

Tuesday
19 January 2021

Volume 687
No. 162



**HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES**

(HANSARD)

Tuesday 19 January 2021

House of Commons

Tuesday 19 January 2021

The House met at half-past Eleven o'clock

PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Virtual participation in proceedings continued (Order, 4 June and 30 December 2020).

[NB: [V] denotes a Member participating virtually.]

Oral Answers to Questions

FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

The Secretary of State was asked—

Poverty-focused Aid

Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD): What steps he is taking to ensure his Department prioritises poverty-focused aid. [910974]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (James Duddridge): Happy new year, Mr Speaker. The Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office has a new strategic framework for official development assistance that focuses on poverty and delivery of sustainable development goals. Specifically, our priorities will be climate, biodiversity, covid, global health, girls' education, science and research, open societies, conflict, humanitarian assistance directly and trade.

Munira Wilson [V]: I am grateful to the Minister for his response. With international development spending already falling in line with the country's drop in gross national income, and given the Chancellor's deplorable plan to slash the UK's commitment to the world's poorest still further, it is more important than ever that UK ODA spending directly reaches developing countries and the communities and individuals in those countries who need it most. Could the Minister explain what criteria are being used to ensure that poverty alleviation is prioritised in decisions on spending? How are the Government planning to consult civil society on this?

James Duddridge: I can reassure the hon. Lady that the UK Government remain one of the most generous donors in relation to ODA, with more than £10 billion focused on poverty reduction. Clearly, we will consult with civil society and non-governmental organisations; Lord Ahmad has recently done that, and we will all continue to do that. In addition, £1.3 billion has been focused specifically on covid, and more than 300 programmes have been repurposed to deal with covid issues.

Chris Law (Dundee West) (SNP) [V]: Global poverty has risen for the first time in more than 20 years, and by the end of this year, it is estimated that there will be more than 150 million people in extreme poverty. Against that backdrop, the UK Government recklessly abolished the Department for International Development, they are renegeing on their 0.7% of GNI commitment, and they do not even mention eradicating poverty in the seven global challenges that UK aid is to be focused on. Can the Minister explicitly commit to eradicating poverty within the new official development assistance framework, rather than pursuing inhumane and devastating cuts as part of the Prime Minister's little Britain vanity project?

James Duddridge: The hon. Gentleman knows that we share a passion for international development. These specific targets do aim to alleviate and eradicate poverty, but the causes of poverty and the solutions to it are complex. That is why the merger of the Departments works, dealing with development and diplomacy alongside one another to overcome the scourge of poverty, which, sadly, has increased not decreased as a result of covid. The joined-up Department will help in the objectives that he and I care so passionately about.

UN Human Rights Council: Sri Lanka

Wes Streeting (Ilford North) (Lab): What steps he plans to take at the UN Human Rights Council in March 2021 in response to (a) Sri Lanka's recent withdrawal from its human rights obligations under resolution 30/1 and (b) forced cremations of people who die from covid-19 in Sri Lanka. [910975]

The Minister for Asia (Nigel Adams): We are disappointed at Sri Lanka's withdrawal of support for resolution 30/1; we made that clear in statements at the United Nations Human Rights Council in February, June and September 2020. We are working with international partners and have had discussions with the Sri Lankan Government on how to take this forward at the UNHRC in March. We are committed to the principles of the resolution, and our approach to Sri Lanka will be a priority for the UK at the HRC over the next few months.

Wes Streeting [V]: The UK's leadership on the issue of human rights in Sri Lanka, in terms of both historical and ongoing human rights abuses, has been critical. We saw, whether through David Miliband as Foreign Secretary or David Cameron as Prime Minister, the importance of leadership at the very highest level. What specifically will the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister do as leaders of the core group ahead of that crucial UN Human Rights Council in Geneva in March to ensure that the perpetrators of human rights abuses in Sri Lanka do not go unpunished, and that we can look forward to a future based on truth, justice and reconciliation for all the peoples of Sri Lanka?

Nigel Adams: As I pointed out in my response, we are absolutely committed to the principles of the resolution. My ministerial colleague, Lord Ahmad, discussed human rights and accountability with the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister and the high commissioner in November and December respectively. We have spoken with Sri Lankan officials and with Geneva over the last week on these very issues.

Stephen Kinnock (Aberavon) (Lab): We on the Opposition Benches believe that the Government's foreign policy should be rooted in our country's commitment to human rights and the rule of law. Therefore, we deeply regret that in February 2020 the Sri Lankan Government withdrew from their Human Rights Council obligations to promote reconciliation and accountability following the country's devastating civil war. More recently, the Sri Lankan Government have introduced forced cremation for covid-19 victims, a policy that has absolutely no basis in science, rides roughshod over the traditional practices of Sri Lankan religious minorities and has rightly caused hurt and outrage among Muslim and Christian communities across the UK. So I ask the Minister: what steps has he taken to persuade the Sri Lankan Government to end forced cremations, what work is he doing with international partners ahead of the next Human Rights Council session in March to ensure that the Sri Lankan Government re-engages with the peace, reconciliation and accountability process, and what discussions has he had about human rights in the context of UK-Sri Lankan trade deal negotiations?

Nigel Adams: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his question and he is right to raise it. We have shared guidance and scientific background with the Government of Sri Lanka on how the UK has ensured that burials can continue to operate in a safe format within the World Health Organisation guidelines. We also discussed, via my colleague Lord Ahmad, the importance of minority rights with the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister in November. Our high commissioner to Sri Lanka has raised forced cremation several times with the Sri Lankans—most recently, just over a week ago. We continue to speak with Sri Lanka, and have done so within the last week, and with Geneva regarding its commitment to upholding this resolution. We are certainly committed to it, and we will continue that dialogue.

Events at US Capitol

David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP): What assessment he has made of the effect of events at the US Capitol building on 6 January 2021 on the state of democracy worldwide. [910976]

Damian Collins (Folkestone and Hythe) (Con): What recent discussions he has had with the US Administration on reports of the (a) detention and (b) assault of journalists covering the rioting in Washington, D.C. on 6 January 2021. [911009]

The Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs and First Secretary of State (Dominic Raab): The resumption of Congress and the certification of Joe Biden's victory on 7 January sent an essential message that the democratic will of the US people cannot be challenged by a violent minority.

David Linden [V]: In the wake of what happened on Capitol hill, politicians around the world looked on in condemnation at the incendiary language of Mr Trump—without regretting how close a relationship they had formed with the President. Sadly, though, the same cannot be said for political figures in this Government. So I must ask the Foreign Secretary whether he and his party regret cosying up to Trump, kowtowing to him

and legitimising him and his racist, climate change-denying rhetoric, or will they remain eclipsed by any populist leader who comes along?

Dominic Raab: I am afraid that the hon. Gentleman's assertion and caricature are very far from the truth. We made it clear that the scenes caused by a small but ugly minority in Washington were disgraceful. We also made it clear we had full confidence in the system of checks and balances in the US to provide a definitive result and a smooth transition. We look forward to working with the new Administration.

Damian Collins [V]: There were 342 assaults on journalists in America last year and there have been 13 further assaults this year. Will my right hon. Friend work with the new Administration in America to protect the rights of journalists around the world, and also call on social media companies to do more—[*Interruption*—not just to tackle harmful disinformation, but to make sure that social media platforms are not used to incite attacks against journalists?

Dominic Raab: I thank my hon. Friend. I do not know whether that bell came from his end or our end, but in any event it certainly added a bit of flourish to his question.

Mr Speaker: It's Amazon.

Dominic Raab: It's Amazon, is it? Okay. Thank you, Mr Speaker, as ever.

My hon. Friend is absolutely right. The press must be allowed to cover events without fear or denial of access. We have discussed our concerns about the violent events that we saw at official level, but also at ministerial level. I have done that myself. I can assure him no British journalists were detained. Of course, working with Canada and others, we have a media freedom coalition, and we certainly look forward to co-operating with the US and many others to pioneer that work through our global leadership year in 2021.

Catherine West (Hornsey and Wood Green) (Lab): Today, we all utterly condemn the lawless and violent storming of the US Capitol on 6 January, with the FBI identifying the involvement of far-right activists and domestic terrorists. It is clear that, week after week, President Trump's behaviour, undermining the electoral victory of President-elect Biden, played a key role in inciting the mob. Does the Foreign Secretary believe that this violent episode has damaged democracy, and what urgent steps can be taken to mend the sense that our Government were lukewarm around the election time and failed to uphold the sense of democracy that we all deeply care about?

Dominic Raab: I say to the hon. Lady that the UK was not lukewarm, and she must have missed the Prime Minister's statement in which he was very clear that what President Trump should have done—[*Interruption.*] We do not conduct diplomacy by Twitter, unlike the hon. Member for Wigan (Lisa Nandy). We were absolutely clear about it. At the same time, we are also confident in the US system of checks and balances, and we are very much looking forward to working with the new Administration.

Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

Paul Holmes (Eastleigh) (Con): What diplomatic steps he is taking to bring Iran back into compliance with the joint comprehensive plan of action. [910977]

The Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs and First Secretary of State (Dominic Raab): We are very concerned about Iran's continued systemic non-compliance with its nuclear commitments, and we have made that clear with our E3 partners, including recently at the ministerial meeting of the joint comprehensive plan of action.

Paul Holmes [V]: Recent confirmation from the International Atomic Energy Agency that Iran has resumed enriching uranium to 20% purity at its Fordow facility is enormously concerning, and it is arguably the most significant breach of the JCPOA. Will the Foreign Secretary confirm that his Department will press the new Administration under President-elect Biden to rejoin the deal, and put much-needed pressure on Iran to return to compliance?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is right about the risk from the now systemic serial non-compliance from Iran. On 21 December we held a meeting of the JCPOA ministerial commission, which was an opportunity to set out clearly our position, not just the UK, but with our French and German partners. It is welcome that President-elect Biden and the new Administration have talked about coming back to the JCPOA, and enhancing and strengthening it, and that will be one of the early topics of conversation that we have with the new Administration.

Tom Tugendhat (Tonbridge and Malling) (Con) [V]: I hope the whole House will join me in welcoming the newest member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Rutland and Melton (Alicia Kearns) on the birth of her second child, which I have just heard about. Before the Secretary of State joins me in offering such congratulations, will he also give some thought to the approach of the new Biden Administration on the Iran deal? He will have read in the Foreign Affairs Committee's report, which was expertly helped by my hon. Friend the Member for Rutland and Melton, the various thoughts that we put down, including looking at how we can work with regional partners and allies who are deeply concerned by the change of Administration, and perhaps a change of tone in the White House. How will my right hon. Friend ensure that the Biden Administration, the UK Administration, and our friends and partners in the region work together to ensure that we stop this malevolent dictatorship expanding its evil reach any further?

Dominic Raab: I thank the Chair of the Select Committee, and pay tribute to my hon. Friend the Member for Rutland and Melton (Alicia Kearns). I congratulate both parents on their new child—a very happy moment. We are obviously putting a lot of thought into how we engage with the new Administration, including on Iran. The E3 unity that we have shown throughout is a value of strength, and a lever for the United States and the new Administration. My hon. Friend will also be aware that there is a window of opportunity between now and

the Iranian presidential elections in early June, to try to make some definitive progress. Against that timeframe we ought to be able to focus minds.

Covid-19 Vaccine Access

Mr Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi (Slough) (Lab): What recent steps the Government have taken to help ensure equitable access to covid-19 vaccines for people living in the global south. [910985]

Bell Ribeiro-Addy (Streatham) (Lab): What recent steps the Government have taken to help ensure equitable access to covid-19 vaccines for people living in the global south. [910989]

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): What recent steps the Government have taken to help ensure equitable access to covid-19 vaccines for people living in the global south. [910997]

Dr Jamie Wallis (Bridgend) (Con): What diplomatic steps the Government are taking to support the development and distribution of covid-19 vaccines (a) in the UK and (b) throughout the world. [910998]

Mark Pawsey (Rugby) (Con): What diplomatic steps the Government are taking to support the development and distribution of covid-19 vaccines (a) in the UK and (b) throughout the world. [911010]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (Wendy Morton): The UK is committed to rapid equitable access to safe and effective vaccines through multilateral collaboration. We are combining our diplomatic influencing, development expertise, and money to tackle covid-19 and secure vaccines. The UK is a founding member, and one of the largest donors to the COVAX advance market commitment. We have committed £548 million to this international initiative for global equitable access, which through match funding has encouraged other donors to commit an additional \$1 billion.

Mr Dhesi: The world is on the brink of a “catastrophic moral failure” according to the head of the World Health Organisation. Unless there is a collaborative global approach, the pandemic and the ensuing human and economic suffering will merely be prolonged. Does the Minister therefore agree that any hoarding of vaccines by richer nations is unforgivable and unconscionable, and that we must all work collectively for the betterment of all humanity by simultaneously helping people within our nation while helping to provide for those who are less affluent than us?

Wendy Morton: The hon. Gentleman makes a really important point and I am sure that he will agree with me that the COVAX AMC is such an important tool and facility for us to help developing countries. This particular facility will support access to covid-19 vaccinations for up to 92 developing countries. This will contribute to the supply of 1 billion doses in 2021 and the vaccination of 500 million people. Let me be clear, Mr Speaker: the UK is at the forefront of multilateral efforts to ensure equitable global access through the COVAX facility.

Bell Ribeiro-Addy [V]: Yesterday, the director of the World Health Organisation stated that 39 million vaccine doses had been administered in 49 higher income countries, whereas in one poor country just 25 doses had been given—not 25 million, not 25,000, just 25. Does the Minister agree that global equality on the vaccine roll-out should not just be a moral imperative but a strategic one to stop the spread of the virus? If she does agree, why do her Government not support calls for pharmaceutical companies to waive intellectual property rights and openly share technology through the World Health Organisation covid technology access pool?

Wendy Morton: When it comes to vaccines, we have been very clear that we support equitable access. This is a global pandemic. This is a virus that respects no boundaries and no barriers. That is why we are working and leading the way at the forefront of multilateral efforts to ensure we get equitable access through this really important COVAX facility.

Rachael Maskell [V]: I want to press the Minister further, because none of us is safe until all of us are safe. Clearly, with the threat of the spread and the mutation of the virus we are all at risk until the world is vaccinated. Will the Minister say specifically what work her Government have done to overcome intellectual property rights to ensure the manufacture of the vaccine in the global south and ensure that those countries that currently cannot get access to the vaccine can distribute it locally?

Wendy Morton: The UK believes that a robust and fair intellectual property system is a key part of the innovation framework that allows economies to grow and become innovators, while enabling society to benefit from knowledge and ideas. We believe that non-exclusive voluntary licensing has advantages over compulsory licensing, because it creates a sounder basis for long-lasting beneficial relationships and incentives to create and commercialise new inventions such as those life-changing vaccines.

Dr Wallis [V]: I thank the Minister for her answer. What steps is her Department taking to ensure that the poorest and most disadvantaged countries have access to vaccines?

Wendy Morton: I think this goes to the heart of this particular question today. Our commitment will support access to covid-19 vaccines for up to 92 developing countries by contributing to the supply of 1 billion doses in 2021. That is only possible through the COVAX AMC facility, which we have been leading on from the front with our big commitment of £548 million to that facility and the encouragement of others to step up to the mark and reach the \$1 billion target, too.

Mark Pawsey [V]: The Minister has set out how important it is for people around the world to be vaccinated against covid-19 and reminded us about the UK's strong record of supporting vaccination in the developing world. Is she confident that we will be able to continue to meet our international commitments on vaccination if we reduce our levels of aid from 0.7% of GNI?

Wendy Morton: I know that my hon. Friend takes a keen interest in international development. The seismic impact of the pandemic on the UK economy has forced

us to take tough but necessary decisions, including our temporary reduction of ODA from 0.7% to 0.5% of gross national income. We will return to that level as soon as the fiscal situation allows, but let me reassure him that we will remain a world-leading aid donor, spending that 0.5% of GNI. When it comes to our commitment, particularly on vaccines and vaccinations, I point to the Gavi vaccine summit, which the Prime Minister hosted in the early part of last year. At that summit the UK Government committed to £1.65 billion over the next five years to support Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance. That will immunise 300 million children and save up to 8 million lives.

Alyn Smith (Stirling) (SNP) [V]: I echo the concerns of colleagues across the House that vaccine nationalism is dangerous and self-defeating. This is not an Olympics; it is a global problem that we must deal with on a multilateral basis. I pay tribute to what the UK has done in donating to the COVAX system. There is still a \$4.3 billion dollar shortfall to this and, as we have heard, nobody is safe until everybody is safe on a global scale. What plans are there to convene a Gavi II summit to bring international donors together to work with colleagues across the world to make sure that nobody gets left behind in this? And would the Minister condemn colleagues in her Government who are indulging in vaccine nationalism and pretending that one country is doing better than another, when we really are facing a common challenge?

Wendy Morton: This is a global pandemic and I commend the work of the Government in the vaccination programme that we have. I look to my constituency and the tremendous work that Walsall Manor Hospital and the Oak Park centre are doing. Alongside that, let me reassure the hon. Gentleman that we are absolutely committed to equitable access. The global Gavi summit that we held earlier last year was just one example of the leading part that the UK Government are taking when it comes to the fight against the covid-19 pandemic.

Preet Kaur Gill (Birmingham, Edgbaston) (Lab/Co-op) [V]: The longer the pandemic rages, the more damage will be done to ordinary families around the world who are suffering from a crisis they did not create. We have an opportunity to save countless lives and livelihoods here in the UK and abroad by playing our part in co-operating with other countries and using our influence to bring them together. As we have seen during the pandemic, the Government have consistently struggled with transparency and accountability, so will the United Kingdom fulfil the ask made yesterday by the director general of the World Health Organisation and make public all bilateral contracts that they have signed for covid-19 vaccines, including on volumes, pricing and delivery dates, so that we can deal with production bottlenecks and ensure equitable access to the vaccine, giving us all the best chance of beating this deadly virus?

Wendy Morton: I do not accept the hon. Lady's assertions when it comes to transparency. We, the UK, are absolutely at the forefront of multilateral efforts on ensuring equitable global access. If we look at what the UK Government have done, we see that we have contributed to CEPI—the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations—in the early part of this pandemic and to FIND, the Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics.

We have contributed to Gavi and to the COVAX AMC. This is all about helping the world's poorest. We have also flexed a lot of our normal aid work to help countries that are suffering from the pandemic, because we know that, as well as the primary impact of covid-19, there are many secondary impacts.

Sarah Champion (Rotherham) (Lab) [V]: The Minister is right that vaccines alone are not enough, and she is aware that the International Development Committee has just done an inquiry on the secondary impacts, which show that developing countries are suffering economically through their healthcare and through gender inequality. What efforts and preparations are being made by the FCDO to prevent there being a development mountain to climb after the pandemic subsides?

Wendy Morton: I recognise the work of the IDC and I am very pleased that its work is continuing. Let me just reiterate that when it comes to covid-19, the UK and the FCDO remain at the forefront. With the funds that we have, we continue to support the world's poorest, and we will continue to focus on the bottom billion. Yes, it is about working with the development world, but it is also about working, where we can, with the public sector and the private sector. I look to the example of Oxford-AstraZeneca. The UK Government invested £84 million in helping to develop that vaccine, and we are now rolling it out. We have committed to the AMC, and we are absolutely committed to helping the world's poorest.¹

Science and Technology: International Development

Dr Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (Con): What steps he is taking to ensure UK science and technology plays a role in international development. [910979]

The Minister for Asia (Nigel Adams): Scientific advances funded by the UK have helped drive reductions in extreme poverty, declines in childhood mortality and increases in life expectancy across the developing world. Our investments, including in affordable rapid diagnostic tests for covid-19 and the world's first child-friendly antimalarial drug, are delivering benefit to hundreds of millions. We will continue to leverage UK and global scientific excellence and invest in cutting-edge technology and research to provide solutions to critical development challenges.

Dr Murrison [V]: The Government are doing extremely well in rolling out the vaccine in the UK. The AstraZeneca vaccine in particular is potentially deployable in developing countries. Will the Minister say at what point we will pass vaccines that we have ordered that greatly surpass the need of our population to COVAX? Does he agree that it is vital that, in advance of that, we do everything in our power to develop healthcare infrastructure in developing countries, without which a credible vaccine roll-out is just not possible?

Nigel Adams: I thank my right hon. Friend for his question. I agree that we should be incredibly proud of the work that we have done with regard to the vaccine.

I have had meetings with my Philippine counterparts on vaccines, alongside AstraZeneca. We are supporting

equitable access through our funding for the COVAX facility. We are one of the largest donors to the COVAX advance market commitment to support access for 92 developing countries; we have committed £548 million. COVAX's partners, which include Gavi, the World Health Organisation and UNICEF, have huge experience in supporting developing country immunisation systems and the programming of immunisation. We expect the initial roll-out to COVAX AMC countries to start in the first quarter of this year.

Antimicrobial Resistance

Kevin Hollinrake (Thirsk and Malton) (Con): What progress the Government have made through international co-operation on tackling antimicrobial resistance. [910980]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (Wendy Morton): The UK is a global leader in promoting action on antimicrobial resistance. It is an international priority. We helped achieve the 2016 UN political declaration on AMR, and UK aid contributes significantly to AMR efforts around the world. This includes our flagship Fleming fund, which builds capacity on AMR in lower and middle-income countries, focusing on investments in water, sanitation and hygiene; healthcare facilities; and broader health systems strengthening.

Kevin Hollinrake [V]: A leading Oxford-based professor of microbiology today described covid as "the short, sharp earthquake" and antimicrobial resistance as "the massive tsunami in the background."

On the basis that AMR in pigs and chickens has trebled in developing nations since 2000, will my hon. Friend press for more action to limit the unnecessary use of antibiotics in humans, pigs and chickens?

Wendy Morton: This is a really important point. My hon. Friend has taken a keen interest in this topic for some time in this place. We absolutely recognise the risks to human health of the inappropriate use of antimicrobials in agriculture and food production, as seen through our national action plan. The vast majority of global antimicrobial use, as he will probably be aware, is in agriculture. We are a major funder of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research, which supports low and middle-income countries in controlling agriculture-associated AMR risks and is working to understand how antimicrobials are used and by whom and how that contributes to their misuse. .

Yemen

Scott Benton (Blackpool South) (Con): What recent assessment the Government has made of the (a) political and (b) humanitarian situation in Yemen. [910981]

Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central) (SNP): What recent discussions he has had with the US Secretary of State on that Administration's proposed designation of Houthis as a terror group. [910987]

Rebecca Long Bailey (Salford and Eccles) (Lab): What support the UK is providing to the UN's work to secure peace in Yemen. [911000]

The Minister for the Middle East and North Africa (James Cleverly): The UK remains deeply concerned by the ongoing conflict and humanitarian crisis in Yemen. We welcome the positive steps towards implementation of the Riyadh agreement, including the formation of a new inclusive Yemeni Cabinet. We condemn in the strongest terms the Houthi attack on Aden airport, which killed over 25 civilians, and we call on the Houthis to cease such attacks and demonstrate a renewed commitment to the political process.

As my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary warned in September, Yemen has never looked more likely to slide into famine. We are using our £214 million in aid funding to help around 500,000 vulnerable people each month and to enrol 25,000 children into malnutrition prevention programmes. While we share the US concerns about the Houthis' continual attacks on civilians in Yemen and cross-border attacks into Saudi Arabia, we do not intend to proscribe the Houthis at this time, but we will keep this under regular review.

Scott Benton: The crisis in Yemen is of great concern to all of us, and it is perfectly clear that Iran is exploiting the conflict for its own ends. Reports of Iran sending advanced unmanned aerial vehicles to the Houthis will no doubt only inflame tensions further. Does the Minister agree that until Iranian aspirations for regional dominance are curtailed, this conflict and many others will continue and more lives will sadly be lost?

James Cleverly: We must see an end to Iran's destabilising influence in Yemen, which has stoked further conflict. We have raised this issue directly with the Iranian Government. Iran's provision of weapons to the Houthis is in contravention of UN Security Council resolution 2216 and the UN Security Council embargo on the export of weapons by Iran. We remain deeply concerned at Iran's political, financial and military support for a number of militant and proscribed groups in the region, and we will continue working with international partners to dissuade Iran from proliferation and wider destabilising actions.

Alison Thewliss [V]: Mark Lowcock, the UN under-secretary-general for humanitarian affairs and emergency relief co-ordinator, has clearly stated that the US's designation of the Houthis as a terrorist group will push Yemen into a famine on a scale not seen for 40 years and that only a reversal of the US decision will fix this, so could I ask the Minister what the UK Government are doing to avert this catastrophe and get the US Administration to change their mind?

James Cleverly: Following President Trump's Administration's decision to designate the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organisation, we have requested that the US put in place comprehensive exemptions to limit the humanitarian impact and the impact on commercial imports and the UN peace effort. Our priority is to support the UN peace effort, and my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary will engage with the incoming US Administration on this and a number of other important bilateral issues.

Rebecca Long Bailey [V]: Salford is home to one of the UK's oldest Yemeni communities, as well as charities providing humanitarian relief to the region, and they fear that the US designation will have a devastating

impact, as humanitarian access and the ability of food supplies and other goods to reach Yemeni civilians will be severely obstructed. I welcome the comments that the Minister has just made, but will he go one step further? Will he contact President-elect Biden and ask him to revoke the designation when he starts in office?

James Cleverly: My right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary will no doubt engage at the earliest opportunity with the incoming Administration in the White House. I have made it clear that we have already requested the US to put in place comprehensive exemptions to facilitate humanitarian support. We will continue to work both bilaterally with the US and internationally through the UN and others to protect the people suffering in Yemen, to prevent famine where we can and to work with all parties involved to bring this extended conflict to a conclusion.

Wayne David (Caerphilly) (Lab) [V]: As we have heard, from today President Trump and Mike Pompeo have designated the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organisation. That will make peace in Yemen more difficult to achieve and could now lead to the starvation of more than 1 million people, yet our Government have said and done little, and even abstained at the United Nations Security Council. Why have the Government failed to condemn this obviously dangerous step? Will they now join us in calling on Joe Biden to reverse this decision as quickly as possible?

James Cleverly: The idea that the UK has not been active on this issue is self-evidently nonsense. My right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary and I have discussed the issue with each other, and with the international community through the UN. We have provided significant amounts of humanitarian support to Yemen. We have lobbied to ensure that humanitarian access remains. This is a genuine global tragedy, and I am incredibly proud of the work that the UK Government have done, both on their own and in conjunction with the international community, to bring this terrible, terrible conflict to a conclusion.

Ethiopia

Duncan Baker (North Norfolk) (Con): What recent assessment he has made of the political situation in Ethiopia. [910982]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (James Duddridge): The British Government remain concerned at the continued conflict in the Tigray region of Ethiopia, and I urge both sides to end fighting, protect civilians and allow unfettered humanitarian access. The Foreign Secretary has stressed those points directly to Prime Minister Abiy, and to Deputy Prime Minister Demeke when he visited the UK recently.

Duncan Baker [V]: Mrs Peta Benson, a constituent of mine, has supported an orphanage in Tigray for years. Like many, we are extremely worried by the reported appalling humanitarian crisis that conflicts have brought to the region. Can my hon. Friend tell me that every effort is being made by the British Government to calm those hostilities and further de-escalate civil war in that region of Ethiopia?

James Duddridge: I thank my hon. Friend for his activity on this issue and can reassure him that we are making such efforts. I certainly underlined the need to end the fighting and prioritise the protection of civilians when I spoke to the Ethiopian Finance Minister last month, and I have also raised the issue of the conflict with regional leaders in the past few weeks. The Foreign Secretary and I will continue to raise these points, and I thank my hon. Friend for the contribution he is making to the debate.

Global Malnutrition

David Mundell (Dumfriesshire, Clydesdale and Tweeddale) (Con): What steps he is taking to tackle global malnutrition. [910983]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (Wendy Morton): The UK has invested £3.7 billion in tackling malnutrition since the nutrition for growth summit in 2013. The UK has reached 55.1 million children, women and adolescent girls through our nutrition programmes from 2015 to 2020. I was really pleased when the Foreign Secretary appointed the UK's first special envoy for famine prevention and humanitarian affairs last year, announcing alongside that £119 million to address food insecurity and a £30 million partnership with UNICEF to address acute malnutrition.

David Mundell: It was excellent to see UK leadership on global nutrition acknowledged by world leaders at the Canada nutrition for growth event in December, which launched 2021 as a year of action for nutrition. That could hardly be more timely, given that covid-19 is causing rates of malnutrition worldwide to rise for the first time in decades. So nutrition must be central to my hon. Friend's new Department's objectives for aid spending. For example, it is impossible to meaningfully progress girls' education while rates of malnutrition among girls are on the rise. Will the Government therefore urgently review their commitment to tackle malnutrition as part of their participation in the year of action?

Wendy Morton: I know my right hon. Friend has taken a keen interest in this and has been trying to get a question at Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office orals for some time. It is evident that good nutrition underpins education and health outcomes, and adult learning, in developing countries. That was the rationale for the UK playing a lead role on nutrition over the past decade. The prevention and treatment of malnutrition remain key to achieving the Government's commitment to ending the preventable deaths of mothers, newborns and children. The Department is, of course, beginning a rigorous internal prioritisation process in response to the spending review announcement, and we will give an update on the implications of that for nutrition as soon as is feasible.

Kashmir: Human Rights

Sarah Owen (Luton North) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the effect of the deaths of Kashmiri citizens Abrar Ahmad Khan, Imtiyaz Ahmad and Abrar Ahmad Yousuf on human rights in that region. [910986]

Mr Steve Baker (Wycombe) (Con): What steps he is taking to support human rights in Kashmir; and if he will make a statement. [911004]

The Minister for Asia (Nigel Adams): We are aware of reports that an Indian soldier has been charged after the deaths of three Kashmiri men. We welcome assurances from the Indian Government that their army is committed to ethical conduct, and that disciplinary action will be undertaken in accordance with Indian law where necessary. Where we have concerns about human rights in Kashmir we will continue to raise them with the Indian and Pakistani Governments.

Sarah Owen [V]: Three young Kashmiris working as labourers were abducted and brutally murdered by an army counter-insurgency officer. Illegal weapons were strapped to their bodies and they were wrongly branded hardcore terrorists. I know the Minister shares my concern that horrific abuses in Kashmir are not new or uncommon, but as our country continues to chart a new course internationally, can he tell us what the Government are actually doing to protect human rights in Kashmir and why the Secretary of State, sat next to him, lacks the courage to speak out against injustices around the world?

Nigel Adams: The hon. Lady, I know, is very passionate about this area and speaks on behalf of many of her constituents who have an interest in Kashmir. I can assure her that the Foreign Secretary has spoken directly with his counterpart as recently as December on this issue. India and Pakistan are long-standing important friends of the UK. We encourage both to engage in dialogue and find lasting diplomatic solutions to maintain stability in the region. It is not for the UK to prescribe a solution or act as a mediator; it is for India and Pakistan to find a lasting political resolution on Kashmir.

Mr Baker [V]: A Kashmiri man showed me footage of his home in Kashmir on fire, purportedly after being shelled by India. I have provided to the Government some evidence that cluster munitions were used by India against another village in Kashmir. These things really matter to my constituents. After the pandemic, people in Wycombe could easily be in their homes in Kashmir. Is it not time to take seriously a UN report on the human rights situation on both sides of the line of control, to have a co-ordinated international effort to put UN human rights inspectors on both sides of the line of control and then to move forward with a new human rights framework for the UK, which can reassure diaspora communities such as mine in Wycombe that the UK is standing up for their human rights when they are in the countries from which their families and their ancestors hail?

Nigel Adams: My hon. Friend is 100% correct to raise this matter again. He is a constant champion for his constituents on this area. We do recognise that there are human rights concerns in both India-administered Kashmir and Pakistan-administered Kashmir. Again, we encourage all states to ensure that domestic laws are in line with international standards and to co-operate with UN human rights officials and all mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. We have requested permission for officials from the British high commission in New Delhi to visit India-administered Kashmir as soon as the situation permits.

Topical Questions

[911034] **Rebecca Long Bailey** (Salford and Eccles) (Lab): If he will make a statement on his departmental responsibilities.

The Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs and First Secretary of State (Dominic Raab): Since the last oral questions, I have visited India, where I had positive conversations with Prime Minister Modi, Foreign Minister Jaishankar and others about strengthening our trade, our security co-operation and, indeed, human rights, which Members have asked about in this session. Last week, I introduced measures to ensure that no British organisations—Government or private—profit from, or contribute to, human rights violations in Xinjiang. Last month, we delivered the historic EU-UK trade and co-operation agreement, which is an excellent deal for all parts of the United Kingdom.

Rebecca Long Bailey [V]: I certainly welcome the comments of the Minister for the Middle East and North Africa earlier regarding the situation in Yemen. However, will the Government now back up their words with action, and suspend all arms sales and military support to the Saudi-led coalition for use in Yemen, especially in the context of President-elect Biden's commitment to end the war in Yemen?

Dominic Raab: We are absolutely pushing every lever to try to precipitate peace in relation to Yemen. Our arms exports to Saudi, to which the hon. Member referred, are subject to a world-leading and very rigorous process, so we are ensuring that we do everything that is required on that front. On 3 December, I announced an extra £40 million of UK aid to help 1.5 million households to access food and medicines, and of course we are pushing, through every possible avenue, the efforts of UN special envoy Martin Griffiths.

[911036] **Duncan Baker** (North Norfolk) (Con) [V]: New variants of coronavirus are emerging, from South Africa to Brazil. The Government have acted quickly by banning flights from these regions, but how can we try to pre-empt these risks? Countries such as Australia shut their borders in March last year to all countries, and only permitted their citizens with permanent residence entry with strict quarantines. What assessment has my right hon. Friend made of following a similar approach in the future, should the public health risks be severe?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is right; we have taken decisive action in relation to South Africa and South America. We have also, as a precautionary measure, suspended the travel corridors and ensured that we have a system in place whereby people have to have a pre-departure negative test. The passenger locator form is backed up by increased enforcement by both Public Health England and Border Force. Of course, we have also reintroduced quarantine on arrival, with extra checks to ensure that people are resting in the home.

Lisa Nandy (Wigan) (Lab): The Foreign Secretary had strong words about the arrest of Alexei Navalny, but he knows that those words will not be taken seriously by Moscow until the UK takes action to disrupt the networks of dirty money on which this regime depends. How many of the Russia report recommendations have now been implemented?

Dominic Raab: We, like the hon. Lady, are absolutely appalled by Alexei Navalny's politically motivated detention. It is a Kafkaesque situation, frankly, when the victim of

this Novichok poisoning, instead of being dealt with and supported, has been arrested. The hon. Lady will know that we have taken action, including imposing sanctions on six individuals and the State Scientific-Research Institute of Organic Chemistry and Technology. We are leading efforts in the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which is the real action that will send a message to Russia.

Lisa Nandy: The Secretary of State seems to be struggling with the answer, so I can tell him that the answer is none. Of 21 recommendations made 15 months ago, the Government have implemented not a single one: no action on foreign agents, no action on golden visas, and the London laundromat is still very much open for business. Can he not see the problem? For as long as the City of London acts as a haven for dark money, he can tweet all he likes, but those words will be met with nothing but derision in Moscow.

Let me ask the Foreign Secretary an easy one that he should be able to answer. We know that the laws in this country on espionage and foreign interference on British soil are not fit for purpose, so will he commit to the House today that he will bring forward legislation to fix this great big gaping hole in our defences—not in the coming months and not at a date to be determined, but before this House rises for recess next month?

Dominic Raab: The hon. Lady raises the report that preceded the poisoning of Alexei Navalny. I am explaining to her what we are doing in response to that, which I thought was what she cared about. Not only have we introduced sanctions on the individuals and the organisation to which I referred; we led the joint statement in December, supported by 58 countries in the OPCW, calling for Russia to be held to account for what it does. If she really wanted to do something about the issue at hand, she would support and commend those efforts.

[911037] **Robert Halfon** (Harlow) (Con) [V]: Covid is bankrupting Iraq and the Kurdistan region. A stalled budget deal between Irbil and Baghdad is bleeding the Kurds dry, and public servants were not paid for half of last year. A Barnett-style revenue sharing formula and progress to resolve the status of the disputed territories are vital, as ISIL is regrouping in the no man's land between Kurdistan and Iraq. Could the UK urge the United Nations to take a more active role between Irbil and Baghdad to help break the logjam so that they can stabilise their relations—and quickly?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (James Duddridge): I thank my right hon. Friend for that question. We recognise the importance of securing a budget deal between Irbil and Baghdad. The UK continues to encourage both sides to work towards resolving their issues to get a sustainable budget solution, but also to solve internal boundary disputes. The Minister for the Middle East and North Africa discussed this with the Governments of Iraq and of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq during his visit in November and December. We regularly raise this in the United Nations and will continue to do so.

[911035] **Jamie Stone** (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD) [V]: Returning to the subject of Alexei Navalny, what discussions has the Foreign Secretary

had with the Home Office about granting refuge to the supporters of Alexei Navalny, and indeed any other human rights defenders in Russia, should they want it or need it?

Dominic Raab: I have had detailed discussions with the Home Secretary about the response to this and other examples of hostile state action. We have one of the most open and generous asylum systems in the world, and we continually focus on the support we provide for civil society groups, including media organisations in both Russia and Belarus.

[911038] **Adam Holloway** (Gravesham) (Con) [V]: How many British Islamic State prisoners—men, women and children—are being held in northern Syria, and are there any plans for them to come back to the UK? If not, what assistance are we providing to the Kurds to secure them, and indeed the other prisoners, because I understand that many of them are escaping?

James Duddridge: I must say that my hon. Friend dresses better at home than he does in the House of Commons.

Travel advice has always been against all travel to Syria. There is no consular support. We do not have a diplomatic presence. For those reasons, sadly, we do not have a firm number. However, I invite my hon. Friend to discuss privately the security issues and very difficult situation of some of these cases—as he very well knows—with the Minister for the Middle East and North Africa to try to carve out a better solution to the problems that he quite rightly and so eloquently and visually addresses.

[911040] **Ellie Reeves** (Lewisham West and Penge) (Lab) [V]: The official end of Nazanin Zaghari-Ratcliffe's five-year detention is less than 50 days away, but despite this, she continues to live under the threat of a further prison sentence. In 2017, when the current Prime Minister was Foreign Secretary, he promised to “leave no stone unturned” to bring Nazanin home. Can the current Foreign Secretary also make this commitment, and will he, unlike his predecessor, actually make good on this promise?

Dominic Raab: We are leaving no stone unturned to secure the release of Nazanin, but also all the other dual nationals arbitrarily detained. I have spoken to Nazanin—she is subject to furlough at the moment—a number of times over recent months. We are doing everything we can. The fact that she is on furlough and not in Evin prison is a sign that we have made some progress, although not enough, in securing her release and return to her loved ones at home.

[911039] **Bob Blackman** (Harrow East) (Con) [V]: I welcome the Government's strong condemnation of anti-Israel bias at the UN Human Rights Council recently, but the robust stance that we have taken there conflicts with our voting at the United Nations General Assembly, where we have supported dozens of resolutions hostile to Israel, even one erasing the Jewish connection to Jerusalem. Will my right hon. Friend commit to ensure that, going forward, our actions will better reflect our words?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is always a great champion for all the different community groups in his constituency. He is right to talk about the importance of

balance in these UN resolutions. In fact, our record has not changed in recent years; it has been consistent. We support the Palestinian right to self-determination consistent with a two-state solution. We support the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. We have called out illegal Israeli settlements. In relation to Jerusalem, what he says is not quite correct, because the resolution explicitly notes its importance as a holy site for the three monotheistic religions. We have also voted against one resolution and abstained on three precisely because we did not feel they were balanced.

[911041] **Alison Thewliss** (Glasgow Central) (SNP) [V]: Oxfam has said that the US designation of the Houthis as a terrorist organisation has already meant that banks are refusing to facilitate vital commercial wheat and rice imports to Yemen. What specific conversations have the UK Government had with the banks on that matter?

Dominic Raab: We can talk to the banks, but of course they will follow the designation made by the US. As the Minister for the Middle East and North Africa, my right hon. Friend the Member for Braintree (James Cleverly), said earlier, we are concerned that those sanctions and that designation will not allow for the humanitarian aid that we, the hon. Lady and others across the House feel is absolutely essential to alleviate the blight of the conflict in Yemen. It is also right to say that the effort has to be on bringing that conflict to resolution, which can happen only through Martin Griffiths and the UN-sponsored plan.

[911042] **Ian Levy** (Blyth Valley) (Con) [V]: I recently received letters from a year 4 class at Seaton Delaval First School in my constituency, who are very concerned about climate change and the various challenges facing our planet. Does my right hon. Friend agree that progress can be made on this matter through international co-operation on tackling climate change, and that we must embrace the views of the youngsters of today to look after the future of tomorrow?

James Duddridge: I could not agree more, and I am more than happy to visit Blyth Valley to talk to my hon. Friend's constituents of all ages. Young constituents, in particular, are a powerful catalyst for change. As COP26 hosts, we will work with all international partners, including young people across the globe. I am particularly interested in talking to them about the fact that the Italian Government are having a pre-COP26 youth event in Milan, bringing together 400 youth delegates. It will make a final declaration, which will be submitted to COP26. I look forward to returning to my office soon and seeing the invitation on my desk.

[911044] **Mrs Emma Lewell-Buck** (South Shields) (Lab) [V]: The Foreign Secretary will know that tripartite talks are taking place today between Bangladesh, China and Myanmar regarding Rohingya repatriation. The process has been slow, as the Rohingya refugees, after fleeing horrific genocidal violence, remain understandably distrustful of the Myanmar Government. Can he say what representations he has made to his counterparts involved in today's talks, and what involvement the UK currently has in the Rohingya crisis?

Dominic Raab: I thank the hon. Lady for her interest and passion. What has happened to the Rohingya is a heartbreaking story. Not only has the United Kingdom

supported the diplomatic efforts, and not only is it a major provider of aid to deal with the refugee crisis, but, as she may be aware, it has imposed travel bans and asset freezes through our Magnitsky sanctions on those responsible for the persecution of the Rohingya.

[911048] **Edward Timpson** (Eddisbury) (Con) [V]: I welcome the recent appointment of my hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone and The Weald (Mrs Grant) as the Prime Minister's special envoy on girls' education, and ask my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary to reassure the House that vital work in this area to tackle poverty and create opportunity across the world will continue to be a key priority for this Government, and that the issue will be raised with the incoming Biden Administration at the earliest opportunity, so that further progress can be made to ensure that every girl gets a decent education.

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. I join him in congratulating my hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone and The Weald (Mrs Grant), who will do a fantastic job in this crucial area. On the UK's approach to girls' education, we have a global target of getting 40 million more girls into education, and ensuring that they can have at least 12 years' quality education. We want to get 12 million young girls literate by the age of 20. We will be discussing that with the new Administration, and I have already discussed it with leading members of Congress, including Speaker Pelosi.

[911045] **Mr Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi** (Slough) (Lab): More than 100 Members of this House signed a cross-party letter to the Prime Minister about our anxieties for the peacefully protesting farmers in India, and we eagerly await his response. Does the Secretary of State agree that it is extremely concerning to hear alarming reports of harassment and intimidation by the authorities there, which have started issuing notices to peaceful protesters, union leaders and human rights activists?

Dominic Raab: I understand the hon. Gentleman's concerns. I discussed the protests with Foreign Minister Jaishankar when I visited India in December. Of course, this is a major, Government-led reform that reduces subsidies as part of the liberalisation process, but the hon. Gentleman makes some important points about freedom of protest and sensitivity. Of course, India's politics is very much our politics, but we need to respect its democratic process.

[911049] **Aaron Bell** (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con) [V]: It is obviously crucial for both scientific understanding and global security that we understand the origins of the covid-19 outbreak. What assessment has my right hon. Friend made of the US State Department's factsheet, published on 15 January, which details that the US Government have reason to believe that several researchers inside the Wuhan Institute of Virology became sick in autumn 2019, before the first identified case of the outbreak, with symptoms consistent with both covid-19 and common seasonal illnesses?

Dominic Raab: We are aware of the factsheet. I have had discussions with Secretary of State Pompeo about this, and will continue to discuss it, I am sure, with the new Administration. Our focus has been on the World Health Organisation review, making sure that the WHO can access the area to conduct the review, and that it has proper access, so that it can come up with the answers that people want. WHO officers and the review team were given access last Thursday, and that is a first step. We need to ensure that they can proceed through that inquiry in order to give the proper, clear and fact-based answers to the questions that my hon. Friend rightly poses.

[911047] **Mike Hill** (Hartlepool) (Lab) [V]: Will the Secretary of State update the House on the situation regarding the Uyghur people in the Xinjiang province of China?

Dominic Raab: I gave an update to the House on the situation recently, just a few days ago. We regard the reports of forced labour, the conditions of detention and the forced sterilisation of women as grave violations of human rights, which is why we have introduced new measures to prevent any British businesses from feeding into the supply chains, or any businesses in China from profiting in the UK from this gruesome trade.

[911050] **Ben Everitt** (Milton Keynes North) (Con): Charities are working harder than ever, both at home and abroad, including, of course, the wonderful World Vision, based in Milton Keynes. Can my hon. Friend the Minister update the House on what support the UK Government are giving to charities that are providing aid to some of the most vulnerable people in the poorest countries in the world? Will my hon. Friend undertake to meet World Vision to discuss their work?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs (Wendy Morton): I am grateful to my hon. Friend for this question, and for highlighting the work that so many civil society organisations do. They are key partners for the FCDO in delivering the response to the covid-19 pandemic. They work as critical delivery partners with other donors and with international organisations, such as the UN, that are active in responding to the crisis. We have allocated almost £67 million directly to international and UK-based charities, so that they can play their critical role in supporting vulnerable communities with the humanitarian impact of this virus. I thank World Vision for the work they do, and if they contact me, I will happily arrange a meeting.

Mr Speaker: I am suspending the House for three minutes to enable the necessary arrangements for the next business to be made.

12.38 pm

Sitting suspended.

UK Musicians: EU Visa Arrangements

12.43 pm

Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire) (SNP) (*Urgent Question*): To ask the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport if he will make a statement on visa arrangements for UK musicians in the EU.

The Minister for Digital and Culture (Caroline Dinéage): This Government recognise the importance of the UK's world-leading cultural and creative industries. We recently demonstrated that commitment by providing an unprecedented £1.57 billion package of support to help them through the covid-19 pandemic. It is therefore entirely consistent that, during the negotiations with the EU, we pushed for ambitious arrangements allowing performers and artists to work across Europe.

Our proposals, which were informed by our extensive consultation and engagement with the UK's cultural and creative industries, would have allowed UK musicians and other cultural touring professionals to travel and perform in the UK and the EU more easily, without the need for work permits. Regrettably, those mutually beneficial proposals were rejected by the EU. As a result, UK cultural professionals seeking to tour in the EU will be required to check domestic immigration and visitor rules for each member state in which they intend to tour. Although some member states allow touring without a permit, others will require a pre-approved visa and/or a work permit.

It is absolutely vital that we now support our touring sectors to understand the new rules associated with working and travelling in the EU. We are delivering an extensive programme of engagement with the sector to help them understand any new requirements. That includes working with Arts Council England and various other sector bodies, to help distil and clarify the new rules.

As my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport has already made very clear, we will also look at whether we can work with our partners in EU member states to find ways to make life easier for those working in the creative industries in our respective countries. In the meantime, we will continue close dialogue with the creative and cultural sectors, to understand the ongoing impacts and ensure that that they have the right support at the right time to continue to thrive.

Pete Wishart [V]: That is an immensely disappointing response from the Minister. Touring Europe means everything to our artists and musicians: the thrill of that first tour, crammed into the Transit van with all your gear; four to a room in a cheap hotel in Paris, Rotterdam or Hamburg; using what is left of the fee for a post-gig beer; the dream of coming back on a lavish tour bus, staying at five-star hotels—gone, all gone. Musicians and artists are mere collateral in this Government's obsession with ending freedom of movement.

