

**Monday
20 July 2020**

**Volume 678
No. 89**



**HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT**

**PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES**

(HANSARD)

Monday 20 July 2020

House of Commons

Monday 20 July 2020

The House met at half-past Two o'clock

PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Virtual participation in proceedings commenced (Order, 4 June).

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

Oral Answers to Questions

HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Secretary of State was asked—

Shared Prosperity Fund

Neale Hanvey (Kirkcaldy and Cowdenbeath) (SNP): What recent discussions he has had with the Scottish Government on the shared prosperity fund. [904949]

Alyn Smith (Stirling) (SNP): What recent discussions he has had with the Scottish Government on the shared prosperity fund. [904961]

Stephen Flynn (Aberdeen South) (SNP): What recent discussions he has had with the Scottish Government on the shared prosperity fund. [904967]

The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Mr Simon Clarke): This Government believe in respecting the results of democratic referendums. Leaving the European Union has provided us with an opportunity to align the objective of the EU structural funds with domestic priorities, while continuing to support vital jobs and growth opportunities across the United Kingdom. The new UK shared prosperity fund will be our vehicle for delivering that. UK Government officials regularly speak to their counterparts in the devolved Administrations about this and other issues.

Neale Hanvey [V]: This vague waffle on timelines and content just will not cut it. The UK has received over €10 billion in structural funding since 2014 as an EU member, and it is now staring at economic disaster, with no information on what will replace those funds. Will the Minister guarantee today that the shared prosperity fund will not result in areas such as Fife seeing any reduction in funding?

Mr Clarke: The 2019 Conservative party manifesto committed at a minimum to matching the size of EU structural funds in each nation. It is very important that we get these decisions right. This is, after all, an enormous sum of money—our money—sent formally

to the EU and then top-sliced and sent back to us with conditions. I very much look forward to controlling it for ourselves.

Alyn Smith: It is not just the Scottish Government who are looking for clarity on this. Just last week, the Institute for Fiscal Studies published a report that said that, four years after the Brexit vote, it is “high time” we had some idea of where the Government are going. Does the Minister agree with me, the Scottish Government, the Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Assembly Government that it is high time we had clarity on these schemes?

Mr Clarke: It is obviously importantly that we provide that clarity—I wholly agree with the hon. Gentleman—and we are going to provide that clarity after the cross-government spending review in the autumn.

Stephen Flynn: The report highlighted by my hon. Friend the Member for Stirling (Alyn Smith) did not end its criticism there. The IFS went on to say that it was “disconcerting” that the shared prosperity fund was still not finalised and suggested that

“With limited time left, one option the government could consider would be to continue with existing EU funding allocations for one more year.”

Will the Minister today commit to do just that, to protect all our communities and ensure that they are not left behind by this incompetent UK Government?

Mr Clarke: Obviously, I do not accept the hon. Gentleman’s characterisation of the Government. We are working very hard to ensure that we deliver on the decision to leave the European Union. We will be in a position to give full details on the UK shared prosperity fund after the cross-government spending review, which will be so important to determining many aspects of our future relationship with Europe, as well as our commitments to our own spending priorities. We will continue working closely as one United Kingdom to understand the changing needs of local and regional economies, and I am happy to meet Ministers from the Scottish Government to find an acceptable way forward.

David Linden (Glasgow East) (SNP): Five months before the transition periods ends, there is still lots of talk from the Government about future funding arrangements but no details. Last month, the Minister told me that he would make inquiries on this, yet his response only promised more details in due course. Does he appreciate that communities cannot afford to wait in perpetuity and need clarity on this now?

Mr Clarke: My officials meet fortnightly with those of the Scottish Government, and it is obviously very important that we maintain that dialogue. As I indicated in my reply to the hon. Member for Aberdeen South (Stephen Flynn), we are clear that we are prepared to have talks at ministerial level with our Scottish counterparts. We want to provide that clarity, and we will be in a position to do so when we have had the spending review, which will detail our commitments in the round.

David Linden: I am grateful, but endless meetings do not give answers to communities and local governments who need that information and clarity. Another issue is

the stronger towns fund. There has been lots of self-congratulatory back-slapping from Tory Back Benchers but very little detail. In the departmental spending debate on the estimates earlier this month, there was still no detail forthcoming. Will the Minister advise us today when Scotland will receive details and a timeline for the stronger towns fund?

Mr Clarke: The stronger towns fund is a vital part of our levelling-up work. I make no apologies whatsoever for saying that it is a really important tool to rectify long-standing economic imbalances in the country. The Barnett formula will be applied to investment for England in the normal way at the spending review. The funding is committed to the devolved nations, which means that the Governments in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will receive a share of funding, with allocations to be confirmed in the next financial year.

Families in Temporary Accommodation

Siobhain McDonagh (Mitcham and Morden) (Lab): What steps his Department is taking to ensure that recipient local authorities are informed when a family is moved by another local authority to temporary accommodation in their local authority area. [904950]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Luke Hall): The Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation) (England) Order 2012 and the homelessness code of guidance set out that local authorities should try to place households within the area; that when that is not possible, they should place the household as near as possible, and that that should be a last resort. If a local authority places a family outside its area, it is required by law to notify the local authority in the area in which the family are placed.

Siobhain McDonagh: How does the law work without enforcement? We know from the programme “Ross Kemp: Living with...” that homeless families travel approximately 400,000 miles—or 16 times round the globe—each year to get to their temporary accommodation, and 60 councils are not informing the receiving authorities. That is the reality; what are the Government going to do about it?

Luke Hall: The hon. Lady cares passionately about this issue and has raised it in the House recently. If a local authority places a household in temporary accommodation in another area, it is, as I said, required by law to notify that local authority to ensure that there is no disruption in schooling or employment. Our homelessness and advice support team should hold local authorities to account for their performance on this matter, and the Local Government Association is doing work with local authorities from London and throughout the country to develop a protocol for out-of-area placements. We are clear, from the Front Bench, that councils should adhere to this basic legal requirement.

Town Centre Investment

Simon Jupp (East Devon) (Con): What steps he is taking to increase investment in town centres. [904951]

Tom Hunt (Ipswich) (Con): What steps he is taking to increase investment in town centres. [904955]

Mark Logan (Bolton North East) (Con): What steps he is taking to increase investment in town centres. [904968]

Sara Britcliffe (Hyndburn) (Con): What steps he is taking to increase investment in town centres. [904973]

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): Our £3.6 billion towns fund will drive the economic regeneration of towns to deliver long-term economic and productivity growth. The towns fund will play an important role in the support of our country’s economic recovery, bringing forward public investment to create jobs and boost confidence in towns, as well as leveraging investment in from the private sector.

Simon Jupp: The beautiful towns across East Devon boast many independent shops on their high streets, providing the customer service that people just cannot get with a click of a mouse. As we reopen our high streets safely and encourage people to think local first, the Government must press on with plans to regenerate town centres. What plans does my right hon. Friend have for the next phase of the future high streets fund?

