, out on the continent, people do not know that there are divisions in the Cabinet or what the situation is in the House of Commons, and were a whisper to get out about some slightly unusual votes in the House of Commons, this would undermine the position of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister and make that position much weaker.

I suspect that the feeling among those on the continent at the moment is that they are utterly bewildered by the Anglo-Saxons and that they have no idea what we think we are doing. They are not hostile to this country; they are waiting for us to make up our minds about what we wish to negotiate before the negotiations start. All the other Governments have to get the approval of 27 national Parliaments. What they are watching is an attempt by the real zealots in this House to stop this Parliament playing any part in the process, which is totally unacceptable.

The time has come to say that all Government policies on any subject, great or small, depend on the ability to command a majority in the House of Commons on the key principles and the direction in which the country is going. I will certainly vote on that basis and I hope that the Government regret the rather intolerant response and all the pressure they have been applying on my right hon. and learned Friends in trying to resist such an obvious proposition.

Peter Grant (Glenrothes) (SNP): Thank you for calling me, Mr Speaker. It is always a daunting prospect to follow the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke), although I am grateful to him on this occasion for warming up the audience a wee bit.

I do not often go along with the tradition of spending the first part of a speech being enormously grateful for getting the chance to speak in this place. After all, speaking here on behalf of our constituents is the absolute right of all Members. Today, however, it is appropriate for me to acknowledge that I am one of the privileged few because I will get to speak today and, who knows, perhaps even tomorrow, whereas the vast majority of elected Members in this place will not have a chance to speak at all.

If we all got an equal say over the next couple of days, every MP would speak for about 10 seconds—and no, I am not going to call time on myself just yet. Each of the amendments, many of them vital for the future, would be debated for about three minutes. In reality, most MPs will not be called and we will be asked to vote on amendments that have never been before this House and that will literally not even be mentioned by name, rank or serial number in the debate because there will not be time. Anybody who believes that that is an example of participative democracy at its best needs to get out of here and spend some time reconnecting with the real world.

The programme motion that the Government got through today is an absolute travesty of democracy, following days and days on which the business collapsed and the Government were inventing things to talk about because they did not have the political courage to bring this Bill or umpteen other Brexit-related Bills before the House. The idea that we can give proper consideration to 160 or 170 amendments in effectively nine or 10 hours

[Peter Grant]

of debate is utterly laughable. It is an indication of how far the hard Brexiteer propagandists and sloganisers have parted company from any kind of rational logic that they and, indeed, many in the Government denounced the Lords for approving 15 amendments that the Government did not like, while welcoming the fact that those self-same Lords approved 166 amendments that the Government asked them to approve. One hundred and sixty-six amendments were requested by the Government, and 15 by the rest of the world, and it is the rest of the world who are the villains and the enemies of democracy in this.

It was inevitable but deeply disturbing to see how the battle lines have been drawn on the front pages of some so-called newspapers, and I know that there was a point of order on this exact point earlier today. Their lordships are the “traitors in ermine”, the “enemies of the people”, as, indeed, are judges in the Supreme Court, for daring to do the job that they are there to do. I am not a fan of the unelected House of Lords, but they are there for a purpose and, whether we agree or disagree with the way in which they have discharged their purpose, the abuse that has been heaped on them in the past few weeks is utterly uncalled for and has no place in any kind of civilised debate.

Ian Murray (Edinburgh South) (Lab): The hon. Gentleman is right to suggest that, rather than deriding the House of Lords, we should be thanking them for introducing 15 sensible amendments and that the Government should also be thanking them for making hundreds of their own amendments because they made such a Horlicks of the Bill in this place in the first place.

Peter Grant: The hon. Gentleman makes a valid point. It seems like the definition of an enemy of the people is not based on where they take the decisions but on whether the decision finds favour or disfavour with Her Majesty’s Government. That is not democracy, Mr Speaker. We are heading to dictatorship if someone’s integrity or patriotism is judged on whether or not they agree with the minority of people who sit on the Government Front Bench.

As I have said, and I shall come back to this later, I am not a fan of the House of Lords. I do not think that it is a democratic institution, but it is not the real threat to our democracy. The real threat to such democracy as we have in these islands does not come from people who disagree with what I say or with what the Government say but from those who use terms such as “traitor” or “enemy” to denounce anybody who holds or expresses a view that differs from their own.

This weekend, we will mark the second anniversary of the murder of one of our colleagues. Possibly the last words she heard in this life were “death to traitors”. Surely, in the name of God, we should know that, when we allow the language of hatred to become normalised, the actions of hatred will follow. Today, someone has pleaded guilty to planning to murder another of our colleagues. I say to colleagues on all sides that we can disagree passionately and fervently with each other, but please get the language of violence out of the vocabulary of this debate and of all debates, not just in the few days before we remember Jo’s sacrifice but every day thereafter, so that Jo and others did not die in vain.

As I have mentioned, the SNP are not fans of the House of Lords, but when the House of Lords has passed amendments to turn a bad Bill into a slightly less bad Bill, we will seek to retain those amendments. Let us be clear that, even with those amendments, this is still a bad thing. It will be damaging to all our interests, but if we can make it the least bad thing that we possibly can, we will have achieved something.

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): Is the hon. Gentleman saying that the SNP’s official position is that we should stop Brexit outright?

Peter Grant: I am not quite sure how to break this to the right hon. Gentleman, but nothing would please me more than to allow his country to implement the decision that its citizens have taken and for my country to be given the right to implement the decision that the people of my country took.

We support the removal from the Bill of a purely arbitrary and symbolic exit day; it does nothing to improve our chances of getting a less damaging deal and makes the prospect of a cliff-edge no deal more likely. It was agreed to only because the Prime Minister was too weak at the time to stand up to the hard-line minority in her own party, who are a vanishingly small minority across the House of Commons as a whole. Recently, the ubiquitous “sources close to the Prime Minister” have been working very hard to spin the line that she is now prepared to face down some of the extremists in her party. May I suggest that she would make a good start by facing them down by supporting the removal of an unnecessary exit day from the Bill and supporting that Lords amendment?

On the amendments to change “necessary” back to “what the Minister deems appropriate,” I am flummoxed by the idea that it needs to be put into legislation that a Minister only does things that they think are appropriate. Do the Government seriously think that their own Ministers will do things that they think are inappropriate? I know that they do things that I think are inappropriate all the time, but imagine having legally to prohibit them from doing things that they thought were stupid, rather than trying to stop them from doing things that everybody else thinks are stupid.

The Secretary of State, who obviously has much more important things to do than staying to listen to the defence of his legislation, told us twice that “necessary” is not a synonym for logical, sensible or proper. The trouble is that the entire Bill is written on the assumption that Her Majesty’s Government are a synonym for logical, sensible or proper, and, indeed, that the whim of a Minister is a synonym for logical, sensible or proper.

The Government do not have a monopoly on logic, good sense or propriety. A Government who lost their overall majority in this place at the demand of the people of these islands should surely have the humility to accept that sometimes, just sometimes, when the ermine-coated lords along the corridor disagree with them, they have got it right and the Government have got it wrong.

2.30 pm

We will support amendments that seek to guarantee Parliament has a meaningful choice and a meaningful vote on the final deal. This gets presented as somehow

usurping the decision of June 2016, but who among us can genuinely claim to have the right to decide whether a final deal, whatever it says, properly delivers the Brexit that people voted for? None of us can because nobody voted for any particular kind of Brexit. They voted for a Brexit. There was not a public vote on membership of the customs union. Nobody voted to leave the single market. Nobody voted to leave Euratom. Nobody voted to damage the United Kingdom economy. People voted for a departure from the European Union. There has been no public vote on the kind of Brexit we should have. The reason there was no referendum on the single market or the customs union is that the Conservative party thought it politically expedient to deny the public that choice.

Mr Alister Jack (Dumfries and Galloway) (Con): The hon. Gentleman confirms that he and his party want to keep Scotland in the European Union. Can he confirm to me whether he wants to keep Scotland in the common fisheries policy as well?

Peter Grant: Certainly not, as currently constituted. If there were a common fisheries policy that actually protected Scotland's fishing industry, instead of it being used by successive UK Governments as an excuse to sell it out, that might be a different matter.

There has of course been a public vote on the possibility of one of the consequences of a hard Brexit: a hard border across the island of Ireland.

Angus Brendan MacNeil: Is my hon. Friend aware that the front page of today's *Financial Times* refers to a shortage of doctors? The Tories in Scotland have the cheek to blame the Scottish National party for the lack of doctors, when they are the ones not giving them the visas to get in to the country. The Tories sold out fishing once and then twice. They told us that they would not accept fisheries in the transition agreement and now they are talking as if they are saving the fisheries—the people who have sold out fishermen twice!

Peter Grant: Few of us can speak on the fishing industry with such knowledge and authority as my hon. Friend.

The nearest we have had to a public vote anywhere on any of the consequences of a hard Brexit was the public vote against the possibility of a hard border across the island of Ireland. The people of Northern Ireland and the people of the Republic of Ireland overwhelmingly rejected such a notion when they endorsed the Good Friday agreement and, of course, the people of Northern Ireland, the only people in the United Kingdom who would be affected by a hard border, voted to remain in the EU. How can anyone argue that the best way to give effect to those votes is for decisions to be taken by Ministers who represent a party with no MPs in Northern Ireland? The people of Northern Ireland have no way of re-electing or not re-electing those Ministers, based on whether their decisions are in the interests of those people.

Tom Brake (Carshalton and Wallington) (LD): Is the hon. Gentleman as outraged as I am that it looks as though we will have no possibility to debate those issues today? Is he as surprised as I am that, unless the

Department for Exiting the European Union has not kept its website up to date, we do not even have a Minister from DExEU here listening to the debate?

Peter Grant: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that we are quite used to seeing Government Ministers abandoning their posts as soon as anybody from the third party in Parliament gets up to speak. He will have to take it up with them why that might be.

At the end of this entire process, we owe it to ourselves, to each and every one of us, to acknowledge that later this year some Members of Parliament—possibly those on the Conservative Benches, possibly those on the Opposition Benches—may in all conscience want to go back to their constituents and say, “I recognise the way that you voted in June 2016. I respect your right to take part in that vote, but in all conscience I cannot be part of a decision that I believe in my heart of hearts will be deeply damaging to your community and to these islands and nations.” Members of Parliament must have the right to say to their constituents, “On this occasion, what I fundamentally believe to be in your interests differs from what you believe to be your wishes.” Each of us should be given the right to go back to our constituents and face the potential political consequences. I have no qualms whatever about the political consequences of following my own conscience if it is against the wishes, expressed or otherwise, of my constituents. That is a decision we all have to be prepared to take from time to time.

This is possibly the most important occasion of this Parliament—and of many previous Parliaments. Members of Parliament must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves where they place the balance between what we believe is best and what our constituents have told us they want. If Members of Parliament are not prepared to face up to that very difficult dilemma, there is a question whether they should be Members of Parliament at all.

Sir Mike Penning: The hon. Gentleman has been very generous in giving way. Surely we cannot ignore a referendum that was voted for by this House. The people made a decision and we cannot go against that decision. To say that perhaps they did not realise what they were doing when they voted to leave the European Union is an insult to the electorate.

Peter Grant: I never suggested that, although it is perhaps worth remembering that at least one of the right hon. Gentleman's own colleagues, a Conservative MP, has admitted that they did not vote in the referendum because the question was too hard for them to understand. I wonder how many other people were in the same position. There is a big, big difference between not fully understanding and being stupid. It is an insult for Conservative Members to suggest that anyone who admits they did not fully understand it, or still do not feel they understand it, is stupid.

My comments were not based on suggesting that people did not understand. My comments were based on the fact that the ultimate responsibility we have is to act on what we believe to be the public's best interest, not simply to follow what we think will get us re-elected next time around. The fact that so many Brexiteers are horrified at the idea that Members of Parliament should

[Peter Grant]

be given the chance to make that statement to their constituents suggests that an awful lot of them think that such a statement may be needed. They think that we will get to the end of the process and a large number of MPs will want to go back to the people and say, “I’m sorry. I supported it this far but I cannot support it any longer because I can see the damage it will cause.” I will leave that for Members to think about. I do not expect anybody to be persuaded just now, but I appeal to Members to think about that over the next wee while. It is fundamental to the nature of the representative democracy we have in this place.

Of course, it goes without saying, on the other amendments the SNP will be supporting, that, in this partnership of equal nations, the elected Parliaments of all the equal nations must have a say on the final deal. They must have a much greater say than they have had up until now. With the contempt shown for the devolved nations through the process so far, it is difficult to believe that the intention has been anything other than inflammatory.

Mr Simon Clarke (Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland) (Con) *rose*—

Geraint Davies (Swansea West) (Lab/Co-op) *rose*—

Peter Grant: I will not give way because I know a number of people who did not support the programme motion will struggle to get in.

The mantra of the “most powerful devolved Parliament in the world” has never been true, but it sounds even more hollow if that “most powerful devolved Parliament in the world” can be stripped of its powers by a party that never wanted it to have those powers, never wanted it to exist in the first place and are intent on acting not just against the majority view of the Parliament of Scotland but against the majority view of Opposition Members of the Parliament of Scotland.

In their continued belief that they and only they are the guardians of common sense, the Government are determined to force this place to have a binary decision on whether we accept the final deal. This is the same Government who keep telling us that the customs union is not a binary decision, the single market is not a binary decision and controlling immigration is not a binary decision. The only time it is a binary decision is when they have to make a decision. The Government are determined that the final decision this Parliament will have to take on what the future will be is “take it or leave it”. For some of us, other futures are available. The Government would do well to reflect on that fact before it is too late. If the only choice they offer is take it or leave it, they may find that the people of Scotland, the people of Wales and the people of Northern Ireland will interpret take it or leave it in a very different way from that which the Government intend.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. I remind the House of what it knows, namely that the time available for this debate is very limited. I want to accommodate as many right hon. and hon. Members as possible, so we will begin

with a limit on Back-Bench speeches of 10 minutes, although it is not obligatory to take the full allocation of time.

Sir Edward Leigh: I agree with the hon. Member for Glenrothes (Peter Grant) that we should use the language of respect. I, for one—and many of my colleagues, I am sure—would never use words such as “traitor”. We all accept that there are very different views in this place, but this is not the EU negotiating Bill. It is not a Bill designed from its inception to give the Government guidance about what sort of deal we should have. I thought—this has been explained to us many times by the Government—that this Bill was simply to try to transform and transfer, in an orderly way, EU laws into our legal system. That was what I understood the Bill to be; it is not an EU negotiating Bill.

I said earlier that we should use the language of respect. I know that it is not in order to call any Member “disingenuous”, but I think that it is in order to call an argument disingenuous, and I do so now. I respect the House of Lords. I understand that it is not elected. I understand that it should try to improve legislation. I serve on the Procedure Committee, and when the Committee considered these matters, there was a detailed debate on the sifting committee and I could understand how the House of Lords can try to improve how we deal with legislation. That seems entirely sensible and credible, but many of us suspect that these amendments, particularly Lords amendment 19, are designed not to improve the legislation or to improve the sifting process by which we transfer these laws, but to frustrate the whole process.

John Redwood: My hon. Friend will remember that we had many hours of debate and decisive votes before we sent the article 50 letter. That was the point when Parliament made up its mind to back the referendum. We cannot keep chopping and changing.

Sir Edward Leigh: I agree with that. As I was saying, although it is perfectly in order for the other place to try to improve legislation, when it seeks to frustrate it, I think that Members of the elected House should start to get worried. Lords amendment 19 is very clear in saying:

“Her Majesty’s Government may implement a withdrawal agreement only if Parliament has approved the withdrawal agreement and any transitional measures... Her Majesty’s Government must follow any direction in relation to the negotiations under Article 50” and so on. What would be the result of that amendment? I say to colleagues that we are not just acting in a vacuum. What would be the result if we fail to overturn this amendment from the other place?

Layla Moran (Oxford West and Abingdon) (LD): Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Sir Edward Leigh: No.

Antoinette Sandbach (Eddisbury) (Con): Will my hon. Friend give way?

Sir Edward Leigh: My hon. Friend takes a very different point of view from me, so in all courtesy, I give way, but this must be the last time I do so.

Antoinette Sandbach: I am very grateful to my hon. Friend for giving way. Does he agree that the amendment tabled by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) deals with the issues that he is raising?

Sir Edward Leigh: No, I do not agree. I talked to my right hon. Friend the Brexit Secretary earlier today. He simply said—he does understand these things—that all the amendment tabled by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) would do would be to implement what the House of Lords wants to do in fewer words, so I do not accept that, I am afraid. We have to bite this bullet now. We have to support the Government and reject the amendment.

As I was asking, what would be the result—we do not operate in a vacuum—if the House of Lords had its way? Of course it would be a catastrophe for the Government. There would be banner headlines in every single newspaper tomorrow saying that the Government had been defeated and that the whole Brexit momentum was in danger. Much more important than that—this is why I think the argument is disingenuous—is the fact those who support the House of Lords are dressing up their arguments in terms of parliamentary sovereignty. It is in order, is it not, for Parliament to debate and amend a Bill, as the House of Lords can do? That is what we do all the time, but what the Lords really want to do is to create a situation in which the whole process is frustrated.

2.45 pm

As has been said again and again, we ourselves voted six to one to transfer this decision from ourselves—uniquely in our history—to the people. They decided to leave. The decision had to be made and Members then voted overwhelmingly. Virtually every single Labour and Conservative Member voted not only to accept the result, but to implement article 50. We have taken the decision. We are a sovereign Parliament. We have made the decision, but we had given that decision to the people.

I go back to my argument about what would happen if the House of Lords had its way and the Government lost this afternoon. Opposition Members are, of course, entitled to cause confusion in the Government ranks. I accept that they may have their own motives, but I appeal to my hon. Friends: what would be the result to our Government if we lost this vote today? It would be a catastrophic blow. I return to the question that I put to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State earlier: what would the European Commission think of that? My right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) had a bit of fun about this. He said, “Oh, of course the European Commission knows that there are some arguments and debates.” It would be an open invitation to the European Commission to pave the way for this catastrophic situation in which there is no deal, because it knows that if there is no deal—if there was going to be a disorderly exit—the House of Commons could unpick the whole process, block Brexit and, as the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent Central (Gareth Snell) said, reopen the whole process.

Mr Kenneth Clarke: These arguments were put—almost as forcefully as my hon. Friend is putting them—when we had our debates before Christmas in Committee.

This House then passed an amendment on a meaningful vote, defeating the Government. People had foreseen that that would undermine the Prime Minister, cause an election and represent a crisis, but the next morning, apart from the fact that there was now to be a meaningful vote, nothing stirred. The position of the Prime Minister was not weakened and negotiations have not been hindered. My hon. Friend is putting his arguments with his usual great eloquence, but, with great respect, they avoid what we are really talking about, which is the important process of parliamentary accountability.

Sir Edward Leigh: I am afraid that my right hon. and learned Friend was not listening to his own speech. Was I not listening—was I not two or three feet away from him—when he said that the amendment that we passed earlier was not going to make much difference to the whole process? It was like giving a statement, was it not? What we are talking about is completely different. This really is the ultimate wrecking amendment, and it is not the wrecking of parliamentary sovereignty; it is the wrecking of the will of the people and democracy. There are so many compromises that we all have to make. There are so many things that I do not understand about this negotiating process, and about how we have got stuck on the hook of Ireland, the backstop, “max fac” and all these other things, but the essential thing is this: the people want us to leave the EU. They want to regain control of their borders and they want us to be out of the European Court of Justice. All this Bill does—it is not the EU negotiating Bill—is simply to implement the will of the people. Parliament, do not stand against the people! Implement their will.

Sir Vince Cable (Twickenham) (LD): Many Members will today be speaking under pressure or while considering different interests. Some will be observing what the hon. Member for Streatham (Chuka Umunna) called the pure Churchillian principle of accountability and thinking clearly about our consciences and judgments, while others will be concerned about the will of the people as expressed by their own or other people’s constituents, or by parts of the UK such as Scotland that are distinct. Others will be thinking about their party and—dare I say it?—some may even consider the views of their party Whips. People will come to different conclusions and weigh these things differently, and the most vocal people will be those who are not necessarily balancing them with the greatest difficulty. We should respect those on both sides who are struggling to reconcile these different pressures.

We are weighing up a difficult constitutional matter, and two constitutional questions are wrapped up in Lords amendment 19. One is about how we reconcile the rights of a plebiscite with those of Parliament—we have debated that many times, and the hon. Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh) was very unambiguous about where he stands—and the other is about how we balance the rights of the Executive with those of the legislature. We have debated that in different contexts. A few weeks ago, we were talking about exactly how to weigh war powers and accountability.

Lords amendment 19 takes us forward in one crucial respect with regard to the so-called meaningful vote. It gives additional clarity. It might be better had we taken the wording proposed by the right hon. and learned

[*Sir Vince Cable*]

Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), but the amendment does give clarity, and it would not have the exaggerated consequences that some have predicted, as was set out very sensibly by the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke).

Andrew Bridgen: Does not the right hon. Gentleman concede that when Lord Bilimoria introduced Lords amendment 19, he said that it had the ability to stop Brexit? Will the right hon. Gentleman not concede that this is a wrecking amendment?

Sir Vince Cable: The House would have to vote in that way, fully conscious of what it was doing. We just have to wait and see how the House chooses to proceed. The overall effect of the Lords amendment is clearly to—

Andrew Bridgen: Stop Brexit.

Sir Vince Cable: No, but stopping Brexit is one option we need to consider.

Although Lords amendment 19 takes us forward, it would not, as the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe just explained, have the damaging consequences anticipated by many exaggerated predictions. It would not necessarily undermine our negotiating position. The EU countries have their own legislation to consider and have already made it clear that their objective is a smooth, quick, clear Brexit. Anything that might cause major disruption—if they were unfair to the UK, for example—and therefore lead to Parliament's rejecting the deal would not necessarily be in their interests, and they would, I am sure, reject that.

The crucial point, which is made in the article by Professor Bogdanor that the Brexit Secretary has quoted at length, is that whereas the amendment is a necessary step, it is not sufficient, and that is because Parliament cannot overthrow the judgment of the people in a referendum. The article is quite clear about that, and so are the Liberal Democrats, although we approach this from the opposite direction to some of the Brexit supporters on the Government Benches. We believe that when Parliament has considered the final deal or the absence of a deal, the public should have the final say on the matter. This is not an extraordinary observation. Countries that rule by plebiscite, such as Switzerland, regard confirmatory referendums as a matter of course. The people vote and then the legislature and Executive review the matter. At the end, there is a confirmatory referendum to determine whether the people accept the proposal. There is no reason why that should present a problem. It is a matter of fundamental—

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Sir Vince Cable: I will complete my remarks and then let others contribute.

Our amendment (a) to Lords amendment 19 expresses that thought very clearly. I notice that the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), who probably more than anyone else is reconciling these different forces today, has accepted that the logic of the position is not simply for the House to have a meaningful vote, but to go back to the people and then accept the result of that vote. Were there to be a vote on the final deal, I would accept it fully, and I

would then then work with people who support Brexit to make that work. If we continue on the present path, however, with a definition of Brexit that is narrow and specific, as in the Lancaster House speech—it was supposedly drafted by the Prime Minister's then adviser—and that many of us would not accept as a proper definition of Brexit, which the Prime Minister has pursued in a stumbling and incoherent way, we will not accept that, and we will not accept the result of the Brexit negotiations even after Brexit has taken place. The public need to have a vote on the final deal at the end of the process.

Sir Henry Bellingham (North West Norfolk) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: I think the right hon. Gentleman has completed his speech.

Sir Henry Bellingham: Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Speaker: Order. The right hon. Member for Twickenham (Sir Vince Cable) cannot give way; he has concluded his oration. We await the thoughts of the hon. Member for North West Norfolk (Sir Henry Bellingham) at a later stage, perhaps.

Mr Grieve: I was amused to discover that my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State was a little taken aback by the amendment I tabled late last night. I tabled it with his best interests at heart. Having spent last week understanding that he might imminently be joining me on the Back Benches and realising that Lords amendment 19, if endorsed by the Commons, might precipitate the same thing again, I thought I ought to do what I could to help him. That is why I tabled my amendment, in addition to the one he has tabled, in lieu of the Lords amendment.

I must tell the House that I really am worried: the irrationality of the debate on the detail of Brexit is truly chilling. A person opens their newspaper and discovers they are about to prevent Brexit, when what the House is doing is legitimately looking at the detail of one of the most complex legal and political exercises in which we have ever engaged in peacetime, and, as a result, our ability to have a rational debate entirely evaporates. If we continue in this way, we will make mistakes and not achieve the best possible outcome.

The House of Lords was not acting irrationally when it agreed amendment 19. It had picked up on something that ought to be of great concern to everybody in this House—namely, that although we can make provision for achieving a deal, if we do not achieve a deal at all, we will be facing an immense crisis. It might be that some of my colleagues on the Government Benches are excited at this prospect and think it a wonderful moment, but I am not; I think it will be catastrophic. The question, therefore, is: how do we take sensible steps, in anticipation of this, to try to ensure a coherent process for dealing with it? That is what this is about. It is not about obstructing Brexit.

If we want to obstruct Brexit, there are plenty of other ways to do it. We could replace the Government with one that would like to stop it, although, having already triggered article 50, we would still have to get

the consent of our EU partners. There is, then, a complete constitutional incoherence in imagining that the Bill and the way it is presented somehow leads to that dastardly outcome.

Mr Jacob Rees-Mogg: My concern about my right hon. and learned Friend's amendment is that it would change the constitutional balance and separation of powers. There is a perfectly reasonable way of ensuring that the Government do the proper thing, and that is a vote of no confidence. As long as the Government maintain the confidence of this House, they ought to be able to negotiate international treaties, but if they fail in their negotiations, the House has a remedy that has been a remedy for very many years.

Mr Grieve: I take my hon. Friend's point, but I would like him to consider for one moment the last part of my amendment, new section 5C, which deals with what happens if, on 15 February 2019, we have no deal. His invitation would be for the House to express no confidence in the Government and to get rid of them. Can one imagine a more chaotic process than the triggering of a general election five weeks before we fall off the edge of the cliff?

Justine Greening (Putney) (Con): I agree with what my right hon. and learned Friend is saying. I think that, far from suggesting that his amendment was wrong, my hon. Friend the Member for North East Somerset (Mr Rees-Mogg) gave the very reason why it is sensible to adopt this structural process to deal with the different scenarios that the House may face.

3 pm

Mr Grieve: I agree entirely with my right hon. Friend. Let me explain. I did take on board the Government's concerns regarding the Lords amendment, but I could see that the micro-management of their negotiating position after the autumn, if there were no deal, could present difficulties. My amendment sought to avoid that by doing two things. First, it sought to provide a mechanism whereby no deal, if there is no deal, must come to this House. That would provide great reassurance to all Members that there was a system in place to deal with the position. Similarly, there would be a system in place to deal with the rejection of a deal, and finally—and only then would there be a mandatory condition—a system that would operate if by February we were still faced with an impossible position of having no deal at all.

The Solicitor General (Robert Buckland): Of course I accept that my right hon. and learned Friend and other colleagues wish to discuss further the role that Parliament will play in all the Brexit scenarios that may present themselves to us. We cannot bind the negotiations, nor can we disrespect the referendum result, but—as my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State said in his speech—we do commit ourselves to meeting to see how we can build on Her Majesty's Government's amendment (a) in lieu today, ahead of the Bill's stages in the House of Lords, and to meeting my right hon. and learned Friend tomorrow to make that important progress on what we have achieved today.

Mr Grieve: I take my hon. and learned Friend's comments at face value, and I am most grateful to him for making them. He must understand, however, that, as usual when we reach this stage of a process, we face some difficult challenges. There is a Lords amendment, and if we agree to it, that is what will go into the Bill. Alternatively, we may endorse the Government's approach and support the amendment in lieu. The Government could, I think, adopt my amendment; it is a rather arcane procedure, but they could include it. If they do not want to do that, however, I shall need some pretty cast-iron assurances that when the Bill returns to the Lords, with the Government's amendment in lieu, we will implement significant parts of what I have put forward, because we cannot allow a situation in which there is no mechanism for dealing with no deal.

The Solicitor General: Overnight, I read my right hon. and learned Friend's amendment (ii) to Government amendment (a) very carefully, and I think that there is much merit in the approach that he urges the House to adopt in subsection (5A). I need more time to think about the other parts of the amendment—[*Interruption*—but by indicating my position on a key part of it, I am indicating that the Government are willing to engage positively ahead of the Lords stages.

Mr Grieve: Again, I am very grateful to my hon. and learned Friend, and let me say to the House that I do not think his views should be dismissed. I am conscious that if we are to make progress, we ought to try to do this by consensus. However, my hon. and learned Friend must also understand—as my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State must understand—the difficulty in which the House finds itself when faced with a choice of this kind. I have been through the same process in opposition and now in government. If the House makes the concession of allowing the dialogue to continue—and I can see the merit in that—it must be done in good faith. Let me say to my hon. and learned Friend that without that good faith, the other place will put the amendment back in, and the good will will be gone when the Bill comes back to this House.

The Solicitor General: I can give my right hon. and learned Friend that assurance. Everything that I do with him and other colleagues is always in good faith, and that will remain the case.

Mr Grieve: I am grateful to my hon. and learned Friend. I was glad to hear what he said about the principle—which, in my view, is entirely innocuous—that “Within seven days of a statement under subsection (4) being laid, a Minister of the Crown must move a motion in the House of Commons to seek approval of the Government's approach.” That is not exactly rocket science. The second principle is that there must be a mechanism providing for a Minister to come to the House of Commons by a suitable date—and I think 30 November 2018 must be the one—in the event of no deal, so that the Government can tell the House how they intend to proceed and seek the approval of the House for that.

I know that subsection (5C) causes my hon. and learned Friend much more difficulty. I understand the constitutional issue, and I will come to that before I finish my speech; but the reality is that without a

[Mr Grieve]

mechanism whereby the House can properly shape the crisis that will be unfolding us at the end of February if we have no deal, we will do it in an ad hoc way, which is likely to be infinitely more damaging to the wellbeing of the citizens of the United Kingdom than putting together a package that can be looked at now.

The Solicitor General: As usual, I am listening very carefully to my right hon. and learned Friend's observations. They will form a clear basis for a formal set of discussions that we can start at the earliest opportunity ahead of the Lords—

Mr Speaker: Order. I do apologise, but the Solicitor General must address the House. This is not a private conversation with another Member, conducted *sotto voce*. I want the whole House to hear what the Solicitor General wants to blurt out, preferably briefly.

The Solicitor General: Of course, Mr Speaker. I was about to give a clear undertaking to use my right hon. and learned Friend's comments as the basis for structured discussions ahead of the Lords stages. [Interruption.]

Mr Grieve: I am grateful to my hon. and learned Friend. Obviously, the House will have to make up its mind about how it wishes to proceed, but, as I have said, there must be a proper understanding of the disquiet that is felt on both sides of the House.

Chris Bryant (Rhondda) (Lab): I know that the Solicitor General has spoken in good faith, but would it not be best for those discussions to take place in a forthright way, for us to vote with their lordships for their lordships' amendment and for the Government to return to the matter in the House of Lords after the discussions?

Mr Grieve: I fear not. I think the reality is that if we accept the Lords amendment, that will be the end of the matter. That is the problem that we face in this House.

Mr Kenneth Clarke: Both my right hon. and learned Friend and I accept without hesitation the good will of our hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General, who is doing his best to resolve the slightly odd situation that we are all in. I think that the majority of Ministers—although I do not know about my hon. and learned Friend—would give my right hon. and learned Friend the undertaking for which he is asking now, and that the majority of our party would be quite happy with an arrangement of the sort proposed in his amendment. However, all we can have is what we had in Committee—offers of good faith, discussions and earnest attempts—because our proposals will be vetoed by the hard-line Brexiters in the Government.

Mr Grieve: I am grateful to my right hon. and learned Friend. I think that we will hear more about that as the debate unfolds.

Sir William Cash: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Grieve: No. I am sorry.

Let me end by saying this. The idea that it is wrong, in a crisis, for Parliament to direct the Government what to do is plainly fallacious. It cannot be right. We are

entitled to do that. Of course, if the Government do not want to do what we direct them to do, that is another matter.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr Speaker: Order. We will have one more speech of up to 10 minutes, but then the limit will have to be cut, because I want to accommodate the maximum number of colleagues.

Hilary Benn (Leeds Central) (Lab): It is with some hesitation that I involve myself in the negotiation that the Government are clearly attempting to conduct with their own Back Benchers. I simply want to observe that this is the single most important amendment that we will be discussing today and tomorrow in relation to the role that Parliament should and indeed must play in determining what kind of Brexit happens.

I simply do not accept the argument that the Secretary of State and other Conservative Members have advanced in trying to suggest that this proposal is somehow illegitimate or improper, or is intended to overturn the result of the referendum. Is it improper for this House to decide that in leaving the EU, we wish to remain within a customs union with it? Is it improper for this House to decide that we wish to remain in a single market, or to continue to have the European arrest warrant system, or that we want to co-operate in future with our friends and neighbours on foreign policy, defence and security? If the answer to all those questions is no, it is not improper; this Lords amendment is about giving Parliament the ability to ensure it can exercise that judgment when the time comes. It seeks to make it clear who will be in control when we come to the end of the process: the Government can go away and negotiate, but they will have to win the consent of the House when they return.

The Government's attempts to neuter the Lords amendment will not work for a number of reasons that have been set out already. I say to the Solicitor General that, frankly, we do not have more time, which is why this is the moment when we have to make the choice. Secondly, as has been clearly pointed out, it makes no provision for what happens in the event of there being no deal. The House is aware of what the consequence of no deal would be for the border in Northern Ireland, our trade, the rights of British citizens abroad and EU citizens here, future co-operation on security and many other matters.

Angus Brendan MacNeil: Given all that the right hon. Gentleman has been outlining, is it not fascinating that when Brexiteer MPs ask themselves about a vote on Brexit, they fear they will lose it and therefore that Brexit will be reversed? That displays no confidence in their argument at all.

Hilary Benn: I say to the hon. Gentleman that the British people have made their decision about the fact that we are leaving the institutions of the European Union in March next year, but it is for this House to decide the way in which we leave and the future of our relationship with our friends and neighbours, who will remain our friends and neighbours after we have left.

Several hon. Members rose—

Hilary Benn: I will not give way again as many other Members wish to speak.

The question is: who decides what happens next in the circumstances either of there being no deal or of Parliament rejecting the deal the Government bring back in October or November? In the event of a rejection I think it is pretty safe to assume that Parliament will, in moving an amendment to the motion asking for approval of the withdrawal agreement, set out its reasons why. Parliament might say for example that it declines to give approval to the withdrawal agreement because it makes no provision for the UK remaining in a customs union with the EU. In those circumstances, as many Members—including the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke), the Father of the House—have made clear, it is perfectly reasonable for the House of Commons then to expect the Government of the day to go back to those with whom they have been negotiating. As always happens in negotiations, people come back and say, as the Chief Whip is now experiencing, “I’m really sorry, I have tried, but the Members will not wear it; we need to talk about doing something else.” It is perfectly reasonable for the House to do that; otherwise, as we have heard many times, the notion that we have somehow taken back control has no force whatsoever.

We need a mechanism that can enable the House to have its say both in the event of there being no deal because an agreement cannot be reached and in circumstances where the House of Commons says it does not accept the deal the Government have brought back.

3.15 pm

Members have spoken with real passion and concern—and we will no doubt hear from others subsequently—about this means of ensuring that Parliament can have its say. I read in the newspapers over the weekend about people asking, “Is this really the right time to be voting not with the Government and in support of the Lords?” While we could argue that in relation to the big question of whether we should remain in a customs union or the single market, because other opportunities to address that will come before the House in the Trade Bill, that is not true of the question of a meaningful vote, as this is the one opportunity we have before the end of these negotiations in October—

Chuka Umunna: The only opportunity.

Hilary Benn: My hon. Friend is correct: it is the only opportunity to make it clear to the Government that we intend to have our say when the negotiations have been concluded. This is the one chance that we have to exercise the sovereignty that we all believe properly rests with this House, whether we voted leave or remain in the referendum. I hope very much that the House, recognising that this is its one chance, will take that opportunity by voting later today for Lords amendment 19.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. I am sorry to disappoint colleagues but do so in the spirit of maximisation: a six-minute limit now applies.

Anna Soubry (Broxtowe) (Con): I have never written a speech before and then had it typed out, Mr Speaker, and now I do not know why I bothered: not only have you cut the time, but you can see how the debate has advanced.

I am sorry but I am going to speak, as ever, frankly. This has got to stop; this is unseemly; this is the most important piece of legislation that this House has considered arguably since the second world war, and we sit here and watch a peculiar sort of horse-trading over the perfectly excellent amendment put forward by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), who served in the Government for decades—*[Interruption.]* He served in the Government for a number of years, but he has served this party for decades and he has never rebelled once. I gently say to my hon. Friend the Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh), who in just eight years rebelled 58 times, and to the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, who along with my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Mr Duncan Smith) rebelled in total 160 times, that we here understand the concept of being loyal to leadership and, indeed, being true and honourable to our principles—and I believe they are men of conscience and principle.

Let us look around us at what is happening. There are good men and women of great ability, and indeed courage, who are, unfortunately, no longer in our Cabinet, such as my right hon. Friends the Members for Ashford (Damian Green), for Putney (Justine Greening) and for Hastings and Rye (Amber Rudd)—all great people who have been lost from our deeply divided Cabinet. Never before have we had a Cabinet that is so divided, and with some of its most senior people, who hold the greatest offices of state, at every twist and turn, when our Prime Minister moves towards securing a Brexit that will serve everybody in our country—the softest, most sensible of Brexits—both publicly and privately undermining her and scuppering her attempts. It simply has to stop, and the moment for it to stop is now.

I know absolutely that the Solicitor General is a man of great honour, whose word will always be true, but I say with the greatest respect to him that he is not the most senior person around today and it is not his decision. He knows that I say that as somebody with great respect and love for him. So where is the Secretary of State? All he has to do is accept the amendment of my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield. If he does not, he will force Members who for decades have never before rebelled to traipse through a Lobby or sit and abstain, just as they did in the Lords—and who I will support in each and every one of those important amendments on the EEA and the customs union and amendment 19.

Those Lords were Members of this place once; they include a former Chief Whip, a former Deputy Prime Minister, more Secretaries of State than we could shake a stick at, a former Leader of the House and two former party chairmen. For decades they were always loyal to every leader. Meanwhile, there lurk some, I am afraid, who for decades have plotted and connived. They have got rid of leaders and anybody and anything that stood in their way, and they will continue so to do. Even if they are supported by Russian bots and their dirty money, they will do what they have had a lifetime’s ambition to do, which is to take us over the cliff into the hard Brexit that my constituents did not vote for. I will continue to represent my constituents. We reckon that overall 52% voted to leave, but the 48% who voted to remain have been put to one side in this process and ignored. That has to stop. We have to come back together and we have to do the right thing.

[Anna Soubry]

I know and understand how difficult it is for many of my colleagues to go through the Lobby and vote against their party, but I say this: I am getting a little tired of the right hon. and hon. Members on the Back Benches, in government and even in the Cabinet who come up to me and others in quiet and dark corridors; of the British businesses that demand private meetings in which they lay bare their despair but refuse to go public; of the commentators who say to me, “You’re doing a great job. Keep on going,” in the face of death threats which have meant that one of our number has had to attend a public engagement with six armed undercover police officers—that is the country that we have created and it has got to stop; and of the journalists who fight nobly for every cause but on this most important of issues are mute. It has got to stop. Everybody now has to stand up and be true to what they believe in.

Finally, Mr Speaker, I hope you will give me time to find and read out some great words:

“The House is made up of 651 robust individuals whose position gives them a powerful say in what the Executive can and cannot do. The powers of the House are sovereign and they have the ability to upset the best-laid plans of Ministers and of Government, which no Minister ever forgets, and nor should any Back Bencher”.

Those words were true then, and they are true now. They were spoken by the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union. Accept the amendment!

Mr Chris Leslie (Nottingham East) (Lab/Co-op): The right hon. Member for Broxtowe (Anna Soubry) has spoken with passion and clarity, and above all she has spoken about courage and about putting our country first. I should like to pay particular tribute to the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), who has done exactly that today. This involved personal sacrifice—and who knows what the electorate might do in the future—but he is using his judgment and making an assessment about what is in the best interests of his constituents, and that is greatly to be respected.

I was fascinated to hear the exchange between the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) and those on the Government Front Bench a moment ago. It seems to me that the obvious solution would be for the Government to signal that they will accept the amendment in lieu tabled by the right hon. and learned Gentleman—

Sir Edward Leigh: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Leslie: No, I am not going to give way. There are lots of others who want to speak—[*Interruption.*] No, sit down.

If the Government were to accept the amendment, and if the House were to approve that—as it would, because this would be done by consensus—that issue would then go to the House of Lords. Through the discussions that would subsequently take place there, it might be amended or tweaked in some way, and there would then be an opportunity for the other place to send it back here for final confirmation. However, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman were simply to take the word of Ministers on this question—I understand that that sometimes happens—the leverage of this House could be lost if those discussions came to naught.

Mr Grieve: We have to be realistic, and there is an issue here. If the Government wanted to accept the entirety of the amendment, that could probably be done this afternoon and that would be the amendment that went back to the Lords, incorporated in theirs. In fairness to the Government, I have always appreciated that there might be some tweaking to be done. I understand that. Having said that, does the hon. Gentleman agree that there needs to be some certainty that the substance of this amendment will come with the acceptance of the Government in the other place?

Mr Leslie: That is right, and a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. I suggest that it is far better to have that amendment in the Bill as it goes to the other place, which may decide to tweak or change it following discussions. That seems to reflect what feels like the majority view in the Chamber today on the need for a sense of certainty that something will be done. This is not just a matter of one Minister, because a Minister’s word can be given and then changed—

Sir William Cash: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr Leslie: No, I will not give way.

Ministers can come and go, but we across this Chamber need that level of certainty. We of course accept the fact that there will be further discussions. The question about taking back control was put to us consistently throughout the referendum. As someone was saying earlier, we obviously cannot call hon. Members hypocrites, but we can point out the hypocrisy in general of the argument of those who might have said in one breath that we should take back control and then had the audacity to come here and say, “Oh well, the UK Parliament clearly has to be cut out of this issue altogether.” I know that we were all elected in 2017 on a mandate drawn up subsequent to the referendum. Our mandate, collectively, has a value, and we should not diminish that and pretend that we should be cut out of this process altogether when there are so many things at stake.