Does the Minister acknowledge that visas and carnets will render such tours beyond the financial reach of future generations of new musicians? Does she appreciate that is not just our new musicians but the whole creative sector that will have increased costs and red tape? What will she say to the crews, the technicians, the set designers, the transport suppliers? We were promised by her predecessor

that arrangements would not change. What has happened to that commitment? The EU said it was prepared to offer a 90-day deal. Why was that turned down? The Government said they were holding out for a better deal, but we have ended up with nothing. How could that happen? Given that the Minister's approach is totally contradicted by the EU, will she provide complete transparency in all these negotiations?

Our constituents really care about this; 263,000 have now signed the petition organised by our artists, calling for this to get sorted. We do not want any more of the EU-blaming—we have had quite enough of that in the past few years; we just want the Government to fix this. The Secretary of State has said that the door is still open, so will she walk through and fix it? Will she restart talks with the EU immediately, to get our artists the arrangements that they need? Will she let the music tour freely once again?

Caroline Dinéage: The hon. Gentleman is right to point out that this is incredibly disappointing news for the music sector—it is not the deal that we wanted; but I am afraid that in many other senses he has fallen for some very selective briefing. The EU did not offer a deal that would have worked for musicians. It is quite simple. The EU made a very broad offer, which would not have been compatible with the Government's manifesto commitment to take back control of our borders. I remind the hon. Gentleman that the British people, the British public, voted for that at successive elections.

To the extent that the EU proposals might have covered music, they would not have worked for touring artists at all. The EU proposals covered ad hoc performances. They would not have covered support staff or technicians at all—who, as the hon. Gentleman will remember from his touring days, are essential. I would love him to explain to me how tours will happen without support staff or technicians, because although I am not a music professional, I cannot see how that could be the case.

The UK's proposals were based on what those in the music industry said they wanted. We spoke to them long and hard about that. I am fascinated to think that the hon. Gentleman knows better than bodies like the Musicians' Union. We fought very hard—[*Interruption.*] We fought very hard for what it wanted, but the EU would not play ball.

Let us focus on the future. If the EU is willing to consider the UK's very sensible proposals, the door is open, and yes, I am very happy to walk through it. I will be the first to walk through that door. A mutually beneficial deal is not what the SNP Members want, though, is it? They voted for a no-deal Brexit, so under their plans, that would have been even harder. As those in the music industry have said, what they need now is clarity, not recriminations; and that is what the British Government are working to provide.

Julian Knight (Solihull) (Con) [V]: This issue is not just about musicians being able to travel and perform with ease. They also need somewhere to strut their stuff. Will the Minister commit to an overarching strategy to get live music thriving again, involving a restart of urgent negotiations for a pan-EU musicians visa, bearing in mind previous EU intransigence, and listening to the music industry? Will the Government also commit

[Julian Knight]

to backing covid insurance for our festivals and live music sector to allow them to plan for the summer and beyond?

Caroline Dinenage: My hon. Friend is absolutely right, and there is quite a lot we can do. The sector needs clarity and certainty, and because the situation with every member state is different, that will be tricky to provide. We therefore need to make it as simple, easy and clear as we can for them to tour and go about their business, and that is what we are setting out to do.

My hon. Friend makes an excellent point about insurance, which we understand is a barrier to many live music events taking place later in the year. We are in discussions with our colleagues in the Treasury about that at the moment.

Alison McGovern (Wirral South) (Lab) [V]: I draw the House's attention to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests. As we have heard, the Government still blame the EU, so, to get this issue straight, will the Minister make clear what exactly the EU proposed, when it was proposed and whether the UK offer was more than the standard visa policy?

The Minister said that the EU offer was a broad offer not consistent with taking back control of our borders. Will she go further and explain specifically when that was turned down? Finally, so that we can all be clear, will she place in the Library of the House of Commons all correspondence between the UK and the EU and all correspondence between UK Government Departments on this issue?

What matters is what happens now. A third of the creative industry is self-employed, and the situation is a massive kick in the teeth for a group of workers who are already having the worst year in living memory. What representations has the UK made to resolve the situation? What meetings are scheduled? Will the UK still rely on mode 4 exemptions, even though doing so is without precedent? Does the Minister agree that the resolution to the situation requires a supplementary agreement?

The Minister must go further and spell out exactly what the proposal is from the UK to resolve the situation. When musicians and creative people tour, they do not just power up an economy that is massively important to us; they represent us all on the global stage, so we must get this resolved now.

Caroline Dinenage: I am happy to talk the hon. Lady through the situation. The EU tabled texts regarding short-stay visa-free travel during the negotiations, and embedded in the proposal was a declaration that would have covered a very small number of paid activities. With regard to artists, it covered ad hoc performances. Of course, the declaration was non-binding and did not address things such as technical or support staff. Crucially, it did not cover work permits, which EU member states can put in place unilaterally. Furthermore, the proposals would have enshrined permanent visa-free short stays for all current and future EU citizens in the agreement, and that is not compatible with our manifesto commitment to take back control of our borders.

Our proposals were based on the views of the music industry and would have been mutually beneficial across the EU and the UK. They would have allowed musicians and support staff to travel and perform in the UK and

the EU more easily without needing work permits. The EU did not propose and would not accept a tailored deal for musicians, artists and their support staff to tour across the EU and the UK.

As I have said, the UK's door remains open should the EU change its mind. We recognise that the outcome means that some additional requirements will need to be met for the sector, and we are working with the sector as fast as we can to put in place the support and information that it needs. Labour Members voted for this deal in the knowledge of what it involved, including the end of free movement. What they are asking us to go back and renegotiate now is exactly what we negotiated at that time. They cannot have it both ways; they need consistency. What the sector needs more than anything at the moment is certainty, and that is what we are working to provide.

Damian Green (Ashford) (Con) [V]: The international success of UK musicians has, for decades, been not just a big economic benefit for the country but a hugely successful way of promoting our culture around the world, so it seems extraordinary that any British Government would turn down a deal that allowed our musicians to tour if that deal was practical. Can the Minister assure me that that is not what happened? What is she doing to resume negotiations, so that we can get a realistic deal, which is essential for the future of our music industry?

Caroline Dinenage: My right hon. Friend is absolutely right; the Government recognise the vital importance of the UK's thriving cultural and creative industries. That is why we pushed for ambitious arrangements for performers and artists to be able to work right across Europe after the end of freedom of movement. The EU did not accept our proposals, so now we need to ensure that we are working to facilitate those arrangements as best we can. That means giving musicians and others access to information and guidance about the criteria for each EU member state and then working with those individual member states to ensure that the process is as seamless, fast, effective and simple as it can be.

John Nicolson (Ochil and South Perthshire) (SNP) [V]: Covid has been gruelling for the industry. The last thing it needs is the new Brexit visa barriers that we now know the UK Government—not the EU, but the UK Government—insisted upon. There is no money to be made from streaming. Artists make their income by touring. New barriers, visas and endless red tape mean that EU performers will not come to our festivals and our performers will face prohibitive new costs. It is wantonly cruel.

The Minister mentioned the Musicians' Union, so let me quote its head. He said:

"the government fails to understand the issues facing touring musicians".

He is an expert, and I know that the UK Government do not like experts, but this is more Brexit zealotry causing misery. Will the Secretary of State listen, intervene and publish that correspondence, as my hon. Friend the Member for Perth and North Perthshire (Pete Wishart) requested? Put it in the Library—let us read it.

Caroline Dinenage: There is a close historical relationship between the UK and the EU. That must endure, and it will endure. Artists and musicians from the EU are

welcome. They are encouraged to visit and perform in the UK and vice versa, and the Government will do everything they can to make that as seamless as possible.

Selaine Saxby (North Devon) (Con) [V]: I thank my hon. Friend for the work she is doing to support the arts and culture sector through the pandemic. Can she confirm how many music venues and other music organisations have benefited from the Government's £1.57 billion culture recovery fund?

Caroline Dinéage: I thank my hon. Friend for the work that she does to champion the cultural institutions across her constituency. She is a great voice for the people of North Dorset—sorry, I mean North Devon, but I am sure she is very nice about the people of North Dorset as well. The £1.57 billion culture recovery fund—of which we have already delivered more than £1 billion in support to various arts, heritage and performance organisations—has, to date, made 680 awards to music totalling more than £111 million.

Kevin Brennan (Cardiff West) (Lab) [V]: I did ask the Prime Minister about this last week, and he promised a meeting with me and the Conservative Chair of the Select Committee, and I was told I would hear from No. 10. I do not know if the Minister can shed any light on that.

I do want the Minister to realise that a lot of touring musicians are not there with a lot of tech support; they are actually individuals who are starting out or perhaps established but not with that level of support. In effect, this represents the research and development of an important industry, but they may just be travelling with a single instrument on a plane with some fans in Europe. I think the most important thing the Minister could do today—others have asked this—is to publish in full the details of the discussions between the EU and the UK on this, so that we can all see what the ambitious proposals were and why she finds them so objectionable.

Caroline Dinéage: I know the hon. Gentleman is a great champion for the music industry, and not a bad musical performer himself. He is absolutely right, and we do understand that, for those starting out in the music industry, the ability to tour is vital to their career and their future prosperity. That is why the EU proposals—they did not support touring activity; they just supported ad hoc artist activity—would not have done it for so many of them, which is why we pushed for something so much better. We are very disappointed that the EU did not see it our way, but we will try to do everything we can to support them. I will speak to my colleagues in the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and the Home Office about publishing the information he has requested.

Mr Gagan Mohindra (South West Hertfordshire) (Con) [V]: As the Minister will be aware, South West Hertfordshire is home to many successful and established musicians. Can my hon. Friend confirm that the UK's proposals in the negotiations were based on the views of the UK music industry and would have allowed musicians to travel and perform in the UK and Europe more easily, without the need for work permits?

Caroline Dinéage: Yes, my hon. Friend is absolutely right to raise this. As I have said already, we worked very collaboratively with a whole range of stakeholders,

including UK Music and the Musicians' Union, to put forward proposals that were really based on the views of the musicians and the music industry about what they needed. It would have been mutually beneficial to the UK and the EU, and it would have allowed musicians—and, crucially, their support staff or their technicians—to travel and perform more easily, without the need for work permits.

Jamie Stone (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD) [V]: I must be honest and say that I do welcome the fact that the door is still "open" to UK performers performing permit-free in the EU. Surely the danger is that concert promoters in the EU will simply take the easy option and go for a Dane or for a German performer, rather than the sheer hassle of British performers. There are also problems with the movement of musical instruments, which we know about. I have written to the DCMS just now, asking if we could please have a meeting between Ministers, me and musicians who are knowledgeable about this issue. At the end of the day, we have to try to sort it out, so I would be extremely grateful if the Minister agreed to such a meeting.

Caroline Dinéage: Absolutely. I am very happy to meet anybody on this, because it is really important that we continue regular engagement with the sector. We need to make sure that we have a very deep understanding of its needs and its questions in the light of these changes, which we know will pose a number of queries. Most recently, we held an EU exit explainer seminar with over 200 sector representative bodies in attendance, and the Secretary of State has a roundtable on Wednesday—tomorrow—with representatives from across the cultural and creative industries. We will keep doing those sorts of sessions for as long as people need and require them.

Sara Britcliffe (Hyndburn) (Con): I have had quite a number of constituents contact me from Hyndburn and Haslingden highlighting their concerns on this, so can the Minister please reassure them by outlining what the Department is doing to address it?

Caroline Dinéage: My hon. Friend is a great champion for her local area and will be taking the concerns of her constituents incredibly seriously, as indeed do we. We understand that we need to work with all the music sector trade bodies to make sure that we give people access to the information they need as to the situations in all the individual nation states; they are all different, which is one of the most confusing things about this. We also need to make sure that we work with those individual nations as closely as we can, to ensure that any barriers that are in place are made as simple and easy to navigate as possible.

Fleur Anderson (Putney) (Lab) [V]: In Putney, creative artists and support staff have already been damaged by the uncertainty around Brexit, on top of the covid effects that mean they are not able to tour. This failure of negotiations on a creative industry 90-day visa is letting down industry and the arts. Is the Minister really just going to sit back with her door open, or will she re-enter negotiations and be prepared for some give and take with individual countries to get that tailored deal that the creative industries really need?

Caroline Dinagen: I do not know what I have said during the course of today that could ever give the hon. Lady the viewpoint that I am just prepared to sit back and do nothing about this, or that I am happy with the way things have panned out; I voted for the trade agreement, but I presume so did she. We are not sitting there doing nothing. We are talking and will continue to talk to EU member states. They could of course unilaterally make things easier for travelling artists and musicians, but any changes they make would be likely to cover all visitors, not just those from the UK. The key thing we can do is to continue to talk to the sector and make sure that we put in place any support, information and guidance that it needs.

Simon Fell (Barrow and Furness) (Con) [V]: I have been contacted by a number of constituents on this issue, notably the Furness Tradition group. Could my hon. Friend confirm that, despite some of the reporting in recent days, touring in the EU is still possible for UK artists and musicians, and that the Government are working towards a more formal arrangement with the EU?

Caroline Dinagen: Quite simply, of course touring is still encouraged. Artists and musicians from the EU are very welcome and encouraged to visit and perform in the UK, and absolutely vice versa. I am sure that individual member states have different restrictions when it comes to visas and work permits; some are very limited, some are a little bit more complicated. This is very much a quid pro quo—it works for the EU as much as it does for our musicians here in the UK—and I am sure that many countries want to come to an arrangement that will allow their musicians to move, travel, work and tour and to take their beautiful music around Europe.

Tracy Brabin (Batley and Spen) (Lab/Co-op): I am sure the Minister will agree that this is a double whammy for anyone who cares about levelling up and the creative industries in West Yorkshire and beyond. Recent figures show that the creative industries in West Yorkshire and the Humber have grown by 10.9%. It is really important for jobs and opportunities that we keep this industry flourishing, so will the Minister tell us what the Government have put in place to compensate for the inevitable loss of these opportunities, and what impact assessment has been done on the changes that this will make to the ability of businesses to continue to flourish after covid?

Caroline Dinagen: Of course we know that this has been such a horrible year, particularly for the sectors that I represent—the cultural and creative industries in west Yorkshire and around the whole UK. Covid has been a bitter blow. Of course we did not get the agreement with the EU that we wanted on touring musicians, but we want to do everything we can to support them, including providing clear, easy-to-access information and speaking to our colleagues in EU member states. We will also talk to our colleagues in the Treasury to see what financial support can be put in place at a future fiscal event.

Tommy Sheppard (Edinburgh East) (SNP) [V]: The Edinburgh Fringe is the largest arts festival in the world. I hope the Minister will be aware that this event and others like it have a vital role to play in developing new work and providing a springboard for artists who then subsequently tour that work. Does she therefore

not understand that by refusing to maintain a visa exemption for artists, she is fatally undermining festivals in Scotland and the United Kingdom?

Caroline Dinagen: I am a massive fan of the Edinburgh Fringe and, in fact, of all the Edinburgh festivals. Last summer was the first I can remember when I was not able to go to Edinburgh to see them at first hand and it was something that I missed greatly. Very recently, just before Christmas, I met representatives from across the Edinburgh festivals to talk about all the issues that they are facing, particularly with regard to coronavirus, but others as well. I should correct the hon. Gentleman. It was not for want of trying that we do not have this free movement of our musicians to be able to perform and to tour across the EU or, indeed, vice versa. We fought very hard for it. Our own arrangements with regard to visas and work permits mean that musicians and performers from outside the UK are very welcome to our shores.

Stephen Crabb (Preseli Pembrokeshire) (Con) [V]: British bands and professional musicians represent a hugely successful cultural export for the UK. I know that the Minister recognises that and I know that she understands the importance of international touring in that success, but may I ask her what more she can do on a bilateral basis with her counterparts in EU member states to find specific solutions to the problems that we are discussing today and ensure that touring remains as easy as possible for our world-leading musicians?

Caroline Dinagen: I thank my right hon. Friend for that question. Of course, as I have said, the door is open and I would love to be able to change this across the board straight away, but that will not be possible in the immediate or foreseeable future. It is all about having those bilateral conversations with colleagues in EU member states. At this stage, it would not be about a waiver but about facilitation and what we can do to make the situation as easy and as straightforward as possible and, of course, those are the conversations that we will be having.

Ian Paisley (North Antrim) (DUP) [V]: Van Morrison penned the protest song “Born to be Free”, but it appears that musicians like him and others are now completely caught up in a red tape trap and are not free at all. Can the Minister clarify the situation with regard to carnets for musicians and instruments travelling from GB to Northern Ireland and from Northern Ireland back to GB? Can she confirm that they are definitely not required within the UK? Once a person gets to Northern Ireland, will they be required to travel south, or will the common arrangements that we have with the Republic of Ireland still be in place? Once south, can a person then onward travel without a carnet to the rest of Europe? Can we have clarity on those issues?

Caroline Dinagen: Van Morrison also penned “Brown Eyed Girl”, which is my own personal anthem. I thank the hon. Gentleman for that question. Artists and organisations based in Northern Ireland will not be required to obtain ATA carnets or musical instrument certificates when touring in the EU because the Northern Ireland protocol means that Northern Ireland is part of the same regulatory environment for goods as the European Union. Northern Ireland citizens who do not hold Irish citizenship as well will be subject to the same changes as

other British citizens on mobility and business travel when going to EU member states, but, of course, not to the Republic of Ireland.

Jane Hunt (Loughborough) (Con) [V]: A number of my constituents in the entertainments, arts and creative industries have contacted me setting out the impacts that the new immigration restrictions will have on their livelihoods. It is clear that the UK Government strove to gain a mutually beneficial agreement with the EU. Will the Minister therefore set out what steps the Government are taking to continue to urge the EU to return to the negotiating table and reopen discussions to reach a more preferable agreement for all parties? May I take this opportunity on behalf of my constituents to ask the EU to reconsider its position?

Caroline Dinenage: I thank my hon. Friend for that question. The negotiating team did negotiate an opportunity to come back and review this in the years ahead, so the light at the end of the tunnel is not entirely switched off, but there is quite a lot we can do between European nation states to try to make things a lot easier and straightforward. She is right to highlight that this impacts EU artists as much as it does those from the UK. We want to make their lives as easy and as straightforward as possible.

Barbara Keeley (Worsley and Eccles South) (Lab) [V]: As well as issues with visas or work permits, UK musicians working in EU countries risk being double-charged their social security contributions if they work in a country that has opted out of the social security co-ordination under the detached worker rules. Can the Minister set out what the Government are doing to avoid that and ensure that UK musicians do not face that financial penalty while they are working in the EU?

Caroline Dinenage: I am really pleased that the hon. Lady has given me the opportunity to answer that question. The protocol on social security co-ordination secured in the agreement ensures that UK nationals and EU citizens have a range of social security cover when working and living in the EU and the UK. It also supports business and trade by ensuring that cross-border workers and their employers are only liable to pay social security contributions in one state at a time. That is, obviously, very beneficial in particular to smaller cultural organisations that may not have the required cash flow to finance any duplicate payments. Member states have until 31 January to sign up to the detached worker provision. The UK continues to engage with our European counterparts via our global and international stakeholder network to encourage countries to sign up to that provision ahead of the deadline.

Bob Blackman (Harrow East) (Con) [V]: There is clearly no substitute for live music and during the covid pandemic opportunities have been severely depressed. In addition to having discussions on how we might ensure musicians can travel within the European Union and within the UK, can my hon. Friend update the House on what discussions she has had with TV companies to allow emerging musicians in particular the opportunity to have their music recorded and broadcast in parts of the European Union?

Caroline Dinenage: As ever, an ingenious question from my hon. Friend. I know that so many of our brilliant cultural organisations have worked really hard to improve their digital offer, particularly over the various lockdowns. Earlier in the year, I visited the Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra and saw the amazing work it is doing to bring its beautiful music to audiences around the world because of the investment it has made in that capacity. He has hit on a really strong concept. I will discuss it with my dear colleague, the Minister for Media and Data, my right hon. Friend the Member for Maldon (Mr Whittingdale).

Alex Davies-Jones (Pontypridd) (Lab) [V]: The Minister may not be aware of this, but the world-renowned Cory Band from Rhondda Cynon Taff are the current European brass band champions. To travel through Europe to defend their hard-fought-for title, and to visit the concerts and workshops, each member of the band will now require a visa and a work permit, despite them being an amateur organisation. This will undoubtedly add an additional financial and administrative burden that could be avoided. What discussions has the Minister had to ensure that brass bands from across the UK can continue to fly the flag for us in Europe without this bureaucracy?

Caroline Dinenage: I was not aware of the hon. Lady's band and I wish them the very best of luck in their endeavours to defend their fantastic title. If the tour they are going on is not paid for by the individual venues they are visiting, there may not be an issue here. The band would have to discuss that with individual member states to get clarity on that, but I am very happy to speak to her further about it.

Richard Fuller (North East Bedfordshire) (Con) [V]: It is clear that this issue gets to the core of our inextricable cultural links with our European partners. It is good to see the Minister stressing the urgency of securing bilateral agreements and ensuring that current arrangements are simplified for people. May I make a special request that she bears in mind individual musicians, many of whom carry multiple instruments, in her efforts to simplify the current arrangements?

Caroline Dinenage: As ever, my hon. Friend makes an excellent point. There are so many facets to this issue that we need to keep in mind as we move forward. That is certainly something that I am very happy to talk to him further about.

Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD) [V]: I have been contacted by a number of constituents—not just musicians, but actors, dancers, choreographers and puppeteers—about the Government's failure to secure visa-free work permits for touring artists in the EU. This comes as a further hammer blow to their livelihoods, with the continued shutdown of live entertainment as well as the huge gaps in the Government's support for many working in these industries. What assurances can the Minister give to my constituents, particularly students such as Fresca David, who is just starting out on her career, that they are not being treated as an afterthought by this Government?

Caroline Dinenage: My message to the hon. Lady's constituent would be that the Government entirely recognise the vital importance of the UK's thriving creative artists.

[Caroline Dinéage]

We want to support them in every way we can. I am just so pleased that there was not a Liberal Democrat Government, who would have voted for no deal.

Andrew Bowie (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (Con) [V]: This is a really serious issue and Scottish musicians will undoubtedly be affected. Does my hon. Friend agree that, instead of simply masquerading as a serious party of government, the Scottish National party should start acting like one, cease these politically charged, ill-informed, deliberately misleading games—an example of which we have seen today—that do nothing to help the situation, work with us and support us in attempting to find a mutually agreeable solution, support Scottish musicians who have been let down by the EU's decision not to accept our compromise proposals, and work to get an agreement over visa arrangements?

Caroline Dinéage: My hon. Friend hits the nail on the head. What we need to do now is to move forward. We need to come forward with sensible proactive solutions for the UK music sector. The industry itself has said that what we need now is clarity, not recriminations. That is what we are working to provide and we very much appreciate support from across the House for us to do that.

David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP) [V]: My Belvidere constituent, Louise McLean, is just one of the many people connected to the music industry who can see that live performers are just the latest casualty in a Brexit that Scotland did not vote for. Last year, as Culture Minister, the hon. Member for Selby and Ainsty (Nigel Adams), said:

“It is essential that free movement is protected for artists post 2020.”—[*Official Report*, 21 January 2020; Vol. 670, c. 56WH.]

Does the hon. Lady agree with her ministerial colleague? Why was that view ignored in Government, if it is also the view of the music industry?

Caroline Dinéage: Yes, absolutely, I agree with the comments of my predecessor. That is why we put to the EU fantastic proposals, which were based on the views of the music industry, would have been mutually beneficial and would have allowed musicians and support staff to tour. We are very disappointed that the EU did not see it the same way.

Caroline Nokes (Romsey and Southampton North) (Con) [V]: I was pleased to hear my hon. Friend mention technicians—the sound and lighting engineers who make touring possible. When she is looking for a solution, which I know she is doing, will she also include companies such as Beat the Street in Romsey, which provides the tour buses that make it possible for artists to travel Europe? It will spell a death knell for the entire industry if they are not able to access the continent.

Caroline Dinéage: My right hon. Friend is such a great champion for businesses in her local area, particularly those that have been so badly affected, not just by covid, but by the very disappointing EU refusal to accept our very reasonable propositions. She will know that the sector has benefited from a range of different support measures over the last year that were put in place

because of covid, but we do need to support it moving forward. The EU's proposal would not have worked because it would not have supported the valuable support workers in my right hon. Friend's constituency to do their work. Quite simply, without them, touring would not be possible.

Mr Ben Bradshaw (Exeter) (Lab) [V]: The Minister and Conservative MPs keep claiming that they made this fantastic offer, but we cannot test that because they have not published it. The EU has. It is there in black and white on page 171 of the draft agreement from March last year, allowing 90-day visa-free touring by British musicians and other cultural activities. Will the Minister publish the Government's proposal, so we can see where the truth lies?

Caroline Dinéage: I have to correct the right hon. Gentleman. The document does not say 90 days visa-free touring by UK musicians; it is a lot more opaque than that, which is why we could not simply sign up to it. It just would not have delivered what we needed for our musicians, and it flew in the face of what the British public voted for in the case of controlling our borders. As I have already said, I will speak to colleagues across BEIS and the Home Office to see what further details on the negotiations we can publish.

Mr Richard Holden (North West Durham) (Con): As you know, Mr Speaker, the north of England has helped to form and then exported some of the biggest musicians and bands across the world in recent decades. Touring is not a “nice to have”; it is an absolute financial necessity for musicians from both the UK and the EU. Can the Minister confirm that it was the UK Government who pushed for a more ambitious agreement with the EU on temporary movement of business travellers, and that it was the EU that unreasonably rejected this proposal?

Caroline Dinéage: I thank my hon. Friend for putting it so simply and succinctly; that is exactly what happened. The proposals that we put forward would have allowed musicians to travel and perform in the UK and the EU more easily, and they were rejected by the EU.

Maria Eagle (Garston and Halewood) (Lab) [V]: I have been listening to the Minister's replies, and it is always somebody else's fault with this Government, isn't it? Our world-class events and production companies, such as Adlib in my constituency, tour the EU with UK and US-based musicians, but very few EU-based companies tour the UK. Does not the Minister realise that her giving up on agreeing comprehensive arrangements to enable this to continue could destroy a sector that has huge export success and destroy the jobs and livelihoods of the technicians, who are already struggling because of the pandemic restrictions to their trade?

Caroline Dinéage: Of course I recognise that this is not the solution that we would have wanted, and it is not the solution that we fought really hard for. I point out to the hon. Lady that the Labour party voted for this deal in the full knowledge of what it involved, including the end to freedom of movement.

Dean Russell (Watford) (Con): From The Horns to the Colosseum to the Palace Theatre, music literally beats at the heart of my constituency of Watford. That means that we have many amazing musicians. They are

asking me whether my hon. Friend can confirm that it was not the UK that ended these visas, and what measures are going forward to support this amazing sector.

Caroline Dinenge: My hon. Friend is such a vibrant champion, and not just for the music industry in his constituency; we have also spoken about the film industry. I expect him at any moment to be descending from the ceiling on a wire in the next “Mission Impossible” movie. He does it all with great panache, and that is exactly what we want to do. The cultural recovery fund has been about supporting music venues so that musicians can get back to doing what they love. Arts Council England is there to support them. We will look at every opportunity we have to put in place more of that vital encouragement and support.

Hywel Williams (Arfon) (PC) [V]: Professor Paul Carr of the University of South Wales reports that in 2019 music tourism alone generated a spend of £124 million in Wales, supporting 1,754 jobs. The Government’s failure to secure visa-free travel is a huge blow, especially to young people at a tipping point in their creative careers. In particular, it will diminish the strong international quality of our national culture. What assessment has the Minister made of the long-term impact of this wholly avoidable mess, specifically on the cultural industry in Wales?

Caroline Dinenge: We know that there will be obstacles in the immediate period for those who want to travel and tour abroad, but I am sure that that will change once we enable people to access the information they need and they can see what the situation is with all the different member states, because they all vary wildly. In Wales in particular, musicians are dedicated, vibrant, resourceful and practical, and I know that they will overcome any bumps in the road to be able to do what they do so brilliantly and to continue to share it with our European neighbours.

Crispin Blunt (Reigate) (Con) [V]: I thank you, Mr Speaker, and the hon. Member for Perth and North Perthshire (Pete Wishart) for providing the opportunity to help the Minister correct the misleading social media chatter among professional musicians and other performance artists, and from Opposition Members, about exactly where the responsibility lies for this situation. Will she confirm my impression that the European Union negotiators appear to have rather cynically used and abused the interests of its musicians and its music fans to undermine the United Kingdom Government’s commitment to its own citizens around regaining control of our borders? However ungrateful and ungracious the Musicians’ Union has been in regard to my hon. Friend’s efforts—

Mr Speaker: Order. I call the Minister, please. That was far too long a question.

Caroline Dinenge: My hon. Friend is right that we did fight very hard for this. We understand the significant not just for performers from the UK, but—he is absolutely right—for performers from the EU, because the UK music scene is, I would say, the best in the world, and putting any obstacles or tests in the way of EU performers coming here is a very difficult position for them as well. We are a lot more forthcoming; we do not put in place

work permits, and we have a lot more sensitive approaches to visas for performers coming across from the EU. It would have been lovely for that to have been the situation right across all EU member states as well.

Martyn Day (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) (SNP) [V]: Similar to many families in my constituency, artists have been pointing out that many bands comprise a mixture of EU and UK nationals. Does the Minister not see the impossible situation that they will now face, with different members being faced with different levels of bureaucracy and red tape wherever they tour?

Caroline Dinenge: Absolutely; I understand the hon. Gentleman’s suggestion that this causes a problem for bands, in particular, or orchestras who have members from all different EU member states. The guidance is that we all have to seek instructions from each member state on how we proceed, but had the EU accepted our suggestions in the first place, we would not be in this position.

Scott Mann (North Cornwall) (Con) [V]: I am sure that my hon. Friend would agree that our world-leading artists and musicians are not just important to the UK economically, but vital to our country’s culture and soft power. The arts play an important role in my constituency, where we have the Leopallooza festival and the Rock Oyster festival, attracting hundreds of talented artists and performers. Given that, I was disappointed to hear of the EU’s rejection of the UK’s visa-free travel offer. Will she commit to doing what she can to secure access to EU countries for UK artists and musicians and keep negotiating to try to encourage the EU to show some flexibility, for the sake of my constituents?

Caroline Dinenge: Yes, of course, we will keep that negotiation open and try to make things as simple and as painless as possible. Our door remains open if the EU wants to come back and look at this again. Where visas apply, our agreement with the EU does contain measures that will help to ensure that processes are as prompt and smooth as possible, and we will work to exploit those as much as we can.

Clive Efford (Eltham) (Lab) [V]: This morning, the UK music industry told the Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee that despite having 1% of the world’s population, the UK produces 10% of its music. This industry has been one of the fastest-growing over the last 10 years. It employs 2 million people, with the potential to create 1 million jobs in the next 10 years, so I am incredulous that the Government have got us into this situation. Will the Minister say when she will start the negotiations on a supplementary agreement so that we can sort this mess out?

Caroline Dinenge: The hon. Gentleman is right to say how incredibly successful our music industry is around the world, and that is why we fought so hard to get much better arrangements in the agreement. What we need to do now is ensure that our sectors are prepared to face any challenges in the future, which is why we are continuing those dialogues with them to understand the ongoing impacts and challenges that may be faced. We need to ensure that they have the right support at the right time and do everything we can to work with other member states to ensure that the transition is as smooth as possible.

Damian Collins (Folkestone and Hythe) (Con) [V]: In addition to trying to improve visa-free travel for musicians, could my hon. Friend say whether the Government hope to make progress on easing the movement of musical equipment from country to country within Europe, so that it is not treated like any other physical goods, and on easing the cabotage restrictions for festivals and bands? Finally, can she confirm whether EU-based music showcases fall under the short business trip exemption for conferences, trade fairs and exhibitions? These showcases are often so important in making the careers of developing talent.

Caroline Dinagen: With regard to the haulage—the cabotage—that has not been imposed just on us because we have left the EU. They are rules that apply to both UK and EU haulage firms. I want to speak more about this with colleagues in the Department for Transport and with European colleagues to see what more can be done to address it. It impacts not just us but companies that are moving musical equipment across Europe, no matter which European member state they come from. As for my hon. Friend's other question, if performers are visiting in a business capacity, that is to negotiate a future tour, for any other scoping arrangements or for various other things, that would fall under the business visa waiver. It is always really important to check the individual rules of that EU nation—that member state—to ensure that they do not have anything that would need to be abided by.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Steve Brine.

Steve Brine (Winchester) (Con): Is it not the case that the longer the situation persists, the worse it gets—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. This is my fault, but I missed out Mary Kelly Foy. I beg the House's pardon and that of the hon. Gentleman. Mary Kelly Foy.

Mary Kelly Foy (City of Durham) (Lab) [V]: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think we can all agree that no competent Government would accept such a significant loss of revenue for an already struggling sector without a plan B to mitigate the economic impact. Can the Minister tell me what plan is in place to make up for the financial shortfall for the creative industries resulting from the Government's failure to negotiate visa exemptions with the European Union?

Caroline Dinagen: I just want to make sure that the hon. Lady is not labouring under any misapprehension that the EU made a bespoke offer on musicians that we turned down. That simply is not the case. We fought very hard to get a solution that would have worked to the benefit of our musicians and those from the EU. As ever, we want to ensure that our music industry is supported. We supported it with the cultural recovery fund, and Arts Council England has a range of grants and financial support on offer. On this particular issue, we will speak to colleagues in the Treasury to see whether any support can be put forward at a future fiscal event.

Steve Brine: Surely the longer this situation persists the worse it gets for UK artists, and the longer their recovery from covid becomes. Right now, musicians,

agents and those who book for them have way too much risk in fixing European gigs. It is no good Opposition Members who voted for no deal joining the debate now. We have the deal, but surely we need to return to it with the sensible UK proposal that was on the table, which presumably, as the Minister has said today, still stands.

Caroline Dinagen: My hon. Friend has just hit the nail on the head, and does so in a much more articulate way than I could. That is absolutely right: the deal is still on the table and our door is open for the EU to come back and take up that deal if it wants to. In the short term, we are speaking to member states bilaterally about the visa regime and whether there is any facilitation, as opposed to a waiver, that could be put in place. What the sector now needs is certainty and for us to be able to put in place the guidance and support for it to move forward.

Dave Doogan (Angus) (SNP) [V]: The Minister acknowledged that this situation is deeply unsatisfactory, and so too have the many MPs who have signed my early-day motion highlighting this crisis for touring artists. Today she committed her Department to preparing the creative sector for this new regime. Can she assure the House that this will be better than the way that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs helped to prepare fishermen and farmers, which was to throw them off the bureaucratic cliff? Is she not worried that this wanton and wholly avoidable impediment to the fraternal sharing of arts and culture exposes a rather narrow and isolationist vision of the future by this UK Government?

Caroline Dinagen: The key is ensuring that we put in place the guidance and support that the sector needs to be able to deal with the new changes. We are talking collaboratively with the sector about that at the moment, and we will be putting in place opportunities for people to learn much more about how things stand and where they need to go to access advice and support. Those are the practical things that we can talk about right now to help our sector move forward and continue to be the vibrant ambassador for the UK and the hugely brilliant cultural sector that it has always been.

Robin Millar (Aberconwy) (Con) [V]: A single European tour may visit dozens of venues, employing hundreds of people skilled in everything from logistics to finance, lighting, pyrotechnics, costumes and more to make it a success. What reassurances can my hon. Friend give people like Aberconwy resident and experienced front-of-house engineer Berenice Hardman that practical arrangements such as visas, carnets and cabotage will be easier and simpler for them to deal with in the future?

Caroline Dinagen: The assurance I would give my hon. Friend's constituent is that we will be having conversations with colleagues across all the nation states of the EU to see what measures we can put in place to facilitate the arrangements. Some of them have very straightforward arrangements right now—some of them do not impose extra work permits, and some are very flexible when it comes to their visas, and others less so. We need to speak to them to ensure that these arrangements

can be as smooth, fast and easy to understand as possible, and that is the key to us being able to move forward.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): There being almost nobody present in the Chamber, I am not going to suspend before we go on to the next item of business, so we will move straight to the ten-minute rule motion.

Freedom of Speech (Universities)

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

1.42 pm

Mr David Davis (Haltemprice and Howden) (Con): I beg to move,

That leave be given to bring in a Bill to place a duty on universities to promote freedom of speech; to make provision for fining universities that do not comply with that duty; and for connected purposes.

I commend your efficiency, Madam Deputy Speaker. The principal reason that our kingdom is a great nation can be encompassed in one word: freedom—freedom of action, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, freedom of belief, freedom of speech and freedom under the law. Of all those freedoms, the most precious is freedom of speech. It has been fundamental to the development of our culture, our society, our literature, our science and our economy. Indeed, our national wealth today owes more to the free exchange of ideas than to the exchange of goods. Freedom of speech is fundamental to everything we have, everything we are and everything we stand for.

Over 300 years ago, it was this Parliament that enshrined our right to freedom of speech in law. The 1689 Bill of Rights became a symbol of hope for the rights of people everywhere throughout the globe. Since then, peoples and democracies the world over have followed our example. When representatives of the globe gathered in 1948, in the aftermath of unthinkable destruction and despair, we as one people—one human race—said, “Never again.” Fundamental to this united course of humanity was article 19 of the universal declaration of human rights, which states:

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

Today that is under threat, and it is under threat in the very institutions where it should be most treasured: our universities.

Freedom of speech only matters when it is controversial—when it is challenging. That is why the greatest characterisation of free speech, attributed to Voltaire by his biographer, who is:

“I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it”.

In one version, it was notably:

“I may detest what you say but I will fight to the death for your right to say it.”

Voltaire understood that creativity and progress in a society depend on acts of intellectual rebellion, dissent, disagreement and controversy, no matter how uncomfortable, but today the cancel culture movement think it is reasonable to obliterate the views of people they disagree with, rather than challenge them in open debate. They are wrong. Why? Because the unwillingness to hear uncomfortable opinion and the refusal of platforms to people they disagree with is damaging to us all. Imagine if their censorious predecessors in the established Churches had been successful in their attempts to suppress Galileo and Darwin. People would still believe that the Earth is the centre of the universe or that the human species was created on the sixth day from clay. Of course, those ideas are ridiculous, but such falsehoods

[Mr David Davis]

were conquered only through the freedom to speak truth to power and to shine light in the dark with the ability to advocate for science and reason.

Today, there is a corrosive trend in our universities that aims to prevent anybody from airing ideas that groups disagree with or would be offended by. Let us be clear: it is not about protecting delicate sensibilities from offence; it is about censorship. We can protect our own sensibilities by not going to hear the speech. After all, nobody is compelled to listen. But when people explicitly or indirectly no-platform Amber Rudd, Germaine Greer, Peter Tatchell, Peter Hitchens and others, they are not protecting themselves; they are denying others the right to hear those people and even, perhaps, challenge what they say.

Let us repeat our thought experiment—our conjecture—in a modern context. Germaine Greer wrote the pivotal book on feminism and was its most powerful and effective advocate. Peter Tatchell was and is an unbelievably brave and very effective campaigner on gay rights and a host of civil freedoms. Peter Hitchens is a professional iconoclast who has challenged overmighty Government of all colours through the decades. Imagine what would have happened if they and their allies had been prevented from pursuing their causes in the public domain. We would have a very different society today, and not a better one. The chilling effect on free speech would be disastrous, and the impact on academic freedom would be catastrophic. Its cost is already too high.

Before I leave this subject, what about Amber Rudd? She was no-platformed for her connection to the Government's handling of the Windrush scandal, yet it was a whole year after she had been explicitly cleared by an investigation that found that she had not been supported as she should have been by the Home Office. In her case, it was not just speech denied but justice denied.

Today, views expressed in a recent survey commissioned by Britain's biggest university academic union showed that Britain has the second-lowest level of academic freedom in all Europe. Just last month, a report by Civitas found that more than a third of our universities impose severe restrictions on freedom of speech—including, I am ashamed to say, Oxford, Cambridge and St Andrews. The fact is that a number of our international allies today protect freedom of speech much better than we do. Some have it specifically written into their country's constitution, and others put it explicitly into law. Ireland, for example, has the Universities Act 1997, which protects "the freedom, within the law, in...teaching, research and any other activities either in or outside the university, to question and test received wisdom, to put forward new ideas and to state controversial or unpopular opinions".

Although in the UK we theoretically have laws protecting freedom of speech, in practice they are buried in education Acts, resulting in the protections not being widely known and universities not always upholding their duties. That is why I am proposing this Bill.

What does this Bill set out to do? It would, in effect, make universities responsible for upholding free speech throughout their campuses. Freedom of speech is not, of course, absolute. With rights come responsibilities, so speech that is illegal—incitement to violence, for example—would of course be forbidden, but speech that is merely unpopular with any sector of the university would not be proscribed. Controversial views and the challenging of established positions would not be proscribed.

Although we may not agree or approve of what is being said, the right to free speech is the foundation stone of our democracy. To stand idly by while that foundation is being eroded is a dereliction of our duty. The Bill makes it the absolute duty of every university authority to protect that most fundamental of our freedoms: the right to free speech.

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered,

That Mr David Davis, Robert Halfon, Esther McVey, Chris Green, Mrs Heather Wheeler, Ben Bradley, James Grundy, Andrew Lewer, Craig Mackinlay, James Sunderland, Lee Anderson and Philip Davies present the Bill.

Mr David Davis accordingly presented the Bill.

Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time tomorrow, and to be printed (Bill 240).

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): In order to prepare the Chamber for the next item of business, we will now suspend the sitting for three minutes.

1.51 pm

Sitting suspended.

1.54 pm

On resuming—

TRADE BILL (PROGRAMME (NO. 2))

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

That the following provisions shall apply to the Trade Bill for the purposes of supplementing the Order of 20 May 2020 (Trade Bill (Programme)):

Consideration of Lords Amendments

(1) Proceedings on consideration of Lords Amendments shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion four hours after their commencement.

Subsequent stages

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

(3) The proceedings on any further Message from the Lords shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion one hour after their commencement.—(David T.C. Davies.)

Question agreed to.

Trade Bill

Consideration of Lords amendments

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): I must draw the House's attention to the fact that financial privilege is engaged by Lords amendment 11. If the Lords amendment engaging financial privilege is agreed to, I will cause the customary entry waiving Commons financial privilege to be entered in the *Journal*.

After Clause 2

PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

1.55 pm

The Minister for Trade Policy (Greg Hands): I beg to move, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 1.

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

Lords amendment 2, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 3, Government motion to disagree, and amendment (a) in lieu.

Lords amendment 4, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 5, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 6, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 7, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 8, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 9, and Government amendments (a) and (b) thereto.

Lords amendment 10, and Government amendment (a) thereto.

Lords amendments 11 to 31.

Greg Hands: This Bill marks a significant milestone. Its passage into law will have numerous benefits for the UK economy: giving certainty to business with regard to our continuity trade agreements; confirming the UK's access to the global procurement markets; providing protection to businesses and consumers from unfair trading practices; and ensuring that we have the appropriate data to support our exporters and importers. This Bill has enjoyed rigorous parliamentary scrutiny, having been through many of its parliamentary stages twice, and I am delighted to finally see it reach this stage. I am sure it will soon be passed into law, to the satisfaction of all.

I will speak to each amendment in turn, beginning with Lords amendment 1, which is in the name of Liberal Democrat peer Lord Purvis. With our new-found freedom, it is right that Parliament should be able to scrutinise effectively the UK Government's ambitious free trade agreement programme. However, Lords amendment 1 goes far beyond what would be appropriate for our unique constitutional make-up and would unduly tie the hands of Government to in negotiating in the best interests of the UK. The Government have listened to the concerns of both Houses throughout the passage

of this Bill and have moved significantly to improve further its enhanced transparency and scrutiny arrangements.

Mr Jonathan Djanogly (Huntingdon) (Con): My right hon. Friend said that the amendment would go too far. In the European Parliament the power existed for MEPs to give consent to trade Bills. Now that power has come back to this country, is he suggesting that this should not go to MPs but should go to the Executive? I think that is what he is suggesting.

Greg Hands: I thank my hon. Friend for that intervention. I know that he has taken a long-standing interest, during the passage of this Bill and its predecessor, in these questions, and I will make two points. First, it would be inappropriate to compare this Westminster style of democracy with the European Parliament and the European Commission. Secondly, all the trade agreements in scope within the continuity provisions of the Bill have already been scrutinised in this House. These arrangements were set out in a written ministerial statement by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for International Trade on 7 December. The enhanced arrangements that we have set out are entirely appropriate for a Westminster-style democracy such as ourselves; they are at least as strong as, and in some cases are stronger than, the arrangements in comparable systems, such as those in Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

Mr Djanogly: Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Greg Hands: I am going to make a bit more progress.

Finally, I remind the House that ultimately if Parliament is not content with a trade deal that we have negotiated, it has statutory powers, under the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010, to prevent ratification by resolving against ratification indefinitely. That is in addition to Parliament's power to vote down any necessary implementing legislation, again thereby preventing ratification.

That brings me on to Lords amendment 5. I suggest to the House that this amendment is unnecessary, as it covers things that the Government are already doing, or that are established precedent of the UK as a dualist state. The Government are already under a statutory obligation to publish an explanatory memorandum when a treaty is laid before Parliament. As Members will have seen, in section 5 of our explanatory memorandum to our agreement with Japan, we set out how we would implement the agreement and where legislation would be required. We, as a dualist state, have well-established precedents for putting in place implementing legislation before ratification of a treaty. If we did not do so, we would risk the UK being in breach of its international obligations. We have no desire to change this established way of working.

2 pm

The Government have clearly stated that we will work to facilitate requests for debates, including from the relevant Select Committees, on free trade agreements as part of CRaG, subject to available parliamentary time. The Government have a good record of this; last year, debates took place in this House and the other place on the Japan free trade agreement, and that is in addition to the six debates we have facilitated in the other place on our continuity agreements.

Anthony Mangnall (Totnes) (Con): One of the complaints of the International Trade Committee, on which I sit, was that there was not enough time to debate the report that the Committee put forward on the Japanese trade deal. Will my right hon. Friend perhaps look at offering extra parliamentary time—I know it is perhaps not in his purview—for Parliament to have such debates? They could be followed up with debates on the general trade agreement that has been agreed by the Government at the time.

Greg Hands: My hon. Friend makes a very strong point. The whole purpose of providing the relevant Select Committee with the relevant text in advance is so that the Select Committee can produce a report that will inform debate in Parliament. In that sense, I agree with him. On his specific point about making time available to the Select Committee to debate that report, I think that question is properly within the domain of Parliament, rather than the Government. I am sure you would agree, Madam Deputy Speaker, that allowing time for a parliamentary Select Committee to debate a report is best done through the usual channels, in conjunction with the Speaker's Office. I do not think it is entirely within the gift of the Government to allocate time to a parliamentary Select Committee.

Mr Djanogly: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: No, I am going to move on, because I want to come on to what I think might be the areas of greatest interest in this debate, including Lords amendments 2 and 3 on human rights. I remind hon. and right hon. Members of the Foreign Secretary's statement on Tuesday last week, in which he outlined a range of measures in response to the deplorable human rights situation in Xinjiang. I also refer colleagues to the article I wrote about Xinjiang as long ago as 2011, showing my personal interest in that question.

I recognise that the amendments before the House are not specific to China per se, but some of the supporters have China in mind, and it is worth reminding Members of what the new measures the Foreign Secretary announced will do, as they are germane to the ongoing debate on human rights. The measures will help to ensure that UK businesses and the public sector are in no way complicit in human rights violations in Xinjiang. They include: first, strengthening the overseas business risk guidance to make clearer the risk to UK businesses investing in, or with supply chains in, Xinjiang; secondly, a review of export controls as they apply to the situation in Xinjiang to ensure we are doing all we can to prevent the export of goods that may contribute to human rights violations in Xinjiang; thirdly, the introduction of financial penalties for organisations that fail to comply with the Modern Slavery Act 2015; and, fourthly, ensuring that the Government or public sector bodies have the evidence they require to help them exclude suppliers that are complicit in human rights violations in Xinjiang.

Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con): I understand the point my right hon. Friend is making, and we do not have a free trade deal with China at the moment, and we are not likely to, but many of us for years have been frustrated that every time we try to raise genocide in this place in terms of trade deals, we are told that it is subject to the international courts, and that China, Russia or other countries in the UN Security Council

have a veto on the matter. Is there any way we can acknowledge that genocide is taking place in a country when we do a trade deal, without losing parliamentary control of our trade deals, and without getting trade deals bogged down for months or even years in courts?

Greg Hands: I can reassure my right hon. Friend that the Government are very ready to have these discussions. I am sure that the amendment in the name of Lord Alton is not an appropriate amendment to put into this Bill. As my right hon. Friend will have seen from the Foreign Secretary's statement last week, we do take the situation in Xinjiang, and other allegations of serious human rights abuses, extremely seriously. However, we also have to think about what we are dealing with—the appropriate role for the High Court in international treaties, and particularly the right in the Alton amendment for an automatic revocation of an international treaty.

Ms Nusrat Ghani (Wealden) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend for presenting what the Foreign Office is doing on human rights. We have tabled a compromise amendment that takes into account all the concerns that the Government have expressed about the Lord Alton amendment, and that makes very clear the separation of powers—fundamentally, that Parliaments advise, and Ministers decide. What is his objection to the compromise amendment tabled by me and my colleagues?

Greg Hands: I will have to look at my hon. Friend's amendment. My role is to speak about the amendment from the other place in the name of Lord Alton.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith (Chingford and Woodford Green) (Con): I gave the amendment to the Foreign Secretary and his team last Wednesday, and it is on the amendment paper today. With respect, it is not a case of, "We can have a look at it"; the Minister must have a view on it, surely, because it is there on the paper.

Greg Hands: I note what my right hon. Friend says. The Government are open to further discussion on these matters. Nobody denies the importance and seriousness of the situation in Xinjiang, or this Government's continued commitment to combating human rights abuses, or that human rights cannot and should not be traded away in a trade agreement or anything like it.

I should emphasise to hon. Members the seriousness with which the Government approach human rights issues as they relate to trade. We are taking action and will continue to do so. The UK has long supported the promotion of our values globally. We are clear that doing more trade does not have to come at the expense of human rights. In fact, as I am sure my hon. and right hon. Friends will agree, there is a strong positive correlation between countries that trade freely and human rights.

Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP): I think we all appreciate the work that the Foreign Secretary has done to ensure that firms look at their supply lines to check that they are not purchasing goods produced through slave labour or through human rights abuses. Now that the United Kingdom is out of the EU, we want to stand on the world stage as a global leader. What objections does the Minister have to putting in the law of this country that we will not tolerate trade deals with countries that abuse their populations by engaging in genocide?

Greg Hands: I emphasise to the right hon. Gentleman, who I know is passionate about these issues, the importance attached by the Government to the underlying issue of allegations of genocide and human rights abuses. However, it is right that the Government give significant attention to how that process would work. The Lord Alton amendment, which allows automatic revocation by the High Court of an international trade agreement that was negotiated between Governments and approved by Parliament, would not be the right way forward.

Lords amendments 2 and 3 pose significant legal and other problems and so cannot be accepted by the Government. Lords amendment 3, tabled by Lord Alton, seeks to revoke trade agreements where the High Court of England and Wales makes a preliminary determination regarding genocide. This would, in effect, take out of the hands of Government their prerogative powers to conduct international relations with regard to trade. That goes to the heart of the separation of powers in Britain's constitutional system. If we accepted the amendment, the High Court could frustrate or even revoke trade agreements entered into by the Government and approved after Parliamentary scrutiny. That would be an unprecedented and unacceptable erosion of the royal prerogative, and not something that the Government could support.

Ms Ghani: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I will make a little more progress, if I may.

It is for the Government, answerable to Parliament, to make trade policy, not the courts. In any event, the Government already have the power to terminate trade agreements. Modern trade agreements include termination provisions as standard, allowing either party to terminate the agreement if they so decide, usually following a specified notice period. The option of terminating agreements would remain available to the Government to use at their discretion, with or without the amendment.

It is crucial to understand that we do not have a bilateral trade agreement with China. There is no trade deal with China to revoke. Not a single person in Xinjiang—the people we are trying to help—would benefit from the amendment.

Steve Brine (Winchester) (Con): I am listening to the Minister carefully. He is right that, of course, we do not have a trade deal with China to alter. If we did, given the situation with the Uyghurs and the genocide going on, would the Government be minded to implement their power to revoke such an agreement?

Greg Hands: Obviously that is something the Government would have to look at. We would have to consult across Government, and there would also be, quite properly, a significant role for the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office in that decision. But it is clear that we do not have a bilateral trade agreement with China that is within the scope of the Bill. We have no plans for a bilateral trade agreement with China. The amendment could have an impact on bilateral trade agreements that the United Kingdom is party to, but China is not a party relevant to the consideration.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: As my right hon. Friend knows, I admire him enormously, but I want to take him back to that point. He said he has no plans for a

trade deal with China, but what that really means is that we may yet make up our mind to have one, so that is not an absolute statement. If he decides that the British Government will never do a trade deal with a country guilty of genocide, how would he know whether a country was guilty of genocide, if only a court can decide that and the International Criminal Court cannot reach that decision? Surely the amendment would give him a chance to say, "Our High Court has said this country is guilty of genocide."

Greg Hands: I am very interested in this topic, but it is not for me as Minister for Trade Policy to make Government policy on which court would be involved, or where that court should be, or on aspects relating to genocide. However, I think the amendment before us is flawed and should be rejected by this House.

Emily Thornberry (Islington South and Finsbury) (Lab): Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: No. The right hon. Lady will have plenty of opportunity to speak, and I can respond to her points in due course.

The lack of evidence for the effectiveness of such action underscores the need for the Government to take targeted, appropriate and effective measures on human rights, such as those we are taking towards China in the package of measures announced by the Foreign Secretary.

Lords amendment 2 seeks, among other things, the publication of risk assessments, annual reports and determinations on whether trade agreements comply with the UK's international obligations. Such legislative requirements would again represent serious constraints on the royal prerogative powers to negotiate, ratify and withdraw from treaties. Erosion of the royal prerogative is a red line for the Government, so we cannot support that amendment, either.

I need to make a little more progress, Madam Deputy Speaker—I am conscious that we are 18 minutes in and there are a lot of speakers. I turn to Lords amendment 4, which would introduce a wide range of restrictions on the regulations that can be made under clause 2. Those relate broadly to the delivery of free, universal health services, the protection of medical data and scrutiny of algorithms, and a prohibition on the use of investor-state dispute settlement, ratchet clauses and negative listing provisions.

2.15 pm

May I first remind the House of a simple fact that underlines our entire trade policy? It is that we are wholly committed to ensuring that the NHS remains universal and free at the point of service. Our position could not be clearer: the NHS, the services it provides and the price it pays for medicines will remain off the table when we are negotiating free trade agreements. These are not just words. I am pleased to confirm that none of the agreements we have signed with 63 partner countries has threatened the delivery of a free and universal NHS. Not a single one of those agreements has affected our ability to protect the health service.

The powers contained in this legislation are required only to provide continuity with the existing EU trade agreements. The NHS was always protected by specific exclusions, reservations and exemptions in the EU trade agreements, which we have rolled over into our continuity

agreements. We do not see the need for this amendment, as protecting the NHS is already a top priority in negotiations. We have all witnessed the heroic efforts of the NHS through the covid-19 pandemic, and we are immensely grateful for all that it has accomplished. The idea that we would now seek to sell off the NHS to foreign corporations is, frankly, offensive and absurd. The NHS is not on the table. The NHS is not and never will be for sale.

I am pleased to address Lords amendment 6. This amendment on standards is both unnecessary and counterproductive, and we will be opposing it today. I remind the House that the powers in the Bill are required for the implementation of non-tariff provisions of continuity agreements. We have already signed agreements with 63 partner countries covering trade worth £217 billion in 2019. Most of those trade agreements are now trading under those terms. Standards have not been undermined in any of those agreements.

I will now address Lords amendment 7, which seeks to prevent the Government from signing international trade agreements that are not explicitly compliant with international and domestic obligations relating to the protection of children online. That is an extremely important subject. The Government are already fully committed to ensuring that every free trade agreement signed, and those yet to be signed, maintains and strengthens our international and domestic obligations on protecting the most vulnerable members of our society from online harm.

The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport has now published an initial Government response to the online harms White Paper, and we believe that online harms protection belongs in online harms legislation. Through the Trade Bill, we are simply seeking to provide continuity in trading relationships with existing partners. I understand that many concerns in this field relate to negotiations with the United States. I remind the House that there are no powers in the legislation to implement a future free trade agreement with the USA or any other new negotiating partners. I ask that we should be judged on our record, which shows that trade policy is not being used to water down protections for vulnerable users online.

Lords amendment 8 seeks to ensure that there is no discrimination in the UK internal market against Northern Ireland goods and services, and I very much share that aim. As the House will be aware, the Government have been unequivocal in their commitment to unfettered access for Northern Ireland goods moving to the rest of the UK market. That means no declarations, tariffs, new regulatory checks, customs checks or additional approvals for Northern Ireland businesses to place goods on the UK market. I can further assure the House that the Government are already fully committed to ensuring there are no barriers or discrimination within the UK internal market.

Sammy Wilson: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I am going to make a little bit more progress, with apologies to the right hon. Gentleman. He obviously has a special interest in this space, but I am conscious that time is moving on.

Turning to the amendments concerning the Trade and Agriculture Commission, the Government have offered alternatives to Lords amendments 9 and 10. We

also accept Lords amendments 11, 12, 29 and 30. These amendments put the commission on a statutory footing to help to inform the report required by section 42 of the Agriculture Act 2020. The Trade and Agriculture Commission was originally set up by the Department for International Trade in July 2020 to boost the scrutiny of trade deals. That is alongside other steps that the Government have taken to ensure that relevant interests are taken into account at every step of the negotiation process, from public consultation at the start, dedicated trade advisory groups during the process and independent scrutiny of the final deal at the end.

The Trade and Agriculture Commission will advise the Secretary of State for International Trade on certain measures set out in section 42 of the Agriculture Act concerning the consistency of certain free trade agreement measures with UK statutory protections for animal and plant health, animal welfare and the environment. The Government amendments were modified in the other place, however, also to include advice on human health. The Government do not consider the inclusion of human health to be appropriate for the Trade and Agriculture Commission, as it would duplicate the work of other appropriate bodies. The fact that human health will not be in the remit of the Trade and Agriculture Commission does not mean that there will be no scrutiny in that area. It must still be covered in the section 42 report under the Agriculture Act, for which the Secretary of State may seek advice from any person considered to be independent and to have relevant expertise.

I hope that that has been a useful introduction to the Lords amendments we have in front of us. I am looking forward to the debate and to responding later.

Emily Thornberry: It is a pleasure to open this debate for the Opposition. I want to thank Members from the other place for all the work they have done on these amendments, which follows the considerable amount of work on the Bill's previous iteration, all of which is welcome.

It is a great tribute to how deeply Members on all sides and in both Houses have engaged in our debates about trade over the last few years that we have such a wide range of important amendments before us today. They reflect the values, priorities and safeguards that we believe the UK should apply when negotiating new trade agreements. We have one amendment that reflects our desire that young boys and girls growing up in this country should be able to learn, play and interact with their friends online without the fear that those experiences will be tainted by bullying, grooming or exposure to harmful content. We have another amendment that reflects our equally strong desire that young boys and girls growing up 4,000 miles away should be able to live in freedom, practise any religion they choose and one day have children of their own without the fear that those rights will be taken away by the criminal actions of the Chinese state. I want to focus most of my remarks today on the amendments relating to human rights and to parliamentary scrutiny, but let me first talk briefly about the other key amendments we have before us.

We welcome Lords amendment 4, which seeks to exclude NHS patient data from the scope of future trade deals. This amendment cuts to the chase of the debate over whether the NHS is on the table when it

comes to trade negotiations. To some people, that concept would mean private healthcare companies from overseas being able to compete against the NHS to provide taxpayer-funded healthcare, but in fact it is much more realistic and pernicious. What it means is those same companies winning a greater right to provide services to the NHS through open procurement contracts and thereby gaining access to the vast resource of NHS patient data, which, quite frankly, they have been actively pursuing for years. This amendment seeks to prevent that, and I cannot see why any Member of the House would disagree with it.

We welcome Lords amendment 6 on standards affected by international trade agreements, which rests on the very simple notion that the international trade agreements we negotiate should not undermine the domestic standards we apply on everything from environmental protection to employment rights—again, something we would have thought everyone would support.

I have spoken already about Lords amendment 7 on the protection of children online, which seeks to protect the very welcome progress we are making in the UK to keep our children safe when using the internet, and to force major service providers to help protect children from exposure to illegal content or harmful activity. We know for a fact that the major US internet companies have sought to use trade deals with Mexico, Canada, Japan and Korea to exempt themselves from liability over the harms caused by their services and to guarantee unrestricted access to user data, including that of children. The Minister might well assure us that the same thing will not happen here, but I would simply urge him to allow the passage of this amendment to ensure that the same thing cannot happen here.

We also welcome Lords amendment 8, the Northern Ireland amendment, on non-discrimination in goods and services, for which we thank my good friend the former right hon. Member for Neath—a much missed presence in this House, but still a good friend to the people of Northern Ireland. When we look at the delays, disruption and economic damage that have been caused by the loss of unfettered access for goods travelling between Great Britain and Northern Ireland surely we would all agree on how important it is that we protect the unfettered access for goods travelling the other way and for the exchange of services in both directions. Indeed, if the Government are promising to maintain that unfettered access, I cannot see why they would urge Members of this House to vote against the opportunity to put that promise into law.

We welcome amendments 9 and 10, which would expand the remit of the Trade and Agriculture Commission to cover the impact of food on public health. If the Government are to leave it to the commission to protect our food and farming standards against low-cost, low-quality imports, rather than putting those protections into law, then the least they can do is ensure that the commission's remit covers all the standards that we wish to protect, including those related to public health. I understand that the Government are trying to lift the public health aspects of this amendment, but, before the Minister does that, I urge him to speak to his colleagues in the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs about Government undertakings that may have been given before we had clause 42 of the Agriculture Bill.

There is a common thread running through all the amendments that I have mentioned and through those that I will come on to relating to human rights. The common thread is this: if we do not have the right procedures in place to allow proper parliamentary engagement in the Government's trade negotiations and proper parliamentary debate and approval of the Government's new trade deals, then, inevitably, Members will seek instead to ring-fence what the Government can give away and protect in law the standards that we want to preserve.

I just do not understand why the Government are so stubbornly holding on to the Ponsonby rule and CRAg and laws that come from a previous century and a previous age. Why we cannot step into the 21st century as a confident democracy is beyond me. In other words, if we do not have proper scrutiny of the Government's trade deals, we must have proper safeguards on what the deals can do. Personally, I argue that we should want the best of both worlds—proper safeguards coupled with proper scrutiny—but surely every Member of this House can agree that the worst and most illogical of all worlds is to have neither. I urge Conservative Members, when they are instructed by the Government later to vote down not just the amendments relating to NHS data, online harms, standards, public health and unfettered access, but Lords amendments 1 and 5 relating to parliamentary scrutiny, please to say to the Government that one set of amendments or the other may be opposed, but logically they cannot oppose them both.

Anthony Mangnall: It is somewhat unfair to suggest that the Government have not moved on this issue already. I serve on the International Trade Committee and the facts are that the Committee is able to scrutinise each trade agreement, Parliament is then able to debate that, and there is CRAg. That means that there is scrutiny, so it is not acceptable to go back to constituents and say that there is no scrutiny mechanism for our trade deals. Does the right hon. Lady not agree that that is enough?

Emily Thornberry: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for what he has said, but as he and I know, the International Trade Committee was promised access to the Japan deal and to the assorted documents attached to it by a certain date, and that did not happen. First, the Committee did not get the time that it should have been given. Secondly, notwithstanding some fairly wild claims made by the Minister about the ability of Parliament to vote on these matters, the reality is different. An international deal can be signed on behalf of Her Majesty by this Government and the only way in which this Parliament can vote against it is under CRAg, which means that Labour needs to use an Opposition Day to have a vote. What happens—and this has happened—when we do not get Opposition Days during the period in which we are allowed to debate a trade deal and have a vote on it? It cannot be claimed that the roll-over deals that we have had so far have been followed by time given to Parliament to debate them.

The hon. Gentleman is in a privileged position as a member of the International Trade Committee, because he has a greater opportunity to scrutinise any deal, but the rest of Parliament does not. We are making deals with countries that come from the same stable—which, for historic reasons, have developed their democracies

[Emily Thornberry]

on the back of learning about democracy from our country—and yet they now have a greater chance than we do to scrutinise those trade deals. What holds up a trade deal is not the British Parliament having the time to scrutinise it, but the other Parliament in the country with which we are signing the trade deal.

Anthony Mangnall: Will the right hon. Lady give way on that point?

Emily Thornberry: I do not think I am going to allow double-dipping; we are talking about democracy but there is no one on our side here in Parliament because we are all participating remotely. The Labour party has taken the decision that the correct way to react to the pandemic is to work from home when necessary, so it is more difficult for Labour Members to intervene in these circumstances. I do not mean to be unreasonable or unfair, but frankly that is the reason why.

2.30 pm

Mr Djanogly: Will the right hon. Lady give way?

Emily Thornberry: I will one more time and then no more.

Mr Djanogly: Is not the situation at the moment that, effectively, the amount of scrutiny provided is at the whim of the Executive? If they want to give us hundreds of pages of Bill the day before we have to sign, they can do that. If they want to give another country a month for scrutiny, as with Japan, but us no time at all, they can do that. We need a system here.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. I do not think we should go much further down this line. I have 59 Back-Bench Members who wish to participate in this scrutiny now, so let us not go down the rabbit hole of scrutiny but stick to the purpose of the amendments before us.

Emily Thornberry: I am grateful, Madam Deputy Speaker. My argument is simply that the scrutiny amendment among these amendments is perhaps the most important, because if Parliament could be allowed scrutiny, we would not focus on other particular issues, because we would know that, in the end, Parliament could make the decision. I would find it particularly astonishing if any Government Minister or Whip were able to look their colleagues in the face and ask them to vote down the amendments on parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals after the shambles we saw in December with the supposed scrutiny of the new continuity agreements—10 deals that were agreed too late to complete the 21-day ratification process before they came into force.

The Minister is an intelligent man, and I am surprised that he is so uninformed. Four of those deals were finally laid before Parliament on the afternoon of new year's eve, just a few hours before they took effect. The deal with Cameroon has still not been laid before Parliament, almost three weeks after it came into force. Needless to say, there was not a single word of parliamentary debate about any of those 10 agreements before they took effect, let alone any suggestion of parliamentary approval. The very fact that it is possible

for all that to happen without falling foul of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act is all the evidence we should need that the procedures set out in CRAg for the scrutiny of the Government's trade deals are simply not up to the job.

The Government might make the argument that, since those 10 deals in December did not sell any NHS data or alter our standards on food hygiene, their agreement does not make the case for the amendments I mention or for new levels of parliamentary scrutiny. However, that brings me to the issue of human rights. What happened in December makes an incontrovertible case for Lords amendments 2 and 3, on human rights, and 1 and 5, on parliamentary scrutiny.

It is understandable and right that many Members will focus their contributions on the situation in China and the plight of the Uyghur people. We have all read with horror the first-hand accounts of torture and extrajudicial killings, mass incarceration in detention camps, forced sterilisation and abortions, servitude and slave labour. It shames the world that this is happening in our lifetime and it disgraces the Government of China. It is absolutely right that if a UK trade deal with Beijing is proposed or agreed, representatives of the Uyghur community should be able to seek a ruling from the High Court that the crimes they face in China meet the criteria for a charge of genocide, in turn requiring the UK Government to consider revoking that trade deal. When the Minister has an opportunity to look at the compromise amendment, as it has been called, he will see that that is what is being suggested.

There have been various arguments by Ministers as to why the proposed genocide amendment is neither appropriate nor necessary. I will deal with one of those in particular. It has already been suggested that no trade deal with China is imminent, and so measures to block such a deal are premature—a point well made, Members may think. However, the problem is that it cannot be squared with the fact that both the UK and China have to different degrees announced their plans to consider joining the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, the trans-Pacific trade partnership.

If the Government cannot guarantee, first, that they will beat China to the punch, and secondly, that they will be given veto power over any future bid by China for membership, I am afraid that the right hon. Gentleman is not in a position to guarantee to Members of the House that a trade deal with China is not on the horizon, because in the shape of CPTPP it most obviously is. That was why I was trying to intervene on the right hon. Gentleman—to see what his answer was. I would be happy to give way again, or perhaps he can answer at the end of the debate.

That dispute about the potential timing of any China deal raises a very important issue, which I hope all supporters of the genocide amendment will consider very seriously. During this debate on trade and human rights, and the surrounding media coverage, it would be very easy to tell ourselves that this is a discussion entirely about China, and therefore entirely about deals that might or might not take place in the future. The reality is that it should, and it must, also be a debate about the deals that the Government have done this month, and the deals that they are openly planning to do in the next two years, because anyone who cares

deeply about the human rights of China must also have deep concerns about the records of Egypt, Turkey and Cameroon or Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Brazil. That is why Lords amendment 3 demands that before the Government negotiate and sign such trade deals in future, they should present Parliament with a report on the human rights record in each country in question and allow Parliament to take that into account during the process of scrutiny and approval.

Let me give the House one example of why Lords amendment 3 is required. Just five days before the US Senate was attacked, it came together to approve a resolution co-sponsored by 20 senators from both parties, from Marco Rubio to Cory Booker. It was about the brutal campaign of subjugation by the French-speaking Government in Cameroon against the country's English-speaking minority. The Senate resolution condemned with great force the atrocities committed by the Anglophone separatist militias, and it speaks with equal power about the actions of the Cameroon Government, including "torture, sexual abuse,"

massacres and

"burning of villages, the use of live ammunition against protestors, arbitrary arrest and"

unlawful

"detention...enforced disappearances, deaths in custody,"

attacks on journalists and the regular killing of

"civilians, including women, children and the elderly".

The Senate resolution noted approvingly that, exactly one year before, the Office of the United States Trade Representative—remember, this was Donald Trump's trade representative, the direct counterpart of the Secretary of State for International Trade—had terminated Cameroon's access to preferential trade rights due to

"persistent gross violations of internationally recognized human rights."

Finally, in that same spirit, the Senate resolution urged members of the international community to join the United States in a strategic collective effort to put pressure on the Government of Cameroon, including through "the use of" all

"available diplomatic and punitive tools".

I have quoted that Senate resolution at length because I believe that we must ask ourselves what on earth those senators would think if they knew that on that very same day, when they were unanimously passing those strong words of condemnation towards the Government of Cameroon and urging the international community to join them, here in the United Kingdom we were bringing into effect a brand-new continuity trade agreement with Cameroon—a trade deal that was agreed by Ministers apparently with no consideration, and clearly no concern, for the persistent gross violations of international human rights that are taking place inside Cameroon; a trade deal that none of us in this House bar Ministers have even been allowed to read, let alone debate or approve; and a trade deal that may or may not contain provisions on human rights, but until the Government finally decide to publish it, we the elected Members of this Parliament simply cannot know. I hope that Members on both sides of the House will keep the example of Cameroon in mind, and consider the words of the US Senate and the actions of the US trade representative, when judging how to vote later.

We all know that on occasions such as this when amendments are up for debate, Ministers will try to persuade us that they do not disagree with the good intentions behind them, but they just do not think that they are really required. However, if that is what Ministers say today in relation to Lords amendments 2 and 3 on human rights, or Lords amendments 1 and 5 on parliamentary scrutiny, I only ask Members to remember Cameroon: a trade deal done with a regime that is slaughtering women and children just because they live in English-speaking towns; a trade deal done in the face of the US Senate on the same day that it called for international support; and a trade deal that, incredibly, has still not been laid before Parliament, almost three weeks after it came into force.

I urge all Members to think about the Cameroon deal and how little consideration Ministers gave either to human rights or to the rights of this Parliament when they decided to sign it. Finally, I urge Members to ask themselves and their conscience whether they accept what those same Ministers are saying when they go through the amendments before us today and tell us, "They're not really required."

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I had hoped that we might manage at least the first part of this consideration without a formal time limit, but I will have to impose a time limit initially of six minutes, at the absolute outside—in the hope that Members will take less time than that.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: It is a privilege to speak in this debate. I am conscious that time is tight, so I am going to try to make my points as quickly as possible. I rise to speak in support of Lords amendment 3, and in particular to support and speak to amendment (a) in lieu of Lords amendment 3 standing in my name and the names of my colleagues, as set out on the amendment paper. Amendment (a), by the way, has been in the hands of the Government now for over a week, and I put it on record that I have had no calls back or contact, but maybe that is going to change.

Let me turn to the reasons behind Lords amendment 3. The Lords tabled this amendment because it would enable the courts in the UK to make an advisory—I stress, advisory—preliminary genocide judgment for Governments to consider when signing trade deals with states accused of committing genocide. The amendment provides a sound legal basis for the Government to engage in obligations under the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide in a way that is consistent, frankly, with the long-standing UK policy on genocide. After all, we were founder signers of the original charter, which bound the UK Government and all Governments to implement that charter in their own rights, rather than simply leaving it to the International Criminal Court.

The amendment is necessary because, as we have all seen, existing international mechanisms have, frankly, failed: in the UN, any reference to the ICC that is not agreed to by particularly intolerant states is immediately vetoed. The amendment would bring back perhaps the most important thing that has gone missing: the ability for victims of alleged genocide to see justice. That would include ethnic and religious minorities, such as those in China's Xinjiang Uyghur region, maybe even the Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar and others. My point is that the amendment would bring that back to the UK courts.

[Sir Iain Duncan Smith]

The amendment is very important, as it deals with the UK's independent trade policy—for the last 50 years, we have not had control; now we have left the European Union and have control—and would allow the UK courts, when a trade arrangement is being negotiated or taking place, to determine on a preliminary basis whether genocide has occurred in the country that we are intending to strike that trade arrangement with at that particular time. Let me say that this is in regard to free trade arrangements; it does not really cover bilaterals.

The amendment is needed because Uyghurs and victims of alleged genocide have been denied justice for many years. As the right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) said, these are people at the moment—there are others as well—who have been pushed into slave labour, have had sterilisation forced on them and whose population has shrunk by some 85%, and that country is exporting trade goods produced by slave labour. It is quite clear to me, but I am not able to say so, that this has all the hallmarks of genocide. I am not able to say so, because at the end of the day we all agree that the courts have to make that decision. It is not for individual politicians to do so.

2.45 pm

That is why the amendment is necessary and what, for us, it is about. I also want to say what it is not about. The amendment does not give the courts too much power, because it does not take power from the House of Commons or the House of Lords. We do not have the power to decide whether the Government should do trade deals or not. It is a Government power under royal prerogative. The power does not go across to the courts. The courts simply make a preliminary judgment. On the back of that the Government, even with this amendment, would have to come back to the House if they disagreed. They could disagree by putting forward primary legislation. Here, I really need to quote the spokesman in the Lords. He was quite clear when he said:

“Parliament would remain sovereign,”

after the amendment passed

“but it would require primary legislation to reverse the court's decision effectively”,—[*Official Report, House of Lords, 7 December 2020; Vol. 808, c. 1053.*]

which it could do. The UK Government therefore could, if necessary, disagree with that. The idea has been put about that it blocks us, locks us and is the end. It does not.

Steve Brine: I am tempted by my right hon. Friend's amendment and I am listening to him very carefully, as I always do. At the moment we have a form of public health activism, where experts make decisions and it is then very difficult for politicians to disagree with those determinations. What does he say to that form of judicial activism? What would be the likelihood of this House disagreeing with such a determination? That is the concern some of us have with his amendment.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: I agree. I put the question back to my hon. Friend, as I have to other hon. Friends. If, on balance, the courts decide—we have faith in our courts—that this is likely to be genocide, I simply ask why would we be doing a trade deal with a country that

is guilty of genocide. We may not wish to disagree, but the power still remains. The pedantic point put forward by the Government was that it was all about loss of power. I say that that is simply not the case. It would certainly not be in our amendment, because it is very specific that the Government have to do that.

On the vexatious claims point, the High Court is quite capable of dismissing anything on that level. By the way, this is the highest bar that can be set for any accusation. To try to wipe out an ethnic group is the No. 1 crime in the world. The High Court knows that and would dismiss anything that was vexatious. There would be no point in doing otherwise—that would demean it and wreck its reputation.

The Government say that the amendment, being limited to genocide, is practically unenforceable. Well, maybe that is true, in which case we need to look again at the UN charter, but the reality is that right now this is unenforceable—nobody out there can bring a charge of genocide, because they are blocked. We come back to the same point: we argue about genocide, and the Government say they do not want to do deals with people who commit genocide. I have huge admiration for my right hon. Friend the Minister. We have worked very closely together on many things. However, I noted his language when it came to accusations of the sale of the NHS. He said, “Not and never will be sold.” When it came to China and a trade deal it was, “No plans to do one yet.” We can be emphatic from the Dispatch Box when we want to be. We can make absolute statements when we want to, but when we do not—I have been in Government—we simply do not. That tells us everything we need to know. The Government need to have that check on them.

I conclude by saying that the Government cannot have it both ways. If they say it is for the courts, then the question is which court and the amendment says that. Overall, I have to say that the amendment is not anti-China, but it is anti-genocide. We need now to stand tall. We left the European Union because we did not want to accept judgments from a court over which we said we did not have power. We did not come away because we disliked our courts. I think we have the best courts in the world, and I think they can make this judgment. My question, therefore, is this: what is it about? Why did we leave? So that we would stand tall and have a global vision about the morality of what we do. I say to my colleagues and to those on the Front Bench that tonight is about more than just pettifogging. Tonight is all about shining a light of hope to all those out there who have failed to get their day in court and to be treated properly. If this country does not stand up for that, then I want to know what would it ever stand up for again. I urge my colleagues to vote to keep Lords amendment 3 in the Bill.

Stewart Hosie (Dundee East) (SNP) [V]: If I may start by making some general observations, we have previously agreed with the Secretary of State for International Trade about the necessity of keeping trade open, recognising the importance of supply chains and how important it is that we stand against protectionism. I am happy to reiterate all of that today. Indeed, we all should, because we need to combat the three main threats to trade. The first, self-evidently, is the covid crisis, which the World Health Organisation suggests could lead to a massive fall in global trade. The second

is the impact of Brexit, and thirdly, we must address the systemic problem of the continued implementation of new trade restriction measures, and the continuation of existing ones. For example, tariffs valued at somewhere north of \$1.6 trillion are in force around the world. I am not confident that any of those problems will be resolved any time soon, and the Bill does not address any of those matters directly. It is presented mainly as trying to facilitate the roll-over of existing deals, and maintaining trade that the UK has with third countries, which is vital.

The Bill does a number of other things, as the Minister set out. It creates procurement obligations arising from membership of the agreement on Government procurement. It creates the Trade and Agriculture Commission, and gives power to HMRC to collect and share data. As I have said, however, it is not without its problems, as evidenced by the large number of amendments that have come from the other place, which cover a large number of areas. I will address those issues shortly—and hopefully briefly.

As the Scottish National party has made clear during the passage of the Bill, a number of the problems relate to the impact on the devolved Administrations and consent, the role and powers of any scrutinising Committee, parliamentary scrutiny and approval, international standards and agreements, food and animal welfare issues, concerns about the NHS and, as we have just heard, concerns about human rights in trading partner countries. The amendments from the other place deal with a number of those issues.

Let me summarise the SNP's attitude to the main amendments. Lords amendment 1 seeks to enshrine parliamentary approval of trade agreements. That is one of the fundamental problems with the Bill as it stands. The absence of meaningful parliamentary scrutiny and a parliamentary vote on significant changes or modifications, or in future on new trade deals that may be envisaged by the Government, is a massive problem. Modern democracies need full scrutiny of trade agreements, from the scope of the negotiating mandate, right through to implementation. Without amendment 1, the CRAg provisions, which are prayed in aid by the Government, amount to little more than a "take it or leave it" choice at the end of the negotiations, without the ability to amend. That is inadequate.

Lords amendment 1 also requires the UK Government to consult the devolved nations. That is not consent, but it is progress of a sort.

Lords amendment 2 seeks compliance with international obligations. We raised that matter previously, and new clause 7 on Report was designed to do a number of things. First, it was intended to affirm the UK's rights and obligations under the sanitary and phytosanitary measures in annex 1A of the WTO agreement. The amendment focuses mainly on human rights, but it also states that before publishing trade objectives, the Government must conduct a risk assessment to consider whether the agreement would comply with the UK's international treaties and other obligations. It seems eminently sensible to ensure that any free trade agreement complies with international obligations, whether human rights obligations or otherwise.

Lords amendment 3 deals with genocide, and as the Minister knows, there has been a great deal of support for such a measure. There are some serious concerns

about the amendment as it stands, not least in allowing the English High Court to determine what is and what is not genocide, but the principle of revoking a trade deal with a state committing such heinous crimes is beyond reproach.

Lords amendment 4 covers IT and related activities in the NHS. I have previously argued that there should be no use of negative listings, because such clauses require that all industries are liberalised in trade agreements unless there are specific carve-outs, and it is not always easy to define which services count as, for example, health services. Digital services may be irrelevant to health, but NHS data management and GP appointment systems are increasingly digitised. There should be no standstill or ratchet clauses, because those provisions would mean that after a trade deal was signed, parties would not be able to reduce the level of liberalisation beyond what it was at the point of signature. Lords amendment 4 explicitly excludes the use of such negative listing and ratchet clauses and rules out the use of ISDS-type provisions for public services, including health, which would be extremely popular with the public.

Lords amendment 5 addresses ratification, including the requirement for a debate. I have previously asked whether, if it was the intention of the Government to provide sensitive information to a scrutiny Committee, that would be the Select Committee on International Trade, chaired by my hon. Friend the Member for Na h-Eileanan an Iar (Angus Brendan MacNeil). I also asked whether any papers provided would be publishable or restricted. Lords amendment 5 would force the Government to publish an analysis, which would presumably ensure that such information was more widely available. The amendment would also ensure that a debate was held, on the recommendation of such a Committee. That is a very sensible measure indeed.

Lords amendment 6 deals with standards, including food and animal welfare standards, which are of massive concern to the public. As I said on Report, we know that trade deals can put pressure on food standards and lead to the importation of low-standard food. For example, the previous US Administration made it clear that they wanted the UK to lower its food and animal welfare standards. We suggested a ban on the importation of food that was produced to standards lower than those in the UK. Lords amendment 6 is clear that a Minister of the Crown should ensure

"as far as possible that a future trade agreement is consistent with United Kingdom levels of statutory protection regarding, among other things—

- (a) human, animal or plant life or health;
- (b) animal welfare;
- (c) the environment;
- (d) food safety, quality, hygiene and traceability;"

and so on. That is an eminently sensible thing to do. The amendment also states that should a Minister seek to change standards, they would have to "seek the consent" of the devolved nations in advance. That is absolutely the right way to proceed.

Lords amendment 7 seeks additional protection for children online, ensuring that legislation is consistent with international treaties. Lords amendment 13, which I understand the Government are minded to accept, addresses the relationship with the devolved Administrations,

[*Stewart Hosie*]

ensuring that Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs can provide information to the devolved Administrations so that they can fulfil their obligations in terms of trade.

A comprehensive trade Bill is vital, but it has to be right. This Bill has been subject to dozens of amendments in the other place, many with widescale public support. There is still a great deal of work to be done and compromises to be made before this Bill is acceptable.

Dr Liam Fox (North Somerset) (Con): I want to say at the outset that I completely agree with the need to set ethical frameworks in all our overseas dealings, including trade. In so far as these amendments deal with China, I also completely agree that the treatment of the Uyghurs is a violation of historic proportions that should be condemned whether or not it meets the very high legal test of genocide. We should be willing to take action when we think that behaviour does not meet that very high international bar.

However, I am against these specific Lords amendments for four reasons. First, I think trade policy should be conducted via the elected Government through Parliament. I, along with many Conservative Members, voted to leave the European Union to take back control. I do not want to take back control from unelected judges in Europe and give more power to judges in the United Kingdom, however high the esteem in which they are held. I want the decisions about the ethical nature of our policy to be decided in Parliament, by elected parliamentarians. I agree with many of the elements that are being discussed here. I do not want to see more powers coming back from Europe, only for them to be exercised by royal prerogative; I want to see them exercised by the democratic House.

3 pm

Those who had discussions with me when I was Trade Secretary will know that my preference, which would have dealt with many of the reservations of the right hon. Member for East Antrim (Sammy Wilson) and my hon. Friend the Member for Wealden (Ms Ghani), was for us to have a meaningful debate on a motion that was amendable at the outset for the mandate of trade discussions. That would have enabled the House to set the ethical parameters within which we would operate, and then the Government would have gone ahead and carried out the negotiation. To have a vote at the end of the process, which could undo a great deal of work, does not seem to be a particularly logical way to go about it. I hope that, at some point, we might be able to change that.

Steve Brine: Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Dr Fox: I will not—my hon. Friend will forgive me—given the constrictions on time.

It would have been possible to create a system that allowed us to do that. The House would have been happy that Parliament would have been able to set those parameters, and not anyone else.

Ms Ghani: Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Dr Fox: Okay, I will give way to my hon. Friend. She has charmed me into it.

Ms Ghani: My right hon. Friend will know that we have offered such a compromise, which very easily separated the role of powers, whether of the courts, the Executive or parliamentarians, but it has been rejected outright. If there is no apparent objection to that, really, what is the Government's position on dealing with genocide within trade?

Dr Fox: My hon. Friend should ask the Government; I am not the Government. My view is that we want to ensure that the powers are exercised exclusively by Parliament. I do not want any outside body, including the courts, to have a say on what we should or should not do. But I agree that we could have had a mechanism that allowed the House to do that in a way that satisfied all the reservations that have been put forward.

My second reason for objecting to the amendment is that I think it is the thin end of the wedge. If we set a precedent that says that the courts can make a judgment on genocide, where does it stop? In future trade Bills, we may get amendments on the use of torture or on other human rights violations. Valid though those points may be, once we have set a precedent that the court can make a judgment and tell Parliament what it can and cannot do, I wonder how we can reverse that trend.

Thirdly, I think the amendment is not good for our judges. It is difficult to know what the evidential base would be upon which judges would make such a decision, and therefore we bring judges into the territory that many of us saw and were uncomfortable with in the last Parliament, where judges are dragged into making political decisions; that is an uncomfortable place for them and us.

Finally, I do not think this amendment would make any difference whatever to the behaviour of the Chinese Government in relation to the Uyghurs or anyone else. It would not affect our trade with China in any way, shape or form. It would not even deal, for example, with dual-use materials when it comes to the Chinese state security apparatus. For that reason, it is an impotent tool when it comes to dealing with the Chinese Government.

If we believe in this Parliament that the behaviour of the Chinese Government warrants sanctions, we have sanctions available to us. The British Government, if enough pressure is applied by Parliament, can use those sanctions—whether the Magnitsky sanctions that come from our more recent legislation, or wider sanctions. We do not have to wait for an international agreement to be able to apply sanctions that we are bringing forward on the grounds of the high bar of genocide. So it is up to Parliament to make such decisions.

We talk about taking back control, but Parliament has got to stop giving its decision-making powers away. If we want to be respected in this Parliament, we have to be the ultimate arbiters of the decisions and direction of travel of our country. We can have those powers. I say to the Minister for Trade Policy that we have had these discussions. I hope that the Government will bring forward mechanisms that allow the House to have much greater scrutiny at the outset of a trade negotiation to set those ethical parameters.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: I will be quick, because I know that my right hon. Friend has to be quick. When it comes to genocide, it is different, because genocide has to be decided by the courts. We have no right to make that decision. So how is he going to allow that we

would affect anything on trade, unless a court makes that decision? Why not the UK courts, so that then we can decide if we implement it or not?

Dr Fox: Because I believe that the high court of Parliament is the appropriate place to do that. Parliament can apply sanctions where it believes they are justified. Our new legislation allows us to do that.

I believe that setting a political precedent to make a political case is bad practice. If Parliament wants to take action against China or any other country, on behalf of those who they believe have been partially, unfairly or violently dealt with, the best route is to try to pressure the UK Government to take those measures. The Lords amendments being put forward today for the very best reasons are the very worst practice. That is a good reason for Parliament to reject them.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. Before I call the next hon. Member, I give notice that the time limit will be reduced to four minutes after the speech of the Chairman of the Select Committee, the hon. Member for Na h-Eileanan an Iar (Angus Brendan MacNeil). We have three more colleagues on six minutes; thereafter, four minutes. I call Shabana Mahmood.

Shabana Mahmood (Birmingham, Ladywood) (Lab) [V]: I wish to speak in support of Lords amendment 3, known as the genocide amendment, moved by Lord Alton in the other place, which deals with trade agreements made with states accused of committing genocide. I associate myself with the remarks made by my right hon. Friend the Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry), the shadow Secretary of State for International Trade, on that amendment and on the human rights situation more generally.

I am grateful for the cross-party efforts that led to the addition of the amendment to the Bill; I hope that another cross-party effort in this House will be successful today. I note the comments the Minister made in opening the debate today. They follow the position taken by the Foreign Secretary when he made a statement to the House on forced labour supply chains last week. The approach taken by the Government is dispiriting and deeply disappointing. If the Government prevail today, I believe they will come to regret it.

The amendment will, first, send a clear signal about the absolute basic threshold that must be crossed before we strike trade deals around the world, and about the sorts of people, countries and regimes that we will do business with. Not being a genocidal state should be the absolute minimum requirement that all of us in this House should be able to sign up to. It would enable the UK courts to make what is, in effect, an advisory preliminary determination of genocide for the Government to consider when they are signing trade deals with states accused of committing genocide.

The Government say that genocide determination is a matter for judges, not politicians. That is the long-standing position of UK Governments of all political persuasions. The amendment would provide the only viable legal route to have a genocide determination made by judges.

That is why the remarks made by the former Secretary of State for International Trade, the right hon. Member for North Somerset (Dr Fox), just a few moments ago, are entirely wrong. When we talk about genocide, it has

to be a determination made by judges in a legal context. The problem is that at the moment the international legal system—the routes provided by the United Nations and international treaties—are, frankly, a busted flush. Something is needed to break the cycle of inaction and ineffectiveness. We are awash with warm words that simply do not change the situation on the ground. All we are currently laying the ground for is an after-the-fact statement of sorrow when genocide has occurred. The world keeps saying, “Never again” in relation to genocide, yet it occurs with shocking, depressing regularity.

China is, of course, the most striking example of the failures of the international system. The Government recognise and condemn the actions of the Chinese regime against the Uyghur people in Xinjiang. Mountains of evidence exist about forced sterilisation, mass detentions, slave labour and the destruction of culture and heritage. To my mind, a genocide is being perpetrated by the Chinese regime against the Uyghur people, but of course that requires a legal determination in a court to have legal force, rather than simply political and moral force.

Every international legal route is blocked by the Chinese Government—China has a veto. It has a majority on the UN Human Rights Council and is not a party to the International Criminal Court. The amendment provides a mechanism for the UK High Court to make a preliminary determination in the context of a trade agreement. If the UK High Court rules that the extremely high evidential bar for the crime of genocide is satisfied, its judgment will be available for the Government to consider.

Perpetrators of genocide should not be rewarded. They must know that actions have consequences, and an increasingly belligerent China needs to see that the British Government will not simply stand by and watch, impotent and unable to do anything whatsoever. The modest import and export restrictions linked to forced labour abuses that were made by the Government last week are welcome, but they do not deal with the specific charge of genocide, so I am afraid that that action, although it is welcome and although it was taken by the Government only last week, cannot get them off the hook on agreeing with the amendment today.

The amendment does not give the courts too much power. It is supported by eminent lawyers in the other place who have dealt with the issues around the separation of powers far better than I can in the short time available to me. In any case, if the Government agree that genocide determination is a matter for judges, the fact that at the moment their position amounts to saying that they will go along with a genocide determination made by international judges through the international system, but not one made by our own High Court, to my mind, simply does not stand up.

The amendment does not prevent the international legal system from kicking into action, although frankly that seems impossible at this point. In any case, it is a preliminary determination. It would enable the word “genocide” to be used credibly in a legal sense and I simply do not buy the idea that the courts would be swamped with vexatious claims. They can, will and regularly do dismiss claims that lack minimum standards of evidence. I say to the Minister that, if the amendment still does not work for the Government, they should have considered compromise amendments and efforts to reach compromise offered by Members

[*Shabana Mahmood*]

from their own Benches, which I agree with and support. They say we have no trade agreement with China. We do not have an FTA with China, but we have other bilateral trade agreements with China, such as the UK-China bilateral trade and investment treaty. Others could be made.

Genocide is described as the crime above all crimes. Surely we can all agree in this House today that it must be the minimum starting point for the conditions we will place on whom we will trade with. I urge the Government to change course and accept the amendment today.

Tom Tugendhat (Tonbridge and Malling) (Con) [V]: It is an enormous pleasure to speak in the debate this afternoon because this is one of the most important questions our House will consider. It is worth remembering why genocide is a crime beyond others. It is not just that many of us in this House have personal experience through family of genocide within the lifetimes of many people alive today. That is one reason why the *Jewish News* has been so active in support of this measure. Genocide tries to do something that no other crime attempts. It tries to end history. It tries to remove an entire people, an entire culture and an entire part of our world from the planet and to pretend it never happened. It is an erasure of life unlike every other crime. It is worse in all senses, therefore, than torture or murder, worse than the destruction of cultural property and worse than slavery, even though it may include all those elements. That is why I think genocide stands unique, and why I think the amendment does not give way to a drip, drip of further encroachment.

Genocide is unique. Genocide is distinct. It is much, much worse than any other crime, even though it makes up others. That is why we have always reserved this power to the courts. We have always said that this is not a political tool. It is not a tool for politicians to wield against trade rivals or enemies. It is a charge that can be wielded only by a court. The way we have done that is to try to act together, and allow the charge to sit only with international courts. For years we could see why that was the case, because it ensured that we all acted together. If there was a charge and it was proven, we were all as one responding to an abuse against the whole of humanity. Genocide is a crime against the whole of humanity.

Sadly, the way the world has changed means that the obstacles we are facing in our international institutions are becoming overwhelming, so we have a choice. That choice is either to allow the current system to stand and to say that in reality we will never again recognise genocide, or to say that there is a way through this. There is a way through, and that is by trusting our institutions and our judges, and recognising that our judges and legal institutions are actually trusted worldwide. The House does not have to take my word for this—look at how many foreign cases are pressed through our courts. That is a choice that we have to make, and I understand the Minister's comments. In fact, he has done an amazing amount of work in supporting Britain's position overseas, defending our legal infrastructure and promoting our legal business around the world, so he knows better than anyone the respect in which we are held.

3.15 pm

I respect very highly my right hon. Friend the Member for North Somerset (Dr Fox) the former Secretary of State for International Trade, so I am sorry that we find ourselves on different sides on this. However, I have to say that I am going to support this amendment, because we are not talking about whether or not it is for the court of Parliament or for a court of justice; we are talking about whether it is for any court at all. The choice is not this court or another court; it is British judges or foreign judges.

We recently voted to take back control of our laws, our borders and our money. This is about taking back control of our laws and, indeed, our conscience. It is about reminding ourselves that when a people is under oppression so that their very existence is threatened, we have a duty and a responsibility to stand up. So I will be standing with the Muslim community around the world—Ummah Islamiyyah—and the Jewish community around the world, as well as with many, many people across the United Kingdom and across the world who are seeing the abuses that we are seeing, sadly, in western China and reminding ourselves that that crime does not just fall on the heads of the victims, but threatens us all. It is therefore genuinely a crime against humanity that cries out for justice in any court, but particularly, in a British court.

Angus Brendan MacNeil (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP) [V]: Feasgar math, Mr Deputy Speaker, and thank you very much for calling me at this stage of the Bill. I am speaking from the island of Barra in Scotland, which has just been included in tier 4 with the mainland. That is one of the reasons why I have not been travelling and why this is the first time I will speak in any stage of the Trade Bill. I am grateful that we are back to a virtual Parliament, which should have been happening long ago.