Robert Jenrick: My hon. Friend will be pleased to hear that we will set out our plans for a competitive round of the towns fund later this year. As I said to him when I visited Exmouth with him last year, that is the kind of town that the fund was designed to serve, and I very much look forward to seeing its submission. In terms of immediate investment, the Heart of the South West local enterprise partnership will receive £35.4 million from the getting building fund for shovel-ready projects across the area, including in Devon. We will announce 160 successful projects from across England at the end of this month.

Tom Hunt: Ipswich town centre is at the heart of life in our town, but it faces many challenges that have only been made greater by covid-19. A great deal of work is going into developing a coherent strategy to regenerate our town centre, with the input of both private and public sectors, under the Ipswich Vision partnership. Will my right hon. Friend recognise the excellent work that has gone into developing the strategy for Ipswich town centre as he considers our proposed timetable for receiving £25 million of town deal funding in October this year?

Robert Jenrick: I am delighted that the ideas developed over the past several years by the Ipswich Vision board are being used as the foundation for the Ipswich town deal. My officials are looking forward to receiving Ipswich’s proposals in the town investment plan that is, as my hon. Friend says, being submitted on 30 October. We have recently announced that Ipswich, like other towns that are recipients of the towns fund, can apply to my Department for up to £1 million to kick-start its work, create jobs, boost confidence and help the local economy to recover.

Mark Logan [V]: Bolton has shovel-ready town centre regeneration schemes including Le Mans Crescent and Church Wharf. Uncertainty created by covid-19 means that financial backers are looking to the Government to act as guarantor of last resort. Will my right hon. Friend

agree to meet me and the leader of Bolton Council to discuss ways to help support those well developed regeneration plans? As I am sure he will concur, Bolton is ready to be the epicentre of this Government's levelling-up agenda.

Robert Jenrick: I congratulate Bolton and my hon. Friend on the very impressive work that they are doing with the council to transform the town. Bolton is one of the initial 100 towns selected to submit proposals for a town deal, and, again, I look forward to seeing the submissions shortly. As I said in my previous answer, Bolton can also apply to the Department for an advance of £1 million from the town deal to fund some of those projects that he describes. I also understand that, as a result of Bolton being part of the future high streets fund, it is likely to include support for Trinity Gateway, Le Mans Crescent, Church Wharf and Crompton Place—a number of extremely important regeneration projects.

Sara Britcliffe: Accrington town centre is one of the many places that have been left behind for too long. It is at the heart of my community and now that I am the Member of Parliament, I intend to be the strong voice that is needed to make sure that it is not a forgotten town any more. Will the Secretary of State accept my invitation to visit Accrington and our amazing local businesses to discuss with me how I can make sure that it gets the investment that is so desperately needed?

Robert Jenrick: I would be delighted to accept my hon. Friend's invitation to Accrington. From what I have seen in her relatively short period in this House, she is exactly the strong voice that her constituents deserve. We have shown consistently through our initiatives, such as the towns fund, which we have been discussing, and the high streets fund, our commitment to levelling up all parts of the country, and we are doing that once again with our £900 million getting building fund, £34 million of which will benefit her constituents in Lancashire. I look forward to announcing, with her local enterprise partnership, those projects by the end of the month.

Naz Shah (Bradford West) (Lab) [V]: Does the Secretary of State agree that the provision of appropriate community spaces and opportunities in town centres can be crucial to social cohesion? During decades of austerity, our communities have lost so much of their town centres. Will the Secretary of State tell me what steps are being taken to ensure that any town centre regeneration plan is drawn up with the help of the community members so that communities are prioritised and benefited, including through jobs and social spaces?

Robert Jenrick: I agree that we need to invest in our town centres and our high streets. The Government had begun that work even before the pandemic created so much additional economic disruption. The towns fund and the high streets fund are important initiatives that will help local communities to set a course for the future, with investment in infrastructure, in town centre regeneration, in skills, and in culture, and local people are at the heart of each and every one of those town deals or high street bids.

Housing Infrastructure Projects

Mr Peter Bone (Wellingborough) (Con): What infrastructure projects the Government are supporting in (a) Northamptonshire and (b) England to enable more housing to be built. [904952]

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): The Government are investing around £150 million in infrastructure projects in Northamptonshire, unlocking the development of more than 19,000 homes in Corby, East Kettering, and at the A43, for instance. The Government are supporting schemes with almost £80 million, which will together unlock more than 12,500 homes. That is part of more than £10 billion of investment in new infrastructure for housing across England.

Mr Bone [V]: That is wonderful news from the Secretary of State, but he missed out one constituency in Northamptonshire and that was Wellingborough. We are planning to build lots of new houses at Wellingborough North, but to realise the full potential of that housing, we must have the Isham bypass. Why can we not get that bypass? It seems to be held up by red tape, so does the Secretary of State agree that the Isham bypass would be an excellent project for the Prime Minister's Project Speed? Let us get the bypass built.

Robert Jenrick: We want to fast-track major building projects in all parts of the country to fuel the economic recovery and to create jobs, and Project Speed is just one part of that. With respect to the Isham bypass, I understand the Department for Transport has prioritised the project for major road network funding. Northamptonshire County Council is due to submit an outline business case later this year. The council has had to amend the route, and will require fresh planning permission and legal orders, but the Department for Transport's officials are in touch with the council to discuss how best the scheme can be taken forward. Obviously, if there is anything my Department and officials can do to assist my hon. Friend, we will do it.

Renters Reform Bill

Tonia Antoniazzi (Gower) (Lab): When the Government plan to bring forward legislative proposals for the renters reform Bill. [904953]

The Minister for Housing (Christopher Pincher): We are committed to bringing forward legislation to deliver a better deal for renters, including repealing section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 as a priority. This will represent a generational change to tenancy, so it is only right that such legislation is considered and balanced to achieve the right outcomes for the sector, for tenants and, of course, for landlords.

Tonia Antoniazzi: The economic consequences of covid-19 could continue for years to come. Given the Secretary of State's commitment that "no one should lose their home as a result of the coronavirus",

does the Minister agree that it is about time this Government looked at the measures the Welsh Labour Government are putting in place to protect renters from eviction by unscrupulous landlords?

Christopher Pincher: I am obliged to the hon. Lady for her question. This Government have brought forward an unprecedented array of measures to support tenants through the coronavirus epidemic. We have protected 8.6 million households because of our actions: we have increased the local housing allowance to the 30th percentile; we have given local authorities £500 million of crisis grants; and we have introduced the furlough scheme, which the shadow Chancellor, in a moment of lucidity, described as a “lifeline”. This Government are acting, and will continue to act, for tenants.

Thangam Debbonaire (Bristol West) (Lab): The evictions ban ends on 23 August and the Government could have already brought in this Bill, raised LHA temporarily to average rents, scrapped section 21 or given courts discretion in arrears cases, but they have not done any of those things and thousands of people are struggling with rent now. So will the Minister guarantee to honour the words of the Secretary of State in March:

“no one should lose their home as a result of the coronavirus”?
Yes or no?