This is not a binary question, and I do not believe that the British people voted to take back control from Brussels only to give that control unilaterally and in its entirety to the Prime Minister and her friends. This is a matter for us, and our constituents would expect nothing less than for us to say, “Hang on a minute, what about our jobs in the manufacturing sector? What about the car industry? What about those who work in the financial services sector?” All the people working in those sectors have the right to expect us to do our job with due diligence.

The right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr Clarke) has rightly pointed out that we could find ourselves in a situation in which no deal is reached because the discussions and negotiations have collapsed. There is no certainty that the motion would then come forward. When the Secretary of State was intervened on and asked what would happen if no deal were to materialise, he said that the Government would come forward with a statement. When he was asked how the Government were going to prevent us from falling over the cliff, no answer was forthcoming. This is an incredibly important point. We have a duty to safeguard our constituents from harm. That harm could affect not only their

livelihoods and their jobs but all the revenues that taxpayers pay towards our public services. So if we care about our NHS, we have to ensure that there is a safeguard in place. If we care about schools and council services, we need this insurance policy in place. We should not go through such a crucially important issue without those particular safeguards.

Mr Jim Cunningham (Coventry South) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend recall that, during the general election, the Prime Minister said that she was being obstructed in Parliament and needed a big majority? Well, she got her answer at that election. Coming back to another point that my hon. Friend has made, the midlands rely on trade, and we should not be jeopardising hundreds of thousands of jobs in the west midlands.

Mr Leslie: My hon. Friend says it perfectly. We would be failing in our duty if we were simply to delegate all our decisions to the Prime Minister and say, “That’s it. Everything has been done.” Leaving the customs union or the single market was not on the ballot paper, and those are things on which we have a right to express our view.

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green) *rose*—

Mr Leslie: I want to conclude. The other problem with the deal is the future relationship, because when that motion comes, my constituents expect that it will be about not just the divorce proceedings, the money and the process of leaving, but what our future relationship will be. It must be. If there is simply a side of A4—a flimsy statement of words—with the famous fudge that we are so used to hearing about stapled as an annex to the back of it, that will be unacceptable. We have a duty to press Ministers to do a proper deal that safeguards our constituents’ interests. As MPs, we must ensure that we exercise pressure on the Government to do things properly.

The right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield clearly now has the majority of the House with him, because we would not see the Government Chief Whip scuttling around so rapidly—I have never seen him move so quickly—trying to find a form of words. I hope that the right hon. and learned Gentleman will take this opportunity to get his amendment in lieu in the Bill now and send it to the House of Lords. The Lords can always amend, change it or look at it again, and we can come back to this next week and do things properly. It is not our fault that only 12 hours were allocated to this whole ridiculous process; we could have had far longer. The Government have made their bed, and they must now lie in it. They set up this process, and they cannot realistically complain, “Ooh, I didn’t have the chance to read this overnight.” If they want a particular change, they need to accept the will of the House. They can always table amendments in the House of Lords. That seems the best way forward.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. With the last speech on the six-minute limit, I call Sir William Cash.

3.30 pm

Sir William Cash: I am somewhat troubled by what the hon. Member for Nottingham East (Mr Leslie) just said, not least because he wants to kick the matter back to the House of Lords. I thought that the whole argument

in respect of the amendment tabled by Viscount Hailsham was about the primacy of the House of Commons. Why would we go back to the other House and ask the Lords for an opinion when it is this House that voted 6:1 in favour of having a referendum? Furthermore, this House endorsed the decision taken by the people to leave the European Union. That is what is now being put under pressure, and it is complete nonsense—junk—to suggest that the amendment about the meaningful vote is not in fact an attempt to reverse the decision of the people.

Sir Edward Leigh: It has been said that the amendment of my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve) is a compromise, but people should read it. Proposed new subsection (5C) is absolutely clear. It states:

“If no political agreement has been reached”,

the Government must come back for

“a resolution in the House of Commons”.

That is exactly the same thing as in proposed new subsection (5) in Lords amendment 19. It is not a compromise; it is a wrecking amendment.

Sir William Cash: I am most grateful to my hon. Friend, because I have the texts of the two amendments in front of me and was just about to make the point that they are not that different. Both state that the Government

“must follow any direction in relation to the negotiations under Article 50(2)...which has been—

(a) approved by a resolution of the House of Commons”.

What on earth is that supposed to mean? There is no way in which this House of Commons—650 Members of Parliament—can arrive at a motion that would prescribe what the Government will do in the negotiations. It is not simply a question whether we are somehow or other departing from normal constitutional procedures; it is that the amendment is complete nonsense and makes no sense.

Furthermore, what would such a resolution say? I heard the right hon. Member for Leeds Central (Hilary Benn), who chairs the Exiting the European Union Committee, talk about the customs union and the single market and so forth. However, the amendments talk about approving a resolution of the House of Commons. Who would devise it? What would it say? How on earth would we get 650 people to agree either on what the motion would say or on what the outcome would be?

I have listened to this debate with great interest, and I must say that this is just a cover for a reversal of the decision. That has to be said, and it has to be said clearly. I find it extraordinary that there should be some attempt to throw the matter to the House of Lords so that they can then tell us—we, the people who are elected by the people of this country, who themselves were given the right by the transfer specifically of the responsibility to make the decision on behalf of themselves, their families and future generations—what to do. This is what people fought and died for, which is who governs this country. I say—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. The hon. Gentleman must be heard. I have never known him to be shouted down, and now is not going to be the first time.

Sir William Cash: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You did quite a good job to shout down the shouter downers.

The reality is that this is about who governs this country. This country is governed ultimately by an Act of Parliament that gave the sovereign right to the people. It was a deliberate and voluntary transfer and—the primacy of the House of Commons rests in this—it was done by 6:1 in this House. Some Opposition Members did not vote for that referendum.

George Freeman (Mid Norfolk) (Con): My hon. Friend knows that I am not a remoaner and that I am completely committed to delivering Brexit, but he is not being fair to the thinking behind the amendment. Many of us are committed to delivering Brexit. Our fear is this, and the question for him is this. I do not want to tie the Prime Minister's hands or to put her negotiations in Europe at the whim of this great colourful Parliament. I want her to be able to go and negotiate, but if we were to vote down a deal or have no deal, is his view that the House would then be locked into accepting no deal, or that this sovereign House at that point should have the ability to say to the Prime Minister, "Go back and push harder."?

Sir William Cash: I absolutely disagree with the notion that this House has the right to overturn the decision taken by the people. Furthermore, approval on the terms of the amendment is completely unacceptable. I repeat that the amendment states that the Government "must follow any direction in relation to the negotiations under Article 50(2)...which has been— approved by a resolution of the House of Commons".

That is not acceptable for one simple reason: the decision was taken by the people. We gave them that decision and we have to stand by it.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. The hon. Gentleman has concluded his oration, and we are grateful to him. The time limit is now reduced with immediate effect to four minutes.

Chris Bryant: The most important point is that we should not be complacent about no deal, first of all for security reasons, which was precisely the point the Prime Minister made in her letter to Donald Tusk notifying the European Commission that we were leaving the European Union. She said in terms:

"In security terms, a failure to reach agreement would mean our cooperation in the fight against crime and terrorism would be weakened."

That was not a threat, but a very simple statement of the truth and of the fact. Consequently, we should not be complacent about the fact that there may be no deal—I do not think the Prime Minister is complacent.

I fear that there is not much overlap in the Venn diagram of what the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Foreign Secretary, Conservative Members and Parliament will vote for and what the European Commission will allow, so there is a real possibility that we will end up with no deal. That is why I say to the Government and to the Solicitor General that we have to have a resolution of this matter today, not in future days.

I was wrong when I said earlier to the former Attorney General, the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), that we could come back to the Lords amendment if we accepted it. However, what

is true is the point made by several hon. Members that, if the Solicitor General accepts the right hon. and learned Gentleman's amendments, they could go back to the House of Lords, which can tidy up afterwards. I honestly say to the Solicitor General that I believe that that is the view of the majority. If I am honest, I believe it is also his view. For that matter, if the Secretary of State were here, and if he were not the Secretary of State, it would probably be his view as well. It was certainly his view in every previous debate that the fundamental principle is that, of course the Government govern, but in the end, Parliament governs the Government.

We have to have government by consent. My anxiety about the way the Government have conducted this whole process is that they do not seem to think that they have enough power. Surely the processes before us today show that they have phenomenal power. We can vote only on matters that the Government allow us to vote on today. The only way we can move forward on the amendment tabled by the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield is if the Minister allows it. The Government have phenomenal power in our system and this is just a brief moment when I think this House would like to say to them, "Go on, you know that that is what the will of the House is. There is no need to divide the Conservative Members. There is no need to divide the House on this. Just accept the amendment from the right hon. and learned Member for Beaconsfield and we can all move forward."

Dr Phillip Lee (Bracknell) (Con): Resigning ministerial office has been an incredibly difficult decision. I did that in order to support my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve)—my trusted friend—in his attempt to amend the Government amendment to Lords amendment 19. I am devastated to have had to take this decision. I owe the House an explanation and there are four points I would make.

For me personally, this is a matter of deep principle. I believe in the Burkean principle that our institutions guarantee our human rights. Most important of all, a Government's first responsibility is to protect their citizens. That is usually understood in military terms, but I believe it applies more generally. It means that, sometimes, when a majority of our people want something that is against the good of society, the Government and Parliament have a responsibility to protect us. That was the case on the death penalty, when for decades politicians went against the majority view and refused to reinstate it. I believe it now needs to be the case on the Brexit process.

Anna Soubry: Congratulations and well done, sir.

Dr Lee: I thank my right hon. Friend for that. I believe there is growing evidence that shows the Brexit policy our Government are currently pursuing to deliver on the 2016 referendum is detrimental to the people we were elected to serve.

Dr Sarah Wollaston (Totnes) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on his courageous decision. Does he agree that there is no majority in this House or in the country for a destructive, cliff-edge, no-deal Brexit?

Dr Lee: I agree with my hon. Friend on that and would add that I am not convinced there is a majority for such a Brexit in my constituency. It is fundamentally

important that Parliament should have a voice so that it can influence the final outcome, in the interests of the people it serves. A fake choice between a potentially bad deal and a cliff-edge no deal—a vote between bad and worse—is not a meaningful choice. It would breach such fundamental principles of human rights and parliamentary sovereignty that we would not recognise it as being valid in other countries, and it is not one that our Parliament should accept. In all conscience, I cannot bring myself to vote for it in this bastion of liberty, freedom and human rights.

The people of Bracknell are my first and most important responsibility, as their Member of Parliament. It now seems inevitable that the people, economy and culture of my constituency will be affected negatively, and I cannot ignore that, as it is to them that I owe my first responsibility, as their Member of Parliament. I must be able to speak out on their behalf on this greatest political issue of our age. It is important at this point to clarify that the Brexit vote in the Bracknell constituency in the 2016 referendum was not clearcut; the Bracknell Forest part of the constituency was marginally in favour of Brexit, whereas the Wokingham part was more strongly in favour of remain. But this is not about whether we Brexit or not. I voted to remain in the 2016 referendum and still believe that, despite the European Union's manifest flaws, that would have been the better strategic course for our country at the time. In this interconnected world, it is nations with allies that will thrive. But we cannot and should not turn back the clock. The point is that, if Brexit is worth doing, it is worth doing well.

It is a huge sacrifice to give up ministerial office. For the past two years, I have been completely committed to enabling our criminal justice system to serve our society better, in a small way bringing some influence to bear to help to make our society more just and secure. The experience has been deeply humbling. I am incredibly sad that I cannot reconcile continuing in ministerial office with representing my constituents' best interests or my own integrity.

I fully support the Prime Minister's leadership and strong Conservative Government. It would be dishonourable, and indeed unprofessional, and it would undermine the leadership that the Prime Minister and our party can give our country, and that it so badly needs at this time, if I were either to keep quiet or to criticise the Government's approach from within. In politics, as in the medical profession, trust and integrity are fundamental. The principle of collective responsibility is also important. That is why I felt that I had to choose this course. I urge my parliamentary colleagues to follow my lead and vote to give our great institution, this House of Commons—and our constituents and our country—the powers it needs to leave our children a legacy of which we can all be proud.

3.45 pm

Kate Hoey (Vauxhall) (Lab): The hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee) said that if Brexit is worth doing, it is worth doing well. I absolutely agree, and I absolutely agree that people in the country want to see Brexit being done well. That means leaving the European Union properly by getting out of the single market and not being in the customs union. If we stay in either of those, we are not really leaving the EU.

I urge the House to reject Lords amendment 19. I spent a few hours—I was going to say “an interesting few hours”, but it was not particularly interesting—reading the entire House of Lords debate on that amendment, as I am sure most Members in the Chamber have. I regret very much that many leading Lords made it clear that they wanted to stop Brexit. I believe that Lords amendment 19, dressed up as it is in the language of parliamentary democracy, is not right and not true. If that means saying that it is disingenuous—if that is the word we have to use—that is what it is, although I would probably use a stronger word.

Mrs Anne Main (St Albans) (Con): Did the hon. Lady note that the right hon. Member for Twickenham (Sir Vince Cable) talked in his speech about the rights of Parliament but not the duties? The duty of this Parliament is to implement the wishes of the British people.

Kate Hoey: I agree with the hon. Lady. I also think that the people of this country will see through Lords amendment 19.

Wera Hobhouse (Bath) (LD): Will the hon. Lady give way?

Kate Hoey: No, I will not.

The people of this country will see that Lords amendment 19 is really about trying to go back on Brexit. Their lordships can say what they want, but that amendment is actually about reversing Brexit. We want to take back control, but taking back control was about the people of this country taking back control and our complying with our constitutional duties as a parliamentary democracy.

The European Commission has tried to be as negative and difficult as possible, and I find it absolutely amazing that anyone would think that if, at the end of the day, we did not negotiate a good deal and we said no, we would send that back for renegotiation. Do hon. Members really think that the European Commission would give us a better deal if it knew that the more obstructive it was, the more likely it would be that any deal would be sent back for renegotiation? The reality is that the European Commission does not want us to leave. It does not want to give us a good deal; it wants to punish us.

Wera Hobhouse: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Kate Hoey: No, I will not.

If Lords amendment 19 is agreed to, it will be a recipe for the EU to try to get no deal so that we will have to go back from this Parliament, cap in hand, and ask for changes. What it really wants is for those changes to be staying in the single market, staying in the customs union, still having the European Court of Justice looking over us, still paying our money—more and more money—and reversing the decision. Whatever is said today, this is really about whether we believe in giving people the right to have their say. We said in the letter that went to everyone, which cost a huge amount of money:

“This is your decision. The Government will implement what you decide.”

Mr John Baron (Basildon and Billericay) (Con): In addition to the referendum, will the hon. Lady reflect on the fact that at last year's general election, both parties stood on a ticket of leaving the customs union,

[Mr John Baron]

ending freedom of movement and repatriating our laws. Both parties were quite unequivocal, and that result needs to be respected.

Kate Hoey: The hon. Gentleman is right that all the manifestos referred to honouring Brexit by leaving the customs union and the single market. Labour put it in a slightly more nuanced way, but, particularly in leave areas, people were told that we would be leaving the single market and the customs union.

This will be very important vote. As we have heard, it is absolutely crucial that we do not allow Lords amendment 19 to be carried. Today we must make a decision. We either support those 17.5 million people who voted to leave, or we say that we will allow people who really want to stop Brexit—by using procedural mechanisms, legal challenges and legal words—to put the whole thing in doubt. I am confident that, in the end, we will not allow the Lords—the unelected House of Lords, which is full of former EU commissioners and people who are funded by the European Union—to decide what we are going to do.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr Speaker: Order. We will now have a three-minute limit.

Mr Harper: In the three minutes available, let me just focus on what I think is at the heart of the argument made by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve). He is trying to deal with a situation in which either we cannot reach agreement, or this House does not support the Government's policy. His approach is well meaning. He is trying to do the right thing, as the Solicitor General indicated during the debate, but his amendment is flawed for two reasons. I am reasonably attracted to the first two provisions, which would give the Government an opportunity to set out an overall strategy and invite the House to support it. I think that that would strengthen the Government's hand, but the third provision is deeply flawed because it would set a time period after which the House would give the Government detailed instructions.

We must remember that this is a negotiation. If I were on the other side of the negotiating table looking at that mandate, I would stall and delay until the Government were in a position in which either they were forced to take whatever poor deal was on offer, or they were forced by this House to do so. That, I know, is not the intention of my right hon. and learned Friend.

The Solicitor General, who is a man of great honour, was making an offer on behalf of the Government. The right way forward is for the House to support the amendment proposed by the Secretary of State. The discussion could then take place, and the Government have given a very clear commitment that they will table an amendment in the House of Lords to reflect that discussion. That is the right way to achieve the outcome that we all want.

Some Members who have spoken in support of that course of action advocated leaving the European Union. I, like many colleagues who are nervous about the amendment tabled by the Secretary of State, advocated

remain. I accept the decision that the public have made. I want to reach a good deal, but I also want the Prime Minister to have the best possible opportunity—the strongest cards to play—to get us such a deal that the House will find acceptable. That is the course that my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield and those who support him ought to follow. The Solicitor General has set out the right course, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Stephen Doughty (Cardiff South and Penarth) (Lab/Co-op): I was utterly horrified when I saw this morning's headlines in *The Sun* and the *Daily Express*. Those particular tabloids do not own patriotism in this country. When we hear a speech such as that made by the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), we know that there are patriots on both sides of this House who are willing to vote with their conscience and with their constituents and the interests of their country at heart. I hope that all hon. Members will examine those three things when they vote today. That is what I intend to do throughout this process. It is what I have been doing, and it is what the hon. Member for Bracknell has made clear that he is going to do.

We have talked a lot about taking back control in this place. Unfortunately, the Government have, on a whole series of occasions, attempted to frustrate this process and Parliament's ability to get information about their plans, whether by keeping papers in the Treasury or attempting to frustrate the release of others. Even for Members who have a wide range of views on Brexit and how the process should go, the Government are attempting to say that it is their way or the highway. That is not acceptable, which is why I support the Lords amendment on a meaningful vote, and I hope that all others will do so as well.

This week, Alex Kalinik—a constituent of mine who campaigned with me for a remain vote in the referendum—sadly died a week before his wedding, aged only in his 30s. He was an individual of great integrity and passion. He worked in the steel industry, but believed passionately in having a close economic relationship with our European partners. Earlier this year, we lost another good friend, Will Cousins, a young man who campaigned passionately as part of the “stronger in” campaign and as a part of Open Britain. Of course, we also lost our very deeply missed friend, Jo Cox, nearly two years ago. Like me, she was passionate about our relationship with our European neighbours.

We are in this place—indeed, in this life—for a very short time. There are some things on which we will compromise, make amends and move over, but when it comes to the very big and defining issues of our time, of which this is one, we should be voting with our conscience and in the interests of our country, and we should be doing so in the interests of a better future for all our constituents.

Charlie Elphicke: When I talk to people on Dover high street about the situation with Europe, they say to me, “Why haven't we left already?” I tell them, “Well, we are now having debates on things like meaningful votes,” and they reply, “But we had a meaningful vote—we had a meaningful vote in a referendum two years ago, and you guys up in Westminster are just endlessly rediscussing that referendum.” In that referendum, I backed remain.

I thought that leaving Europe would be big project that would take up a lot of our capacity as a country, and I urged caution on my constituents, but they were really clear that they wanted to leave the European Union.

We need to respect the result of the referendum. I take a very pragmatic approach that, having had the instructions of my constituents and knowing their clear view, my duty is to discharge the instructions that I have very clearly been democratically given by the people. Those people are my master and I am their servant, so their wishes and requirements ought to be honoured. And that goes for the country as a whole. The country as a whole had a referendum and made a decision. We need to make this work and we need to get the best position for Britain.

That brings me to the next question. When people say, “Parliament should approve this,” what do they really mean? What will they think across the channel? What deal will they want to offer us? The people in the European Commission are not stupid. They can see how the numbers stack up in our Parliament. They can see that, if this provision on a meaningful vote is passed, they could offer us any kind of rubbish deal and the Government would be in a position whereby the Commission would have this country over a barrel. If we want this country to have a really bad deal, measuring the level of this country’s problems in billions of pounds, and if we want to get the worst possible accommodation and the worst possible departure from the European Union, this is how we would achieve it.

That is why, while I have the utmost respect for my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), I would say to him that his proposal is not the right way to proceed. We cannot micromanage the negotiation, but, worse than that, we cannot have a negotiation where we cannot walk away from the table as the other side knows that we will never be able to do so. I urge the House to take the pragmatic approach of supporting the Government’s amendment in lieu, which will enable us to have an effective negotiation and support the national interest.

4 pm

Seema Malhotra: I want to focus my remarks on Lords amendment 19, which is about the fundamental question of the engagement of Parliament in the process and the outcome of Brexit.

It has been argued that the amendment has been tabled to, in essence, frustrate the Brexit process, but that could not be further from the truth. At its heart, this debate is about what we mean by a meaningful vote. The Prime Minister and other senior Ministers have promised Parliament a meaningful vote. I echo the words of the noble Lord Hailsham, who said that

“in a parliamentary system of government, parliamentarians, and in particular Members of the House of Commons, have a right and a duty to determine what is meant by ‘a meaningful vote’.”—*[Official Report, House of Lords, 30 April 2018; Vol. 790, c. 1847.]*

If the decision of Parliament, on the basis of good argument or after effective scrutiny, is to reject the terms of the deal, then Parliament should have the right to determine and suggest further negotiations or options on how we move forward. There is an important principle that did not get as much of an airing in the Secretary of State’s speech as I would have expected—namely, the role of Parliament. In a parliamentary democracy, is it

not right that whatever the outcome, deal or no deal, this country’s future should be determined by Parliament—ultimately, by the House of Commons—and not by Ministers? That is what ought to be meant by a meaningful vote.

It is in the interests of this country for there to be an orderly, stable and predictable Brexit process that enables businesses and families to plan ahead and do all they can to manage the risks of transition—a point often made to me by businesses in my constituency. If the Government are as confident as they make out about getting a good deal, they should have no problem accepting this amendment.

Andrew Bridgen: The hon. Lady claims that she is very worried about the fact that we could have a bad deal or no deal, but will she not concede that in advocating amendment 19, she is more or less guaranteeing that the EU will offer us a bad deal to create a constitutional crisis in our country?

Seema Malhotra: I thank the hon. Gentleman for that comment, but I do not agree.

Legislation is passed in this House not just to plan for when things go well but to provide protections and a route map for actions when things do not go well. There may well be an honest intention to reach a deal by October 2018, but there is no guarantee. I am not talking down the Government’s negotiation attempts, but there is a real possibility that that may not happen.

Let me be clear: this is not about an unnecessary extension of, or thwarting of, the process; it is about providing for clarity in this House, in the circumstances that may arise, about what happens in the final months before Brexit. This can only be helpful in managing the risks of Brexit for our country in the event that a deal is well under way but not reached, or that a deal has not been agreed. It would certainly not be against the spirit of the referendum result, and it could be precisely in the national interest at the time.

Kevin Hollinrake: As a remainder who voted to remain and campaigned heavily to remain, and who would do so again if we ever had another referendum—not that I am advocating that—I think it is fair that Members on both sides of the House raise their concerns about the economy and the effect on jobs and trade. As you know, Mr Speaker, I am still involved in business to this day, so this has a potential personal impact on me. It is quite reasonable that colleagues will want to see the substance of this deal. That is the temptation, but it is not a position I advocate, for a number of reasons.

The Prime Minister has sought to mitigate the effects of leaving, even in difficult circumstances. We have to keep this in perspective and take into account the fact that our exports to the European Union account for around 12% of our trade and of our economy. We also have to remember that the Prime Minister is quite rightly taking a staged approach to withdrawal, which involves staying in the customs union until we have customs processes in place, and maintaining regulatory alignment until we negotiate a reasonable new approach.

Subsection (5) of the new clause proposed in Lords amendment 19 raises the prospect of the Government following “any direction” that Parliament gives. Similarly, new subsection (5C) proposed in amendment (ii) to

[Kevin Hollinrake]

Government amendment (a) in lieu of Lords amendment 19, tabled by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), raises the prospect that Parliament will simply send the Government back to the negotiating table. What will happen if we go back to the negotiating table and the European Union says no? There is no clarity at that point. It opens up and allows the possibility of staying in the EU for an extended time, with no clarity about how long that will be; it may be weeks, months or years. We should remember that those on the other side of the negotiating table do not want the United Kingdom to leave the European Union, and that raises the prospect of their being even more difficult in those negotiations, which are very difficult in the first place.

Angus Brendan MacNeil: I have heard a number of times that the meaningful vote might or would enable the European Union to give us a bad deal. I argue that it is the contrary. A UK Government with any wit about them would say to their negotiating opponents, “We’ll never get this through Parliament unless it is improved.” It actually strengthens their hand in the negotiations, rather than weakens it, if they have any wit about them.

Kevin Hollinrake: I find that assessment of the circumstances very hard to follow. We are not negotiating on our own; we are negotiating with another party, and clearly it is in their interest to put a bad deal on the table in that situation. That would delay the exit process, which is effectively what these amendments seek to do. I am not saying that my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield is looking to frustrate the process of Brexit, but it would delay the process of Brexit and raise the possibility of that process never happening at all. We are handing over the negotiating advantage to the EU.

The Solicitor General: I thank my hon. Friend for giving way. I want to reiterate the commitment that I have given at the Despatch Box on behalf of the Government to further discuss the matter with my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield and others. I am particularly interested in new subsections (5A) and (5B) of his proposals and want to use that as the basis of a structured discussion as we reach the Lords amendments.

Mr Speaker: I advise the hon. Member for Thirsk and Malton that others wish to speak.

Kevin Hollinrake: I am about to conclude, Mr Speaker.

The amendment would hand over the negotiating advantage to the EU and raise the prospect, whether Members intend it or not, that we may never leave. Opposition Members should not support it.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: I would like Members to speak for two minutes each and no more.

Tom Brake: I say to the Secretary of State that if he goes naked to the negotiating table—flaunting it all—it is because he and his supporters have conducted their ideological warfare on the airwaves and in our newspapers, not because of any votes we may have today.

The Liberal Democrats have tabled amendment (a) to Lords amendment 19, which would provide people with a final say on the deal. It would be an opportunity to test the will of the people, and I do not quite understand why the Government—and, indeed, the Brexiteers—are so scared by the concept of testing the will of the people.

We have heard a lot about the will of the people, and I must say that it is now the only reason the Government can deploy for supporting Brexit. If we look at the economic grounds, we know from the impact assessments that it will do us damage. On the diplomatic grounds, our friends despair at what we are doing. On the security grounds, we hear threats and counter-threats about not delivering on the security agenda. On savings, we know there will not be any because, among other things, the Government will have to set up a whole series of parallel institutions doing exactly the same thing as the EU ones. On trade, do we really think we are going to get a huge boost from trade with Trump as a protectionist President?

Our amendment (a) to Lords amendment 19 would provide the people with an opportunity to have their views known on this subject, against a background in which much has changed since the referendum vote two years ago. It would give them a say on the final deal, which they are entitled to and deserve, and I think that would put this issue to bed once and for all.

Mr Jonathan Djanogly (Huntingdon) (Con): The key difference between Lords amendment 19 and Government amendment (a) is that, in the event of a no deal scenario, the Government amendment simply requires a statement, while the Lords amendment in effect grants Parliament a power to issue negotiating directions. On the face of it, it looks attractive to say that if the Government cannot deliver, the Commons should be able to step in, but on these procedural amendments, I can see the other side of the argument.

Governments negotiate treaties, under the terms of the royal prerogative, and Executives govern, and I am not one who would wish to undermine that concept except in the most extreme circumstances. That is what I have been weighing up in recent days. I also recognise that the proposal in Government amendment (a) concedes the Lords request that Parliament should gain a legal right to a veto on an international agreement. I believe that this would be the first time such a veto had been allowed in law in the UK, and it moves us into line with the European Parliament approvals. It is fair to say that, in the past few days, the Government have gone some way to address the concerns on this issue.

In my considerations, I have been no little influenced by the Prime Minister, who I sincerely believe wants the best deal possible for the UK and who is asking to be able to go to the June EU meeting with the freest possible hand. However, if the Prime Minister gets the deal this country needs, even with the Government concession in their amendment (a), there is still no plan B if Parliament then rejects the deal. That is why I think the new compromise, tabled last night by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve), moves towards the balance required in retaining both constitutional integrity and practical requirements. I was therefore very pleased to hear the

Secretary of State say that this issue will now be looked at again in the Lords, and the Solicitor General reinforced that in his earlier comments.

Mr Speaker: I call Frank Field. You have two minutes.

Frank Field: Two great dramas are being played out. The Father of the House asked how we, as part of a representative system of government, should implement a referendum result. There has also been a drama on this side of the House. Two thirds of Labour constituencies voted to leave—

Mike Gapes (Ilford South) (Lab/Co-op): But two thirds of Labour voters voted to remain.

Frank Field: I am not disputing that. If my hon. Friend wants to intervene, he can do so and give me another minute. I am not trying to impugn anybody's motives, but when we signed up to the referendum, rather than the normal four sides of A4 of additions—

The Solicitor General: May I just say to the right hon. Gentleman that with regard to the issues we have been discussing, I and the Government are looking very carefully at amendments that may be tabled in the other place? Such amendments will be the product of any discussions I have with my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Beaconsfield (Mr Grieve).

Frank Field: For the referendum, it was not four sides, but a small telephone directory of people—they are generally talked about in a disdainful way—who were saying they had nowhere else to go. My real concern is what happens to representing those key Labour interests. I hope that there will be those further discussions and, in the process of coming to a good resolution and ensuring that the majority of the two thirds of the Labour constituencies are well represented, may I be part of any of those private discussions?

Antoinette Sandbach: I want to say how grateful I am that the Lords have given the consideration they have to the Bill, and they have improved it considerably before sending it back to us. I accept that the Solicitor General has given an important concession today and I would have supported the Lords amendment had that concession not been made.

Mr Ben Bradshaw (Exeter) (Lab): I think it would be very helpful to the House if the hon. Lady could spell out in a little more detail exactly what the consensus is—

Mr Speaker: Order. I am sorry, but time is up—*[Interruption.]* Order. We are all governed by the programme motion, which the House voted to agree. I have no vote in these matters; the House adopted the programme motion.

4.15 pm

Three hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments, the debate was interrupted (Programme Order, this day).

The Speaker put forthwith the Question already proposed from the Chair (Standing Order No. 83F), That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 110.

The House divided: Ayes 324, Noes 302.

Division No. 166]

[4.15 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Davies, Glyn
Afolami, Bim	Davies, Mims
Afriyie, Adam	Davies, Philip
Aldous, Peter	Davis, rh Mr David
Allan, Lucy	Dinenage, Caroline
Allen, Heidi	Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Argar, Edward	Docherty, Leo
Atkins, Victoria	Dodds, rh Nigel
Bacon, Mr Richard	Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Badenoch, Mrs Kemi	Donelan, Michelle
Baker, Mr Steve	Dorries, Ms Nadine
Baldwin, Harriett	Double, Steve
Barclay, Stephen	Dowden, Oliver
Baron, Mr John	Doyle-Price, Jackie
Bebb, Guto	Drax, Richard
Bellingham, Sir Henry	Duddridge, James
Benyon, rh Richard	Duguid, David
Beresford, Sir Paul	Duncan, rh Sir Alan
Berry, Jake	Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
Blackman, Bob	Dunne, Mr Philip
Blunt, Crispin	Ellis, Michael
Boles, Nick	Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
Bone, Mr Peter	Elphicke, Charlie
Bottomley, Sir Peter	Eustice, George
Bowie, Andrew	Evans, Mr Nigel
Bradley, Ben	Evennett, rh Sir David
Bradley, rh Karen	Fabricant, Michael
Brady, Sir Graham	Fallon, rh Sir Michael
Braverman, Suella	Field, rh Frank
Brereton, Jack	Field, rh Mark
Bridgen, Andrew	Ford, Vicky
Brine, Steve	Foster, Kevin
Brokenshire, rh James	Fox, rh Dr Liam
Bruce, Fiona	Francois, rh Mr Mark
Buckland, Robert	Frazer, Lucy
Burghart, Alex	Freeman, George
Burns, Conor	Freer, Mike
Burt, rh Alistair	Fysh, Mr Marcus
Cairns, rh Alun	Gale, Sir Roger
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Garnier, Mark
Cartlidge, James	Gauke, rh Mr David
Cash, Sir William	Ghani, Ms Nusrat
Caulfield, Maria	Gibb, rh Nick
Chalk, Alex	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
Chishti, Rehman	Girvan, Paul
Chope, Sir Christopher	Glen, John
Churchill, Jo	Goldsmith, Zac
Clark, Colin	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
Clark, rh Greg	Gove, rh Michael
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth	Graham, Luke
Clarke, Mr Simon	Graham, Richard
Cleverly, James	Grant, Bill
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Grant, Mrs Helen
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Gray, James
Collins, Damian	Grayling, rh Chris
Costa, Alberto	Green, Chris
Courts, Robert	Green, rh Damian
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Greening, rh Justine
Crabb, rh Stephen	Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
Crouch, Tracey	Griffiths, Andrew
Davies, Chris	Gyimah, Mr Sam
Davies, David T. C.	Hair, Kirstene

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
Harrison, Trudy
Hart, Simon
Hayes, rh Mr John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris
Heaton-Jones, Peter
Henderson, Gordon
Herbert, rh Nick
Hinds, rh Damian
Hoare, Simon
Hollingbery, George
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Adam
Howell, John
Huddleston, Nigel
Hughes, Eddie
Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
Hurd, rh Mr Nick
Jack, Mr Alister
James, Margot
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Sir 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
Keegan, Gillian
Kennedy, Seema
Kerr, Stephen
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kwarteng, Kwasi
Lamont, John
Lancaster, rh Mark
Latham, Mrs Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Lee, Dr Phillip
Lefroy, Jeremy
Leigh, Sir Edward
Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
Lewer, Andrew
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Lidington, rh Mr David
Little Pengelly, Emma
Lopez, Julia
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Mr Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Mackinlay, Craig
Maclean, Rachel
Main, Mrs Anne

Mak, Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mann, Scott
Masterton, Paul
May, rh Mrs Theresa
McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
McPartland, Stephen
McVey, rh Ms Esther
Menzies, Mark
Mercer, Johnny
Merriman, Huw
Metcalfe, Stephen
Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Milling, Amanda
Mills, Nigel
Milton, rh Anne
Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Moore, Damien
Mordaunt, rh Penny
Morgan, rh Nicky
Morris, Anne Marie
Morris, David
Morris, James
Morton, Wendy
Mundell, rh David
Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Murrison, Dr Andrew
Neill, Robert
Newton, Sarah
Nokes, rh Caroline
Norman, Jesse
O'Brien, Neil
Offord, Dr Matthew
Opperman, Guy
Paisley, Ian
Parish, Neil
Patel, rh Priti
Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Pawsey, Mark
Penning, rh Sir Mike
Penrose, John
Percy, Andrew
Perry, rh Claire
Philp, Chris
Pincher, Christopher
Poulter, Dr Dan
Pow, Rebecca
Prentis, Victoria
Prisk, Mr Mark
Pritchard, Mark
Pursglove, Tom
Quin, Jeremy
Quince, Will
Raab, Dominic
Redwood, rh John
Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Robertson, Mr Laurence
Robinson, Gavin
Robinson, Mary
Rosindell, Andrew
Ross, Douglas
Rowley, Lee
Rudd, rh Amber
Rutley, David
Sandbach, Antoinette
Scully, Paul
Seely, Mr Bob
Selous, Andrew
Shannon, Jim
Shapps, rh Grant
Sharma, Alok

Shelbrooke, Alec
Simpson, David
Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Skidmore, Chris
Smith, Chloe
Smith, Henry
Smith, rh Julian
Smith, Royston
Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Soubry, rh Anna
Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Spencer, Mark
Stephenson, Andrew
Stevenson, John
Stewart, Bob
Stewart, Iain
Stewart, Rory
Stride, rh Mel
Stringer, Graham
Stuart, Graham
Sturdy, Julian
Sunak, Rishi
Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Syms, Sir Robert
Thomas, Derek
Thomson, Ross
Throup, Maggie
Tolhurst, Kelly
Tomlinson, Justin
Tomlinson, Michael

Tracey, Craig
Tredinnick, David
Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Truss, rh Elizabeth
Tugendhat, Tom
Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Vara, Mr Shailesh
Vickers, Martin
Villiers, rh Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watling, Giles
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Whittaker, Craig
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill
Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, rh Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wood, Mike
Wragg, Mr William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Paul Maynard and
Stuart Andrew

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ali, Rushanara
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Amesbury, Mike
Antoniazzi, Tonia
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, rh Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blomfield, Paul
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
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cable, rh Sir Vince
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa

Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Carden, Dan
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Charalambous, Bambos
Cherry, Joanna
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Dakin, Nic
Davey, rh Sir Edward
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Cordova, Marsha
De Piero, Gloria
Dent Coad, Emma
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Dodds, Anneliese
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Peter

Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glendon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan

Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Stephen
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie

Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth

Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 110 disagreed to.

Schedule 7

REGULATIONS

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 128.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 325, Noes 304.

Division No. 167]

[4.31 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve

Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick

Bone, Mr Peter	Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, rh Mr David	Perry, rh Claire
Bottomley, Sir Peter	Francois, rh Mr Mark	Jones, Mr Marcus	Philp, Chris
Bowie, Andrew	Frazer, Lucy	Kawczynski, Daniel	Pincher, Christopher
Bradley, Ben	Freeman, George	Keegan, Gillian	Poulter, Dr Dan
Bradley, rh Karen	Freer, Mike	Kennedy, Seema	Pow, Rebecca
Brady, Sir Graham	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Kerr, Stephen	Prentis, Victoria
Braverman, Suella	Gale, Sir Roger	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Prisk, Mr Mark
Brereton, Jack	Garnier, Mark	Knight, Julian	Pritchard, Mark
Bridgen, Andrew	Gauke, rh Mr David	Kwarteng, Kwasi	Pursglove, Tom
Brine, Steve	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Lamont, John	Quin, Jeremy
Brokenshire, rh James	Gibb, rh Nick	Lancaster, rh Mark	Quince, Will
Bruce, Fiona	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Raab, Dominic
Buckland, Robert	Girvan, Paul	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Redwood, rh John
Burghart, Alex	Glen, John	Lee, Dr Phillip	Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Burns, Conor	Goldsmith, Zac	Lefroy, Jeremy	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Burt, rh Alistair	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Leigh, Sir Edward	Robinson, Gavin
Cairns, rh Alun	Gove, rh Michael	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver	Robinson, Mary
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Graham, Luke	Lewer, Andrew	Rosindell, Andrew
Cartledge, James	Graham, Richard	Lewis, rh Brandon	Ross, Douglas
Cash, Sir William	Grant, Bill	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Rowley, Lee
Caulfield, Maria	Grant, Mrs Helen	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Rudd, rh Amber
Chalk, Alex	Gray, James	Lidington, rh Mr David	Rutley, David
Chishti, Rehman	Grayling, rh Chris	Little Pengelly, Emma	Sandbach, Antoinette
Chope, Sir Christopher	Green, Chris	Lopez, Julia	Scully, Paul
Churchill, Jo	Green, rh Damian	Lopresti, Jack	Seely, Mr Bob
Clark, Colin	Greening, rh Justine	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Selous, Andrew
Clark, rh Greg	Grieve, rh Mr Dominic	Loughton, Tim	Shannon, Jim
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth	Griffiths, Andrew	Mackinlay, Craig	Shapps, rh Grant
Clarke, Mr Simon	Gyimah, Mr Sam	Macleane, Rachel	Sharma, Alok
Cleverly, James	Hair, Kirstene	Main, Mrs Anne	Shelbrooke, Alec
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Halfon, rh Robert	Mak, Alan	Simpson, David
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Hall, Luke	Malthouse, Kit	Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Collins, Damian	Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Mann, Scott	Skidmore, Chris
Costa, Alberto	Hammond, Stephen	Masterton, Paul	Smith, Chloe
Courts, Robert	Hancock, rh Matt	May, rh Mrs Theresa	Smith, Henry
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Hands, rh Greg	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick	Smith, rh Julian
Crabb, rh Stephen	Harper, rh Mr Mark	McPartland, Stephen	Smith, Royston
Crouch, Tracey	Harrington, Richard	McVey, rh Ms Esther	Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Davies, Chris	Harris, Rebecca	Menzies, Mark	Soubry, rh Anna
Davies, David T. C.	Harrison, Trudy	Mercer, Johnny	Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Davies, Glyn	Hart, Simon	Merriman, Huw	Spencer, Mark
Davies, Mims	Hayes, rh Mr John	Metcalfe, Stephen	Stephenson, Andrew
Davies, Philip	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Stevenson, John
Davis, rh Mr David	Heapey, James	Milling, Amanda	Stewart, Bob
Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Mills, Nigel	Stewart, Iain
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Heaton-Jones, Peter	Milton, rh Anne	Stewart, Rory
Docherty, Leo	Henderson, Gordon	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stride, rh Mel
Dodds, rh Nigel	Herbert, rh Nick	Moore, Damien	Stringer, Graham
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hinds, rh Damian	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Stuart, Graham
Donelan, Michelle	Hoare, Simon	Morgan, rh Nicky	Sturdy, Julian
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hoey, Kate	Morris, Anne Marie	Sunak, Rishi
Double, Steve	Hollingbery, George	Morris, David	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Dowden, Oliver	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morris, James	Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Morton, Wendy	Syms, Sir Robert
Drax, Richard	Holloway, Adam	Mundell, rh David	Thomas, Derek
Duddridge, James	Howell, John	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Thomson, Ross
Duguid, David	Huddleston, Nigel	Murrison, Dr Andrew	Throup, Maggie
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Hughes, Eddie	Neill, Robert	Tolhurst, Kelly
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy	Newton, Sarah	Tomlinson, Justin
Dunne, Mr Philip	Hurd, rh Mr Nick	Nokes, rh Caroline	Tomlinson, Michael
Ellis, Michael	Jack, Mr Alister	Norman, Jesse	Tracey, Craig
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	James, Margot	O'Brien, Neil	Tredinnick, David
Elphicke, Charlie	Javid, rh Sajid	Offord, Dr Matthew	Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Eustice, George	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Opperman, Guy	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Paisley, Ian	Tugendhat, Tom
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenkyns, Andrea	Parish, Neil	Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Fabricant, Michael	Jenrick, Robert	Patel, rh Priti	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Johnson, rh Boris	Paterson, rh Mr Owen	Vickers, Martin
Field, rh Frank	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Pawsey, Mark	Villiers, rh Theresa
Field, rh Mark	Johnson, Gareth	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Walker, Mr Charles
Ford, Vicky	Johnson, Joseph	Penrose, John	Walker, Mr Robin
Foster, Kevin	Jones, Andrew	Percy, Andrew	Wallace, rh Mr Ben

Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin

Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Paul Maynard and
Stuart Andrew

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John

Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian

Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Stephen
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.

McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahon, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sherman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin

Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz

Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter

Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Howell, John
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir 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
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengelly, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 128 disagreed to.

Clause 14

INTERPRETATION

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 37.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 326, Noes 301.

Division No. 168]

[4.45 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona

Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishty, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan

Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith

Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross
 Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Paul Maynard and
 Stuart Andrew**

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul

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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim

Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris

Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Stephen
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel

Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debbonaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 37 disagreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 39.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 324, Noes 302.

Division No. 169]

[4.58 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Howell, John
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir 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
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengelly, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit

Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David

Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross
 Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig

Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jo Churchill and
Nigel Adams

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie

Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David

Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan

Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby

Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 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, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex

Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 39 disagreed to.

Schedule 7

REGULATIONS

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 125.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 328, Noes 297.

Division No. 170]

[5.13 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben

Bradley, rh Karen	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Kennedy, Seema	Pincher, Christopher
Brady, Sir Graham	Gale, Sir Roger	Kerr, Stephen	Poulter, Dr Dan
Braverman, Suella	Garnier, Mark	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Pow, Rebecca
Brereton, Jack	Gauke, rh Mr David	Knight, Julian	Prentis, Victoria
Bridgen, Andrew	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Kwarteng, Kwasi	Prisk, Mr Mark
Brine, Steve	Gibb, rh Nick	Lamont, John	Pritchard, Mark
Brokenshire, rh James	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Lancaster, rh Mark	Pursglove, Tom
Bruce, Fiona	Girvan, Paul	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Quin, Jeremy
Buckland, Robert	Glen, John	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Quince, Will
Burghart, Alex	Goldsmith, Zac	Lee, Dr Phillip	Raab, Dominic
Burns, Conor	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Lefroy, Jeremy	Redwood, rh John
Burt, rh Alistair	Gove, rh Michael	Leigh, Sir Edward	Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Cairns, rh Alun	Graham, Luke	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Graham, Richard	Lewer, Andrew	Robinson, Gavin
Campbell, Mr Ronnie	Grant, Bill	Lewis, rh Brandon	Robinson, Mary
Cartlidge, James	Grant, Mrs Helen	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Rosindell, Andrew
Cash, Sir William	Gray, James	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Ross, Douglas
Caulfield, Maria	Grayling, rh Chris	Lidington, rh Mr David	Rowley, Lee
Chalk, Alex	Green, Chris	Little Pengelly, Emma	Rudd, rh Amber
Chishti, Rehman	Green, rh Damian	Lopez, Julia	Rutley, David
Chope, Sir Christopher	Greening, rh Justine	Lopresti, Jack	Sandbach, Antoinette
Clark, Colin	Grieve, rh Mr Dominic	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Scully, Paul
Clark, rh Greg	Griffiths, Andrew	Loughton, Tim	Seely, Mr Bob
Clarke, Mr Simon	Gyimah, Mr Sam	Mackinlay, Craig	Selous, Andrew
Cleverly, James	Hair, Kirstene	Maclean, Rachel	Shannon, Jim
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Halfon, rh Robert	Main, Mrs Anne	Shapps, rh Grant
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Hall, Luke	Mak, Alan	Sharma, Alok
Collins, Damian	Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Malthouse, Kit	Shelbrooke, Alec
Costa, Alberto	Hammond, Stephen	Mann, John	Simpson, David
Courts, Robert	Hancock, rh Matt	Mann, Scott	Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Hands, rh Greg	Masterton, Paul	Skidmore, Chris
Crabb, rh Stephen	Harper, rh Mr Mark	May, rh Mrs Theresa	Skinner, Mr Dennis
Crouch, Tracey	Harrington, Richard	Maynard, Paul	Smith, Chloe
Davies, Chris	Harris, Rebecca	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick	Smith, Henry
Davies, David T. C.	Harrison, Trudy	McPartland, Stephen	Smith, rh Julian
Davies, Glyn	Hart, Simon	McVey, rh Ms Esther	Smith, Royston
Davies, Mims	Hayes, rh Mr John	Menzies, Mark	Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Davies, Philip	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Mercer, Johnny	Soubry, rh Anna
Davis, rh Mr David	Heapey, James	Merriman, Huw	Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Metcalf, Stephen	Spencer, Mark
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Heaton-Jones, Peter	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Stephenson, Andrew
Docherty, Leo	Henderson, Gordon	Milling, Amanda	Stevenson, John
Dodds, rh Nigel	Herbert, rh Nick	Mills, Nigel	Stewart, Bob
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hinds, rh Damian	Milton, rh Anne	Stewart, Iain
Donelan, Michelle	Hoare, Simon	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stewart, Rory
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hoey, Kate	Moore, Damien	Stride, rh Mel
Double, Steve	Hollingbery, George	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Stringer, Graham
Dowden, Oliver	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morgan, rh Nicky	Stuart, Graham
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Morris, Anne Marie	Sturdy, Julian
Drax, Richard	Holloway, Adam	Morris, David	Sunak, Rishi
Duddridge, James	Hopkins, Kelvin	Morris, James	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Duguid, David	Howell, John	Morton, Wendy	Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Huddleston, Nigel	Mundell, rh David	Syms, Sir Robert
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Hughes, Eddie	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Thomas, Derek
Dunne, Mr Philip	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy	Murrison, Dr Andrew	Thomson, Ross
Ellis, Michael	Hurd, rh Mr Nick	Neill, Robert	Throup, Maggie
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	Jack, Mr Alister	Newton, Sarah	Tolhurst, Kelly
Elphicke, Charlie	James, Margot	Nokes, rh Caroline	Tomlinson, Justin
Eustice, George	Javid, rh Sajid	Norman, Jesse	Tomlinson, Michael
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	O'Brien, Neil	Tracey, Craig
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Offord, Dr Matthew	Tredinnick, David
Fabricant, Michael	Jenkyns, Andrea	Opperman, Guy	Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Jenrick, Robert	Paisley, Ian	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Field, rh Frank	Johnson, rh Boris	Parish, Neil	Tugendhat, Tom
Field, rh Mark	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Patel, rh Priti	Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Ford, Vicky	Johnson, Gareth	Paterson, rh Mr Owen	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Foster, Kevin	Johnson, Joseph	Pawsey, Mark	Vickers, Martin
Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, Andrew	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Villiers, rh Theresa
Francois, rh Mr Mark	Jones, rh Mr David	Penrose, John	Walker, Mr Charles
Frazer, Lucy	Jones, Mr Marcus	Percy, Andrew	Walker, Mr Robin
Freeman, George	Kawczynski, Daniel	Perry, rh Claire	Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Freer, Mike	Keegan, Gillian	Philp, Chris	Warburton, David

Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy

Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jo Churchill and
Nigel Adams

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith

Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet

Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz

McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahon, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo

Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, Valerie

Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debbonaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 125 disagreed to.

Tom Brake: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Having failed to secure three days of debate on the Lords amendments through an earlier Liberal Democrat amendment—which we can see was in fact desperately needed, because we are not going to have any time at all to discuss Northern Ireland or the devolution settlements—I must now seek your guidance on another matter.

There is a Liberal Democrat amendment on the amendment paper that would provide for a final say on the deal. It is supported by more than 20 Members of Parliament, and more have indicated that they would support it if it was pushed to a vote, but that is not going to be possible. Indeed, the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), with his new-found freedom, may have wanted to support it.

I seek your advice on what we can do to make our proceedings more transparent to the public and ensure we vote on matters that are dear to the public's heart, such as a final say on the deal. I also seek your advice on how to stop the Government closing down debate on matters that they consider to be uncomfortable or that would expose their incompetence or inconsistency.

Mr Speaker: I am most grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for his point of order and for his courtesy in giving me advance notice of his intention to raise it. Of course I understand his points; he would probably be more than a little perturbed if I did not. To be clear—I think it warrants a simple explanation or statement to the House—all I can do is to select or not select amendments and to decide whom to call to speak. His amendment was selected, and I vividly recall that he was able to make a brief contribution to the debate.

I am as tightly bound by the Standing Orders of the House as the right hon. Gentleman is, and—I say this for wider intelligibility of our proceedings—once the knife has fallen during consideration of Lords amendments, which means in simple parlance once time for debate is up, only Ministers may put propositions to the House. That may dissatisfy some colleagues, but I am sure everyone will accept that we have to operate in accordance with the rules, and where there is no discretion, I cannot assume that there is. I hope that that is at least helpful in explaining how we are doing things and why we are doing what we are doing. I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman.

Before Clause 9

PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL OF THE OUTCOME OF
 NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 19.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 324, Noes 298.

Division No. 171]

[5.30 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishtii, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.

Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew

Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Hopkins, Kelvin
 Howell, John
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir 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
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengelly, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig

Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, John
 Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Maynard, Paul
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew

Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross
 Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin

Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggan, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jo Churchill and
Nigel Adams

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Austin, Ian
 Bailey, Mr Adrian
 Bardell, Hannah
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Berger, Luciana
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan

Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen

Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan

Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess

Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Sherriff, Paula
 Shuker, Mr Gavin
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smeeth, Ruth
 Smith, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Soubry, rh Anna

Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:

Thangam Debbonaire and
 Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 19 disagreed to.

*Government amendments (a) and (b) made in lieu of
 Lords amendment 19.*

Schedule 1

FURTHER PROVISION ABOUT EXCEPTIONS TO SAVINGS AND INCORPORATION

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House
 disagrees with Lords amendment 52.—(Mr David Davis.)*

The House divided: Ayes 326, Noes 301.

Division No. 172]

[5.45 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kerni
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake

Blackman, Bob	Field, rh Mark	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Blunt, Crispin	Ford, Vicky	Johnson, Gareth	Pawsey, Mark
Boles, Nick	Foster, Kevin	Johnson, Joseph	Penning, rh Sir Mike
Bone, Mr Peter	Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, Andrew	Penrose, John
Bottomley, Sir Peter	Francois, rh Mr Mark	Jones, rh Mr David	Percy, Andrew
Bowie, Andrew	Frazer, Lucy	Jones, Mr Marcus	Perry, rh Claire
Bradley, Ben	Freeman, George	Kawczynski, Daniel	Philp, Chris
Bradley, rh Karen	Freer, Mike	Keegan, Gillian	Pincher, Christopher
Brady, Sir Graham	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Kennedy, Seema	Poulter, Dr Dan
Braverman, Suella	Gale, Sir Roger	Kerr, Stephen	Pow, Rebecca
Brereton, Jack	Garnier, Mark	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Prentis, Victoria
Bridgen, Andrew	Gauke, rh Mr David	Knight, Julian	Prisk, Mr Mark
Brine, Steve	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Kwarteng, Kwasi	Pritchard, Mark
Brokenshire, rh James	Gibb, rh Nick	Lamont, John	Pursglove, Tom
Bruce, Fiona	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Lancaster, rh Mark	Quin, Jeremy
Buckland, Robert	Girvan, Paul	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Quince, Will
Burghart, Alex	Glen, John	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Raab, Dominic
Burns, Conor	Goldsmith, Zac	Lee, Dr Phillip	Redwood, rh John
Burt, rh Alistair	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Lefroy, Jeremy	Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Cairns, rh Alun	Gove, rh Michael	Leigh, Sir Edward	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Graham, Luke	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver	Robinson, Gavin
Cartlidge, James	Graham, Richard	Lewer, Andrew	Robinson, Mary
Cash, Sir William	Grant, Bill	Lewis, rh Brandon	Rosindell, Andrew
Caulfield, Maria	Grant, Mrs Helen	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Ross, Douglas
Chalk, Alex	Gray, James	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Rowley, Lee
Chishti, Rehman	Grayling, rh Chris	Lidington, rh Mr David	Rudd, rh Amber
Chope, Sir Christopher	Green, Chris	Little Pengelly, Emma	Rutley, David
Churchill, Jo	Green, rh Damian	Lopez, Julia	Sandbach, Antoinette
Clark, Colin	Greening, rh Justine	Lopresti, Jack	Scully, Paul
Clark, rh Greg	Grieve, rh Mr Dominic	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Seely, Mr Bob
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth	Griffiths, Andrew	Loughton, Tim	Selous, Andrew
Clarke, Mr Simon	Gyimah, Mr Sam	Mackinlay, Craig	Shannon, Jim
Cleverly, James	Hair, Kirstene	Macleane, Rachel	Shapps, rh Grant
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Halfon, rh Robert	Main, Mrs Anne	Sharma, Alok
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Hall, Luke	Mak, Alan	Shelbrooke, Alec
Collins, Damian	Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Malthouse, Kit	Simpson, David
Costa, Alberto	Hammond, Stephen	Mann, Scott	Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Courts, Robert	Hancock, rh Matt	Masterton, Paul	Skidmore, Chris
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Hands, rh Greg	May, rh Mrs Theresa	Smith, Chloe
Crabb, rh Stephen	Harper, rh Mr Mark	Maynard, Paul	Smith, Henry
Crouch, Tracey	Harrington, Richard	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick	Smith, rh Julian
Davies, Chris	Harris, Rebecca	McPartland, Stephen	Smith, Royston
Davies, David T. C.	Harrison, Trudy	McVey, rh Ms Esther	Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Davies, Glyn	Hart, Simon	Menzies, Mark	Soubry, rh Anna
Davies, Mims	Hayes, rh Mr John	Mercer, Johnny	Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Davies, Philip	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Merriman, Huw	Spencer, Mark
Davis, rh Mr David	Heappey, James	Metcalfe, Stephen	Stevenson, John
Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Stewart, Bob
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Heaton-Jones, Peter	Milling, Amanda	Stewart, Iain
Docherty, Leo	Henderson, Gordon	Mills, Nigel	Stewart, Rory
Dodds, rh Nigel	Herbert, rh Nick	Milton, rh Anne	Stride, rh Mel
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hinds, rh Damian	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stringer, Graham
Donelan, Michelle	Hoare, Simon	Moore, Damien	Stuart, Graham
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hoey, Kate	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Sturdy, Julian
Double, Steve	Hollingbery, George	Morgan, rh Nicky	Sunak, Rishi
Dowden, Oliver	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morris, Anne Marie	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Morris, David	Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Drax, Richard	Holloway, Adam	Morris, James	Syms, Sir Robert
Duddridge, James	Hopkins, Kelvin	Morton, Wendy	Thomas, Derek
Duguid, David	Howell, John	Mundell, rh David	Thomson, Ross
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Huddleston, Nigel	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Throup, Maggie
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Hughes, Eddie	Murrison, Dr Andrew	Tolhurst, Kelly
Dunne, Mr Philip	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy	Neill, Robert	Tomlinson, Justin
Ellis, Michael	Hurd, rh Mr Nick	Newton, Sarah	Tomlinson, Michael
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	Jack, Mr Alister	Nokes, rh Caroline	Tracey, Craig
Elphicke, Charlie	James, Margot	Norman, Jesse	Tredinnick, David
Eustice, George	Javid, rh Sajid	O'Brien, Neil	Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Offord, Dr Matthew	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Opperman, Guy	Tugendhat, Tom
Fabricant, Michael	Jenkyns, Andrea	Paisley, Ian	Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Jenrick, Robert	Parish, Neil	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Field, rh Frank	Johnson, rh Boris	Patel, rh Priti	Vickers, Martin

Villiers, rh Theresa
Walker, Mr Charles
Walker, Mr Robin
Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Warburton, David
Warman, Matt
Watling, Giles
Whately, Helen
Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Wiggin, Bill

Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, rh Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wood, Mike
Wragg, Mr William
Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Craig Whittaker and
Andrew Stephenson

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ali, Rushanara
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Amesbury, Mike
Antoniazzi, Tonina
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, rh Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blomfield, Paul
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
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cable, rh Sir Vince
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Carden, Dan
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Charalambous, Bambos
Cherry, Joanna
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John

Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim
Dakin, Nic
Davey, rh Sir Edward
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Cordova, Marsha
De Piero, Gloria
Dent Coad, Emma
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Dodds, Anneliese
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Peter
Drew, Dr David
Dromey, Jack
Duffield, Rosie
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Dame Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Frith, James
Furniss, Gill
Gaffney, Hugh
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
George, Ruth
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Gill, Preet Kaur
Glindon, Mary
Godsiff, Mr Roger
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Grogan, John
Gwynne, Andrew

Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hardy, Emma
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Sir Mark
Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hill, Mike
Hillier, Meg
Hobhouse, Wera
Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Howarth, rh Mr George
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jardine, Christine
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Darren
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham P.
Jones, Helen
Jones, rh Mr Kevan
Jones, Sarah
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Khan, Afzal
Killen, Ged
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Laird, Lesley
Lake, Ben
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Lee, Karen
Leslie, Mr Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Linden, David
Lloyd, Stephen
Lloyd, Tony
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Angus Brendan
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Marsden, Gordon
Martin, Sandy
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm

McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McMahon, Jim
McMorris, Anna
Mearns, Ian
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Moran, Layla
Morden, Jessica
Morgan, Stephen
Morris, Graham
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Norris, Alex
O'Hara, Brendan
O'Mara, Jared
Onasanya, Fiona
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Owen, Albert
Peacock, Stephanie
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pidcock, Laura
Platt, Jo
Pollard, Luke
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rashid, Faisal
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Ellie
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Ms Marie
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rodda, Matt
Rowley, Danielle
Ruane, Chris
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
Ryan, rh Joan
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, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Eleanor
Smith, Laura
Smith, Nick
Smith, Owen

Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen

Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, James

Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Howell, John
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir 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
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengeley, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 Maynard, Paul
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 52 disagreed to.

Clause 7

DEALING WITH DEFICIENCIES ARISING FROM WITHDRAWAL

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House
 disagrees with Lords amendment 10.—(Mr David Davis.)*

The House divided: Ayes 320, Noes 305.

Division No. 173]

[5.58 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishty, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims

Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David

Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross
 Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Craig Whittaker and
 Andrew Stephenson**

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen

Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris

Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Stephen
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel

Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 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, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Moran, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 10 disagreed to.

Clause 17

CONSEQUENTIAL AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISION

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 43.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 322, Noes 306.

Division No. 174]

[6.12 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Andrew, Stuart
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Frank
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill

Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Howell, John
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir 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
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian

Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengeley, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 Maynard, Paul
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew
 Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee

Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
 Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross

Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Craig Whittaker and
 Andrew Stephenson**

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummings, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha

De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry
 George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine

Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Stephen
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan

O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt
 Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 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, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura

Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debbonaire and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 43 disagreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 45.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 317, Noes 306.

Division No. 175]

[6.25 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben

Bradley, rh Karen	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Knight, Julian	Prisk, Mr Mark
Brady, Sir Graham	Gale, Sir Roger	Kwarteng, Kwasi	Pritchard, Mark
Braverman, Suella	Garnier, Mark	Lamont, John	Pursglove, Tom
Brereton, Jack	Gauke, rh Mr David	Lancaster, rh Mark	Quin, Jeremy
Bridgen, Andrew	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Quince, Will
Brine, Steve	Gibb, rh Nick	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Raab, Dominic
Brokenshire, rh James	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Lee, Dr Phillip	Redwood, rh John
Bruce, Fiona	Girvan, Paul	Lefroy, Jeremy	Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
Buckland, Robert	Glen, John	Leigh, Sir Edward	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Burghart, Alex	Goldsmith, Zac	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver	Robinson, Gavin
Burns, Conor	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Lewer, Andrew	Robinson, Mary
Burt, rh Alistair	Gove, rh Michael	Lewis, rh Brandon	Rosindell, Andrew
Cairns, rh Alun	Graham, Luke	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Ross, Douglas
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Graham, Richard	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Rowley, Lee
Cartledge, James	Grant, Bill	Lidington, rh Mr David	Rudd, rh Amber
Cash, Sir William	Grant, Mrs Helen	Little Pengelly, Emma	Rutley, David
Caulfield, Maria	Gray, James	Lopez, Julia	Sandbach, Antoinette
Chalk, Alex	Grayling, rh Chris	Lopresti, Jack	Scully, Paul
Chishti, Rehman	Green, Chris	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Seely, Mr Bob
Chope, Sir Christopher	Green, rh Damian	Loughton, Tim	Selous, Andrew
Churchill, Jo	Greening, rh Justine	Mackinlay, Craig	Shannon, Jim
Clark, Colin	Griffiths, Andrew	Maclean, Rachel	Shapps, rh Grant
Clark, rh Greg	Gyimah, Mr Sam	Main, Mrs Anne	Sharma, Alok
Clarke, Mr Simon	Hair, Kirstene	Mak, Alan	Shelbrooke, Alec
Cleverly, James	Halfon, rh Robert	Malthouse, Kit	Simpson, David
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Hall, Luke	Mann, Scott	Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Masterton, Paul	Skidmore, Chris
Collins, Damian	Hammond, Stephen	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick	Smith, Chloe
Costa, Alberto	Hancock, rh Matt	McPartland, Stephen	Smith, Henry
Courts, Robert	Hands, rh Greg	McVey, rh Ms Esther	Smith, rh Julian
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Harper, rh Mr Mark	Menzies, Mark	Smith, Royston
Crouch, Tracey	Harrington, Richard	Mercer, Johnny	Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Davies, Chris	Harris, Rebecca	Merriman, Huw	Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Davies, David T. C.	Harrison, Trudy	Metcalfe, Stephen	Spencer, Mark
Davies, Glyn	Hart, Simon	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Stephenson, Andrew
Davies, Mims	Hayes, rh Mr John	Milling, Amanda	Stevenson, John
Davies, Philip	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Mills, Nigel	Stewart, Bob
Davis, rh Mr David	Heapey, James	Milton, rh Anne	Stewart, Iain
Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stewart, Rory
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Heaton-Jones, Peter	Moore, Damien	Stride, rh Mel
Docherty, Leo	Henderson, Gordon	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Stuart, Graham
Dodds, rh Nigel	Herbert, rh Nick	Morgan, rh Nicky	Sturdy, Julian
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hinds, rh Damian	Morris, Anne Marie	Sunak, Rishi
Donelan, Michelle	Hoare, Simon	Morris, David	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hollingbery, George	Morris, James	Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Double, Steve	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morton, Wendy	Syms, Sir Robert
Dowden, Oliver	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Mundell, rh David	Thomas, Derek
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Holloway, Adam	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Thomson, Ross
Drax, Richard	Howell, John	Murrison, Dr Andrew	Throup, Maggie
Duddridge, James	Huddleston, Nigel	Neill, Robert	Tolhurst, Kelly
Duguid, David	Hughes, Eddie	Newton, Sarah	Tomlinson, Justin
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy	Nokes, rh Caroline	Tomlinson, Michael
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Hurd, rh Mr Nick	Norman, Jesse	Tracey, Craig
Dunne, Mr Philip	Jack, Mr Alister	O'Brien, Neil	Tredinnick, David
Ellis, Michael	James, Margot	Offord, Dr Matthew	Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	Javid, rh Sajid	Opperman, Guy	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Elphicke, Charlie	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Paisley, Ian	Tugendhat, Tom
Eustice, George	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Parish, Neil	Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jenkyns, Andrea	Patel, rh Priti	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenrick, Robert	Paterson, rh Mr Owen	Vickers, Martin
Fabricant, Michael	Johnson, rh Boris	Pawsey, Mark	Villiers, rh Theresa
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Walker, Mr Charles
Field, rh Mark	Johnson, Gareth	Perrose, John	Walker, Mr Robin
Ford, Vicky	Johnson, Joseph	Percy, Andrew	Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Foster, Kevin	Jones, Andrew	Perry, rh Claire	Warburton, David
Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, rh Mr David	Philp, Chris	Warman, Matt
Francois, rh Mr Mark	Jones, Mr Marcus	Pincher, Christopher	Watling, Giles
Frazer, Lucy	Kawczynski, Daniel	Poulter, Dr Dan	Whately, Helen
Freeman, George	Keegan, Gillian	Pow, Rebecca	Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Freer, Mike	Kennedy, Seema	Prentis, Victoria	Whittaker, Craig
	Kerr, Stephen		Whittingdale, rh Mr John
	Knight, rh Sir Greg		Wiggin, Bill

Williamson, rh Gavin
Wilson, rh Sammy
Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Wood, Mike
Wragg, Mr William

Wright, rh Jeremy
Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Paul Maynard and
Stuart Andrew

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
Abrahams, Debbie
Ali, Rushanara
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Amesbury, Mike
Antoniazzi, Tonia
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, rh Ian
Blackman, Kirsty
Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
Blomfield, Paul
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
Butler, Dawn
Byrne, rh Liam
Cable, rh Sir Vince
Cadbury, Ruth
Cameron, Dr Lisa
Campbell, rh Mr Alan
Campbell, Mr Ronnie
Carden, Dan
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Champion, Sarah
Chapman, Douglas
Chapman, Jenny
Charalambous, Bambos
Cherry, Joanna
Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
Clwyd, rh Ann
Coaker, Vernon
Coffey, Ann
Cooper, Julie
Cooper, Rosie
Cooper, rh Yvette
Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Cowan, Ronnie
Coyle, Neil
Crawley, Angela
Creagh, Mary
Creasy, Stella
Cruddas, Jon
Cryer, John
Cummins, Judith
Cunningham, Alex
Cunningham, Mr Jim

Dakin, Nic
Davey, rh Sir Edward
David, Wayne
Davies, Geraint
Day, Martyn
De Cordova, Marsha
De Piero, Gloria
Dent Coad, Emma
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Dodds, Anneliese
Doughty, Stephen
Dowd, Peter
Drew, Dr David
Dromey, Jack
Duffield, Rosie
Eagle, Ms Angela
Eagle, Maria
Edwards, Jonathan
Efford, Clive
Elliott, Julie
Ellman, Dame Louise
Elmore, Chris
Esterson, Bill
Evans, Chris
Farrelly, Paul
Farron, Tim
Fellows, Marion
Fitzpatrick, Jim
Fletcher, Colleen
Flint, rh Caroline
Flynn, Paul
Fovargue, Yvonne
Foxcroft, Vicky
Frith, James
Furniss, Gill
Gaffney, Hugh
Gapes, Mike
Gardiner, Barry
George, Ruth
Gethins, Stephen
Gibson, Patricia
Gill, Preet Kaur
Glindon, Mary
Godsiff, Mr Roger
Goodman, Helen
Grady, Patrick
Grant, Peter
Gray, Neil
Green, Kate
Greenwood, Lilian
Greenwood, Margaret
Griffith, Nia
Grogan, John
Gwynne, Andrew
Haigh, Louise
Hamilton, Fabian
Hardy, Emma
Harman, rh Ms Harriet
Harris, Carolyn
Hayes, Helen
Hayman, Sue
Healey, rh John
Hendrick, Sir Mark

Hendry, Drew
Hepburn, Mr Stephen
Hermon, Lady
Hill, Mike
Hillier, Meg
Hobhouse, Wera
Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Hollern, Kate
Hosie, Stewart
Howarth, rh Mr George
Huq, Dr Rupa
Hussain, Imran
Jardine, Christine
Jarvis, Dan
Johnson, Diana
Jones, Darren
Jones, Gerald
Jones, Graham P.
Jones, Helen
Jones, rh Mr Kevan
Jones, Sarah
Jones, Susan Elan
Kane, Mike
Keeley, Barbara
Kendall, Liz
Khan, Afzal
Killen, Ged
Kinnock, Stephen
Kyle, Peter
Laird, Lesley
Lake, Ben
Lamb, rh Norman
Lammy, rh Mr David
Lavery, Ian
Law, Chris
Lee, Karen
Leslie, Mr Chris
Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Lewis, Clive
Lewis, Mr Ivan
Linden, David
Lloyd, Stephen
Lloyd, Tony
Long Bailey, Rebecca
Lucas, Caroline
Lucas, Ian C.
Lynch, Holly
MacNeil, Angus Brendan
Madders, Justin
Mahmood, Mr Khalid
Mahmood, Shabana
Malhotra, Seema
Mann, John
Marsden, Gordon
Martin, Sandy
Maskell, Rachael
Matheson, Christian
Mc Nally, John
McCabe, Steve
McCarthy, Kerry
McDonagh, Siobhain
McDonald, Andy
McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
McDonald, Stuart C.
McDonnell, rh John
McFadden, rh Mr Pat
McGinn, Conor
McGovern, Alison
McInnes, Liz
McKinnell, Catherine
McMahon, Jim

McMorrin, Anna
Mearns, Ian
Miliband, rh Edward
Monaghan, Carol
Moon, Mrs Madeleine
Moran, Layla
Morden, Jessica
Morgan, Stephen
Morris, Grahame
Murray, Ian
Nandy, Lisa
Newlands, Gavin
Norris, Alex
O'Hara, Brendan
O'Mara, Jared
Onasanya, Fiona
Onn, Melanie
Onwurah, Chi
Osamor, Kate
Owen, Albert
Peacock, Stephanie
Pearce, Teresa
Pennycook, Matthew
Perkins, Toby
Phillips, Jess
Phillipson, Bridget
Pidcock, Laura
Platt, Jo
Pollard, Luke
Pound, Stephen
Powell, Lucy
Qureshi, Yasmin
Rashid, Faisal
Rayner, Angela
Reed, Mr Steve
Rees, Christina
Reeves, Ellie
Reeves, Rachel
Reynolds, Emma
Reynolds, Jonathan
Rimmer, Ms Marie
Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
Rodda, Matt
Rowley, Danielle
Ruane, Chris
Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
Ryan, rh Joan
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, Angela
Smith, Cat
Smith, Eleanor
Smith, Laura
Smith, Nick
Smith, Owen
Smyth, Karin
Snell, Gareth
Sobel, Alex
Soubry, rh Anna
Spellar, rh John
Starmar, rh Keir
Stephens, Chris
Stevens, Jo

Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie

Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debbonaire and
Jeff Smith

Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan, rh Sir Alan
 Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain
 Dunne, Mr Philip
 Ellis, Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Charlie
 Eustice, George
 Evans, Mr Nigel
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Fabricant, Michael
 Fallon, rh Sir Michael
 Field, rh Mark
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Gauke, rh Mr David
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goldsmith, Zac
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Luke
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Bill
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Greening, rh Justine
 Grieve, rh Mr Dominic
 Griffiths, Andrew
 Gyimah, Mr Sam
 Hair, Kirstene
 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
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Simon
 Hayes, rh Mr John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Heaton-Jones, Peter
 Henderson, Gordon
 Herbert, rh Nick
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Hoey, Kate
 Hollingbery, George
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Howell, John

Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy
 Hurd, rh Mr Nick
 Jack, Mr Alister
 James, Margot
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenner, Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnson, Joseph
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, Gillian
 Kennedy, Seema
 Kerr, Stephen
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kwarteng, Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Lancaster, rh Mark
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Lee, Dr Phillip
 Lefroy, Jeremy
 Leigh, Sir Edward
 Letwin, rh Sir Oliver
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lidington, rh Mr David
 Little Pengelly, Emma
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Maclean, Rachel
 Main, Mrs Anne
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mann, Scott
 Masterton, Paul
 McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Ms Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Milton, rh Anne
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Moore, Damien
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morgan, rh Nicky
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morton, Wendy
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, Dr Andrew

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 45 disagreed to.

Clause 9

IMPLEMENTING THE WITHDRAWAL AGREEMENT

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 20.—(Mr David Davis.)

The House divided: Ayes 321, Noes 305.

Division No. 176]

[6.38 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Allen, Heidi
 Argar, Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Mrs Kemi
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, Stephen
 Baron, Mr John
 Bebb, Guto
 Bellingham, Sir Henry
 Benyon, rh Richard
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, Jake
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Boles, Nick
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Brady, Sir Graham
 Braverman, Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buckland, Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, Conor
 Burt, rh Alistair

Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, Colin
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Cleverly, James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, Dr Thérèse
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Cox, Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crouch, Tracey
 Davies, Chris
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Glyn
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Dodds, rh Nigel
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard

Neill, Robert
 Newton, Sarah
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Perry, rh Claire
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Prisk, Mr Mark
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, Dominic
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Rudd, rh Amber
 Rutley, David
 Sandbach, Antoinette
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Mr Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, Alok
 Shelbrooke, Alec
 Simpson, David
 Simpson, rh Mr Keith
 Skidmore, Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Soames, rh Sir Nicholas

Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
 Spencer, Mark
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stewart, Rory
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stringer, Graham
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, Rishi
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Swire, rh Sir Hugo
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Thomson, Ross
 Throup, Maggie
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Tredinnick, David
 Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Mr Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wollaston, Dr Sarah
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:

**Paul Maynard and
 Stuart Andrew**

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 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, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blackman-Woods, Dr Roberta
 Blomfield, Paul
 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

Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cable, rh Sir Vince
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Mr Alan
 Campbell, Mr Ronnie
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Chapman, Jenny
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth
 Clwyd, rh Ann
 Coaker, Vernon
 Coffey, Ann
 Cooper, Julie
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creagh, Mary
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Cunningham, Mr Jim
 Dakin, Nic
 Davey, rh Sir Edward
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 De Piero, Gloria
 Dent Coad, Emma
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Drew, Dr David
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Ellman, Dame Louise
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farrelly, Paul
 Farron, Tim
 Fellows, Marion
 Fitzpatrick, Jim
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flint, rh Caroline
 Flynn, Paul
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Frith, James
 Furniss, Gill
 Gaffney, Hugh
 Gapes, Mike
 Gardiner, Barry

George, Ruth
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Godsiff, Mr Roger
 Goodman, Helen
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Grogan, John
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hayman, Sue
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hepburn, Mr Stephen
 Hermon, Lady
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Mr George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Diana
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Graham P.
 Jones, Helen
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Sarah
 Jones, Susan Elan
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Killen, Ged
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Laird, Lesley
 Lake, Ben
 Lamb, rh Norman
 Lammey, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lee, Karen
 Leslie, Mr Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lewis, Mr Ivan
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lucas, Ian C.
 Lynch, Holly

MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Mann, John
 Marsden, Gordon
 Martin, Sandy
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McInnes, Liz
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moon, Mrs Madeleine
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 O'Mara, Jared
 Onasanya, Fiona
 Onn, Melanie
 Onwurah, Chi
 Osamor, Kate
 Owen, Albert
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pearce, Teresa
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pidcock, Laura
 Platt, Jo
 Pollard, Luke
 Pound, Stephen
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rashid, Faisal
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Mr Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Emma
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Mr Geoffrey
 Rodda, Matt

Rowley, Danielle
 Ruane, Chris
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Ryan, rh Joan
 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, Angela
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Eleanor
 Smith, Laura
 Smith, Nick
 Smith, Owen
 Smyth, Karin
 Snell, Gareth
 Sobel, Alex
 Soubry, rh Anna
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Sweeney, Mr Paul
 Swinson, Jo
 Tami, Mark
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turley, Anna
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twigg, Stephen
 Twist, Liz
 Umunna, Chuka
 Vaz, rh Keith
 Vaz, Valerie
 Walker, Thelma
 Watson, Tom
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitfield, Martin
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Williams, Dr Paul
 Williamson, Chris
 Wilson, Phil
 Wishart, Pete
 Woodcock, John
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Thangam Debonnaire and
Jeff Smith

Mr Paul Sweeney (Glasgow North East) (Lab/Co-op): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I want to raise a real concern among Labour Members. We voted against the programme motion—we presented an alternative—and we will not be able to debate our amendment on the devolution settlement in the House because we will not have sufficient time. We therefore—*[Interruption.]*

Mr Speaker: Order. Mr Bowie, you are usually the epitome of urbanity and restraint. There is an enormous amount of gesticulation taking place of a very unseemly character, of which our witnesses, sitting cerebrally in the Gallery, would almost certainly very strongly disapprove. *[Interruption.]* Order. A Government Whip chunters from a sedentary position, “They love it.” I do not know whether he has conducted his own opinion poll, but they may not be a homogeneous group—some of them may love it and some of them may not, but we do not know. We are going to hear from the hon. Member for Glasgow North East (Mr Sweeney), who is himself a most cerebral individual, and then we will proceed.

Mr Sweeney: Insufficient parliamentary time has been allocated for debate. We presented an alternative programme motion that would have afforded sufficient time. I therefore seek your advice, Mr Speaker, in relation to how the Labour party will stand up for the people of Scotland and the devolution settlement, and how we can deliver that amendment. It is not acceptable that we are unable to debate it in Government time, so we seek your advice.

Mr Speaker: I always take the hon. Gentleman extremely seriously—*[Interruption.]* Order. I most certainly do. He is a very assiduous new Member of this House, and I do. However, I hope he will not take it amiss if I say that I think what he has just said amounted to a declaration of intent on his own behalf and that of his colleagues to get his message across. I am not sure that, in any meaningful sense at this point, he is really in need of my advice. In so far as he wants my advice, my general advice to all colleagues is a word beginning with p and ending with t—persist. Persist, man!

Ian Blackford (Ross, Skye and Lochaber) (SNP) *rose*—

Angus Brendan MacNeil *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. I think that it is better if we—*[Interruption.]* Order. I am saving the right hon. Member for Ross, Skye and Lochaber (Ian Blackford) up; it would be a pity to squander him too early in our proceedings—*[Interruption.]* Order. The hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry) should calm herself. I will hear fully from the right hon. Gentleman when he is ready. All I am suggesting to colleagues—it is hardly a controversial proposition—is that it might be tidy if we first dispose of the remaining amendments in the group. I will hear the right hon. Gentleman either before or after the second group of amendments, the choice being his. The idea that that should evoke headshaking and disapproval is frankly beyond credulity. The leader of the Scottish National party, whose point of order it is, seems perfectly content with that proposed arrangement, and I am grateful to him for his nod from a sedentary position in confirmation of that important fact.

Angus Brendan MacNeil *rose*—

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 20 disagreed to.

Mr Speaker: I am coming to the hon. Gentleman, too.

Lords amendments 11 to 14, 18, 21 to 23, 44, 47, 102 to 107, 112, 113, 115 to 119, 121 to 124, 126, 127, 130 to 134, 136 to 140, 142 to 148, 150, 152, 154, 156 to 158, 171 and 172 agreed to, with Commons financial privileges waived in respect of Lords amendments 13, 18, 22 and 121 to 124.

Mr Speaker: As the House is in a state of repose, I suggest, building on earlier conversations that perfectly properly took place with the Chair, that we come now to the next Lords amendment, but if the right hon. Member for Ross, Skye and Lochaber, who leads his party, would prefer to raise his point of order now, I will be perfectly sanguine about that.

Ian Blackford indicated dissent.

Mr Speaker: No. He will come to it afterwards. Very good; I am grateful to him for his guidance.

Before Clause 10

CONTINUATION OF NORTH-SOUTH CO-OPERATION AND THE PREVENTION OF NEW BORDER ARRANGEMENTS

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Minister for the Cabinet Office (Mr David Lidington): I beg to move Government amendment (a) to Lords amendment 25.

Mr Speaker: With this it will be convenient to discuss the following:

Lords amendment 25, and Government amendments (b) to (e) thereto.

Lords amendments 15 to 17.

Lords amendment 26, and amendments (a) to (k) thereto.

Lords amendments 27 to 31, 46, 48 to 50 and 54 to 58.

Lords amendment 59, and amendments (a) to (d) thereto.

Lords amendments 60 to 101, 108, 109, 111, 114, 120, 129, 135, 141, 149, 151, 153, 155, 162, 165, 169, and 173 to 196.

Mr Lidington: This group of amendments covers two subjects: first, the operation of competences returning to this country from the European Union that intersect with devolved competences under the three devolution settlements; and, secondly, the Lords amendment on Northern Ireland and the Belfast agreement.

Let me turn first to the matters that apply to devolution. In its original form, the Bill, in what was then clause 11, provided for all those powers to be held initially at Westminster and transferred to a devolved level only when agreement had been reached on an appropriate UK-wide framework to protect and preserve the UK single market and respect our international obligations. The key charge against the old clause was that it was not right to hold otherwise devolved powers returning from the EU in Westminster by default.

Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire) (SNP): Is the right hon. Gentleman not ashamed, embarrassed and appalled that we have only 15 minutes to discuss

these critical devolution issues? These amendments were designed in the House of Lords, but we, the directly elected Members, have not had the opportunity to debate them. Is he not ashamed of himself?

Mr Lidington: No. I think that the Government allowed perfectly adequate time for debate on these issues. As the hon. Gentleman knows, these questions on devolution matters have been discussed in great detail by me, my Ministers and officials, and the Welsh and Scottish Governments and legislatures for many months. As I hope to explain, the Government have made very substantial compromises to address precisely the concerns raised by both Scotland and Wales. I am pleased that the Welsh Government have accepted the merits of the compromise we proposed and reached an agreement.

7 pm

We listened carefully to the contributions made by hon. Members and Members of the House of Lords, the views of the devolved Governments and legislatures, and the concerns of business and other stakeholders, particularly those in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The revised approach we worked on with the Scottish and Welsh Governments means that, by default, all decision-making powers returning from the EU that intersect with devolved competence will pass directly to Cardiff, Edinburgh and Belfast unless we take explicit steps to preserve temporarily an existing EU framework. Of the 153 areas of policy returning from Brussels that intersect with devolved competences, the great majority will now go straight to the devolved level. Some will require a non-legislative framework such as a memorandum of understanding. In only 24 out of 153 areas of policy do we think that a legislative framework would be needed and that we may need to consider a temporary freeze of current arrangements exercised at EU level, which have been accepted by the devolved Governments in Scotland and Wales for many, many years. We would do so to give certainty and clarity for businesses.

We have also addressed criticisms that the effect of the old clause 11—now clause 15—might be indefinite, despite our clear intention that the arrangement should be temporary. That matter has been firmly put to bed. We are subjecting the powers we seek in the Bill to a sunset provision, meaning that freezing regulations can be made only for up to two years after exit day, following which the power to make regulations will lapse all together. Regulations made under this power may only last for a maximum of up to five years. We hope that in most cases we will be able to get agreement on a long-term future UK framework to protect the United Kingdom's internal market and that the freezing power can therefore be ended much sooner than the five-year maximum period.

Martin Whitfield (East Lothian) (Lab): Does not the Minister agree that there might be more confidence in the Government's approach if he had managed to table his amendments in this House before the Bill went to the other place?

Mr Lidington: The purpose of a parliamentary process is to examine in detail. In respect of these clauses, the House of Lords has done its job as a constructive revising Chamber. I certainly had very good conversations

with Members of the House of Lords from the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties, as well as those from my own party and Cross Benchers. As I said, we continued very detailed conversations with not just the Welsh Government, who have agreed, but the Scottish Government. I want to put on record that although we have not been able to reach a final agreement, the Scottish Government have engaged for many months in a very constructive fashion. Many of the detailed changes embodied in this group of amendments actually reflect things that the Scottish Government, as well as the Welsh Government, sought from us.