I would like to mention a couple of things before I get to the meat of this. A lot of constituents, and people who are not constituents, have been getting in touch about the NHS. I did hear the Minister say that the NHS would not be on the table and I hope that that includes the back door and every other side angle into the NHS. Food standards concern an awful lot of people. Over a quarter of a million emails were sent to MPs in the last year on food standards, so we should be very aware of that, as indeed we should be of standards in agriculture and general trade. The role of Parliament in scrutinising deals comes up a lot in correspondence, so I will raise that, too. ActionAid has pointed out, very valuably, that the fallout from covid-19 has shone a new light on the disproportionate impact of trade policies on women and girls, who comprise the majority of unpaid carers. It has had a particular impact on women and girls in the global south and has affected the work of women in trade. When trade is considered, we should think of all of humanity, and particularly the half of us who are of a different gender.

Scrutiny is indeed a very good thing. Let us think about this. With a lack of scrutiny, which Brexiteer thought that they were making the EU bureaucrat king over the UK's export trade? But that is what has happened, as the shellfish guys and girls, and other exporters, will tell us. Much to the frustration of many in the shellfish sector, we have the EU bureaucrat with the clipboard,

demanding five or six more bits of paper before things can move, where once they moved freely. And it is not just them, but exporters in general. From July, they will be met by not just the EU bureaucrat, but another set of bureaucrats coming in as quasi-monarchs—the bureaucrats of the UK—and importers will be hit as well. The lack of scrutiny was probably one of the reasons why it came as a late dawn for many that the UK trade bloc is now smaller than the UK—quite an achievement for Brexit.

We move towards scrutiny in a bit more depth in amendment 5. My Committee had difficulty with the Japan agreement because of the time we had at the end for scrutiny and the experts we could share it with. I would have raised this concern earlier in Parliament had I been able to, but of course then there was no virtual Parliament. The access we had to negotiators was very interesting. We usually got the debonair, bland kind of guys at the top when we wanted the guys at the coalface who were negotiating during the trade deal—but that did not happen. Information we got during the briefings did not bear much relation to the matters that came up at the end, such as UK negotiators setting the principle of playing second fiddle to the EU when it came to tariff rate quotas in relation to Japan.

The UK boasts that it is doing 63 more trade deals. What it is doing is rolling over trade deals, and it is not actually getting any GDP increase from that. It is worth considering the numbers, because in the flowery language that is often thrown around on this, the numbers talk most. The cost of Brexit at the moment is 4.9% of UK GDP; it is costly. No trade deal that the UK has made or signed so far is recovering this 4.9% damage. The Japan trade deal was touted as being a 0.07% gain. To put this in context so that people understand, let us call that £4.90. The Japan trade deal was reported as giving us back 7p of that damage, but in fact it was not, because the UK was already trading under the trade deal that the EU had with Japan, so the net gain was, in effect, zero. The UK Government had not done the numbers comparison between the two, which was disappointing. Again, the need for scrutiny is large.

When it comes to the best trade deal we can get—the American trade deal—that is only going to give the UK about a 20p increase on the £4.90, comparatively, that is lost. We need 24-and-a-half times such trade agreements to make up the damage. As America has a quarter of the world's GDP, that effectively means finding seven or eight planets we can drive lorries to, or ship containers on boats to, to counteract the GDP damage that Brexit has done, so clearly it ain't going to happen. The trade deals that we are doing need to be looked at responsibly and carefully. Incidentally, on the American side, the GDP gain for them is only 0.02%, or 2p. I am sure that the new Biden Administration will have bits of paper showing other priorities for greater economic growth, before a trade deal with the United Kingdom. Again, that scrutiny could have stopped us misleading ourselves.

On Amendment 3, I think everybody considers that to be the right thing. It is just that if the FTAs are suspended, do we then go back to trading on WTO rules, and when does that happen? Surely something stronger needs to be in place on that.

The best of all trade deals available is the one we have just walked away from. If the UK wants to increase GDP by 4.9%, there is the single market and the customs union, and that will help our shellfish guys as well. Tapadh leibh, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): You are still smiling, Angus. We now go down to a four-minute limit.

Katherine Fletcher (South Ribble) (Con) [V]: Let me speak to the Lords amendment tabled in the name of Lord Alton. I join colleagues in utterly condemning the human rights abuses in Xinjiang with the Uyghurs. They are awful; it shames the perpetrators and to put it bluntly they should stop, immediately. However, like many colleagues, I am concerned about subcontracting Government policy to a bunch of unelected judges and lawyers. We cannot, as a Government, put ourselves in the position, however noble the intent, of allowing an agreement by a democratically elected Government with another Government to be struck down or put in jeopardy by a court, no matter how morally correct the case may be and how much I would personally agree with it. I say this because trade is just too important to our people—to the businesses and communities of South Ribble, Lancashire and beyond.

We heard recently in this House about global Britain—quite right. This Government are creating opportunities. We had 60-odd trade deals signed last year and there are more under negotiation. These are brilliant times. Instead of involving the courts, we should put all our focus on encouraging and supporting small businesses and breaking down barriers to trade. We should do everything we can as a Government and strain every sinew to encourage small businesses to trade globally, exporting their goods and services.

Practically, I am calling on the Government to use and build on their brilliant work in this area to further the take-up of this challenge in two main areas. The first is practical help. If somebody is thinking about exporting and they put “How to export” into Google, they get a list of nonsense. We need simple, clear “how to” guidelines to get people started and to build their confidence so that they believe that this is something for them. We need to invest in start-up units at affordable rates to make sure that somebody with a great idea or somebody wanting to expand is not getting caught with huge capital costs up front. Let us make exporting the everyday thing it so easily is, as I know from my own experience.

Secondly, we need to address the emotions of pride and ambition, and community pride. If a business person starts exporting and they create a job for somebody in their community because of it, the whole pub should buy them a drink, because what they are doing is on a par with the amazing community spirit that we have seen during these covid times of volunteers. They are doing a community service and they should be celebrated. Let us have a national award scheme for businesses that start exporting, and let us give them a plaque to put up on their business's wall, “Here resides a great British exporter”.

I will oppose the Lords amendments today because I do not think this is the right place, but I welcome this whole Trade Bill. Ultimately, I believe that global Britain wins arguments against repressive regimes by proudly sharing how our way is better for all of our peoples.

Alex Sobel (Leeds North West) (Lab/Co-op): We were told that we were going to take back control and we were going to ensure our sovereignty, and that to do that, we must be allowed a say on the rules and standards by which we are governed—to be rule makers, not rule

[Alex Sobel]

takers. These are phrases we have heard many times over the last few years, and these amendments coming back from the Lords today will do precisely that—give our sovereign Parliament a say over any trade agreements made by the Executive.

When we were members of the European Union, our MEPs had, on any trade deal negotiated, a guaranteed debate and vote in the European Parliament, and if a trade deal was not deemed acceptable, it could be rejected. Why would we now accept a lesser say in this Parliament? Our constituents expect representation. It is not just in Europe, but in Japan and the United States that they have higher standards.

I welcome President Biden's inauguration tomorrow, and he will be working with a new Senate and a new House. The new Congress will enjoy scrutiny of its trade deals, but without these amendments, we will not. Before negotiations, Congress can see and vote on general objectives, which are then published for public consultation. Once negotiations are complete, the agreement must then be ratified by Congress. Why would we hold ourselves to a lesser standard than that?

I know these principles have wide cross-Bench and public support, including from the National Farmers Union, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Greener UK, the CBI, Which? and so on—we should pass Lords amendment 1. However, that is not the only amendment in front of us today. Half a million people have signed a petition calling on the Government to protect our food standards in law. Lords amendment 6 provides that

“a Minister of the Crown ensures as far as possible that a future trade agreement is consistent with United Kingdom levels of statutory protection”

for food standards, as well as animal welfare, employment and welfare standards, and environmental protections.

If this year has taught us anything, it is that we need to ensure that we do not have a race to the bottom. We must keep our qualities and standards, and we cannot leave the quality of our food on the table in any trade negotiation. In addition, we need a robust TAC that defends public health, protects the environment and ensures the future of our farming communities. As president of COP26, one of the weapons in our armoury for a binding agreement is trade deals, and we would not want to have trade pulling one way and diplomacy another.

Finally, I come to Lords amendments 2 and 3, and the many excellent speeches from around this Chamber on human rights and democracy. We have a responsibility to people across the globe who are suffering tyranny and genocide. While others have mentioned the impact that these amendments will have in relation to the Uyghurs, they would also be powerful in challenging transactions in Hong Kong as well as human rights abuses by several other countries, such as Egypt.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) made an excellent speech about Cameroon, and the suppression of the Anglophone people there. We have signed a trade agreement with Cameroon that we have not yet seen, which is quite

unbelievable. We have future trade negotiations with Indonesia. The Department for International Trade met the Indonesians in November. Future trade discussions must take into account the horrific human rights abuses in West Papua, which many universities have classified as a genocide. We need only look at the current beating and intimidation of voters and Opposition politicians in Uganda to know that situations emerging around the world are important to consider in future trade negotiations.

3.30 pm

There is not time to cover in detail all the amendments that I will vote for, as many others wish to speak and time is limited, but this is a defining moment in our history. The Brexit referendum in 2016 was divisive, but no one voted to lessen our standards and safeguards and no one voted to dilute our democracy. We need to pass the Lords amendments so that we can continue to be a beacon of light and hope across the world, championing the human rights of all people.

Mr Tobias Ellwood (Bournemouth East) (Con): I am an internationalist. I came into politics to encourage Britain to play a more than influential role on the international stage. We certainly have a track record of building alliances and stepping forward when other nations hesitate as a force for good, but the world is changing fast: power bases are shifting and threats are diversifying and, indeed, intensifying. What the debate illustrates is a temporary absence in clarity about what we now stand for, what we believe in and what we are willing to defend. Those are the basic benchmarks that frame our international standing, and they can all be summed up in the absence of an integrated review. We await the Government's defence, security and foreign policy review—to give it its full name—which is the critical statement of intent that defines our ambitions on the international stage, assesses the current and emerging threats and gives clarity on how our soft and hard power capabilities should be upgraded. Without that, the term global Britain lacks direction, and there is no strategic or doctrinal clarity over how to approach the geopolitical challenges posed not least by China.

International opinion on China is clearly changing, following its conduct in suppressing the pandemic's outbreak, challenging security laws in Hong Kong and continued militarisation of the South China sea as well as, more widely, snaring ever more countries in debt through its One Belt, One Road programme and telecoms programmes. The Foreign Secretary broke new ground last week by speaking so robustly about China's breaches in human rights, with over a million Uyghurs in political re-education camps, extensive use of surveillance targeting minorities and systematic restrictions on the freedom of religion. That came on the back of the Government's changes to telecoms policy to remove high-risk vendors from our critical national infrastructure.

We must not lose momentum. For too long, the west bit its tongue as China ignored international trade norms and exercised human rights abuses while we still hoped that it would mature into a responsible international citizen. That clearly is not going to happen. China is on a geopolitical collision course with the west, taking full advantage of our wobbly international rules-based order while we remain in denial.

Today, President Trump is in his last day of office, and President-elect Biden has made it clear that his foreign policy objectives are to recommit to building western alliances and to attempt to address the geopolitical challenges posed by China. The Lords amendment is about offering strategic clarity directed not just at China and standing up to its human rights abuses, but at the United States, our closest ally. This is an opportunity for Britain to craft a post-Brexit international role as we assume the G7 presidency.

The world watched and hesitated when genocide took place in Rwanda and, indeed, in Syria. Let us not hesitate again. Let us have the moral courage to stand tall on what we believe in and what we are willing to defend. It saddens me that I am having to rebel today to encourage my Government to take the moral high ground. It should be our default position.

Sammy Wilson: I rise to support Lords amendment 8, in relation to Northern Ireland, and Lords amendment 3, in relation to acts of genocide. First of all, I will deal with Lords amendment 8. I believe that it is a necessity that we have in the Bill a commitment that Northern Ireland will not be excluded from the benefits of any trade agreements that this country reaches with the rest of the world. People in Northern Ireland are still reeling from the impact that the withdrawal agreement, and particularly the Northern Ireland protocol, have had on their economy and indeed on their preferences and their ability to purchase goods from other parts of the United Kingdom.

Despite some of the efforts made to undo and mitigate the impact of the protocol, it is clear that the withdrawal agreement that we reached with the EU will have a detrimental impact on the Northern Ireland economy. Lords amendment 8 seeks to ensure that, when we enter into future trade agreements with other parts of the world, the impact and benefit of those agreements are not reduced as a result of the protocol. A commitment that no agreement can be ratified until it is ensured that Northern Ireland will have unfettered access to the GB market and services coming from GB is very important.

Lords amendment 3 concerns genocide. I have listened to the arguments—that we are handing control over to the courts; that we are diminishing the role of Parliament; that such a situation would be unworkable—but I believe that, first of all, this country has an important duty to send out a message when entering into trade agreements with other parts of the world. That if the Governments of those countries are guilty of abusing their population or seeking to wipe out certain sections of their population, we will not do business with them. We have talked about taking a lead on the global stage now that we have left the EU. Well, here is an opportunity to make clear in legislation where we stand on this issue and that if Governments wish to do business with the fifth biggest economy in the world, we expect certain standards of them.

I do not accept that we would be giving too much power to judges. First of all, this is a very specific power and not the thin end of the wedge, as has been suggested, and if we wished to give more power to the judges, we would have to amend the legislation. We are simply saying, “Look, the only body capable of making a judgment about whether genocide has occurred is the courts.” In fact, it would be wrong for Parliament to have that power. It would be abused, and our arguments

against genocide could be diminished, because people could say we made them only for political reasons, or because the majority in this Parliament do not like those people or have some other axe to grind. I therefore think it is important that that power is in the Bill.

Assurance needs to be given to people in Northern Ireland that we still remain part of the United Kingdom and will have the benefits of United Kingdom trade deals, and assurance still needs to be given to people across the world who are being persecuted. The best way of doing that is to include both amendments in the Bill.

Anthony Mangnall: It is a pleasure to speak on this Bill. I rise to speak against Lords amendments 1 and 3. I start by saying how sorry I am that I will not be in the same Lobby as my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith) and my hon. Friend the Member for Wealden (Ms Ghani). I have gone into battle with them in the past and hope to do so again.

At the start of the Minister’s statement, he made a point about the opportunities that Parliament would have to ensure that human rights were included in trade deals, and that mechanisms could be provided to ensure that every trade deal had the proper level of parliamentary scrutiny. I would welcome his going further—and intervening, if he must—and telling us how Parliament will be able effectively to ensure that every Member can scrutinise, debate and discuss these issues.

Greg Hands: I thank my hon. Friend for that specific request. I think it is fair to say that this House enjoys significant expertise and experience on questions of human rights, which the Government would seek to take advantage of. I hear various Members and Chairs of Select Committees and others with great experience in this space, and the Government are absolutely committed to making sure that knowledge is utilised and to exploring how we can make sure that the views of colleagues are heard and considered on these issues in relation to our future trade agreements.

Anthony Mangnall: I thank the Minister for his comment, which I would echo in terms of the scrutiny that the International Trade Committee, through the reports we publish, can give each and every one of the trade deals that comes before us.

What is the intent here? We are trying to address the injustices that people face around the world, from the Uyghurs to the Yazidis to the Rohingyas.

Emily Thornberry: Does the hon. Gentleman remember giving any scrutiny to the roll-over deal with Egypt, given that Egypt is one of the worst human rights abusers?

Anthony Mangnall: The right hon. Lady is very quick to criticise the fact that many of the deals that we now have are continuity arrangements from the EU. She complained last week that the deals took too long to do and did not include enough detail. The purpose of these deals is not to be the end point but the start point for the future relationship that we wish to have with those countries.

I go back to the point about the intent of amendment (a) in lieu of Lords amendment 3. The intent for every single one of us should be to eradicate genocide and to

[Anthony Mangnall]

do everything we can to prevent human rights injustices. Instead, we have an amendment that will do grave injustice not only to the trade deals, but will still essentially see countries trade with one another. My right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green suggested that this non-advisory trade amendment was advisory. He makes the point that we will be able to take the advice of the High Court but potentially ignore it. That is not what is written in the wording.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: My hon. Friend is completely wrong. It is absolutely clear that that remains the right of the Government, and I read out what the Government spokesman said in the Lords. If they wish, they can change it—I do not say whether they want to or not, but it is in there; it is our right as Parliament to do that.

Anthony Mangnall: The letter of the law and what amendment (a) in lieu says is that international bilateral trade agreements are revoked if the High Court of England and Wales makes a preliminary determination.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: Will my hon. Friend give way?

Anthony Mangnall: I will carry on, but my right hon. Friend can come back to me later on. We need to get to the point where we can help those countries where genocide is being committed. That is not done by a trade deal. What do the people who are suffering expect? Is it the High Court deciding whether or not to sign a trade deal? They expect the international community to be engaged and to take action, and that is what we must seek to do. This is global Britain, and global Britain must reach out to its allies to create new institutions and ensure that we take action where appropriate. If we are unhappy with the current international landscape, let us seek to create new international bodies with like-minded colleagues, whether it be Five Eyes or North America. Those are the things that we must do, and we must be ambitious in doing so. I believe to my heart that the Government have the right intent of doing that.

I will speak briefly on Lords amendment 1 on scrutiny. We have heard much from the Opposition about how the Bill does not give any scrutiny to the trade agreements, but that is simply not true. The whole purpose of what is going on in the International Trade Committee, of CRaG and of having debates in this Chamber is to be able to debate such agreements. Frankly, to stand up and say that Parliament is given no time is not an acceptable line of argument. While the Committee had less time to scrutinise the Japanese-UK trade deal, that is now being amended. Ministers have proven themselves particularly willing to listen and have accepted a checklist of parameters before putting forward a trade agreement in the future.

Mr Djanogly: Does my hon. Friend accept that under amendment 5—the Lansley amendment—if a Committee of this House says there should be a debate on a trade deal under CRaG, which he supports, that should happen?

Anthony Mangnall: I revert to what the Minister said earlier about the House being able to have more scrutiny through the International Trade Committee's individual report on a trade deal, and then a future trade debate can happen around the deal, whether it is between the

UK and America or whoever. There should be multiple debates on these trade deals, so that we can all feel that the scrutiny has taken place. That is important, and I do not believe it to be completely against what others are arguing. [Interruption.] The right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) is chuntering from a sedentary position. In her entire speech, she said absolutely nothing about the EU-China deal. She seems completely content to ridicule every continuity agreement that we have come to. The purpose of what we are doing here today, what we have done previously and what we will do in the future is to enable us to scrutinise those trade deals, so that the Committee may report back, and to ensure that Back Benchers from every part of this country are able to decide what our future is when it comes to those deals.

As time is ticking away, I will conclude. I appreciate hon. Members' intention in supporting Lords amendment 3, but we can do better than that and we can go farther. No one in this House supports genocide. No one in this House supports the violation of human rights. So let us look to different ways in which we can effectively engage the international community and show leadership.

3.45 pm

Ms Lyn Brown (West Ham) (Lab) [V]: I am grateful to my right hon. Friend the Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) for speaking so exceptionally well for us on the amendments.

Tonight I will support the amendments protecting our NHS, child safety, parliamentary scrutiny, our environment and animal welfare, but I shall use my short time this afternoon to speak on the amendments on the most serious human rights abuses and genocide, which is clearly the most heinous crime of all. Those Lords amendments would help us to ensure that our trade policy was in line with our words—and if not now, when? Today, I have time to give voice to just one example, and I want to make it about the Uyghur people in Xinjiang in China. In 2006, tired of racism, Gulbahar fled with her family to France. Ten years later, she was told that she had to return to sign important documents. She returned, and was immediately detained. Her daughter had been at a Uyghur rights demonstration in France, and Gulbahar was therefore branded a terrorist. She was imprisoned in a re-education camp and endured more than two years of humiliating, terrifying, torturous abuse and violence from the Chinese state; and she was forcibly sterilised. She came to understand that the strategy was

“not to kill us in cold blood, but to make us slowly disappear. So slowly that no one would notice.”

Finally, she was found innocent on the trumped-up charges and released.

Such practices are part of a systematic abuse of human rights aimed at millions of Uyghur Muslims. Perhaps, legally, it still is not classified as genocide, but the Uyghur people deserve a fair hearing. We must hear them. I believe our courts must be empowered. If the very worst abuses are going on, it is clear that our trade policy must change. We have heard from holocaust survivors about the importance of that change, and I believe it is about living up to our words when we say “never again”. Every year, we make that commitment for Holocaust Memorial Day. I hope that on that day, next week, the UK can say that it is acting decisively to give those words substance.

Today we should do the right thing, because if we do not, tomorrow we will certainly be judged. Let us not be found wanting in our duty to act.

Mark Menzies (Fylde) (Con) [V]: It is a great privilege to be called in this debate. I spoke on Second Reading, but today I am speaking in opposition to the Lords amendments. Before I say anything else, I should make it clear that I am a huge supporter and a friend of Lord Alton, a person of tremendous integrity, and I respect what those who are supporting the amendments are seeking to do, but are we really saying that on genocide—the most heinous crime imaginable—the Government's trade policy should be reliance on the ability to go to a court? Surely to goodness, if we in this House believe that genocide is occurring, we should be acting a lot more swiftly and a lot more decisively than simply seeking the opinion of judges. It is this Parliament and this House that should be acting, and forcing a Government of any persuasion to take action against any country in the world engaged in genocide.

I urge colleagues to think carefully about what they are seeking to do. What would happen if Parliament decided that genocide was occurring and action had to be taken, but the courts felt that the bar for what determined genocide was not met? What action would be taken then? Would that tie the hands of Government? Would it mean that action, whether on trade or otherwise, was constrained? That would be one of the concerns with the amendment. I do not believe that supporting this measure would, to use the words of my right hon. Friend the Member for Bournemouth East (Mr Ellwood), give us moral courage. The opposite is true. It would allow some people to say, "It is now up to the courts to decide. It is not a matter for Parliament." If we believe in moral courage, it is for Parliament to show it, take action, challenge the Government, and hold them to account when we believe that genocide or any other significant human rights abuses are occurring, whether in relation to trade or anything else.

I am also very much reassured by the contribution from the Minister for Trade Policy. As a member of the Select Committee on International Trade, I can say that we will use all the powers available to us—and will seek more powers as time rolls on—to make sure there is scrutiny, and that Parliament carries out its role and looks at continuity or roll-over agreements. This is not a matter of accepting continuity agreements as they stand. As those agreements move from being continuity roll-over agreements, as they are now in most cases, to something country-specific or trade bloc-specific, this House absolutely needs more of a voice in making sure that nothing in there is detrimental to the British people.

Above all, it is important that this Bill goes through; after all, it is about ensuring that trade takes place and the prosperity of our constituents is protected. More importantly, it is about vulnerable countries around the world—ones that are desperate to trade with the UK in order to enrich their populations and take themselves out of poverty. It is really important that this Bill goes through to allow that to happen. It has my support.

Layla Moran (Oxford West and Abingdon) (LD) [V]: The Liberal Democrats will today vote to put human rights at the centre of our country's trade policy. Our party has a long history of leading the way in upholding

human rights, from our opposition to South African apartheid to the late Paddy Ashdown's role in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with colleagues in all parts of this House on that frontline again today.

The world is watching us, and we have a choice: to make a bold, confident statement about our fundamental commitment to human rights or accept this Government's buccaneering approach to trade, in which effective scrutiny, rights and freedoms are trumped by self-interest. We of course back Lords amendment 2, which requires the Government to conduct due diligence and report to the House on the human rights implications of trade deals, but I wish to focus in particular on Lords amendment 3, the so-called genocide amendment.

Is there anything that blackens humanity's soul more than genocide? Edmund Burke famously said:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

For too long, in cases of suspected genocide, despite many good men and women raising the alarm, nothing has been exactly what happens, and it is time to change that. I believe that what is happening to the Uyghurs in Xinjiang is genocide. Of course, it is not the only instance of genocide being committed in the world right now, but it is not for me or for this Government to make the legal determination; that is quite rightly a matter for the courts, but the Chinese Government, by virtue of their position, regularly block routes to such determinations, and so we tie ourselves up in knots while the perpetrators of these gross atrocities go largely unchallenged, leaving victims and survivors without justice.

The UK needs a practical mechanism for fulfilling its international legal obligations on genocide, and Lords amendment 3 provides that. It is based on the world as it is, not the world as we hope it to be. Allowing UK judges to make an advisory, preliminary determination is a necessary step if the UK is to lead by example and meet its obligations. That determination can then be taken up in international courts, but we will have made our position clear.

The Government say that they would revoke an agreement well before we reached that stage. If so, why not just accept the amendment? It does not prohibit them from doing that. A number of colleagues have talked about Parliament taking action, challenging Government and standing up on this issue. Well, in 2016, Parliament voted unanimously to recognise the Yazidi genocide, and the Government ignored it. Can the Minister tell us what exactly has changed since then?

This amendment is backed by the International Bar Association, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Muslim Council of Britain and many others, and it has support on both sides of the House. Never again should we wring our hands in horror after the fact, saying we should and could have done more. "Never again"—words we use every Holocaust Remembrance Day, and words that we today have a chance to live up to.

Dr Neil Hudson (Penrith and The Border) (Con) [V]: I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in the debate on this important piece of legislation. I welcome this Trade Bill, and believe it is vital for our country as we move forward as an independent trading nation and navigate the turbulent economic situation that we face

[Dr Neil Hudson]

as a result of the global coronavirus pandemic. Existing trade agreements and the future ones we can sign will be crucial in our recovery from the coronavirus shock to the economy, and will give us the platform to become a major independent global trader. It will say to the world, “The UK is open for business; come trade with us.”

As I have said in the House on many occasions, it is so important that we uphold our high animal health and welfare and farming standards in existing and future trade deals. As an MP and veterinary surgeon, I was gutted that we were not able to secure that in the Agriculture Act 2020. We missed a real opportunity for the UK to make the powerful statement that we can be a beacon in these areas—to say, “If you wish to trade with us, you must come up to our high standards in animal health and welfare and farming.” I will continue to stand up for the farmers in Penrith and The Border and across Cumbria and the wider UK. We have the best farmers, and produce great food using high standards. We should be very proud of that.

I welcome the fact that the Government listened to colleagues on both sides of the House, to Minette Batters and the NFU, and to the British public, and created the Trade and Agriculture Commission and put it on a statutory footing. However, we can go further with parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals, including the option for the House and relevant Select Committees to amend and block deals, not just delay them. Accordingly, I will be supporting amendments to increase parliamentary scrutiny; to uphold our high animal welfare, food production and environmental standards in trade deals; and to further bolster the Trade and Agriculture Commission.

I am pleased that the Government have repeatedly assured the House that products such as chlorinated chicken and hormone-treated beef will remain banned in the UK. However, in drafting trade deals, a practical solution would be to reaffirm that ban, and specify other banned products, such as ractopamine-fed pork, excessive use of antimicrobials, use of bovine somatotropin and use of growth promoters. If bans on those products were written into animal welfare chapters in trade deals, that would make it clear that these products are off the table, allowing other acceptable products to be traded. That would drive up animal welfare standards globally. From speaking to prospective trading partners, I know that this approach could work and be acceptable; they would merely exclude these products from shipments to the UK. I hope the Government will continue to listen and move on these issues, which are important to my constituents and folk across the United Kingdom.

I truly believe that we have the potential to be an outward-looking, ethical, progressive country with a trade policy that matches that, and I believe that this Conservative Government have the appetite to do that. Maintaining our high standards in animal health and welfare, farming and food production is pivotal. As this Trade Bill completes its journey, I wish it well.

4 pm

Mick Whitley (Birkenhead) (Lab) [V]: I understand that we are pressed for time as many Members wish to speak on this important matter, so I will endeavour to be brief.

In the coming months and years, the Government will seek a range of free trade agreements which will profoundly change our country and the lives of our constituents. That is obviously a matter of great interest to my constituents, and I have been inundated in recent weeks with messages urging me to speak in this debate. The view of the people of Birkenhead is clear: they do not want these trade deals to be agreed behind closed doors and signed in secret. They understand that the only way to safeguard our health service, maintain our world-leading food standards and protect our environment is to ensure robust parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals by elected representatives. This is one of the opportunities that this House has to discuss the 10 continuity agreements that the Government have signed since the new year.

The experience of the past few weeks has shown that we simply cannot depend on the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 to guarantee parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals. I am therefore glad that this Bill has returned from the other place amended by Lords Purvis and Stevenson. Their amendments are badly needed and would go a long way to addressing the democratic deficit at the heart of the UK’s trade policy, so I hope that when this debate concludes, Members from across the House will join me in voting for the amendment to guarantee Parliament’s right to debate and approve trade deals.

Ms Ghani: I rise to speak in support of Lords amendment 3—the genocide amendment. It is the only vote on genocide on the table today. I regret that the compromise amendment that we tabled has been rejected.

Let us remember that we are talking about genocide: the systematic destruction of an entire people. It is a threshold that is so hard to reach because it is the most heinous of all crimes—the forced sterilisation of women, forced labour and re-education camps for hundreds of thousands of children. The Board of Deputies of British Jews stated that it is reminded of the holocaust when it thinks of the plight of the Uyghurs; it cannot get any worse than that.

Members across the House have a very simple choice to make today. We can, by voting in favour of Lord Alton’s amendment 3, empower the UK to fulfil its UN obligations under the genocide convention and ensure that we do not offer advantageous trade deals to genocidal states. It really is that simple. The UN continues to fail to recognise that genocides are happening until it is too late. The UN and the Security Council are in a state of frozen paralysis, held hostage by Russia and China and incapable of holding genocidal states to account.

Against the amendment, the Minister and some of my hon. Friends argue that we should not outsource trade policy to the UK courts, and that the proper place to make decisions about genocide is in international courts. In practice, that means that we have to accept that foreign states will always hold a veto over our determination of genocide. I do not accept that that is taking back control. I do not accept that our courts are not skilled enough to determine breaches of international law. I do not accept that the Bill as drafted gives Parliament sufficient say over whether states that we wish to strike trade deals with are committing genocide.

I understand the concerns about Executive power, and the role of Parliament versus the courts, which is why I tabled an amendment with colleagues in lieu of

Lords amendment 3 to address those concerns. Courts will judge, Parliament will opine and Ministers will decide. Yet that amendment was rejected. If the Government believe that this is still an unacceptable derogation of power, what is the alternative and what are the Government's objections? If we do not pass the amendment today, we will be outsourcing all future decisions on genocide to Russia and China. We now have an independent trade policy after leaving the EU, and Brexit was a vote of hope and optimism and for Britain to play its part in leading the world, so why would we want to use our new-found freedom to trade with states that commit and profit from genocide? Britain is surely better than that.

Tomorrow, Joe Biden becomes the President of the United States, our closest ally. Today is Britain's moment to blaze a trail and showcase global leadership on trade and international law. We can all talk about our noblest values, but we cannot do so while allowing the vilest of crimes to continue. We have an amendment. We can make a stand against genocide. We can uphold our United Nations obligations and ensure that we do not trade with genocidal states, or we can do nothing, and to do nothing is a counsel of despair.

Jonathan Edwards (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (Ind) [V]: It is a pleasure to speak briefly in this debate in support of the amendments made in the other place. It is also a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for Wealden (Ms Ghani) who made a very passionate and convincing case for supporting Lords amendment 3, to which I will refer later.

Lords amendment 1 would introduce vital democratic safeguards into international trade policy by ensuring that the Executive cannot operate unilaterally. It would strengthen the hand of Parliament without undermining the ability of the UK Government to conduct negotiations as they see fit. In reality, the negotiations with the European Union have clearly shown that trade agreements can have far-reaching consequences for people's everyday lives, from food standards to workers' rights, from environmental legislation to the impact on our public services. It is to be welcomed then that Lords amendment 1 would require the UK Government to outline their negotiating objectives to Parliament prior to the commencement of any trade negotiations and to secure the agreement of both Houses before a deal is ratified, giving Members of Parliament a meaningful role in setting trade policy.

There was much debate during earlier proceedings on the Bill about how domestic democratic empowerment would strengthen the hand of the UK Government when it comes to trade negotiations. That was certainly my experience during a brief visit to the United States many years ago to scrutinise the proposed transatlantic trade and investment partnership between the EU and the US, where we were reminded that there were certain matters, such as access to food markets, which were non-negotiable for Congress.

Although I support Lords amendment 1, I would have liked to see it go even further in respect of strengthening the role of the Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish Governments and respective Parliaments. That would not be without precedent. In the EU, every single member state has a veto over its international trade deals as well as sub-national Governments such as Wallonia in Belgium. Although I accept that the UK Government have a

direct responsibility for trade policy, I believe that a world of constitutional trouble awaits us unless there are statutory safeguards for the respective countries of the British state. I therefore urge the British Government not only to retain Lords amendment 1, but to go a step further by giving the devolved Parliaments a veto on trade agreements.

I wish briefly to pledge my support for Lords amendment 3—the so-called genocide amendment—which several right hon. and hon. Members have supported this afternoon. Effectively, it couples international trade policy with the promotion of human rights.

Lords amendment 4 would place protections for the NHS on a legislative basis. I also support Lords amendment 6, which sets out to protect a range of regulatory standards such as those for food, animal welfare and workers' rights. Given the increasing noises coming from the Government Benches about a bonfire of standards, acceptance of this amendment would go a long way to allaying fears that our trade policy would be used as a regressive Trojan horse.

I am disappointed to see that the Government are seeking to remove provisions from Lords amendment 9 that strengthen the Trade and Agriculture Commission. Again, I ask Ministers to include representatives from the devolved Governments on the commission and introduce scrutiny protocols for the commission with the Welsh Senedd, the Scottish Parliament and the Northern Ireland Assembly.

Richard Graham (Gloucester) (Con) [V]: A lot in this Trade Bill is to be welcomed, including its reinforced commitments to an agriculture commission, which has been welcomed by the farming sector and the NFU, as well as more scrutiny by the International Trade Committee. In my 10th year as trade envoy for three Prime Ministers, I believe that the Bill is further evidence of our commitment to take forward UK trade and investment across the world as a key part of global Britain, and that is not just an idle slogan, for international trade and investment secures jobs across our country, funds our welfare and social justice, and requires engagement globally.

Today we face the so-called genocide amendment, which would propose to replicate the role of the UN and the International Criminal Court because of issues with how that process is currently functioning. The amendment would—as the right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) clearly illustrated when she spoke about both Cameroon and Egypt—be used by many Members who wish to expand the creation of such a court to have a much wider role on human rights issues and their implications for our trade arrangements, including those already signed, as well as those proposed.

Earlier we heard another Opposition Member, the hon. Member for Leeds North West (Alex Sobel), refer to human rights abuses in Indonesia—a country that has moved further and faster in the development of an open democratic society over the last decade than almost anywhere else I can think of—so let us be in no doubt as to where some would take this amendment. We would find, in an imperfect world, that such a court would be used to limit and constrain our free trade severely, which neither the Labour party nor the SNP was ever in favour of anyway. These are issues that should be decided by our Government and, above all, this Parliament.

[Richard Graham]

Let me briefly address the Uyghur question, for Lords amendment 3 in the first place is aimed squarely at the People's Republic of China. Many years ago, I almost died in Xinjiang, crossing its great Taklamakan desert. What has happened there for many decades, but with greatly increased severity since 2009, cannot conceivably be supported by anyone in the United Kingdom, but I do not believe that this amendment, if implemented, would achieve anything at all for the Uyghurs or Xinjiang. We should not be asking judges to make political judgments. It is for this place to decide what our relationship with China should be. Over the last decade, we have veered from golden era to worst era in a short period of time. We have to find that balance, and the Trade Bill is not the place for it. It should be part of the integrated review on foreign policy and defence that we await shortly. Meanwhile, I support the Government strongly in opposing an amendment that would subcontract our scrutiny of human rights and of our trade relationships to a new court.

Florence Eshalomi (Vauxhall) (Lab/Co-op) [V]: I am pleased to see this Bill return to the House in a much better state than when it left. Taken together, the Lords amendments will ensure that our trade deal lives up to the standards that the public rightly expect, both at home and in regard to our international obligations. I will focus my comments on Lords amendment 3 to 5, because they address issues that Vauxhall residents are concerned about.

I heard the Minister's opening statement, seeking to reassure us that the NHS is safe, but I am not reassured. My late mother, as a sufferer of sickle cell disease, received excellent care from King's College Hospital, and in later life as a renal dialysis patient. My two children were born locally, in St Thomas' Hospital—the same hospital that treated our Prime Minister during the height of the coronavirus pandemic. My constituents do not support the creeping marketisation of the NHS and neither do I, so I urge Members to vote to ensure the amendment is protected on our statute book.

Lords amendment 3 focuses on the extreme crime of genocide and obliges the Government to revoke any future trade agreement with countries found responsible for it by the UK High Court. Our trade policy sends a message to the rest of the world about who we are and what we stand for. Surely no one in this House wants us to continue to trade with countries where genocide occurs, so will the Government reconsider their opposition to Lords amendment 3 and support it today?

4.15 pm

Finally, we all recognise that Parliament is sovereign when it comes to lawmaking. It is the cornerstone of our democracy and vital for legitimacy and accountability, yet in the past month alone we have seen numerous trade agreements come into effect without proper parliamentary scrutiny. Lords amendment 5 improves the procedure for ratification and prevents important domestic safeguards on issues such as food safety from being undermined by external trade agreements. I hope every Member will reflect on that fact and vote for the amendment to ensure that our trade deals are subject to the proper procedures, debates and approvals as a matter of parliamentary right, not as a concession and an afterthought from the Government.

Mr Djanogly: The Bill was intended to provide a limited scrutiny process for EU trade deals that we wished to roll over for the UK to operate post Brexit. That objective has now largely been achieved, which means that if this Bill is to be of any meaningful scrutiny benefit it must now address scrutiny of future trade deals, including with roll-over countries, and any proposed with countries such as the US, India and China. If we fail to do that, we will have to fall back on a pre-EU, 1920s-based system of allowing limited recourse to debates, whereby a trade deal can be delayed but not stopped and then only on ratification but not before signature. This system, now contained in the CRaG Act, is inadequate for modern needs and requires reform towards a system of pre-signature parliamentary approval, as is used by our trading counterparts such as the US, the EU and Japan.

Lords amendment 1, from Lord Purvis, based on my Report stage new clause 4, is the proposed way of proceeding. It gives Parliament a vote on deals before and after negotiations, and will require the Government to report on any changes to food, health, environment, human rights and equalities standards. It provides for consultation with devolved authorities, but it specifically retains the Government's prerogative powers to commence, conduct and conclude trade negotiations. Lords amendment 1 has the support of all Opposition parties and many Conservative colleagues in both Houses. It has the support of the NFU, the British Medical Association, many environmental, human rights, food standards and data use groups, business concerns, the CBI and so on.

Against that, Ministers complain about loss of prerogative power, but the existing CRaG Act itself restricts such powers. Even if Ministers were to stick with CRaG, they are the only people saying that CRaG does not need reform. Lord Lansley has provided in Lords amendment 5 that if a relevant Committee asks for a ratification debate, the Government must make time for that to happen. Even that mild, common-sense proposal is rebuffed by Ministers. Ministers suggest that a pre-signature vote would make them look less decisive and weaken their hand, but I would suggest that the opposite is actually the case. In the US, negotiations are often strengthened by the Executive suggesting that Congress simply will not accept such and such a proposal.

As things stand, unbelievably, the UK shall have less legislative scrutiny of trade deals than when we were a member of the European Union. Surely that is not what taking back control was all about. The power of approval that was given to MEPs now needs to come back here to Parliament, not to be forgotten about by Ministers. Having proper scrutiny votes will go towards establishing the UK as a modern, democratic, confident international trading nation. We should be embracing that by supporting the Purvis amendment and by voting no to the Government motion to disagree to it.

Paul Girvan (South Antrim) (DUP) [V]: In the House in November 2020, the Secretary of State gave me an assurance from the Dispatch Box that Northern Ireland would have full access to any trade agreements struck by the United Kingdom, and that they would apply to Northern Ireland in the same manner as they do to other parts of the United Kingdom. It is of paramount importance that the Government clarify again the Northern Ireland protocol, which has seriously undermined the promises made by the Prime Minister of unfettered access to our internal markets between all parts of the

United Kingdom. I have serious concerns that any future trade deal will not deliver the level access that the Secretary of State promised.

I would warmly welcome a commitment today from the Government that Northern Ireland will have full and equal access to the trade deals of the United Kingdom. As an example, I want to mention our steel industry, which is predominantly engaged in export. It contributes £3.2 billion to the Northern Ireland economy in transport, manufacturing and engineering. Much of its product has to come from GB and from mainland UK. Unfortunately, tariffs of 25% were going to be imposed on steel. We need clarity on all aspects of the additional costs that are going to be given to Northern Ireland businesses in relation to the additional paperwork that will be required because we have not left on the same terms as the rest of the United Kingdom.

A major player is our agrifood industry, which contributes about £1.5 billion to the Northern Ireland economy. We welcome the support from the House to ensure that our high standards are protected. The United Kingdom leads the world in food standards and in welfare production of food, and we want to ensure that those standards are not lowered, and that other parts of the EU come up to the standards that we require.

On Lord Alton's amendment, we as a party will be supporting Lords amendment 3 on the basis that we believe it will deal with issues such as genocide and those countries that turn a blind eye to human rights issues. It is vital that we have some pre-emptive norms set within the Bill to ensure that we can deal with those in any future trade deals that are brought forward. Northern Ireland basically has not been given the opportunity to benefit from the trade deals that the United Kingdom will benefit from through leaving the EU.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): I know we have had some problems getting through to you, Damian, but I am glad to see that the communications are now working.

Damian Collins (Folkestone and Hythe) (Con) [V]: I will be speaking to Lords amendment 7, tabled by Baroness Kidron, which seeks to protect the rights of children online with regard to the use of their data and the design of services targeted at them. This has been enshrined in UK legislation through the age-appropriate design code—something that Baroness Kidron has been a tireless campaigner for. That world-leading piece of legislation is already influencing the decisions of technology companies on how they design and create tools for young people to use online.

In opening the debate earlier, my right hon. Friend the Minister for Trade Policy told the House that the Government's forthcoming online harms Bill was the correct place to ensure the internet safety of children and all UK citizens. However, I understand why Baroness Kidron moved to insert Lords amendment 7 in the Bill, to ensure that those rights cannot be traded away in the small print of a future agreement. We can easily see how rights granted in international trade agreements on how companies can use data, where they can process it and whether they can be subject to an independent audit of their algorithms could undermine the ability to create and enforce a robust duty of care regime on technology companies to meet their obligations to tackle online harms. In fact, in the trade negotiations between the UK Government and

the outgoing Trump Administration in America, the US negotiators have sought to do just that. President Trump's Government have sought to persuade the UK to trade away digital and data rights as part of securing a deal, as they have done in their agreements with Canada, Mexico and Japan. That would clearly be unacceptable, and I am pleased that Ministers continue to reassure me and others that they would not allow that to happen. Indeed, the UK has objected to those provisions being inserted in the trade agreement. A first positive step from the incoming Biden Administration will be to remove those clauses from the negotiating text.

It is important, though, for us to consider how the House will scrutinise detailed trade negotiations involving data and citizens' and children's rights online. I would not want to see trade agreements becoming the mechanism through which domestic legislation is undermined. In the agricultural and food sectors, the Government have now given a particular role in statute to the Trade and Agriculture Commission to advise Parliament on the impact of future trade deals on food standards and food safety. The Information Commissioner's Office should have the same role on a formal basis to give advice to Parliament on the impact of draft trade agreements with regard to child protection, data sharing and data privacy.

A consumer can make a decision about whether they want to buy goods or not, depending on how they are made. Governments can enter into trade agreements to seek to reduce tariffs on particular goods to boost trade, create jobs and lower costs to consumers. All of those actions can be good things, but the impact of getting trade agreements wrong on data privacy and protection can be hard to see. It is hard to see how someone is exploiting a loophole in a trade agreement to gain improper access to someone's data and to use it in ways to which they would not have consented. That is why it is so important that we safeguard digital rights online.

I will not be voting against the Government tonight on these amendments, but I ask the Minister to consider a formal role for the Information Commissioner to advise Parliament on future trade agreements, and in particular to make sure that they comply with our data protection laws and the age-appropriate design code, to keep children safe online.

Taiwo Owatemi (Coventry North West) (Lab) [V]: I will first talk about Lords amendment 1, pertaining to parliamentary scrutiny. The Bill provides inadequate statutory procedures for parliamentary scrutiny and ratification of trade agreements, and Lords amendment 1 seeks to remedy that. It also ensures parliamentary engagement and scrutiny during the negotiation process and consultations with devolved authorities and means that the Government are obliged to seek approval from both Houses of Parliament before becoming a signatory to any trade deal. It means that colleagues across the House can scrutinise any agreements that impact on our constituents or Britain's reputation and standing on the international stage.

The amendment is important as it ensures that an independent impact assessment is carried out on any proposed trade deal on human rights and equalities, employment and labour and the protection of human, animal or plant life or health, among a whole host of other important markers.

[*Taiwo Owatemi*]

On the back of that, I am also proud to give my support to Lords amendment 2, which ensures that we do not embark on trade agreements with countries that have committed grave human rights abuses. By creating a triple-lock barrier against such agreements, the amendment ensures that we will keep our international and national commitments to respect human rights, guaranteeing that we do not enter trade negotiations with those who seek to undermine human rights principles through actions such as unlawful detention and the unlawful killing of citizens.

Lords amendment 3 sets out in clear terms the UK's determination to abide by human rights principles, standing firmly against the grave human rights abuse of genocide more specifically. By voting against that amendment, the Government will showcase the fact that that a country committing genocide is not of any consequence for the UK when seeking trade deals, which ultimately makes us complicit. The amendment ensures that we do not do business with countries that have a low regard for human life.

I also speak in support of Lords amendment 4, which seeks to protect our NHS and NHS data and safeguards our NHS, particularly in the event of a trade deal with the United States, which is of the utmost importance. The amendment protects NHS patient data against private healthcare corporations. The amendment is crucial, as it prevents the Government from making deals with those who want to undermine the Government's ability to deliver free, universal public health and care services. It sends a strong message that our NHS is not for sale and that this Government are committed to respecting and protecting the long legacy of providing free healthcare to all at the point of use.

Finally, I also support Lords amendment 7, which focuses on protecting children from online harm. The Government have gone so far with the online harms White Paper to outline the actions they are determined to take to protect young people online. The amendment provides another opportunity for the Government to protect young people when they use the internet, particularly when the Government are seeking to embark on trade negotiations with countries that have poor or relaxed online protections.

4.30 pm

Sir Edward Leigh: I think we need to be far more robust about calling out genocide when it takes place. I can do no better than quote our present Prime Minister, writing in the *Financial Times* in 2016, when he criticised the Foreign Office because

“for some baffling reason the Foreign Office still hesitates to use the term genocide”

about the attacks on the Yazidis. In our own lifetimes, we have seen appalling acts of violence based purely on people's ethnicity. We need to be robust.

I was originally attracted to the amendments, particularly as they come from good friends such as Lord Forsyth and Lord Alton. I am grateful to the Minister for having spoken to me earlier today, and to his colleague in the Foreign Office. I listened to every word the Minister said. Although I was attracted to the Alton amendment, I now think there are serious faults with it. It is true that

our efforts to name and shame on genocide and to act on it have been stymied in the international courts. On the one hand, we have said that it is for the courts to decide. On the other, because of the power of veto of major players on the world stage, international courts will not act.

We have to remember that we are Members of Parliament. We are elected. We are the high court of Parliament. It is for elected officials, not court officials, to decide trade policy. Any other approach would be utterly chaotic.

I am a barrister. I know that when we accuse somebody in a court, the defendant has a right to turn up. Do we really think that, if we accused any country—China, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, Egypt—they would agree for a moment to send counsel to defend their position? Look at it from our point of view. Some people around the world think that our human rights record, for instance in Ireland, is not that great. What would we think if we were going to do a trade deal with somebody and some group took us to court in, say, Japan? Would we ever turn up in some Japanese court and defend our position? No, we would think that that would be a fundamental denial of the supremacy of this Parliament. So I do not think that the court route is the right approach.