Christopher Pincher: I know that the hon. Lady is coming under pressure from her extreme left wing to, in essence, write off all rents. I am not entirely sure who that is expected to help—it certainly will not help those people who are working very hard to pay their rents. As I said, the Government have brought forward an array of measures to support hard-pressed renters. We have introduced measures that will support those people. I believe my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor is about to introduce a measure that will make it difficult for landlords who do not show “good cause” in bringing their application to court by describing what the effect on their tenants will be of an eviction—the courts will be able to adjourn those actions. That is practical support for people on the ground, not pie in the sky from the hon. Lady.

Covid-19: High Streets

Huw Merriman (Bexhill and Battle) (Con): What steps he is taking to support the safe reopening of high streets as covid-19 lockdown restrictions are eased.
[904954]

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): My Department has brought forward a range of measures to support the safe reopening of high streets across England, including providing flexibility for outdoor dining, which has helped to create an al fresco dining renaissance in this country; enabling business to operate on takeaways; making it easier to hold outdoor markets; and pedestrianising town centres and high streets to support local businesses. That is in addition to the Government’s VAT cut for hospitality, the eat out to help out scheme and the £50 million reopening high streets safely fund.

Huw Merriman: The Secretary of State and his Housing Minister are welcome to come for a bit of al fresco dining in Bexhill and Battle whenever they are around. I give credit to both of them for the way in which they

have helped to reform the planning system so that high streets can reopen. Will they take further steps, if required, particularly in respect of temporary structures, where help with permitted development rights could be given, if that were so needed?

Robert Jenrick: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for those kind words. We are certainly open to further measures that we can take to make the lives of small businesspeople across the country easier as they seek to recover their businesses and livelihoods after the pandemic. In particular, I can give him reassurance that the existing legal framework that enables one to put up a temporary structure for 28 days is being extended to 56 days during 2020 to enable, for example, a pub to put up a marquee, a restaurant to do the same, or a market to operate for longer than it would ordinarily do—all designed to help local businesses to prosper in the weeks and months to come.

Covid-19: Local Authority Revenue Losses

Mr Speaker: Question 16 has been withdrawn, so we come to the shadow Secretary of State, Steve Reed.

Steve Reed (Croydon North) (Lab/Co-op): I am grateful to you, Mr Speaker, for allowing me to ask the supplementary despite my hon. Friend the Member for Newport East (Jessica Morden) being held up.

Does the Minister recognise that after all Government funding is taken into account, including the emergency funding, councils still face a funding gap of between £6 billion and £10 billion, while they are of course required by law to balance their budgets in-year and take appropriate measures to ensure that that happens? How many jobs does he estimate will be lost as councils are forced to make severe cuts to plug this gap?

The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Mr Simon Clarke): Our engagement with councils has enabled us to understand pressures at a national and local level across England. To date, we have announced £4.3 billion-worth of additional resource to councils, including £3.7 billion of un-ring-fenced funding. We have also announced the sales fees and charges co-payment scheme to compensate for irrecoverable income loss that is designed to flex according to the extent of the losses as they crystallise. We will also extend the period over which councils must manage shortfalls in local tax income relating to this financial year from one year to three years. All those measures are intended to prevent councils from having to make difficult in-year decisions. I reiterate the message that I have now sent out countless times to individual authorities: any authority facing an unmanageable situation should make contact with my officials.

Local Authorities: Covid-19 Prevention

Alex Cunningham (Stockton North) (Lab): What discussions he has had with the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care on the role of local authorities in helping to prevent local outbreaks of covid-19.
[904957]

The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Mr Simon Clarke): My Department has been working closely with the Joint Biosecurity

Centre and the Department of Health and Social Care to develop a framework for the local management of further outbreaks of coronavirus, and councils will play a crucial role in this process. All upper-tier local authorities have published their local outbreak control plans. I am in regular contact with my counterparts at DHSC. We gave new powers to councils to control local outbreaks of covid-19 that came into effect only this Saturday.

Alex Cunningham: Eighteen of 55 patients who tested positive for coronavirus were transferred from North Tees University Hospital into local care homes between 1 March and 15 April. That was directly in line with the Government advice that a negative test was not required before discharge. A further 266 were transferred without a test. The policy changed on 16 April, but does the Minister accept that many deaths on Teesside, and perhaps thousands across the country, could have been prevented if the Government had got it right in the first place?

Mr Clarke: I pay enormous tribute to the care workers on Teesside and of course to our local NHS, which we share as Teesside MPs. This has been a constantly evolving and very complex situation, as Governments around the world, including our own, have obviously learned as matters have progressed. We have acted consistently and in good faith throughout. We have worked very hard with the care sector to protect patients. The £600 million infection control fund that we have instigated is designed to ensure that the care sector is safe, with a strong measure of containment against the disease for patients going forward.

Mr Clive Betts (Sheffield South East) (Lab) [V]: The Minister may not know this, but on 1 June, following the Prime Minister's appearance at the Liaison Committee, I wrote to him about local authority involvement in tackling this virus. In particular, I asked him to "give an assurance that data will be shared fully with all partners...In particular...directors of public health."

I have not had a response to that letter, but I have heard from Greg Fell, the director of public health in Sheffield, and other directors that they are only getting generalised data—they are not getting, on a daily basis, the names, addresses and NHS numbers of those infected and those they have been in contact with. Does the Minister accept, therefore, that while this information is held by Public Health England, it needs to be passed on to directors of public health, and passed on quickly, and will he give an assurance that that will happen this week?

Mr Clarke: Since 24 June, all local authorities have been able to access postcode-level testing data through their director of public health, and that is securely shared by PHE on a weekly basis. I understand that that has been going on pretty much from the moment that it became available. PHE also shares information with local directors of public health as part of the routine investigation of outbreaks and incidents. That includes information on individual cases and their contacts, as required, to support the public health response.

Kate Hollern (Blackburn) (Lab): The Health Secretary quite rightly praised my local council of Blackburn for its efforts to bring down infection rates. I quote:

"On Blackburn, I think the council... are doing a fantastic job... they've taken... steps locally and I applaud that. This is exactly the sort of local action we want to see."

Although Councillor Khan welcomes the praise, as do the communities that have worked closely with the council through this difficult time, does the Minister recognise that they have been failed by the test and track system? I raised that in the House last week. Data made available to me over the weekend shows that only 43% of people from the national service have been contacted successfully. Does he accept that the additional burden on the council requires resources to help keep services running and keep our communities safe? They need the funding now. Finally, will Minister agree to meet me and Councillor Khan to discuss the challenges going forward?