We have, alongside the amendments, designed, working with the devolved Governments, a comprehensive intergovernmental agreement. This makes it clear that the UK Government will always seek agreement from the devolved Governments and should act by agreement, wherever possible. In response to the request from both Wales and Scotland, we have underpinned that principle with a commitment that we will not normally ask the UK Parliament to approve regulations to preserve existing frameworks without devolved consent for those regulations.

Jonathan Edwards (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (PC): Is it not the case that the Minister is placing legal constraints on the Governments of Wales and Scotland, but only political constraints on the Westminster Government?

Mr Lidington: It is simply not possible, by legislation, to constrain the UK Parliament. The UK Parliament is sovereign. I know the hon. Gentleman's party in the Welsh Assembly opposed the compromise on offer, but I was very pleased to see that the Labour Government in Wales and the Liberal Democrats in Wales were prepared to accept what I thought was a reasonable compromise, to vote in favour of a legislative consent motion and to commit themselves to repeal the Welsh Government's continuity Bill at the earliest possible occasion.

The Scottish and Welsh Governments have also been clear that we should not try to use these regulations as a mechanism to avoid seeking legislative consent when creating future frameworks. We agree, and we have spelled that out in terms in the agreement. They asked us for a guarantee that we would not legislate for England where devolved powers to legislate for their respective nations were frozen, and we have put that into the agreement as well. That is why I do not accept the case that has been put forward by the Scottish Government for withholding consent for these proposals.

Ian Blackford: I am grateful to the Minister for giving way. Does he not acknowledge that when we passed the Scotland Act 1998—the right hon. Gentleman was a Member of Parliament at the time—it was very specific about what are reserved matters? We cannot get away from the fact that what this Government are doing is legislating on matters that are devolved. This is a power grab. Will the Secretary of State commit today not to legislate without a legislative consent motion from the Scottish Parliament on behalf of the Scottish people?

Mr Lidington: Not only do the agreements that we have reached with the Welsh Government and embodied in these amendments respect the devolution settlement—

indeed, Welsh Ministers have said very firmly that they believe that devolution is fully respected—but I think that we have complied in full with our obligations under the Sewel convention. The right hon. Gentleman should look again at the statement by Mr Mike Russell, the Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe from the Scottish Government, who described the situation we are in as a “novel” one and said:

“In normal times, such a bill would follow a normal timetable, but these are not normal times.”—[*Scottish Parliament, Official Report*, 1 March 2018; c. 29.]

It is the Scottish Government who are saying that we are not in a normal situation.

Ross Thomson (Aberdeen South) (Con): At a time when President Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un, the most difficult of partners, can show that an agreement can be reached, is it not telling that the only person who cannot reach an agreement is Nicola Sturgeon, because all the SNP cares about is grievance and independence?

Mr Lidington: My hon. Friend puts his finger on the truth. It is of course a great disappointment that the Labour party in the Scottish Parliament, despite its protestations of Unionism, on this occasion decided to ally itself with the Scottish nationalists.

Luke Graham (Ochil and South Perthshire) (Con): Will my right hon. Friend confirm that the 119 powers coming to the Scottish Parliament and the 24 powers being reserved are exactly what people in Scotland want? It strengthens devolution but maintains Scotland in the United Kingdom. Does he also agree that perhaps if Holyrood had had more than 25 hours of debate versus the 252 hours of debate here, we could have reached an agreement, and we would not be here today?

Mr Lidington: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for reminding the House that we should bear in mind, when listening to the criticisms of the allocation of time here, that it is sometimes a question of people living in a glass house flinging rocks around. I say to him, too, that of course Scottish business has been very clear that we need UK-wide frameworks to protect a single UK market that brings great benefits both to Scottish business and Scottish consumers. It is only a few weeks since the Scottish Retail Consortium, the Scottish Food and Drink Federation and the Scottish Bakers said in terms in public that the maintenance of United Kingdom-wide frameworks on such matters as food standards and food labelling was of vital importance to the future wellbeing of their member companies and the customers whom they serve.

Ian Murray: While Government MPs and the SNP fight over flags, I would rather fight for my constituents, so can the Minister tell the House when I will be able to debate this particular clause on behalf of my constituents, because this elected House has had no time either to debate that clause or the very important issues in Northern Ireland and in Wales?

Mr Lidington: I say to the hon. Gentleman, who I suspect does not share the views of the Labour party at Holyrood on this matter, that he should address his concerns and criticisms to his own Front-Bench team. It was their decision to divide, but it was approaching

[Mr Lidington]

the ridiculous for us to have three separate Divisions on whether the word “necessary” should replace the word “appropriate”. It was open to the Opposition to accept a single vote grouping those three amendments, but they chose not to, and that has used up a significant amount of our time.

We have ensured that no existing power will be taken from the devolved institutions and have provided for a significant increase in the decision-making powers of the devolved Administrations after exit. In doing so, however, we have also made sure that we do not compromise on those important common approaches we have to safeguard our internal market, manage our common resources and allow us to be an open and competitive trading nation as we develop new arrangements to replace the EU frameworks.

Jenny Chapman (Darlington) (Lab): Will the Minister accept that the programme motion passed earlier today has led to the ridiculous situation that these important amendments, including amendments on the Irish border, have to be debated in such a short period and it looks as though his is the only voice that will be heard?

Mr Lidington: There is a balance between my giving way frequently and allowing more time for others to speak. I repeat to the hon. Lady that it was the choice of her Front-Bench team to have 11 or 12 Divisions, in a number of cases duplicating in one Division what had already been determined in another.

I will turn now to Lords amendment 25 on the Northern Ireland border. In many ways, the amendment is, as a number of noble Lords noted, a statement of Government policy and was prompted very eloquently in the Lords by my noble Friend Lord Patten. It seeks to ensure that we will not act incompatibly with the Northern Ireland Act 1998 and that we will have due regard to the joint report of December last year. It seeks to protect north-south co-operation between Northern Ireland and Ireland and to prevent, among other things, physical infrastructure on the border with Ireland.

Nigel Dodds (Belfast North) (DUP): I welcome the decision to tidy up the jurisdiction and sovereignty issues raised in the House of Lords in the Patten amendment. Will the Minister confirm that the powers in the amendment are restricted purely to the purposes of the Bill?

Mr Lidington: I can confirm that the right hon. Gentleman’s interpretation of the Government amendment in lieu is exactly as he has described.

Lady Hermon (North Down) (Ind): The Minister will be well aware that there is considerable concern in Northern Ireland that we should have no hard border. The Government have repeatedly confirmed their commitment to that, and I do not doubt the Minister’s bona fides, but that commitment appears to be contradicted on the ground by decisions of the Chief Constable of the Police Service of Northern Ireland, who has in recent weeks asked for funding for up to 400 additional police officers for operational duties along the border post Brexit and, significantly, is retaining three disused

border police stations. What does the Minister think he is doing? Is he preparing for a hard border?

Mr Lidington: As the hon. Lady knows, Ministers in the United Kingdom Government have no power to direct or even give guidance to the Chief Constable of the Police Service of Northern Ireland or the Northern Ireland Policing Board. The Government could not have been clearer about our commitment to ensuring no hard border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. That was a key element of the joint report agreed last December, and it is a commitment that the Prime Minister described in her Mansion House speech as a fundamental underlying principle of our approach to our negotiations with the European Union.

We said in the House of Lords that we agreed with the spirit and intent of Lord Patten’s amendment, but that it was not drafted in a legally appropriate way. We therefore tabled a number of amendments to try to tidy it up and ensure that it was in a fit form, which I hope will command consensus in the House. It reflects the reality that the withdrawal agreement—

7.15 pm

Six hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments, the proceedings were interrupted (Programme Order, this day).

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

Government amendments (a) to (e) made to Lords amendment 25.

Lords amendment 25, as amended, agreed to.

Question put, That this House agrees with Lords amendments 15 to 17, 26 to 31, 46, 48 to 50, 54 to 101, 108, 109, 111, 114, 120, 129, 135, 141, 149, 151, 153, 155, 162, 165, 169 and 173 to 196.

The House divided: Ayes 321, Noes 40.

Division No. 177]

[7.16 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Bradley, Ben
Afolami, Bim	Bradley, rh Karen
Afriyie, Adam	Brady, Sir Graham
Aldous, Peter	Braverman, Suella
Allan, Lucy	Brereton, Jack
Allen, Heidi	Bridgen, Andrew
Argar, Edward	Brine, Steve
Atkins, Victoria	Brokenshire, rh James
Bacon, Mr Richard	Bruce, Fiona
Badenoch, Mrs Kemi	Buckland, Robert
Baker, Mr Steve	Burghart, Alex
Baldwin, Harriett	Burns, Conor
Barclay, Stephen	Burt, rh Alistair
Baron, Mr John	Cairns, rh Alun
Bebb, Guto	Campbell, Mr Gregory
Bellingham, Sir Henry	Cartledge, James
Benyon, rh Richard	Cash, Sir William
Beresford, Sir Paul	Caulfield, Maria
Berry, Jake	Chalk, Alex
Blackman, Bob	Chishti, Rehman
Blunt, Crispin	Chope, Sir Christopher
Boles, Nick	Churchill, Jo
Bone, Mr Peter	Clark, Colin
Bottomley, Sir Peter	Clark, rh Greg
Bowie, Andrew	Clarke, rh Mr Kenneth

Clarke, Mr Simon	Hair, Kirstene	Main, Mrs Anne	Seely, Mr Bob
Cleverly, James	Halfon, rh Robert	Mak, Alan	Selous, Andrew
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Hall, Luke	Malthouse, Kit	Shannon, Jim
Coffey, Dr Thérèse	Hammond, rh Mr Philip	Mann, Scott	Shapps, rh Grant
Collins, Damian	Hammond, Stephen	Masterton, Paul	Sharma, Alok
Costa, Alberto	Hancock, rh Matt	McLoughlin, rh Sir Patrick	Shelbrooke, Alec
Courts, Robert	Hands, rh Greg	McPartland, Stephen	Simpson, David
Cox, Mr Geoffrey	Harper, rh Mr Mark	McVey, rh Ms Esther	Simpson, rh Mr Keith
Crabb, rh Stephen	Harrington, Richard	Menzies, Mark	Skidmore, Chris
Crouch, Tracey	Harris, Rebecca	Mercer, Johnny	Smith, Chloe
Davies, Chris	Harrison, Trudy	Merriman, Huw	Smith, Henry
Davies, David T. C.	Hart, Simon	Metcalfe, Stephen	Smith, rh Julian
Davies, Glyn	Hayes, rh Mr John	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Smith, Royston
Davies, Mims	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Milling, Amanda	Soames, rh Sir Nicholas
Davies, Philip	Heapey, James	Mills, Nigel	Spelman, rh Dame Caroline
Davis, rh Mr David	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Milton, rh Anne	Spencer, Mark
Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Jones, Peter	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stephenson, Andrew
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Henderson, Gordon	Moore, Damien	Stevenson, John
Docherty, Leo	Herbert, rh Nick	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Stewart, Bob
Dodds, rh Nigel	Hinds, rh Damian	Morgan, rh Nicky	Stewart, Iain
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Hoare, Simon	Morris, Anne Marie	Stewart, Rory
Donelan, Michelle	Hobhouse, Wera	Morris, David	Stride, rh Mel
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hoey, Kate	Morris, James	Stuart, Graham
Double, Steve	Hollingbery, George	Morton, Wendy	Sturdy, Julian
Dowden, Oliver	Hollinrake, Kevin	Mundell, rh David	Sunak, Rishi
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Drax, Richard	Holloway, Adam	Murrison, Dr Andrew	Swire, rh Sir Hugo
Duddridge, James	Howell, John	Neill, Robert	Syms, Sir Robert
Duguid, David	Huddleston, Nigel	Newton, Sarah	Thomas, Derek
Duncan, rh Sir Alan	Hughes, Eddie	Nokes, rh Caroline	Thomson, Ross
Duncan Smith, rh Mr Iain	Hunt, rh Mr Jeremy	Norman, Jesse	Throup, Maggie
Dunne, Mr Philip	Hurd, rh Mr Nick	O'Brien, Neil	Tolhurst, Kelly
Ellis, Michael	Jack, Mr Alister	Offord, Dr Matthew	Tomlinson, Justin
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	James, Margot	Opperman, Guy	Tomlinson, Michael
Elphicke, Charlie	Javid, rh Sajid	Paisley, Ian	Tracey, Craig
Eustice, George	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Parish, Neil	Tredinnick, David
Evans, Mr Nigel	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Patel, rh Priti	Trevelyan, Mrs Anne-Marie
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenkyins, Andrea	Paterson, rh Mr Owen	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Fabricant, Michael	Jenrick, Robert	Pawsey, Mark	Tugendhat, Tom
Fallon, rh Sir Michael	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Vaizey, rh Mr Edward
Field, rh Mark	Johnson, Gareth	Penrose, John	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Ford, Vicky	Johnson, Joseph	Percy, Andrew	Vickers, Martin
Foster, Kevin	Jones, Andrew	Perry, rh Claire	Villiers, rh Theresa
Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jones, rh Mr David	Philp, Chris	Walker, Mr Charles
Francois, rh Mr Mark	Jones, Mr Marcus	Pincher, Christopher	Walker, Mr Robin
Frazer, Lucy	Kawczynski, Daniel	Poulter, Dr Dan	Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Freeman, George	Keegan, Gillian	Pow, Rebecca	Warburton, David
Freer, Mike	Kennedy, Seema	Prentis, Victoria	Warman, Matt
Fysh, Mr Marcus	Kerr, Stephen	Prisk, Mr Mark	Watling, Giles
Gale, Sir Roger	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Pritchard, Mark	Whately, Helen
Garnier, Mark	Knight, Julian	Pursglove, Tom	Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Gauke, rh Mr David	Kwarteng, Kwasi	Quin, Jeremy	Whittaker, Craig
Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Lamont, John	Quince, Will	Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Gibb, rh Nick	Lancaster, rh Mark	Raab, Dominic	Wiggin, Bill
Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Redwood, rh John	Williamson, rh Gavin
Girvan, Paul	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Rees-Mogg, Mr Jacob	Wilson, rh Sammy
Glen, John	Lee, Dr Phillip	Robertson, Mr Laurence	Wollaston, Dr Sarah
Goldsmith, Zac	Lefroy, Jeremy	Robinson, Gavin	Wood, Mike
Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Leigh, Sir Edward	Robinson, Mary	Wragg, Mr William
Gove, rh Michael	Letwin, rh Sir Oliver	Rosindell, Andrew	Wright, rh Jeremy
Graham, Luke	Lewer, Andrew	Ross, Douglas	Zahawi, Nadhim
Graham, Richard	Lewis, rh Brandon	Rowley, Lee	
Grant, Bill	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Rudd, rh Amber	
Grant, Mrs Helen	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Rutley, David	
Gray, James	Lidington, rh Mr David	Sandbach, Antoinette	
Grayling, rh Chris	Little Pengelly, Emma	Scully, Paul	
Green, Chris	Lopez, Julia		
Green, rh Damian	Lopresti, Jack		
Greening, rh Justine	Lord, Mr Jonathan		
Grieve, rh Mr Dominic	Loughton, Tim		
Griffiths, Andrew	Mackinlay, Craig		
Gyimah, Mr Sam	Maclean, Rachel		
		Bardell, Hannah	
		Black, Mhairi	
		Blackford, rh Ian	
			Tellers for the Ayes:
			Paul Maynard and
			Stuart Andrew
			NOES
			Blackman, Kirsty
			Brock, Deidre
			Brown, Alan

Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Crawley, Angela
 Day, Martyn
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Gethins, Stephen
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hosie, Stewart
 Lake, Ben
 Law, Chris
 Lucas, Caroline

MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Mc Nally, John
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 Monaghan, Carol
 Newlands, Gavin
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Saville Roberts, Liz
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Skinner, Mr Dennis
 Stephens, Chris
 Thewliss, Alison
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Williams, Hywel
 Wishart, Pete

Tellers for the Noes:
Marion Fellows and
David Linden

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendments agreed to, with Commons financial privileges waived in respect of Lords amendment 72.

Points of Order

7.30 pm

Ian Blackford (Ross, Skye and Lochaber) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. This was an important day for the people of Scotland. The House has just agreed to a series of sweeping amendments to the European Union (Withdrawal) Bill made by the Government in the House of Lords that fundamentally changes the devolution settlement on these islands—changes from which the Scottish Parliament has expressly withheld its consent.

We have had no adequate time for debate and, in the time available, we simply heard from the Minister for the Cabinet Office. There was no chance for a vote on any of the amendments tabled by Members of Parliament from Scotland—amendments that would have protected the position of the Scottish Parliament. Moreover, Scotland's voice has been shut out of the Brexit debate—*[Interruption.]* The Conservatives are chuntering and I can see the hon. Member for Moray (Douglas Ross) shaking his head. He has just voted with his colleagues to undermine the powers of the Scottish Parliament, and he should be ashamed of himself—*[Interruption.]*

Mr Speaker: Order. The right hon. Gentleman started out on a virtuous path of raising a point of order with the Chair, from which he was diverted by the forces of gesticulation. The right hon. Gentleman must and will be heard. His point of order is with the Chair, and it must not lead to a kind of conduct of orchestra scenario, with which the House is becoming all too familiar, between SNP Members and Government Back Benchers. Let me hear the point of order and respond to it.

Ian Blackford: I will just simply say that we are used to the boorish behaviour of the Scottish Conservatives.

Mr Speaker, I seek your advice on where we go next. We are in unprecedented, uncharted constitutional territory. The Conservative Government have used unelected Lords to veto the will of the Scottish Parliament and have refused to allow time for this House to debate the alternatives properly. The Government could have ensured protected time for Scotland's parliamentarians to speak today, but they did not, so we fell silent. What options are available to us in this House to ensure that the Government understand the real concern among people in Scotland at this unprecedented power grab? How can we ensure that our voices are heard?

Mr Speaker: I am most grateful to the right hon. Gentleman, and I will respond, but I think that the hon. Member for Dwyfor Meirionnydd (Liz Saville Roberts) wants to raise a not altogether dissimilar point.

Liz Saville Roberts (Dwyfor Meirionnydd) (PC): Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. What avenues are open to me to seek further clarification on the operation of the Sewel convention, about which we heard so much, when the precedent set today is so corrosive to public trust in Wales?

Several hon. Members *rose—*

Mr Speaker: Order. Let me seek, if I may, to attend to the matters that have been raised, and then I will come to the hon. Member for Perth and North Perthshire (Pete Wishart) and others as necessary.

On the subject of the absence of a legislative consent motion from the Scottish Parliament, I can merely observe that I have no powers to stay—I use that term in a technical sense in this context—or to interrupt proceedings because there is no such motion passed. Whatever the very understandable sense of grievance that exists, which I am not disputing or arguing against or for, I am satisfied that, so far as the Chair is concerned, I can with authority say that the House has complied with its Standing Orders.

That may be very, very, very far from comforting or satisfactory to Members who are aggrieved. I understand what they are telling me, but the House has complied with its Standing Orders. That is the first point. There is in that sense no procedural impropriety, but the absence of procedural impropriety does not mean that people do not feel aggrieved for other reasons or on other grounds.

Secondly, both Members in a sense asked me, “Well, what recourse do we have?” Perhaps I should start by saying what recourse Members do not have. Today’s proceedings are effectively coming to an end and there is then an Adjournment debate, so the House will know that there is no recourse tonight, and people attending to our proceedings should know that. Moreover, tomorrow the House is treating of these matters appertaining to the withdrawal Bill, but it is dealing with very different sets of issues, on which the right hon. Gentleman’s concerns do not bite, so there is no obvious opportunity for these matters to be aired tomorrow.

However, without going into the full arsenal of weapons open to a Member of Parliament, there are means by which Members can try to secure the attention of the House to matters that they judge to be important, and if they feel that that needs to be done relatively soon. The right hon. Gentleman, who has now been here three years, is well familiar with some of the opportunities that are open to him and it is perfectly legitimate for him to seek to use those mechanisms. I get the impression, both from the right hon. Gentleman and from the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh South West (Joanna Cherry), who has legal expertise and some experience of these matters, that the nodding of the head suggests that they understand what I am saying to them.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Very well. As I referred to the hon. and learned Lady, I will take her point of order first.

Joanna Cherry (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. When my right hon. Friend the Member for Ross, Skye and Lochaber (Ian Blackford) was asking you what options were open to Scottish parliamentarians to raise their concern about what has just occurred today, the hon. Member for Bridgwater and West Somerset (Mr Liddell-Grainger) shouted, “Suicide”. Is that in order, Mr Speaker?

Mr Speaker: I would say to the hon. and learned Lady that I did not hear that. [*Interruption.*] I am not disputing it; I am simply saying that I did not hear it. If I had heard it, I would not have approved of it. [*Interruption.*] Order. What I would say to the hon. and learned Lady, and for the benefit of people listening to our proceedings, is that I would judge that, frankly, to be distasteful. Is it disorderly? It is almost certainly

not disorderly. The hon. and learned Lady will probably know—she is a student of these matters—that the House long ago dispensed with the idea of a formal list of disorderly words, not least because the list became too long and therefore unmanageable. Therefore, everything has to be judged in context—on the basis of the context in which a particular word or phrase is used. Is the word “suicide” disorderly? No, but in this context, it is distasteful, and I am sorry that it was used.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: There are a lot of Members wanting to raise points of order. I think I will come to a Dorset knight first.

Sir Robert Syms (Poole) (Con): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Many of us on the Government Benches are disappointed that the matters of devolution did not have more debate. That was a consequence of the Opposition calling so many Divisions, thereby reducing the amount of time. What additional help can the House authorities give in time management training for the official Opposition so that, on future occasions when we have a clearly defined time for debate, they can decide when they are going to vote and when they can allow free-standing debate?

Mr Speaker: I hope the hon. Gentleman, who entered the House with me in 1997—I have known him a very long time—will not mind if I say that I think his point of order was delivered with a puckish grin and was of what I call a rhetorical character.

Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Can you confirm that what has to happen now is that this Bill has to be presented for Royal Assent and that the timing of that presentation is a matter for the Government? Is it right that within that period they could still seek to make some arrangement with the Scottish Parliament and that Royal Assent should not be granted until a legislative consent motion has been passed in the Scottish Parliament? Surely that must now be what happens, because the Scottish people, who have been watching these proceedings today, are ashamed and appalled at what has happened in their name and at the way the devolution settlement has been turned on its head. Surely, even at this stage, something should be done to protect the devolution settlement.

Mr Speaker: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for his point of order. I hope he will not take it amiss if I simply say that the matter of Royal Assent is not one for the Chair—it is somewhat above my pay grade. It is for people with expertise in that subject. I hope he will not mind—I am going to say this even if he does—when I say that he is a little ahead of himself. I know he is a quick thinker, but he is a bit ahead of himself, because the Bill has first to complete its passage through the two Houses before the issue of Royal Assent arises. This Bill has not yet completed its passage through the two Houses. We are still engaged in what might be described as legislative or parliamentary table tennis with the upper House. Only when that process—that game of ping-pong—has been concluded will the issue of Royal Assent arise. So although I understand what he is telling me, and it may be an issue to be broached at some point by some person, that point is not now.

Ian Murray (Edinburgh South) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I, like many Members in this House, have received hundreds, if not thousands, of communications from constituents on this Bill. As many Members from across the House have said, it is the most important issue this House has dealt with since perhaps the second world war. I seek your guidance, but I also seek to put this on the record. It reflects very badly not only on this House but on all parliamentarians of all colours that I cannot represent the thousands of constituents who have contacted me about significant amendments that have been brought forward from the other place because of the time restrictions put in place by the Government programme motion. I know that is not your responsibility as Chair, but if we want politics and Parliaments in this country to thrive, we have to ensure that we present something to the public that allows them to feel, first, that they are engaged and, secondly, that their representatives can take part in debate to make their representations known. We have been unable to do that this evening, and the Government should reflect on the fact that people will be watching these proceedings and will be very upset that their representatives have been unable to contribute.

Mr Speaker: I am very grateful to the hon. Gentleman for his point of order and for the courtesy with which he raised it. What I want to say succinctly to him, and for the benefit of the House and others interested in our proceedings, is that there are matters that admit of discretion and matters that do not. Where there is discretion that can be exercised by the Chair—I say this in no spirit of self-advertisement and am simply trying to put the fact on the record—my instinct, as I have said to a number of colleagues in conversation today, has always been to allow more debate and more votes. If there is a desire for an urgent question and I think it is urgent, I grant it. I have done that on hundreds of occasions during the past nine years. That will please some people and displease others, but I am trying to do the right thing by the House of Commons.

I hope that the hon. Gentleman will understand—I know Ministers will—when I say that the Standing Orders are not accidental. This is not an inadvertent omission or construction of words on the part of those who drafted the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders are as they are for a reason, which is that they were drawn up for a purpose and they have been accepted by the House, and they do not admit of any discretion on my part. If I had discretion, no doubt I would exercise it, but I do not. I entirely understand what the hon. Gentleman is telling me, but my advice to him and to others who are similarly concerned—this is a general piece of advice, not specifically in relation to this Bill—is that if they feel strongly that there is an aspect of our procedures that should be handled differently, it is a good idea to address such matters in what I would call “peacetime”, rather than simply raising them in “wartime”. I have never known any Member previously raise this matter with me by way of complaint. Members are now complaining—I am not complaining that they are complaining, as they have every right to complain if they so wish—because it affects them here and now, or it affects the point they want to make, the subject they want to broach or the amendment they want to put to the vote. I have to work on the basis of the Standing

Orders as they exist, and that is what I have done. I am not insensitive to the wider point that the hon. Gentleman has made.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr Speaker: Order. I call Dr Philippa Whitford, then I will come to Mr Coaker.

Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. We were told on Report and Third Reading that the Bill was going to the Lords, where there would be amendments, and that when it came back, because the Secretary of State for Scotland had not tabled his amendments, we would have time to debate it in detail. There was 19 minutes, all of which was used up by the Minister for the Cabinet Office. That is unacceptable, so how do we prevent it from happening when the Bill returns from the Lords next time?

Mr Speaker: I am alert to the danger of a repetition, as articulated by the hon. Lady. I think the answer is that it is up to the House to determine the programme motion. If the programme motion is considered unsuitable and unlikely to facilitate the nature and extent of the debate that the hon. Lady and her colleagues want, they know what their recourse is. They must seek to persuade a majority of the House to reject such a programme motion.

I have looked very closely at the amendability of such motions, and I know that an amendment was tabled. The Standing Order specifies that the Question on the programme motion should be put forthwith. As the hon. Lady knows, I regularly select amendments in debates that are voted upon, including on legislation, and while amendments to the programme motion are not prohibited—they can be tabled—there is no means by which they can be voted upon, as I interpret the Standing Order. It is therefore up to Members, if they do not like the programme motion, to defeat it. I am sorry if that does not satisfy the hon. Lady. I am not insensitive to this issue, but that is the factual position. Some Members may not like Standing Orders, but I owe it, in fairness to those who drew them up, to say that there is no constitutional or procedural impropriety in what has happened today. There may be other grounds for objection, but there is no procedural impropriety. The Minister, in addressing the matters as he did, allegedly for 19 minutes, was entirely within his rights to do so and, to be fair, he did take quite a lot of interventions in that period.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr Speaker: Mr Gray, I do not think your mother would forgive me if I did not take your point of order.

Neil Gray (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your advice on what constitutes a debate. Does one Minister speaking for 19 minutes, and riding roughshod over 20 years of the devolved settlement, constitute a debate in your eyes or under Standing Orders?

Mr Speaker: I do not have a photographic recall of the Standing Orders, but I am sorry to tell the hon. Gentleman that the word “debate” does not feature especially prominently in them. Ordinarily, one would

of course interpret the word “debate” as meaning the exchange of opinions, and there was some exchange of opinions. I have known the right hon. Member for Aylesbury (Mr Lidington) for over 30 years. We knew each other before either of us came into this House and we have known each other for over 20 years in this House, including for the last 21 years as next-door neighbours, he in Aylesbury and I in Buckinghamshire. He is a most courteous fellow, and he did take a lot of interventions in his speech. Was it a debate in the sense that there was more than one speech? No, but if the hon. Member for Airdrie and Shotts (Neil Gray) is suggesting that the powers of the Speaker should be extended to allow him to adjudicate on these matters, heralding a panoply of new Standing Orders that would invest the Speaker with some sort of imperial power, I fear that he may find that this would not be altogether popular in the House. I would live with it—it would be a considerable burden, but I would do so with as much stoicism and fortitude as I could muster—but I rather doubt that the hon. Gentleman would persuade the House of the merits of such a proposition.

Vernon Coaker (Gedling) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is there nothing that we can do, through your good offices, to reflect on the fact—you will have seen it and it has been a privilege to have you here all day to observe these proceedings—that numerous Back Benchers have not been able to comment on what everyone has talked about as one of the most momentous days in the history of this Parliament? People of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have been prevented from contributing. Not only that but, on the second set of amendments, the only person whom we heard from was the Minister. Labour’s Front Bencher could not contribute. Other Members who may have wished to contribute could not do so. We have spent three hours and 20 minutes on a momentous, historical change for our country. That is absolutely ridiculous.

May I just ask whether it is in order for the Minister simply to say, “These are the amendments which the Government think are a good thing and therefore the whole House should simply accept them.”? There was no opportunity for Members from Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales or England to hold the Minister and the Government to account. Surely that is the function of this Parliament and the Minister should be ashamed of himself.

Mr Speaker: I am sorry to repeat myself. There is much to be said for originality, but there is more to be said for truth, and I am afraid that I do just have to stick to the truth that no procedural impropriety has transpired today. I say to the hon. Gentleman—again I came into the House with him more than 20 years ago; I respect him enormously and I think he is a very widely respected Member in this House—that, if there is a further need for this House to treat of these matters later in the week, for example, or subsequently, and if such a need therefore necessitates a new programme motion, it is perfectly open to the Government to frame such a motion to take account of, and to demonstrate either sensitivity to or acquiescence in, some of the concerns that have been expressed this evening. Of course discussions take place, as people should know, between the usual channels and behind the scenes, about such matters and there may be some accommodation there.

I am always in favour of an outbreak of amity on procedural matters. It is best if we can avoid grave disharmony on such matters, but it will be for others to decide whether that should happen. That could happen. If the hon. Gentleman feels strongly about that, I feel sure that he will make a beeline for those on his own Front Bench, who engage in discussions on these subjects with the Government, to try to ensure that his concern is reflected.

Simon Hoare (North Dorset) (Con): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is clear, I think, from this afternoon’s proceedings that there is a feeling, shared, I suggest, on both sides of the House, that the Opposition have used the opportunity to call Divisions to act as a fig leaf to hide some of their embarrassment over this debate about devolution. Although I would probably have disagreed with many of the arguments deployed by SNP Members, they certainly have a right to be able to articulate them in this place.

Mr Speaker, accepting entirely your ruling that we are all bound by the rules of procedure and our Standing Orders, what scope, if any, exists—and, if it does exist, what avenues do Members have to promote this—to invite the Procedure Committee to consider that, on such a debate with multiple Divisions, the time taken by Divisions should not be included within the three-hour segment of debate, almost like the extra minute that we get when we give way to somebody when we are under a time limit? It would require a proper hearing by the Procedure Committee, but that might be one way to address what is clearly a very thorny issue.

Mr Speaker: I am very grateful to the hon. Gentleman for his point of order. It would be perfectly possible for a programme motion to allow for such injury time caused by Divisions, but it is not for the Speaker to stipulate that it should. However, it could. Moreover, these matters could indeed be considered by the Procedure Committee, of which the hon. Gentleman was a distinguished ornament and of which, for all I know, he may still be a member.

Simon Hoare *indicated dissent.*

Mr Speaker: Ah, he advises me that he is no longer a member of that Committee. I am sure that the Committee will feel considerably impoverished by his departure from it, but will do its best to cope in the circumstances. It is an unenviable scenario for the Committee, but I hope that it will manage.

Several hon. Members *rose—*

Mr Speaker: Members seem determined to raise their points of order. I hope that they are genuine points of order.

Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I have to be honest—sometimes I get easily confused. Today, I have wondered whether some hon. Members have been trying to confuse me further or, more concerningly, have perhaps inadvertently misled the House. I have two examples. The Minister for the Cabinet Office spoke about the Scottish Government withholding a legislative consent motion. The reality is that the Scottish Government do not have a majority at Holyrood, and three other parties voted alongside the

[Alan Brown]

Scottish National party—so it was the Scottish Parliament, not the Scottish Government. We then heard a point of order from the shadow Minister about standing up for Scotland, but the Labour Members then proceeded to sit on their hands in a vote for devolution. I am just wondering how I can—

Mr Speaker: Order. I do not mean to be unkind to the hon. Gentleman, who is an absolutely indefatigable Member of this House and an almost permanent presence in the Chamber, but the second part of his observations was pure politics. That is not a novel phenomenon in the House of Commons, but I am afraid that it was not even dressed up as a point of order. I think that we will have to leave it there.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: I will hear other Members if they insist, but the hour is late, so I would ask colleagues to show some sensitivity to the need to move on to the Adjournment debate. If people want to be heard, I will hear them briefly.

Peter Grant (Glenrothes) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Earlier, the Minister for the Cabinet Office gave the House an assurance that the new powers over the devolved nations being taken by the Government would not normally be used against the consent of those devolved Parliaments. He used almost exactly the same words as those that are already enshrined in the Sewel convention, which the Government have today cast aside by whipping their own MPs to vote against it. As Members have heard assurances by the Minister, and in some cases have possibly been persuaded how to vote by those assurances, what means are available to Members to ensure that those assurances are not cast aside with the same impunity as the assurances in the Sewel convention or, indeed, the assurances that we were given by the Secretary of State for Scotland in the early stages of the debate?

Mr Speaker: The answer is that, if I may say so, scrutiny is a process, rather than a fact. It is not a matter of an isolated incident or a single statement, gesture or occasion. It is a process—if you will—remorseless inquisition. It is perfectly open to the hon. Gentleman, who has fast become familiar with the mechanisms of House scrutiny, to scrutinise the Government through written and oral questions, pursuit of Adjournment debates and the like on the matter of the Executive's adherence to the Sewel convention, or, as he sees it, their non-compliance with it. I do not want to get into a great attempted exegesis of the Sewel convention but, from memory, the convention stipulates that the Government will “not normally” proceed on matters without a legislative consent motion. But, as the hon. Gentleman will know, the presence of the words “not normally” does admit of exceptions. That is the reality of the matter. It is a political matter, rather than one that lends itself to a ruling from the Chair.

Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. You have been a champion of this House, and you have done what you can to improve and to protect its reputation. Today's events

have damaged the reputation of this House irreparably. How can we ensure that such an undemocratic shambles never happens again?

Mr Speaker: Procedural change could prevent it. That is putting it very simply. The hon. Lady will probably be aware that I have heard representations privately from her leader and her Chief Whip, and in days to come, if she and her colleagues wish to take opportunities to air these matters further, it should not be beyond their ingenuity and sagacity to find such opportunities. If there is a desire for such opportunities, the Chair is not an obstacle; the Chair is a facilitator.

John Lamont (Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk) (Con): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Given that the effect of the vote on the last group of amendments was to create an even more powerful Scottish Parliament, which Scottish Nationalist party Members have voted against, what procedural changes will be made in this House to reflect those changes across the United Kingdom?

Mr Speaker: Off the top of my head, I do not have the foggiest idea. I do not know. The reason, however, why I do not feel very guilty in responding in such terms to the hon. Gentleman is that although it is always a pleasure to listen to him, and his intervention was enjoyable, it did suffer from the material disadvantage that whatever else it was, it was not a point of order.

David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: I wonder whether the stentorian tones of the hon. Gentleman indicate that his point of order is, or alternatively is not, a point of order. I dare say we will learn ere long.

David Linden: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. In 1999, when I was nine years old, the Scottish Parliament was established. Tonight, in the space of 19 minutes, the Government have managed to swat that away, with all the powers and conventions of the Scottish Parliament completely disrespected. Have you been given advance notice of a ministerial statement tomorrow from the Secretary of State for Scotland so that he can come to this House and apologise for letting down the people of Scotland?

Mr Speaker: No, I have not.

Martin Whitfield (East Lothian) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your guidance in relation to the amendments. When the Bill left this House and went down the corridor, we had clause 11, to which the Government tabled an amendment. That has returned today and has been voted on. If that amendment had fallen today, is it correct that we would have gone back to the previous drafting of the Bill, which we all agreed was deficient?

Mr Speaker: If Lords amendment 26 had been defeated, the effect would have been to restore to the Bill subsections (1) to (3), which that amendment omitted. But that is all hypothetical, and I would not want to go any further for fear of causing confusion, not least as there were proposals from all sides, as people will not be surprised to hear, for amendments to amendments.

Marion Fellows (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am very grateful to you for pointing out that no procedural impropriety has taken place here today. However, there has been an awful lot of walking and an awful lot of time—almost three hours—wasted on voting. Would it be possible, very soon, to introduce electronic voting in this House so that affairs that happened this afternoon, which meant that Scottish Members had no opportunity to speak against the devolution amendments, would have more time?

Mr Speaker: I hear what the hon. Lady has said. I hope that she will not take offence if I say that that point is not new. That is not an indictment of it. There are not that many new points made in this House. Repetition in the House of Commons is not a novel phenomenon. This is a matter for consideration by the Procedure Committee. I have expressed views myself in the past on the matter of electronic voting, but I have always done so taking care to make the point that the question of the means by which we vote in this place is a matter for the House of Commons. It is certainly something that can be strongly argued by the hon. Lady. I myself can see many arguments in favour of electronic voting, but it is not a matter for me—it is a matter for the House. She has made her own point in her own way, and it is on the record.

Drew Hendry (Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your guidance. Many of my constituents asked me to raise points in the debate today but, like my colleagues in the Scottish National party, I was unable to do so, even though all 35 SNP Members stood to try to catch your eye during the short period allowed. Can you advise me how to put it on the record that all SNP MPs today tried to take part in the debate but, due to the self-interest of the UK Government, were unable to do so?

Mr Speaker: The hon. Gentleman has achieved his own salvation. He has put that on the record, and he can circulate it to media outlets in his constituency and elsewhere. Moreover, if he continues to be the eager beaver that he has always been thus far in his membership of the House, I dare say he will beetle into the Chamber for business questions on Thursday morning and leap to his feet to seek a debate or a governmental statement on that very matter. He is many things, but he is not lacking indefatigability, and he is not knowingly understated.

Douglas Ross (Moray) (Con): Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. The hon. Member for Inverness has just—

Drew Hendry: Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey.

Douglas Ross: The hon. Member for Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey (Drew Hendry) has just informed the House that all 35 SNP Members wanted to speak in the debate and were aware that there were 90 minutes available. What kind of debate do you think we would have procedurally if each Member had 30 seconds to speak, as the SNP was trying to impose on us?

Mr Speaker: It would be a debate characterised by extraordinarily short speeches—that is true, but that too, though an interesting reflection from the hon. Gentleman, is not a point of order.

Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. While I have huge sympathy with him and with the defence of this place and its procedures, does he agree that the public in not just Scotland but across the UK and the world will be looking at our procedures and laughing, because it is clear that they are inadequate and that the devolution settlement in Scotland and other parts of the UK is being ridden roughshod over? Does he agree that the points about changing the procedures of this place are in grave danger of closing the gate after the horse has bolted?

Mr Speaker: I am mildly tickled by the hon. Lady's use of words. I assume when she referred a number of times to "he" that she was in fact referring to me.

Hannah Bardell *indicated assent.*

Mr Speaker: I believed that to be so. I am not sure that I can presume to judge what assessment people around the world will make of this matter. I rather suspect that it will not be a unanimous judgment. In my experience, it is a very common tendency—one that no doubt I share myself—to assume that views that we hold are views that most sensible people also hold. That may be so, and it may not be so. There may be people who think that these arrangements are deeply reprehensible and other people who are rather more relaxed about them.

I understand what the hon. Lady says—that any attempt to reform procedures would come after these events. I was just gently making the point, to go back to what the hon. Member for Perth and North Perthshire (Pete Wishart) was saying in reference to Royal Assent, that this Bill is unfinished business, and if it still has further consideration in this House, which remains to be seen, it may be that there will be a programme motion that will bring a smile to her face. I am not volunteering that with especial confidence, but it is possible.

Mr Paul Sweeney (Glasgow North East) (Lab/Co-op): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Thank you for your patience in hearing this point of order. I seek your clarification on the programme motion. It was entirely in the gift of the Government to set the time according to their requirements. Indeed, it was negotiated with the Opposition as well and Labour voted against the programme motion, but, crucially, we faced a binary Division whereby we were voting on a Government amendment that is deficient in the eyes of the Labour party, but we then faced a situation where we reverted to the original Bill, which is doubly insufficient and deficient in our eyes. We are not able to give any expression to the position that we hold as parliamentarians in expressing the views of our constituents and of our party.

It is not only that. It has been grossly misrepresented that we are taking a position that is contrary to the views that we hold. In the position where we are not able to give expression to, and far less vote on, what we believe as parliamentarians, representing the Labour party and our constituents, how do we give expression to those views, in the absence of the opportunity to do so in this House?

Mr Speaker: I think the hon. Gentleman has just done so. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I have been in the Chair, and it is an enormous honour to have been in the Chair, without interruption, since 11.30 this

[Mr Speaker]

morning—I have now been in the Chair for eight and a half hours, and it is my great privilege to be here and to sit through these debates and, for however long it takes, through all the points of order—but I genuinely do not think there is anything in what he said, with his usual eloquence, that requires a response from me. Forgive me, but I think he has said what he said, and I respect that.

Lady Hermon (North Down) (Ind): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am very grateful to you for allowing me to raise a point of order reflecting the concern in Northern Ireland. You will know that we have not had a functioning Assembly since January 2017. In the absence of a functioning Assembly in Northern Ireland, it was critical that we had a full examination and discussion today of the key amendments relating to having no hard border and, curiously, to north-south co-operation.

The term “north-south co-operation” is specifically defined in the Belfast agreement, and I have no doubt that Ministers—all of them—will have read the Belfast agreement in its entirety. It was therefore important for us to have had time today to discuss whether the Government had in fact unilaterally amended the Belfast agreement. That is a really interesting point, but we had no time to discuss it. I therefore ask your advice about how we can encourage the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland or, indeed, the Brexit Secretary to come to the House and make a statement on critical constitutional points affecting Northern Ireland and the whole United Kingdom?

Mr Speaker: I am grateful to the hon. Lady. It is open to Ministers to come to the House and make a statement. The hon. Lady is an experienced Member of the House, and she will know that Ministers tend to preface the delivery of an oral statement with the courteous words, “With permission, Mr Speaker,” but it is in fact a prerogative of a Minister to come to the House and make an oral statement if he or she so wishes. I am sure that the point that the hon. Lady has made will be heard by the Cabinet Ministers to whom she referred, and it is open to them to do so tomorrow. Alternatively, it is open to Members to seek to procure their presence.