I listened to the Opposition spokesman, the right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry), and was quite alarmed by what she said. We all know that what is happening to the Uyghurs is quite appalling. We suspect that it is genocide, and we think that if there is any sort of trade deal with China we should question it very closely. But then she started talking about other countries. She started talking about Egypt, Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Where would it all stop? Any trade deal could be bound up for months—years—in the courts, and any group could take the Government to court.

I voted for Brexit to take back control. I am a free trader; I believe in international free trade. I want these free trade deals, but there is one very important point that I hope the Minister will address when he winds up. There is a lacuna in parliamentary scrutiny of these trade deals; there is no doubt about it. It is simply far too late to conduct a trade deal, agree it and then at the very last minute send it to the International Trade Committee. Sometimes there is no opportunity for Parliament to discuss it at all.

As my right hon. Friend the Member for North Somerset (Dr Fox), a former International Trade Secretary, said, let us have a proper parliamentary scrutiny system so that as we embark on a trade deal the Select Committee can consider it in detail at the start and can report back to Parliament, so that we can debate it and give either instructions or guidance to Government. That is the way the Government should proceed, and I commend that approach to them this evening.

Kenny MacAskill (East Lothian) (SNP) [V]: I support the amendments from the other place, particularly Lords amendments 1, 2, 4 and 6. I am conscious of time, so I shall restrict my points.

First, we have to put this in context. We are in the lee of Brexit and the trade deal that has followed from that, which has taken us into new territory. Speed will be

required because of the urgency of the situation. We must try to minimise difficulties and maximise employment opportunities. What we are seeing at ports is shameful, frankly, and we cannot have that continuing or being replicated. But some things have to remain constant and some standards have to be maintained. As other Members have correctly said, parliamentary scrutiny is essential. This is a democracy, and that deal fundamentally affects each and every one of our people, so we have to ensure that Parliament is able to properly scrutinise it.

Secondly, we have to ensure that food and animal welfare standards are maintained. We are rightly proud of those high standards and have always adhered to them here, and that must be maintained. Thirdly, it is absolutely essential that the national health service's being free at the point of delivery and predicated on being a service delivered by a public duty, rather than by private practices, is maintained. We have to ensure the integrity of the NHS and ensure that it is not undermined.

Putting that into context, we have to remember that we are in a situation where urgency is to the forefront, but we are also at a time when we have to negotiate trade deals that are by their very nature complicated. A trade deal with the United States will be essential, given the nature and scale of the country and its importance to us. However, let us remember that the United States may be the home of capitalism and free trade, but it is deeply protective of its own sectors and industry. When it comes to a trade deal with the UK, the US will be looking after its interests, companies and people, and we have to ensure that ours are not undermined as a result. Let us also remember that US Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross made it quite clear—this will continue under President Biden's Administration—that Brexit was an opportunity to eat the UK's lunch, which means to have a go at our food and agriculture standards and to undermine the circumstances of our protecting the NHS from privatisation, so we have to ensure that steps are taken.

It is always the situation that all Governments have Executive creep—that was no doubt the situation even in the Government I served in another Parliament and institution. Governments tend to do that by nature. However, in the United Kingdom over recent generations, it has certainly become a hell of a lot worse, which requires to be addressed. The nadir was the shameful absence of opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny of the European Union (Future Relationship) Bill for Brexit. It may have had to be delivered in the last few days before Brexit, but the almost total absence of that opportunity cannot be allowed to be replicated, because at the end of the day, in my constituency, high food and agriculture standards are essential. We make premium products there, and we cannot have a race to the bottom that would see our own industry undermined. We have to protect and cherish our health service. We welcome the steps it has taken on coronavirus. We have seen it hollowed out with privatisation south of the border. We cannot allow those two areas of our society and economy to be sold out in a trade deal delivered to ensure that the United States protects its own vested interests.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): Order. Before I call Gary Sambrook, for the information of the House and those contributing from outside the Chamber, Minister Greg Hands will respond to the debate at 5.39 pm, and the first Division will be called at 5.54 pm. I understand that there may be several Divisions thereafter.

Gary Sambrook (Birmingham, Northfield) (Con): I am pleased to see the Bill making progress through the House today. It is important to reflect for a moment on the backdrop of the Bill and why we are where we are. Ever since 2016 when we had the referendum, we have constantly heard from Opposition Members that much of this was never going to be possible, that in some way the world would overlook the United Kingdom and reach across us to the European Union and so on. We are making good progress, and it is because of the imagination and determination of our Prime Minister, this Government, the Secretary of State and departmental Ministers that we have secured 63 deals across the world, covering £885 billion in trade. These are really good things that will create opportunities for people in all our constituencies up and down the country, which we can all be proud of.

However, we cannot be proud of the tone that this debate has taken over many years. For as long as I have been alive, there have been allegations that the Conservative party and this Government were going to in some way sell off the NHS, and we see that again today in some of these amendments, which shape the argument as if some Government estate agent is outside a hospital banging in a for sale sign, or we are taking Donald Trump around A&E and he is deciding what wallpaper he wants to put up. All this has always been nonsense. We see it all the time in the opportunities Members have in Opposition day debates, which they use to spread fear and misinformation. It is damaging to our politics because those allegations cause fear, spread anxiety, arouse anger and stoke suspicion in our politics. That is not healthy. It is unfounded, it is wrong, it is irresponsible and it is dangerous to our democracy.

The all-party parliamentary group for trade and export promotion, of which I am co-chair with Lord Waverley from the other place, has been talking to businesses and consumers about how we want global Britain to be shaped over the coming years. We are clear from the conversations we have had that our global trade strategy should be green. It should be about supporting biodiversity and reducing waste. It should be about promoting opportunities for sustainable, high-quality jobs for people across the United Kingdom. It should be about supporting fair and sustainable trade. It should be about capitalising on the digital economy, and it should promote sustainable investment and finance. All those things are the way in which Britain can stand tall in the world, be a beacon for high standards across the world and ensure we create the conditions in which people have the opportunities to prosper, to trade and, most importantly, to get the jobs that, as we come out of the covid pandemic, many of our constituents will need. The Government are creating the foundations for a fine opportunity and I wholly support them in their endeavours today.

Margaret Greenwood (Wirral West) (Lab) [V]: The amendments we are discussing are incredibly important. Lords amendment 1 would provide vital parliamentary scrutiny obligations preventing the UK from signing a free trade agreement unless a draft of the agreement had been laid before and approved by both Houses of Parliament. That is immensely important when we consider protecting human rights, environmental standards, and animal welfare regulations and protecting the NHS as a public service. Those are all matters of immense importance to my constituents. The trade justice movement has highlighted

[Margaret Greenwood]

that the provisions of the amendment offer a considerable improvement on the level of parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals in the UK, and that currently our processes lag behind those of the US, the EU and other countries.

Lords amendment 4 would provide for protection against the undermining of the ability of Government to deliver free and universal public health and care services. That is extremely important, particularly given the Government's very clear agenda to privatise the national health service and put it in the hands of profit-making companies, instead of protecting it as a public service, as they should. It would also provide for the protection of employment rights for public sector employees and those working in publicly funded health and care sectors. The fact that the Government will not commit in legislation to protect our NHS is worrying for us all. It is time for Members across this House to show their support for the NHS and those who work in it by voting for the amendment.

There is also immense concern about environmental standards and animal welfare. A report published in November by the Future British Standards Coalition, which includes representatives from Sustain, Compassion in World Farming and the Campaign to Protect Rural England, warned that

“the UK government has already weakened protections around food imports and is failing to consider the impact of trade on public health, animal welfare and the environment with adequate rigour or transparency.”

Lords amendment 6 would require the Secretary of State to establish a code of practice setting out how a Minister should maintain standards in certain areas, including the environment, animal welfare and food, where they are likely to be affected by a proposed international trade agreement. A National Farmers Union petition that states that the Government

“should ensure that all food eaten in the UK...is produced in a way that matches the high standards of production expected of UK farmers”

has been signed by more than 1 million people.

Trade agreements should contain commitments on the protection of human rights. I believe that all Members across the House should support Lords amendment 2, which proposes a triple barrier against trade agreements with countries that abuse human rights. They should also support Lords amendment 3, which would provide the power to revoke bilateral international trade agreements if it was found that a signatory to that agreement had committed genocide as defined in the genocide convention. Trading is global, and so are our responsibilities. I believe our treaties should respect that.

4.45 pm

Jeremy Wright (Kenilworth and Southam) (Con) [V]: I wish to make some brief comments about three of the amendments, including Lords amendment 3 on genocide. I have listened to some excellent speeches from colleagues across the House who have made a clear and passionate case for the amendment, and I agree, of course, that states that engage in genocide must face serious consequences for their actions, including in trade. However, in addition to arguments about the separation of powers, which have already been made, I have serious concerns about the practicalities of Lords amendment 3 and about the amendment in lieu.

The amendment refers to a preliminary ruling by the High Court, but it is not clear what that means in this context, or how authoritative it would be. Neither is it clear how the court would deal with the applications that are envisaged. The amendment sets out who could bring an action, but not who the respondent would be. As my right hon. Friend the Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh) said earlier, it is hard to see the respondent being the foreign Government in question. Would it be the UK Government instead, and if so, how would they present a case about the behaviour of a foreign Government, of whom they are likely to have been critical? All that needs to be clarified before such a change in legislation could be contemplated.

Lords amendment 7 deals with the protection of children online. I cannot support the amendment as drafted, because I think its drafting contains the seeds of potential conflict between current and future parliamentary judgments, and potentially between parliamentary and ministerial authority. I also think that the concerns it expresses are more relevant to trade deals that are not covered by the Bill, although I entirely support and share those concerns.

The Government have made important and welcome progress in their plans to reduce and remove so-called online harms, and offer real protection to children and others from harassment, abuse, manipulation, and misery. It is that progress that Baroness Kidron, who tabled the amendment in the other place, and others, are determined to defend, and they are entirely right to do so. It may well need defending when negotiations on a trade deal with the USA in particular begin. Although I welcome what the Minister said about the Government's determination not to bargain away the progress we have made, I hope he will recognise Parliament's determination to reinforce that, and engage further on how that can be done, before we move on to discuss other trade deals in detail. I agree entirely with what my hon. Friend the Member for Folkestone and Hythe (Damian Collins) said about that, especially his suggestion about how Parliament might benefit from the assessment by the Information Commissioner's Office on the digital aspects of any deal.

That brings me to Lords amendment 1 on the approval of trade agreements in Parliament, with which I have considerable sympathy. I take the Minister's point that the trade deals covered by the Bill may not be those where parliamentary scrutiny is most important, but the CRaG processes that he relies on were not designed for post-Brexit Britain, or for the trade deals of breadth and ambition to which the Government rightly aspire. For those, Parliament needs more time and information than CRaG currently allows us in order to do our job of scrutiny properly. The Government need to think further on that, and do more before those broader trade deals are negotiated.

Claire Hanna (Belfast South) (SDLP) [V]: We are experiencing a number of challenges with the outworkings of Brexit, not least here in Northern Ireland, and that is, in part, due to the failure to progress and confront some of the realities of the situation. That is followed through by the fact that the trade deal is in place without this Bill, and there is also an environmental governance gap, due to the failure to pass the Environment Bill before the end of what passed for the transition period. Many see that as a reflection of the Government's priorities regarding environmental and other protections.

I had the opportunity to speak on Second Reading of the Trade Bill in May and, at that point, set out the SDLP's concerns about the loss of rights, standards and protections that were enjoyed by everybody in the UK as members of the EU, as well as our disappointment about the lack of scrutiny and oversight provided for by the Bill. I do not want to rehash all those as well, but I raised specifically the potentially regressive impact that the Bill might have on food standards and on the NHS, which is an issue of great concern to my constituents in south Belfast. Several of the amendments before us today would assist greatly in protecting and maintaining those standards. I say again that warm words and assurances, and protesting too much, as I think we heard in a number of previous speeches, do not give reassurance to the public if opportunities are not taken to place protections in law. If the Government are serious about protecting the environment, workers and the NHS, they will have no issue in legislating to put those protections into law.

On scrutiny, we heard a lot from Vote Leave about taking back control and about the sovereignty of the UK Parliament, but we see in practice in this Bill much control being put into the hands of a small number of Cabinet Ministers, and very little in the way of parliamentary oversight. The UK Government's scrutiny processes and, therefore, democratic legitimacy for trade deals fall far behind those of, for example, the US and the EU. If Brexit was an issue of accountability for many people, I believe that this approach is further storing up dissatisfaction with the political process.

Lords amendments 8 and 9 provide a good opportunity for the UK to ensure that trade policy is in line with other international obligations on not entering into trade deals with those committing human rights abuses and genocide, and we very much welcome this. On the issue of Northern Ireland, trade deals and non-discrimination—that is, Lords amendment 26—the SDLP has been very clear before and since 2016 that we do not wish, and have never wished, to see any barriers to trade from Northern Ireland north-south or east-west. That is what we enjoyed pre-Brexit, as well as trading arrangements with the vast majority of the planet, but we are now restricted by the need to manage the problems that have been foisted upon us by an ill-thought-out Brexit. The Ireland-Northern Ireland protocol exists precisely to protect the people of Northern Ireland from the risks and consequences of a hard border. We therefore have to take a very cautious approach to anything that might inadvertently or deliberately undermine that. It remains the case—I will finish with this point—that the higher the UK's commitments to the standards that we maintain here in Northern Ireland, the softer the barriers to trade in the Irish sea will be.

Andrew Bowie (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (Con) [V]: It is a pleasure to speak in such an important debate this afternoon and to hear such eloquent arguments on the merits of the amendments that we are considering today, and I have listened intently to the arguments on both sides.

Last week, in the debate on global Britain, we debated in this House how we wanted this country and its values to be a beacon of hope in this dark world—a country that champions free trade, the rule of law, human rights and democracy. It is these values, which everyone in the House shares, that are driving my right hon. and hon. Friends to support Lord Alton's amendment or

amendment (a), backed by colleagues this afternoon. Nobody in this House or beyond would ever support this country doing a trade deal with a country engaging in acts of genocide. The United Kingdom continues to encourage all states to uphold international human rights obligations, including under the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, and our position on that will never change.

We all look at what is happening in Xinjiang and the plight of the Uyghur Muslims with increasing alarm. In response, the UK has announced an ambitious package of measures to help make sure that no British organisation, whether Government or private sector, is inadvertently contributing to human rights violations against the Uyghur Muslims or other minorities in the region. On 6 October, the UK and 38 other countries made a statement at the UN Third Committee expressing deep concern about the situation. This House and this country therefore cannot be accused of not being aware of or not taking seriously the issues in China at the present time.

However, the amendments pose a serious threat to the separation of powers that this country has observed for hundreds of years. It is this place, and it is the Executive who are held to account in this place, that are responsible for developing trade agreements and the operation of our foreign policy. It is really important that we separate the issues here. Is there increasing alarm over whether genocide is occurring in Xinjiang alongside horrific acts of slave labour and forced sterilisation? Yes; that is not in question. Should we allow the High Court power over British trade and foreign policy? No. Although my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith) stresses that the Court would only be able to make a preliminary decision, it would be impossible—rightly, might I say—to ignore that decision. Therefore, we would be *de facto* giving powers to the High Court.

I would be ashamed if it took a decision from the High Court to determine that a country we were looking at doing a trade deal with was engaging in acts of genocide for us to revisit whether it would be the right thing to do. I have faith—faith borne out by the recent examples of what we have done and how we have acted towards states that do not share our values—that the British Government today and in the future will do the right thing, and that if the day comes when they do not, this House will hold them to account and rightly stop them. That is how parliamentary democracy works. We do not offload or subcontract our moral compass to judges in the High Court. We are elected to take tough decisions.

I am against these amendments, but I am for tougher action against China and other Governments around the world who are committing human rights abuses. I have spoken about my support for the Bill before, so I will not take up the House's time by going over the same ground again. The Bill has been improved since it first came before Parliament, not least with the creation and putting on a statutory footing of the Trade and Agriculture Commission, which puts the voice of farmers, who were concerned about the effect on standards of future trade deals, at the heart of the Government's trade policy. I hope we can now allow this very good Bill—a Bill on which the Government have listened and acted and which they have improved—to proceed.

Kerry McCarthy (Bristol East) (Lab) [V]: I am pleased that this Bill has returned from the other place in a much stronger form, with an enhanced role for parliamentary scrutiny, and I will be opposing any attempts to water down those changes today. If I had a bit more time, I would talk about protecting NHS patient data, protecting children from online harms and, of course, the genocide amendments, all of which have been raised with me by concerned constituents, as well as the need for a triple barrier against trade agreements with countries that abuse human rights. I am pleased that so many other speakers have more than done justice to those issues, in particular raising concerns about appalling human rights abuses in China.

Only last week, we saw shocking reports about the connection between many global brands and the forced labour camps in Xinjiang. This is something we simply should not tolerate in our business relationships. In this speech, I will focus—not for the first time—on another issue that constituents have contacted me about in droves: the need to ensure that we do not bargain away our existing environmental and food standards in the heated pursuit of new trading relationships.

The damage we have done to our trading relationship with our closest partners in the EU with the flimsy Brexit deal last month puts the UK in an even weaker negotiating position, but we need to stand firm and, for the sake of our health and the planet, refuse to sacrifice British standards. The Government have continually claimed that they will not allow UK food and environmental standards to be ripped up but have still fought every attempt to put such protections into law, despite massive public support for them. Principles-based parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals, impact assessments and a robust Trade and Agriculture Commission are essential if we are to hold the Government to account.

It is not just about protecting our own standards. We ought to be using what leverage we have in trade negotiations to put pressure on other countries to raise their standards where they are low. If we import and consume food, or if our companies are involved in its financing or production, from countries where land degradation and the abuse of animals and workers are commonplace, we are complicit. Deforestation in Brazil is one such example. Current Government proposals to eliminate illegal deforestation from UK supply chains simply do not go far enough—not when there are Governments such as Bolsonaro's in Brazil, who have given the green light to it. The World Wide Fund for Nature found that 43 million hectares—an area the size of California—was lost in deforestation fronts such as the Amazon in the 13 years between 2004 and 2017. If business continues as usual, by 2030 we will have lost another 170 million hectares.

Put simply, I do not trust the Government to raise such issues in anything more than a tokenistic way when it comes to negotiating a bilateral trade agreement with the likes of Brazil. When I asked about that in the Chamber last week, the answer that I got confirmed that. That is why parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals is so important, and why I will be voting for these amendments.

5 pm

Tom Randall (Gedling) (Con) [V]: There are several amendments to be considered today, but I propose to speak only to Lords amendment 3—the so-called genocide amendment—which I have particularly considered.

After Brexit, the country appeared to divide into two camps: those who saw Brexit as a problem to be solved and those who saw it as an opportunity to be embraced. I am firmly in the latter camp. We can now develop our own trade policy in a way that we have not for some time. It also gives us the opportunity to export our values—if hon. Members will excuse the phrase—as well as our goods and services.

I hope that Britain's trade policy in the 21st century will be like that of the 19th—the Britain of the West Africa Squadron, unafraid to stand up for what we believe in around the world. However, we have to take the world as it is. Not all countries are western-style democracies, and as we stride the world at large it is inevitable that we will want to trade with some countries that are perhaps not quite the same as ours, but there are obviously limits. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda described genocide as “the crime of all crimes”.

Rightly, this country will not seek to make trade arrangements with countries that commit it.

In that light, Lords amendment 3 has much to commend it. It could apply to any country, but discussion of the amendment so far has centred on the People's Republic of China and its treatment of ethnic minorities. As the vice-chair of the all-party parliamentary group on Hong Kong, I have become much more aware of and interested in China's activities, and the amendment would send a very powerful message to China that her actions are unacceptable.

I have a great deal of sympathy with those who are minded to support the amendment, and I applaud the work of the Board of Deputies, of British Jews the Muslim Council of Britain and others that have raised the profile of the amendment and the surrounding discussion. However, lawmaking is not just about sending messages; it is also about creating a set of workable rules. In that respect, I regrettably have some doubts about the Lords amendment.

A free trade agreement is likely to take the form of a treaty that has been through Parliament under the procedure set out in the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010. The amendment would effectively revoke a trade agreement on a ruling from a High Court judge. That introduces a judicial element that may or may not be desirable, but needs to be considered at greater length and very carefully. Is it desirable that a judge considers an international agreement that has already been considered and approved by Parliament? If a free trade agreement is being considered with a country that is suspected of committing genocide, which I suggest is a situation that is not going to arise, is this House not capable of considering that and voting it down? Is a court able to amass the relevant evidence to decide whether genocide has occurred? Can the Government or Parliament not do so? Perhaps the Government are better placed to do those things.

I am not sure how the amendment might work in terms of our international law obligations. Would our domestic legislation be overturned while our international obligations, which the trading partner could still enforce, were still in place?

I have not fully addressed those questions in my own mind, and it is for those reasons that, with considerable regret, I do not feel that I can back the amendment as it stands. I urge the Government to consider this matter

carefully, use this amendment as a first draft and turn it into a workable safeguard to ensure that, in the future, Britain continues to hold its head high on the international stage.

Stephen Kinnock (Aberavon) (Lab): I rise to speak in favour of the amendments tabled in the names of the noble Lords Alton and Collins, the driving purpose of which is to root our foreign and trade policies in the values and principles that our country and our constituents hold dear.

According to the British Foreign Policy Group's polling, more than eight in 10 of the UK public believe that the UK should sometimes or always lead the way on global issues, while across this House we know that if global Britain is to mean anything, our country must have the moral authority to lead by example. That authority will be fatally undermined if we end up sacrificing our ethics and values on the altar of tawdry trade deals with genocidal states.

The term "genocide" evokes harrowing memories of Bosnia, Rwanda, Cambodia and, of course, the holocaust. If ever there is a time for Britain to show global leadership and stand up for our values, it is at the very moment when we witness those early, chilling signs of genocide. On that note, the nation was collectively aghast when we saw Andrew Marr show the Chinese ambassador a video of shaven-headed Uyghur Muslims being forcibly loaded on to trains, the video accompanied by moving accounts of women being sterilised and the horrors of forced labour camps. The Jewish community knows all too well that comparisons with the holocaust should be used sparingly, so when the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews writes to the Prime Minister to draw parallels between events in Xinjiang and Nazi Germany and then calls for the Prime Minister to support the Alton amendment, the Government must surely take note.

I turn now to the profoundly misleading and disingenuous arguments that the Government are deploying against the Alton amendment. First, the Foreign Secretary claims that the amendment is unconstitutional because it would allow the High Court to frustrate trade agreements. That is nonsense, as it has been the settled policy of UK Government for decades that judges, not politicians, rule on genocide; so the Alton amendment is entirely consistent with that principle. The only difference is that we would be empowering, through that amendment, our esteemed British judges to make such a ruling, rather than the judges in an international court.

Secondly, the Foreign Secretary claims that the evidentiary bar for genocide is simply too high, and that the Government would set their own threshold far lower, by which to determine whether the UK would be entering into trade deals. Well, fine—then the Government should cease their attempts to defeat the amendment, as the amendment should surely be seen as purely an insurance policy against future backsliding. Moreover, if it is indeed the case that the Government are seeking to adopt an even more progressive approach, then Conservative MPs should also be supporting the Collins amendment, which rightly sets out why the UK Government should apply a human rights assessment to all negotiations.

Thirdly, the Foreign Secretary argues that the amendment would give rise to vexatious claims—again, disingenuous nonsense. The High Court has a well-established process

for filtering vexatious claims out of its system. For far too long, the international community has allowed authoritarian regimes to hold the international human rights legal order hostage. Russia and China wield their vetoes cynically and ruthlessly, and that is why the UK Government have never succeeded in recognising a genocide while it is ongoing since the Nuremberg trials, 75 years ago.

If this House votes with the courage of its convictions tonight, we will be grasping the opportunity to lead the world in standing up to those regimes and breaking the stranglehold that they currently have on our system. Let us show some global leadership. Let us back Alton and Collins this evening. Let us send a message to the world about the type of country we really are.

Julie Marson (Hertford and Stortford) (Con) [V]: I believe this is a good Bill, which we should pass in its current form, but I want to address the amendments raised most frequently by my constituents—Lords amendments 1 to 3.

First, I have confidence in the robustness of our system of scrutiny. We have been absolutely clear that in all our negotiations we will not compromise on our high environmental protection, animal welfare and food standards, and every Government announcement has been entirely consistent on that. The Food Standards Agency maintains rigorous standards. The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 transfers existing EU import requirements on to the UK statute book. We have the power of Parliament, where MPs will be able to scrutinise and effectively veto future trade deals under the CRaG procedure, and we have the Trade and Agriculture Commission, with newly extended powers putting it on a statutory footing.

Secondly, I am, of course, appalled by the reports from Xinjiang, but the amendment on genocide will do nothing to help the Uyghur people. I simply say that the UK has a long and proud history of extending and protecting human rights, and promoting our values abroad. A well-intentioned amendment to bring human rights within the scope of this Bill would seriously compromise the separation of powers. I do not want to see judicial intervention in legitimate trade and foreign policy, particularly in the context of our existing checks and balances. I believe in this Parliament, and in its duty and commitment to determine appropriate sanctions and in what circumstances we conduct trade negotiations.

Most vital is what the Bill enables in its current form. It provides a fantastic platform for growth. It is my firm belief that to realise the potential of global Britain, we need to recognise the role of this place in that endeavour. We do not create growth, but we can enable it. Throughout the pandemic, we have relied on frontline heroes—our doctors, nurses, care workers, police and shop workers—to get us through, but in the next stage of recovery it will be the wealth creators, business people and entrepreneurs who will take us forward, leading our recovery into long-term prosperity. What they need is a dynamic and investable playing field open to them. To think differently, innovate and grow, we need the freedom to trade.

This Bill has the power to transform Britain's economy by going further and faster in the sectors of the future. It will not be establishment banks and oil companies dominating the FTSE 100 in 20 years' time, it will be the innovation sector, digital, data and artificial

[Julie Marson]

intelligence that create the most new wealth, and we can enable Britain now to become the global hub for growth sectors for the future. I will not be supporting today's amendments, because I am truly confident in the levels of scrutiny that exist and I am confident that this Parliament and Britain's moral compass do not rely on judicial intervention. Most of all, I believe in the global Britain that this Bill represents and realises.

Mary Kelly Foy (City of Durham) (Lab) [V]: Whenever this Bill comes before this House my inbox is the same, as I suspect every Member's is; once again, constituents have emailed en masse to express their support for many of the amendments being debated today. From this correspondence, it is clear that my constituents do not want to compromise on standards; that they fear for the future of the NHS under any US trade deal; and that they want more scrutiny, not less. However, what is clear more than anything else is that they do not trust this Government. Although the Government have said that our farmers will not be undercut, that the NHS is safe and that human rights are non-negotiable, my constituents simply do not believe them. There is a very simple reason for that: although the Government are happy to make promises, they will not commit them to law. People have suffered too many U-turns, too many failures and too many excuses from this Government to believe them any longer. My constituents want legal guarantees, not empty ones.

The incredible thing is that these Lords amendments cover issues on which the vast majority of this House would claim to agree, yet the Government will today vote down a series of vital protections. Who can argue that a trade deal with a state such as Egypt, whose Government jail and execute religious minorities and human rights activists, should not contain iron-clad human rights clauses? If we are to be a country that promotes and defends human rights, we should make a stand and not do business with those who seek to destroy those protections. A faction in government is proud of its record and would welcome scrutiny, yet not surprisingly this Government want to hide from it. It is time that this Government recognised that MPs are paid to debate important issues, make decisions and represent our constituents. Why are they so afraid to do so?

Finally, there is the issue of standards. Whether it is food standards, environmental standards or labour standards, people are worried. These standards have been fought for in this country and the EU, and we do not want them undermined or undercut. It would be devastating for our farmers and damaging to already struggling businesses.

5.15 pm

While the Government will no doubt ignore the public's concerns once more and vote down these reasonable amendments, they should know that the Labour party will continue to fight for our NHS, fight for our standards, and fight for our right to scrutinise this Government.

Imran Ahmad Khan (Wakefield) (Con) [V]: Alongside many Conservative colleagues, I have had a very difficult decision to make. Rebellion against one's own Government is torturous, but in this case I feel compelled. I have no doubt that it is the right thing to do.

The United Kingdom has a proud history as a staunch defender of human rights, champion of the oppressed and celebrant of diversity and freedoms everywhere. The anti-genocide amendment is our chance to continue this proud tradition and help protect innocent lives from evildoers. The amendment creates a necessary mechanism by which the United Kingdom is able to uphold its international obligations regarding genocide, and safeguards us from being complicit, through commerce and trade, with genocidal regimes. I have spent many years in places scarred by war, slavery and genocide. What I witnessed moulded me, and I swore I would do all I could to inhibit such suffering.

Critics of the amendment note that a designation of genocide should be determined only by international courts. We all know that there are certain states against which a verdict of genocide is inconceivable, due to the nature and limitations of the international legal system, its courts and base Realpolitik. We must not allow those who commit crimes against humanity, such as genocide, to be protected by the deficiencies of our evolving international system. We must be prepared to act unilaterally when required and lead by example.

Encouraging states to uphold their international human rights obligations should be the keystone on which we build global Britain. As a newly independent, sovereign United Kingdom, now is the time to re-establish ourselves as a global moral authority. The best way to do this is by standing up for our values and employing innovative thinking, as exemplified in the genocide amendment.

I have heard several hon. Members express concern about our courts determining whether there has been a genocide. I find it curious that international courts are not objected to, yet our domestic ones are. Other Members have suggested that Parliament alone should determine genocide; I remind them that this runs against long-established UK policy. I also ask Members to consider that in 2016, this House unanimously voted to recognise the Yazidi genocide, but the Government took no action, stating that genocide recognition is for the courts.

I loathe rebellion and would go to great lengths to avoid it, but there are occasions when it is simply impossible to reconcile personal conviction with party loyalty. The genocide amendment is not perfect, but it provides a real opportunity for a new beginning for a reimagined foreign policy. I urge all in this House to support the genocide amendment and find themselves on the right side of history.

Liz Twist (Blyton) (Lab) [V]: It is a pleasure to speak in this important debate. I echo the words of my hon. Friend the Member for City of Durham (Mary Kelly Foy) in saying that whenever this Bill comes to the Chamber, the interest and concern from my constituents is huge.

I will start by talking about Lords amendment 4 and the NHS. So much of the past year has been about protecting the NHS. It is fair to say that we all appreciate the NHS more than ever before, and this must be reflected in the Bill. My constituents are concerned about the increasing marketisation and outsourcing of NHS services. They are concerned, too, about the selling of and open access to NHS UK patient data. They want to protect our NHS. That is why Lords amendment 4 on data protection is so important. While the Government consistently claim in public statements that the NHS is

not for sale in future trade deals, the best way to ensure this is to legislate in this Bill, once and for all, to ensure that the NHS is outside the scope of any future trade agreement, in all respects. The Government's resistance to taking that step and to including that in the Bill gives us reason for concern about their long-term intentions.

I turn to Lords amendment 6 on our food and farming standards. I have received an overwhelming number of emails from constituents on food standards and animal welfare standards, which go hand in hand. It is so important that we get this right. We have some of the most stringent food and farming standards in the world, in terms of the rules that producers must keep to before food reaches our shelves. It is crucial that we keep the standards consistent across imported goods as well. We need a code of practice, as provided for by amendment 6, to ensure that standards are maintained in any trade deal expected to affect food, animal welfare or, very importantly, the environment.

It is really important, as we have heard, that Parliament has the chance to scrutinise properly the full text of any trade deals. The CRaG arrangements are simply not effective and strong enough to ensure that we have a chance to consider whatever is in the trade deals. We need a much stronger way of scrutinising these deals, which affect so many aspects of our lives. That is why I support the amendments on scrutiny.

Finally, I want to speak in support of the amendments on human rights, including the so-called genocide amendment. For so many years, UK Governments have supported the principle that trade treaties should contain commitments on the protection of human rights, and have given the European Union the right to suspend or revoke those treaties if there are serious abuses of human rights. Now that we are no longer part of the EU, it is right that we make sure that we retain that provision. The two cross-party amendments to the Bill agreed by the House of Lords would obligate the Government to provide an assessment of the human rights record of a state before starting trade negotiations with it, as well as allowing for that assessment to be scrutinised by MPs and peers. It is vital that we include these changes.

Marco Longhi (Dudley North) (Con) [V]: I start by saying that I will not vote in favour of any Lords amendments this evening.

The huge efforts we witnessed the trade team make in order to secure continuity agreements worth £897 billion are not just one of the strongest expressions of Brexit delivered, but bring confidence to businesses by eliminating the uncertainty that so many pundits said that Brexit would bring. That confidence means investment, which means growth, and growth means jobs. It is lamentable, especially at this time of crisis, that we have not had a single speech from an Opposition Member of any party that promotes UK plc; instead, we have had a litany of criticism and negativism, which does the opposite of generating business confidence. One would think that at least some of the pragmatists on the Opposition Benches might, in the national interest, bring themselves to accept that Brexit has happened, and that we should come together to do everything possible to rebuild our economy, because that means jobs for the people of Islington and Camden, as it does for the people of Dudley North.

There are huge prizes to be had. Accession to the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership would open up amazing opportunities in a market worth about \$30 trillion. I have huge confidence that our team will bring this about; that we will sign agreements with Australia, New Zealand and the USA; and that we will strengthen ties with Mercosur countries such as Brazil, which have huge growth potential.

Lords amendment 3 has special importance for some of my colleagues. Although I completely agree with the spirit and intentions behind it, the key for me is that Parliament must always remain sovereign. Ultimately, this is what Brexit was all about—answering the crucial question, “Who decides?” The unintended consequence of this amendment is that it would provide the judiciary with powers that would undermine Parliament. My contention is that questions of genocide—its definition, its impact over time, and measures for responding to it—are so complex that it is not the judiciary, but Parliament, under advice and with the royal prerogative, that is best placed to deal with them. Therefore, while I very much respect colleagues who are minded to support this amendment, and understand their reasons for doing so, I will not.

Kim Johnson (Liverpool, Riverside) (Lab) [V]: I welcome the opportunity to speak in this most important debate. I will support the Collins and Alton amendments on human rights. Members from all parts of the House will have heard the Foreign Secretary on the “Andrew Marr Show” this weekend. When challenged about today's amendments on human rights, he responded,

“we shouldn't be engaged in free trade negotiations with countries abusing human rights.”

What does that mean for the UK's continued arms trade with some of the most despotic regimes in the world, including Saudi Arabia, the UK's biggest arms customer and one of the world's most authoritarian regimes? UK-made warplanes, bombs and missiles are playing a central role in the attacks on Yemen by the Saudi-led coalition, which has led the largest and longest humanitarian crisis in the world.

Today, 80% of the population in Yemen are living a brutal cycle of starvation, malnutrition and sickness, and they are in desperate need of humanitarian assistance. In the words of a recent UN report, the situation in Yemen is a “stain on humanity's conscience”. By continuing to sell arms to the Saudi regime, despite overwhelming evidence of that regime's repeated breaches of international humanitarian law, Britain is made complicit in these war crimes. The same UN report states that the continued supply of weapons is only perpetuating the conflict and prolonging the suffering of the Yemeni people.

Between March 2015 and July 2020, there were 535 alleged breaches of international humanitarian law by the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen, according to the Ministry of Defence. That is more than one a week for the entire duration of the conflict. These breaches include strikes in residential areas—on schools, hospitals and family homes. Civil rights organisations such as the Campaign Against Arms Trade and Amnesty International have repeatedly and consistently called for the UK Government to halt arms transfers to the Saudi-led coalition because of the clear risk of such arms being used to breach human rights and international humanitarian law in Yemen.

[Kim Johnson]

While this Government continue to duck their legal responsibilities, Yemeni civilians are dying in their thousands. It is shameful, and it has to stop. Questions of legality have already been raised around our ongoing arms deals with Saudi Arabia. These amendments would add an extra layer of scrutiny, so that we could ensure that UK products were not being used in violation of international humanitarian laws. They would oblige Ministers to provide a full assessment of the human rights records of any overseas states before starting trade negotiations with them. MPs and peers could scrutinise any evidence, and human rights reports would be reviewed annually to check ongoing compliance with a robust system that ensured that the UK's ongoing and future trade partners adhered to basic human rights principles. If being an independent trading nation means one thing, it should be the choice to decide which countries we are prepared to trade with and which we are not. If we do not support the amendment today, the Government will have clearly shown that it is happy to turn a blind eye to the blood on its hands. Today, we have a chance to put that right, and the constituents of Liverpool, Riverside urge Members from all parts of the House to support the amendment.

5.30 pm

Ben Everitt (Milton Keynes North) (Con): This Bill builds on a really strong platform that we delivered in 2020, despite those headwinds of the global pandemic. Having got Brexit done, we have struck trade deals with 63 countries around the world, covering £885 billion-worth of trade.

We are here to talk about the amendments sent from the other place. On genocide, the United Kingdom has never shied away from protecting the rights of the world's most vulnerable.

Christian Wakeford (Bury South) (Con): A lot has been said about the atrocities and, let us face it, genocide going on in Xinjiang. Does my hon. Friend agree that while Lords amendment 3 is not perfect, it is a starting point to address the real human rights concerns? Now is a chance to be the light in the darkness.

Ben Everitt: I welcome that intervention from my hon. Friend. He is right to highlight what is going on in China at the moment. It is an incredibly awful, complex situation. My worry with Lords amendment 3, to address his point, is that it would place our courts in a uniquely difficult position. They would be acting akin to international courts in determining where and when acts of genocide have occurred. Invariably, they will be doing so with unco-operative and oppressive states, as we are witnessing at the moment.

We risk, I think, turning our courts into arenas for foreign nations to play out their foreign policy objectives. The political and diplomatic risks associated with that would go far beyond the intended scope of the amendment, well-meaning though it is. It would be a dereliction of our duty as parliamentarians to place a political burden on our judges. We would undermine the separation of powers that is the bedrock of the political stability of this nation, and it would erode the royal prerogative powers to conduct international relations. That is not something I think any Government could do, and it is not something I can agree to.

On scrutiny, Lords amendment 1 would place limits on the ability of negotiators to seek trade deals with flexibility. In a rapidly changing world, fortune will favour the nimble. Dither and delay will not help and will not bring back those trade deals. We are all familiar with deals, no deals and bad deals, but any deal negotiated by a Government is the legacy of that Government. The amendment would remove the responsibility from Government and the obligations would fall between those institutions that I have talked about. Our trade policy would be aimless, not decisive—hesitant, not energetic. If Parliament is not content with the terms of any negotiated agreement, the power remains for ratification to be blocked. The Bill does not change that.

In general, Lords amendments 1 and 3 simply contradict each other. One pulls the centre of political gravity towards the legislature, and the other towards the courts. We would be dismantling a proven structure for approving trade deals of scale at pace.

The Bill in general builds upon our newly acquired status as an independent trading nation. We will be taking a values-driven approach to trade policy, which includes defending, championing and promoting high standards around the world in areas such as food and animal welfare, the environment and human rights. It comes at the beginning of an important and exciting year for the UK. Despite everything that the world has thrown at us and at itself over the last year, this year can be the UK's year: more trade deals; the G7; the G20; and leadership of the COP26. This is Britain's year, and the Bill goes a long way to kick-starting us into that year.

Zarah Sultana (Coventry South) (Lab) [V]: The Government are at pains to say that the NHS is safe in their hands. They say that we do not need to worry about US healthcare companies. They say that it is fear-mongering. "Trust us," they say, "and stop asking questions." But in politics, if you want to know someone's agenda, just look at their actions: see what they say when they think people are not listening. If we do that, we see that the Government are saying something quite different.

A 2011 book argued that the "monolith" of the NHS should be "broken up", and that

"private operators should be allowed into the service, and, indeed should compete on price."

The book set out a plan for a Conservative Government after the coalition. Its authors? Well, they were five newly elected Conservative MPs, who now sit on the Government Front Bench, including the Secretary of State for International Trade, the Home Secretary, the Foreign Secretary, and the new Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. It does not stop there. The Prime Minister, when he was a Back Bencher in this House, called for the privatisation of what he called the "monolithic" and "monopolistic" NHS. Writing in a 2002 book, he also said:

"we need to think about new ways of getting private money into the NHS."

If we look at this Government's actions, again we see their true intentions. During the last 10 years of Conservative rule, the NHS has not just been chronically underfunded; it has been privatised by stealth. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 opened the floodgates to private health companies. In the last five years, nearly £15 billion-worth of contracts have been handed to private providers; that is an 89% increase. In this crisis,

again they see an opportunity. They call it NHS Test and Trace, but really we all know that it is Serco test and trace. Billions of pounds have been handed out to failing private companies that put profits before people.

The clearest test of all was last summer's vote on the amendment to this Bill that would have provided legal protection for the NHS from outside private health companies. The Government voted it down, with not a single Tory MP rebelling to vote in its favour. Sadly, I do not have time to go through the donations, speaking fees and close links between Government Members and private healthcare companies and firms linked to NHS privatisation—but, of course, they know that too well.

In conclusion, the NHS is our proudest and most precious public service. Its staff are incredible, dedicated to public health and caring for our country. Today we can show our thanks. Conservative MPs can finally put their warm words into action. This House can vote to protect our NHS. I urge all Members to vote for the NHS protection amendment, Lords amendment 4, and for the scrutiny amendment, Lords amendment 6.

Greg Hands: With the leave of the House, I will respond to what has been a wide-ranging debate, covering many domestic and international matters.

Let me first say that the Government recognise that this House enjoys significant expertise and experience on questions of human rights. We are committed to ensuring that that knowledge is utilised, and to exploring how we can ensure that the views of colleagues are heard and considered on these issues in relation to our free trade agreements.

Let me turn to the points raised during the debate, although I do not have long to respond. The shadow Secretary of State made a number of points. She said that the Government were stubbornly holding on to CRaG and the Ponsonby rule, despite entry into the 21st century. I was intrigued by that, because, of course, CRaG was introduced by the last Labour Government, in the 21st century—and the right hon. Lady supported it. I would add that, through CRaG, there is an ability to prevent ratification.

Through the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010, we have added to the process the publication of negotiation objectives and economic impact assessments, and parliamentary statements after each round of negotiations. We have created the Trade and Agriculture Commission to inform Parliament; section 42 of the Agriculture Act reports; and the International Trade Committee and the International Agreements Subcommittee having access to the texts to provide their own reports to Parliament.

The right hon. Lady mentioned China. She has come a long way in a short time on China. In her very first appearance at the Dispatch Box in this role on 12 May, she asked my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State to make it clear to the USA that she would not agree to

“any version of article 32.10 of the USMCA that would constrain the UK's ability to negotiate our own trade agreement with China”.—[*Official Report*, 12 May 2020; Vol. 676, c. 111.]

She did not want anything that would conflict with the UK's ability to negotiate a trade agreement with China. I have been absolutely clear that the Government—

Emily Thornberry: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: No.

The Government have no plans to negotiate a trade agreement with China, but it does seem that the right hon. Lady might.

I turn to my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith). We know that he is passionate on the issue and we know he has had a long-standing interest. We have worked together on many aspects and on trade. He is right that it is for the UK to shine a light across the world. I do not disagree with any of his passionate statements about human rights and genocide. However, we also in this country shine a light around the world by making good law. The scope of his amendment is very wide. It would cover not just free trade agreements, but potential trade agreements, and agreements that the UK might hope to accede to. It covers not only bilateral agreements, but plurilateral and global agreements—even WTO agreements. I do not think it would be right for the Government to wait for the human rights in a country to reach the level of genocide, which is the most egregious international crime, before halting free trade agreement negotiations. Any responsible Government would have acted before then.

It is also unclear what is meant by preliminary determination procedure. The nature of that procedure has not, I believe, been thought through. As a matter of international law, it is individuals not states who commit genocide. Therefore, in requiring a preliminary determination as to whether a state has committed genocide, it is also unclear what both amendments would actually require a court to deliver.

What the official spokesman for the SNP, the hon. Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie), did not say is that it is the SNP's policy to rejoin the EU.

Patrick Grady (Glasgow North) (SNP): Hear, hear.

Greg Hands: The hon. Member for Glasgow North (Patrick Grady) says, “Hear, hear.” But that would mean immediately having to sign up to the EU—

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: Will my right hon. Friend give way?

Greg Hands: I am not going to take any interventions. I have a lot of points to respond to. I apologise to my right hon. Friend, but I have responded to his speech.

As I was saying, that would mean immediately having to sign up to the EU's brand new investment deal with China from day one. The hon. Member for Glasgow North says, “Oh, we wouldn't do that,” but he has just said that he would re-join the EU.

My right hon. Friend the Member for North Somerset (Dr Fox) made the very strong point that trade policy must be conducted by the elected Government. We have taken control from unelected judges in Brussels and it should be for elected parliamentarians to scrutinise. He said that amendments put forward today for the very best reasons will result in the very worst practice.

My hon. Friend the Member for Tonbridge and Malling (Tom Tugendhat) and Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee made a powerful speech, in particular about his own family's experience of genocide. He is absolutely right. Genocide is the worst crime there is; it removes an entire people, but we still need to make sure we are making good law. If a country is committing genocide,

[*Greg Hands*]

it is extremely unlikely that any UK Government of any colour would be negotiating a trade agreement with it. I do not believe it would need a court to tell us that—a point also made by my hon. Friends, particularly my hon. Friend the Member for West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine (Andrew Bowie).

The Chair of the International Trade Committee had a few points to raise in terms of the Committee's scrutiny of the Japan deal. I remember that his Committee actually praised it, but we can work with him further to improve scrutiny.

We had some very good speeches. My hon. Friend the Member for South Ribble (Katherine Fletcher) spoke against the involvement of courts. My right hon. Friend the Member for Bournemouth East (Mr Ellwood) made strong points on the UK's international position, but I do not believe that if he had really dug into Lords amendment 3 he would be supporting it.

My hon. Friend the Member for Totnes (Anthony Mangnall), who has studied the amendments, made an excellent speech. He pointed out that, from the scrutiny from the International Trade Committee, Ministers have proven ready to listen. My hon. Friend the Member for Fylde (Mark Menzies) knows trade policy well and was also against the amendments.

My hon. Friend the Member for Penrith and The Border (Dr Hudson) called for more parliamentary scrutiny. Well, there is a very significant increase in parliamentary scrutiny from the CRAg position that we inherited. We compare favourably with other Westminster-style democracies, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

My hon. Friend the Member for Wealden (Ms Ghani) was passionate on the issue, but she said that the UK Government are in a do-nothing position. That is not correct. The statement made by the Foreign Secretary last week was very clear about the trade actions that the UK Government are putting in place on supply chains and information and on making sure that no companies benefit from any of the appalling practices happening in Xinjiang.

Ms Ghani: Will the Minister give way?

5.45 pm

Greg Hands: I am going to try to summarise all the points that have been made.

The Lords amendment in front of us says:

“International bilateral trade agreements are revoked”—

it is not a suggestion—

“if the High Court of England and Wales makes a preliminary determination that they should be revoked”.

That is an absolutist position as expressed in the Alton amendment. More to the point, there is not a bilateral free trade agreement with China to revoke. I will come back to that point shortly.

My hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Richard Graham), who has been to Xinjiang and spoke strongly against what is happening there, made the point that the amendment, which may have China in mind, could well be used for countries with whom we do have trade agreements. I agree on finding a balance,

but the Bill, as he rightly points out, is all about continuity trade agreements and agreement on Government procurement and so on.

My hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly) quoted the amendment of the LibDem peer Lord Purvis. I say to him that parliamentarians can have their say through the CRAg process on any future trade deal, if Parliament has concerns. That is a key part of our scrutiny arrangements that are set up.

The hon. Member for South Antrim (Paul Girvan) questioned whether Northern Ireland would benefit. It is absolutely clear that Northern Ireland will benefit from UK trade deals. The UK says that. The EU says that. The 63 continuity trade deals all apply to Northern Ireland and the withdrawal agreement and protocol are clear that Northern Ireland will benefit from UK FTAs.