Mr Clarke: I thank the hon. Lady for her question. It is obviously very important we get control of the situation in Blackburn. Public Health England and NHS Test and Trace are actively working with Professor Harrison and his colleagues there to ensure a rapid solution is implemented to support their local work. Clearly, this is precisely why we have allocated £300 million to support the wider Test and Trace programme. We are also supporting Professor Harrison and his team with additional mobile testing capacity and a local visit in order to better understand how the needs of the community in Blackburn can be supported. I am obviously very happy to meet the hon. Lady and Councillor Khan to discuss how we take this forward, as I have with a number of other authorities in a similar situation.

Housing: Environmental Standards

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): To ask the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, what steps he is taking to ensure that new housing is of the highest standard of environmental sustainability. [904958]

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): Our proposed future homes standard will ensure all new homes from 2025 result in at least 75% lower carbon emissions than those built to the current standard. Earlier this month, the Chancellor announced £8.8 billion of new infrastructure, decarbonisation and maintenance projects, including a £3 billion green investment package, which could help support around 140,000 green jobs, and upgrade buildings and reduce emissions.

Mr Sheerman [V]: Can I urge the Secretary of State to look at the letter from 18 conservation groups, deeply worried this morning by the fact that they believe that the planning system is going to be radically deregulated? Does he not agree that we want sustainably built homes in sustainable locations? Will he talk to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and get his act together over this suggestion that there will be no more environmental impact assessments worthy of that name?

Robert Jenrick: I can give this assurance to the hon. Gentleman: the planning reforms that we intend to bring forward in the weeks ahead will not row back on any of our commitments to the environment. This Government want to bring forward homes that are truly fit for the future. We do not want to see homes being built in the years ahead that will need to be retrofitted at huge expense either to the state or to individuals in time. We want to

ensure that we meet our obligations to the environment, to biodiversity and to the climate change challenge, and that is exactly what the proposals that I intend to publish later this month, or at the beginning of August, will do.

Residential Buildings: Cladding

Ian Byrne (Liverpool, West Derby) (Lab): What steps his Department is taking to ensure that dangerous cladding is removed from residential buildings of all heights. [904959]

The Minister for Housing (Christopher Pincher): We are taking action with the biggest reforms of building and fire safety in nearly 40 years through the Building Safety Bill, which we are publishing in draft form today. To tackle the most urgent problems, we have made available £1.6 billion to remove unsafe cladding systems, so there should be no excuse for further delay. We have made progress. Over two thirds of high-rise buildings with the most dangerous Grenfell-type aluminium composite material, or ACM, cladding have either been completed or they have started their remediation.

Ian Byrne: With applications for more than 1,000 buildings made to the building safety fund already, it is clear that £1.6 billion will not be anywhere near enough to remedy all high-risk residential buildings that still have dangerous cladding, more than three years after the Grenfell Tower fire. The Government are trying to find ways to fit a potential £15 billion liability into a £1.6 billion funding pot. Will the Minister commit to release more funding in line with the Select Committee recommendation to ensure that all fire safety defects in every high-risk residential building are addressed, allowing residents to live safely in their homes without fear of bankruptcy?

Christopher Pincher: I am obliged to the hon. Gentleman for his question. To date, we have received 1,378 completed registration forms for the building safety fund. We expect the money made available by the Chancellor in this fiscal year to be fully allocated by March, so that the buildings that most need remediation where the owners were not able to act quickly can be helped. We have always made it clear that we expect a significant proportion of remediation costs to fall on the shoulders of those responsible for the original work or the building owners, and certainly not on the leaseholders.

Mike Amesbury (Weaver Vale) (Lab): Although we welcome the publication, finally, of the draft building safety Bill today, the Department's own figures highlight the fact that 246 buildings are still wrapped in Grenfell-style cladding and thousands more are cladded in equally flammable materials. How will the measures outlined in the Bill speed up remediation while increasing the size and the scope of the building safety fund?

Christopher Pincher: Some 72% of buildings that had ACM cladding have had that cladding removed. I refer to the hon. Gentleman to the Adjournment debate secured by the hon. Member for Bethnal Green and Bow (Rushanara Ali) to which I replied. I said that tough enforcement action is on its way for those owners that are responsible but are not taking action to remediate

their buildings. I look forward to working with the hon. Gentleman as the Building Safety Bill passes through this House and the other place to make sure that we have a good Bill that is fit for purpose. This Government are committed to doing so; I trust he is, too.

Housing Associations: House Building

Nicola Richards (West Bromwich East) (Con): What steps he is taking to support house building by housing associations. [904960]

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): We have announced a £12 billion investment in affordable homes, the largest in a decade. That will deliver up to 180,000 new affordable homes across England, with the vast majority delivered by 2026. That is building on our previous £9 billion affordable homes programme, which delivered about 250,000 affordable homes. Figures published last week show the highest number of starts of affordable homes since records began in 2010, and a 91% increase in homes for social rent over the year. We have also extended the previous programme by one year to ensure delivery of homes that would otherwise, regrettably, have been lost because of covid disruption.

Nicola Richards: The Prime Minister says that we need to build, build, build, and that is absolutely the right approach. Will my right hon. Friend join me in praising Bishop Llewellyn Graham and everyone at Nehemiah housing association for their amazing work in West Bromwich East, and work with them to ensure that local people are skilled up so that we can get the right homes built at affordable prices?

Robert Jenrick: I will join my hon. Friend in thanking Nehemiah housing association for its work on housing in the west midlands over the past 20 years. Compared with the start of the decade, the number of homes built in the west midlands last year had doubled. She is right to talk about skills; delivering the homes this country needs depends on having a skilled workforce. The Construction Industry Training Board estimates that we will need 688,000 skilled construction workers if we are to deliver our target of 300,000 new homes every year.

Leasehold and Commonhold Reform

Sir Peter Bottomley (Worthing West) (Con): What his timetable is for bringing forward legislative proposals on leasehold and commonhold reform. [R] [904962]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Luke Hall): We are committed to reforming the leasehold market and have already set out that we will reduce ground rents to zero on future leases and ban new leasehold houses. We are also working with the Law Commission on enfranchisement, commonhold and right to manage. Given the impact of covid-19 on the agenda and the Government's wider work to restart the economy, we will bring forward legislation on leasehold as soon as parliamentary time allows.

Sir Peter Bottomley: Mr Speaker, if you and the Minister came to Worthing station and walked from there to my flat, you would walk past a site where Homes England could help Worthing Borough Council to produce extra social housing and potentially more leasehold or commonhold homes. Six times a year, on average, over the last 10 years, Ministers have talked of progress on ending leasehold abuse and providing better homes for the future, as my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State said just now. This time, can we have action, and could Ministers also look at whether statutory instrument 2020/632, the Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020, takes into account the disbenefits to leaseholders of people putting extra storeys on leasehold blocks?

Luke Hall: I know that my hon. Friend has raised issues about this particular statutory instrument. We believe we need to encourage the densification of our towns and cities to allow for additional homes. In the last four years, 60,000 additional homes have been delivered through permitted development rights for change of use. This new permitted development right could deliver an extra 800 homes a year for families across our cities and help to protect the countryside too. Of course, permitted development rights remain subject to prior approval by the local planning authority on a number of matters, including the amenity of neighbours and occupiers of the block.