Equally, it is open to Members to air these matters at business questions on Thursday, if they so wish. If Members of different political parties, or of several political parties, want to air their discontent—to some extent, they have done so tonight, but they might wish to do so in a more formal way to try to influence a subsequent programme motion—it is absolutely open to them to do so, and it will then be for the House to decide how it wishes to proceed.

Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Given that it was open to the Government to protect time properly to debate and vote on matters of importance to the devolved Governments, do you agree that what has happened today shows the utter contempt that the Government have for the democratically elected will of the Scottish Parliament, given the power grab that will now ensue?

Mr Speaker: The hon. Lady is seeking an opinion from me about support for the Government’s position or opposition to it, and I genuinely do not think it is

proper for the Speaker to offer such an opinion. I have been quick to say that no procedural impropriety has occurred. I was completely sensitive to that before this array or flurry of points of order, but 43 minutes in, I am even more familiar with the extent of the irritation on this subject. I am not knocking it, but trying to be fair, as the Chair should be. No procedural impropriety has taken place.

I entirely understand the hon. Lady’s anger and that of the leader of her party, her Chief Whip and other Members. They have not stayed for the benefit of their health, but because they wish to make a point with force, and they have done so. I hope they will agree that I have been patient, as I should be, in listening to them doing so. As to whether things change in the days to come, wait to see, and bear in mind that Members can use the mechanisms open to them, as the leader of her party knows, to try to register a view more fully and to elicit a ministerial response.

Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central) (SNP) *rose*—

Hugh Gaffney (Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill) (Lab) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Is it really necessary to add to the list? Oh, very well; I will come to the hon. Gentleman in due course.

Alison Thewliss: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Perhaps you can advise. Government Members were suggesting that Opposition Members were wasting time by calling votes. More than 100 amendments were proposed; there were not 100 votes. Do you agree that this illustrates how poor the procedures of this House are, given that it is just not possible even for all the amendments on the amendment paper to be voted on and debated fully? Even covering the relatively small number we had today has taken quite a long time.

Mr Speaker: It is not for me to support the programme motion or oppose it, which in a sense is what I am being invited to do. I certainly would not accuse any Member of wasting time by having a vote. I would not do that. It is for Members to judge when they want a Division. The hon. Lady is right that there are a very large number of amendments on the paper and that there have been rather fewer votes. Her point is clearly registered. As to whether things should be done differently, that is another matter. It is a simple fact that there was not a lot of time today for all the issues to be aired in the way that Members wanted and for anything like the number of Members who wished to speak to have had the chance to do so. That is a matter of regret to a great many Members, and if it is a matter of sufficient regret to them that they wish to try to bring about a change next time, they must make their preparations sooner rather than later.

Stephen Gethins (North East Fife) (SNP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is 20 years since this place passed the Scotland Act 1998, which means that we have had less than one minute of debate per year to make the greatest changes to that Act since it was passed. The Secretary of State for Scotland, who is in the Chamber, made a commitment to bring changes to clause 11 to the House of Commons. Will he make a statement on whether 19 minutes of debate were adequate,

and do you think that there are ways in which we can make the Secretary of State more accountable? How do you think that this compares with democracy in other European institutions?

Mr Speaker: I briefly studied comparative politics at the University of Essex a little over 30 years ago, but I did not study these particular matters. Of course, I could not possibly have studied matters relating to the Scottish Parliament for the simple reason that it did not exist at the time at which I was undertaking my undergraduate exertions. These matters will come to be considered in the days ahead, and there will be opportunities for Members to keep raising these issues. Whether a statement is offered or not is not a matter for me, but it is open to Members to seek to put questions of an urgent character if they see fit. There are many opportunities for that, and if matters are thought to be not just of urgency but of emergency, there is a procedure available for that purpose as well. The Speaker is not an obstacle. The Speaker seeks, as appropriate—I have to reserve the right to judge each case—to be a facilitator.

Hugh Gaffney *rose*—

Martin Docherty-Hughes (West Dunbartonshire) (SNP) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: I am keeping the hon. Member for Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill (Hugh Gaffney) till last, because he was the last to stand. Do not worry, Mr Docherty-Hughes. You have an audience.

Martin Docherty-Hughes: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. First, may I congratulate you on staying in the Chair? It seems that we both studied comparative politics at the University of Essex. Perhaps I have as selective a memory as you about it.

Mr Speaker, can you set me straight about the constitutional position of this House and its relationship with the Parliament of Scotland and the historical narrative we are seeing played out here today in relation to the other place? There are Members of that other place, such as the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England, who are unelected and unrelated to the national Church of Scotland—we have no episcopacy in the governance of Scotland—who it seems have had greater time and ability to consider this, whereas the Parliament of Scotland's will not to give a consent motion has been rejected and the majority of Scotland's constitutionally elected constituency MPs have been unable to engage. I am sure that you will agree that that is the constitutional position of this House, and I must say that for Scotland it reflects very badly.

Mr Speaker: I understand the hon. Gentleman's point. He and I have had an exchange of letters about the University of Essex—I think we are both immensely proud of our link with the University of Essex—and I hope he will not be offended if I say that his point of order had a kind of university essay quality about it. I felt that he was reverting to academic practice. I do not think that it is for me to attempt to compare and contrast the respective merits of the two Houses' consideration of matters. The House of Lords operates on a different basis. We have procedures that have been adopted here that do not apply there. The other place must go about matters in the way it thinks fit. My concern is simply to try to do the right thing by the House. I will continue at all times to do so, wanting the maximum number of Back-Bench Members to have the chance to contribute to important debates that affect their constituents, present and future.

I think we come to what I hope—I do not mean this unkindly—is the last point of order.

Hugh Gaffney: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. We have just spent nearly an hour debating points of order. I admire your work, Mr Speaker, but as a union rep, I am always concerned about health and safety, and you have stood on your feet for eight and a half hours. That concerns me, Chair.

Mr Speaker: Well, that is very kind of the hon. Gentleman. I will let him into a secret: I was advised on a previous occasion by the good doctor, the hon. Member for Central Ayrshire (Dr Whitford), that it is not good for one's health to sit in the Chair for very, very extended periods, as I did at the start of December 2015. The reason I do not think the hon. Gentleman should worry too much is that that was a genuinely long session for the Syria debate. I was in the Chair without interruption for 11 hours and 24 minutes; it was a very great privilege. Today, I have not notched up even nine hours yet, so I do not think the hon. Gentleman needs worry too much. [*Interruption.*] The Chairman of Ways and Means says that he could help. I am already 22 minutes late for a dinner engagement; that does not matter—the House is more important. I take all good wishes in the spirit with which they are volunteered. All I can say is that having spent as long in the Chair as I have, I probably ought to go for decent length's swim in the morning, as I did this morning.

I understand people's upset and irritation, but I thank them for the courtesy with which they have raised their points. We are now coming to the Adjournment debate. The House will probably be very relieved to know that it will be rid of me for tonight and that it will luxuriate in the lather of having its proceedings chaired by the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Sexual Exploitation: Newcastle

Motion made, and Question proposed, That the House do now adjourn.—(Paul Maynard.)

8.22 pm

Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab): All of us here will have tremendous sympathy with the victims of sexual exploitation and the challenges, barriers and burdens they face. I want to pay tribute to the bravery, strength and perseverance of the victims of sexual exploitation, who deserve not merely our sympathy but our concrete, committed and long-term support.

Last August, a jury returned guilty verdicts on 17 men and one woman who had committed abhorrent crimes in Newcastle. This was the culmination of Northumbria police's Operation Sanctuary, a three-year investigation into the sexual exploitation of vulnerable women and girls. No convictions would have been secured without the bravery of the victims in testifying against their attackers, re-living their terrible experiences, in some cases more than once. To be subject to such abuse is more than anyone should have to bear. To then describe it to a court full of strangers shows the sort of courage that the rest of us can only hope to equal.

I feel personally ashamed that the city in which I grew up, and which I now have the privilege to represent, harboured men who groomed, exploited and raped women and young girls. They targeted women and girls because they were vulnerable, turning the vulnerable into victims, but I am also grateful to the victims for their courage, which has made Newcastle a safer city.

At the end of 2013, Northumbria police were contacted by a woman who informed them of sexual exploitation in the west end of Newcastle. Northumbria police responded rapidly. The national charity Changing Lives has worked extensively with the victims, and it told me that the police believed the victims immediately and maintained unconditional positive regard throughout the process, which has not always so in other sexual exploitation cases.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I spoke to the hon. Lady beforehand just to tell her some things that we are doing in Northern Ireland. The Safeguarding Board for Northern Ireland said that people who have had up to six adverse childhood experiences—in this case, sexual exploitation—are not only traumatised but, it is estimated, could die some 20 years earlier as a result of their experiences. Does she agree that this clearly underlines the need for more support to be given at an earlier stage and that the police need to be more active for the victims of sexual exploitation, whose lives are shortened as a result of what they have experienced?

Chi Onwurah: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his intervention. I agree that the impact of such sexual exploitation on the lives, mental health and long-term opportunities of the victims is significant. That is why long-term support is required, and I will touch on that in more detail later.

The police acted upon 1,400 pieces of intelligence, identifying 278 victims and arresting 461 suspects. Eight crime gangs were identified, all of which are now subject to ongoing disruption, and 220 child abduction notices have been issued, warning suspects that they face arrest

if they contact children. The professionalism with which Northumbria police conducted Operation Sanctuary has made Newcastle safer. As April's police and crime panel report put it,

"it is difficult to overstate the positive impact of Sanctuary."

That was not only because perpetrators were taken off the streets; there was also a recognition that victims would need long-term support provided by various agencies.

Catherine McKinnell (Newcastle upon Tyne North) (Lab): I commend my hon. Friend for securing this really important and timely debate, and I join her in commending the actions of Northumbria police and other organisations in Newcastle that have tackled this head-on, but does she share my concern that there appears still to be a lack of understanding among statutory bodies, including Departments, about the national strategic response that we need to this horrific crime? More than half the victims in Newcastle were not children but vulnerable adults, and this must be recognised by the Government and at a local level.

Chi Onwurah: I thank my hon. Friend and neighbour for her intervention; that is exactly what I will come on to.

In April 2015, the police, Newcastle City Council, adult and child social care, and key voluntary sector groups, including Changing Lives, Barnardo's and Bright Futures, came together to establish a multi-agency hub, providing person-centred support to 166 women and girls so far. Newcastle City Council referred to the hub as "a return to true social work values and innovative practice".

At the same time, the council commissioned a joint serious case review known as the Spicer report. This report emphasised that the needs of victims are different. Some are children, some are adults, and some experience as children sexual exploitation that continues into adulthood. It pointed out that all of the victims would need ongoing and, in some cases, lifelong support.

The experience of Changing Lives shows that without this support victims are more likely to have contact with homelessness services, domestic abuse services, community rehabilitation companies, the National Probation Service, the Prison Service, addiction treatment services, children's social care and others. Basically, without long-term support, these victims of appalling abuse are more likely to have further negative experiences. This is unacceptable and why the hub is so important. The Spicer report praised the hub as an example of good practice and quoted victims as saying:

"The support I have had has been exceptional."

"The support from the Hub is brilliant."

"I could not have better support than Sanctuary."

On 6 March, I asked the then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Justice, the hon. Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee):

"Will the Minister be responding directly to the Spicer review's recommendations?"

I was told:

"The Department is of course aware of that serious case review of the sexual exploitation of children... Like all the agencies involved, we are looking into ways to continuously improve our service."—[*Official Report*, 6 March 2018; Vol. 637, c. 148.]

He appeared unaware, however, of the point my hon. Friend just made: that the report emphasised that Operation Sanctuary concerned the sexual exploitation of vulnerable females both under and over 18—women and girls—which is key to some of the issues raised.

Since then, I have asked a number of written questions without receiving any useful assurances. Will the current Minister now commit to an official response to the Spicer review, or explain why she is unable to do so? In answers to my questions on 7 March and 12 March, both the Home Office and the Office of the Attorney General said they had “taken significant action”, with £40 million having been allocated to tackle child sexual exploitation. Once again, does the Minister acknowledge that more than half the victims of the sexual exploitation uncovered by Operation Sanctuary were over 18, and will she commit the Government to providing support and funding for tackling the sexual exploitation of adults as well as children? Answers to my questions also referred to funding for sexual assault referral centres, which is welcome, but SARCs are established to provide immediate support for victims of sexual violence, not long-term support.

I have also written to the Government about the case of at least one victim denied compensation because of time spent in juvenile detention and have yet to receive a reply. Will the Minister commit to addressing this issue?

Catherine McKinnell: I fully support what my hon. Friend is saying. I too have tabled written questions to Ministers and have always been replied to in the context of child sexual exploitation, which completely ignores the fact that many of the victims were adults. Does she also share my concern that Changing Lives’ recent application for tampon tax funding to provide much needed support and adult support services for victims of exploitation has been turned down? Will the Minister commit to reconsidering that application and the work it does to support these very vulnerable victims?

Chi Onwurah: I thank my hon. Friend for her intervention.

The Spicer review’s recommendations require funding, but this has been difficult to secure. The sexual exploitation hub previously received £1.7 million through the police innovation fund, but this ran out in March 2017. Since then, funding has been drawn from local sources, with the police, the clinical commissioning group, Newcastle City Council and voluntary organisations enabling its work to continue. The council has provided temporary funding of £250,000, which should last until March 2019, and this includes staffing as well as the council’s contribution to the building and utilities, which is paid for from the social care precept.

It is difficult for the council to plan for the future of the hub when adult social care nationally is chronically underfunded, there is no clarity regarding the long-term funding of adult social care, and there is no information from the Government about what will happen at the end of the current rounds of the adult social care grant, the improved better care fund and the social care precept. Moreover, the council is under acute pressure because its central Government grant has been slashed in half since 2010. It told me:

“Clearly we are unable to adequately plan for the future when adult social care nationally is chronically underfunded and there is no clarity regarding the long term funding of adult social care”.

Does the Minister expect a council whose budget has already been decimated to fund the hub?

As there is no consensus on whether responsibility for the hub lies with the violence against women and girls agenda, with public health services, or with community safety, police, and police and crime commissioner victim services, there is a risk that it could fall between the cracks. That would be a tragedy, and the Government would rightly be blamed for abandoning vulnerable girls and women. Can the Minister clarify which Department is responsible, and can she commit that Department to working with Newcastle City Council to ensure the long-term survival of the hub? Will she also commit herself to making more funds available, so that the ground-breaking work of the hub can continue to support victims of sexual exploitation in Newcastle?

I always tell people that Newcastle is the best city in the world. For the young women and girls who were victims of terrible sexual exploitation there, it was clearly not the best city in the world, but in their bravery we can see the best of Newcastle, and in the work of the hub that supports them we can see a model that could be successfully transplanted to other cases in other towns and cities. So far in 2018, we have seen further cases of organised groups of men grooming women and girls for the purposes of sexual exploitation in Telford, Stockton and Sheffield. As the Spicer report says, if agencies “do not recognise sexual exploitation...in their area, it is because they are not looking hard enough.”

However, to bring such support to other areas, and to secure its future in Newcastle, requires money, and it also requires leadership.

Our country can and must be a place of safety and security for girls and young women, and I am immensely saddened that, in my own city, so many did not receive the protection that is their due. We cannot go back in time, but we can change the course of their lives in the future. It would be a betrayal of hideous proportions if we were to fail to do so, given all that they have suffered. Let me ask the Minister my ninth and final question. Will she guarantee to the victims of Operation Sanctuary and to all my constituents that in 10 years’ time the same support will be available to them as is available to them today?

8.38 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Victoria Atkins): I thank the hon. Member for Newcastle upon Tyne Central (Chi Onwurah) for securing the debate. She talked not only about the need for support, but about the long-term effects of such disgraceful and unacceptable behaviour to a fellow human being. She has represented her constituency this evening with passion and understanding, but also with a clear determination to ensure that her great city does not see a repetition of these terrible episodes.

I know that this subject is enormously important to Members in all parts of the House. I was glad that the hon. Member for Newcastle upon Tyne North (Catherine McKinnell) intervened on her hon. Friend’s speech, because I have received parliamentary questions from both Members. I will start with an observation that they made, quite properly, about the responses that they had received to questions about the Spicer review and the fact that answers had tended to focus on child

[Victoria Atkins]

sexual exploitation. I very much take that on board, and I apologise. They are right that, sadly, the abuse in Newcastle not only concerned children, which is appalling enough; these defendants appear to have targeted vulnerable people, some of them with learning disabilities. The ruthlessness of the exploitation is almost too much to comprehend. I am therefore grateful to both Members for speaking up tonight.

The details are shocking and we know that vulnerable people were let down by a range of services in Newcastle over many years. I am pleased that the serious case review concluded that local practice has improved tremendously since 2014, but of course the victims and survivors still bear the terrible scars of their abuse.

The Government welcome David Spicer's comprehensive serious case review. Although it is clear that significant improvements have been made locally, it shows us that Government still have more to do. His recommendations are already informing the way Government work with local commissioners, and we will certainly look at how best to provide advice on supporting vulnerable adult victims of sexual exploitation in addition to child victims. His recommendation that further research be carried out into the perpetrators of this awful abuse will be taken forward through the work of our centre of expertise, which I will discuss in more detail later. It will assess UK and international impacts and evidence for both victims and perpetrators. The report makes many recommendations for central Government action, all of which will be considered as part of our ongoing work.

I will not be able to deal with all of the questions the hon. Member for Newcastle upon Tyne Central has raised, but I will respond in writing on those I do not respond to tonight. She wishes the Government to respond officially to the report, and I commit to writing to her covering the national recommendations in the review. As she knows, the Government do not usually respond to serious case reviews, but the details of this review are significant enough for me certainly to write to her about it. On the funding of Changing Lives, unfortunately I do not get to make funding decisions, but I will make inquiries about the application that charity made. I am pleased to hear of the work the hub is doing, and I understand that the police and crime commissioner has received £1.56 million plus £116,000 for victims of child sexual abuse. The Ministry of Justice is reviewing long-term funding not just for the hub but for all local and national provision, because we do take on board the point that the victims of these terrible crimes live with the consequences if not forever for very many years and decades.

The Government want to ensure that all victims of sexual exploitation feel that they can come forward to report abuse and that they can get the support they need. Whether a victim is a child or an adult, the same principle must apply.

This Government have empowered PCCs to deliver services for victims. So in the first instance PCCs must make an assessment of the support needs of all victims in their force area, including children and vulnerable adults alike, and commission services to meet those needs. We are allocating around £68 million to PCCs this year to provide emotional and practical support services for victims of crime, and we have increased the

overall victims' support services budget from around £50 million in 2012-13 to around £96 million in the current financial year.

As I have said, the PCC in Northumbria has been allocated more than £1.5 million of core victim grant to provide support to victims, and additional money to the tune of £116,000 has been allocated to services for victims of child sexual abuse. Of course, the PCC has her own budget from the main grant, and central Government say to PCCs, "You know the needs of your local area and we trust you to make these decisions." We therefore hope is that if she feels that more funding needs to be allocated, she will be able to do that from the main grant.

We have also provided £250,000 this year to support four rape support centres in Northumbria, including the Grace Project in Newcastle. The Grace Project is one of 15 rape support centres that have opened since 2010 with Government funding. We now support 98 centres directly, helping women, men, boys and girls to begin to recover from the effect of these appalling crimes, and we have committed to maintaining funding for rape support services at the current level until at least 2020.

Our ambition is to support victims and survivors, whoever they are and wherever they are. That is why we have invested £100 million in this spending review period to support our commitment to tackling violence against women and girls, and it is why NHS England has now commissioned 47 sexual assault referral centres in England at a cost of £27 million, including the Teesside SARC, which provides support for victims of sexual violence across the north-east. It is also why we have recently launched the £13 million trusted relationships fund, protecting vulnerable people from sexual exploitation, gang exploitation and peer abuse.

We want to do more, so we are investing £7.5 million in the centre of expertise on child sexual abuse, which will tell us far more about what works, where gaps exist and what more support we can give to professionals and commissioners. It has already published research into local commissioning practice, which will form the basis for a framework for commissioners. The Home Office will publish that framework later this year. It will share good practice and help commissioners to assess need and provide support. We are also piloting the child house model, based on international best practice. In a child house, child victims can receive all the support they need in a single, comfortable environment. We have invested more than £4 million in the first house, which will open its doors in London in the autumn.

Despite all that has been achieved in recent years, we must continue to challenge ourselves to improve the support we provide for victims, not only because the needs of victims change over time but because the nature of crime itself is continually evolving. That is why we are developing a new cross-Government victims strategy, which will comprehensively review how crime has changed and ensure that our response still meets the needs of victims. The strategy will provide a framework for future work and national cross-Government direction. For example, as part of the strategy, we are developing a more sustainable funding model for sexual violence support services, so that victims can access the support they need immediately after the crime and throughout every stage of their recovery.

The strategy will consider how we might improve provision of the services that victims are entitled to receive under the victims code. It will also continue to drive improvement in victims' experience of the criminal justice process. The hon. Lady's description of the ordeal of victims having to give evidence at trial summed up the need for that very strongly. We must ensure that criminal justice agencies provide victims with a service that is appropriate to their needs and respectful of them as individuals. Victims want cases to be well managed and dealt with swiftly, so that they can deal with the experience and, hopefully, put it behind them. We will consider how the agencies responsible for delivery of those services might be better held to account.

I know the interest of the hon. Lady and the hon. Member for Newcastle upon Tyne North, so I would value a meeting with them and my officials to discuss any thoughts that they may have on how the victims strategy can be improved to cover the points raised in tonight's debate.

Chi Onwurah: I thank the Minister for giving way, for the tone of her comments and for the way in which she recognises the importance of the issues that I have tried to raise on the behalf of my constituents. I have listened carefully to what she says, and I appreciate the offer of a meeting and the commitment to some sort of response to the Spicer review. However, I get the impression that

funding for the hub and the multi-agency approach will come from the police and crime commissioner and potentially the sexual violence support grant as part of any future strategy, or is that something that we can discuss in detail in a meeting?

Victoria Atkins: Could we discuss that in the meeting? We have always tried to ensure that local commissioners are commissioning the services that they feel are needed in their area, but I am happy to hear the hon. Lady's thoughts on that in the meeting that we will have with my officials.

In conclusion, I thank the hon. Lady once more for securing this important debate. Victims and survivors of the most appalling crimes rely on us, both in government and on both sides of this House, to represent their needs and to ensure that they receive the support to which they are entitled. It will be a privilege to continue to work with colleagues across the Government and across the House, and with representatives locally, to ensure that victims in Newcastle and in all areas of England and Wales are heard, are supported and are able to recover.

Question put and agreed to.

8.51 pm

House adjourned.

Westminster Hall

Tuesday 12 June 2018

[SIR DAVID CRAUSBY *in the Chair*]

Coastal Erosion

9.30 am

Kirstene Hair (Angus) (Con): I beg to move,
That this House has considered coastal erosion.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. The future of Britain's coastline, and of our coastal communities, is finally getting the political attention that it deserves—not a moment too soon. From the need to curb plastic waste to prevent environmental damage to our shores to the opportunities that Brexit presents for reviving our long-struggling fishing communities, Britain's coasts are coming to the forefront of the political agenda. I am glad, because if our coastal communities are to benefit from this renewed focus on their future, we need to act now to ensure that they have a future.

Coastal erosion threatens large parts of Britain's coasts and puts houses, businesses and entire communities at risk of flooding or, in some cases, total destruction. Many hon. Members will be familiar with this issue, as coastal erosion threatens about 17% of the UK's coastline, specifically along the east coast. The Environment Agency estimates that more than 700 properties in England could be lost to coastal erosion by the 2030s, while in Scotland, erosion is believed to pose a risk to a fifth of the coastline and the erosion rate has doubled since the 1970s. In 2013 and 2014, storms and extreme tides caused erosion that experts believed would never happen, but it has happened, and even quicker than they thought as it occurred almost overnight. Businesses and individuals are increasingly concerned about the impact of the increasingly rapid degradation of our coastline.

Our coasts are vital areas and hubs of economic activity. As well as the obvious tourism draws, they are home to much of our crucial infrastructure. In Scotland, the soft coastline, which is about 19% of the total, and which is most at risk, includes roads, railways and Scotland's water network. There are 30,000 buildings, 100 km of railway lines, 1,300 km of our roads and a large amount of cultural and natural heritage located near to potentially erodible stretches of the Scottish coast. They could come under threat if erosion rates continued to increase in the near future.

Sir Henry Bellingham (North West Norfolk) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate. She will be aware that East Anglia suffered serious floods as the result of surge tides in 2013. The private sector has financed a lot of the recharging of the beaches through a community interest company in my constituency, but does she agree that that will not be enough in future and that there will have to be some form of ring-fenced funding?

Kirstene Hair: I am sure my hon. Friend will be pleased to hear what I am calling for the Minister to provide for my community and his.

It is time that Government at all levels took the issue more seriously. In the past, they have been guilty of putting too much emphasis on study and not enough on preventive action. If ever there was a time for urgent action, my constituents would say that it is now.

David Duguid (Banff and Buchan) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate, which is important to communities in my constituency such as Pennan, Crovie, Gardenstown and Rosehearty, which to some extent have all suffered coastal erosion or flooding recently. In England, there is a dedicated scheme that local authorities can bid into for funding to combat coastal erosion. In Scotland, there is no such dedicated fund, and local authorities must decide how to fund such works from the overall funding they receive from the Scottish Government. Does she agree that it would be better if Scottish local authorities also had access to such dedicated funding?

Kirstene Hair: I absolutely agree with my hon. Friend. The Scottish Government have put such scathing cuts on all our local authorities—indeed, Angus has taken one of the biggest hits—that there is no way they can expect them to fund millions of pounds to secure our coastlines. I agree that they need to take further action.

Erosion is a pressing issue in my constituency, as in many other areas of the United Kingdom. Like most of Scotland's east coast, Angus has experienced a large increase in erosion since the 1970s. Hon. Members know that they have a big rural issue when "Countryfile" pitches up in their constituency. The BBC recently covered the incredible acceleration of Montrose's erosion in a piece that alarmed viewers across the United Kingdom.

Montrose is one of the largest towns in my constituency, with a population of about 13,000, and it is particularly threatened. The Montrose golf links, one of the oldest golf courses in the world, is literally being washed away hole by hole, green by green. That vital part of Montrose's local economy—a piece of history that has survived for 456 years—is slipping away before our eyes.

The course loses 1.5 metres of land to sea every year. The second, third and sixth holes have already had to move since last summer. That cannot go on forever—it probably cannot even go on for another decade. At this rate, the links will run out of space at some point and will have to relocate entirely. Action is needed to save this historic and beautiful course, which is economically important and a valuable piece of Angus' cultural and sporting history, for future generations. In 1999, GlaxoSmithKline invested in rock armour for a stretch of the coastline, for which the local area was incredibly grateful, but we cannot continue to lean on private businesses for that type of infrastructure, which costs millions of pounds.

In Montrose, we also have the booming port authority along the shoreline, which is already feeling the financial strain of coastal erosion. It was previously dredging 60,000 tonnes of sand per annum, which has now reached 150,000 tonnes—a marked change in five years.

The flooding aspect of erosion can often be overlooked, but it remains a real threat in Angus. We know the economic, cultural and personal damage that flooding can do to a community, if we think back to the flooding that we saw wreak havoc across Scotland in early 2016. The disruption, the clean-up operation, the rebuilding

[*Kirstene Hair*]

of infrastructure, the reconstruction of defences and the insurance claims all came at huge cost to the local and wider economies. Failure to act and invest in proper defences for coastal communities is not only wrong; it is a false economy.

I am glad that, since 2010, the UK Government have spent £3.2 billion on flood and coastal erosion risk management, as opposed to £2.7 billion in the five years before that, which is a real-terms increase of 8%. Those figures show that there is action from the Government, not just words. That is the sort of long-term, real-terms increase that we need if we are successfully to tackle coastal erosion. I hope that the UK Government will not only maintain but redouble their commitment in this area, and that the Minister will provide more clarity on that.

The Government also need to work with local authorities, the Environment Agency and others to ensure that the approach to erosion is well funded, proactive and, most importantly, ambitious. We need constantly to look 10, 20 or 30 years ahead with a long-term strategy, as opposed to short-term fixes that do not serve our communities.

Sadly, I have found the Scottish Government lacking in ambition in this area. Their enthusiasm for centralisation is renowned, but in this instance, it has left the local authority, Angus Council, with fewer resources and more responsibility. Unlike England, the funding model means that Scottish local authorities receive no dedicated funding, and coastal defences must come at local authorities' expense. At a time when Angus Council has been forced to find budget savings of a staggering £40 million by 2021—one of the largest cuts to any local authority across Scotland—it simply cannot take any more financial strain from the Scottish Government, if we want to ensure that our frontline services remain in place.

Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP): I congratulate the hon. Lady on securing this important debate, but I have to take issue with some of what she says. The council in her constituency is Tory run and it has not used the full amount of money allocated to it for coastal erosion by the Scottish Government. Billions of pounds are being cut from the Scottish Government's budget by her Tory colleagues. Perhaps she will address those issues.

Kirstene Hair: The Scottish Government funding—I will come on to that in a little more detail later—goes nowhere near far enough towards trying to address the problem in Angus. In fact, there have been numerous letters to the Cabinet Secretary, who is the hon. Lady's colleague, to suggest that we need more funding in Angus, but the responses have been filled with empty words.

The fund that the Cabinet Secretary announced was the same old Scottish National party announcement—an all-singing, all-dancing fund—but the Scottish Government have not detailed the amount of money in the fund, nor have they detailed how Angus can benefit from it. However, I will indeed go into that matter in more detail later.

Significant dedicated erosion funding must be put in place, such as the UK Government's flood and coastal erosion risk management schemes in England. The issue

is important and specific enough not to have been put under the umbrella of flood risk management. At a time when the Scottish Government should be looking at ways to boost Scotland's poor economic growth rate—I say that on the basis of their appalling current record—they should be doing all they can to protect the economic potential of coastal Scotland from slipping beneath the waves.

Mr Bob Seely (Isle of Wight) (Con): I am so grateful to my hon. Friend for giving way and for securing this debate. Does she realise that I fully support her call for erosion funding and I will be seeking a meeting with the Minister on this issue? The most significant ground instability problem and the largest occupied landslip in the United Kingdom is the undercliff on the Isle of Wight. Part of the road there gave way, and it has done so many times, lastly in 2014. My problem is that the council is unwilling to invest in rebuilding that road unless we can understand better and at reasonable cost the water flows underneath that part of our coastline. Therefore, we need projects such as the coastal erosion fund to give us the funding to understand some of these more geologically sensitive parts of the United Kingdom.

Kirstene Hair: I thank my hon. Friend for his intervention and I absolutely agree. There are huge studies going on in my constituency as well, because we need to do the groundwork, but we also need to have the funding ready for when those studies complete, so that we can go ahead with the work that needs to be done.

Of course, when it comes to coastal erosion, the waves do not respect local authority boundaries. Erosion affects areas up and down the coastline and different local authorities face common and related problems. This is not something that should be left to local authorities alone; there is space for a much more joined-up approach to erosion at all levels of Government. However, such action must also be timely. I do not want to see Montrose ending up as a cautionary tale for other parts of the coastline.

Unfortunately, the Scottish Government are risking that happening by leaving the implementation of further solutions to the 2022 to 2028 six-year plan for flood risk management. Angus cannot wait until 2022, or until any time between 2022 and 2028. Even by 2022, swathes of the Angus coastline will have been lost. The risk of flooding and erosion to Montrose, Arbroath and other coastal communities in Angus will be even more serious than it is today, and existing defences are being put under increasing and unbearable strain.

It is the responsibility of local authorities, the devolved Administrations and the UK Government alike to start working together on the issue as a matter of urgency, so that we can quite literally hold back the tide that threatens so many of our coastal communities. The Government are due to publish their updated national flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy next year, and within that I ask the Minister to consider ways to make that work happen, ensuring that everyone involved in protecting our coasts around the whole UK is working effectively together.

Will the Minister ensure that the dedicated funding is available from Montrose to Margate? If the Scottish Government cannot support my constituency, can Scotland's other Government step in, once again, to help?

Coastal erosion and the associated issues warrant their own fund, and such a fund must not work as slowly as the flood risk management strategies. In Angus and across Scotland, erosion is happening fast and we need a scheme that operates more quickly than on a six-year cycle.

I hope that the Scottish Government will take these suggestions seriously and give communities fighting erosion the renewed and dedicated support that they need, but what about the individuals and businesses who cannot be helped, or who do not get the help they need in time? They deserve our support too, and I ask the Minister to consider a form of compensation scheme for those who lose their property or land to erosion. It is only right that those affected by erosion get help to rebuild or relocate, and such a scheme would help to cancel out the deterrent effect of the threat of erosion if people considering moving to or investing in a coastal community had that reassurance.

No such scheme exists anywhere in the United Kingdom and it is my hope that sooner rather than later we get such support in place—not only in Scotland, but in all parts of the United Kingdom.

John Lamont (Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk) (Con): My hon. Friend is speaking passionately about this important issue. Is she aware of the economic impact that flooding can have? A number of businesses in my constituency have been affected by flooding and have then been unable to get insurance for their premises, so they now face relocating to another part of Scotland just to allow them to continue doing business—not because they have been directly affected by flooding, but because insurance companies are no longer able to provide them with insurance on competitive terms.

Kirstene Hair: I absolutely agree with my hon. Friend and hope that the Minister will take seriously my call for this kind of compensation scheme, which would help constituents in the borders, in Angus and indeed across our United Kingdom in areas that are prone to flooding.

Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North) (SNP): Will the hon. Lady give way?

Kirstene Hair: I am running out of time. I have just a little of my speech left and we have a huge number of Members who want to speak.

Our coastal communities are thriving areas and we must do everything we can to support them. To do that, we must act on erosion and act quickly to secure their future not only to protect our coastline from erosion, but to eliminate, as far as possible, the looming threat that erosion poses. So let this be a call for ambition, co-operation and urgency—from the Scottish Government in particular, but also from the UK Government, the other devolved Administrations and our local authorities. We should all be invested in the bright future of our coastal economy. Let us not allow erosion to spoil it.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Sir David Crausby (in the Chair): Order. I intend to call the three Front-Bench speakers at 10.30, but a number of Members wish to speak, so, if Members keep their contributions to about four minutes, we will have a chance of getting everybody in.

9.46 am

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): Thank you for that, Sir David. Four minutes? What a challenge.

I thank the hon. Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) for bringing this matter to Westminster Hall for consideration. I am very happy to support her, as she knows. I am glad to say that I come from what I believe to be one of the most beautiful constituencies in the whole of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland—Strangford. I am privileged to live in the heart of the Ards peninsula, on the family farm. Every morning, I wake up and look over at Strangford lough, and I am very aware of the beauty of the area. I see the sun glinting off the water, I see the mountains of Mourne in the distance and I am always very conscious of the wonder of God's creation.

At the same time, the sun glinting off the water alerts me to the issue of coastal erosion. The water may seem somewhat pretty at times, but the fact is that our coastline is crumbling away under our feet, under the foundations of our homes and under our coastal roads. Our foundation is crumbling and we must do something to address that. The issue is not a new one. I will give a Northern Ireland perspective, to show where I am on it. When I wore my former hat as an Assembly Member, I spoke about it in the Northern Ireland Assembly and things have naturally worsened since then.

Most recently, I read an article that referred to a report by the National Trust that had been commissioned on the issue of coastal erosion, which stated the shocking view that:

“Northern Ireland faces major risks from coastal erosion and marine flooding but ‘lacks basic information’”—

those are the very things that the hon. Member for Angus referred to—

“to deal with them.”

The article went on to say that the National Trust

“manages 108 miles of coast in the north, reveals that 46,000 properties are at risk from river or marine flooding, while recent stormy winters have had ‘major impacts on coastal residents’.

Climate change and rising sea-levels are leading to flooding and coastal erosion, the report found. The charity has called for ‘a strategic approach to shoreline management’ to address the challenges of marine flooding and erosion...saying at present it is ‘reactive and poorly structured’”.

That is exactly the problem that our region, like other regions, faces and it is something we are concerned about.

Sir Henry Bellingham: The hon. Gentleman talked about shoreline management. Does he agree that there is a major role for the private sector to contribute, working in partnership with local authorities?

Jim Shannon: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his intervention and I totally agree with what he has said. Northern Ireland has a lack of information about how its coast works—the rates of change, the sources of coastal material, patterns of sand movement, the impact of storms and post-storm recovery—along most of the coastline. Those are the issues for us when it comes to coastal erosion.

Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP): Does my hon. Friend agree that some parts of our Northern Ireland coastline are not only very scenic and beautiful, as is the case in parts of Scotland, England

[Mr Gregory Campbell]

and Wales, but are most majestic and historic? Does he agree that those parts of it that are at risk really need to be safeguarded and that we need both private sector and Government action to do that?

Jim Shannon: I thank my hon. Friend and colleague for his intervention, and I wholeheartedly support the things that he has put forward.

The National Trust's report called for a "strategic approach" and it also

"predicts that rising sea-levels will re-shape the north's coastline." It states that:

"These changes will affect existing and new infrastructure and will result in more frequent flooding and a general tendency for shorelines to move landwards that will be experienced as erosion." That was also made clear by the hon. Member for Angus. The report goes on to state that the length of the "strategic road network" that is at risk will increase by 28%—a significant figure.

The storms in Northern Ireland have meant that Transport NI has seen its costs rise by some £800,000. In my constituency, the road replacement at Whitechurch Road in Ballywalter cost £280,000, the damage to Shore Road in Ballyhalbert cost £36,000, and to Roddens Road £86,000, and there were road repairs at Portaferry Road in Ards, Greyabbey and Kircubbin. The total came to £800,000, which is almost the full budget of the local Transport NI section in Newtownards. What was a once-in-18-years or once-in-20-years occurrence is now a once-in-three-years occurrence. Frustration reigns when Transport NI, the Department of the Environment, the Northern Ireland Environment Agency, the Rivers Agency and the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs either cannot or will not accept responsibility for damage to property and take preventive measures to prevent flooding.

I accept that the matter is a devolved one, but I want to illustrate the problems, which the hon. Member for Angus put forward clearly. At Saltwater Brig in my constituency, many houses and businesses have been damaged by high tides, with insurance claims in excess of £100,000. As the regularity of flooding due to coastal erosion becomes commonplace, we can no longer use sticking plasters to address the issue. The impact on the local community includes accessibility to the road network, the effect on community life and the tourist potential that is yet to be realised—a potential that could deliver more jobs if the road structure and coastal erosion issue were addressed. The House must establish a strategy for the coastlines of the UK. The hon. Member for Angus knows that the matters are devolved, but she looks to the Minister for a response, as do I.

We have a duty to protect people's homes and livelihoods, their connectivity to urban areas and, most importantly, our incredibly beautiful coastlines that are unparalleled anywhere in the world. We must work now to preserve them for the future. A joined-up approach is necessary. We look to the Minister, as always, to give us the help we need in Northern Ireland and, in particular, in my constituency.

9.51 am

John Lamont (Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk) (Con): It is always a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David.

I commend my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing this important debate. She is a tireless champion for Angus on a number of local issues and this morning she has again demonstrated what a strong voice she is for her constituents. In Berwickshire in my constituency, we do not have the same coastal erosion problems as in Montrose and other parts of Angus. However, the coastline remains vulnerable and I want briefly to mention some of the challenges we face.

I would argue that Berwickshire has some of the finest coastline in the United Kingdom. Anyone who has taken the east coast main line will have been impressed by the Berwickshire coastline north of the border. The communities of St Abbs, Coldingham and Eyemouth, and Cove all have spectacular views of sea cliffs, fantastic beaches and the wide-open North sea. The 28-mile-long Berwickshire coastal path from Cockburnspath in my constituency to Berwick-upon-Tweed has, at Tun Law, the second highest cliffs on Britain's east coast and some internationally important habitats for sea birds, coastal flora and marine life. We also have one of the world's most famous geological sites, that of Siccar point. It is an example of a Hutton's unconformity, which led the founder of modern geology, James Hutton, to conclude that the Earth was much older than was widely believed in the 18th century. From the beautiful Pease bay to the spectacular St Abb's Head and Coldingham bay, this stretch of coastline deserves to be looked after and cherished, in the same way as those in other parts of the United Kingdom.

We are lucky in Berwickshire that, because the cliffs are mainly of hard rock, they are more resistant to weathering. However, the softer cliffs at Lower Burnmouth and Cove are under threat. Local erosion through the use of the coastal paths, as well as residential and recreational development, may threaten maritime cliff and slope habitats as well as coastline stability. Parts of the coastline are also vulnerable to flooding, particularly around Eyemouth, where damage to properties has occurred four times since 2012—just last March, a flood warning was issued. The town is lucky to have an extremely well organised community group, the Eyemouth response team, who respond efficiently and professionally to emergencies such as flooding. They were in action at the beginning of the year and, astonishingly, were able to put up flood barriers at the end of the harbour in just 20 minutes.

The Scottish Borders Council manages the Berwickshire coastline well, including maintaining and protecting the coastal path and working alongside Edinburgh Council on the Forth estuary local flood risk management plan. However, I agree that the Scottish Government must step in. In recent years, the choice of the Scottish National party's Administration in Holyrood has been to slash local authority budgets across Scotland. Since 2013, the Scottish Government's revenue budget has fallen by 1.8%, but the SNP Administration have chosen to pass on a much larger cut of 7.1%—£744 million—to local councils, including those in my constituency in the Scottish borders and that of my hon. Friend the Member for Angus. Councils simply cannot be expected properly to protect their coastline without additional support from the Scottish Government, and I commend my hon. Friend for her efforts to put pressure on them. I hope that the UK Government will be able to assist too, in doing more to protect our beautiful coastlines.

9.55 am

John Woodcock (Barrow and Furness) (Ind): It is a pleasure to see you in the Chair, Sir David. I, too, congratulate the hon. Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing the debate.

I want briefly to talk about the serious issue of erosion on the island of Walney, which is just opposite Barrow-in-Furness. That strip of land is connected to the mainland by a bridge. We have wanted a second bridge for many generations, but Walney could need one in a way that we had never anticipated, because it is quite possible that unless action is taken, the island will be split in two by the serious erosion that is taking place—similarly to in other areas across the country—far faster than any study has predicted.

There are two main issues, one in the north of the island and one in the south. In the north, there is what is officially known as West Shore caravan park. The name might suggest that it is a transient part of the visitor economy, but people have bought static caravans there and live in a community. They have seen the erosion getting closer and closer to their homes, threatening several hundred properties. For many years, we have beseeched the Government and looked to the local authority, and potentially to private investment, but the issue remains critical. In the main, the park provides homes for low-income and often elderly, retired people. They are afraid of what nature is doing and fear for the homes they had always dreamed of having on the coast.