My hon. Friend the Member for Folkestone and Hythe (Damian Collins) spoke on platform liability. He asked us to agree that what happened with the US in relation to the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement, which the right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury quoted earlier, will not take effect in the UK. We have been absolutely clear that those provisions will not take effect in the UK. He also called for a formal role for the Information Commissioner. I met her recently and I am considering what she has to say on the matter.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh) made a powerful point about the importance of the issue, but the flaw is in the amendment in front of us today. It is not for the courts to revoke trade treaties. That is a denial of the fundamental supremacy of Parliament. He is absolutely right on that, while being passionate about what is going on in China and other parts of the world. He asked for more parliamentary debate. Determining the parliamentary timetable is not always entirely in any Government Department's hands, but we at the Department for International Trade always welcome more debate on trade deals, whenever parliamentary time allows. It is great to have Members passionately interested in trade deals.

My hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham, Northfield (Gary Sambrook) made a powerful speech on the 63 deals done. My right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Kenilworth and Southam (Jeremy Wright), a former Attorney General, raised some really strong points about the legal language of the genocide amendment. What does a preliminary hearing mean? Who is the respondent? Would it be the foreign Government, or would the UK Government have to respond for that foreign Government, which in almost all conceivable cases would be a Government that the UK Government would have been very critical of? He raised serious points that get to the heart of the amendment and how it is not appropriate in our constitutional settlement for the High Court to be doing such a thing as trying to revoke an international treaty. On online harms, I am very happy to engage with him further.

There were excellent speeches from my hon. Friends the Members for West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine, for Hertford and Stortford (Julie Marson), for Dudley North (Marco Longhi) and for Milton Keynes North (Ben Everitt) on the importance of our trade agenda.

My hon. Friend the Member for Gedling (Tom Randall) is quite right. He is passionate—he is the vice-chairman of the all-party parliamentary group on Hong Kong—but

he also said that lawmaking is about workable rules and doubted whether a court should have the right to automatically revoke an international treaty.

May I also say a few words about some of the Opposition contributions? I do not have time to reply to all of them, but it is good courtesy to try to reply to as many as possible. I think the hon. Member for Aberavon (Stephen Kinnock) was making an argument about whether courts should pronounce on genocide, and that is a relevant topic for debate. However, what we have in front of us is not the question of whether courts should pronounce on genocide; the question is whether the courts should have the right to automatically revoke an international trade agreement. That is the amendment that is in front of us, and that is the amendment that I urge my colleagues to reject. It is not for a court to revoke international treaties.

The NHS was raised by Opposition Members including the hon. Members for Vauxhall (Florence Eshalomi), for Bristol East (Kerry McCarthy) and for Wirral West (Margaret Greenwood). The Government have been consistently clear about their commitment to the guiding principles of the NHS: that it is universal and free at the point of need. The Government's position is definitive: the NHS is not and never will be for sale. The NHS is of course the most beloved of British institutions and is not in anyone's interests, including this Government's, to change that. No UK trade deal will change that either.

Let me just say a few final words about Lords amendment 3 on genocide from Lord Alton. I know Lord Alton well. I have worked with him closely on a lot of these issues. He and I were instrumental in the all-party parliamentary group on North Korea, and I know his absolute passion on these issues. I also know from my own involvement in these questions in relation to central Asia, including here in Parliament in 2006, and in articles that I wrote in 2011, how passionate he is about these issues. Being passionate about an issue it is why we are in this place, but it is also incumbent on us to make good law, and that is fundamentally the question in front of us tonight with the Alton amendment.

I want to make three other points quickly. The first is that there is no bilateral free trade agreement with China to revoke, so even if the High Court decided to do so, that would not bring any comfort to the Uyghurs. Secondly, as I have mentioned, is it a matter for the courts automatically to revoke international treaties negotiated by this Government and approved by Parliament? I do not think that can be right. Thirdly, we do not have a bilateral free trade agreement with China, but we do have such agreements with dozens of other countries. I am not at all sure that it is the right role for the High Court to be potentially clogged up with questions of other countries, international relations and international treaties. I ask my right hon. and hon. Friends to consider carefully whether that is the route they wish to go down.

The amendments introduced into the Bill by the other place were undoubtedly done with good intentions, and I hope that I have spoken to all the points arising in this debate and to the speakers and the amendments. But it is our strongly held position that these amendments would, in the aggregate, be to the detriment of the Bill rather than to its advantage. I hope that what I have said here provides the House with clarity regarding the Government's position on the amendments we are discussing today, and that it will vote to reject them.

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

The House divided: Ayes 353, Noes 277.

Division No. 199]

[5.53 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Cleverly, rh James
Afolami, Bim	Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
Afriyie, Adam	Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
Ahmad Khan, Imran	Colburn, Elliot
Aiken, Nickie	Collins, Damian
Allan, Lucy	Costa, Alberto
Amess, Sir David	Courts, Robert
Anderson, Lee	Coutinho, Claire
Anderson, Stuart	Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey
Andrew, Stuart	Crabb, rh Stephen
Ansell, Caroline	Crosbie, Virginia
Argar, Edward	Daly, James
Atherton, Sarah	Davies, David T. C.
Atkins, Victoria	Davies, Gareth
Bacon, Gareth	Davies, Dr James
Bacon, Mr Richard	Davies, Mims
Badenoch, Kemi	Davies, Philip
Bailey, Shaun	Davison, Dehenna
Baillie, Siobhan	Dinenage, Caroline
Baker, Duncan	Dines, Miss Sarah
Baker, Mr Steve	Docherty, Leo
Baldwin, Harriett	Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Barclay, rh Steve	Donelan, Michelle
Baron, Mr John	Dorries, Ms Nadine
Baynes, Simon	Double, Steve
Bell, Aaron	Dowden, rh Oliver
Benton, Scott	Doyle-Price, Jackie
Beresford, Sir Paul	Drax, Richard
Berry, rh Jake	Drummond, Mrs Flick
Bhatti, Saqib	Duddridge, James
Blackman, Bob	Duguid, David
Blunt, Crispin	Dunne, rh Philip
Bone, Mr Peter	Eastwood, Mark
Bowie, Andrew	Edwards, Ruth
Bradley, Ben	Ellis, rh Michael
Bradley, rh Karen	Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
Braverman, rh Suella	Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
Brereton, Jack	Eustice, rh George
Bridgen, Andrew	Evans, Dr Luke
Brine, Steve	Evennett, rh Sir David
Bristow, Paul	Everitt, Ben
Britcliffe, Sara	Fabricant, Michael
Brokenshire, rh James	Farris, Laura
Browne, Anthony	Fell, Simon
Bruce, Fiona	Fletcher, Katherine
Buchan, Felicity	Fletcher, Mark
Buckland, rh Robert	Fletcher, Nick
Burghart, Alex	Ford, Vicky
Burns, rh Conor	Foster, Kevin
Butler, Rob	Fox, rh Dr Liam
Cairns, rh Alun	Francois, rh Mr Mark
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Frazer, Lucy
Carter, Andy	Freeman, George
Cartlidge, James	Freer, Mike
Cash, Sir William	Fuller, Richard
Cates, Miriam	Fysh, Mr Marcus
Caulfield, Maria	Garnier, Mark
Chalk, Alex	Ghani, Ms Nusrat
Chishti, Rehman	Gibb, rh Nick
Churchill, Jo	Gibson, Peter
Clark, rh Greg	Gideon, Jo
Clarke, Mr Simon	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
Clarke, Theo	Girvan, Paul
Clarke-Smith, Brendan	Glen, John
Clarkson, Chris	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert

Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew

Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lockhart, Carla
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherylyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh 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
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom

Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stewart, Bob
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh 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
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom

Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Maggie Throup and
Tom Pursglove

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Aldous, Peter
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn

Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon

Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debonnaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McCartney, Jason
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex

O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Seely, Boband
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stevenson, John
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel
Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 1 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

6.4 pm

More than four hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings on consideration of Lords amendments, the proceedings were interrupted (Programme Order, this day).

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

Government amendments (a) and (b) made to Lords amendment 9.

Lords amendment 9, as amended, agreed to.

After Clause 6

TRADE AND AGRICULTURE COMMISSION: ADVISORY FUNCTIONS

Amendment (a) proposed to Lords amendment 10.—(Greg Hands.)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The House divided: Ayes 365, Noes 265.

Division No. 200]

[6.6 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atherton, Sarah
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Kemi
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baron, Mr John
 Baynes, Simon
 Bell, Aaron
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Conor
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carter, Andy
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chalk, Alex
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Clarke, Theo
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Cleverly, rh James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey

Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Coutinho, Claire
 Cox, rh Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John

Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lockhart, Carla
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward

Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lockhart, Carla
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh 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
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark

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

Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Maggie Throup and
Tom Pursglove

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin

Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette

Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debonnaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glendon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera

Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex

O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex

Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baron, Mr John
 Baynes, Simon
 Bell, Aaron
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib
 Blackman, Bob
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Conor
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carter, Andy
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Clarke, Theo
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Cleverly, rh James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Coutinho, Claire
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve

Dowden, rh Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Amendment (a) made to Lords amendment 10.

Lords amendment 10, as amended, agreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS: DETERMINATION ON COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND STATE ACTIONS

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 2.—(Greg Hands.)

The House divided: Ayes 364, Noes 267.

Division No. 201]

[6.17 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart

Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atherton, Sarah
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Kemi
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan

Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lockhart, Carla
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherylyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw

Metcalf, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh 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
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg

Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan

Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Michael Tomlinson and
David T. C. Davies

NOES

Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum

Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glindon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive

Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz

Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen

Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 2 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

AGREEMENTS WITH STATES ACCUSED OF COMMITTING GENOCIDE

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 3.—(Greg Hands.)

The House divided: Ayes 319, Noes 308.

Division No. 202]

[6.27 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atherton, Sarah
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Kemi
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baron, Mr John
 Baynes, Simon
 Bell, Aaron
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Browne, Anthony
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Conor
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex

Churchill, Jo	Grundy, James	May, rh Mrs Theresa	Scully, Paul
Clark, rh Greg	Gullis, Jonathan	Mayhew, Jerome	Selous, Andrew
Clarke, Mr Simon	Halfon, rh Robert	Maynard, Paul	Shapps, rh Grant
Clarke, Theo	Hall, Luke	McCartney, Jason	Sharma, rh Alok
Clarke-Smith, Brendan	Hammond, Stephen	McCartney, Karl	Shelbrooke, rh Alec
Clarkson, Chris	Hancock, rh Matt	McPartland, Stephen	Simmonds, David
Cleverly, rh James	Hands, rh Greg	McVey, rh Esther	Skidmore, rh Chris
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Harper, rh Mr Mark	Menzies, Mark	Smith, Chloe
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse	Harris, Rebecca	Mercer, Johnny	Smith, Greg
Colburn, Elliot	Harrison, Trudy	Merriman, Huw	Smith, rh Julian
Collins, Damian	Hart, rh Simon	Metcalfe, Stephen	Smith, Royston
Costa, Alberto	Hayes, rh Sir John	Millar, Robin	Solloway, Amanda
Courts, Robert	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Miller, rh Mrs Maria	Spencer, Dr Ben
Coutinho, Claire	Heapey, James	Milling, rh Amanda	Spencer, rh Mark
Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Mills, Nigel	Stafford, Alexander
Crabb, rh Stephen	Henderson, Gordon	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Stephenson, Andrew
Crosbie, Virginia	Henry, Darren	Mohindra, Mr Gagan	Stevenson, Jane
Daly, James	Higginbotham, Antony	Moore, Damien	Stevenson, John
Davies, Gareth	Hinds, rh Damian	Moore, Robbie	Stewart, Bob
Davies, Dr James	Holden, Mr Richard	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Stewart, Iain
Davies, Mims	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morris, Anne Marie	Streeter, Sir Gary
Davies, Philip	Holloway, Adam	Morris, David	Stride, rh Mel
Davison, Dehenna	Holmes, Paul	Morris, James	Stuart, Graham
Dinenage, Caroline	Howell, John	Morrissey, Joy	Sturdy, Julian
Dines, Miss Sarah	Howell, Paul	Morton, Wendy	Sunak, rh Rishi
Docherty, Leo	Huddleston, Nigel	Mullan, Dr Kieran	Sunderland, James
Donelan, Michelle	Hudson, Dr Neil	Mumby-Croft, Holly	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Dorries, Ms Nadine	Hughes, Eddie	Mundell, rh David	Syms, Sir Robert
Double, Steve	Hunt, Jane	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Thomas, Derek
Dowden, rh Oliver	Hunt, Tom	Murrison, rh Dr Andrew	Throup, Maggie
Doyle-Price, Jackie	Jack, rh Mr Alister	Neill, Sir Robert	Timpson, Edward
Drax, Richard	Javid, rh Sajid	Nici, Lia	Tolhurst, Kelly
Drummond, Mrs Flick	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Norman, rh Jesse	Tomlinson, Justin
Duddridge, James	Jenkinson, Mark	O'Brien, Neil	Tracey, Craig
Duguid, David	Jenkyns, Andrea	Offord, Dr Matthew	Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
Dunne, rh Philip	Jenrick, rh Robert	Opperman, Guy	Trott, Laura
Eastwood, Mark	Johnson, rh Boris	Parish, Neil	Truss, rh Elizabeth
Edwards, Ruth	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Patel, rh Priti	Vara, Mr Shailesh
Ellis, rh Michael	Johnson, Gareth	Paterson, rh Mr Owen	Vickers, Martin
Elphicke, Mrs Natalie	Johnston, David	Pawsey, Mark	Vickers, Matt
Eustice, rh George	Jones, Andrew	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Villiers, rh Theresa
Evans, Dr Luke	Jones, rh Mr David	Percy, Andrew	Walker, Mr Robin
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jones, Fay	Philp, Chris	Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Everitt, Ben	Jones, Mr Marcus	Pincher, rh Christopher	Wallis, Dr Jamie
Fabricant, Michael	Jupp, Simon	Poulter, Dr Dan	Warman, Matt
Farris, Laura	Kawczynski, Daniel	Pow, Rebecca	Watling, Giles
Fell, Simon	Kearns, Alicia	Prentis, Victoria	Webb, Suzanne
Fletcher, Katherine	Keegan, Gillian	Pritchard, Mark	Whately, Helen
Fletcher, Mark	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Pursglove, Tom	Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Fletcher, Nick	Knight, Julian	Quin, Jeremy	Whittaker, Craig
Ford, Vicky	Kruger, Danny	Quince, Will	Whittingdale, rh Mr John
Foster, Kevin	Kwarteng, rh Kwasi	Raab, rh Dominic	Wiggin, Bill
Fox, rh Dr Liam	Lamont, John	Randall, Tom	Wild, James
Frazer, Lucy	Largan, Robert	Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob	Williams, Craig
Freeman, George	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Richardson, Angela	Williamson, rh Gavin
Freer, Mike	Leigh, rh Sir Edward	Roberts, Rob	Wood, Mike
Fuller, Richard	Levy, Ian	Robertson, Mr Laurence	Wright, rh Jeremy
Fysh, Mr Marcus	Lewis, rh Brandon	Robinson, Mary	Young, Jacob
Gale, rh Sir Roger	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Ross, Douglas	Zahawi, Nadhim
Garnier, Mark	Loder, Chris	Rowley, Lee	
Gibb, rh Nick	Logan, Mark	Russell, Dean	
Gibson, Peter	Longhi, Marco	Rutley, David	
Gideon, Jo	Lopez, Julia	Sambrook, Gary	
Glen, John	Lopresti, Jack	Saxby, Selaine	
Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Lord, Mr Jonathan		Tellers for the Ayes:
Gove, rh Michael	Mackrory, Cherylyn		Michael Tomlinson and
Graham, Richard	Macleane, Rachel		David T. C. Davies
Grant, Mrs Helen	Mak, Alan		
Grayling, rh Chris	Malthouse, Kit		NOES
Green, Chris	Mangnall, Anthony	Abbott, rh Ms Diane	Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
Griffith, Andrew	Mann, Scott	Abrahams, Debbie	Amesbury, Mike
Griffiths, Kate	Marson, Julie	Ahmad Khan, Imran	Amess, Sir David
		Ali, Rushanara	Anderson, Fleur
		Ali, Tahir	Antoniazzi, Tonia

Ashworth, Jonathan	Dowd, Peter	Johnson, Kim	Osamor, Kate
Bardell, Hannah	Dromeey, Jack	Jones, Darren	Osborne, Kate
Barker, Paula	Duffield, Rosie	Jones, Gerald	Oswald, Kirsten
Beckett, rh Margaret	Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain	Jones, rh Mr Kevan	Owatemi, Taiwo
Begum, Apsana	Eagle, Dame Angela	Jones, Ruth	Owen, Sarah
Benn, rh Hilary	Eagle, Maria	Jones, Sarah	Paisley, Ian
Betts, Mr Clive	Eastwood, Colum	Kane, Mike	Peacock, Stephanie
Black, Mhairi	Edwards, Jonathan	Keeley, Barbara	Pennycook, Matthew
Blackford, rh Ian	Efford, Clive	Kendall, Liz	Perkins, Mr Toby
Blackman, Bob	Elliott, Julie	Khan, Afzal	Phillips, Jess
Blackman, Kirsty	Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	Kinnock, Stephen	Phillipson, Bridget
Blake, Olivia	Elmore, Chris	Kyle, Peter	Pollard, Luke
Blomfield, Paul	Eshalomi, Florence	Lake, Ben	Powell, Lucy
Blunt, Crispin	Esterson, Bill	Lammy, rh Mr David	Qureshi, Yasmin
Bonnar, Steven	Evans, Chris	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Rayner, Angela
Brabin, Tracy	Farron, Tim	Lavery, Ian	Reed, Steve
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben	Farry, Stephen	Law, Chris	Rees, Christina
Brennan, Kevin	Fellows, Marion	Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma	Reeves, Ellie
Bridgen, Andrew	Ferrier, Margaret	Lewer, Andrew	Reeves, Rachel
Brock, Deidre	Fletcher, Colleen	Lewis, Clive	Reynolds, Jonathan
Brown, Alan	Flynn, Stephen	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
Brown, Ms Lyn	Fovargue, Yvonne	Linden, David	Richards, Nicola
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas	Foxcroft, Vicky	Lloyd, Tony	Rimmer, Ms Marie
Bryant, Chris	Foy, Mary Kelly	Lockhart, Carla	Robinson, Gavin
Buck, Ms Karen	Francois, rh Mr Mark	Long Bailey, Rebecca	Rodda, Matt
Burgon, Richard	Furniss, Gill	Loughton, Tim	Rosindell, Andrew
Butler, Dawn	Gardiner, Barry	Lucas, Caroline	Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
Byrne, Ian	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Lynch, Holly	Saville Roberts, rh Liz
Byrne, rh Liam	Gibson, Patricia	MacAskill, Kenny	Seely, Bob
Cadbury, Ruth	Gill, Preet Kaur	Mackinlay, Craig	Shah, Naz
Callaghan, Amy	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	MacNeil, Angus Brendan	Shannon, Jim
Cameron, Dr Lisa	Girvan, Paul	Madders, Justin	Sharma, Mr Virendra
Campbell, rh Sir Alan	Glindon, Mary	Mahmood, Mr Khalid	Sheerman, Mr Barry
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Grady, Patrick	Mahmood, Shabana	Sheppard, Tommy
Carden, Dan	Grant, Peter	Malhotra, Seema	Siddiq, Tulip
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair	Gray, James	Maskell, Rachael	Slaughter, Andy
Chamberlain, Wendy	Gray, Neil	Matheson, Christian	Smith, Alyn
Champion, Sarah	Green, rh Damian	Mc Nally, John	Smith, Cat
Chapman, Douglas	Green, Kate	McCabe, Steve	Smith, Nick
Cherry, Joanna	Greenwood, Lilian	McCarthy, Kerry	Smithy, Karin
Chishti, Rehman	Greenwood, Margaret	McDonagh, Siobhain	Sobel, Alex
Clark, Feryal	Griffith, Nia	McDonald, Andy	Spellar, rh John
Cooper, Daisy	Gwynne, Andrew	McDonald, Stewart Malcolm	Starmer, rh Keir
Cooper, Rosie	Haigh, Louise	McDonald, Stuart C.	Stephens, Chris
Cooper, rh Yvette	Hamilton, Fabian	McDonnell, rh John	Stevens, Jo
Corbyn, rh Jeremy	Hanna, Claire	McFadden, rh Mr Pat	Stone, Jamie
Cowan, Ronnie	Hanvey, Neale	McGinn, Conor	Streeting, Wes
Coyle, Neil	Hardy, Emma	McGovern, Alison	Stringer, Graham
Crawley, Angela	Harman, rh Ms Harriet	McKinnell, Catherine	Sultana, Zarah
Creasy, Stella	Harris, Carolyn	McLaughlin, Anne	Tami, rh Mark
Crouch, Tracey	Hart, Sally-Ann	McMahon, Jim	Tarry, Sam
Cruddas, Jon	Hayes, Helen	McMorrin, Anna	Thewliss, Alison
Cryer, John	Healey, rh John	Mearns, Ian	Thomas, Gareth
Cummins, Judith	Hendrick, Sir Mark	Miliband, rh Edward	Thomas-Symonds, Nick
Cunningham, Alex	Hendry, Drew	Mishra, Navendu	Thompson, Owen
Daby, Janet	Hill, Mike	Monaghan, Carol	Thomson, Richard
Davey, rh Ed	Hillier, Meg	Moran, Layla	Thornberry, rh Emily
David, Wayne	Hoare, Simon	Morden, Jessica	Timms, rh Stephen
Davies, Geraint	Hobhouse, Wera	Morgan, Stephen	Trickett, Jon
Davies-Jones, Alex	Hodge, rh Dame Margaret	Morris, Grahame	Tugendhat, Tom
Davis, rh Mr David	Hodgson, Mrs Sharon	Murray, Ian	Turner, Karl
Day, Martyn	Hollern, Kate	Murray, James	Twigg, Derek
De Cordova, Marsha	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Nandy, Lisa	Twist, Liz
Debonnaire, Thangam	Hopkins, Rachel	Newlands, Gavin	Vaz, rh Valerie
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh	Hosie, Stewart	Nichols, Charlotte	Wakeford, Christian
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Howarth, rh Sir George	Nicolson, John	Walker, Sir Charles
Docherty-Hughes, Martin	Huq, Dr Rupa	Nokes, rh Caroline	Warburton, David
Dodds, Anneliese	Hussain, Imran	Norris, Alex	Webbe, Claudia
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Jardine, Christine	O'Hara, Brendan	West, Catherine
Doogan, Dave	Jarvis, Dan	Olney, Sarah	Western, Matt
Dorans, Allan	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Onwurah, Chi	Whitehead, Dr Alan
Doughty, Stephen	Johnson, Dame Diana	Oppong-Asare, Abena	Whitford, Dr Philippa

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

Wragg, Mr William
Yasin, Mohammad
Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 3 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS: HEALTH, CARE
OR PUBLICLY FUNDED DATA PROCESSING SERVICES AND
IT SYSTEMS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROVISION OF
HEALTH AND CARE

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House
disagrees with Lords amendment 4.—(Greg Hands.)*

6.37 pm

The House divided: Ayes 357, Noes 266.

Division No. 203]

[6:37 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
Afolami, Bim
Afriyie, Adam
Ahmad Khan, Imran
Aiken, Nickie
Aldous, Peter
Allan, Lucy
Amess, Sir David
Anderson, Lee
Anderson, Stuart
Andrew, Stuart
Ansell, Caroline
Argar, Edward
Atherton, Sarah
Atkins, Victoria
Bacon, Gareth
Bacon, Mr Richard
Badenoch, Kemi
Bailey, Shaun
Baillie, Siobhan
Baker, Duncan
Baker, Mr Steve
Baldwin, Harriett
Barclay, rh Steve
Baron, Mr John
Baynes, Simon
Bell, Aaron
Benton, Scott
Beresford, Sir Paul
Berry, rh Jake
Bhatti, Saqib
Blackman, Bob
Blunt, Crispin
Bone, Mr Peter
Bowie, Andrew
Bradley, Ben
Bradley, rh Karen
Braverman, rh Suella
Brereton, Jack
Bridgen, Andrew
Brine, Steve
Bristow, Paul
Britcliffe, Sara

Brokenshire, rh James
Browne, Anthony
Bruce, Fiona
Buchan, Felicity
Buckland, rh Robert
Burghart, Alex
Burns, rh Conor
Butler, Rob
Cairns, rh Alun
Carter, Andy
Cartledge, James
Cash, Sir William
Cates, Miriam
Caulfield, Maria
Chalk, Alex
Chishty, Rehman
Churchill, Jo
Clark, rh Greg
Clarke, Mr Simon
Clarke, Theo
Clarke-Smith, Brendan
Clarkson, Chris
Cleverly, rh James
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
Colburn, Elliot
Collins, Damian
Costa, Alberto
Courts, Robert
Coutinho, Claire
Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey
Crabb, rh Stephen
Crosbie, Virginia
Crouch, Tracey
Daly, James
Davies, David T. C.
Davies, Gareth
Davies, Dr James
Davies, Mims
Davies, Philip
Davis, rh Mr David
Davison, Dehenna
Dinenage, Caroline

Dines, Miss Sarah
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Docherty, Leo
Donelan, Michelle
Dorries, Ms Nadine
Double, Steve
Dowden, rh Oliver
Doyle-Price, Jackie
Drax, Richard
Drummond, Mrs Flick
Duddridge, James
Duguid, David
Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
Dunne, rh Philip
Eastwood, Mark
Edwards, Ruth
Ellis, rh Michael
Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
Eustice, rh George
Evans, Dr Luke
Evennett, rh Sir David
Everitt, Ben
Fabricant, Michael
Farris, Laura
Fell, Simon
Fletcher, Katherine
Fletcher, Mark
Fletcher, Nick
Ford, Vicky
Foster, Kevin
Fox, rh Dr Liam
Francois, rh Mr Mark
Frazier, Lucy
Freeman, George
Freer, Mike
Fuller, Richard
Fysh, Mr Marcus
Gale, rh Sir Roger
Garnier, Mark
Ghani, Ms Nusrat
Gibb, rh Nick
Gibson, Peter
Gideon, Jo
Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
Glen, John
Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
Gove, rh Michael
Graham, Richard
Grant, Mrs Helen
Gray, James
Grayling, rh Chris
Green, Chris
Green, rh Damian
Griffith, Andrew
Griffiths, Kate
Grundy, James
Gullis, Jonathan
Halfon, rh Robert
Hall, Luke
Hammond, Stephen
Hancock, rh Matt
Hands, rh Greg
Harper, rh Mr Mark
Harris, Rebecca
Harrison, Trudy
Hart, Sally-Ann
Hart, rh Simon
Hayes, rh Sir John
Heald, rh Sir Oliver
Heappey, James
Heaton-Harris, Chris

Henderson, Gordon
Henry, Darren
Higginbotham, Antony
Hinds, rh Damian
Hoare, Simon
Holden, Mr Richard
Hollinrake, Kevin
Hollobone, Mr Philip
Holloway, Adam
Holmes, Paul
Howell, John
Howell, Paul
Huddleston, Nigel
Hudson, Dr Neil
Hughes, Eddie
Hunt, Jane
Hunt, rh Jeremy
Hunt, Tom
Jack, rh Mr Alister
Javid, rh Sajid
Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
Jenkin, Sir Bernard
Jenkinson, Mark
Jenkyens, Andrea
Jenrick, rh Robert
Johnson, rh Boris
Johnson, Dr Caroline
Johnson, Gareth
Johnston, David
Jones, Andrew
Jones, rh Mr David
Jones, Fay
Jones, Mr Marcus
Jupp, Simon
Kawczynski, Daniel
Kearns, Alicia
Keegan, Gillian
Knight, rh Sir Greg
Knight, Julian
Kruger, Danny
Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
Lamont, John
Largan, Robert
Latham, Mrs Pauline
Leadsom, rh Andrea
Leigh, rh Sir Edward
Levy, Ian
Lewer, Andrew
Lewis, rh Brandon
Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
Loder, Chris
Logan, Mark
Longhi, Marco
Lopez, Julia
Lopresti, Jack
Lord, Mr Jonathan
Loughton, Tim
Mackinlay, Craig
Mackrory, Cherilyn
Maclean, Rachel
Mak, Alan
Malthouse, Kit
Mangnall, Anthony
Mann, Scott
Marson, Julie
May, rh Mrs Theresa
Mayhew, Jerome
Maynard, Paul
McCartney, Jason
McCartney, Karl
McPartland, Stephen

McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shapps, rh Grant

Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Maggie Throup and
Tom Pursglove

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara

Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike

Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela

Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Gilding, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David

Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Opong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy

Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds,
 Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Gill Furniss and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 4 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND TREATIES

*Motion made, and Question put, That this House
 disagrees with Lords amendment 5—(Greg Hands.)*

6.47 pm

The House divided: Ayes 364, Noes 266.

Division No. 204]

[6.47 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Chalk, Alex
Afolami, Bim	Chishti, Rehman
Afriyie, Adam	Churchill, Jo
Ahmad Khan, Imran	Clark, rh Greg
Aiken, Nickie	Clarke, Mr Simon
Aldous, Peter	Clarke, Theo
Allan, Lucy	Clarke-Smith, Brendan
Amess, Sir David	Clarkson, Chris
Anderson, Lee	Cleverly, rh James
Anderson, Stuart	Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
Andrew, Stuart	Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
Ansell, Caroline	Colburn, Elliot
Argar, Edward	Collins, Damian
Atherton, Sarah	Costa, Alberto
Atkins, Victoria	Courts, Robert
Bacon, Gareth	Coutinho, Claire
Bacon, Mr Richard	Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey
Badenoch, Kemi	Crabb, rh Stephen
Bailey, Shaun	Crosbie, Virginia
Baillie, Siobhan	Crouch, Tracey
Baker, Duncan	Daly, James
Baker, Mr Steve	Davies, David T. C.
Baldwin, Harriett	Davies, Gareth
Barclay, rh Steve	Davies, Dr James
Baron, Mr John	Davies, Mims
Baynes, Simon	Davies, Philip
Bell, Aaron	Davis, rh Mr David
Benton, Scott	Davison, Dehenna
Beresford, Sir Paul	Dinenage, Caroline
Berry, rh Jake	Dines, Miss Sarah
Bhatti, Saqib	Docherty, Leo
Blackman, Bob	Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Blunt, Crispin	Donelan, Michelle
Bone, Mr Peter	Dorries, Ms Nadine
Bowie, Andrew	Double, Steve
Bradley, Ben	Dowden, rh Oliver
Bradley, rh Karen	Doyle-Price, Jackie
Braverman, rh Suella	Drax, Richard
Brereton, Jack	Drummond, Mrs Flick
Bridgen, Andrew	Duddridge, James
Brine, Steve	Duguid, David
Bristow, Paul	Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
Britcliffe, Sara	Dunne, rh Philip
Brokenshire, rh James	Eastwood, Mark
Browne, Anthony	Edwards, Ruth
Bruce, Fiona	Ellis, rh Michael
Buchan, Felicity	Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
Buckland, rh Robert	Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
Burghart, Alex	Eustice, rh George
Burns, rh Conor	Evans, Dr Luke
Butler, Rob	Evennett, rh Sir David
Cairns, rh Alun	Everitt, Ben
Campbell, Mr Gregory	Fabricant, Michael
Carter, Andy	Farris, Laura
Cartlidge, James	Fell, Simon
Cash, Sir William	Fletcher, Katherine
Cates, Miriam	Fletcher, Mark
Caulfield, Maria	Fletcher, Nick

Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth

Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Lockhart, Carla
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline

Norman, rh 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
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander

Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggan, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Maggie Throup and
Tom Pursglove

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive

Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen

Burton, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Charalambous, Bambos
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Giindon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate

Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine

McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahon, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Opong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra

Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Derek
 Twigg, Karl
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Gill Furniss and
Jeff Smith

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 5 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

STANDARDS AFFECTED BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 6.—(Greg Hands.)

The House divided: Ayes 353, Noes 270.

Division No. 205]

[6.58 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel	Ahmad Khan, Imran
Afolami, Bim	Aiken, Nickie
Afriyie, Adam	Aldous, Peter

Allan, Lucy	Davies, Dr James	Hart, Sally-Ann	Maynard, Paul
Amess, Sir David	Davies, Mims	Hart, rh Simon	McCartney, Karl
Anderson, Lee	Davies, Philip	Hayes, rh Sir John	McPartland, Stephen
Anderson, Stuart	Davis, rh Mr David	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	McVey, rh Esther
Andrew, Stuart	Davison, Dehenna	Heapey, James	Menzies, Mark
Ansell, Caroline	Dinenage, Caroline	Heaton-Harris, Chris	Mercer, Johnny
Argar, Edward	Dines, Miss Sarah	Henderson, Gordon	Merriman, Huw
Atherton, Sarah	Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Henry, Darren	Metcalfe, Stephen
Atkins, Victoria	Docherty, Leo	Higginbotham, Antony	Millar, Robin
Bacon, Gareth	Donelan, Michelle	Hinds, rh Damian	Miller, rh Mrs Maria
Bacon, Mr Richard	Dorries, Ms Nadine	Holden, Mr Richard	Milling, rh Amanda
Badenoch, Kemi	Double, Steve	Hollinrake, Kevin	Mills, Nigel
Bailey, Shaun	Dowden, rh Oliver	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
Baillie, Siobhan	Doyle-Price, Jackie	Holloway, Adam	Mohindra, Mr Gagan
Baker, Duncan	Drax, Richard	Holmes, Paul	Moore, Damien
Baker, Mr Steve	Drummond, Mrs Flick	Howell, John	Moore, Robbie
Baldwin, Harriett	Duddridge, James	Howell, Paul	Mordaunt, rh Penny
Barclay, rh Steve	Duguid, David	Huddleston, Nigel	Morris, Anne Marie
Baron, Mr John	Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain	Hughes, Eddie	Morris, David
Baynes, Simon	Dunne, rh Philip	Hunt, Jane	Morris, James
Bell, Aaron	Eastwood, Mark	Hunt, rh Jeremy	Morrissey, Joy
Benton, Scott	Edwards, Ruth	Hunt, Tom	Morton, Wendy
Beresford, Sir Paul	Ellis, rh Michael	Jack, rh Mr Alister	Mullan, Dr Kieran
Berry, rh Jake	Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias	Javid, rh Sajid	Mumby-Croft, Holly
Bhatti, Saqib	Elphicke, Mrs Natalie	Jayawardena, Mr Ranil	Mundell, rh David
Blackman, Bob	Eustice, rh George	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Murray, Mrs Sheryll
Blunt, Crispin	Evans, Dr Luke	Jenkinson, Mark	Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
Bone, Mr Peter	Evennett, rh Sir David	Jenkyns, Andrea	Neill, Sir Robert
Bowie, Andrew	Everitt, Ben	Jenrick, rh Robert	Nici, Lia
Bradley, Ben	Fabricant, Michael	Johnson, rh Boris	Nokes, rh Caroline
Bradley, rh Karen	Farris, Laura	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Norman, rh Jesse
Braverman, rh Suella	Fell, Simon	Johnson, Gareth	O'Brien, Neil
Brereton, Jack	Fletcher, Katherine	Johnston, David	Offord, Dr Matthew
Bridgen, Andrew	Fletcher, Mark	Jones, Andrew	Opperman, Guy
Brine, Steve	Fletcher, Nick	Jones, rh Mr David	Parish, Neil
Bristow, Paul	Ford, Vicky	Jones, Fay	Patel, rh Priti
Britcliffe, Sara	Foster, Kevin	Jones, Mr Marcus	Paterson, rh Mr Owen
Brokenshire, rh James	Fox, rh Dr Liam	Jupp, Simon	Pawsey, Mark
Browne, Anthony	Francois, rh Mr Mark	Kawczynski, Daniel	Penning, rh Sir Mike
Bruce, Fiona	Frazer, Lucy	Kearns, Alicia	Penrose, John
Buchan, Felicity	Freeman, George	Keegan, Gillian	Percy, Andrew
Buckland, rh Robert	Freer, Mike	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Philp, Chris
Burghart, Alex	Fuller, Richard	Knight, Julian	Pincher, rh Christopher
Burns, rh Conor	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Kruger, Danny	Poulter, Dr Dan
Butler, Rob	Gale, rh Sir Roger	Kwarteng, rh Kwasi	Pow, Rebecca
Cairns, rh Alun	Garnier, Mark	Lamont, John	Prentis, Victoria
Carter, Andy	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Largan, Robert	Pritchard, Mark
Cartlidge, James	Gibb, rh Nick	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Pursglove, Tom
Cash, Sir William	Gibson, Peter	Leadsom, rh Andrea	Quin, Jeremy
Cates, Miriam	Gideon, Jo	Leigh, rh Sir Edward	Quince, Will
Caulfield, Maria	Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl	Levy, Ian	Raab, rh Dominic
Chalk, Alex	Glen, John	Lewer, Andrew	Randall, Tom
Chishti, Rehman	Goodwill, rh Mr Robert	Lewis, rh Brandon	Redwood, rh John
Churchill, Jo	Gove, rh Michael	Lewis, rh Dr Julian	Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
Clark, rh Greg	Graham, Richard	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Richards, Nicola
Clarke, Mr Simon	Grant, Mrs Helen	Loder, Chris	Richardson, Angela
Clarke, Theo	Gray, James	Logan, Mark	Roberts, Rob
Clarke-Smith, Brendan	Grayling, rh Chris	Longhi, Marco	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Clarkson, Chris	Green, Chris	Lopez, Julia	Robinson, Mary
Cleverly, rh James	Green, rh Damian	Lopresti, Jack	Rosindell, Andrew
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Griffith, Andrew	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Ross, Douglas
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse	Griffiths, Kate	Loughton, Tim	Rowley, Lee
Colburn, Elliot	Grundy, James	Mackinlay, Craig	Russell, Dean
Collins, Damian	Gullis, Jonathan	Mackrory, Cherylyn	Rutley, David
Costa, Alberto	Halfon, rh Robert	Maclean, Rachel	Sambrook, Gary
Courts, Robert	Hall, Luke	Mak, Alan	Saxby, Selaine
Coutinho, Claire	Hammond, Stephen	Malthouse, Kit	Scully, Paul
Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey	Hancock, rh Matt	Mangnall, Anthony	Seely, Bob
Crabb, rh Stephen	Hands, rh Greg	Mann, Scott	Selous, Andrew
Crosbie, Virginia	Harper, rh Mr Mark	Marson, Julie	Shapps, rh Grant
Daly, James	Harris, Rebecca	May, rh Mrs Theresa	Sharma, rh Alok
Davies, Gareth	Harrison, Trudy	Mayhew, Jerome	Shelbrooke, rh Alec

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

Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Michael Tomlinson and
David T. C. Davies

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan

Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela

Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glendon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hoare, Simon
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David

Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Matheson, Christian
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McCartney, Jason
 McDonagh, Siobhain
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell

Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth

Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:

**Bambos Charalambous and
 Jeff Smith**

Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishtii, Rehman
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Clarke, Theo
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Cleverly, rh James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Coutinho, Claire
 Cox, rh Sir Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, Michelle
 Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard

Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkins, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 6 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN ONLINE

Motion made and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 7.—(Greg Hands.)

The House divided: Ayes 355, Noes 267.

Division No. 206]

[7.8 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atherton, Sarah
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Kemi
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baron, Mr John
 Baynes, Simon
 Bell, Aaron
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Conor

Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew

Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben

Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggan, Bill

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed

Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
David T. C. Davies and
Michael Tomlinson

NOES

David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Glendon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark

Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hoare, Simon
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James

Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick

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

Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 7 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

After Clause 2

NORTHERN IRELAND: NON-DISCRIMINATION IN GOODS AND SERVICES

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 8.—(Greg Hands.)

The House divided: Ayes 357, Noes 274.

Division No. 207]

[7.19 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, Edward
 Atherton, Sarah
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Badenoch, Kemi
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baron, Mr John
 Baynes, Simon
 Bell, Aaron
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Bradley, rh Karen
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Brokenshire, rh James
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Conor
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, Mr Simon
 Clarke, Theo
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Cleverly, rh James
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Courts, Robert
 Coutinho, Claire
 Cox, rh Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davies, Philip
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinéage, Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, Michelle

Dorries, Ms Nadine
 Double, Steve
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Michael
 Ellwood, rh Mr Tobias
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, Vicky
 Foster, Kevin
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Gale, rh Sir Roger
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 Hancock, rh Matt
 Hands, rh Greg
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, James
 Heaton-Harris, Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian

Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Johnston, David
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Knight, Julian
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Brandon
 Lewis, rh Dr Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 McVey, rh Esther
 Menzies, Mark
 Mercer, Johnny
 Merriman, Huw

Metcalf, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Mrs Maria
 Milling, rh Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Morton, Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Neill, Sir Robert
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Parish, Neil
 Patel, rh Priti
 Paterson, rh Mr Owen
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Percy, Andrew
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pritchard, Mark
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Raab, rh Dominic
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Mr Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Rosindell, Andrew
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Sharma, rh Alok
 Shelbrooke, rh Alec

Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vara, Mr Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Wakeford, Christian
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallace, rh Mr Ben
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warburton, David
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Mr John
 Wiggin, Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Wright, rh Jeremy
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Maggie Throup and
Tom Pursglove

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Rushanara
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena

Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah

Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blackman, Kirsty
 Blake, Olivia
 Blomfield, Paul
 Bonnar, Steven
 Brabin, Tracy
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, Ian
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Campbell, Mr Gregory
 Carden, Dan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal
 Cooper, Daisy
 Cooper, Rosie
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Crawley, Angela
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cummins, Judith
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davey, rh Ed
 David, Wayne
 Davies, Geraint
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Doughty, Stephen
 Dowd, Peter
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie

Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Evans, Chris
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Gill, Preet Kaur
 Girvan, Paul
 Glindon, Mary
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Gray, Neil
 Green, Kate
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Fabian
 Hanna, Claire
 Hanvey, Neale
 Hardy, Emma
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Healey, rh John
 Hendrick, Sir Mark
 Hendry, Drew
 Hill, Mike
 Hillier, Meg
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony

Lockhart, Carla
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Mahmood, Mr Khalid
 Mahmood, Shabana
 Malhotra, Seema
 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
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Monaghan, Carol
 Moran, Layla
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Murray, James
 Nandy, Lisa
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Paisley, Ian
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, Angela
 Reed, Steve

Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Saville Roberts, rh Liz
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Sheppard, Tommy
 Siddiq, Tulip
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Nick
 Smyth, Karin
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thewliss, Alison
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twigg, Derek
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitehead, Dr Alan
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 8 disagreed to.

The list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy, is published at the end of today's debates.

Lords amendments 11 to 31 agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 83H), That a Committee be appointed to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to their amendments 1 to 8.

That Greg Hands, Maria Caulfield, Maggie Throup, Emily Thornberry and Patrick Grady be members of the Committee;

That Greg Hands be the Chair of the Committee;

That three be the quorum of the Committee.

That the Committee do withdraw immediately.—
(*Mr Marcus Jones.*)

Question agreed to.

Committee to withdraw immediately; reasons to be reported and communicated to the Lords.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): In order to observe social distancing, the Reasons Committee will meet in Committee Room 12.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 15 and No. 41A),

That, at this day's sitting, the motion in the name of Andrew Stephenson relating to Business of the House (High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill) may be proceeded with, though opposed, until any hour and Standing Order No. 41A (Deferred divisions) shall not apply.—(*Mr Marcus Jones.*)

Question agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL)

Ordered,

That, at today's sitting, proceedings on consideration of Lords Amendments to the High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill may continue for up to one hour from the commencement of proceedings on the motion for this Order and shall then (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 83F (Programme orders: conclusion of proceedings on consideration of Lords Amendments).—(*Andrew Stephenson.*)

High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill

Consideration of Lords amendments

Clause 58

RESUMPTION OF PREVIOUS USE OF LAND

7.32 pm

The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Andrew Stephenson): I beg to move, That this House agrees with Lords amendment 1.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): With this it will be convenient to discuss Lords amendments 2 to 12.

Andrew Stephenson: Let me say at the outset that the majority of these amendments are clarifications, corrections and updated references. When a Bill has had such a lengthy passage through these Houses as this one, it is perhaps amazing that there are so few amendments that need to be made. Let me say also that the Government accept all the amendments made by the other place to this Bill.

As you would expect, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will provide some comment on the more substantial amendments, but before I do so, I would like to thank the other place for its careful scrutiny of this Bill. In particular, I thank my noble Friend Baroness Vere of Norbiton for her very great skill and diligence in steering this Bill through the other place. I also wish to extend especial thanks to Lord Hope of Craighead and his Committee for their careful and considered approach to the petitions against the Bill in the other place and for the way they handled their processes during the global pandemic.

Turning to the amendments, Lords amendment 2 introduces a requirement on the nominated undertaker to provide and publish annual reports on the impact of the construction of the High Speed 2 project on ancient woodland. This is a scheme-wide amendment: it applies not just to phase 2a of HS2, but to all phases, including those that the House has not yet considered. The requirement in this amendment to report is about ancient woodland, but I have also committed to wider environmental reporting on the impacts of HS2. I look forward to the first of these environmental reports being published, and I am absolutely committed to holding HS2 Ltd to account on environmental matters.

Lords amendment 3 introduces a new requirement on the Government to undertake the consultation prior to 1 May 2021. This consultation is to be for the people of Shropshire, Staffordshire and Cheshire, and it is to seek views on various types of impacts from the HS2 works. The Government opposed this amendment in the other place, but that was on the basis that it was deemed unnecessary. There has already been considerable consultation with the people of Shropshire, Staffordshire and Cheshire. Nevertheless, I think that accepting this amendment is the right thing to do. As the Minister for HS2, I have been charged with resetting the relationship between the HS2 project and local communities. I have worked continuously with colleagues across the House who represent communities along the line of route. I am listening, and I will not stand in the way of the opportunity to listen more through further consultation. I want to

[*Andrew Stephenson*]

reassure the House that I am taking action on what I hear, where it is needed. Further, I will do all I can to ensure that officials and those working on the project for HS2 Ltd put any consultation responses to the best possible use.

I am acutely aware of the strength of feeling in the affected communities, and I am therefore mindful of the motivation and the sentiments of those who supported and voted for this amendment in the other place. As I have mentioned, extensive consultation has already been undertaken. It is crucial, though, that we remember that local communities are at the heart of this project. HS2 is a massive infrastructure project from which the whole nation will benefit, but there are those who will have to bear a burden for that to happen.

I cannot move on without mentioning that there is a price tag of around £350,000 attached to the consultation. However, the costs of running a consultation are minor compared with the costs of delaying the Bill and of not listening to those who are directly affected by the impacts of these works. Let me therefore be very clear about consultation and engagement. The passing of this Bill does not mean the end of engagement with local communities. Indeed, it is only the beginning of a renewed effort to try to mitigate the impacts of the HS2 works on them. Therefore, while there has already been extensive consultation, I see no harm in there being even more.

The last amendment to which I wish to draw the House's attention is Lords amendment 5. It simply clarifies when a new road constructed under the powers in the Bill becomes specifically a public highway, and when a temporary highway ceases to be a public highway. This clarifies the position for local authorities and has been highlighted as necessary through learning the lessons from phase 1. The remainder of the Lords amendments—amendments 1 and 4, and 6 to 12—delete references to some specific phase 1 works that have been made obsolete by a Transport and Works Act 1992 order, delete references made obsolete by the repeal of some local Acts and update other references in relation to the Communications Act 2003.

The Bill has already taken far longer to go through Parliament than was anticipated when the legislation was introduced in July 2017. I do not want to delay it further today. I want this section of the railway to be built so that we can hasten the benefits of HS2 to the north as soon as possible and, given all that I have said, I urge the House to agree to the Lords amendments.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):

Before I call the shadow Minister, I should say that there will be a three-minute time limit on Back Benchers, because we have only an hour for this debate. I remind hon. Members that when a speaking limit is in effect for Back Benchers, a countdown clock will be visible on the screens of hon. Members participating virtually and on the screens in the Chamber. For hon. Members participating physically in the Chamber, the usual clock in the Chamber will operate.