Planning Reforms: Environmental Standards

Sarah Champion (Rotherham) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the effect on environmental standards of the Government's proposed planning reforms. [904963]

Ruth Cadbury (Brentford and Isleworth) (Lab): What assessment he has made of the effect on environmental standards of the Government's proposed planning reforms. [904971]

The Minister for Housing (Christopher Pincher): As my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State mentioned in response to the hon. Member for Huddersfield (Mr Sheerman), the Government are committed to building not just better and faster but greener. As we consider reforms to our planning system, we are committed to ensuring that they create better outcomes for the environment and that decision making is properly informed by the science. My right hon. Friend the Environment Secretary set out this morning our intention to develop a reform framework for environmental assessment and mitigation.

Sarah Champion [V]: In 1958, planning permission was granted for Droppingwell tip to open in my constituency. The local community managed to get the tip closed in the 1990s because of their serious environmental concerns. Now, with no consultation and the vagaries of the planning system, it has been given the go-ahead again. It is likely to reopen in the very near future and is an environmental timebomb. For the last four years, I have been raising this repeatedly with the Environment Agency and the Government but to no avail. Will the Minister please meet me to look into this disastrous plan and step in to stop this unwanted and environmentally damaging development?

Christopher Pincher: I have every sympathy for the hon. Lady and her concerns in championing her constituents. I would point out that in my quasi-judicial role I cannot discuss individual planning matters, but I will refer her concern to my right hon. Friend the Environment Secretary, and of course if she wants to talk to me about a broader range of issues, I would be very happy to do that.

Ruth Cadbury: Hounslow Council's new council housing will no longer have gas boilers installed, only the newest low-energy systems available. Both the leader of Hounslow, Councillor Steve Curran, and community organisation Brentford Voice have said they would like national planning policies to require all new developments to incorporate low-emission energy systems. Will the Housing Secretary's reforms require all new homes to be zero-carbon and affordable to run, yet still to be warm in winter and cool in summer?

Christopher Pincher: We were the first Government in the world to legislate to be zero-carbon by 2050, and we intend to meet that pledge, which is why we have introduced the future homes standard to reduce carbon emissions from homes built after 2025 by between 75% and 80%. I am prepared to listen to and consider all proposals to make us greener and better, and I look forward to hearing those proposals from the hon. Lady.

Second Home Ownership

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): What recent assessment he has made of the effect of trends in the level of second home ownership on local communities. [904964]

The Minister for Housing (Christopher Pincher): Second homes can bring significant benefits to local areas, including boosting tourism, consumer spending and investment in the local economy. However, we are aware of the need to balance this with the housing needs of local people. We have taken decisive action to address these challenges through the introduction of a stamp duty surcharge on second homes.

Tim Farron: Excessive second home ownership robs communities of life, schools and other services. Does the Minister understand, then, why people in the south Lakes are so appalled that the Government have chosen to give a £15,000 stamp duty bonus to those lucky enough to be able to afford a second home? When there are 3 million hard-working people excluded from Government support at the moment, are these not appalling priorities? Will he end the second homes bonus and instead support the 3 million excluded?

Christopher Pincher: Second home owners contribute significantly to the economy of many parts of our country, particularly those parts that rely on the tourist economy. I remind the hon. Gentleman that, in 2013, we removed the requirement to offer a council tax discount on second homes, and 95% of the 253,000 second home dwellings now have council tax applied to them. It is very important that we balance the needs of the local economy with the rights of local people. We think we have got that balance right as we try to get this country through a very difficult epidemic, and every penny spent locally matters to local businesses and people.

Topical Questions

[905009] **Sally-Ann Hart** (Hastings and Rye) (Con): If he will make a statement on his departmental responsibilities.

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): This week, we announced the most significant reforms to building safety legislation in 40 years, delivering new and enhanced regulatory regimes. I welcome the voices of all right hon. and hon. Members, on both sides of the House, as we move this critical legislation forwards.

Earlier this month, we set out our comprehensive financial plan to ensure that local councils can proceed with their crucial work with confidence, including a one-of-a-kind scheme reimbursing councils for lost income, measures to spread tax deficits, and an extra £500 million in un-ring-fenced funding. We are also making sure that as we recover from the pandemic, our communities can bounce back with investment in housing and infrastructure and for our town and city centres. Our announced reform of use classes will help to revitalise high streets and town centres, and the Chancellor's stamp duty cut will help many to realise their dream of owning a home.

Sally-Ann Hart: Many councils have had to use emergency accommodation and hotels to house rough sleepers during coronavirus. As we look to winter, it will not be possible to build enough social housing within the timeframe required to ensure that people are able to stay off the streets, and many options will need to be considered: for example, social lettings agencies could be established to deal with private rental procurement for vulnerable people and homeless people to access accommodation. All options require funding, so what measures is my right hon. Friend considering to keep vulnerable people off the streets come winter?

Robert Jenrick: Can I say once again how grateful for and proud I am of the work of local councils and homelessness and rough sleeping charities across the country and the remarkable effort that they have made together to protect rough sleepers during the pandemic? That has undoubtedly saved hundreds, if not thousands, of people's lives. We saw that in the recent Office for National Statistics figures that were published, showing that 16 rough sleepers had died in this country during the pandemic. Each of those deaths, of course, is a tragedy, but that number is far lower than that of any other major developed country. We are making £105 million of immediate support available for local areas to fund exactly the kind of interventions that my hon. Friend refers to.

Mr Speaker: Order. We need to get through topicals, so can we speed up a little?

Janet Daby (Lewisham East) (Lab)[V]: YourNeighbour.org, a digital platform supporting over 1,300 churches, estimates that faith groups are providing more than 10 million meals a month to people up and down our country who would otherwise go hungry. Our faith groups have missed out on weekly donations and opportunities to raise funds, and they are running out of money and are in desperate need of financial assistance. What assessment

has the Minister's Government made of the financial hit to places of worship, and why have the Government not provided ring-fenced support to ensure that they can continue their very much needed work?

Robert Jenrick: I pay tribute to the work of faith groups across the country. I have been regularly meeting with faith leaders from all the major religions through our places of worship taskforce. I am extremely grateful for the hard work of that organisation, which has helped us to reopen places of worship safely. I am aware of the financial impact that the pandemic has had on many places of worship and faith organisations. The schemes created for charities by the Chancellor were open to those from faith organisations and many have taken part in them.

[905010] **Steve Double** (St Austell and Newquay) (Con): Town and parish councils across mid-Cornwall have done an incredible job of supporting their communities through the pandemic, going out of their way to provide extra services. As a result, they have incurred extra costs, as well as seeing their income drop because of car parks. I know the Government have made money available to Cornwall Council to support these hard-pressed councils, but so far it has declined to pass that on. Will the Minister join me in thanking town and parish councils across the country for all the work they have done in recent months? What more can the Government do to ensure the money they have made available gets to these parish councils?