On the south of the island is South Walney nature reserve, which is home to Cumbria's only grey seal colony and to the Walney geranium, which is unique to the island. There is a rare vegetated shingle patch, and the yellow horned poppy, which I am reliably told is hard to find, is grown there. The reserve is an invaluable resource for Barrow's schoolchildren. Teachers in some of the schools tell me that many children have never seen the natural environment until they are taken to such places. The reserve is connected by a road that is in desperate need of rock armouring. Without such flood and coastal erosion protection, there is the potential for the island to be cut in two and for the nature reserve to be rendered impassable.

As if all that were not enough, it is not simply about saving the yellow horned poppy; the nation's continuous at-sea deterrent may be at stake for the want of a single road that could be rock armoured for, the landowner tells me, only £200,000. We are in the process of spending about £30 billion on renewing the nation's deterrent—I know everyone in this room will be thoroughly behind that; it is great value to protect the nation from the threat of nuclear destruction—but for the want of £200,000 and a few rocks, we could render the exit passage from Barrow shipyard impassable. At the moment, the boats come out of the dock and sail down Walney channel and away to start their sea trials. They then come back to Faslane. The amount of silt that flows into the channel from the erosion on Walney could make the narrow passage impassable. Often, submarines can pass through it only once a month.

Bob Stewart (Beckenham) (Con): My back is hurting so it takes me a while to get up. Is that channel dredged to ensure that it works all the time?

John Woodcock: The hon. Gentleman asks a very good question. The channel has been dredged in the past, and it could be in the future, but that would probably only be at the cost of many hundreds of millions of pounds—certainly if the nature of it were to change. A preventive measure would be simply to put in the rock-armoured road, which would protect the nature reserve and the caravan site to the south, and keep our nation safe from the potential for nuclear blackmail. That has to be good value. As a first step, I urge the Minister to consult his colleagues at the Ministry of Defence to see whether we can get an official study into the nature of the threat to the channel and the potential blocking of submarine access.

10.1 am

Gillian Keegan (Chichester) (Con): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing this important debate and highlighting the risk to all our coastal communities.

Many of my constituents are lucky enough to live by the sea, with beautiful views and a vibrant tourism economy. The Chichester constituency is home to some of the UK's most beautiful beaches and diverse marine ecosystems, but with those privileges comes a great deal of risk. Coastal erosion and flooding are a constant threat to many areas. Over the past century, we have observed a global mean sea level rise of 20 cm and that trend is set to continue over the coming years, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. To contextualise that, just a 50 cm rise in local sea levels would make 200 km of our current defences vulnerable to failure. Under the IPCC's modelling, that is within the range of likely outcomes by the end of this century.

In my area, Chichester District Council is doing well to tackle the symptoms, if not the cause. It maintains the majority of the populated open coastline that stretches from Emsworth to Pagham. The council has shoreline management plans in place for each stretch of its coastline. Its work is highly collaborative and transparent, and by working with local stakeholders and the Environment Agency, it ensures that its work benefits the area's economy, community and ecosystems.

Sir Henry Bellingham: My local council has similar policies in place, but there is a real problem coming down the track with the disappearance of the revenue support grant. When that goes, there will surely have to be some form of top-slicing or maybe a ring-fenced precept for local authorities such as my hon. Friend's and mine.

Gillian Keegan: I agree. My local authority is very concerned by negative RSG, not just the disappearance of RSG. Negative RSG would mean having to pay more to support other areas.

The council's collaborative work has achieved high levels of third-party investment and led to better coastal protection. My hon. Friend is right that we need to properly fund our coastal areas. At East Head and at Pagham harbour, coastal advisory groups run the UK's only two active management sites. Both sites have a highly dynamic coastline, so predicting erosive and flood patterns can be very challenging. Active management

[Gillian Keegan]

involves long-term monitoring and observation to ensure interventions are effective and in tune with the natural processes.

The regional coastal monitoring programme, based in Southampton, is key to that process, providing data on waves, tides and the changing nature of the coastline. Armed with that data, the group can make decisions on interventions such as replacing or removing failing structures or replenishing beach sediments. Such is the success of the programme that natural changes at Pagham since 2016 have removed the threat to residents in the short term and introduced an intertidal wetland habitat that is now a Royal Society for the Protection of Birds nature reserve.

The council receives a grant of £250,000 a year. That funding allows it to protect people, business and habitats. Over recent years, the Environment Agency has invested a further £30 million as part of its flood and coastal erosion risk management at Medmerry, where the UK's first managed realignment site is ongoing. West Wittering, where erosive processes are mitigated to maintain the beach, attracted around 800,000 visitors last year, driving the local economy and simultaneously helping protect the internationally important saltmarsh environment sheltered by East Head spit.

There is still significant concern in my area, however. In the long term, the council has warned that highly populated areas such as Selsey, Bracklesham and East Wittering will eventually require significant investment.

Bob Stewart: I know West Wittering; it is a fabulous beach. Knowing it quite well, I wonder how the heck it and the saltmarshes can be protected. The area is so big, and the whole of my hon. Friend's constituency is quite low lying. With rising sea levels, I do not see how we can do much about it.

Gillian Keegan: That is the point of the debate; we have to do something about it, because no one would want to see the disappearance of such an important stretch of coastline or the nature reserves we have in the area. My hon. Friend is right that we have to focus on low-lying areas, but protecting the Chichester constituency coastline and the south coast will be increasingly important.

As an area, we must continue to invest in our coastal infrastructure. We look forward to the larger investment that will be required alongside our innovative approaches, such as managed realignment and active management. It is true that we cannot do it alone. We require further investment from the Department.

10.7 am

Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. I congratulate the hon. Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing this debate, despite her tone at times and some of the substance, with which I did not agree.

Members may question why the Member for Livingston is taking part in a debate on coastal erosion. I do not have any coastline in my constituency, but I spent six years of my professional life in the north-east of Scotland in Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen, and I saw the impact of coastal erosion on that area. I worked for Alex

Salmond, the former Member for Gordon and for Banff and Buchan. One of the first things I dealt with in my time as his office manager was the flooding in Pennan and the impact it had on that community. I spent most of the three years working for him in the community, working with the families there.

I will never forget the experience of going into the house of an elderly gentleman who lived there—many of the homes in Pennan are second homes; only a small number live in that very important community—and convincing him to leave because the back windows had dirt coming in and he was at risk of being crushed if he stayed in his own home. As the hon. Member for Angus mentioned, there are challenges in dealing with insurance companies.

There is no doubt that we have significant challenges in coastal erosion the length and breadth of Scotland and beyond, and it is vital that all the Governments of the UK work together. I want to set the record straight on what the Scottish Government have done. I hope the hon. Lady will be aware of the £42 million a year that the Scottish Government have made available via the capital settlement since 2008—that is, £420 million—to enable local authorities to invest in flood prevention and coastal erosion works. That is backed up by some of the things that my hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen North (Kirsty Blackman) will mention, such as the marine protection monitoring and Scotland's "Dynamic Coast" national coastal change assessments, which are being taken forward with various academic institutes across Scotland. As the hon. Member for Angus rightly said, we have to ensure the academic community are included.

I am a surfer. I took it up when I spent time in the north-east of Scotland, and having surfed various coasts in Scotland and around the UK, I have seen the impact that coastal erosion has on those communities and the surfing environment. The mudslides that I saw in Pennan during my time working in the north-east of Scotland showed me how complex and difficult some of the issues are; in many cases, there are no simple fixes, or indeed fast fixes. The hon. Member for Angus talked about the speed at which some of these issues need to be dealt with. I agree with her in many respects, but, given the geography of her constituency and the impact that it has had, she will appreciate that sometimes the issues are not dealt with as quickly as we would like. They can be very complex. I remember various discussions with Aberdeenshire Council about whether it was going to put the rocks in casings or pin them back. A significant geological survey often needs to take place, and that can be complex and difficult.

The hon. Lady is a great champion of her own constituency, and I have no doubt she will take her case to the Scottish Government as well. I hope that we can work together and not get ourselves into an overtly party political, partisan debate. As we go through the Brexit process, environment policy and the funding that will be available for our Government and for the UK Government will be significantly impacted. We have yet to know the real impact.

I want to draw attention to the marine protected area monitoring strategy, which allows fishermen to support the monitoring and surveying of some of Scotland's most vulnerable marine habitats and ensure that detailed information is collected from the MPA network to

create a more accurate picture of the health of marine environments. The Scottish Government ensured that we engaged as broadly as we possibly could and that those at the forefront of the issues of coastal erosion are those who are monitoring it and reporting back.

Of the areas around Scotland that have been eroded, 40 metres to 60 metres of beach have eroded since the 1980s, and that rate will continue over the next 30 years. That is a significant challenge to a country that has one of the biggest coastal areas in Europe. Our SNP Government in Scotland are committed to taking on those challenges. I hope that the UK Government will work with our colleagues in Scotland and that, as we go through the process of Brexit, issues such as coastal erosion and protecting the environment will not be lost in the noise coming from that debate.

10.12 am

Sir Hugo Swire (East Devon) (Con): In following the hon. Lady's speech just now, I am not certain as to which is eroding more quickly: the coastline of Scotland or support for the increasingly incompetent SNP Administration in Edinburgh.

I want to confine my remarks to a particular part of my constituency, one of the jewels in the crown of East Devon: Sidmouth, a regency seaside town well known to my hon. Friend the Minister. Sidmouth is at the gateway to the Jurassic coast world heritage site, and a large part of the town is in a conservation area. For years now, I have been working with various bodies and individuals in the town—not least the local councillors, Councillor Stuart Hughes and now Councillor Tom Wright—to try to resolve what has become an increasingly difficult problem, particularly for the residents of Cliff Road, overlooking Pennington Point, which has seen erosion year on year. Indeed, earlier in 2018 it was widely reported in the national press that Cliff Road was one of the most endangered roads in the UK, owing to coastal erosion.

We are very dependent on the south-west coastal path in Sidmouth. We have replaced the Alma bridge, but the various different schemes have gone on for too long. Over the years I have had Sir James Bevan, the chief executive of the Environment Agency, down to see the erosion. Andrew Sells, who is in charge of Natural England, has been down. I even had my right hon. Friend the Member for North Shropshire (Mr Paterson), who was then the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, come and look at it.

There are two issues at stake. One is the complexity of trying to get a satisfactory solution. It is a complicated engineering issue. Many different bodies are involved in the steering group: East Devon District Council, Sidmouth Town Council, local fishermen, the Environment Agency, Devon County Council, the National Trust and the Cliff Road Action Group. All of those groups have a rightful interest, but that has delayed the implementation of a scheme that can arrest the erosion that we see year on year.

The new scheme, the preferred scheme, for the Sidmouth beach management plan would see a new groyne wall installed on East Beach and a plan to raise the splash wall along the promenade. I am extremely nervous about the prospect of raising the wall along the promenade because we have seen what happened in the neighbouring

constituency of Tiverton and Honiton: one can drive down the esplanade in Seaton and not actually see the sea. We would not want that replicated in Sidmouth. This part of the £9 million project would last around 100 years.

We now have a funding issue. East Devon District Council needs to raise £3.3 million, with the rest hopefully being secured from the Environment Agency. Work would begin in 2019 and be completed in 2020. When we look at the areas we can raise the money from, we see that we are left with either a local levy, the district council, Sidmouth Town Council, South West Water, local charities, visitors, East Devon housing, and residents. I humbly submit to the Minister that it is not satisfactory to try to leave a small local authority with a funding gap that will prevent the scheme from being realised.

Sir Henry Bellingham: My hon. Friend is being incredibly generous in giving way. My local authority has similar problems, but it faces a structural funding deficit. The Minister's Department and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government must consider making some form of ring-fenced precept available to local councils, and perhaps there should be more contributions from town and parish councils inland.

Sir Hugo Swire: I agree with my hon. Friend that it is almost impossible to ask local authorities for large amounts of money to fill the gap because they all operate under very strict financial constraints now. Such schemes should not be held back by relying on the local authority to make up the difference, so I ask the Minister whether Bellwin can be extended. Can my residents of Cliff Road, who have found it impossible to get mortgages and increasingly difficult to get insurance as they see their gardens disappear, get a compensation package?

I hope that the whole area can be dealt with quickly. We need a masterplan for the whole Port Royal area along the esplanade, but there is no point in doing that until we have secured the Pennington Point and rock revetment scheme, because that would threaten the sewage works in the area, which could in due course flood the entire town.

I do not want to delay the debate unduly. The Minister is welcome to come to Sidmouth at any time to see the situation for himself. We are almost there now. This has gone on for so long. The scheme must be implemented. We cannot wait any longer. We have got people onsite. We have got everything lined up now. I pay tribute to all those who have got this far, but we have a funding deficit and I ask the Minister to be creative in looking at the compensation issue for the residents of Cliff Road and also in helping with the funding that we need to get the scheme under way.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Sir David Crausby (in the Chair): Order. If Members keep their contributions to three minutes, we will get everyone in.

10.18 am

Steve Double (St Austell and Newquay) (Con): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David.

I am honoured to represent one of only three constituencies in the country that has two separate coasts: the beautiful, rugged north coast of Cornwall

[*Steve Double*]

with its surf beaches and the south coast with its coves and ports. The Minister's constituency also has that type of coastline.

I want to address the issue of planning. We are seeing more frequent and more severe cliff falls in Cornwall as a result of the weather. People's gardens are being eroded and houses built on the cliff tops are threatened. There is an increasing trend in Cornwall for people to buy old properties and then apply for planning permission to build larger properties that invariably encroach nearer to the cliff edge. That is causing great concern, particularly in Newquay in my constituency. I pay tribute to Protect Newquay Clifftops, which has been campaigning for some time to try to stop that trend, which is not only spoiling the view of our clifftops, but putting those properties, I believe, at future risk as the erosion continues.

The national planning policy framework provides protection for coastal areas and clifftops, saying that plans should

"reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development".

I am delighted that our local authority, Cornwall Council, often refuses planning applications where properties would encroach on the cliff edge. However, all too often those applications go to appeal, and the planning inspector, who does not seem to have any local knowledge or appreciation of the situation that we face in Cornwall, allows the building to go ahead.

I know this does not come under the Minister's portfolio, but I am aware that the Marine Management Organisation plays a particular role in, and is often consulted on, such planning issues. Perhaps there could be an increased role for the MMO in the planning process to ensure that cliff erosion and cliff falls, which take place much more frequently in Cornwall, are a significant factor in policy when planning applications are considered for construction on clifftops, particularly in such places as Cornwall. I am concerned that we are storing up trouble for future generations by allowing such developments to take place. If the cliff continues to erode, properties will be put at risk. I ask the Minister to look into whether there could be an increased role for the MMO in the planning process in our coastal regions.

10.21 am

Peter Aldous (Waveney) (Con): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David, and I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing the debate. I welcome the Minister to his place, though I highlight the sterling work done by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, my hon. Friend the Member for Suffolk Coastal (Dr Coffey), on the protection of the coast, both locally and nationally. I wish her well, and hope to see her back in her place very shortly.

It is vital that we have an effective coastal and flood erosion policy in place, as the challenge that we face is going to increase over the coming years as sea levels rise. The management of the coast takes place within a legislative framework that was set down in 1949. Although it has been adapted, that framework has drawbacks. Local authorities are fragmented and coastal defence is only one of a multitude of demands that they face. At a

national level, there is a need for a more cross-Government approach. The Environment Agency's focus is very much on the short term, but we need to look at the longer-term needs of coastal communities as well.

There is good news. Many innovative schemes are taking place around the coast. In East Anglia, in recognition of the impact of coastal change, all six coastal planning authorities in Suffolk and Norfolk are drafting a statement of common ground, and are taking a common approach to managing the coast in revising their local plans. Three schemes are taking place in my constituency. The Lowestoft flood risk management project is at its detailed planning stage and will be completed in 2020-21 at Corton and Kessingland.

To promote more cost-effective long-term strategic coastal management the Government need to address three specific issues. First, there needs to be better reporting on schemes from around the country, so we can learn from those projects. Secondly, we need to promote long-term adaptation of vulnerable coastlines, and make the planning system simpler to do that. Thirdly, as we have heard, the Bellwin scheme needs to be looked at more fully. If we do that, we can move away from a crisis management approach to more of a long-term, strategic, collaborative approach.

10.23 am

Scott Mann (North Cornwall) (Con): I, too, congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing today's debate. Coastal erosion is an important issue, threatening livelihoods, homes, environments and economies. In North Cornwall, we have a great number of assets along our Cornish coastline that make up our heritage and our economy. The coast itself is the reason people visit Cornwall and the wider south-west. They come for our beaches, fishing villages and fantastic food, and, importantly, our coast paths. It is important that we include in that the south-west coast path. That huge asset is a big economic driver for the south-west tourism industry as a whole, as well as North Cornwall's. It is great to see the fantastic "Poldark" back on our TV screens regularly on Sunday evenings, showcasing the great south-west, with Poldark parading around on our beaches and our coastal footpaths.

The south-west coast path is 630 miles long. It is the longest national trail in the country, stretching from Minehead across the north coasts of Somerset, Cornwall and Devon, and heading back along the south coast all the way to Poole in Dorset. With breath-taking views and leisurely walks, the coast path is popular with locals, tourists, hikers and charity walkers alike. If coastal erosion progresses in Cornwall, the south-west coast path will be one of the first things to fall into the sea, threatening numerous local economies.

In 2012, the South West Coast Path Association and Visit Cornwall released figures showing that walkers who used the path spent £436 million in the local economy. That was an increase of 15% on the previous three years, and I have no doubt that those figures will have increased since 2012. It is therefore essential that we protect the coast path and this beautiful asset for generations to come.

Tintagel castle in my constituency is another asset that could be vulnerable to coastal erosion, and which contributes hugely to the North Cornwall economy.

Situated on Tintagel Island, the castle dates back to the 13th century and is linked to the legend of King Arthur. According to recent statistics, the castle was visited by a quarter of a million people in 2017—up by 70,000 over the past 10 years. That obviously creates huge tourism benefits for Tintagel and surrounding communities, and is an example of why we should take coastal erosion seriously.

Research shows that sea levels are rising, creating all sorts of challenges in coastal communities that we need to address robustly. That is why today's debate is vital not only for Cornwall, but for other parts of the UK. I know mine has been only a small contribution, but the coast paths are vital to our economy. I know that the Minister cares about the issue because he has some beautiful coastline in his constituency. I hope that he will do all that he can to ensure that we protect this heritage asset for the future.

10.27 am

Douglas Ross (Moray) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing this extremely important debate. Moray has suffered from significant flooding over several decades. Millions of pounds have been invested in flood alleviation schemes in Forres, Elgin, Dallas, Newmill, Keith, Rothes and Lhanbryde, but none of those is a coastal community. Coastal communities, which suffer just as much as inland communities, feel neglected in our area. Portknockie, for example, suffered landslips just last year, and although I welcome yesterday's announcement from Sustrans and Moray Council—in response to my correspondence—that work is being done to reopen a path between Portknockie and Cullen, I still have constituents living in homes at the top of a landslip, precariously close to the edge, who fear every day for their properties.

For 10 years before being elected to Parliament, I was a councillor on Moray Council. Part of my Fochabers Lhanbryde ward was the communities of Garmouth and Kingston. They have suffered more than most. Ross House, which 10 years ago was 150 yards from the River Spey, now has the river lapping against its walls. That shows how much coastal erosion there has been. Garmouth and Kingston golf course, like Montrose golf links in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Angus, has suffered considerably. We have had a par 5 go to a par 4, and it is now a par 3 because so much of it has been washed away.

I welcome the fact that Garmouth and Kingston could be designated as potentially vulnerable areas under the new Scottish Environment Protection Agency scheme, but I was struck by the words of my hon. Friend, who said that too much time is spent on studies and not enough on action. I endorse that wholeheartedly.

Many studies, at my request, have looked at dredging, for example. Every time that I, as an elected representative, and communities say we should dredge the River Spey, people come back to us to say, "Well, no—you've got to worry about the flora and the fauna." I am sorry, but I do not worry about the flora and the fauna; I worry about my constituents, who are living in fear every day that their house might be flooded, that they might be moved away or that they could lose property altogether. Some of the studies have to look at the real personal impacts of flooding and coastal erosion in their area.

I would finish with a quote from a lady from Garmouth who said, "We want action, not sympathy." They are fed up with warm words from politicians of all Governments. What they want now is action from their Governments, whether that be the Scottish Government, the UK Government or local authorities, because they are living in fear of coastal erosion. It is only right that we as politicians stand up for them to get the changes they need and deserve.

Sir David Crausby (in the Chair): I ask the two Opposition Front-Bench spokespeople to divide up their time to give the Minister enough opportunity to wind up the debate and to allow the mover of the motion time for a brief response at the end. I call Kirsty Blackman.

10.30 am

Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North) (SNP): Thank you, Sir David. I will do my best not to take too long. I am grateful to you for chairing the debate, and I thank the hon. Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) for securing it and the Backbench Business Committee for scheduling it.

This is a useful debate; it is clear that this is a serious and worrying issue with the potential for long-lasting devastating effects. The other point made clear today is that the issue is not the same in all areas. Just like the varied coastline throughout Scotland, England, Northern Ireland and Wales, the issues that each part of that coastline faces are different.

As my hon. Friend the Member for Livingston (Hannah Bardell) mentioned, the Scottish Government fund such issues on a recurring basis, with £42 million of capital funding per year since 2008. That is really important in relation to flood prevention and coastal erosion, which are linked.

Douglas Ross: I welcome the hon. Lady's point, but the figure from the Scottish Government that she cites pales into insignificance when we take into consideration that the Elgin flood alleviation scheme alone cost £86 million. The funding coming from her Government in a year does not even fund half of that scheme.

Kirsty Blackman: The Scottish Government would have more money to spend on issues such as flood prevention and coastal erosion—

Douglas Ross: If they were not obsessed with independence.

Kirsty Blackman: The Scottish Government would have more money if Scotland was an independent country and we had the ability to raise our own taxes and, for example, support immigration and grow our population in the way that we would like it to grow. Immigration is important for coastal communities, particularly because of the people who have moved out of those communities. As my hon. Friend the Member for Livingston mentioned, many of the houses in Pennan are owned by second-home owners, not people who live there. We need to grow Scotland's population so that people are living there and standing up for and protecting those areas.

The hon. Member for Moray (Douglas Ross) was very clear about how important it is that his constituents are protected, which I completely agree with, but I was

[Kirsty Blackman]

concerned about his disregard for the flora and fauna that we also need to protect. A huge number of people have raised concerns about the effect of plastics in our oceans, for example, and I think many of our constituents would be hugely concerned about the impact on marine wildlife of any changes that are sought. That is why it is important that any decisions on protecting areas from coastal erosion are made with the best information, and why the Scottish Government have funded the national coastal change assessment. Phase 1 is completed and they are on to phase 2. Given the dramatic effects of climate change, and that coastal erosion is speeding up, it is incredibly important that any decisions are taken while looking at the current effects of climate change. It is an ever-moving feast and we need to have the best possible information before taking any decisions.

It was interesting to hear some of the issues hon. Members have with studies taking place. Angus Council's study will not be finished until July 2019; the hon. Member for Angus is pushing for action right now, when the council has not completed its study. The other point that bugs me about what that council is doing is that it has not committed to use the full funding it has been given for the purpose of protecting against coastal erosion. It takes a special kind of hypocrisy for a council to say, "We are not spending all of the money we have been given for this purpose, but we would like some more." I do not think that is a sensible position to take. The case made by the hon. Member for Angus would be much stronger if the local authority could evidence that it had spent all the money it had been allocated in the correct way to protect against coastal erosion.

Further on funding, the Scottish Government have committed to putting their Crown Estates money towards the betterment of coastal communities, which will be a recurring amount of money provided to councils such as Angus. It would be useful if that council would commit to using the money for preventing coastal erosion, particularly in relation to the concerns around the golf links that the hon. Lady mentioned and the erosion that is happening at some speed in that area.

I represent Aberdeen, with its beautiful beach that was immortalised in the mid-20th century railway posters as "the Silver City with the Golden Sands". In 2006, action was taken in Aberdeen to protect our coastline from erosion and we now have what are called T-groins—large defences that ensure our beach is not washed away. It was good that that action was taken, but it did not receive universal buy-in when it was first put forward. People, not least the surfing community, raised a number of concerns. It has taken time for that to bed in and for us to be able to prove that it has not had the negative effects suggested.

One of the important things going forward with action on coastal erosion is to ensure that communities buy into it and that we are doing whatever we can to protect housing, properties and tourism, but also marine life. In Scotland, the marine litter strategy was introduced a number of years ago—it is not a new thing. It is about tackling the issues that damage the most vulnerable marine wildlife.

It is very important that we come together. We absolutely must look at making sure that studies are done so that the best possible, futureproofed, action can be taken,

but we must get the communities on board, including those in the wider community—perhaps those who do not live near the coast but are particularly concerned about the impact on wildlife. As I have said in Westminster Hall a number of times, we need to work together and we can all learn from each other. Action taken in some places in Scotland could be replicated in some places in England, and vice versa. We need to make sure that with any action we take to protect any of our coastlines, we are learning from the experiences of others and ensuring that those coastlines are protected for future generations.

10.37 am

Holly Lynch (Halifax) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. I join colleagues in paying tribute to the hon. Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing this debate and I thank her for a detailed and engaging speech, in which she outlined that 17% of our coastline is at risk of erosion, along with the infrastructure that is inseparable from those seaside communities. She told us that the second, third and sixth holes have already been relocated on the iconic golf course in her Angus constituency and she has done her constituents proud in making sure that their voices are heard in this debate today.

As the shadow Minister with responsibility for coastal communities, I agree that this debate is incredibly important. With rising sea levels and increasingly extreme weather, our coastlines are particularly vulnerable to the impact of climate change. Hon. Members will be aware that my own constituency, while entirely land-locked, experienced devastating flooding in 2015, and so I am all too aware of how increasingly extreme weather can impact on all of our lives.

We have heard some compelling speeches. The hon. Member for Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk (John Lamont) made a very important point about Flood Re and the Government's failure to really get to grips with an insurance offer for flood-affected businesses. While Flood Re is working very well for domestic properties, we really do not have an offer together for flood-affected businesses. I hope the Minister will be able to offer some help to businesses and that this is not a problem put on the "too difficult to solve" pile.

My hon. Friend the Member for Barrow and Furness (John Woodcock) told us of the risks to Walney island in his area and talked of the risk of the unique biodiversity on the island being lost to the elements forever without intervention to protect it. The hon. Member for Chichester (Gillian Keegan) made a similar point about the nature reserves in her constituency. The hon. Member for North Cornwall (Scott Mann) spoke with passion about the coastline in his area, which has been showcased by the BBC drama "Poldark"—I confess, I am not sure everybody watches "Poldark" to admire the scenery in the background. We have heard about the challenges in Scotland, and we have heard from hon. Members representing coastlines all over the country.

It is always a pleasure to see the Minister in his place, but I join the hon. Member for Waveney (Peter Aldous) in wishing the Under-Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the hon. Member for Suffolk Coastal (Dr Coffey), a speedy recovery. She has a great deal of experience in this area, and will no doubt be watching this debate with great interest.

For a country of our size, the UK has an exceptional length of coastline, totalling more than 17,000 km. In contrast, the Netherlands has about 500 km. Although historically it has created opportunities for fishing, tourism and a variety of other economic interests, a significant proportion of our coastal landscapes are at risk of coastal erosion. About one third of the English coastline, and more than half of the coastline in my home region of Yorkshire and the Humber, is subject to erosion. Across the country, incredibly tough decisions are being taken about whether to hold the line or surrender it.

There is nothing new about coastal erosion; it has been taking place for millions of years. Waves and winds erode some areas, but can deposit matter elsewhere. The haunting story of what happened at Hallsands in Devon in 1917—the entire village of 29 homes was lost to the sea within 48 hours—is a reminder of the power of the sea, and coastal erosion can be accelerated by storms.

Although coastal erosion is not a new problem, changing weather patterns and rising sea levels are creating new challenges. It is increasingly clear that what was once termed “exceptional weather” is occurring with worrying regularity. Although it is difficult to link any particular extreme weather event directly to climate change, the trend is clear. Last month’s unusually warm weather was officially classified as the hottest May since records began, and December 2015—just over two years ago—was the wettest month on record, and there was extensive flooding. Speaking after those floods, Professor Myles Allen, of the University of Oxford, summed up the new reality well:

“Normal weather, unchanged over generations, is a thing of the past. You are not meant to beat records by those margins and if you do so, just like in athletics, it is a sign something has changed.”

Current UK annual damages from coastal flooding are estimated to be £540 million per year, which will almost certainly increase with future sea level rises. According to the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, the global mean sea level has already risen 20 cm since the 1900s. POST also notes that the rate of the rise was 1.5 mm per year between 1901 and 1990. However, from 1993 to 2014, it rose an average of 3.2 mm per year.

It often feels as if we are only reluctantly facing up to the devastation that could result from sea level rises. The Committee on Climate Change warned that

“for levels of sea level rise beyond one metre, which could occur this century, 200 km of coastal defences in England are projected to become vulnerable to failure in storm conditions”.

It is clear that we are facing a challenge of the most serious kind, which requires big thinking and effective action. We know that there is a very human cost for those in affected areas. It is hard to imagine how difficult it must be for a person to give up their family home because it has simply become too dangerous to live there.

We also know about the threat to our sporting heritage. As we have heard, the Montrose Golf Links faces many problems. It is estimated that one sixth of Scotland’s golf courses are vulnerable, due to their coastal location. Ironically, Donald Trump’s Aberdeenshire golf course is also at risk of severe flooding, according to Ordnance Survey research, which predicts that the coastline next to the Trump International Golf Links resort will recede

by tens of metres over the next 20 to 30 years. We look forward to seeing him still refuse to take action on climate change when his own golf course is underwater.

I hope the Minister can address a number of concerns shared by those living in coastal areas. I will be interested to hear his response to the Committee on Climate Change’s adaptation sub-committee report, published last June, which said:

“Sea level rise of more than one metre by the end of this century cannot be ruled out, and this would mean some communities in the UK would no longer be viable...Shoreline Management Plans identify areas where existing defences will become unsustainable or not cost-effective to maintain by the 2030s and beyond. This will have significant implications for some stretches of coastline, but the affected communities have not yet been seriously engaged in adaptation planning and need to, long before coastal defences become unsustainable.”

Given that the committee’s advice is so clear, what steps are the Government taking to ensure people living in those areas are aware of the risks and are planning for the future? Such conversations will always be difficult, but given the severity of the predictions and the actions set out in the management plans, people need to be clear about what is likely to happen.

Further to the point made by the hon. Member for St Austell and Newquay (Steve Double), according to the national planning policy framework, it is not appropriate to allocate permanent new residential development within an area susceptible to coastal change. Local plans identify that coastal change management areas as likely to be affected by erosion. The Minister may be aware that a National Trust survey found that in 2015, only 29 of England’s 94 coastal planning authorities had defined coastal change management areas. One third of the coastal planning authorities did not have such policies. Can the Minister update the House about the situation? Has he been assured that all planning authorities in coastal areas are incorporating long-term coastal erosion projections into their planning policies?

Further to the point made by the hon. Member for Angus, I am keen to see the next national flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy. Although flooding is the most common consequence of coastal erosion, the Minister will appreciate the very different challenges in addressing coastal erosion and inland flooding. I hope that is reflected in the funding and resources dedicated to those different but not unconnected challenges.

More broadly, we cannot ignore the relationship between extreme weather, climate change and coastal erosion, so I must probe the Government further on what they are doing to tackle carbon emissions. In recent years, the Government have sold off the Green Investment Bank and scrapped the Department of Energy and Climate Change, and new low-carbon investment is now lower than it was when they took office. It is therefore not surprising that the UK is now on course to miss its carbon reduction targets and its legally binding 15% renewable target by 2020.

I appreciate that energy policy is not directly within the Minister’s remit, but I am afraid to say that, since the demise of the Department of Energy and Climate Change, it looks like climate change has not been mainstreamed across Government, but has fallen through the cracks. I hope the Minister will urge others in Government to treat this issue with the seriousness and urgency it deserves.

[Holly Lynch]

Coastal erosion is a huge concern along significant lengths of our coastline. With rising sea levels, significant parts of our coastline face being literally swept off the map. I am inclined to agree with the hon. Member for Angus that now is the time for long-term, joined-up thinking. I hope the Minister will respond to the points raised in this debate and assure us that the Government are serious about tackling climate change, defending our coastlines and, crucially, taking communities with them in facing up to these challenges.

10.47 am

The Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (George Eustice): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. Like a number of other hon. Members, I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Angus (Kirstene Hair) on securing the debate. She articulated the problems facing her constituents in Montrose with passion, and was characteristically robust in the points she made. I am conscious that this issue affects many parts of the country, including my own, as my hon. Friends from various Cornish constituencies pointed out. It is good that so many Members turned up at 9.30 am to raise this important issue in the first debate of the morning when we might face a lateish night in this place.

As the shadow Minister pointed out, the Under-Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, my hon. Friend the Member for Suffolk Coastal (Dr Coffey), would normally lead on this part of the portfolio. I am covering this debate because, as a number of hon. Members know, she is recuperating from a recent illness. However, she will be following the debate closely, as coastal erosion is an ongoing challenge for her constituency of Suffolk Coastal. I very much look forward to receiving a text from her later this morning, as often happens after such debates, giving me an update on how I did.

As everybody is aware, responsibility for the management of coastal erosion is devolved to the Governments of the four nations of the UK. I will return later to some of what they are doing.

Coastal erosion is a natural process that always has and always will change the shape of our coastline, but change can be distressing for those living nearby. In March this year, we all saw the dramatic pictures from Hemsby when the “beast from the east” struck the coast of Norfolk. That county has a dynamic coastline, which has been retreating progressively over past centuries, but on that occasion the concentrated power of wind and sea eroded nearly 5 metres of shore along a 700-metre frontage, leaving 13 homes balanced precariously above the sea. Proactive management by the Environment Agency and the local council led to residents being evacuated by Great Yarmouth Borough Council. After the storm, 11 properties were demolished and, of the remainder, one property was saved by the owner rolling it back, and another needed only part of it to be demolished as it too was rolled back.

The key difference between fluvial flooding and coastal erosion is that, while still distressing, the impact of fluvial—river—and surface flooding tends to be temporary, while the impact of coastal flooding is terminal and carries much greater risk to human life. Of the £2.5 billion

to be invested in flood defences between 2015 and 2021, nearly £1 billion is dedicated to coastal areas, reflecting how seriously we take that challenge.

Given my constituency, I understand people’s concerns. Cornwall has the longest coastline in England, at more than 1,000 kilometres, and the occurrence of coastal flooding is likely to increase threefold over the next 100 years. My constituency has both a north-facing and a south-facing coastline, and some of the exposed cliffs along the north coast have historical rates of coastal erosion of up to 40 metres in the past 100 years. They are likely to experience at least a further 40 metres of erosion in the next 100 years.

Sustainable coastal management needs to embrace change. I recognise that this debate was called on the back of a particular Scottish concern, in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Angus, but this is a UK-wide matter and I feel that I should consider how we approach things in each nation, starting of course with England, where the Government set the overall policy and local councils lead on management of coastal erosion risk in their areas.

Earlier this decade, a significant decision was taken by the Government to recognise formally that we would not defend every part of our coastline from erosion. We devolved decision making to a local level, confirming what had already been happening in practice. That made the process for councils designing a shoreline management plan more meaningful. Such plans set out at a high level the policy framework to manage the risk of change.

Covering three time horizons—20, 50 and 100 years—the plans recommend four approaches to management: first, advancing the line, or moving defences out beyond the coast, which is used in some circumstances; secondly, holding the line, which means using either soft or hard defences to reduce or eliminate erosion; thirdly, managed realignment, where we accept the inevitable but manage the process, taking account of local geology and wildlife; and, finally, an approach of no active intervention, which allows nature to take its course.

Much of the debate has focused on whether the devolved Administrations are doing enough to support their councils. I shall say a little about what we do in England. To support our councils, the Environment Agency provides a national picture of what is happening on the coast. It has established national coastal erosion risk maps that provide a consistent assessment of coastal erosion risk around the country and set out a best-practice method for calculating that risk. The agency is also supporting a national refresh of shoreline management plans to ensure that they remain based on accurate information. There is also investment, which, inevitably, was a big feature of this debate.

We put significant investment into coastal erosion prevention. In England, between 2015 and 2021, our plans will see £885 million invested in projects to manage coastal erosion and better to protect communities against flooding from the sea. At the same time as the Government made the decision specifically not to defend the entire coastline, they also made the important decision that any scheme with a positive benefit-cost ratio could still receive some Government funding to support partnership funding locally. We also established corporation tax relief for businesses to contribute to such projects.

Our partnership approach means that schemes that would not have progressed in the past can go ahead if local funding can be found through the partnership model. Our £2.6 billion capital investment programme is expected to attract more than £600 million in partnership funding contributions on top of that.

In Norfolk, an innovative public-private project will provide protection for nationally important gas infrastructure and enhance protection for local communities.

Sir Hugo Swire: I hear what the Minister says about local businesses helping, but in a town such as Sidmouth, where the average local business is a small retailer already suffering under business rates and with lack of footfall on the high street, is it realistic to expect such smaller companies to contribute?

George Eustice: There will always be challenges in raising funding, but we are committed to the partnership model and projects that would not have been able to take place before we introduced those measures can now do so. I visited Sidmouth last year, so I am familiar with what my right hon. Friend highlights—his constituency has a beautiful, albeit quite hilly, footpath along the coastal road—but I am happy to visit his constituency again to look at those issues at first hand.

To complete my point about the innovative approach in Norfolk, we are seeing a technique called sandscaping, whereby 1.8 million tonnes of sand and gravel are deposited near the shore. That provides direct protection from storms and acts as a source for material to nourish beaches.

My hon. Friend the Member for Angus highlighted a comparison between the approaches to funding taken in Scotland and in England. The difference is that every year, despite budgetary pressures, we have increased funding on flooding, which is up from £399 million in 2010-11 to £502 million now. We have ring-fenced money specifically for coastal erosion, as she acknowledged.

This issue is devolved, so it is for each part of the UK to decide how to operate such matters, but it is complex and difficult, as hon. Members have pointed out, and we can all learn from each other, from the success or failure of the different approaches that we take. I am sure that the point she has made today will be heard by those in her constituency and, indeed, by the Scottish Government.

In those areas where defence from coastal erosion is neither practical nor economic, it is important that affected communities are supported and helped to adapt.

That means anticipating the changes. Local authorities need sustainable approaches that reduce future burdens on communities, encourage a more positive approach and promote economic growth in a viable manner.

Finally, I want to touch briefly on the approach taken by the devolved Administrations. My hon. Friend raised the specific issue of Montrose, where up to 80 metres of coast could wear away in the next 50 years. In Scotland, the Scottish Government have concluded a piece of evidence called “Dynamic Coast: Scotland’s Coastal Change Assessment”, which was launched in August 2017 and identified some of the challenges ahead. I understand that Scotland has allocated a budget of £42 million a year to help local authorities with flooding and coastal erosion. In Northern Ireland, a gap has been recognised. The approach taken has been on the principles of the Bateman report, but, in the last Assembly, Ministers recognised the need for a more strategic approach to coastal management. They committed to work together on a baseline study, which is now under way. Last but by no means least, in Wales, I am aware that the Welsh Government have also made significant investments to improve coastal defence infrastructure over the past few years through new schemes.

To conclude, we have had a comprehensive debate covering many different issues and areas, with hon. Members raising issues relating to particular constituencies. It has been a pleasure to respond to the debate.

10.59 am

Kirstene Hair: I thank the Minister and all Members who have participated in the debate. I am delighted to have cross-party support on an important issue for our constituents and for our beautiful coastlines throughout the United Kingdom. Clearly, the UK Government and the devolved Administrations are called on to do more.

I want to clear up one point about Angus. The studies finish next year, so we need the funding to be ready and, indeed, we need enough funding—the funding promised has a question mark over it and is not enough to put my constituents out of fear. I shall continue to campaign for the Scottish Government to confirm and release the funding sooner, and I shall continue to campaign for the UK Government to see whether we can implement a compensation scheme, so that our constituents need not continue to live in fear if they live in a coastal community.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House has considered coastal erosion.

Care of Prisoners' Children

11 am

Fiona Bruce (Congleton) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered care of prisoners' children.

I will be considering the care of prisoners' children following the sentencing of their parent. Are we doing all we can to support the wellbeing of children with a parent in prison, bearing in mind the traumatic impact that the detention of a parent can have on a child? It is estimated that more than 200,000 children a year are separated from a parent by parental imprisonment. About 17,000 of those children experience their mother's imprisonment. Because women are more likely than men to be the primary carer, often children are suddenly separated from the closest relationship they have known in their lives. In up to 95% of cases, the children are suddenly without a parent or a home. I understand that there is no systematic recording or monitoring to support those children, so in many ways they are a hidden population.

The arrangements for the care of such children are often very informal, with the children being suddenly left with a relation, for example, whose life circumstances mean that they are ill prepared for the additional responsibility, with all the consequences that ensue for them and, importantly, for the children. One of the worst examples I heard was of a woman who was arrested in the middle of the night, but who was still nursing a baby. On the way to the police station, the police asked her, "Where shall we drop the baby off?". She had to tell them a house where the baby was to be dropped off. That mother did not have the care of that child again for well over a year. That is a startling situation.

Before going into further detail about the impact on children and their carers, I thank Justice Ministers for their very positive response to Lord Farmer's review, which was published last August, "The Importance of Strengthening Prisoners' Family Ties to Prevent Reoffending and Reduce Intergenerational Crime". The acceptance of the importance of maintaining family ties to the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners, which was implicit in the Government's response to the review, was most welcome.

At the same time, it is important that we recognise that prisoners' families, particularly their children, can experience severe difficulties following the imprisonment of a parent. Greater consideration of their circumstances and wellbeing would help to improve the likelihood of their parents' better reintegration and rehabilitation. Importantly, it would reduce the risk of those children being imprisoned in later life. The statistics are devastating: some 60% of boys with a father in prison will end up in prison themselves. Staggeringly, I am informed that if they also have a brother in prison, that figure can rise to 90%.

We should take care of prisoners' children not just to keep them out of prison, but to give them the best chance to make something of their lives when they have been placed in an extremely vulnerable situation at a young age. Research shows that prisoners' children face significantly reduced life chances. They are less likely to be in education, training or employment in later life. They have an increased risk of mental health problems

and substance abuse. The imprisonment of a parent can compound any pre-existing family problems that the child may have experienced or witnessed, such as domestic abuse, mental health issues or substance abuse.