Mr Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi (Slough) (Lab): I rise to support the Bill and all the Lords amendments. I thank the Minister for his acceptance of Labour

amendments, particularly Lords amendment 3, and for his acknowledgement that the Bill did not go far enough to ensure that local voices were heard. This progress would not have been possible without the excellent work of my Labour colleagues in the other place, including Lord Rosser and Lord Tunnicliffe. I appreciate the hard work that has been done to get us to these final stages since the Bill's introduction to the House in July 2017. As I am left holding the baton, it falls to me to place on record my immense gratitude to all those who have contributed so far, including House staff, Members' staff and officials at the Department for Transport. I would also like to thank my predecessors, my hon. Friends the Members for Middlesbrough (Andy McDonald) and for York Central (Rachael Maskell), for their work in previous years to help improve transport infrastructure.

While I am pleased that we are making progress today, I am deeply concerned about the Government's approach and commitment to High Speed 2. Yet again, it seems the Government are overspending and underdelivering. They repeat ad nauseam about "levelling up" the north, but their continuing refusal to commit to delivering HS2 in full, including the phase 2b leg to Leeds, and their 40% budget cut to Transport for the North is the exact opposite of levelling up. I sincerely hope that cities such as Leeds are not going to miss out on the benefits of HS2 due to the Government's failure to get a grip on ballooning costs.

Our northern towns and cities deserve better from the Government, so perhaps the Minister will make the commitment today that HS2 will go all the way to Leeds. I am happy to give way to the Minister if he wants to make that commitment now. That is disappointing, because high-speed rail projects deserve and require long-term and sustained commitment from Government to succeed.

Right now, we are seeing a complete absence in Government support for HS1 and Eurostar. What message does that send about the Government's commitment to high-speed rail? For this project to be as successful as it can be, we need the Government's full commitment to control the exploding costs of the project, commit to the stage 2b eastern leg to Leeds, minimise the environmental impact from construction and ensure public consultation.

Lords Amendment 3 addresses one of those main concerns—local consultation. The section of the line that we are considering today stretches from Fradley Wood to Crewe in Cheshire, largely following the Staffordshire-Shropshire border. Residents of those local areas will have their daily lives impacted by the ensuing construction, yet many will see no material transport benefit. Under-investment in transport in those three counties brought about by a decade of underfunding and austerity means links to the HS2 line are simply insufficient. Time and again, the residents of Staffordshire, Shropshire and Cheshire are promised investment from the Government, but they have consistently failed to deliver.

Oswestry, a town in Shropshire, has a population of almost 20,000, yet no train station. That is not an isolated example. Labour's amendment will minimise disruption from the project and make sure that all three counties benefit by launching a consultation with the good people who know the needs of these counties best—local residents.

Consultation thus far has been poor, yet it was a key promise from the Government and from HS2. Many have voiced their concerns. For example, in the village of Woore in Shropshire, members of the local parish council have repeatedly been told that their point of contact has changed. Just recently, they have been transferred to their fifth official. On an issue that will impact their daily lives for years, that is simply unacceptable.

Many other residents have been frustrated and are left feeling ignored by Ministers and HS2 when they refuse to meet them. How does avoiding proper local engagement assist with development and investment? I am pleased that the Government have finally committed to enhance consultation and to bring any findings to this House. Residents need action, not more warm words, as we have seen with other aspects of the Bill.

Lords amendment 2 concerns ancient woodland. We all know that this project must minimise negative implications for our natural environment, including ancient woodlands. HS2 will deliver increased rail capacity to grow freight and passenger usage, helping to address our climate emergency. For this project not to be held to account on its environmental commitments would be a failure of leadership. After all, while rail accounts for 10% of all passenger miles, it contributes only around 1% of all greenhouse gas emissions from transport. Rail is integral to reaching net zero.

Ensuring rail is more accessible, affordable and sustainable should be a huge part of HS2 and I hope Ministers remain mindful of that. While the Government claim that they want to level up transport, action has yet to be seen. With one of the worst regional inequalities in the developed world, which has only been exacerbated by a global pandemic, levelling up in the north and midlands is more important than ever. Local people must be heard and Government promises must be delivered.

7.45 pm

Dame Cheryl Gillan (Chesham and Amersham) (Con) [V]: There is less justification for this grossly overpriced project than there was when Labour first proposed it. It is the most expensive way to destroy lives and homes, and tear apart the environment. It also ensures that highly paid HS2 personnel continue to bulldoze through this unpopular project. Public polls show it is an unpopular scheme, and Chris Packham's petition to halt it in its tracks has already attracted over 136,000 signatures. It is a shame that the Government and this Minister, excellent though he is, do not have the courage to cancel it or suspend construction.

Turning to the Lords amendments, because three minutes really is not enough, Lords amendment 2 applies to all phases of HS2, including the one that tears through the heart of Chesham and Amersham. It covers all ancient woodland, but I am not sure it goes far enough. For example, there was an ancient oak tree on a property of one of my constituents, but it was on land that was only potentially required during the construction of the railway. It was cut down. There was not the accompanying consultation and the destruction was probably unnecessary, but HS2 did it because it could. That, for me, is not good enough. I hope that Lords amendment 2, now accepted by the Government, will at least go wider and ensure that consultations do take place. I hope that individual trees will be covered and that the reports the Minister gets will include how

wildlife is affected, such as the barbastelle bats that have been disturbed at Jones' Hill wood in my constituency. When HS2 was told it had to stop cutting down trees, it immediately put up very powerful lights at night so that would cause damage to the bats and the environment—so thoughtless and such a cavalier attitude to this rare species.

Turning to Lords amendment 3, the Minister mentioned the cost of £350,000. Let us get that in proportion. It is less than half a year's salary of the chief executive of HS2. I hope the consultation further up the track will be superior to that exhibited in phase 1 in our area. Our local Chilterns Conservation Board experienced the superficial engagement from HS2, which alienated communities and risks designs, such as that for the Amersham vent shaft, being foisted on our community. They are going to build a headhouse that will stand out like a sore thumb in perpetuity. If that is what consultation means for HS2, beware all of you on the phase 2 line of route. So far, consultation has proved to be poor and inaccurate. On this and on many other parts of the construction, HS2 has failed to inform, consult, communicate and engage meaningfully with the people in communities affected by this wasteful project. At a time when our financial resources should be directed to the benefit of the whole UK, it is a project that is to the detriment of the many and of benefit to the highly paid few.

John Spellar (Warley) (Lab): To follow on from the right hon. Member for Chesham and Amersham (Dame Cheryl Gillan), I find it slightly bizarre that at a time when rail travel has been upended and changed dramatically, there was no mention of that in the Minister's comments. Keynes said, "When the facts change, I change my mind." The pandemic has certainly changed the facts even more than those who questioned the original rationale of this project could have anticipated. It has especially highlighted the contrast between the grand project—the great project—and the incremental improvement of capacity. That is what the Eddington report, produced back in the early 2000s, highlighted. It should have been listened to much more.

That is to some extent on the supply side. The impact on the demand side has been dramatic. The question is whether that is a blip or oscillation, or a structural seismic shift. Has it, in fact, changed travel patterns for good, both for conurbation commuting and for inter-city travel? One factor will be possible annual recurrences of the pandemic, as with flu. It may not be as dramatic in a future wave, but it will certainly have an impact.

We have also seen work patterns change. We see that here, with many people working from home. They may not continue to do that all the time, but they may well be working split weeks. That will have an impact on demand. Far more meetings are now conducted by Zoom. That process has accelerated dramatically in a way that nobody, not even the founders of such companies, anticipated. If those meetings patterns change, what will that do to daytime inter-city travel? Will there actually be the demand? Will having the west coast main line and HS2 not actually mean that both become unviable?

I have to ask the Minister, in the light of those developments, whether the Transport Department has actually reassessed the fundamentals of the project—what work has it done on it? While considering the Lords amendments, and given the astronomical sums involved,

[John Spellar]

should there not be a pause and a reassessment, which could require a complete rethink of the project? We may have sunk a few billions—the sunk costs argument is always attractive and seductive but fundamentally wrong—but do we really want to continue to spend tens of billions more?

Mr Owen Paterson (North Shropshire) (Con) [V]: It is a great pleasure to speak in the debate. I begin by thanking the noble Lord Rosser for taking up the cause of my constituents in Woore, a small village where Cheshire, Staffordshire and Shropshire meet; Woore actually means boundary. It comprises a strip of about a mile and a half entailing Ireland's Cross down to Pipe Gate, with a footpath that crosses the road three times. The road is already inadequate for modern traffic, yet perversely, HS2 has decided to go on three sides of a rectangle to take, at the peak, 300 heavy goods vehicles per day—a total of 130,000 extra heavy goods vehicle movements over seven years.

That road is completely inadequate as it stands, and I take my hat off to the parish council and Mr Cowey, the chairman, for battling for those who live in Woore. It is now really urgent, and I welcome the fact that the Government have endorsed and will adopt these amendments, because we have to move rapidly. I will be in Woore again tomorrow morning talking to HS2 and Shropshire Council. We proposed 38 mitigation measures and are down to 33. These are now really important. They mean more than just turning the crossing into a pelican crossing or having a lollipop lady at busy times, when 65 children try to get to their school. I am seriously concerned for the safety of my constituents. The construction phase will begin shortly; it sadly looks as though this project will go ahead.

It really is important that we have a proper consultation and that the Minister, as he is bound to by Lords amendment 3, listens carefully, and that he ensures that those mitigation measures are pushed through and financed by HS2. We plan to spend, apparently, £80 billion, according to the House of Commons Library. It was £30 billion when I was in the Cabinet. I was told we were going to link it up to HS1 and go to Heathrow, but we are not; we are going to somewhere called Old Oak Common. As my right hon. Friend the Member for Chesham and Amersham (Dame Cheryl Gillan) and the right hon. Member for Warley (John Spellar) said, this project is now completely out of date. We can use Zoom and Teams. It would be far better to spend £30 billion of that giving every single household in this country top-class superfast broadband.

However, sadly, this project has its own momentum. If I had the chance tonight, I would vote against it again. I thank the Minister very much for adopting Lords amendment 3 and taking on this consultation, but will he absolutely promise my constituents in Woore that those 33 proposed mitigation measures will be financed by HS2 and will be implemented before those 300 trucks a day start pounding down the narrow lane and past that footpath that crosses the road three times?

Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con) [V]: I am glad that the Minister has agreed to accept the amendments from the House of Lords, particularly Lords amendment 3,

which relates to consultation for the people of Staffordshire, Shropshire and Cheshire, who are affected most grievously by this monstrous white elephant, which has cost so much—it has spiralled out of control. I very much endorse the views expressed by my right hon. Friends the Members for North Shropshire (Mr Paterson) and for Chesham and Amersham (Dame Cheryl Gillan) and the right hon. Member for Warley (John Spellar). It has already caused exceptional physical and social disruption in my constituency, which will receive no benefit from its construction. It has blighted my constituency down the line from top to bottom, wreaking havoc on the countryside and the value of properties and damaging the environment.

HS2 is profoundly unpopular in my constituency. I do not have the time today to go through all the examples of the inadequacy and unreasonableness of HS2, all of which are set out not only in the debates I have taken part in, but in all the petitions in the Commons and Lords. I congratulate Lord Berkeley, Lord Rosser and other Members of the House of Lords who voted for this amendment, including my noble Friend Lord Framlingham. This amendment would never have been presented in the House of Lords without them and without the indefatigable presentation of the case by the Stone Railhead Crisis Group, all of whom deserve congratulations, particularly Trevor Parkin. I also want to pay tribute to Whitmore Parish Council and all those in the north of my constituency, particularly Ian Webb, Bill Murray and Sheila Ramage, and all the volunteers too numerous to mention, some of whom have, I am afraid, already died. I also wish to mention Fred Smith.

This amendment provides for these works, which include road traffic, the environment, and woodlands, and relates to a question about the provision of further railway facilities. I draw the House's attention to the fact that all these improvements should be included for the whole line. In particular, the consultations should follow the Gunning principle, which prescribes the basis on which consultation must be followed. I also suggest that people read what has been said by the Consultation Institute and the comments by its redoubtable adviser Rebecca Wright on proper consultation, which is vital.

This has been a long and tortuous journey. These amendments will assist in mitigating some of the problems, but nothing affects my objections in principle and the economic judgment that I have formed about this project as a whole, which I have voted against at every opportunity throughout its passage through Parliament.

Matt Western (Warwick and Leamington) (Lab) [V]: It is a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for Stone (Sir William Cash). I wish to speak to Lords amendment 2, which will ensure regular reporting on works around ancient woodlands and which, I understand, has been accepted by the Government. However, I am not entirely happy, because this will take the form of annual reports produced by HS2 Ltd, so it will be marking its own homework. We need external bodies, such as the Environment Agency, to be central to that process.

That is important, given the extent of environmental damage. HS2 Ltd itself states that a total of 11 ancient woodlands will be subject to direct impacts as a consequence of phase 2a. To put that in context, the UK is one of the least wooded areas in Europe, with just 13% woodland cover, which compares with a figure of about 37% in the

EU27—so we are talking about just one third of that. It is also worth noting that 2% of Britain is ancient woodland older than 400 years, so this is a precious amenity that we need to protect. In all, 63 ancient woods stand in the intended path of HS2. In Warwickshire, four ancient woods have already been felled. In South Cumbria, we have lost much of that 5 acres, but it will be Whitmore wood in Staffordshire where we will see the single biggest loss of ancient woodland on the entire scheme—an enormous 5.5 hectares.

The environmental devastation being wrought by this project needs to be put into the context of the original premise of HS2. It was claimed by the Department for Transport that it would triple the capacity of the trains across the entire route, but then we come to the cost. The original estimate was £38 billion, but by 2015 that had become £56 billion and in 2019 the chairman of HS2 Ltd quoted figures of £72 billion to £78 billion. At the same time, the Chief Secretary to the Treasury was talking about a figure of £110 billion, a figure echoed by Lord Berkeley, the deputy chair of the independent Oakervee review of HS2. Then we had the issue of the timetable, as this was already so very late. Yet there has been concern that the Government will not even deliver the phase 2b eastern leg to Leeds.

Lords amendment 2 is focused on the environmental damage, and I want simply to question the economic and environmental priority here. What are the most pressing challenges facing this country, particularly in the light of the pandemic? Given the costs and immediate issue of climate change, is this really the best project we can be investing in? We need electric vehicle infrastructure. We need 280,000 public charge points installed by 2030. We need the delivery of hydrogen to our towns and cities. The need for broadband has been mentioned. A national roll-out of full-fibre broadband would cost £30 billion. We also have the need for regional rail networks. The report by the National Infrastructure Commission highlighted the importance of rail needs for the Midlands and north—that is where the priority should be given, particularly given that the world has been turned upside down this past year, a point highlighted by Arup in its “Future of offices in a post-pandemic world” report.

I am grateful for the work done by colleagues in the other place, but it is important that the type of regular reports called for in these amendments should be supported by reviews and debates in Parliament. That is what I want to see and it is what many in this House want to see, and Members may be assured that I will campaign for that.

8 pm

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con) [V]: The case for HS2 before the pandemic hit was made on the basis of the need to expand capacity. I always argued that there was a quicker and cheaper solution for capacity, and that was to digitalise signalling, introduce more short sections of bypass track and improve engineering around the main stations. By those means, we could have got a 25% or so increase in capacity much more quickly at a fraction of the cost, leaving over money to improve local services and the use of the existing railway, and for other purposes.

Now that we have had the pandemic, as we move to the recovery phase, which we hope will be quite soon, we have to accept, as the right hon. Member for Warley

(John Spellar) and others have mentioned, that the nature of work and the use of the office will change. We may well find that the intense pressure during the Monday-to-Friday morning and evening peak, as a result of people tending to start work at 9 and tending to leave for home at 5 or half-past 5, will diminish. We may well find that people will want much more flexible use of their railway—that they will not travel every day, and will not necessarily be going at peak hours. One of the big problems that the railways face—capacity on journeys to main towns and cities at peak—will be changed or relieved by that.

We are due, from the Government and the industry representatives that advise them, their interim thoughts on what the shape of the railway and railway demand might look like in two or three years' time, assuming that all has gone well with vaccination, and that there is a pretty good, robust recovery. We should not assume that it will be recovery to the same work and railway travel patterns that we had before.

I hope that we will make more intelligent use of the railway for freight, because there is still plenty of scope for that if we can get better at single-wagon marshalling, and can make better use of the railway for the relatively longer distances that freight often has to travel to get from ports to all parts of the United Kingdom. That would be a possible use of the capacity that we already have. I dare say that there will also be plenty of promotional schemes for leisure and tourist travel. The fact remains, however, that the use of the railway for work will change very dramatically. I do think this whole project needs appraising in the light of that, and that we are owed a proper plan with the latest forecasts, which must be very different from the forecasts that the Government were using when they first put this proposal to the country and to the House.

Theo Clarke (Stafford) (Con) [V]: I wish to speak to Lords amendment 3, which requires the Secretary of State to consult Staffordshire residents, and Lords amendment 2, regarding the protection of ancient woodlands, in order to represent my constituents who have endured the spectre of HS2 for many years.

From speaking to residents since I have been an MP, I am very aware of the problems that HS2 has caused, and like my predecessor, I have done all I can to assist my constituents in dealing with HS2. I have already visited numerous local groups and businesses who are being affected, and I have worked with Staffordshire County Council to try to come up with solutions to the disruption that HS2 has caused, and continues to cause. I have also met multiple constituents whose lives have been blighted by dealings with HS2, and have tried my best to improve the situation for them. In September, I presented a petition and stood up for local residents and businesses at the House of Lords Select Committee on the High Speed Rail (West Midlands–Crewe) Bill.

The fact remains, however, that despite the best efforts of local residents and everyone I have mentioned, HS2 will be extremely disruptive for the people of Staffordshire. Lords amendments 2 and 3 go some way to addressing many of my Stafford constituents' concerns, so I am very pleased to hear the Minister's remarks this evening. HS2 construction will also disrupt the A34, the A518, the A51 and the M6 motorway, all of which will potentially cause more traffic for my constituents, which is why

[*Theo Clarke*]

Lords amendment 3, requiring consultation with my local residents, is so important. I am also very concerned about the feasibility of construction of the Stone railhead and maintenance base, the increase in heavy goods vehicles and the disruption, which will certainly exacerbate the situation on Staffordshire's roads. This is another reason why Lords amendment 3 is so vital—it will ensure that local residents are adequately consulted on scheduled works.

Lords amendment 2 reflects the importance of our ancient woodlands. At a time when Britain is leading the way on climate change and hosting COP26, we should not be seen to be cutting down trees, which is counterproductive.

Since my election, I have consistently represented my constituents with regard to HS2, and I remain extremely disappointed by the way they have been treated by HS2. I am grateful to the Minister for meeting me on numerous occasions, and responding on specific constituency places. The way that HS2 has behaved is simply unacceptable, and I am pleased that the Government are supporting the amendments and will consult with my constituents. It is right that they be listened to.

Jack Brereton (Stoke-on-Trent South) (Con) [V]: I wish to speak to Lords amendment 3, which I am delighted the Government are supporting. I also wish to outline why it is so important. HS2 will cut straight through Staffordshire, and we cannot be subject to all the pain without any gain. I am pleased that the Government have committed to classic-compatible HS2 services for Stoke-on-Trent—an area where levelling-up is essential. HS2 must truly be transformative.

The economic uplift in Stoke-on-Trent would be significant. It is an area with huge potential that has punched far below its weight. HS2 services must match our economic ambitions for jobs and housing growth. One service an hour terminating in Macclesfield, while extremely welcome, will be insufficient. Our services need to terminate at Manchester. We also want Birmingham HS2 services, to address overcrowding north of Birmingham. That might also resolve the lack of direct services to Liverpool and Manchester airport. Network Rail must undertake work to the classic network to facilitate new HS2 services and additional future local services.

We need better engagement from HS2 with Stoke-on-Trent City Council and local MPs to maximise the potential of HS2 and mitigate the impacts. It is vital that disruption to road and rail during construction be minimised, as recognised by subsection (2)(a) of the new clause inserted by Lords amendment 3. There are significant concerns about construction traffic at junction 15 of the M6, on the A500, and on the A34. Junction 15 is already desperately congested, and is included in Highways England's road investment strategy 3 pipeline. Additional measures are also needed to mitigate impacts on the A34 and A500, particularly given the intense housing growth in the Hanford and Trentham area.

Improving local transport is vital to unlocking the true benefits of HS2; that is reflected in subsection 2(c) and (d) of the new clause inserted by Lords amendment 3. Public transport in north Staffordshire is inadequate, and the area is heavily car dependent. Around 80% of trips in Stoke-on-Trent are by car, yet around a third of

people do not own one. HS2 needs to be plugged into all our communities if we are to deliver the full benefits. The start of that is the Transforming Cities fund, which has £36.4 million for local bus and rail, but we must go further. We need to reopen local stations, including Meir; that is progressing well, due to the Restoring Your Railway fund. There is also the Stoke to Leek line, which connects communities in the city with the Moorlands. We must reopen either Trentham or Wedgwood stations.

The city council has ambitious proposals for a light rail system to connect everything up, but we need a feasibility study that brings that together. I believe HS2 should consider contributing funding to such a study, to ensure that HS2 can be plugged into every part of north Staffordshire. Without investment in local transport, the benefits of HS2 will be severely constrained, and the last few miles could end up taking longer than the rest of the HS2 journey.

Dr Kieran Mullan (Crewe and Nantwich) (Con) [V]: I am speaking in support of Lords amendment 3, which I am glad the Minister has indicated he will accept. I thank him for the open and proactive way that he has engaged with me and other Members of the House. HS2 represents a huge opportunity, not just for Crewe, but for my constituents in the surrounding area. Crewe has a proud railway heritage as an original UK railway town that was once the site of the largest railway and locomotive works in the world, and it is a uniquely well-connected industrial town.

Like many post-industrial towns, Crewe has faced challenges forging a new future for itself, but businesses still come to Crewe because it remains a fantastic location from which to reach the rest of the country. It is home to nationally and internationally recognised manufacturing and engineering businesses that provide high-skilled, high-quality employment. We must build on this. The advantages that HS2 brings for residents are needed to deliver further high-paid, high-skilled work. Parts of Crewe still face high levels of deprivation, and well-paid jobs are at least part of the answer to that.

HS2 is already providing more opportunities; businesses are investing and growing in anticipation of its arrival. If local employer Bombardier is successful in its bid to help build the trains for HS2, the benefits to Crewe and the surrounding area will be even greater. The bid has my full support. HS2 will also unlock improved local transport connections, which I know are the priority for my residents over quicker travel to London.

For this reason, I support HS2, but that does not mean that I do not understand the very real concerns of residents in my constituency and others who will pay a high price. I pay tribute to various Members who have spoken before me and done their best to represent their residents in opposition to HS2. It is important that HS2 does everything possible to listen to people on whom it will have an impact to ensure that it can avoid or minimise that impact. I have already seen examples of HS2 altering its plans in response to feedback from residents, and we know that nationally other approaches are in place, such as the 7 million trees that are being planted to mitigate for lost woodland.

This is not just about minimising adverse impacts. Local voices are on top of local issues and challenges. In my submission in December to the most recent round of consultation on HS2, I was able to identify roads and

routes planned for use during construction that I know will not be available because of local transport redevelopment. Being open and listening to local knowledge and expertise will improve the delivery of the project, which is why I welcome Lords amendment 3 and the Government's support for it.

I finish by saying that I welcome this historic final step in the passage of the Bill through the House, and all the opportunity it will bring to my residents in Crewe and Nantwich.

Aaron Bell (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con) [V]: It is a pleasure to follow so many hon. Friends and constituency neighbours, such as my hon. Friend the Member for Crewe and Nantwich (Dr Mullan). I, too, support Lords amendment 3 and welcome the consultation that the Government have agreed to with people in Staffordshire, Shropshire and Cheshire. The railway skirts my constituency of Newcastle-under-Lyme and passes through the borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme in the ward of Maer and Whitmore, in the constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Stone (Sir William Cash). I pay tribute to him for all he has done to stand up for his constituents, and to the local councillor, Graham Hutton, who has done a huge amount of work on this for his residents. He is my former office manager, but I pay tribute to him for what he has done as a representative.

As my hon. Friend the Member for Stoke-on-Trent South (Jack Brereton) said, it cannot be all pain and no gain for the residents of Staffordshire. We must see benefits from HS2. I am pleased that we have had commitments on services from Stoke-on-Trent, but they are not good enough, as my hon. Friend said. These trains need to run all the way through to Manchester or down to Birmingham or London. It will not be good enough if they terminate too early. He also mentioned some of the mitigation that affects his constituency and mine, particularly the mitigation relating to junction 15. I welcome the fact that that is already in road investment strategy 3, but HS2 will need to do a lot more to satisfy my local residents, given the impact that it will have on their lives.

This is perhaps a more tangential point, but it is one colleagues have made. Newcastle-under-Lyme town centre needs to be connected back to our mainline railway network, whether that is to Stoke-on-Trent to the east, to the HS2 main line in the west, or via a metro. Newcastle-under-Lyme is one of the largest towns in the country that does not have a railway station of its own. Yes, lots of people use Stoke-on-Trent, but that creates huge pressure on our local roads, particularly Basford Bank. We need much better public transport in north Staffordshire, as my hon. Friend the Member for Stoke-on-Trent South said.

In conclusion, I welcome the stance that the Government have taken today. HS2 can be beneficial for north Staffordshire, but I am very conscious that the construction of HS2 poses a large amount of complications for my residents, and residents nearby. I welcome the fact that the Government are engaging with that. As the Minister said in his opening remarks, the cost of this consultation is not nothing, but it is minor compared with the cost of the project, and the cost of not listening to the people of Staffordshire, and to the people of Newcastle-under-Lyme—my constituents. Not having the consultation

would have been a huge mistake, and I am pleased that the Government have chosen to accept the amendment. I am happy to support them.

Andrew Stephenson: I am grateful for the contributions to this debate from many Members. The amendments that we are discussing are very narrow, and many of the contributions we heard were not within the remit of the debate. However, I appreciate the sincerely held views of all who have spoken today. I am sure that there will be a general debate on the merits of the HS2 project more generally in due course—not least because, as my right hon. Friend the Member for Chesham and Amersham (Dame Cheryl Gillan) reminds us, her petition calling for such a debate has now passed 130,000 signatures. I will try to respond to as many of the points as I can, but I am also happy to meet any Members who have spoken and to write on any points that I do not address because they fall outside the remit of this debate and would probably be better addressed in the upcoming debate.

8.15 pm

I start by thanking the hon. Member for Slough (Mr Dhesi) for his support and the continuing support of his party for the HS2 project. He rightly paid tribute to the Bill team, the Clerks and everybody who has been involved in this process, which has been running since 2017. Hybrid Bills are massive undertakings, and there have been a huge number of people involved across the House and working behind the scenes diligently to deliver the Bill, so it is right that we pay tribute to them.

The hon. Member for Slough asked about some general points. I do not want to stray too far from the debate, but he will know that I have said many times that the integrated rail plan would be published before Christmas. I failed—it was not published before Christmas—but we are keen to get it published as soon as possible. The integrated rail plan will bring together the Government's plan for these transformational investments across the midlands and the north of England.

As the hon. Member for Slough knows, the rail-needs assessment from the National Infrastructure Commission only arrived with us in December. We have to consider that, and we also have to consider stakeholders' thoughts about that report before responding. This morning I spoke to the leader of Leeds City Council, the leader of Bradford Council and others to ensure that I am hearing their views and critiques of the report and that they can be taken into account. I very much hope that we will respond as soon as possible. It is fair to say that we are investing record amounts and getting on with many projects such as 2a, despite the challenges posed by covid-19.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Chesham and Amersham is a committed opponent of the scheme and has spoken eloquently and passionately about the concerns of her constituents for many years. I have many conversations with her offline, and I am sure that they will continue to address some of the specific concerns in her constituency. We will ensure that the measures in the amendments we are discussing—for example, annual sustainability reporting—really do reflect the impact of the whole project across all phases, including on ancient woodland and things that are directly relevant to her constituency.

The right hon. Member for Warley (John Spellar) questioned the reason for moving forward with HS2 at the current time. As he will be aware, the Government's top priority at the moment is dealing with the covid-19 pandemic, but this is ultimately a project for the long term. Phase 1 of the railway is not expected to be opened until 2029 to 2033. Whatever projections we come to about the impact of covid on the business case, this is a long-term investment that is about transforming rail journeys in the UK and freeing up the existing network.

John Spellar *rose*—

Andrew Stephenson: In case it pre-empts a point that the right hon. Gentleman is about to make, I will just add that the revised business case will be published when we make an investment decision. While I cannot come out with a revised business case today, before the Treasury commits, there will be a revised business case based on that investment decision, and as with to phase 1, we will publish that business case for all to see and scrutinise.

John Spellar: I thank the Minister for that helpful reply. Are the Government undertaking an assessment of whether patterns of travel have structurally changed or whether this is just a temporary blip? If patterns of travel have changed, the whole basis of this scheme may have done as well.

Andrew Stephenson: We can all see that patterns of travel have changed in the short term, but we are not sure how long that will last. The uncertain end of covid-19—we will get through this, but we are not sure when—means that it is quite hard to predict how long the impact will be. Many studies are going on into this—many academic studies and lots of thought. My personal view is that the global trend we have seen across the world of urbanisation and of people wanting to live in cities and commute between those cities is something we will continue to see. We have seen that in parts of the world that have been affected by previous pandemics and virus outbreaks.

I still think that many people in this country will want to live in cities. When I was growing up, Manchester was like a ghost town and Leeds was similar. Now they are thriving cities and places where people want to live. Therefore I think that projects such as HS2, which is about connecting up the largest cities, still hold sway. As I say, this is an investment for the long term, and phase 1 will not be opening until 2029 at the absolute earliest. I think there is still a strong rationale for it.

I am happy to commit to continuing to keep the House updated. When I was in front of the Transport Committee earlier this month, I committed to informing the House of our thinking about HS2 in my six-monthly report to Parliament. The next six-monthly report on HS2 will be in April, so I intend to give more of the Government's thinking then. Also, if there is a general debate on this issue, when I am sure lots of these points will be made, I am sure I will be much more closely challenged on the broader point.

John Spellar: Is one of the main drivers not peak-time capacity and daytime capacity? Inter-city travel is very much driven by business travel. We have seen how remote conferencing—Zoom we call it, but there are all

the other companies as well—has changed the ways in which people are undertaking those meetings. Might that not really drive down use, so that we do not need that peak-time capacity? In the evenings, there is no problem at all, and that may be when people travel for leisure. Has there not possibly been a significant change?

Andrew Stephenson: This matter really needs its own debate—I am sure it will get one—where we can go through these things in some depth. What I will say is that if we look at the aspirational growth plans of some of the cities we intend to connect, we see that Leeds, for example, intends to double the size of the city centre. We are going to see different people wanting to use transport. We are certainly going to see changes. How long those last for, who knows? We have all in this House spent many months now on Zoom. I cannot wait for us to return to normality and to get back to face-to-face meetings. This is a debate for another day, however, and with your permission, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will try to get back to the topic and the amendments in hand. I am more than happy to debate this topic with the right hon. Gentleman at another stage.

Turning to the comments from my right hon. Friend the Member for North Shropshire (Mr Paterson) about the village of Woore in his patch, and the impact on that particularly affected parish, I am more than happy to commit to meeting him to discuss the challenges in that area, as well as the undertakings and assurances that have been given, to ensure that we continue to mitigate where we can the impact on his local residents. While the Bill contains numerous undertakings and assurances, it is an ongoing process, and we need to ensure that we are continually looking at the best available evidence of the impacts and mitigating wherever we can.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stone (Sir William Cash) spoke with passion about his constituency. He has met me many times about this topic. He is one of the directly affected line-of-route MPs on the 2a route. I am very keen to visit his constituency. He has invited me a number of times to meet specific residents and some of the directly impacted local groups. I am very keen to do so when it is safe for me to do that.

The hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington (Matt Western) talked about environmental reporting and his concerns that, if HS2 does that via a sustainability report, there could be an element of HS2 marking its own homework. I want to be clear that that is something about which I am very passionate. I want to see HS2 setting a good standard—a new standard—for environmental sustainability reporting. I touched on that point in my last six-monthly report to Parliament. I hope to provide more details in my next six-monthly report.

I am committed to ensuring that the project starts the reporting in a way that looks at all the material impacts and in a way that is seen as credible by stakeholders, and not just greenwashing or something else. The board of HS2 Ltd has now formed an environmental sub-committee chaired by Allan Cook that is looking at this, among other issues. I really want to get environmental sustainability reporting right: it needs to be at the heart of this increased transparency from HS2 Ltd. I am therefore more than happy to meet hon. and right hon. Members to discuss the details of how we get it right, not just on reporting about ancient woodland but on reporting about a whole range of environmental impacts.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Wokingham (John Redwood) again questions the demand for HS2. I think we have covered that quite well. I am more than happy, obviously, to write to him. As I said, I hope to shed some light on that in my next six-monthly report, but I am sure it will also be the focus of future debates.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stafford (Theo Clarke) talked with passion about her constituency and the need for the consultation provided for under Lords amendment 3. She lobbied me very hard about Lords amendment 3, as she has about a number of land and property cases since being elected to this House. I pay tribute to her as a doughty champion for her constituents.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stoke-on-Trent South (Jack Brereton) talked about the benefits to his area—comments that were echoed by my hon. Friend the Member for Crewe and Nantwich (Dr Mullan), who sees the benefits to Crewe. I was pleased to be able to visit Crewe prior to the start of the pandemic to meet my hon. Friend and the local council leader to talk about the benefits for regeneration in Crewe. Amendment 3 is important for further consultation with residents in Staffordshire and in Cheshire to ensure that we are taking all people's views into account. My hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Aaron Bell) also talked about Lords amendment 3 and the importance of consulting with Staffordshire because, again, he recognises the benefits.

The Bill itself concerns 36 miles of track between Fradley in the west midlands and Crewe in Cheshire. At its conclusion, the Bill is accompanied by over 17,000 pages of environmental assessment and a register of undertakings and assurances that make over 1,500 individual commitments to petitioners and other interested parties about matters they have raised during its passage. The Bill has been scrutinised carefully by both Houses and improvements have been made to it.

I am sure that the wider debate about HS2, on which we have been slightly exercised tonight, will continue for many months and years. I look forward to further engagements as we prepare for the next stage of HS2—the hybrid Bill taking HS2 from Crewe into Manchester. It is right that we debate this project because it is of such significance nationally, and also so costly at a time of so many pressures on the public finances.

At its heart, though, HS2 is a project that will connect people and places. It is a project that will help the country to level up and help us to build back better from the coronavirus pandemic. Therefore, it is my view

that we must get on with it. We must equip our people with the training and education needed to undertake the highly skilled roles in planning, in engineering and in constructing this railway. We must offer the jobs promised and get shovels in the ground. This Bill is a small part of a bigger project that will create much-needed capacity on our rail network. I believe that opponents—they may disagree—are short-sighted.

It is right that people stay at home now and we reduce travelling to an absolute minimum, but this will not last forever, as we will defeat the virus. The pandemic will end. People will travel again, both for business and for leisure. When that time comes, I want people to be connected. I want this House to have thought about the long-term future of our country and to have planned for it. I want to join up the west midlands and Crewe. I want us to drive investment in infrastructure, in skills and in growth across a whole levelled-up country. In short, I want this Bill to pass.

Lords amendment 1 agreed to.

Lords amendments 2 to 12 agreed to.

PETITION

Reduction in VAT for home energy bills

8.29 pm

David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP) [V]: Earlier this month, Citizens Advice Scotland launched Big Energy Saving Month, which is incredibly important, not least because approximately 25% of Glaswegians live in fuel poverty. Tonight, I present a petition on behalf of my east end constituents calling for a reduction in VAT for home energy bills. The petition states:

The petition of residents of the constituency of Glasgow East,

Declares that there is widespread public support and acknowledgement of the need for countries across the UK to lockdown to suppress the spread of coronavirus; notes that in doing so many constituents are experiencing greatly increased energy costs as a result of staying at home; and declares that people should not have to bare unfairly the financial burden of complying with stay-at-home guidance in the height of a pandemic and during cold winter weather when energy bills are typically higher.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urge the Government to bring forward measures to temporarily reduce VAT liability for home energy bills.

And the petitioners remain, etc.

[P002644]

Animal Charities: Covid-19

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(Michael Tomlinson.)

8.31 pm

Sir David Amess (Southend West) (Con): It is no exaggeration to say that since this Adjournment debate was announced, I have been engulfed by all sorts of animal charities wishing me to raise their plight in what is a very short debate. It is not possible to mention them all, but their excellent Members of Parliament will certainly do that. My hon. Friends the Members for North Norfolk (Duncan Baker) and for Dudley North (Marco Longhi) would like to catch your eye for a minute each, Madam Deputy Speaker, although they understand that the point of these debates is to allow the Minister some time to respond to the point that is being made.

My right hon. Friend the Member for Rayleigh and Wickford (Mr Francois) is very concerned about animal charities in his constituency. My hon. Friend the Member for Rochford and Southend East (James Duddridge) has Adventure Island in his constituency, and there is a wonderful charity there. My hon. Friend the Member for Thurrock (Jackie Doyle-Price) has some animal welfare interests in her constituency; she is very concerned. My hon. Friend the Member for Castle Point (Rebecca Harris) has Acres Way in her constituency, and she is very concerned about animal charities too.

The coronavirus pandemic has undoubtedly changed all our lives. In the long list of businesses, individuals and organisations that have been negatively affected by coronavirus, charities can often be overlooked—especially animal welfare charities. Charities in Southend and the rest of the country work tirelessly throughout the year to provide essential support to those who are most vulnerable and are often unable to help themselves. Animal charities do much of the same work, but instead care for animals that are unable to help themselves. It is up to Members of Parliament to seize the opportunity to speak for them. It is those types of charities that this debate will focus on.

Animal charities have been somewhat ignored during the coronavirus pandemic, and as a result they have suffered greatly, and so have the animals in their care. Animal rescue and care teams are being stretched to their absolute limits. As an industry, animal charities care for all animals, not just cats and dogs. Farm animal sanctuaries and equine charities, for example, are as important as the charities that focus on caring for more traditional pets. No charity should be discriminated against when it comes to financial support because of its size or the animals it cares for.

Animals, and especially pets, have become very important during the coronavirus pandemic. There has been a surge in the number of households with pets. Many who purchased a puppy during the pandemic agree that their dog was a lifeline in the lockdown. Although having a pet in the house during the lockdown is an attractive idea to many, as it can inject a new sense of life and optimism into the home, not everyone knows what looking after an animal entails. When households rush into buying an animal, and subsequently fail to look after it properly, it is the animals that suffer. According to a survey undertaken by the Kennel Club

between March and June last year, 38% of breed rescue organisations saw zero dogs come into their organisations. That could be because dog owners were apprehensive about going to a breed rescue organisation because of lockdown rules.

Many households may not be reporting animal cruelty as much because lockdown prevents them from witnessing it, and they may not be returning pets because they cannot leave their homes, but that does not mean that animal cruelty is not happening. As such, it is very important that lockdown restrictions allow people to relinquish their pets if they cannot meet their welfare needs.

Mr Mark Francois (Rayleigh and Wickford) (Con): Does my hon. Friend remember, some years ago, jointly opening with me the Dogs Trust Essex rehoming centre at Nevendon? It was a multimillion pound investment, and its sole purpose is to rehome those dogs who, unfortunately, have not been cared for as they should have been. Does he commend the Dogs Trust and everything it does?

Sir David Amess: I absolutely do. The wonderful Dogs Trust provided us with two rescued pugs. While I think of those good old days in Basildon, we also have the horse rescue centre there. I am pleased to see my hon. Friend the Member for West Dorset (Chris Loder) in his place. I am sure he has interests in animal welfare in his constituency as well.

The main problems for the animal charities as a result of coronavirus can be broken down into two main categories: they have less income and they have fewer employees. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals estimates the financial loss across the animal welfare sector last year to be £101.4 million. Those charities have seen significantly reduced income due to Government restrictions to curb the spread of coronavirus resulting in shops being forced to close and face-to-face fundraising events not being allowed. While individual givers remain eager to provide whatever support they can, personal finance worries have affected how much they can afford to donate. While this problem has affected all animal charities, the smaller ones—that is what I am really speaking about—are particularly worried as, more often than not, they do not have access to reserve funds or a big organisation behind them.

Despite the charities' reduction in income, the number of animals needing care and attention has not decreased and, as they experience a reduction in income, they are forced to make difficult, heart-breaking cost-saving decisions. I have spoken to many animal charities, all of which have been appreciative of the coronavirus job retention scheme and have tried to furlough their employees instead of letting them go permanently. However, I say to my hon. Friend the excellent Minister responding to the debate that, unfortunately, they have lost much of the voluntary force they rely on so heavily for support.

That, however, is just the negative effects of coronavirus on the charities' business side. The coronavirus pandemic has also introduced massive problems for animals as a result of the charities' loss in income and staff, but unfortunately the virus's effect on animals has been largely forgotten. It is important to remember that animals are dying as a result of a lack of care caused by the pandemic. Because of a lack of income, charities

that care for sick or injured animals with the aim of rehoming them or supplying subsidised veterinary care have not been able to purchase as much food or medicine as normal or house as many animals. More animals are therefore left to fend for themselves without access to the essential care they would have had before the pandemic.

As a result of having fewer staff, charities have had to limit the help they can give to animals and alter the way in which they care for them. The RSPCA, which is a wonderful organisation, and Lady Stockton is a wonderful trustee, had to switch to emergency calls only, and it stopped its 24-hour inspectorate cover. That again meant that charities had less range and scope to deal with new cases, and many animals were left unattended without help. With the sudden rise in demand for pets, and unfortunately the increase in the number of households unable to properly care for their pets, there is extra pressure on animal charities. These charities have had to do a lot of damage limitation that they had not previously needed to do on such a large scale and in such a short time. That has meant that these charities have had to reduce the amount of work they can do on new cases of animal abuse.

The development of behaviour problems in pets and animals as a result of the pandemic is not as widely reported, but can have long-lasting health impacts on animals' lives. According to the RSPCA, owners who reported that their quality of life was poorer also had dogs with a lower quality of life. My right hon. Friend the Member for Rayleigh and Wickford mentioned the Dogs Trust; it similarly reported that many owners found increased incidents of clinginess and attention-seeking behaviours, as well as behaviour associated with fear or frustration.

With many dog trainers unable to operate because of the coronavirus restrictions and facing many financial hardships, the behavioural issues that dogs have begun to exhibit cannot be quickly dealt with. One in five respondents to the Kennel Club survey are worried about the lack of training for their puppies, which they have not received due to lockdown restrictions, and a quarter are concerned about future behavioural problems, such as aggression with other dogs once we return to normal. That could potentially result in an increase in the number of dogs surrendered to animal rescue charities following the pandemic, due to behavioural issues, and increase the strain on animal charities further in the long run.

The voluntary sector and animal charities are in a constant state of financial uncertainty. I am very grateful for the Government support that has relieved some of the financial pressure and enabled charities to continue to carry out essential work. However, as always, more needs to be done. The pandemic has financially ruined those charities for close to a year now, and it will have a long-lasting negative effect on animal welfare issues in the future. Too many animal welfare organisations were not eligible for support from the frontline charities relief fund in April 2019, and have therefore received no direct support other than that available through a wider scheme. One consequence of that was that a parliamentary petition, e-petition No. 314968—"Include animal charities in emergency funding due to the coronavirus pandemic"—was launched. The Government responded in July, acknowledging that the animal welfare sector had faced serious challenges, and stated that they were exploring how those challenges could be alleviated.

I say this to my hon. Friend the Minister: I do hope that the Government act on their statement and are ready to quickly implement support packages to alleviate animal charities' financial worries and enable them to continue to carefully care for animals. There should be support packages targeted at specific charities within the animal charity sector. That is particularly important for equine charities because, as the RSPCA revealed, 79% of equine organisations only had funds for six months or did not know how long those funds would last. Battersea plans to publish a second report in 2021, which will look at the longer-term financial and social impact of the pandemic on animal welfare and the organisations that exist to protect animals. I truly hope that the Government co-operate with those charities and implement their suggestions.

As a patron of the wonderful Conservative Animal Welfare Foundation, I believe that Ministers and the Department need to work with the animal welfare sector to help prevent a significant increase in demand for rescue services this year. Part of the work should cover issues such as puppy farming, puppy smuggling and the unscrupulous selling of puppies and kittens by third parties, which are increasingly relevant given the sudden increase in demand for pets.

Zoos are also a crucial part of animal welfare in this country. I was privileged to visit Chester zoo not so long ago and see the wonderful work that they are doing there; of course, we see their wonderful programmes on TV. Zoos undertake charitable work and have extensive welfare and treatment programmes for sicker injured animals. Throughout last year, zoos and animal sanctuaries were closed and then told that they could reopen and then forced to close again. That is a terrible challenge for them. Opening a zoo on such a large scale, only to have to close again, uses a lot of money, time and resources that could be better targeted at directly caring for animals. I also think of our zoo in Colchester. In an already suffering industry, zoos need governmental support to make up for lost ticket revenue.

The charity Four Paws was hit especially hard when it had to close its animal sanctuaries worldwide. Without the ability to fundraise on a large scale, essential welfare services will inevitably decrease and so will the level of care that the animals receive. Many zoos and animal sanctuaries are outside, and with proper coronavirus safety measures put in place, such as mandatory face coverings, one-way systems and time slots, they can reopen safely. Keeping our zoos shut is reducing the amount of charitable work that zoos can undertake and reducing the quality of care that they can give animals. Whether or not zoos are able to reopen soon, they need financial support to purchase essential medical supplies and to feed the animals.

The zoo support fund was warmly welcomed by the zoos and animal sanctuaries that matched the eligibility criteria, but, according to the British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums, only 26 out of 300 zoos in England have been successful with the fund. That is ridiculous. Unspent funds must be redeveloped into a more accessible support mechanism for the sector, so that all zoos can benefit. A parliamentary petition, e-petition No. 308733, on providing financial help to zoos, aquariums and rescue centres during the pandemic, which received more than 135,000 signatures, was debated in June last year. The Government said that they were

[*Sir David Amess*]

keeping the situation under close review. Now that the situation has changed due to the added restrictions, I hope that the Government are intending to increase the support for zoos.

In conclusion, while coronavirus has undoubtedly created unprecedented problems for multiple industries, including the animal welfare sector, it has provided an opportunity to address key animal welfare issues concerning the link between wild animals and the spread of zoonotic diseases. This should prompt a much-needed reconsideration of our relationship with animals. This pandemic may be all about our relationship with animals. Incarcerating animals in cage systems on factory farms provides the ideal breeding ground for dangerous new strains of the virus. We have all been appalled by the huge culling of 17 million mink on industrial fur farms in Denmark over fears of a mutated form of coronavirus. Without extensive support measures directed at animal charities, the problem will continue to occur and animals will continue to suffer long after the coronavirus pandemic is over and we return to normality. We rely on our wonderful voluntary industry to selflessly help those more vulnerable than us. We must not forget about the animals. We need to ensure that animal charities have the resources and the finances to look after animals' welfare. Now is the time to set out a new vision and a compassionate way forward.

8.47 pm

Duncan Baker (North Norfolk) (Con) [V]: I thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) for bringing such an important debate to the House and for letting me speak briefly. I am grateful to be given one minute to bring an equally important matter to the Floor of the House concerning animals—that of the kennel and cattery boarding industry.

Animal charities are now becoming overwhelmed with pets purchased during the lockdown. If they are having difficulties, our local authorities have an obligation to house strays for a period of time, and this is usually with local commercial boarding kennels. Here is the problem: many have not had sufficient financial assistance during the pandemic, with the lack of industry definition making obtaining the Government grants problematic. They are technically open, but they have had limited or no income, because no one has been on holiday. These issues will become increasingly problematic as kennels fall by the wayside, and animal charities—our wonderful animal charities—will undoubtedly bear the brunt of the ensuing problems. I urge the Minister to please have a thought for this.

8.48 pm

Marco Longhi (Dudley North) (Con) [V]: I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess) for arranging this debate this evening. Zoos such as Dudley Zoo are among our foremost animal charities, caring for some of the world's most endangered animals and undertaking essential conservation and research work to ensure a sustainable future for all species. They are reliant on income from visitors, and coronavirus has had a devastating impact on their ability to raise funds, but they are still incurring the high costs of high-quality animal welfare.