The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Mr Simon Clarke): I thank my hon. Friend for his question. There is no question but that we owe an enormous debt to town and parish councils for everything they have done throughout the pandemic. We have encouraged principal authorities to discuss the funding provided with their town and parish councils where they are delivering covid-related services. The grant funding of £3.7 billion is un-ring-fenced, recognising that local authorities need to make appropriate decisions about how to meet major covid-19 service pressures in their local area. I certainly hope that Cornwall Council will give that proper consideration.

[905011] **Wera Hobhouse** (Bath) (LD): Over 820,000 people have already fallen into council tax arrears as a direct result of covid-19. The expiry of the emergency protection on 23 August will make it worse for vulnerable and struggling families, who could face unfair and unsafe bailiff action. Will the Minister consider the introduction of a pre-action protocol to protect them?

Robert Jenrick: We have, for several weeks now, been in exactly those sorts of conversations with my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor, who holds the relationship with the judiciary and the Master of the Rolls. The Lord Chancellor has already set out today some initiatives and I am hopeful that further announcements will be made shortly to provide exactly the kind of protection the hon. Lady asks for.

[905012] **Karl McCartney** (Lincoln) (Con): For a mainly rural large county such as Greater Lincolnshire, the effective management of change for local government reform and devolution is critically important to all

businesses and individuals. I am aware of a recent speech by the Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, my hon. Friend the Member for Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland (Mr Clarke), and wondered if he had anything to add with regard to achieving the best outcome for his parliamentary colleagues and our district and county councils for a right and fair deal for my constituents.

Mr Clarke: I thank my hon. Friend for his question. I had recent constructive discussions with both Lincolnshire MPs and all Greater Lincolnshire council leaders on this subject. It is now for them to develop proposals for local government reform and I am committed to working with them. Levelling up all areas of the country by devolving money, resources and control from Westminster is a priority for the Government. Our devolution and local recovery White Paper, to be published this autumn, will set out our detailed plans, including for restructuring local institutions and establishing more mayors.

[905014] **Grahame Morris** (Easington) (Lab) [V]: There are sections of my community blighted by absentee landlords, substandard housing and a total disregard for the need for tenant vetting. Will the Minister take this opportunity to support the Horden housing masterplan in my constituency to regenerate local housing, which could be replicated in neighbouring areas that face the same housing issues and create much needed jobs in the local economy in construction and the housing industry?

Robert Jenrick: I would be delighted to discuss with the hon. Gentleman that masterplan and to learn more of its details. It is extremely important to us that we not only build more homes, but tackle substandard homes in all parts of the country. That means making them greener and, in some cases, regenerating parts of towns and cities that desperately need it. That will be a focus both for our planning reforms and future investment.

[905013] **Greg Smith** (Buckingham) (Con): With the good news that leisure centres can reopen again from this weekend, my local council, Buckinghamshire Council, has identified, over and above the extremely generous and unprecedented level of additional spending for councils, a further £3 million cost pressure from waived management fees, loss of income from social distancing measures and so on. What assurances can my right hon. Friend give me that council tax payers in Buckinghamshire will not be left in the deep end?

Robert Jenrick: I am extremely pleased that leisure centres will be able to open shortly, in a safe and socially distanced manner. The income guarantee scheme that we have already announced will reimburse local councils for 75p in the pound for lost income, including for the leisure centres that they own and operate themselves. I appreciate that many leisure centres are not owned and operated by local councils; I am working with my right hon. Friend the Culture Secretary to see what further package of support we might be able to bring forward to assist.

[905015] **Stuart C. McDonald** (Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East) (SNP) [V]: Waiting until autumn for details of the shared prosperity fund means huge uncertainty for recipients of structural funds, loss of

staff and expertise, and near impossible transition planning. So I ask again: why not just guarantee, as a minimum, existing EU funding allocations for next year—and do it now?

Robert Jenrick: As my hon. Friend the Minister for Regional Growth and Local Government said in his earlier remarks, we made a manifesto commitment to ensure that, at a minimum, each of the nations of the United Kingdom will continue to receive the same amount of funding as they did from within the EU. We intend to keep that commitment.

[905016] **Mark Eastwood** (Dewsbury) (Con): For many years, I have been working alongside community groups within my constituency at Chidswell, Mirfield and Skelmanthorpe, who all have genuine concerns regarding inappropriate developments on farmland, the green belt and areas susceptible to flooding. Will my right hon. Friend agree to meet me to discuss those concerns?

Robert Jenrick: I would be happy to meet my hon. Friend, who I know campaigns vigorously on these issues. I reassure Members on both sides of the House that the Government intend to bring forward a review of the planning system and how it interrelates with flood plains, to ensure that homes are not built irresponsibly on parts of the country that routinely flood.

[905019] **Cat Smith** (Lancaster and Fleetwood) (Lab): On 20 November, two days after meeting Richard Desmond at a Conservative party fundraising dinner, the Secretary of State's office instructed departmental officials to speed through the Westferry decision before the date when the new community infrastructure levy came into force. The Secretary of State was informing his officials of that date, so it cannot have been them who told him about it. That begs the question: who did?

Robert Jenrick: The fact that Tower Hamlets Council was preparing a new local plan that included a CIL schedule attached to it was a matter of public record; anybody knowledgeable about London's housing issues would have known that. It is a perfectly legitimate planning consideration to ensure that a decision is made prior to a material change like that. That is exactly how my officials rightly advised me.

[905017] **Stephen Metcalfe** (South Basildon and East Thurrock) (Con) [V]: Will my right hon. Friend tell the House what steps he is taking to ensure that dangerous cladding is removed from high-rise residential buildings and that the assistance is targeted to support leaseholders, who face large bills preventing them from being able to sell their homes at the moment?

Robert Jenrick: We have brought forward the now £1.6 billion fund tackling not just ACM cladding—on which there has been some progress, although far more progress is required—but other types of dangerous cladding such as HPL. I strongly encourage buildings to come forward, apply to the fund and get that money out of the door.

As I said earlier this week, we have also published the building safety Bill in draft form. Once again, I strongly encourage colleagues to participate in ensuring that that Bill meets the challenges and radically improves the standards of building safety regulation in this country.

[905023] **Jessica Morden** (Newport East) (Lab): The Western Gateway project has the potential to mean up to £56 billion for the UK economy, benefiting businesses from Swansea to Swindon. Will Ministers commit to working with the new all-party parliamentary group on the Western Gateway, the Welsh Government and local authorities to realise its potential?

Robert Jenrick: I am delighted to hear that the hon. Lady is now chairing the APPG. We were pleased to launch the Western Gateway initiative at the end of last year. I think it has huge potential to drive economic growth in that part of the country, to represent the south-west and south Wales on the international stage, and to attract international investment to her constituency and those of her neighbours.