Children who witness their mother's arrest often experience nightmares and flashbacks. Separation from parents, particularly mothers, can be deeply traumatic for children and can result in the development of attachment disorders in young children. Children with a parent in prison may experience stigmatisation, isolation and discrimination, as well as confounding grief that is expressed in angry and aggressive behaviours. They may have no one at school with whom they can share their situation.

The emotional and physical stress after separation often requires intensive parenting, for which professional help and support ideally would be available, but often it is not. Family members who step in as carers at short notice are often unprepared for what their role involves. Often, they have to give up work to provide care. One grandmother explained:

"emotionally, it's terrible. It's like they've changed so much, they've got behavioural problems. They weren't like that before. Especially the little one who cries for his mum all the time."

Understandably, those who take on such caring roles do not always do so willingly. The subsequent breakdowns of family placements cause further harm to children. Families who do so willingly still often have to adjust their living arrangements, creating further difficulty for both the carer and the child. I thank Dr Shona Minson at Oxford University for drawing my attention to the gravity and scale of the situation. In her research, one grandmother's experience exemplifies that perfectly:

"It's cramped. What was my bedroom, I've now got two lots of bunk beds and four boys in there. The middle room is my daughter's room and the baby sleeps in there and I sleep on the settee in the front room."

Another grandmother explained the serious financial problems she encountered, having to go back to work to support her enlarged family and getting into debt at the same time.

Because of the difficult living arrangements and frequent relationship breakdowns in what can be very temporary homes, often there is accompanying schooling disruption. Children have four different carers on average during a mother's sentence. Many encounter other significant changes, such as separation from siblings.

Michael Tomlinson (Mid Dorset and North Poole) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing this debate and on powerfully speaking out for some of the most vulnerable in our society. She has raised some powerful examples. She mentioned Justice Ministers earlier, it is excellent to see the Education Minister in his place and she also mentioned housing. Does she agree that this is a cross-departmental issue? It is important that the Minister works together with Ministers from other Departments to help some of the most vulnerable in our society.

Fiona Bruce: I thank my hon. Friend for, as ever, making a highly pertinent point.

What I am speaking about forms part of a much larger piece of work that is encompassed in "A Manifesto to Strengthen Families". It was launched last September and has the support of 60 Conservative Back-Bench

colleagues. It contains a range of policies that aim to strengthen family relationships. As my hon. Friend says, they straddle many Departments, from Health to Education, Defence, Justice, Work and Pensions, and Housing, Communities and Local Government. As part of the work on strengthening families, it is important that Departments across Government pull together and that the machinery of government works holistically.

Many Departments are doing good work to strengthen family life, such as through the recent announcement of £6 million for the children of alcoholics, and a much larger sum provided for children with mental health problems, many of which stem from their family backgrounds. However, a key ask in the manifesto is for a Cabinet-level Minister for the family. I am delighted to see the Minister with responsibility for children here. I would be even more delighted if he were promoted to the Cabinet and had the role of drawing together all the various strands for supporting family life, many of which could appropriately be channelled into family hubs in local communities.

I am delighted that there will be a roundtable this afternoon at No. 10, at which people from across the country will give examples of best practice for creating family hubs in local communities. Those are places people can go for support to strengthen their families—not just people with children from nought to five, but those with children aged up to 19, sandwich generation people who are struggling to support an elderly parent, and people whose marriage is at an early stage of breakdown and want light-touch early intervention to ensure that it does not fall apart completely and end up in the divorce courts. Family hubs may also be places for prisoners' children and their wider families to get help.

There is often no official recognition of the plight of prisoners' children, and they often have inadequate support, if any. Care givers are often not assessed, and they receive little, if any, financial assistance or other support. In the light of that, there appears to be a big difference in treatment between those children and children who are separated from their parents and go through care proceedings. The impact on prisoners' children can be lifelong. They encounter multiple disadvantages, which often match those of children who are put before the court in care proceedings.

Children who are separated from their parents due to parental abuse or neglect are represented by lawyers and may be appointed a guardian ad litem, and a real focus is placed on their interests. If such a child is left without a parent, they are found a new home. Support is provided to those who care for them. Foster carers are assessed and receive training and financial support. The child is also likely to be classed as a looked-after child or a child in need, both of which open doors to additional funding in health and education, such as the pupil premium. That can ensure that the child is given more support and a more understanding environment at school. If the child moves to a new area, a school place is arranged for them.

However, in criminal proceedings involving parents of dependent children, the court may be completely unaware that the person it is sentencing has children. Even when the court is made aware, the impacts on those children often are not appropriately considered.

For example, in a recent piece of research, the Prison Reform Trust reported that one mother explained that the jury

“didn't ask me anything, didn't even ask me if I had a child. I had to stand up and say 'I've got a daughter at home who needs looking after.' Thankfully, I've got a very supportive mother and she took the role of carer. I was not asked if she had a carer, it was just me they were focused on, just getting me to where I need to be.”

I called this short debate, in the light of that, to draw attention to the impact of parental imprisonment on those most vulnerable children. I ask the Minister what can be done more systematically and empathetically to identify and support the needs of prisoners' children and their care givers, so that we avoid giving them a hidden sentence, which may be lifelong, when their parents are sentenced by the courts.

As time permits, let me touch on one or two other points before the Minister responds. The relationship between a parent and a child is often damaged by the child's inability to visit their parent. Many families would welcome more being done to facilitate visits, perhaps through the provision of travel funding that is not means-tested. Shona Minson of Oxford University found in a recent study that a number of factors influence the possibility of a child being unable to attend visits, including restricted visiting hours; unaffordable travel, which I mentioned; the frightening environment for children; traumatic endings; and indirect contact by telephone or letter, which children do not particularly favour. The Farmer review confirmed that face-to-face contact was the best way to develop family ties, and that family members found security checks frightening and stigmatising.

It would be helpful if prisons identified that family visits improve outcomes for prisoners and should be viewed as an intervention, not just to help reduce offending but to improve the quality of life of prisoners' children. Family ties may also be strengthened through one-to-one mentoring support for prisoners' children, parenting classes and courses to strengthen prisoners' relationships with their families. There is plenty of evidence of good practice by faith-based and non-voluntary organisations, which are working together to strengthen prisoners' family ties.

Let me give the example of a young girl and her family. During a family day visit at HMP Wandsworth, a charity worker from Spurgeons noticed that 14-year-old Jade, who was visiting her father, was sitting with him in floods of tears. When staff asked Jade's mother why she was distressed, her mother confided that the family was having a difficult time. Jade was upset and struggling to cope with being separated from her father. Her school work was suffering as a result. Her mother had asked the school for help, but it seemed unable to offer any. Spurgeons staff sent a link worker to visit Jade's school and put in an appropriate plan. Her mother thanked Spurgeons for that intervention and explained that, although she had been asking for help since the moment her husband was taken to prison, that was the first time anyone had actually offered the family any support.

Charities such as Spurgeons certainly have an impact on families such as Jade's, but their reach and resources are limited. Diane Curry, chief executive of Partners of Prisoners, argues that that

“is one reason why provision is so patchy and a lot better developed in some geographical areas...than others.”

[Fiona Bruce]

In the light of that, I ask the Government to look at improving services to support children such as Jade and their families. As I said, the strengthening families manifesto outlines that the Government need to focus on supporting families to ensure that policies for children are prioritised and co-ordinated across Departments. Ideally, they should also ensure that every local authority has a family hub, which can act as an important site for prisoners' families to receive support services, and that prisons put families at the heart of efforts to reduce reoffending and improve the lives of prisoners' children.

11.17 am

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Education (Nadhim Zahawi): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir David. I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Congleton (Fiona Bruce) on securing the debate.

As Minister for Children and Families, I have listened and spoken to many people about the issues concerning some of the most vulnerable children in our society. I have been inspired by the commitment of our frontline practitioners, such as social workers, teachers and others in the sector—including charities, which my hon. Friend spoke about so convincingly. I commend her on bringing concerns to life through the voices of children and their families. Those practitioners work tirelessly to achieve better outcomes for children in challenging circumstances.

I am aware of my hon. Friend's concerns about the support that children who are affected by having a parent in prison receive, both to maintain a relationship with that parent and to deal with the long-term challenges they might face in relation to their own outcomes. I share those concerns, and I reassure her that I will continue to do all I can, in my capacity as Minister for Children and Families, to ensure that all children get the help and support they need from across Government to live fulfilled and happy lives.

A parent going to prison can be hugely traumatic for the child—it can make them vulnerable or even put them at risk of harm. Effective multi-agency working is vital to ensuring that vulnerable children are identified and known to all relevant authorities from justice, which my hon. Friend mentioned, to social care and schools. Reforms introduced by the Children and Social Work Act 2017 underpin a stronger but more flexible statutory framework for local multi-agency arrangements that will support local partners to work together more effectively to protect and safeguard children and young people, and ensure the effectiveness of those processes.

We are also taking significant steps to improve information sharing on safeguarding children, which is vital to ensuring that an offender's caring responsibilities are disclosed and services are alerted to changes in a family's circumstances. Under the Children Act 1989, local authorities have overarching responsibility for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children in their area, which applies regardless of what care arrangements are in place for a child. Where concerns have been raised about a child in need, the "Working together to safeguard children" statutory guidance sets out the principles of what good assessment looks like. Assessments should be child centred, involving children

and families, and building on strengths as well as identifying weaknesses, and addressing the child's needs within their family and, of course, the wider community.

Michael Tomlinson: I am listening with interest to the Minister, who will have heard my intervention about working across Departments. Will he be able in due course to explain to the House what work he can do across Departments—perhaps with the Prisons Minister, my hon. friend Member for Penrith and The Border (Rory Stewart)—in addition to the multi-agency work he is rightly highlighting?

Nadhim Zahawi: I did hear my hon. Friend clearly. We already work across Departments, and I hope that in the rest of my speech I will be able to convince him that we are doing some really good work in this area.

There should be a clear focus on actions and outcomes for children, with plans for how assessment and support provided will be reviewed. All decisions regarding formal care placements will also be child focused to ensure that arrangements meet the needs of that child and promote their safety and welfare. That process is the same for each child, including in cases where a child's primary carer goes to prison.

My hon. Friend the Member for Congleton rightly said that in many cases care arrangements might be with wider family or friends, often recognised as kinship care. We recognise the vital importance of those placements, which are likely to provide more continuity than a placement with previously unknown carers and can help to preserve a child's sense of belonging to a wider family network. For most children, there is huge benefit from being brought up by a family member whom they trust and already have an established relationship with, rather than by a stranger.

The law requires local authorities to support the upbringing of looked-after children and those on the edge of care by their families whenever possible. That option should always be fully explored by the local authority before making an application for a care order, provided that it does not jeopardise the child's safety or welfare.

Local authorities are under a statutory duty to publish a policy that sets out the authority's approach to promoting and supporting the needs of all children living with carers who are family and friends, regardless of their legal status. The policy should be clear, regularly updated, and made freely and widely available. Approved family and friends foster carers receive the same support as other foster carers, including financial support. Family and friends carers in informal arrangements are treated equally with birth parents in the benefits system in relation to child benefit, child tax credits and other means-tested benefits.

Local authorities also have a statutory role where children are being cared for by friends, neighbours or certain other relatives under a private fostering arrangement. The local authority must visit such an arrangement within seven days of being notified of it and should speak to the parents and provide support and advice where necessary. Local authorities must also carry out follow-up visits to ensure that the arrangements remain in the best interests of the child.

I turn briefly to education. It is not only children's social care that has an important role to play; school and college staff are particularly important as they are in a position to identify concerns early, provide help for children and prevent concerns from escalating. We recently published revised "Keeping children safe in education" guidance, which will commence on 3 September. Having worked closely with the Ministry of Justice, we have reflected on the importance of school staff considering the additional needs of children with parents in prison, so the guidance now highlights the fact that such children are at risk of achieving poor outcomes—including poverty, stigma, isolation and poor mental health—and signposts staff to the National Information Centre on Children of Offenders website, which provides specialist advice and resources for professionals who work with offenders' children and their families.

All school staff should be aware of the systems within their school or college that support safeguarding, as well as being able to identify children who might be in need of extra help and protection, such as children of offenders. That is vital to avoiding children's needs going unidentified and so that any trauma a child has experienced can be taken into account in responding to any behavioural issues.

The Department's advice on behaviour says that schools should consider whether disruptive behaviour might be the result of a child's needs, such as any arising from the trauma of a family member or parent going to prison. School staff should also be prepared to identify children who might benefit from early help. To be clear, if a child is in danger, has been harmed or is at risk of harm, a referral should be made to local authority children's social care and, where appropriate, the police.

It is important that all children get the support they need. Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service is working in partnership with Barnardo's to deliver the National Information Centre on Children of Offenders, which is an online resource to provide support for children affected by having a parent in prison. We are also supporting cross-Government programmes for prevention and diversion work, including the troubled families programme and those focusing on school inclusion.

Good mental health is another particular priority. We recognise the emotional upheaval that a parent going to prison can cause a child, and when children are struggling with poor mental health, that can have a profound impact on the whole of a child's life. That is why the Government are investing an additional £1.4 billion nationally to transform children and young people's mental health services. On top of that, the measures proposed in the Government's Green Paper on children and young people's mental health will provide £300 million of additional funding to introduce a new mental health workforce to work with mental health leads in schools and colleges and reduce waiting times for those with the most serious conditions.

The Ministry of Justice is working with the Department of Health and Social Care to develop a series of trailblazers that will test such teams outside of mainstream schools, including with youth offending teams.

Where a parent is involved in the justice system, it is vital that families receive support from the outset and that courts are aware that a defendant has children before they are sentenced. That is critical to avoiding those children being unseen or unaccounted for, so we are ensuring that the National Probation Service's pre-sentence reports, which assist the court in making sentencing decisions, highlight whether an offender has dependent children and the potential impact on those children of a sentence so that that can be considered. We are also working to encourage defendants to tell the court about children, overcoming reluctance or fear if there are concerns that their children will be immediately taken into care. That includes supporting the roll-out of training material developed by the academic expert, Dr Shona Minson, which raises awareness of the diverse implications of maternal imprisonment for children.

Families can play a significant role in supporting an offender. Positive family relationships have been identified as a protective factor in desistance, or ceasing to commit crime. For that reason, the Government are promoting strong family and significant other ties as an important plank of our prison reforms, alongside education and employment.

Lord Farmer's report on the importance of strengthening prisoners' family ties, which my hon. Friend referred to, was published last year. It made several recommendations to strengthen family or significant other ties to help offenders to turn their lives around and protect public safety. Across Government, and through the Ministry of Justice in particular, we have taken forward key recommendations, including giving prison governors the budget and the flexibility to spend their resources appropriately—such as on family-friendly visiting areas—to help prisoners to keep important family or significant other ties.

The Ministry of Justice is developing new performance measures that we will pilot this year for future full implementation. That will provide crucial guidance to deliver more consistent services to improve relationships between prisoners and their families or significant others, such as flexible visitations and family days across the entire prison estate.

A new family and significant other policy framework will be published this year, which will set out requirements for governors in that area. To support that new approach, from April this year all prison governors have been required to produce local strategies that set out how they will support prisoners to improve their engagement with friends and family. We know that maintaining relationships with loved ones is crucial for prisoners and for their families. In England and Wales last year, we spent—

Sir David Crausby (in the Chair): Order.

Motion lapsed (Standing Order No. 10(6)).

11.30 am

Sitting suspended.

Hepatitis C

[MR GARY STREETER *in the Chair*]

2.30 pm

Sir David Amess (Southend West) (Con): I beg to move,

That this House has considered elimination of hepatitis C.

I should tell the House at the outset that I am not really the instigator of this opportunity to debate hepatitis. The colleague who had succeeded in securing the motion is not able to be here, but I am delighted to share my thoughts with the House.

I was a member of the Health Committee from 1998 to 2007, and during that time we certainly spent a lot of time considering hepatitis. I am also the co-chairman of the all-party parliamentary group on liver health. I have been the chairman now for some 13 years—simply because I do not think anyone else wants to take on the mantle, to be frank. When we set up our all-party parliamentary group, we looked for a celebrity to head it all, as one does, and we chose George Best. The House might feel that George Best was an unlikely person to head up the charity, but at that time he was a reformed character, and he did a lot of good in those early years. Unfortunately, as we all know, a great toll was taken on his health and, sadly, he died.

We then looked for another celebrity, and—what a joy—Anita Roddick of The Body Shop, who was a wonderful and remarkable lady, became our patron. She died in 2007. The House may know that she contracted hepatitis C from a blood transfusion in 1971 and was unaware that she was living with the disease until 2004. A routine blood test revealed the diagnosis. She was a tireless campaigner, and we owe her a great debt of gratitude, but since 2007 we have struggled to find a patron to head up the organisation as president. If colleagues have any ideas, I know our APPG would be glad to hear from them.

The APPG recently conducted an inquiry into the elimination of hepatitis, and in March it launched a report entitled “Eliminating Hepatitis C in England”. It is my intention to refer to the report’s recommendations throughout my speech. We have an excellent Minister here, and I hope that both he and the shadow spokesperson have had sight of the report. If not, we will ensure that they get it in full; perhaps they could come back with their suggestions on how we might take the recommendations forward.

In our report, we suggest raising awareness, prevention, testing and diagnosis, care and treatment, funding and monitoring progress, so we have covered every single aspect. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Charles Gore, the former head of the World Hepatitis Alliance, and to the secretariat of the APPG, the Hepatitis C Trust, for all their assistance. They have been wonderful in all the work they do for us, ensuring that our group is effective.

On 14 December, I visited Her Majesty’s Prison Wandsworth—not because I had been sent to prison but, ironically, to accompany the Minister who has resigned from the Government today, my hon. Friend the Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee), although I do not think his resignation was the result of our visit. It was a very good visit indeed, and of course it is in the constituency of the hon. Member for Tooting (Dr Allin-Khan).

The visit allowed us to tour the secondary screening and healthcare facilities in the prison and to participate in a roundtable on the subject of the hep C virus and the importance of testing and of attending appointments. It was a wonderful visit; I pay tribute to the governor, and I know the Government are focused on the excellent work that is being done there. We talked to inmates and the governor, and the Ministry of Justice, NHS England, the Department of Health and Social Care and Public Health England were represented.

Perhaps the Minister and I should have compared notes, but I will say a little bit about what hepatitis C is. As I am sure that most hon. Members are aware, it is a blood-borne disease that affects the liver. It can subsequently lead to liver cirrhosis and cancer, and it has been linked to cardiovascular disease, musculoskeletal pain, kidney issues and mental health problems. I see we have two practitioners present in the Chamber; they might want to contradict me if they think I have got the cause of hepatitis C wrong.

The virus is said to chronically infect some 71 million people globally. Sadly, 214,000 of them reside in the United Kingdom. That is why I welcome the United Kingdom’s decision to join 193 other states in signing the World Health Organisation’s global health sector strategy on viral hepatitis in 2016. It has the principal aim of eliminating hepatitis C as a major public health threat by 2030—and I believe that if we are serious about that, we can do it. At least one Member of the House of Lords, who regularly attends our APPGs, has the illness himself. He speaks with great passion in the other House about the challenges he faces.

I say to my hon. Friend the Minister that I also welcome the target announced by NHS England in January of eliminating hepatitis C by 2025, five years ahead of the WHO. However, many problems surround the virus and its elimination, and confusion persists over how the virus is spread. Many people do not appreciate that it is spread by blood-to-blood contact. Instead, some still believe it can be spread by sneezing, coughing, spitting or other forms of physical contact. I am advised that that is not the case and it is only blood-to-blood.

Furthermore, it is estimated that between 40% and 50% of the approximate number of people chronically infected with the virus in England do not know they have it. At the start of the debate, I pointed out that Anita Roddick did not know she had it until she was tested in 2004. Between 64,000 and 80,000 people are living in England without the knowledge that they have the virus. Even more worrying is the Polaris Observatory’s prediction that the UK is set to miss the WHO target of eliminating hepatitis C by 2030.

Mr Jim Cunningham (Coventry South) (Lab): I welcome the efforts the Government are making to tackle this problem. I do not want to digress too much, but there is still the outstanding problem of contaminated blood. The hon. Gentleman knows that as well as I do, because we have had many debates on this in the House of Commons. Even the previous Prime Minister said he was going to do something, but nothing has really happened yet, and there have also been allegations that some of the records—for want of a better term—have disappeared somewhere. We asked for an inquiry into that in the last Parliament.

Sir David Amess: The hon. Gentleman makes an excellent point. The hon. Member for Kingston upon Hull North (Diana Johnson) has done a fantastic job in bringing this issue to the attention of the whole House, but we must not take our eye off the ball. The hon. Gentleman is certainly right to remind me how important that issue is.

This country unfortunately lags behind Australia, Brazil, Georgia, Egypt, Germany, Iceland, Japan, the Netherlands and Qatar, which are all predicted to eliminate the virus within the proposed timeframe. I have said to my hon. Friend the Minister that we cannot really compare those countries with the UK, but it would be good if we could perhaps make even more progress on eliminating hepatitis C in this country. In the words of Polaris Observatory, the UK is “working towards elimination” of hepatitis C.

The APPG’s report highlighted awareness. First of all, it noted that awareness of hepatitis C has gradually improved in recent years, which we celebrate. However, awareness is still relatively low, and the stigma of having the virus remains a hurdle to people actually getting tested, diagnosed and treated in the first place. The report also found that there is low awareness of transmission risks among at-risk groups, with many people underestimating the seriousness of the condition and the urgency of accessing treatment. Even so, there are still misgivings among those with greater knowledge of the condition. Within that group, there is still a lack of awareness of new treatments that are available, and many still have worries regarding the side effects of former treatments.

The same is true of the stigma attached to the virus. Although it has decreased over time, the report found that progress still needs to be made in this area, as that stigma often acts as a barrier to people presenting themselves for testing or seeking treatment. The APPG therefore recommended initiating local and national publicity campaigns in an attempt to increase awareness. That is why I mentioned celebrities. Although I am not big on celebrities, I suppose that people do not listen so easily to us politicians—they tend to switch off. However, a so-called celebrity who is prepared to speak out publicly attracts more attention.

The report suggests two ways to increase awareness. One is among primary care professionals, through targeted testing initiatives in primary care, together with additional resources—it is always about securing more money—and support for primary care workers. The second is to raise awareness among at-risk groups through peer-to-peer messaging programmes. During my visit to HMP Wandsworth, I witnessed a peer-led group operated within the prison by inmates. It was wonderful what they had achieved.

However, it should be said that raising awareness of hepatitis C is in fact a short-term goal. Our long-term goal of eradicating the infection should see a switch to the offensive—to preventing the disease in the first place. That is what we are really aiming for.

Dr Dan Poulter (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich) (Con): I congratulate my hon. Friend on securing the debate and more generally on all his work on this issue and on promoting effective liver health during the many years he has been an MP.

On prevention, given that intravenous drug use is one of the primary causes of the transmission of hepatitis C, does he agree that at the moment a lot of drugs policy is seen far too much through the prism of the criminal justice system? We need to bring that much more into the health domain. Effective working with prisons and with the Ministry of Justice is vital if we are to get on top of this issue, reduce infection rates and provide proper treatment for people who are infected.

Sir David Amess: My hon. Friend was a Health Minister and has real expertise in this area. I shall use the expression “joined-up government”. He is absolutely right that we need Departments to work together. That is why it was so good that we visited the prison.

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Brine): I may be able to help my hon. Friend here. As he knows, the drug strategy board is a cross-government committee. It met yesterday, chaired by the Home Secretary, and its members include the Justice Secretary, Health Ministers, Home Office Ministers, Housing, Communities and Local Government Ministers and representatives from the Department for Work and Pensions, as well as senior police officers, representatives from the National Crime Agency and a representative of the police and crime commissioners. That board takes that cross-government look, and hepatitis C is certainly an issue I would like to see it look at.

Sir David Amess: That is excellent news. I thank my hon. Friend for that positive response to looking at this issue.

The testing and treatments initiatives in place will lead to a decline in the prevalence of the disease. However, prevention will come from identifying and educating at-risk groups. To do that, we need the help of substance misuse services, sexual health clinics and peer programmes that can educate those most vulnerable sections of society on the transmission of the virus. I am advised that these services are at risk of closure without sufficient increases in their funding. Perhaps the Minister will have some news on that when he replies.

Harm reduction is another paramount mode of prevention. If we can reduce the harm to at-risk groups, we can combat one way in which the disease is transmitted. That can be achieved by providing clean and sterilised injecting equipment. Our report also emphasises the treatment-as-prevention approach towards tackling newer infections. That approach has been successful in treating drug users and other users engaging in riskier behaviours to prevent the spread of hepatitis C.

As I said earlier, between 40% and 50% of people living with hepatitis C in England are undiagnosed, which is shocking. It is therefore vital that we continue to increase testing and diagnosis levels. It is generally believed that the vast majority of those who have been diagnosed and put in touch with support services have now been treated, which I welcome. The challenge is therefore to locate those people who remain undiagnosed. That is a tricky one; it will be a real challenge.

Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP): The hon. Gentleman talks about all of those people who have hepatitis C who have been diagnosed being treated, but my understanding is that these new antivirals are

[*Dr Philippa Whitford*]

given to those with the most severe disease and have cirrhosis, rather than to everyone who is diagnosed with hepatitis C on a preventive basis. Can he clarify that?

Sir David Amess: I am concerned by what the hon. Lady says. No doubt the Minister will eventually be passed a note from his officials and will advise us on the situation. That does not seem right if it is what is happening, and I hope that the Minister will correct me if that information is wrong. It is also vital to re-engage those who have been diagnosed and have slipped through the net to the point where they are no longer in touch with those services.

The APPG thinks that the way to combat these issues is to change how we test for the virus. We recommend routine testing in substance misuse services, sexual health clinics and prisons. We also advocate increasing testing in primary care and in settings such as hostels, day centres and police custody. I know that that will not be cheap, but if it could be done it would be wonderful. Another solution is to test for hepatitis C on occasions when people are already having blood tests, which seems like common sense to me. For example, should we not consider testing people for hepatitis C while they are being tested for HIV, or when taking blood in accident and emergency centres?

Diagnosis is one thing, but accessing care is another. It is therefore essential that people who are diagnosed are referred for treatment as soon as possible, without delay. There should be a direct link between diagnosis and care. The time between diagnosis and the commencement of treatment should be minimised, to prevent patients from dropping out of the care pathway altogether. One way to achieve that would be to make treatment available immediately following diagnosis. That may be ambitious, but it is, ideally, what our APPG wants. Another way would be to streamline the referrals process. As it stands, some secondary care services will only accept referrals for treatments from general practitioners. Allowing referrals from any service at which someone might be tested and diagnosed, as the APPG recommends, would go some way to solving the problem.

Dr Poulter: I agree entirely with my hon. Friend. One challenge that we face is the fragmentation of the commissioning of substance misuse services and sexual health services. Those are commissioned by local authorities under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, which I think we have to reflect on as a mistake in this context, as opposed to many secondary care services, which are commissioned by the NHS through clinical commissioning groups. Until we sort out that fundamental issue of commissioning, we will not be able to put in place the improvements that he suggests.

Sir David Amess: Oh dear! I say to my hon. Friend—I and, indeed, you, Mr Streeter, were in this place when we were dealing with all these issues—that the fragmentation is very worrying. My hon. Friend is right to point out that more work needs to be done on the issue.

Dr Whitford: I am not sure whether the hon. Gentleman is aware that there is a cap on the number of patients who are allowed to receive drugs such as sofosbuvir; certainly, hepatologists I have met in recent years report

having to ration it to the most severe cases. The limit was set at about 10,000 patients a year. This year, it has been increased to 15,000, but that is not a target; it is a cap. It means that despite it having been stated that 160,000 patients in England suffer from hepatitis C, it would literally take 10 to 16 years to treat them all, so this is a matter not of referral but of access to the drugs.

Sir David Amess: I said at the start that I was totally the wrong person to lead this debate. I put my hands up: I was not aware of the cap. It, too, is a little worrying, but perhaps the Minister will have an answer. I am the first to admit that money is not always available for these things, but it is worrying that we are talking about another 16 years. That is not what our all-party group wants.

If services share data more effectively, the number of patients lost to follow-up will certainly be reduced. That will minimise cases such as prisoners who have been diagnosed being released before being referred to a service that provides the treatment that they so desperately need. Another example is where general practitioners have records of people who have been diagnosed but never received treatment.

On the subject of treatment, pioneering treatments have been in place since 2014. I am advised that they are shorter in duration and have higher cure rates and fewer side effects. They have thus been instrumental in making progress in the way we treat hepatitis C, and many people have been cured thanks to the drugs available since 2014. Notwithstanding that, we should continue to maintain targets for the number of people treated and to maintain universal access to treatment for those who have been reinfected. Those targets should be local, regional and national.

There is even an argument for making the targets more aspirational. Currently, there is a target to treat 12,500 people in England per year, and the all-party group would like that to increase to 20,000 new treatment initiations. If the target is not raised, there is little chance of achieving NHS England's target of eradicating hepatitis C by 2025. It might be more pragmatic to have initially an even greater target, which would progressively be lowered in the future. That approach would reflect the assumption that, as overall prevalence falls and approaches minimal levels, those still living with the virus will be harder to locate within the population.

Treatment should be focused in the community. That will ensure that access is not hindered for those who have difficulty accessing secondary care services. The all-party group recommends making treatment more readily available in GP clinics and pharmacies, homeless shelters, substance misuse centres, sexual health clinics and prisons.

Funding is where the crunch comes, and we have quite a bit to say on it in our report. Although new curative treatments have considerably decreased in cost, pioneering new treatments for hepatitis C are not immune to concerns. The way in which the new treatments were initially rolled out by NHS England drew criticism at the time. For example, restrictions were placed on the number of patients able to access them each year in England. Of course, the hon. Member for Central Ayrshire (Dr Whitford) has reminded the House of that. I am sure that the Minister is aware of recent negotiations between NHS England and the industry to develop a

new funding model in this area and one that does not restrict access for patients. Without such dialogue, elimination in England would be severely compromised.

The all-party group has gone further, however. We recommend that any future deal should prioritise equitable availability throughout the country—I suppose we are thinking here of the postcode lottery—that does not discriminate against patient populations. On the subject of the all-party group's recommendations, we believe that we should continue to monitor elimination progress with reference to progressive targets. The report calls for more diverse data on the virus to be collected and shared. It is the group's belief that that would additionally allow for improved allocation of testing and treatment resources.

As the all-party group's report makes clear, we believe that the eradication of hepatitis C in the foreseeable future is an extremely achievable goal—we really think we can do this. It is a goal to which our international partners are committed, which is very good. Some of them are making greater progress towards achieving it than we are, for whatever reason. For the target to be met, we must change our approach to hepatitis. It is my belief that the recommendations that I have summarised today must be implemented, and as soon as possible. Failure to do so will only prolong the existence of hepatitis C in this country. We have at our disposal the means to eliminate it. Let us do that.

2.56 pm

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): Let me express special thanks to the hon. Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) for setting the scene. He said that he was not the master of the debate, but he was certainly the master of delivery. He told us about all the important issues, with the help of the two learned doctors in Westminster Hall today: the hon. Members for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) and for Central Ayrshire (Dr Whitford).

As my party's spokesperson on health, I take an interest in all health matters in the House. Some people would say, "He takes an interest in just about everything in the House," but that is by the bye. Health matters are my specific interest, so I am here to make a contribution in that capacity and will make a comment from a Northern Ireland perspective. Obviously, that will come into the debate.

First, I commend the all-party parliamentary group on liver health for the report that it has put forward. The hon. Member for Southend West is absolutely right: if people listen and read its recommendations, they will realise that the APPG has a really firm and dedicated interest in this matter. I am most impressed by the APPG's recommendations and report; I am sincerely impressed by the work carried out by it. In my research for my contribution to the debate, I learned a lot from its recommendations and from the work that it does. The contents of the report are informative in the extreme. It provides lots of detail and information, which I hope will help us to contribute to the debate in a positive fashion.

I sincerely hope, too, that there will be such an opportunity for the Minister, who is always responsive and helpful. We are pleased to have a Minister who clearly has an interest in the subject matter. When he

speaks, we will understand just how important that is. However, we need to implement the recommendations for so many people throughout the UK. I am also pleased to see in her place the shadow Minister, the hon. Member for Washington and Sunderland West (Mrs Hodgson). I know that she will be equally positive.

The hon. Member for Southend West referred to George Best. He was the greatest footballer this world has ever known, according to Pelé, and what better person to say that than a man who many think was the best footballer in the world, even though whenever he has been asked he has said that it was George Best.

Unfortunately, George Best had problems; that was just the fact of it. With his talent and expertise came a problem, and the problem was alcohol. For a time, he and his wife lived in my constituency, just outside Portavogie, and he was very much someone who everyone wanted to associate with and spend time with. We well remember the day that he died and his funeral at Stormont. It was unusual for someone to be given the accolade of being buried from Stormont. I remember that it was a rainy day, but the crowds came from all over the Province just to be there and be part of what was a very poignant occasion as we laid to rest one of Northern Ireland's greatest and, indeed, one of the world's greatest when it came to playing football. I just wanted to say that, as the hon. Member for Southend West introduced it in his comments.

My parliamentary aide first went to Africa on a humanitarian aid project. She is a member of the Elim Church in my constituency. Elim Missions Ireland does some fantastic work out in Swaziland and Zimbabwe when it comes to helping with medical and education projects, as well as general all-round giving. It takes out a number of containers every year to help with that. When she told me about the list of vaccinations she had to get, one of which was for hepatitis A and another for hepatitis B, she said, "All I am really missing is hepatitis C." Little did we understand in the office that the hepatitis C vaccine is greatly needed not simply on the plains of Africa, but in our own country. The hon. Gentleman referred to that.

The Northern Ireland Hepatitis B & C Managed Clinical Network is a website with great information that helps us to construct our speeches. Hepatitis C is an infection of the liver caused by the hepatitis C virus, which is carried in the blood stream to the liver. We know that it can cause inflammation and swelling. It can cause fibrosis and the scarring of the liver tissue, and sometimes liver damage. It may subsequently lead to cancer of the liver and possible death. Over the years as an elected representative, I have represented quite a few people who have died of liver cancer, although that is a separate debate. I remember only one person in that time who survived liver cancer to live for a longer period.

In Northern Ireland, there are more than 2,500 people known to be infected. A large proportion of people, however, remain unaware that they have the virus. That is one of the key issues on which we look to the Minister for a response. How do we raise that awareness to address those who do not know they have it, but need to know today? We all know that we need early diagnosis. If we find out early that something is wrong, we can do something about it, but if people are carrying the virus in their system and do not know, that is a real problem.

[Jim Shannon]

Like so many unseen diseases, the problem lies in the fact that many people do not realise they have been infected with the virus, because they have not had any symptoms or they may have flu-like symptoms that can easily be mistaken for another illness. I declare an interest as a type 2 diabetic, which is a chronic disease. Every year, I get that flu jab to try to stop flu and colds. By and large it works—it has for the last few years, anyway. People who get colds and flu regularly might wonder whether it is just a cold or flu, or something more. That is the question we are all asking.

With the pressure the NHS is under, as we all know, there are few of us who would not struggle through the winter with a perpetual cold or flu, thinking we were simply run down. Few people would bother their doctor with a cold, yet for some that prevents treatment from being started when it would be most effective.

This is Men's Health Week. Those of us who fit into that category know that we need to look at our health more seriously. In Men's Health Week, we need to say, "If you have a problem, go to your doctor." People say that man flu is one of the worst things to have, but us men, unfortunately, do not respond to our health issues as strongly as we should. We should be going to our GP.

I have learned that there are six types of hepatitis C virus, which all have different genes, which are called genotypes and numbered 1 to 6. Almost all people in the UK who have hepatitis C have genotype 1, 2 or 3. It is important to know which type a patient has, as different types respond differently to treatment. It is possible to be infected with more than one type of hepatitis C at the same time. I remember an awareness event in the House of Commons not too long ago—it may have been last year—on hepatitis C. That day aimed to highlight the issue and make us more informed of the problems.

Hepatitis C is a blood-borne virus and there is some stigma attached, because it can be transmitted sexually or through sharing needles. That is certainly true, but it needs to be publicised that the virus can also be shared through an unsterilized needle in a tattoo parlour or something as innocuous as sharing a toothbrush, a razor or other personal items, because the blood can survive outside the body. An old toothbrush, therefore, can bring about a whole mess of issues. One person in four will clear the virus, but it is possible to catch it more than once.

The APPG's positive recommendations on how hepatitis C could be eradicated should be central to our thoughts on where we go. All the issues I have mentioned are reasons we are not finding it easy to meet our own target of eradication by 2025 and the World Health Organisation target of world eradication by 2030. People may not be fully aware. Will the Minister confirm what has been done to meet those targets? Can the targets be met? What is new in the way that we address or respond to these things?

We need to ensure that those who present symptoms are tested and those with a history are re-tested. Someone who has had the virus before can have it again, and they might not know. With new drug combinations, it is anticipated that it will be possible to cure approximately 90% of persons with the HCV infection. Those new

combinations are effective against the infection in patient groups that were previously described as difficult to treat. We need to focus on those difficult-to-treat areas.

I agree in totality with the recommendation of the APPG on liver health regarding the fact that NHS England has recently entered negotiations with industry to develop a new funding model for hepatitis C, which is expected to guarantee access to treatment without restriction. That is good news. I agree that the resulting deal should include effective mechanisms to ensure that funds are distributed equitably across different geographies and patient populations, so that no one is left behind. I will go further: Northern Ireland must be a key part of the distribution list, not simply the mainland of England, if we are to eradicate hepatitis C and address the issues, whatever they may be.

The hon. Member for Central Ayrshire, who is the Scottish National party spokesperson, will give us not only a Scotland perspective, but a United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland perspective. We need to look at how we can do this with the Welsh Assembly, the Scottish Parliament and the Northern Ireland Assembly, despite the limbo land that it is in, through the permanent secretary. Any new funding must be accompanied by a comprehensive and strategic plan to ensure that it is implemented effectively.

To conclude, there is a way forward with hepatitis C. It is treatable. Let us put this in perspective: it can be done. All we need is the will and the strategy to make it happen. People need to be aware that they have hepatitis C in the first place, but other work needs to be done too.

3.7 pm

Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Streeter. Hepatitis C was identified about 25 years ago. When I was a young doctor, it was simply known as non-A, non-B hepatitis, because no one had any idea what it was. As the hon. Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) said, we are talking about something that many people simply do not know they have. That is a key, underlying problem. Patients may only be aware that they have hepatitis C when they start to have liver symptoms, which is the start of cirrhosis or malignancy.

With any condition, we first want to prevent it. As was mentioned, at needle exchanges we already have blood screening to ensure that it is not coming from transfusion. We have to remember those in this country who previously suffered from contaminated blood that was iatrogenic—caused by doctors and the health service.

I agree with the hon. Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) that we need a more medical approach to the issue of drugs. If we drive problems underground, there is no possibility of detecting and treating people, to achieve the elimination that the World Health Organisation is aspiring to.

In Scotland we are recognised as world leaders, in the sense that we had a strategy in 2005, 2008, 2011 and then our elimination strategy, which was introduced in 2015. The 2011 strategy fed into what became the World Health Organisation strategy, as one of our senior leaders was seconded to it. The big change is sofosbuvir and ledipasvir—the new antivirals that are well tolerated and able to clear the viral load in 90% of all patients. Of course we would prefer a vaccine, as the hon. Member

for Strangford (Jim Shannon) mentioned; that is how we eliminated smallpox and how we are trying to eliminate polio. However, the problem with hepatitis C is that, as he said, there are six genotypes, but 50 subtypes, and it mutates regularly. It is one of those viruses with a coating that is very hard to get a handle on with the immune system and therefore to develop a vaccine for, so we need to use the drugs until a vaccine is available.

The Scottish Medicines Consortium passed sofosbuvir in 2014 and NICE passed it in 2015. Unfortunately, NHS England took the approach of trying to slow things down because the drugs are very expensive. However, dealing with liver failure and having to consider liver transplantation is even more expensive. A cap of 10,000 patients with cirrhosis and the most severe conditions from hepatitis C was set.

In Scotland in 2015, we took the opposite approach—a public health approach—to try to reduce the virus in the community and prevent it from occurring.

Dr Poulter: The hon. Lady is making very good points. I am sure she will correct me if I am wrong, but the other point to make is that in Scotland there has been a much more joined-up approach in tackling heroin addiction. Scotland is much further forward than England in addressing such issues, in having a co-ordinated strategy and in recognising how addiction leads to prisons and the criminal justice system. Indeed, there is not the fragmented commissioning of services that we see in this country. Does she agree with me that that is something that England can learn from in addressing the lack of joined-up working and commissioning?

Dr Whitford: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his comments. As NHS Scotland is still a single public body, we do not have the issue around commissioning. We are also trying to take a much more health-based approach to addiction. As happens in England as well, we have multiple needle exchange programmes. This place has held us back from trying to introduce safe injection in Glasgow, which has one of our highest drug-addicted populations and highest incidence of drug-related deaths. However, that initiative comes under the Home Office and we have not been granted permission to try to take it forward. Always taking a criminal justice approach gets in the way of achieving the medical outcomes that we want.

It is really important to recognise the breakthrough of the drugs. With an eight or 12-week course, expensive as it is, more than 90% of patients will achieve a sustained virological response. That means they remain with undetectable levels of virus 12 to 24 weeks after the end of their treatment. The problem with rationing treatment to those who are actually ill is that it is the people who are not ill with hepatitis who spread it to other people, because they are out and active. If they are drug users, they are still using drugs. Someone who is so ill that they are confined to bed is not spreading it. That is why we took a public health approach to eliminating hepatitis C over the coming years. We certainly aim to achieve that before the World Health Organisation target date.

As the hon. Member for Southend West said, one of the key issues is people not knowing that they have the virus, so, in Scotland, part of our approach has been to create opt-out screening at various points of blood

being taken. That will be from general practice in areas of high prevalence. It already includes bloods taken in accident and emergency. It includes screening at other times such as when we screen for HIV. Obviously, we screen for HIV when a woman has her booking appointment at the time of her pregnancy. We need to use all the opportunities that we can. Of course a patient always has a right to opt out, but when we make something the norm it becomes easier for people to agree.

The prison population obviously has a big problem with drugs, including IV drugs—either in the present or the past, before the prisoners were incarcerated. It is important that we get the tests taken up by such populations.