Dudley zoo has only just qualified for a quarter of a million pounds of the much welcomed £100 million zoo animals fund. To be eligible for this emergency funding, it must see its finances diminish dangerously to just three months of reserves, which is impractical to ensure the welfare of animals in its care. It would not be right for zoos to have to euthanise animals in their care simply because they can no longer afford to care for them. Although I am deeply grateful for the support scheme, my plea to Ministers on behalf of Dudley zoo and zoos across the United Kingdom is to revisit the support package, eligibility criteria and deadline to save our zoos.

8.50 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Victoria Prentis): It is a great pleasure to take part in this excellent debate, called by my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West (Sir David Amess). There is only one issue about which he feels more strongly than Southend becoming a city: animals and their welfare. Madam Deputy Speaker, if you were to read his excellent book, "Ayes and Ears"—probably available in all good bookshops—you would be aware that he is the proud patron of the Conservative Animal Welfare Foundation and has devoted much of his life to campaigning on behalf of our furry friends.

Like my hon. Friend, the Government greatly appreciate the work that animal welfare organisations do, often on a voluntary basis. They protect animals against cruelty and ensure that unwanted animals are offered a loving home. We have heard some great examples this evening, not least the Dogs Trust, which was mentioned by my right hon. Friend the Member for Rayleigh and Wickford (Mr Francois).

The good news is that we have all appreciated animals in a new and different way over lockdown. There has been increased interest from people wanting to rehome pets, which has helped to alleviate pressure on the sector. Far fewer pets have been abandoned during lockdown. In fact, it is estimated that about 50% fewer were abandoned in 2020 than in 2019 or 2018. The latest data from the RSPCA—although we must read this with the caveats that my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West mentioned—shows that there has been a reduction in animal cruelty, with fewer calls about cruelty and fewer complaints needing to be investigated. But of course my hon. Friend is right to highlight fears about people adopting pets when they are not suitable or do not have the ability to train those pets, and we will continue to work closely with the sector on those issues.

The less good news is, of course, that many charities have suffered income shortfalls during this difficult time, because charity shops cannot open and it is difficult to fundraise. Charitable providers of veterinary care have also found it challenging to deliver a full service during lockdown, and have just done emergency care. The Government are very keen to support the animal welfare sector and have made sure that in the covid restrictions, the welfare needs of animals are considered and protected. We have tried to ensure that we can continue to allow animal charities that concentrate on rehoming to continue to carry out their business as best they possibly can within the restrictions.

The Minister responsible for animal welfare, who sits in the other place, meets the sector very frequently, and I know that he will be watching tonight's debate with interest and will take forward the ideas that have been raised. I particularly want to mention a meeting that he had in September with the chief executive officers of leading equine welfare charities, to discuss their specific worries about the winter horse problem, which happens annually; they were particularly worried about people who care for horses not having enough money to care for them properly this year. We feel that that is going well so far, but we are keeping a close eye on it.

The sector is a really useful source of information to my Department—for example, on rehoming rates and animal cruelty investigations. We have kept up a useful dialogue with the pet industry, local authorities and vets, who are also useful sources of information. It has been really encouraging to see the sector working together collaboratively to safeguard animals in its care, and it has organised emergency grant schemes itself specifically to support smaller organisations.

As my hon. Friend mentioned, these charities can apply for the full range of Government support measures. The furlough scheme has made a significant difference to between 50% and 60% of animal welfare charities, although of course a certain number of staff have to be kept in place to care for the animals that are still in the home. The Charity Commission has issued really useful guidance on running a charity during covid, including advice for trustees on managing reserves in restricted funds and on provisions to help charities through this difficult period.

On animal welfare generally—I think it is fair to say that my hon. Friend mentioned a wide range of issues during his speech—I would like to say that the Government, despite the pandemic, have been working hard not to take our foot off the accelerator in our agenda in this space. In March last year, I was very pleased, as a former pig keeper, to oversee the new code of practice for the welfare of pigs. In April last year, we introduced the ban on third-party commercial sales of puppies and kittens, which tied in with the earlier pet fish campaign to help people make informed choices when looking for a pet.

In November last year, we launched a new agricultural policy, more details of which will come out in the following weeks and months. An integral part of this is

the animal health and welfare pathway, which is there to promote the production of animals at a level beyond compliance with current regulations. This is a way of reaching a large number of animals, and of protecting and improving the way we care for them.

On 3 December, we launched a consultation on plans to ban exports for slaughter and fattening, alongside wider proposals on animal welfare during transport. I would encourage all those with an interest in this sector to reply to that consultation by 28 January. On 6 December, we launched a call for evidence on the shark fin trade. On 12 December, we launched the primates as pets consultation. On 23 December, we launched the consultation on the compulsory microchipping of cats, which follows on from the earlier decision several years ago to make the microchipping of dogs compulsory.

We are also very keen as a Government to support the Bill to increase custodial sentences for animal cruelty. This Bill, the Animal Welfare (Sentencing) Bill, as you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, is currently awaiting its Committee stage in this place.

Among the other points raised briefly by my hon. Friends was the issue of boarding kennels, raised by my hon. Friend the Member for North Norfolk (Duncan Baker). That is primarily a matter for local authorities, but I will pass on his words to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

My hon. Friend the Member for Dudley North (Marco Longhi) raised the difficulties that Dudley zoo has been having. He has raised them many times, and most forcefully, with the Department, and I was glad to hear that he feels the zoo animals fund is more acceptable than the zoo support fund, the previous fund, which was mentioned by my hon. Friend the Member for Southend West. We feel that this package is working well with the sector at the moment, but we continue to keep the matter under review.

In brief, this Government are committed to animal welfare, as is my hon. Friend, and I look forward to continuing to work together with him in this area.

Question put and agreed to.

8.57 pm

House adjourned.

Members Eligible for a Proxy Vote

The following is the list of Members currently certified as eligible for a proxy vote, and of the Members nominated as their proxy:

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Ms Diane Abbott (Hackney North and Stoke Newington) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Aaron Bell (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Debbie Abrahams (Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Hilary Benn (Leeds Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Nigel Adams (Selby and Ainsty) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Scott Benton (Blackpool South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Bim Afolami (Hitchin and Harpenden) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Sir Paul Beresford (Mole Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Imran Ahmad Khan (Wakefield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jake Berry (Rossendale and Darwen) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Nickie Aiken (Cities of London and Westminster) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Clive Betts (Sheffield South East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Peter Aldous (Waveney) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Saqib Bhatti (Meriden) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Rushanara Ali (Bethnal Green and Bow) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mhairi Black (Paisley and Renfrewshire South) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Tahir Ali (Birmingham, Hall Green) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Ian Blackford (Ross, Skye and Lochaber) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Lucy Allan (Telford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Bob Blackman (Harrow East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Rosena Allin-Khan (Tooting) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Mike Amesbury (Weaver Vale) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Olivia Blake (Sheffield, Hallam) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Sir David Amess (Southend West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Paul Blomfield (Sheffield Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Fleur Anderson (Putney) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Crispin Blunt (Reigate) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Lee Anderson (Ashfield) (Con)	Chris Loder	Mr Peter Bone (Wellingborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Stuart Anderson (Wolverhampton South West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Steven Bonnar (Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Caroline Ansell (Eastbourne) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Andrew Bowie (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Tonia Antoniazzi (Gower) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Tracy Brabin (Batley and Spen) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Edward Argar (Charnwood) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Ben Bradley (Mansfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jonathan Ashworth (Leicester South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Karen Bradley (Staffordshire Moorlands) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sarah Atherton (Wrexham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Ben Bradshaw (Exeter) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Victoria Atkins (Louth and Horncastle) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Suella Braverman (Fareham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Gareth Bacon (Orpington) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kevin Brennan (Cardiff West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mr Richard Bacon (South Norfolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jack Brereton (Stoke-on-Trent South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Kemi Badenoch (Saffron Walden) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Andrew Bridgen (North West Leicestershire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Shaun Bailey (West Bromwich West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Steve Brine (Winchester) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Siobhan Baillie (Stroud) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Paul Bristow (Peterborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Duncan Baker (North Norfolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Sara Britcliffe (Hyndburn) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Steve Baker (Wycombe) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Deidre Brock (Edinburgh North and Leith) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Steve Barclay (North East Cambridgeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	James Brokenshire (Old Bexley and Sidcup) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Hannah Bardell (Livingston) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudon) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Paula Barker (Liverpool, Wavertree) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Ms Lyn Brown (West Ham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mr John Baron (Basildon and Billericay) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Anthony Browne (South Cambridgeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Simon Baynes (Clwyd South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Chris Bryant (Rhondda) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Margaret Beckett (Derby South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Felicity Buchan (Kensington) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Apsana Begum (Poplar and Limehouse) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Ms Karen Buck (Westminster North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
		Robert Buckland (South Swindon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
		Alex Burghart (Brentwood and Ongar) (Con)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Richard Burgon (Leeds East) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Rosie Cooper (West Lancashire) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Conor Burns (Bournemouth West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Yvette Cooper (Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Dawn Butler (Brent Central) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Ind)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Rob Butler (Aylesbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Alberto Costa (South Leicestershire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ian Byrne (Liverpool, West Derby) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Robert Courts (Witney) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Liam Byrne (Birmingham, Hodge Hill) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Claire Coutinho (East Surrey) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ruth Cadbury (Brentford and Isleworth) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Ronnie Cowan (Inverclyde) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Alun Cairns (Vale of Glamorgan) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Geoffrey Cox (Torridge and West Devon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Amy Callaghan (East Dunbartonshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Stephen Crabb (Preseli Pembrokeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Lisa Cameron (East Kilbride, Strathaven and Lesmahagow) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Angela Crawley (Lanark and Hamilton East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Mr Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson	Stella Creasy (Walthamstow) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Dan Carden (Liverpool, Walton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Virginia Crosbie (Ynys Môn) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Alistair Carmichael (Orkney and Shetland) (LD)	Sarah Olney	Tracey Crouch (Chatham and Aylesford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Andy Carter (Warrington South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jon Cruddas (Dagenham and Rainham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
James Cartlidge (South Suffolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John Cryer (Leyton and Wanstead) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Judith Cummins (Bradford South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Miriam Cates (Penistone and Stocksbridge) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Alex Cunningham (Stockton North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Alex Chalk (Cheltenham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Janet Daby (Lewisham East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Wendy Chamberlain (North East Fife) (LD)	Sarah Olney	James Daly (Bury North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sarah Champion (Rotherham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Ed Davey (Kingston and Surbiton) (LD)	Sarah Olney
Douglas Chapman (Dunfermline and West Fife) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Wayne David (Caerphilly) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Joanna Cherry (Edinburgh South West) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Gareth Davies (Grantham and Stamford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Rehman Chishti (Gillingham and Rainham) (Con)	Sir Iain Duncan Smith	Geraint Davies (Swansea West) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jo Churchill (Bury St Edmunds) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Dr James Davies (Vale of Clwyd) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Feryal Clark (Enfield North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mims Davies (Mid Sussex) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Greg Clark (Tunbridge Wells) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Alex Davies-Jones (Pontypridd) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mr Simon Clarke (Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Philip Davies (ShIPLEY) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Theo Clarke (Stafford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr David Davis (Haltemprice and Howden) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Brendan Clarke-Smith (Bassetlaw) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Dehenna Davison (Bishop Auckland) (Con)	Ben Everitt
Chris Clarkson (Heywood and Middleton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Martyn Day (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
James Cleverly (Braintree) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Thangam Debbonaire (Bristol West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown (The Cotswolds) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Marsha De Cordova (Battersea)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Dr Thérèse Coffey (Suffolk Coastal) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi (Slough) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Elliot Colburn (Carshalton and Wallington) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Caroline Dinenage (Gosport) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Damian Collins (Folkestone and Hythe) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Miss Sarah Dines (Derbyshire Dales) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Daisy Cooper (St Albans) (LD)	Sarah Olney	Leo Docherty (Aldershot) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
		Martin Docherty-Hughes (West Dunbartonshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
		Anneliese Dodds (Oxford East) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Sir Jeffrey M. Donaldson (Lagan Valley) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson	Marion Fellows (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Michelle Donelan (Chippenham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Margaret Ferrier (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (Ind)	Stuart Andrew
Dave Doogan (Angus) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Colleen Fletcher (Coventry North East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Allan Dorans (Ayr, Carrick and Cumnock) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Katherine Fletcher (South Ribble) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ms Nadine Dorries (Mid Bedfordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mark Fletcher (Bolsover) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Steve Double (St Austell and Newquay) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Nick Fletcher (Don Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Stephen Doughty (Cardiff South and Penarth) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Stephen Flynn (Aberdeen South) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Peter Dowd (Bootle) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Vicky Ford (Chelmsford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Oliver Dowden (Hertsmere) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kevin Foster (Torbay) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Richard Drax (South Dorset) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Yvonne Fovargue (Makerfield) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jack Dromey (Birmingham, Erdington) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Dr Liam Fox (North Somerset) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mrs Flick Drummond (Meon Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Vicky Foxcroft (Lewisham, Deptford) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
James Duddridge (Rochford and Southend East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mary Kelly Foy (City of Durham) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Rosie Duffield (Canterbury) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mr Mark Francois (Rayleigh and Wickford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
David Duguid (Banff and Buchan) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Lucy Frazer (South East Cambridgeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Philip Dunne (Ludlow) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	George Freeman (Mid Norfolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ms Angela Eagle (Wallasey) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mike Freer (Finchley and Golders Green) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Maria Eagle (Garston and Halewood) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Richard Fuller (North East Bedfordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Colum Eastwood (Foyle) (SDLP)	Patrick Grady	Marcus Fysh (Yeovil) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mark Eastwood (Dewsbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Sir Roger Gale (North Thanet) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jonathan Edwards (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (Ind)	Stuart Andrew	Barry Gardiner (Brent North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Ruth Edwards (Rushcliffe) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mark Garnier (Wyre Forest) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Clive Efford (Eltham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Nick Gibb (Bognor Regis and Littlehampton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Julie Elliott (Sunderland Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Michael Ellis (Northampton North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Peter Gibson (Darlington) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Tobias Ellwood (Bournemouth East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jo Gideon (Stoke-on-Trent Central) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sir Alan Campbell (Ogmore) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Preet Kaur Gill (Birmingham, Edgbaston) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mrs Natalie Elphicke (Dover) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Dame Cheryl Gillan (Chesham and Amersham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Florence Eshalomi (Vauxhall) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell	Paul Girvan (South Antrim) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson
Bill Esterson (Sefton Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	John Glen (Salisbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
George Eustice (Camborne and Redruth) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mary Glendon (North Tyneside) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Chris Evans (Islwyn) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mr Robert Goodwill (Scarborough and Whitby) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Luke Evans (Bosworth) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Michael Gove (Surrey Heath) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sir David Evennett (Bexleyheath and Crayford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Richard Graham (Gloucester) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ben Everitt (Milton Keynes North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mrs Helen Grant (Maidstone and The Weald) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Michael Fabricant (Lichfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Peter Grant (Glenrothes) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Laura Farris (Newbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	James Gray (North Wiltshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD)	Sarah Olney	Neil Gray (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Stephen Farry (North Down) (Alliance)	Sarah Olney		
Simon Fell (Barrow and Furness) (Con)	Stuart Andrew		

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Chris Grayling (Epsom and Ewell) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Anthony Higginbotham (Burnley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Damian Green (Ashford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mike Hill (Hartlepool) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Kate Green (Stretford and Urmston) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Meg Hillier (Hackney South and Shoreditch) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Lilian Greenwood (Nottingham South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Damian Hinds (East Hampshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Margaret Greenwood (Wirral West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Simon Hoare (North Dorset) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Andrew Griffith (Arundel and South Downs) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Wera Hobhouse (Bath) (LD)	Sarah Olney
Nia Griffith (Llanelli) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Dame Margaret Hodge (Barking) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Kate Griffiths (Burton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mrs Sharon Hodgson (Washington and Sunderland West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
James Grundy (Leigh) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kate Hollern (Blackburn) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jonathan Gullis (Stoke-on-Trent North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kevin Hollinrake (Thirsk and Malton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Andrew Gwynne (Denton and Reddish) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Adam Holloway (Gravesham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Louise Haigh (Sheffield, Heeley) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Paul Holmes (Eastleigh) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Robert Halfon (Harlow) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Rachel Hopkins (Luton South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Luke Hall (Thornbury and Yate) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Stewart Hosie (Dundee East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Fabian Hamilton (Leeds North East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Sir George Howarth (Knowsley) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Stephen Hammond (Wimbledon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John Howell (Henley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Matt Hancock (West Suffolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Paul Howell (Sedgefield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Greg Hands (Chelsea and Fulham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Nigel Huddleston (Mid Worcestershire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Claire Hanna (Belfast South) (SDLP)	Ben Lake	Dr Neil Hudson (Penrith and The Border) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Neale Hanvey (Kirkcaldy and Cowdenbeath) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Eddie Hughes (Walsall North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Emma Hardy (Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Jane Hunt (Loughborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ms Harriet Harman (Camberwell and Peckham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Jeremy Hunt (South West Surrey) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Carolyn Harris (Swansea East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Rupa Huq (Ealing Central and Acton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Rebecca Harris (Castle Point) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Imran Hussain (Bradford East) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Trudy Harrison (Copeland) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Alister Jack (Dumfries and Galloway) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sally-Ann Hart (Hastings and Rye) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Christine Jardine (Edinburgh West) (LD)	Sarah Olney
Simon Hart (Carmarthen West and South Pembrokeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Dan Jarvis (Barnsley Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Helen Hayes (Dulwich and West Norwood) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Sajid Javid (Bromsgrove) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sir John Hayes (South Holland and The Deepings) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Ranil Jayawardena (North East Hampshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sir Oliver Heald (North East Hertfordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Sir Bernard Jenkin (Harwich and North Essex) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
John Healey (Wentworth and Dearne) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mark Jenkinson (Workington) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
James Heapey (Wells) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Andrea Jenkyns (Morley and Outwood) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Chris Heaton-Harris (Daventry) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Robert Jenrick (Newark) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Gordon Henderson (Sittingbourne and Sheppey) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Boris Johnson (Uxbridge and South Ruislip) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sir Mark Hendrick (Preston) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell	Dr Caroline Johnson (Sleaford and North Hykeham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Drew Hendry (Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Dame Diana Johnson (Kingston upon Hull North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Darren Henry (Broxtowe) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Gareth Johnson (Dartford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
		Kim Johnson (Liverpool, Riverside) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
		David Johnston (Wantage) (Con)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Darren Jones (Bristol North West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Carla Lockhart (Upper Bann) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson
Andrew Jones (Harrogate and Knaresborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mark Logan (Bolton North East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr David Jones (Clwyd West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Rebecca Long Bailey (Salford and Eccles) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Fay Jones (Brecon and Radnorshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Marco Longhi (Dudley North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Gerald Jones (Merthyr Tydfil and Rhymney) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Julia Lopez (Hornchurch and Upminster) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Marcus Jones (Nuneaton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jack Lopresti (Filton and Bradley Stoke) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ruth Jones (Newport West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mr Jonathan Lord (Woking) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sarah Jones (Croydon Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Tim Loughton (East Worthing and Shoreham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Simon Jupp (East Devon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Mike Kane (Wythenshawe and Sale East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Holly Lynch (Halifax) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Daniel Kawczynski (Shrewsbury and Atcham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kenny MacAskill (East Lothian) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Alicia Kearns (Rutland and Melton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Steve McCabe (Birmingham, Selly Oak) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Gillian Keegan (Chichester) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kerry McCarthy (Bristol East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Barbara Keeley (Worsley and Eccles South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Jason McCartney (Colne Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Liz Kendall (Leicester West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Siobhain McDonagh (Mitcham and Morden) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Afzal Khan (Manchester, Gorton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Stephen Kinnock (Aberavon) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Stewart Malcolm McDonald (Glasgow South) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Sir Greg Knight (East Yorkshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Stuart C. McDonald (Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Julian Knight (Solihull) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John McDonnell (Hayes and Harlington) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Danny Kruger (Devizes) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Pat McFadden (Wolverhampton South East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Kwasi Kwarteng (Spelthorne) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Conor McGinn (St Helens North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Peter Kyle (Hove) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Alison McGovern (Wirral South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mr David Lammy (Tottenham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Craig Mackinlay (South Thanet) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
John Lamont (Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Catherine McKinnell (Newcastle upon Tyne North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Robert Langan (High Peak) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Cherilyn Mackrory (Truro and Falmouth) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mrs Pauline Latham (Mid Derbyshire) (Con)	Mr William Wragg	Anne McLaughlin (Glasgow North East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Ian Lavery (Wansbeck) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Rachel Maclean (Redditch) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Chris Law (Dundee West) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Jim McMahan (Oldham West and Royton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Andrea Leadsom (South Northamptonshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Anna McMorrin (Cardiff North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John Mc Nally (Falkirk) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Ian Levy (Blyth Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Angus Brendan MacNeil (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Mrs Emma Lewell-Buck (South Shields) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Karl McCartney (Lincoln) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Andrew Lewer (Northampton South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Stephen McPartland (Stevenage) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Brandon Lewis (Great Yarmouth) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Esther McVey (Tatton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Clive Lewis (Norwich South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Justin Madders (Ellesmere Port and Neston) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Dr Julian Lewis (New Forest East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew		
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger (Bridgwater and West Somerset) (Con)	Stuart Andrew		
David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady		
Tony Lloyd (Rochdale) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell		

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Khalid Mahmood (Birmingham, Perry Barr) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Dr Kieran Mullan (Crewe and Nantwich) (Con)	Chris Loder
Shabana Mahmood (Birmingham, Ladywood) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Holly Mumby-Croft (Scunthorpe) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Alan Mak (Havant) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	David Mundell (Dumfriesshire, Clydesdale and Tweeddale) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Seema Malhotra (Feltham and Heston) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Ian Murray (Edinburgh South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Kit Malthouse (North West Hampshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	James Murray (Ealing North) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Scott Mann (North Cornwall) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mrs Sheryll Murray (South East Cornwall) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Julie Marson (Hertford and Stortford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Lisa Nandy (Wigan) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Christian Matheson (City of Chester) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Sir Robert Neill (Bromley and Chislehurst) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mrs Theresa May (Maidenhead) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Gavin Newlands (Paisley and Renfrewshire North) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Jerome Mayhew (Broadland) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Charlotte Nichols (Warrington North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Paul Maynard (Blackpool North and Cleveleys) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Lia Nici (Great Grimsby) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ian Mearns (Gateshead) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	John Nicolson (Ochil and South Perthshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Mark Menzies (Fylde) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Caroline Nokes (Romsey and Southampton North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Johnny Mercer (Plymouth, Moor View) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jesse Norman (Hereford and South Herefordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Huw Merriman (Bexhill and Battle) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Alex Norris (Nottingham North) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Stephen Metcalfe (South Basildon and East Thurrock) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Neil O'Brien (Harborough) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Brendan O'Hara (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Robin Millar (Aberconwy) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Dr Matthew Offord (Hendon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mrs Maria Miller (Basingstoke) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Amanda Milling (Cannock Chase) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Guy Opperman (Hexham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Nigel Mills (Amber Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Abena Oppong-Asare (Erith and Thamesmead) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Navendu Mishra (Stockport) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Kate Osamor (Edmonton) (Lab/Co-op)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Mr Andrew Mitchell (Sutton Coldfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kate Osborne (Jarrow) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Gagan Mohindra (South West Hertfordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Kirsten Oswald (East Renfrewshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Carol Monaghan (Glasgow North West)	Patrick Grady	Taiwo Owatemi (Coventry North West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Damien Moore (Southport) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Sarah Owen (Luton North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Layla Moran (Oxford West and Abingdon) (LD)	Sarah Olney	Ian Paisley (North Antrim) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson
Penny Mordaunt (Portsmouth North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Neil Parish (Tiverton and Honiton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jessica Morden (Newport East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Priti Patel (Witham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Stephen Morgan (Portsmouth South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mr Owen Paterson (North Shropshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Anne Marie Morris (Newton Abbot) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mark Pawsey (Rugby) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
David Morris (Morecambe and Lunesdale) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Stephanie Peacock (Barnsley East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Sir Mike Penning (Hemel Hempstead) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
James Morris (Halesowen and Rowley Regis) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Matthew Pennycook (Greenwich and Woolwich) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Joy Morrissey (Beaconsfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John Penrose (Weston-super-Mare) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Wendy Morton (Aldridge-Brownhills) (Con)	Stuart Andrew		

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Andrew Percy (Brigg and Goole) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Toby Perkins (Chesterfield) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jess Phillips (Birmingham, Yardley) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Bridget Phillipson (Houghton and Sunderland South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Chris Philp (Croydon South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Christopher Pincher (Tamworth) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Luke Pollard (Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Dr Dan Poulter (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Rebecca Pow (Taunton Deane) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Lucy Powell (Manchester Central) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Victoria Prentis (Banbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mark Pritchard (The Wrekin) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jeremy Quin (Horsham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Will Quince (Colchester) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Yasmin Qureshi (Bolton South East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Dominic Raab (Esher and Walton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Tom Randall (Gedling) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Angela Rayner (Ashton-under-Lyne) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Steve Reed (Croydon North) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Christina Rees (Neath) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Ellie Reeves (Lewisham West and Penge) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Rachel Reeves (Leeds West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jonathan Reynolds (Stalybridge and Hyde) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Nicola Richards (West Bromwich East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Ms Marie Rimmer (St Helens South and Whiston) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Rob Roberts (Delyn) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Laurence Robertson (Tewkesbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Gavin Robinson (Belfast East) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson
Mary Robinson (Cheadle) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Matt Rodda (Reading East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Andrew Rosindell (Romford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Douglas Ross (Moray) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Lee Rowley (North East Derbyshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Dean Russell (Watford) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Brighton, Kemptown) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
David Rutley (Macclesfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Liz Saville Roberts (Dwyfor Meirionnydd) (PC)	Ben Lake
Selaine Saxby (North Devon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Paul Scully (Sutton and Cheam) (Con)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Bob Seely (Isle of Wight) (Con)	Nusrat Ghani
Andrew Selous (South West Bedfordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Naz Shah (Bradford West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP)	Sammy Wilson
Grant Shapps (Welwyn Hatfield) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Alok Sharma (Reading West) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Virendra Sharma (Ealing, Southall) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell
Alec Shelbrooke (Elmet and Rothwell) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Tommy Sheppard (Edinburgh East) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Tulip Siddiq (Hampstead and Kilburn) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
David Simmonds (Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Chris Skidmore (Kingswood) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Andy Slaughter (Hammersmith) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Alyn Smith (Stirling) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Cat Smith (Lancaster and Fleetwood) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Chloe Smith (Norwich North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Julian Smith (Skipton and Ripon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Nick Smith (Blaenau Gwent) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Royston Smith (Southampton, Itchen) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Karin Smyth (Bristol South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Alex Sobel (Leeds North West) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Amanda Solloway (Derby North) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Ben Spencer (Runnymede and Weybridge) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Alexander Stafford (Rother Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Keir Starmer (Holborn and St Pancras) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Chris Stephens (Glasgow South West) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Andrew Stephenson (Pendle) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jo Stevens (Cardiff Central) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Jane Stevenson (Wolverhampton North East) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
John Stevenson (Carlisle) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Bob Stewart (Beckenham) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Iain Stewart (Milton Keynes South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jamie Stone (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)	Sarah Olney
Sir Gary Streeter (South West Devon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Wes Streeting (Ilford North) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Mel Stride (Central Devon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Graham Stringer (Blackley and Broughton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Graham Stuart (Beverley and Holderness) (Con)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Julian Sturdy (York Outer) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Ben Wallace (Wyre and Preston North)	Stuart Andrew
Zarah Sultana (Coventry South) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Dr Jamie Wallis (Bridgend) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Rishi Sunak (Richmond (Yorks)) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Matt Warman (Boston and Skegness) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
James Sunderland (Bracknell) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	David Warburton (Somerset and Frome) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mark Tami (Alyn and Deeside) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Giles Watling (Clacton) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Sam Tarry (Ilford South) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Suzanne Webb (Stourbridge) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Claudia Webbe (Leicester East) (Ind)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy
Derek Thomas (St Ives) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Catherine West (Hornsey and Wood Green) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Gareth Thomas (Harrow West) (Lab/Co-op)	Sir Alan Campbell	Matt Western (Warwick and Leamington) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Nick Thomas-Symonds (Torfaen) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Helen Whately (Faversham and Mid Kent) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Owen Thompson (Midlothian) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Mrs Heather Wheeler (South Derbyshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Richard Thomson (Gordon) (SNP)	Patrick Grady	Dr Alan Whitehead (Southampton, Test) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Emily Thornberry (Islington South and Finsbury) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Stephen Timms (East Ham) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mick Whitley (Birkenhead) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Edward Timpson (Eddisbury) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Craig Whittaker (Calder Valley) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Kelly Tolhurst (Rochester and Strood) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	John Whittingdale (Malden) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Justin Tomlinson (North Swindon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Nadia Whittome (Nottingham East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Craig Tracey (North Warwickshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Bill Wiggin (North Herefordshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Anne-Marie Trevelyan (Berwick-upon-Tweed) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	James Wild (North West Norfolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Jon Trickett (Hemsworth) (Lab)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Craig Williams (Montgomeryshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Laura Trott (Sevenoaks) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Hywel Williams (Arfon) (PC)	Ben Lake
Elizabeth Truss (South West Norfolk) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Gavin Williamson (Montgomeryshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Tom Tugendhat (Tonbridge and Malling) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD)	Sarah Olney
Karl Turner (Kingston upon Hull East) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Beth Winter (Cynon Valley) (Lab)	Rachel Hopkins
Derek Twigg (Halton) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire) (SNP)	Patrick Grady
Liz Twist (Blaydon) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell	Mike Wood (Dudley South) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Shailesh Vara (North West Cambridgeshire) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jeremy Wright (Kenilworth and Southam) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Martin Vickers (Cleethorpes) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Mohammad Yasin (Bedford) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell
Theresa Villiers (Chipping Barnet) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Jacob Young (Redcar) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
Mr Robin Walker (Worcester) (Con)	Stuart Andrew	Nadhim Zahawi (Stratford-on-Avon) (Con)	Stuart Andrew
		Daniel Zeichner (Cambridge) (Lab)	Sir Alan Campbell

Written Statements

Tuesday 19 January 2021

TREASURY

Counter-Terrorist Asset Freezing Regime: 1 July to 30 September 2020

The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (John Glen): Under the Terrorist Asset-Freezing etc. Act 2010 (TAF 2010), the Treasury is required to prepare a quarterly report regarding its exercise of the powers conferred on it by part 1 of TAF 2010. This written statement satisfies that requirement for the period 1 July 2020 to 30 September 2020.

This report also covers the UK's implementation of the UN's ISIL (Daesh) and al-Qaeda asset-freezing regime (ISIL-AQ), and the operation of the EU's asset-freezing regime under EU Regulation (EC) 2580/2001 concerning external terrorist threats to the EU—also referred to as the CP 931 regime—for the same period (1 July 2020 to 30 September 2020).

Under the ISIL-AQ asset-freezing regime, the UN has responsibility for designations, and the Treasury, through the Office of Financial Sanctions Implementation (OFSI), has responsibility for licensing and compliance with the regime in the UK under the ISIL (Daesh) and al-Qaeda (Asset-Freezing) Regulations 2011.

Under EU Regulation 2580/2001, the EU has responsibility for designations, and, throughout the transition period while the UK was a member of the EU, OFSI had responsibility for licensing and compliance with the regime in the UK under part 1 of TAF 2010.

EU Regulation (2016/1686) was implemented on 22 September 2016. This permits the EU to make autonomous al-Qaeda and ISIL (Daesh) listings.

UK sanctions following the end of the transition period

Since the transition period ended at 11:00pm on 31 December 2020, the UK no longer applies EU sanctions regulations and all sanctions regimes will be implemented through UK regulations. The Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Act 2018 (the Sanctions Act) provides the legal framework for the UK to impose, update and lift sanctions autonomously. Information on the three new counter-terrorism sanctions regimes can be found via this link:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/uk-counter-terrorism-sanctions>.

These new sanction regimes ensure that the UK implements its international obligations under UN Security Council Resolution 1373 and give effect to the UK's obligations under UN Security Council Resolution 2368.

There will be a final quarterly report to Parliament on the UK's Terrorist Asset-Freezing Regime, covering the period 1 October 2020 to 31 December 2020, which will be released in due course.

Attachments can be viewed online at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2021-01-19/HCWS719>.

[HCWS719]

EDUCATION

Secondary Schools and Colleges: Covid Testing

The Secretary of State for Education (Gavin Williamson): On 15 December 2020 we announced that we would be deploying the latest rapid-result coronavirus tests using lateral flow devices to secondary schools and colleges from 4 January to enable weekly screening of staff and daily contact testing of both staff and students who are a close contact of a positive case. This will help us to find those who have the virus but are not displaying symptoms and isolate them quickly.

The asymptomatic testing programme does not replace current testing policy for those with symptoms. Anyone with symptoms, whether they are involved in the rapid asymptomatic testing programme or not, will still be expected to obtain a PCR test and follow NHS Test and Trace guidance, self-isolating until they have received their results.

This testing programme, alongside other protective measures such as social distancing and handwashing, can support school leaders to maintain the continuity of education through the pandemic.

We can confirm that, as planned, the rapid asymptomatic testing programme in schools and colleges is being expanded to twice-weekly testing of primary school staff. Primary schools, including attached early years settings, should expect to receive initial deliveries of home testing kits to offer regular testing to all staff from the week commencing 18 January. Deliveries to maintained nurseries will be slightly later—dates to be confirmed.

Primary school staff will be asked to take tests at home rather than take them on-site following the recent approval of home test kits from the MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency).

Primary school staff will be supplied with lateral flow device (LFD) test kits, which enable self-swabbing. They will be advised to test in the morning before coming into school twice a week (3-4 days apart). The LFDs supplied do not require laboratory processing and can provide a quick result in up to 30 minutes. Staff will then upload the outcome of their test (positive, negative or void) on the gov.uk website.

Taking part in the testing is not mandatory for staff and they will not be expected to provide proof of having taken a test, to enter the school. However, testing is strongly encouraged, and we expect all primary schools to offer tests to staff.

Those who test positive will need to self-isolate in line with the stay-at-home guidance.

As with all policy, this will be kept under review in light of scientific evidence, and the Government will provide further advice if necessary.

[HCWS723]

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

Covid-19 Update

The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Matt Hancock): On 5 January 2021, the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All Tiers) (England) Regulations 2020 (All Tier Regulations) were amended. These amendments instructed people across England to

stay at home and only to leave where they have a legally permitted reasonable excuse, as well as requiring the closure of many businesses and venues.

Although we are getting the virus under control, the numbers of covid-19 cases, hospital and ICU admissions, and deaths remain extremely high nationally. As a result, our hospitals are now under more pressure from covid than at any time since the start of the pandemic.

The weekly case rate in England is 520 per 100,000 for all ages and 414 per 100,000 in people aged 60 and over. There are 127 local authorities with case rates greater than 500 per 100,000. Overall positivity for England is 14.4%, with rates remaining high across all regions and continuing to increase in the north-east, west midlands and south-west. The highest positivity is in London (21.7%) and lowest in the south-west (9.5%).

These figures are significantly higher in comparison to early December and there still remains considerable pressure on NHS systems nationwide as hospitalisations continue to increase. General and acute bed occupancy for covid-19 across England has risen by 1,786 to 31,459 from 29,673 last week. Mechanical ventilation bed occupancy for covid-19 across England has similarly risen to 3,570 from 2,310 in the previous week. Deaths within 28 days of a positive test remain high at 887 on 13 January, the last day of complete reporting.

In line with our commitments, I have kept the measures in place for the national lockdown under ongoing review. On 19 January I completed a review of both the geographical allocations and the restrictions as required by the regulations and have determined that the measures remain necessary and proportionate for all areas in England. While there are early indications that new infections may have started to decline in those areas which have been under stricter measures for the longest, scientific advice and the latest epidemiological data is clear that lifting restrictions now would be too early. The restrictions are kept under continual review and will be lifted as soon as it is safe to do so.

On 18 January the Government made some minor technical amendments to the all tier regulations to clarify policy and ensure consistency. The Health Protection (Coronavirus Restrictions) (All Tiers) (England) (Amendment) 2021 were laid before Parliament on 19 January and will come into force on 20 January.

[HCWS724]

HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Building Regulations: Future Homes Standard and Future Buildings Standard

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): I am today announcing a package of changes in relation to part L and F of the building regulations. This includes the Government's response to the 2019 future homes standard consultation and the launch of the future buildings standard consultation.

Some 40% of the UK's energy consumption and carbon emissions arise from the way buildings are lit, heated and used, and homes—both new and existing—account for 22% of emissions. Therefore, if we are to

meet our ambitious target to reduce the UK's carbon emissions to net zero by 2050, we must improve the minimum energy efficiency standards of new buildings and homes. By improving energy efficiency and moving to cleaner sources of heat, we can reduce carbon emissions, lower energy consumption and bills for households and ensure that we will be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state than we found it.

I am publishing the Government's response to the future homes standard consultation of 2019. This was the first stage of a two-part consultation which proposed an ambitious uplift in the energy efficiency of new homes through changes to part L (conservation of fuel and power) of the building regulations.

The future homes standard will deliver a considerable improvement in energy efficiency standards for new homes. We expect that homes built to the future homes standard will have carbon dioxide emissions 75% to 80% lower than those built to current building regulations standards, which means they will be fit for the future, with low carbon heating and very high fabric standards. The interim uplift to energy efficiency requirements will act as a stepping stone towards the full future homes standard, and should result in a meaningful and achievable 31% in carbon emissions savings compared to the current standard. We anticipate that a two-stage approach to implementing the future homes standard will help to prepare the necessary supply chains and appropriately skilled workforce by encouraging the use of low-carbon heating in new homes, while accounting for market factors.

The Prime Minister's 10-point plan for a green industrial revolution noted that we must implement the future homes standard within the shortest possible timeline. Therefore, our priority will be to implement an interim uplift to the energy efficiency requirements for new homes and nondomestic buildings as swiftly as possible. This key stepping stone will enable us to successfully implement the future homes standard and future buildings standard. We have also listened to those stakeholders that called for a swifter and more certain pathway to implementation. Our work on a full technical specification for the future homes standard has been accelerated and we will consult on this in 2023. We also intend to introduce the necessary legislation in 2024, with regulations coming into force from 2025. In the meantime, to provide greater certainty for all stakeholders, we have published a draft notional building specification for the future homes standard alongside this consultation response which provides a basis on which we can begin to engage with all parts of industry on the indicative technical detail of the future homes standard.

To ensure as many homes as possible are being built in line with new energy efficiency standards, transitional arrangements will now apply to individual homes rather than an entire development and the transitional period will be one year. This approach will support implementation of the 2021 interim uplift and as such the successful implementation of the future homes standard from 2025.

I am also publishing today the future buildings standard, which is the second stage of the two-part consultation. This consultation builds on the future homes standard consultation by setting out energy and ventilation standards for non-domestic buildings, existing homes and to mitigate against overheating in residential buildings.

The future buildings standard consultation proposes changes to the building regulations and primarily covers new and existing non-domestic buildings. This includes an interim uplift of part L and part F requirements for new and existing non-domestic buildings. The interim uplift will also encompass existing homes, meaning that when works take place in an existing home, such as an extension to a property, the work carried out will need to meet the standards set by building regulations—these requirements will not apply to the wider building. It also proposes some changes to requirements for new homes, including to the fabric energy efficiency standard; some standards for building services; and to guidance on the calibration of devices that carry out airtightness testing. Finally, it details a new standard for mitigating overheating in new residential buildings.

Together, the future homes standard and future buildings standard set out a pathway towards creating homes and buildings that are fit for the future; a built environment with lower carbon emissions; and homes that are adapted to the overheating risks caused by a warming climate. By making our homes and other buildings more energy efficient and embracing smart and low carbon technologies, we can improve the energy efficiency of peoples' homes and boost economic growth while meeting our targets for carbon reduction.

I am depositing a copy of the Government response to the 2019 future homes standard consultation and the future buildings standard consultation in the Libraries of both Houses.

[HCWS721]

Building and Construction Products Safety

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): I wish to update the House on the Government's work to tighten regulatory oversight of construction product safety, so that people can feel confident that the products used to construct our homes will perform as they should.

Introduction

Shocking recent testimony to the Grenfell inquiry has shown that some manufacturers of safety-critical construction products appear to have put lives at risk by gaming product-testing regimes, putting products on the market that do not perform as advertised, and to be refusing to take responsibility when caught in the act.

This is unacceptable. This Government will act decisively to protect residents by ensuring that companies who manufacture or sell construction products act responsibly or face the consequences.

In her independent review of the building regulations and fire safety system, Dame Judith Hackitt recommended that industry should ensure that construction products are properly tested, certified, labelled and marketed and Government should put in place a robust regulatory framework to incentivise and oversee this. We agree.

In July 2020, this Government published in draft the Building Safety Bill. The Bill set out the biggest reforms to building safety regulation for a generation, including provisions to strengthen and extend the scope of the powers available to Government to regulate construction products. I welcome the constructive report published by the pre-legislative Committee on the draft Bill—the Government will respond to it shortly and we intend to

introduce the Bill in the spring. In my statement to the House of 20 July 2020, I also committed that the Government would develop options for a new, national regulatory function that would ensure that those regulations are better enforced. Today, I want to update the House on the progress we have made on both fronts—the regulations and the regulator—as well as our plans to go further on product testing.

Broader, tougher construction products regulations

First, we are making good progress in extending and strengthening construction product regulations. At present, some products are not covered by the regulations. Our Bill will ensure that all construction products will be covered by the regulatory regime, and that all manufacturers will be required to ensure that their products are safe before putting them on the market. The Bill will also ensure that products designated as “safety critical” will be subject to additional requirements, including having to meet clear performance standards and to have undergone mandatory testing and control processes before they can be sold. The Bill will also make it possible for regulators to remove from the market any product that poses a significant safety risk, and to prosecute or use civil penalties against any company that flouts the rules.

A strong national regulator for construction products

Secondly, I am pleased to announce today that this Government will establish a national regulator to ensure that the regulations are better enforced, and to provide vital market surveillance that will enable us to spot and respond to safety concern earlier and more effectively. We will do this by extending the remit of the Office for Product Safety and Standards (OPSS), which will take on oversight of construction products alongside its existing responsibilities. OPSS has valuable skills and experience in regulating consumer products and of working closely with local authority Trading Standards and other regulators, and will be granted up to £10 million in 2021-22 to establish the new function.

The national regulator will have strong inspection and enforcement powers—including to commission and conduct its own product testing when investigating concerns—and will work with both national regulators (such as the Building Safety Regulator) and local regulators (such as Trading Standards) to encourage and enforce compliance. The regulator will also advise the public, Government and the sector on technical and policy issues, pursuant to its function. Over coming months, I expect the regulator to begin to operate in shadow form, including engaging with the sector to clarify how the new regime will operate in practice.

Going further on product testing

Thirdly, recent testimony to the Grenfell inquiry has shone a light on appalling practices by some manufacturers of construction products, including what appears to be wilful attempts to game the system and to rig the results of safety tests that are intended to give the market vital information about how products will perform in a fire.

I have written to the Advertising Standards Authority and National Trading Standards to ask them what steps they can take to ensure that marketing of construction products is not misleading. We will provide further information to the House on this in due course.

Furthermore, I am today announcing that I will shortly commission an independent review to examine in detail the deficiencies in testing and conformity assessment

regime for construction products, and to recommend how we can prevent abuse of the system by irresponsible companies who are prepared to put profits before lives. The review will report later this year, and may lead to further regulatory changes.

Ongoing work to improve building safety

These measures come on top of other major steps we are taking as we deliver our commitment to bring about a generational shift in building safety, including:

- £1.6 billion of funding to remove dangerous cladding from high rise buildings

- Introducing the Building Safety Bill and Fire Safety Bill to bring about the biggest change in building safety for a generation

- Establishing a new building safety regulator

- Recruiting the first ever chief inspector of buildings

Conclusion

I trust that these important measures will receive broad support across the House. I also call on companies who manufacture, sell or distribute construction products to do the right thing and address the rotten culture and poor practice that have come to light. We have a shared responsibility to confront poor practice and establish new norms that will restore public confidence in the industry. Residents deserve and expect nothing less.

[HCWS722]

Local Plans: House Building

The Minister for Housing (Christopher Pincher): The country needs more, better and greener homes in the right places.

This Government's ambition is to deliver 300,000 homes per year by the mid-2020s and one million homes over this Parliament. Increasing the number of up-to-date local plans across England is central to achieving that goal. Local plans not only unlock land for development and ensure that the right number of new homes are being built in the right places, they also provide local communities with an opportunity to have their say on how their local areas will change over the coming years, and how the local environment can be protected and enhanced.

Some 91% of local planning authorities have now adopted a local plan, but we know that many of them are not being kept up to date. In March 2020, the Government set a clear deadline of December 2023 for all authorities to have up-to-date local plans in place.

It is critical that work should continue to advance local plans through to adoption by the end of 2023 to help ensure that the economy can rebound strongly from the covid-19 pandemic. Completing local plans will help to ensure that we can build back better and continue to deliver the homes that are needed across England.

To support this, we recently rolled forward temporary changes that we made over the summer to ensure the planning system continues to operate effectively during the pandemic. In addition, we announced changes to the methodology for assessing local housing need and published the 2020 housing delivery test measurement. This should help to provide greater certainty for authorities who are currently preparing local plans. The Government recently issued a formal direction in relation to South Oxfordshire District Council's local plan to ensure it continued to adoption. Where necessary, we remain committed to using all powers available to Government in order to ensure that progress on plan making is maintained.

We also want to see neighbourhood plans continue to make progress with the support of local planning authorities, to give more communities a greater role in shaping the development and growth of their local areas.

The "Planning for the future" White Paper consultation closed in October. The White Paper sets out proposals to deliver a significantly simpler, faster and more predictable system. These proposals will need further development. Authorities should not use this period as a reason to delay plan-making activities. Authorities who have an up-to-date plan in place will be in the best possible position to adapt to the new plan-making system.

I will consider contacting those authorities where delays to plan-making have occurred to discuss the reasons why this has happened and actions to be undertaken.

This written ministerial statement only covers England.

[HCWS720]

ORAL ANSWERS

Tuesday 19 January 2021

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE	753	FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE—continued	
Antimicrobial Resistance	762	Poverty-focused Aid	753
Covid-19 Vaccine Access.....	758	Science and Technology: International Development.....	761
Ethiopia	764	Topical Questions	766
Events at US Capitol.....	755	UN Human Rights Council: Sri Lanka.....	754
Global Malnutrition	765	Yemen	762
Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.....	757		
Kashmir: Human Rights.....	765		

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Tuesday 19 January 2021

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
EDUCATION	38WS	HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—continued	
Secondary Schools and Colleges: Covid Testing	38WS	Building Regulations: Future Homes Standard and Future Buildings Standard.....	39WS
HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE	38WS	Local Plans: House Building.....	43WS
Covid-19 Update.....	38WS	TREASURY	37WS
HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	39WS	Counter-Terrorist Asset Freezing Regime: 1 July to 30 September 2020	37WS
Building and Construction Products Safety	41WS		

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 26 January 2021**

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 19 January 2021

Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 753] [see index inside back page]

Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs

UK Musicians: EU Visa Arrangements [Col. 773]

Answer to urgent question—(Caroline Dinéage)

Freedom of Speech (Universities) [Col. 790]

*Motion for leave to bring in Bill—(Mr David Davis)—agreed to
Bill presented, and read the First time*

Trade Bill [Col. 793]

Lords amendments considered

High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill [Col. 902]

Lords amendments considered

Petition [Col. 918]

Animal Charities: Covid-19 [Col. 919]

Debate on motion for Adjournment

Written Statements [Col. 37WS]

Written Answers to Questions [The written answers can now be found at <http://www.parliament.uk/writtenanswers>]