[905018] **Theresa Villiers** (Chipping Barnet) (Con): My constituency feels like it is under siege from developers trying to build blocks of flats that local infrastructure just does not have the capacity to cope with. Will the Secretary of State reduce Barnet's housing target and reform the planning system to end this reckless attempt to urbanise the suburbs?

Robert Jenrick: We are very sensitive to the issues that my right hon. Friend describes, and I have had a number of conversations with her already. I appreciate that her constituents have particular concerns about high-rise buildings. We do need to build more homes in London, and that is why we are bringing forward some of the reforms that we have already announced to enable gentle densification, building up on top of people's individual homes or blocks of flats so that homes can be built in a manner that maintains the look and feel of the suburbs.

[905025] **Clive Efford** (Eltham) (Lab): My local authority faces a deficit in excess of £40 million because of its response to covid. The Government said that councils should spend what it takes, so why are they not assisting local authorities that have spent that sort of money?

Robert Jenrick: We said at the outset of the crisis that we would ensure that councils have the resources they need, and that is exactly what we are doing. We have now brought forward over £4 billion of funding for covid-related expenditure. We have also created the income guarantee of 75p in the pound for lost income on sales, fees and charges, and I am working with the Chancellor with respect to tax losses so that councils have the confidence to move forwards and end the financial year in good financial health.

[905020] **Sir Desmond Swayne** (New Forest West) (Con): What will the Secretary of State do to increase development on brownfield land?

Robert Jenrick: The Chancellor announced the other day our £400 million brownfield fund, which will support projects across the country, and our planning reforms that we have already announced, such as the right to demolish a vacant building and turn it into new housing, are exactly designed for brownfield sites.

Mr Speaker: In order to allow the safe exit of hon. Members participating in this item of business and the safe arrival of those participating in the next, I suspend the House for three minutes.

3.32 pm

Sitting suspended.

China

3.35 pm

The Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and First Secretary of State (Dominic Raab): With permission, Mr Speaker, I will make a statement updating the House on the latest developments with respect to China, and in particular Hong Kong.

As I told the House on 1 July, the UK wants a positive relationship with China. China has undergone an extraordinary transformation in recent decades, grounded in one of the world's ancient cultures. Not only is China the world's second largest economy, but it has a huge base in tech and science. The UK Government recognise China's remarkable success in raising millions of its own people out of poverty. China is also the world's biggest investor in renewable technology, and it will be an essential global partner when it comes to tackling global climate change. The Chinese people travel, study and work all over the world, making an extraordinary contribution.

Let me be clear: we want to work with China. There is enormous scope for positive, constructive engagement. There are wide-ranging opportunities, from increasing trade to co-operation in tackling climate change, particularly with a view to the COP26 summit next year, which the UK will be hosting. However, as we strive for that positive relationship, we are also clear-sighted about the challenges that lie ahead. We will always protect our vital interests, including sensitive infrastructure, and we will not accept any investment that compromises our domestic or national security. We will be clear where we disagree, and I have been clear about our grave concerns regarding the gross human rights abuses being perpetrated against the Uyghur Muslims in Xinjiang.

It is precisely because we recognise China's role in the world as a fellow member of the G20, and fellow permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, that we expect China to live up to the international obligations and responsibilities that come with that stature. That is the positive, constructive, mature and reciprocal relationship that we seek with China, striving for good co-operation, but being honest and clear where we have to disagree. We have been clear about the new national security law that China has imposed on the people of Hong Kong. That is a clear and serious violation of the UK-China joint declaration, and with it a violation of China's freely assumed international obligations.

On 1 July, I announced that we are developing a bespoke immigration route for British nationals overseas and their dependants, giving them a path to citizenship of the UK. The Home Secretary will set out further details of the plans for a new bespoke immigration route for BNOs and their dependants before the recess. That bespoke route will be ready by early 2021, and in the meantime the Home Secretary has already given Border Force officers the ability to grant leave to BNOs and their accompanying dependants at the UK border.

Beyond our offer to BNOs, today we are taking two further measures, which are a necessary and proportionate response to the new national security legislation that we have now had the opportunity to assess carefully. First, given the role that China has now assumed for the internal security of Hong Kong, and the authority that

it is exerting over law enforcement, the UK will extend to Hong Kong the arms embargo that we have applied to mainland China since 1989. To be clear, the extension of the embargo will mean there will be no exports from the UK to Hong Kong of potentially lethal weapons, their components or ammunition, and it will also meet a ban on the export of any equipment not already banned that might be used for internal repression, such as shackles, intercept equipment, firearms and smoke grenades.

The second measure relates to the fact that the imposition of this new national security legislation has significantly changed key assumptions underpinning our extradition treaty arrangements with Hong Kong. I have to say that I am particularly concerned by articles 55 to 59 of the law, which give mainland Chinese authorities the ability to assume jurisdiction over certain cases and to try those cases in mainland Chinese courts. The national security law does not provide legal or judicial safeguards in such cases, and I am also concerned about the potential reach of the extraterritorial provisions.

I have consulted the Home Secretary, the Justice Secretary and the Attorney General, and the Government have decided to suspend the extradition treaty immediately and indefinitely. I should also tell the House that we will not consider reactivating those arrangements unless and until there are clear and robust safeguards that can prevent extradition from the UK being misused under the new national security legislation.

There remains considerable uncertainty about the way in which the new national security law will be enforced. I just say this: the United Kingdom is watching and the whole world is watching. In the past few weeks, I have been engaged with many of our international partners in a concerted dialogue about how we should best respond to the unfolding events we are seeing in Hong Kong. On 8 July, I spoke with our Five Eyes Foreign Minister partners. We agreed on the seriousness of China's actions and the importance of pressing Beijing to meet its international obligations. I welcome the fact that Australia, Canada and the US have taken a range of measures with respect to Hong Kong including, variously, export controls and extradition, as we have done today.

I also discussed the situation with our European partners, including Josep Borrell, the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs. The UK Government also welcome the EU announcement on 13 July, which sets out further proposed measures in response to the national security legislation.

A number of our international partners are also considering what offers they may be willing to make to the people of Hong Kong following the UK's offer in relation to BNOs. I can reassure the House that we will continue to take a leading role in engaging and in co-ordinating our actions with our international partners, as befits our historic commitment to the people of Hong Kong.

As I said at the outset, we want a positive relationship with China. There is a huge amount to be gained for both countries. There are many areas where we can work productively and constructively to mutual benefit together. For our part, the UK will work hard and in good faith towards that goal, but we will protect our vital interests. We will stand up for our values, and we will hold China to its international obligations. The specific measures

[Dominic Raab]

I have announced today are a reasonable and proportionate response to China's failure to live up to those international obligations with respect to Hong Kong, and I commend this statement to the House.

3.43 pm

Lisa Nandy (Wigan) (Lab): I thank the Foreign Secretary for his statement and for advance sight of it. May I be clear that the Opposition strongly welcome both of the measures he has announced today? He is right to ensure that Britain does not allow our exports to be used against the people of Hong Kong, and I thank him warmly for taking this step forwards.