We also offer testing in more social settings, where there have been education events around hepatitis and HIV and where peer-to-peer work has been done. It is important that we raise awareness and try to reduce the stigma. There is a problem with always talking about HIV drug users, as opposed to recognising that someone might have been contaminated by blood in this country, while undergoing maternity care or surgery overseas, or, as was mentioned, in a tattoo parlour: it means that people do not care. We end up with, “Well, it’s their own fault”, which maintains the risk to everyone else and hampers elimination. As well as raising awareness, we absolutely have to reduce the stigma.

It is important to take a public health approach, as we have done in Scotland. I commend that to NHS England, which should remove the cap and do as we are doing: try to set a minimum target for new people to be found and treated as soon as possible. We have seen the new cases reduce from 1,500 in 2007 to 700 in 2013, but it is the chronic cases that have been out there for years that we have to find because they still carry the virus and can spread it to other people.

Of course, NHS England should try to get the price down. There is no right for drug companies to profiteer as opposed to having a fair return, but the issue must be taken in the round. We must recognise that eliminating the virus by using drug treatments while we wait for a vaccine will overall be an huge benefit to society.

3.16 pm

Mrs Sharon Hodgson (Washington and Sunderland West) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Streeter. I thank the hon. Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) for securing this important debate and for the work that he has done as co-chair of the all-party group on liver health for many years, as well as for his excellent opening speech today. My hon. Friend the Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma), a vice-chair of the all-party group, is not in his place today, but I pay tribute to him for the work that he has done to raise awareness of this issue. I thank the hon. Members for Strangford (Jim Shannon) and for Central Ayrshire (Dr Whitford) for their excellent contributions and I thank the hon. Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter) for his interventions.

Finally, I thank Professor Steve Ryder, whom I met earlier this year, for his expert briefing and for the obvious passion that he has for eradicating hepatitis C in this country as soon as possible. I also pay tribute to the Hepatitis C Trust and the Hepatitis C Coalition for the work that they do.

[Mrs Sharon Hodgson]

I welcome NHS England's ambitious commitment earlier this year to eliminate hepatitis C by 2025, five years ahead of the World Health Organisation's target. Healthcare professionals and experts are confident that hepatitis C can be eliminated, notwithstanding everything we have heard today about the cap on the treatment. Today is the first time I have heard about that, but I am sure the Minister will respond to the issue in his remarks soon. I remain concerned about some of the challenges that need to be faced by 2025 if the target is to be achieved.

Hepatitis C, as we have heard, is a hidden disease with patients experiencing few or no obvious symptoms for many years, but its long-term effects can cause severe liver damage if it goes untreated. Across the UK, around 214,000 people are infected with hepatitis C, but I understand that 40% to 50% remain undiagnosed. That huge percentage of people going undiagnosed is one of the biggest challenges to eliminating this virus—we cannot treat people if we do not know who they are. As Professor Paul Klapper and Pam Valley of Manchester University ask in an article published this year,

“how do we identify those who are infected so that they can be guided into treatment and care?”

As I, and many others, have mentioned today, hepatitis C is a hidden disease. People may be completely unaware that they are living with the virus, and at risk of unknowingly passing it on to those around them. Although awareness of hepatitis C is gradually improving, low awareness and stigma remain a challenge to ensuring that as many people as possible are tested, diagnosed and treated.

Levels of stigma and poor awareness are particularly high among at-risk groups, such as former or current drug users, or those who do not access conventional healthcare facilities, possibly because of fear of being challenged or stigmatised. How will the Government ensure that those at-risk groups are reached—not only for testing but for continued treatment? Again, this is where the cap will come into things; as more people come forward and are diagnosed, we must be able to treat them.

People need continued support throughout their treatment to ensure that they complete the course of medicine—if they do not, it is just a waste of time and money. Will the Government provide extra support to at-risk groups to ensure that that happens? An effective way of raising awareness and breaking down the stigma of hepatitis C is to introduce peer-to-peer messaging programmes for at-risk groups. Such a provision could be increased in settings such as drug services and prisons, and would mean that there will already be an understanding and relationship between the two parties. Has the Minister made any assessment of the role that a peer-to-peer programme might have in achieving the goal of eliminating hepatitis C by 2025?

Although at-risk groups make up a huge proportion of those living with hepatitis C, people who do not consider themselves to be at risk also pose a challenge to the 2025 target. As we have heard, Anita Roddick from The Body Shop was one of those who would not have been in an at-risk group, and she would have had no way of knowing that she was infected with hepatitis C. The excellent all-party group on liver health stated that

“A high-profile, Government-backed awareness campaign should be considered, and awareness messaging should be targeted through novel channels at those who may not consider themselves to be ‘at risk’.”

Do the Government have any plans to support Public Health England in raising awareness of hepatitis C among the wider general public, and what format might that campaign take?

Crucially, awareness among primary care professionals should be increased through targeted testing initiatives in primary care, with additional resources and support for primary care workers. If we are to eliminate hepatitis C, we must seize the opportunity when people are already having blood taken—tests for HIV for example, or when bloods are taken in A&E—and test them for hepatitis C. Testing should become routine in substance misuse services, sexual health clinics and prisons, and it must also increase in primary care and community settings, such as hostels, daycentres and police custody. The prevalence of hepatitis C among the prison population is four times that of the population as a whole. If the amount of people tested increases, we will be closer to identifying the 40% to 50% of infected people who are living with it unknowingly, and we will be one step closer to eliminating the virus.

A big step in recent years has been the development of a new class of drugs—direct-acting antivirals or DAAs—that has revolutionised the treatment of hepatitis C. The drugs no longer carry the toxicity or side effects of previous treatments, and the short treatment courses effectively cure the infection in a high percentage of cases. Once patients are diagnosed, however, it is crucial that they are treated immediately, because the time between diagnosis and starting treatment poses the greatest risk of patients dropping out of the care pathway.

For example, a prisoner who is diagnosed and treated while in prison but who is then released might not continue with the treatment and could be at risk of infecting others, as well as of not being cured. What mechanisms will the Government put in place to ensure that those who begin their treatment can finish it, regardless of any change in circumstances? Quicker referrals are also needed to simplify the process of linking people into care. Currently, some secondary care services will only accept referrals for treatment from GPs. The all-party group on liver health recommends that referrals for hepatitis C treatment should be accepted from any service where someone might receive a test and be diagnosed. Has the Minister made any assessment of that recommendation?

Finally, I move on to prevention. If we are to eliminate hepatitis C—we all want that to happen—we must ensure that the number of new infections falls. Substance misuse services and sexual health clinics have a crucial role in that, but their funding has consistently been cut by the Government. The King's Fund estimates that spending on tackling drug misuse in adults has been cut by more than £22 million compared with last year, and funding for sexual health services has been cut by £30 million compared with last year. What role do the Government expect such services to play in the elimination of hepatitis C, given such finite funding and resources? Those services provide not only a testing service, but an educational one that could help reduce reinfection rates—a further challenge to the elimination of this virus.

I am sure the Minister will agree that serious challenges lie ahead in meeting our ambition to eradicate hepatitis C by 2025. All those challenges need to be addressed—not only to meet NHS England’s target, but to ensure that this potential public health crisis is averted. I look forward to hearing the Minister’s response on how the Government plan to tackle those challenges in the months and years ahead.

3.27 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Steve Brine): It is genuinely a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Mr Streeter, and to be back in Westminster Hall on such a quiet day in Westminster. The hon. Member for Ealing, Southall (Mr Sharma) is sadly not in his place today, but I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) for securing and leading this debate. Although he said that he was not the best person to introduce the debate, he could have fooled us because he did it very well.

Hepatitis C is a significant health issue in our country, and for too long it has been overshadowed by other public health concerns that, despite the superstars involved, have had higher public profiles. I pay tribute to the Hepatitis C Trust and the wonderful Charles Gore, whom I have got to know in this job. He is a colossus in this area, and has become a friend. I also thank the Hepatitis C Coalition—this issue has been central to both those organisations.

My hon. Friend mentioned lots of local services for Southend residents, and a lot is going on in his constituency. Few MPs champion their constituency more than he does, so for his press release I will mention that screening and onward referral services are provided by the Southend Treatment and Recovery Service, known as STARS. For primary care, GP practices refer people to the specialist treatment services in my hon. Friend’s much-loved Southend Hospital. Local drug and alcohol treatment services in Southend hold outreach screening sessions for hepatitis, and all positive cases are referred for onward treatment. Big local successes that I noted in my papers included last year’s hepatitis C roadshow, which took place in my hon. Friend’s area, and there is the hepatitis C operational delivery network educational event 2018—he can see me after class for more details if he would like.

It is always good to see the hon. Member for Strangford (Jim Shannon) in his place, speaking so knowledgeably and passionately about this issue, as well as the hon. Member for Central Ayrshire (Dr Whitford), and my hon. Friend the Member for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (Dr Poulter).

The World Health Organisation has set ambitious targets to reduce the burden of chronic hepatitis C over the coming years, with a pledge to eliminate it as a major public health threat by 2030. The UK Government are committed to meeting and beating that target, as has rightly been said.

A few years ago, hepatitis C-related mortality was predicted to increase in our country, but through the measures that we have in place and the hard work and dedication of so many unsung heroes in the field, 9,440 treatments were delivered nationally against a target of 10,000 in 2016-17; the number of deaths fell for the first time in more than a decade, and that has

been sustained for another year; and between 2014 and 2016, there was a 3% fall in deaths from hepatitis C-related end-stage liver disease. That is good news.

However, hepatitis C continues to make a significant contribution to current rates of end-stage liver disease. I welcomed the recommendations to tackle that in the report, “Eliminating Hepatitis C in England”, which was published in March by the all-party parliamentary group on liver health, of which my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West is co-chair. I often produce a recommendation-by-recommendation response to Select Committee reports in my area, but when I checked with my officials during the debate, I found that I did not do it for that report—I was not asked to by the group—but I offer to do so. In fact, I will go further than that—I will go crazy and do it. The group will get that from me as a written response to its report.

This is a timely debate, because NHS England recently launched its procurement exercise for the new generation of hepatitis C antivirals. If that exercise delivers successfully, the ambition is to eliminate hepatitis C as a public health threat earlier than the WHO goal of 2030, and to get to 2025.

Dr Poulter: Given the experience that we had with NHS England on HIV PrEP medication and its argument that that was a public health responsibility, which I believe was wrong and which was legally found wanting, will the Minister ensure that he holds its feet to the fire on hepatitis C so it recognises that although it is a public health issue, it has a responsibility for the effective procurement of antivirals and for making them available to all people with hepatitis C?

Steve Brine: Point taken; feet will be held to said fire. I do not think that NHS England is found wanting in this area, and I will go on to say why, but I take my hon. Friend’s point and will follow it through, because I want this to work.

The new industry deal may allow for longer contract terms that cover a number of years, but whether a long-term deal can be reached and what its duration is will be contingent on the quality and value of the bids submitted by industry. I expect the outcome of that in the autumn.

On local delivery networks, NHS England has established 22 operational delivery networks across our country to ensure national access to the antiviral therapy. I will touch on the issue of the cap in a minute. Those clinically led operational networks are given a share of the national annual treatment run rates based on estimated local need.

That local operational delivery network model ensures better equity of access. Many patients with chronic hepatitis C infections come from marginalised groups that do not engage well with healthcare, as has already been said. Through the development of networks, it has been possible to deliver outreach and engagement with patients outside traditional healthcare settings, such as offering testing through drug and alcohol services and community pharmacies.

As hon. Members know, I have a great soft spot for community pharmacies, and I think that they can and do play an important role in this space. In April, I hopped along to Portmans Pharmacy, which is just up

[*Steve Brine*]

the road in Pimlico, to see the pharmacy testing pilot of the London joint working group on substance use and hepatitis C that is going on there. I saw the testing and the referral to treatment that takes place in pharmacies that offer needle and syringe programmes across six boroughs in London.

Portmans Pharmacy has provided a needle and syringe programme and the supervised consumption of methadone for a number of years. Those points of contact with people who inject, or previously injected—a key distinction—drugs provide an ideal opportunity for us to make every contact count and to test for hepatitis C, as we think that about half of people who inject drugs in London have the virus.

The approach of Portmans Pharmacy and the London joint working group is innovative. It aims to provide quick and easy access to testing and a clear pathway into assessment and treatment in specialist care, which is obviously critical. I pay great tribute to the work that the group has done. It has rightly received a lot of coverage and a lot of plaudits. I am anxious and impatient—as my officials know, I am impatient about everything—to see the peer-reviewed results of that work and where we can scale it out more.

The hon. Member for Central Ayrshire mentioned treatment in respect of the cap. It is different north of the border, but NHS England offers treatment as per the NICE recommendations. The drugs that she mentioned are expensive, which limits the number of people who can be treated each year, but treatment has been prioritised for those most severely affected. The NHS then provides treatment to others who are less severely affected. So far, 25,000 people in England have been treated with the new drugs and a further 13,000 will be treated this year. The NHS procurement exercise should allow for even larger numbers to be treated each year. Of course, nothing is perfect in life. Resources in a publicly funded health system are finite, which is why we have to target them at the most challenged group. That is one of the reasons why making every contact count through primary care and pre-primary care, as I call community pharmacies, is so important.

Dr Whitford: Does the Minister accept, though, that the people who are likely to continue to spread the condition are those who are less ill? The old concoctions tend not to be so effective or well tolerated. That is a big difference from the new antivirals, which are very effective and very well tolerated. It strikes me that in England, we may be letting more people become more ill before they qualify for the better drug.

Steve Brine: Of course, the hon. Lady states a fact not an opinion, and I accept that, which is why I speak of the importance of primary care and of making every contact count. The people who Portmans Pharmacy interacts with are not all sick. People who have a hepatitis C infection or a drug-use issue have other issues—they get flu too—so they interact with that pharmacy, and the pharmacy makes every contact count by grabbing people earlier. That is one reason why I am so passionate about the way that that underused network can help us to reach the ambitious targets that we have set.

Everyone has rightly talked about prevention—in many ways, I am the Minister with responsibility for prevention and it is the thing that I am most passionate about in our health service. As well as testing and treating those already infected, an essential part of tackling hepatitis C must be the prevention of infection in the first place, or the prevention of reinfection of those successfully treated, which would not be a smart use of public resources.

NHS England and Public Health England, which I have direct ministerial responsibility for, are actively engaged in programmes at a local level to prevent the spread of infection. As people who inject drugs or share needles are at the greatest risk of acquiring hepatitis C, prevention services, particularly those provided by drug treatment centres, are key components of hepatitis C control strategies. Clearly, the key to breaking the cycle of hepatitis C is to prevent infection happening in the first place.

Dr Poulter: The fundamental issue is that there is no greater evidence of fragmentation—I speak from my own clinical experience—and failure of joined-up working than the fact that local authorities commission substance misuse services but that the NHS commissions mental health services for the same patients and secondary care services for hepatitis C patients. People are falling through the gaps. Many people who have hepatitis C do not present to GPs, and are not even routinely on their lists, so the issue has to be looked at in a much more effective way if we are to make a difference.

Steve Brine: I hear my hon. Friend's experience of the frontline and I would not disagree that in some areas there is unhelpful fragmentation. If I remember rightly back to those happy early days of the election of my hon. Friend and I to this place, we sat on the Health and Social Care Bill Committee. That piece of legislation, controversial as it was, enacted the decision to pass that responsibility to local authorities and, of course, all local authorities are now, in effect, public health bodies. All of them—well, top-tier authorities in England—have directors of public health.

Just because there are challenges and fragmentation, that is not a reason to redraw the system. I do not think there is any desire within the system for a top-down or bottom-up reorganisation—I suspect that, as a doctor, my hon. Friend would agree with that—but there is a challenge to the system to come up with a much better whole-system approach, to make sure that people do not fall between those cracks.

My hon. Friend and I could debate at length—I am sure we will—whether those cracks can ever be filled, and whether there will ever be Polyfilla that is big enough or strong enough to fill those holes, but I do not think that it is a reason to break open the system.

Dr Poulter *rose*—

Steve Brine: I give way to my hon. Friend for the last time.

Dr Poulter: This fragmentation of commissioning is a really important point and it comes up in so many debates in Westminster Hall and, indeed, in the main Chamber. I urge my hon. Friend and indeed the rest of

the health team—we have got to put right the things that we got wrong. If we want to get this issue right, and get it right for people with hepatitis C, and for people with mental health conditions who are not getting access to services because of this fragmentation, then we have to revisit it.

I urge my hon. Friend to go and spend some time out on the frontline with some professionals and to get them to talk to him candidly—not on a ministerial visit. He should get them to talk to him candidly about these problems, because we have to recognise that this situation needs to change for the benefit of the people we care about, who are the patients.

Steve Brine: I will not prolong this discussion, Mr Streeter, but I take my hon. Friend's point and I think it is a subject that will receive further airing, to put it mildly.

Dr Whitford: Will the Minister give way one last time?

Steve Brine: One last time and then I must conclude, because I want to touch on prisons.

Dr Whitford: Obviously, this debate has emphasised the importance of diagnosing people and getting people to undergo testing. However, does the Minister see that it is much easier to encourage people to undergo a test when they can be promised that they will get effective, tolerable treatment that will be successful, as opposed to their perhaps being left languishing on what is now relatively old-fashioned treatment that is full of side effects?

Steve Brine: Yes, of course, and that is why I have talked about the local networks, and about early detection and prevention. What the hon. Lady says is self-evident.

The Hepatitis C Trust, which has rightly received many plaudits today, has played an important role for us in recent years in piloting pretty innovative ways of increasing testing rates, through mobile testing vans—for example, in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West—and the pharmacy-based testing work that I mentioned, as well as the introduction of peer educators in prisons, which a number of people have mentioned today. My hon. Friend mentioned his visit to Wandsworth Prison, which he was right to say is a very good example of peer educators working.

The subject of prisons is one the House knows is of great interest to me. Given the number of people who, sadly, actively inject drugs across the criminal justice system and the custodial system today, it is obviously likely that a significant proportion of those in the infected but undiagnosed population will have spent some period at Her Majesty's pleasure.

As part of the health services commissioned for those in detained settings, an opt-out testing programme for blood-borne viruses, including hepatitis C, in adult prisoners was fully implemented across the English secure estate last year, 2017-18. Because of the expected higher rates of prevalence, opt-out testing for blood-borne viruses is offered in 100% of the prison estate in England, as part of the healthcare reception process, although, it has to be said, with differential success and outcomes. We are currently addressing that through a range of initiatives that have been put in place to improve the

delivery of testing and the provision of successful treatment in prisons. So, in some areas the whole-system changes are being piloted.

My shadow, the hon. Member for Washington and Sunderland West (Mrs Hodgson), made the very good point that we've started, so we must finish. Absolutely; as I said earlier, it would be a very inefficient use of public resources to start treatment inside the secure estate. That is why, when we talk about through-the-gate treatment, that treatment must include health treatment. That is something—I cannot believe that my hon. Friend the Member for Bracknell (Dr Lee) is getting a second mention in this debate; I see that he is on his feet in the main Chamber—that I look forward to talking to the new Minister with responsibility for prison healthcare about, whenever he or she takes up that lucky role in future hours or days.

Let me take the opportunity once again to congratulate the all-party parliamentary group on liver health. It is not the first time that I have said this and it will not be the last: so much good work in this place goes on in all-party parliamentary groups, including so much informed debate. As a Minister—I am sure that others in the Chamber who have been Ministers would concur—I think that those groups are incredibly valuable to us and to the work that we do.

That is why I spend so much time listening to all-party parliamentary groups, helping them, including helping them to launch their reports, and then writing back with line-by-line responses to their reports, because their work is so vital to us. It is critical on a public health issue such as this, which, as I said at the start, is often overlooked and sometimes brushed under the carpet as being a little bit, "We don't want to discuss this." That is because, exactly as the hon. Member for Central Ayrshire said, there may even—God forbid—be an unspoken feeling that, "Well, with their behaviour they had it coming." She is very brave to say it and I have no qualms in repeating it, but I think that feeling does exist.

The measures that I have spoken about today are not a panacea; the target is an incredibly challenging one for us. However, the Government, Lord O'Shaughnessy—who speaks for us in the other place on this subject and shares an office with me—and I are all passionate about this issue. We passionately believe that it is something that we can and will beat. We are taking it seriously, and we are in a good position to push forward and significantly reduce the burden of hepatitis C, in line with our commitment on it.

This debate shows us that improvement in hepatitis C testing and delivery of treatment are best delivered where there have been whole-system improvements. The Government, together with the wider health and social care system, have got to take all the opportunities available to us to address this key, but sometimes overlooked, public health challenge.

3.47 pm

Sir David Amess: I am really happy with what my hon. Friend the Minister has said about all-party parliamentary groups because, sadly, the recommendations of the all-party parliamentary group on fire safety and rescue were not listened to over a number of years, and of course we had the Grenfell disaster. However, I get

[Sir David Amess]

the distinct impression from my hon. Friend that he is listening to the recommendations of this report by the all-party parliamentary group on liver health.

It has been a great privilege to learn one or two things from other colleagues with more expertise in this field than I have. In every sense, this debate has been time well spent, and I am very, very optimistic about the future progress towards eliminating hepatitis C. I thank all colleagues for the time that they have spent here in Westminster Hall, participating in this debate, and I very much look forward to celebrating with my hon. Friend the Minister within a few years the elimination of hepatitis C.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House has considered elimination of hepatitis C.

3.48 pm

Sitting suspended.

Logbook Loans

[SIR EDWARD LEIGH *in the Chair*]

3.56 pm

Yvonne Fovargue (Makerfield) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered protection from logbook loans.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Edward. I really did not expect to have to bring forward this debate, and it is with regret that I do so.

Until about four weeks ago, a Bill to reform logbook loans was expected in this parliamentary session. It was included in the Queen's Speech, the Law Commission was tasked with drafting the text and the draft Goods Mortgages Bill was duly published last December. In effect, that was it—we were ready to go. And then the Government pulled the plug. On 14 May, we were told that there would no longer be a Bill and that the matter was to be referred to the Financial Conduct Authority—the FCA—in what looked like a kick into the long grass.

Many of us are nonplussed by the Government's U-turn. The Bill is largely uncontroversial and will have all-party support. It is undeniable that in their present form logbook loans cause great consumer harm. To say that reform of the loans is long overdue is pretty much an understatement. The case for reform is absolutely overwhelming. Bills of sale—their official title—are governed by two statutes that are dated 1878 and 1882. They were designed in a different age to be used in a different age. They are antiquated and have no part to play in the consumer credit marketplace of the 21st century.

Andrew Bailey, the FCA's chief executive, recently called them “quaint”. They are a lot more than that: they are downright dangerous. Although they are not a huge part of the high-cost credit market, they affect a really vulnerable group. Citizens Advice, for instance, found that clients with logbook loans had twice as many debts as those without.

Logbook loans are a way for borrowers to use their car or van as security for a loan. The problem for the borrower is that the vehicle becomes the property of the lender until the loan is repaid. If any payments are missed at any time during the agreement, the vehicle can be repossessed without a court order—and that routinely happens, not least because the interest rates are so high. One example from logbookloans.com is that if a customer borrows £850 over 18 months, they will pay flat-rate interest of 132%, with an annual percentage rate, or APR, of 450%. That equates to 18 monthly payments of £140.70, and a total cost of £2,533.

I will give a case study of someone who took out a logbook loan. Sophie lives in Greater Manchester—that is around my area—and she needs her car to get to work. Two years ago, she took out a logbook loan for £2,700, with payments of £688 a month. She kept up with them until recently, when she had to pay a large council tax bill and she fell into arrears. The logbook loan company repossessed her car. She tried to negotiate with the company, but it would not listen. It demanded the total cost of the loan—£7,000—in full and is threatening to add charges. She cannot get to work, as she has no car, and she has a loss of income and the risk of losing her job.

I do not think borrowers always realise what they are letting themselves in for. Many borrowers are desperate. Logbook loans are aimed at people who cannot borrow from anywhere else. They do not fully engage with details of the loan agreement. Frankly, the tone of the advertising is irresponsible. I quote from an online lender, Mobile Money Ltd:

“You could get a same day loan without leaving the house. Try out a loan from the UK’s longest running logbook loan lender. Click ‘Apply Now’.”

To suggest that someone should “Try out a loan” makes it sound more like pizza delivery than a serious lender. Those words are not appropriate.

The other key fact is that logbook loans do not just disadvantage the original lender; unlike any other kind of lending, they can also harm people who are not party to the loan. Someone who buys a car that, unbeknownst to them, is subject to a logbook loan can have it repossessed because the original owner did not keep up repayments. There is nothing they can do about that, even though they bought the car in good faith. It is not even as though they can do a hire purchase investigation check, which can be done with cars bought on hire purchase. That is a real legal loophole.

The Law Commission measure—the Goods Mortgages Bill—would have given borrowers protections similar to those offered by hire purchase law. They would have gained a new right to hand back their car to the lender without being responsible for the remainder of the loan, and there would have been a new requirement for lenders to obtain a court order before seizing goods, provided that the borrower had paid off a third of the loan and had opted in.

Crucially—and this is one of the issues on which the Financial Conduct Authority cannot help—a private individual who bought a vehicle in good faith and without knowing it was subject to a logbook loan would become the owner of the vehicle and not be made liable for the loan. What protection can the FCA offer to an innocent third-party purchaser?

We all agree that it is not a perfect Bill. Some have questioned whether vulnerable customers should have to opt into protection, instead of it being by default. We might ask why protection does not extend to those who have paid off less than one third of the loan, but, taken in the round, the Bill would have been a huge step forward. StepChange, Citizens Advice, the Money Advice Trust—all the agencies said, “It may not be perfect, but it is a huge step forward.”

That brings me to the obvious question: why on earth is the Bill being dropped? Some say it is because of a lack of parliamentary time, but that cannot possibly be the case. Only last week, I spoke on Second Reading of the Non-Domestic Rating (Nursery Grounds) Bill, which irons out an anomaly in the business rate system as it applies to agricultural land. The Minister confirmed in that debate that the anomaly has applied to just a handful of people since it came to light in 2015, yet we had a Government Bill on the Floor of the House to deal with that handful of people.

Logbook loans affect 50,000 people a year, yet we cannot find time for a Bill? What is more, a Law Commission Bill, as the Minister knows, is able to use a special parliamentary procedure that minimises time on the Floor of the House. The procedure is designed to save parliamentary time, so it would be ironic if a lack of it was cited as an excuse not to bring it in.

There must be some other reason. Is the legislation more controversial than expected? If so, how? Could the issues not be dealt with by the parliamentary process? It could be argued, of course, that since the FCA has been undertaking a review of high-cost credit, the matter of logbook loans should sit with the regulator. However, the FCA explicitly declined to include the matter in the recent review, despite the fact that it took on responsibility for regulating logbook loans in 2014. Of course, the FCA knew that the Law Commission was taking on the task of looking at the issue and that many of us have had meetings with the Law Commission about it, and that may have prompted the FCA to shelve the issue. That could be seen as quite reasonable in the circumstances.

Even so, it means that the regulator is on the back foot and that wholesale reform, which is what we need, is years away. I have questioned before and I question again whether the FCA has the powers to deliver the protections that would be enacted by the Goods Mortgages Bill. The consensus is that we need a new statute, and the FCA cannot deliver that. Clearly, the FCA has not prioritised logbook loans, and it needs to do so now.

The FCA could do a number of things. For example, it could impose an interest rate cap and ban top-ups or roll-overs, as it did for payday loans. It could enforce more stringent affordability checks. It could do something about the kind of irresponsible advertising that abounds in the industry, or it could prohibit completely any products that allow for summary repossession. If it plans to do any of those things, it needs to do so quickly.

Frankly, anything the FCA brings forward can only be a sticking plaster—a temporary cover that will not heal the wounds. Outdated legislation, designed for the purchase of hansom cabs and distorted to fit a modern world by unscrupulous lenders, is causing misery for tens of thousands of the most vulnerable consumers every year. I urge the Minister to reconsider and allow the Law Commission Bill to make the progress that was promised in the Queen’s Speech.

4.6 pm

The Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury (Robert Jenrick): I am grateful to the hon. Member for Makerfield (Yvonne Fovargue) for raising this issue and for the leadership she has shown on it. She has been following it for some time. The constituents and cases that she has raised are very serious. I am grateful for her involvement in the matter.

Like the hon. Lady, we believe that consumer credit plays an important role in society. It helps individuals spread income and costs over time and cope with unexpected financial shocks. However, it is vital that consumers are treated fairly and that we ensure that their interests are protected, particularly in the case of high-cost products, of which logbook loans are an important example. The hon. Lady set out a number of instances where the costs incurred in some logbook loans are egregious. One would have to question whether individuals should take out such loans.

It is worth pointing out that the number of logbook loans has fallen substantially in recent years. They now make up a very small percentage of the wider high-cost credit market. The total value of outstanding logbook

[Robert Jenrick]

loan debt was less than £100 million in 2016, compared with £2.7 billion of debt from payday loans, doorstep lending, and rent-to-own.

Yvonne Fovargue: Does the Minister agree with me and Citizens Advice, who fear that the message being sent by not putting the Bill forward will increase and mainstream logbook lending?

Robert Jenrick: I hope I can give some explanation over the course of my remarks as to why we have chosen not to proceed with the Bill at the moment. My opening remarks that the market has shrunk considerably is not to diminish the concerns that the hon. Lady has raised about some of those logbook loans. It is important context to the debate, though, that the market appears to be shrinking, at least for the moment.

The number of bills of sale registered at the High Court has fallen from 52,000 in 2014 to around 35,000 in 2016. That compares with 760,000 people taking out a total of 3.6 million payday loans in 2015 alone. Logbook loans remain an important, if small, part of the loan market and are worthy of attention.

In September 2014, the Government asked the Law Commission to examine the Bills of Sale Acts—the legislation that underpins logbook loans. As the hon. Lady set out, those Acts hark back to a long-distant era. There were concerns over stories of consumer exploitation and high levels of interest, and she has given further examples. Those stories include vehicles being seized too readily on default and unwitting third parties buying a vehicle subject to a logbook loan. All of those things are cause for concern. The Law Commission concluded that the Bills of Sale Acts were out of date and recommended that they should be replaced with a new Goods Mortgages Bill. The Government were sympathetic and agreed that the Law Commission should prepare a draft Bill, which it did, consulting on the draft clauses in the summer of 2017.

Separately, in September 2017, the Government, again showing our good faith and desire to progress the matter, consulted on the aims of the Bill and published the consultation response in May 2018. Although the consultation responses undoubtedly showed a degree of concern about the logbook loan market and broad support for the proposed approach set out in the draft Bill, many stakeholders raised significant concerns, which I will discuss in a moment. Overall, there was less agreement on the detail of the draft Bill than we would normally expect following the Law Commission process, and less than we would wish to see before being ready to proceed with it.

Let me set out a few of the concerns from different stakeholders. Consultees suggested that the draft Bill did not do enough to provide clarity for courts, and expressed concern about its requirement for consumers to opt in to the court process, rather than its being the default. Some consultees also said there needed to be more clarity about the circumstances in which a lender could repossess a secured good without requiring a court order—an important issue, to which the hon. Lady alluded. Other consultees highlighted the risk of borrowers exploiting the protections in the draft Bill for fraudulent purposes.

In addition, a number of consultees argued that the draft Bill could encourage lending to vulnerable consumers by making it easier for consumers to grant security over their goods. Access to credit is obviously an important issue to Members on both sides of the House. The Government are determined to ensure that any legislative changes lead to better outcomes for consumers and do not have unintended consequences.

Having given careful thought to the concerns raised in the consultation, we decided that it was not the right moment to take forward the Bill as currently constituted, and that we wanted to give the matter further consideration. In the light of that decision, the Financial Conduct Authority has decided to look more closely at the logbook loan market, and we welcome that. The FCA will use its supervisory and policy tools to assess whether further action is required, including new rules that are necessary to protect consumers.

The hon. Lady has already set out examples of some of the actions that the FCA could choose to consider, at its discretion. The Government believe that at the moment that is a more proportionate approach, given the declining numbers in the logbook loan market and the concerns that were raised in the consultation about the Bill as currently drafted.

Yvonne Fovargue: Could the Minister explicitly say what powers the FCA has to protect innocent consumers who buy cars in good faith, who cannot check anywhere whether they are subject to a logbook loan, and yet who can still have them repossessed?

Robert Jenrick: That is one of the matters to which the FCA will need to give careful consideration. We hope that it will take that forward. It is also considering, as the hon. Lady suggested, a number of measures with respect to the high-cost credit market. It published an update on 31 May announcing a package of initial measures to tackle problems in the high-cost credit market, including a proposal to cap the cost of rent-to-own.

Those measures show the seriousness with which the FCA is taking the wider issue, and I hope that it will give this issue the consideration that it deserves. The hon. Lady has raised one of a range of issues to which the FCA will need to give careful thought. This is an example of the FCA using the powers that it has been given by the Government to protect consumers. We will continue to work closely with the FCA as it undertakes its review of, more generally, the high-cost credit market and, in particular, the logbook loan market. We will consider whether the Government should take any further action in the light of its findings. This is not the end of the story. We want to give the matter a great deal more thought.

Alongside that, the Government are taking further action to protect borrowers. We are supporting families to build their financial literacy through the Money Advice Service, and £27 million is provided every year through MAS to co-ordinate financial education in schools and to improve the public's financial capability. A further £49 million was spent in the previous financial year on providing more than 440,000 free-to-client debt

advice sessions across the country. We want to continue to look for measures to protect the public and to improve financial literacy and awareness.

I know that the hon. Lady is disappointed by the Government's decision at this stage. I reassure her that the decision was not taken due to pressures on parliamentary time, although that is always a consideration when introducing legislation. The Government's primary objective is to ensure that, if we legislate, we do so correctly, and bring in interventions that will protect

consumers without unintended consequences. That is why we decided, following the consultation, that the Bill was not yet in the right place.

Question put and agreed to.

4.16 pm

Sitting suspended for Divisions in the House.

6.51 pm

Sitting adjourned without Question put (Standing Order No. 10(14)).

Written Statements

Tuesday 12 June 2018

DEFENCE

Contingent Liabilities

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence (Guto Bebb): I am today laying a departmental minute to advise that the Ministry of Defence (MOD) is retrospectively notifying Parliament about contingent liabilities not previously disclosed, due to procedural errors. HMT recognise the urgency for these contingent liabilities to be laid before Parliament and have approved them in principle. Final approval is expected pending the outcome of a wider departmental review, as part of the balance sheet review, being conducted by Her Majesty's Treasury.

The minute describes the contingent liabilities that the MOD holds against three Air Command contracts, two Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and one Navy Command contract. It is usual to allow a period of 14 sitting days prior to accepting a contingent liability, to provide hon. Members an opportunity to raise any objections. Regrettably, this was not done ahead of contract award in these cases and I sincerely apologise for our failure to do so. The purpose of the minute is to regularise the position with Parliament. The contracts remain fully enforceable and the associated contingent liabilities will be reported in the 2017-18 MOD annual report and accounts.

Failure to notify these contingent liabilities prior to the award of the associated contracts has been reported to the Public Accounts Committee. The Department has noted the Committee's concerns about this situation and fully accepts the need to follow the correct approvals and reporting procedures. Air Command, DIO and Navy Command have put in place a series of measures to address this issue including staff briefing, mandated training, improving the clarity of internal guidance and procedures and additional controls in the approvals process, to ensure compliance.

If the liability is called, provision for any payment will be sought through the normal supply procedure.

If, following the laying of the departmental minute, a Member signifies an objection by writing to me, I undertake to examine the objection and respond to the member concerned.

[HCWS759]

ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS

Multi-agency Flood Plan Review Report

The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Michael Gove): On 3 November 2017 I announced that DEFRA and the Environment Agency would be undertaking a review of multi-agency flood plans produced by local resilience forums (LRFs) in England, as part of the Government's ongoing work to address flood risk (written statement - HCWS221). The remit of the review was to look at the effectiveness and

consistency of current flood plans, to identify good practice and provide advice on how it can be spread, to help make sure we have the best plans in place across the country. The review was led and overseen by Major General (ret'd) Tim Cross, as an independent external reviewer.

I am very pleased today to be publishing General Cross's review. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to General Cross for conducting such careful, insightful analysis and so quickly. The review report includes 12 recommendations which General Cross developed in light of his discussions and evidence gathering with LRFs and specialists across the country and he has brought to the fore important issues that need to be addressed.

I will now consider the report's recommendations in detail, in consultation with other Departments, and will publish a Government response later in the year.

I have arranged for a copy of the report to be placed in the Libraries of the House.

[HCWS758]

JUSTICE

Justice and Home Affairs Post-Council Statement

The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Mr David Gauke): The Justice and Home Affairs Council took place in Luxembourg on 4 and 5 June 2018. The UK was represented by a senior official from the Ministry of Justice on Justice Day (4 June). The Home Secretary represented the UK on Interior Day (5 June).

Justice Day began with a discussion on the contract law—sales of goods directive. The UK supported the presidency's approach of a single set of rules in this measure for all goods (including those with embedded digital content), and on guarantee periods, but expressed concern on the potential for full harmonisation of remedies. A more general concern was expressed around the room, including by the UK, about the impact of the remedies provisions on consumer protections set out in national laws. Work will continue at technical level in line with the digital content directive, taking this concern into account.

The presidency secured a partial general approach on the insolvency directive provisions covering the discharge of debts for honest entrepreneurs, training for judges and practitioners and data collection, in line with UK views.

There was a discussion around certain policy questions on Brussels 1la, with broad support for circulation of provisional measures in relation to child abduction cases, as well as the need for consent in relation to the placement of children in foster or institutional care in another member state. On the recognition and enforcement of judgments, member states were divided on whether (and how) to treat cases involving children differently, with the presidency concluding that further work would be required at technical level.

There was a report on the preparatory steps needed to be taken to ensure that the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) becomes operational in 2020. The UK will not participate in the EPPO.

Member states discussed the misuse of user data and the protection of democracy in relation to Facebook. The UK provided an update on the ICO's (Information Commissioner's Office's) investigation. The Commission noted the importance of fully implementing the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and welcomed the co-operation between the UK and Ireland on the Cambridge Analytica case.

Judicial training and the role of the European judicial training network was discussed over lunch. There was broad support for more money for the network in the next multi-annual financial framework.

The incoming Austrian presidency provided an update on their programme. They will aim to achieve a general approach in a number of dossiers: insolvency, e-evidence, sale of goods, service of documents and taking of evidence; political consensus on Brussels IIa; and the adoption of the confiscation, Eurojust and ECRIS TCN (European Criminal Records Information System—Third Country Nationals) measures. The July informal JHA Council will also include a discussion on mutual trust and mutual recognition, and developing ECJ jurisprudence (in particular the Irish references on UK and Polish European arrest warrants (EAWs)).

In a joint session of Justice and Home Affairs Ministers there was a policy debate on the draft EU legislation on improving cross-border access to electronic evidence. Ministers agreed on the need to explore further whether to include live intercept and direct access in the scope of the legislation. The Council also reaffirmed widespread support among member states for a common EU approach towards the negotiation of an executive agreement with international partners, and concluded that the Commission should submit recommendations for negotiating mandates before the summer. The UK has a JHA opt-in decision to take on this regulation by 22 August.

Ministers adopted Council conclusions on support for victims of terrorism. A new co-ordination centre for victims of terrorism will bring together expertise and facilitate co-ordination.

Interior Day began with a discussion on progress made on negotiations on the reform of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS). Of the measures that make up CEAS, the UK has only opted in to the recast of the Eurodac regulation. Member states remained split on the inclusion of a mandatory redistribution mechanism in the recast Dublin regulation. The June European Council will aim to reach agreement as a priority.

There was a policy debate on the regulation amending the Schengen visa code. The UK does not participate in the border and immigration aspects of the Schengen acquis so this legislation has no impact upon the UK.

Over lunch, Ministers exchanged views on the current developments on the migration situation at the eastern, central and western Mediterranean migration routes. The UK reinforced our commitment to the EU-Turkey statement and called for focus on breaking the people smugglers' business model and encouraged more action on strategic communications. The Council agreed the immediate and short-term measures proposed by the presidency.

Ministers then exchanged views on enhancing co-operation between counterterrorism authorities. The Council endorsed the importance of the Counter Terrorism Group's work and endorsed the call for heightened co-operation between intelligence and law enforcement communities.

On internal security, the Council signalled continued support for the multidisciplinary approach of the EU policy cycle to counter organised and serious international crime.

Finally, there was a discussion on co-operation between common security and defence policy operations and EU JHA agencies. The Council was updated on the establishment of the new "Crime Information Cell" in the EUNAVFORMED Operation Sophia.

[HCWS760]

ORAL ANSWERS

Tuesday 12 June 2018

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY	697	BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY—	
Automotive Industry.....	701	<i>continued</i>	
British Steel.....	712	Gas Sector: Scotland.....	711
Carbon Capture and Storage Taskforce	712	High Street Businesses	707
Economic Growth and Emissions	697	Industrial Strategy	713
Energy Bills.....	703	Science, Technology and Innovation Investment	709
Energy Generation and Consumption: Kettering...	700	Sirius Minerals Polyhalite Project	709
Feed-in Tariff Scheme.....	706	Sustainable Electricity Generation	705
Food and Drink Sector: South-west.....	700	Tidal Lagoons.....	714
		Topical Questions	714

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Tuesday 12 June 2018

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
DEFENCE	31WS	JUSTICE	32WS
Contingent Liabilities.....	31WS	Justice and Home Affairs Post-Council Statement.	32WS
ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS.	31WS		
Multi-agency Flood Plan Review Report	31WS		

No proofs can be supplied. Corrections that Members suggest for the Bound Volume should be clearly marked on a copy of the daily Hansard - not telephoned - and *must be received in the Editor's Room, House of Commons,*

**not later than
Tuesday 19 June 2018**

STRICT ADHERENCE TO THIS ARRANGEMENT GREATLY FACILITATES THE
PROMPT PUBLICATION OF BOUND VOLUMES

Members may obtain excerpts of their speeches from the Official Report (within one month from the date of publication), by applying to the Editor of the Official Report, House of Commons.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 12 June 2018

Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 697] [see index inside back page]
Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Alcohol (Minimum Pricing) (England) [Col. 724]
*Motion for leave to bring in Bill—(Fiona Bruce)—agreed to
Bill presented, and read the First time*

European Union (Withdrawal) Bill [Col. 726]
*Programme motion (No. 3)—(Mr David Davis)—agreed to
Lords amendments considered*

Sexual Exploitation: Newcastle [Col. 863]
Debate on motion for Adjournment

Westminster Hall
Coastal Erosion [Col. 279WH]
Care of Prisoners' Children [Col. 305WH]
Hepatitis C [Col. 313WH]
Logbook Loans [Col. 334WH]
General Debates

Written Statements [Col. 31WS]

Written Answers to Questions [The written answers can now be found at <http://www.parliament.uk/writtenanswers>]