I am particularly glad that the Government have listened to my right hon. Friend the Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry), the shadow Secretary of State for International Trade, and suspended the export of surveillance equipment alongside the suspension of the export of crowd control equipment, which was demanded of the Government by the Labour Opposition last year. Will the Foreign Secretary go further and also review the training of the Hong Kong police by the College of Policing and other UK police forces to ensure that we are playing a part in helping to uphold, and not suppress, the rights of the people of Hong Kong?

May I also welcome the indefinite suspension of the extradition treaty and the safeguards that the Foreign Secretary announced today? It affords protection to the Hong Kong diaspora community here in the UK, and particularly to the brave young pro-democracy activists, whom I recently had the pleasure to meet.

We believe it is vital that the world shows a co-ordinated front on this issue. I was heartened to hear that the Foreign Secretary had discussions with our Five Eyes partners. Canada, Australia and the USA have already taken this step. Will he speak to other key allies, including Germany, to ensure that there is a co-ordinated international response? He also made no mention of our Commonwealth partners. Has he reached out to those Commonwealth countries that have extradition treaties with Hong Kong, to ensure that BNO passport holders and pro-democracy activists can travel freely without fear of arrest and extradition?

The Foreign Secretary could take a number of other steps. He made a commitment today that the UK will not accept investment that compromises our national security. Will he confirm that that will extend to the proposed nuclear power project at Bradwell, and will he tell us what assessment the Government have made of the security implications of Sizewell C?

Elections are due to take place in Hong Kong in the autumn, and we are concerned that, just as in the case of Joshua Wong, the Chinese Government may seek to bar candidates from standing. A clear statement from the Foreign Secretary today that candidates selected through the primary process are legitimate and must be allowed to stand in those elections would send the message that, as he says, the world is watching. I also ask him to work internationally to ensure that independent election observers are allowed into Hong Kong to oversee those elections.

The Foreign Secretary was a little irritated by my suggestion yesterday that the UK ought to impose Magnitsky sanctions on Chinese officials involved in

persecuting the Uyghur people and undermining basic freedoms in Hong Kong, but I gently say to him that we have known that Uyghurs have been detained in camps since at least 2017. Has any work at all been done on that by the Foreign Office? Given that the USA has already imposed similar sanctions, is he working with our US counterparts to build the case for UK sanctions, and will he discuss this with the US Secretary of State tomorrow when he meets him?

The Foreign Secretary may not have done the groundwork to enable him to impose Magnitsky sanctions now, but his Government have the power right now to take action. He could, as the US has done, bar Communist party of China officials from the UK. Why has he not done that? The Chinese ambassador said yesterday that he reserves the right to take action against British companies. What discussions has the Foreign Secretary had with British companies operating in China to offer advice and assistance? I have asked him a number of times whether he has had discussions with HSBC and Standard Chartered about their stated support for the national security law. He must condemn that support. We should be showing the best of British business to the world, not the worst.

I was pleased to hear that the Foreign Secretary had discussions with Australia and New Zealand about their making a similar offer to BNO passport holders, but we are concerned, after asking a range of parliamentary questions, that there are serious holes in this offer. We have been told by the Government that BNO passport holders and their families will not receive home status for tuition fees, will not have access to most benefits and will have to pay the NHS surcharge. That seems wrong.

We are welcoming BNO passport holders to the UK for similar reasons to refugees, but these measures are completely out of step with that. Without serious action before these proposals are published, we will essentially be offering safe harbour only to the rich and highly skilled. That may benefit the UK, but it lacks the generosity and moral clarity that this situation demands. The Foreign Secretary will also know that many young pro-democracy activists are too young to be eligible for BNO passports. The Home Secretary said last week that she was considering a specific scheme for 18 to 23-year-olds. Will those details be published before the summer, and can he provide more detail today?

Finally, this must mark the start of a more strategic approach to China based on an ethical approach to foreign policy and an end to the naivety of the golden era years. If it does, the Foreign Secretary can be assured that he will have the Opposition's full support. Like him, our quarrel is not with the people of China, but the erosion of freedoms in Hong Kong, the actions of the Chinese Government in the South China sea and the appalling treatment of the Uyghur people are reasons to act now. We will not be able to say in future years that we did not know. I urge him to work with colleagues across government to ensure that this marks the start of a strategic approach to China and the start of a new era.

Dominic Raab: I thank the hon. Lady for her response and in particular for her support for the two measures that we are taking today: suspending the extradition treaty arrangements and extending the arms embargo. I note that there is a drastically different tone being taken by Opposition Front Benchers from that taken even a

few weeks ago, but we welcome her support, and do so in a spirit of cross-party endeavour and the importance of sending a very clear signal to Beijing, and indeed to our international partners, about where we stand.

The hon. Lady asks about the review of policing. Of course she is right about that: it is a question of balance. We will keep that under constant review. She mentions a range of details on BNOs, and they will be set forward by the Home Secretary shortly in the way that I have described. I urge the hon. Lady to wait for the detail before critiquing it. The Home Secretary and the Home Office have been doing a huge amount of work since September last year on all that, and of course we also need to bear in mind the offers that other countries quite rightly and usefully will be making.

I welcome what the hon. Lady says on international co-ordination. She is right about the importance of working with my German opposite number. I am seeing him this week, and it is something that is squarely on the agenda. We have also, through the Five Eyes membership, already touched base with a number of our Commonwealth colleagues, but I will continue to do that. She is right that it needs to be more than just the Europeans and the UK with the North Americans—the traditional Five Eyes and Europeans—because there is a whole range of non-aligned countries out there that are very much influenced by what China is doing and saying. We want them to support us in upholding the international rule of law, which in all areas, including, as she mentioned, the South China sea, will be very important.

We rigorously review not just all investments into this country from a security point of view but whether our powers are sufficient. That is something that we will keep under review, and I know that the Secretary of State for Business is looking at it very carefully.

The hon. Lady is right as well about the September LegCo elections. I have made it clear that we want to see them allowed to take place in the way that is recognised in not just the joint declaration but the Basic Law. I agree with her point about the disqualification of candidates. We also need to be realistic, if I am honest with her, about the likelihood of China, or the Hong Kong authorities, accepting international observers.

The hon. Lady asks about the Magnitsky sanctions. She is simply wrong to say that we have not done our homework on them; we have done our homework since August of last year, which is why we could introduce those sanctions for the situation with Jamal Khashoggi, Sergei Magnitsky and North Korea. Of course, the national security legislation, which we are responding to, has only just been enacted, let alone started to be enforced. We will patiently gather the evidence, which takes months. It is not, as the hon. Lady has previously suggested, just something that can be done on a political whim; indeed, it would be improper if that were the case. Of course, if we introduce those targeted sanctions in this field, and indeed any other, without having done our factual evidential due diligence, not only are they likely to be challenged but we are at risk of giving a propaganda coup to the very people that we are seeking to target.

The hon. Lady mentions HSBC. She may or may not have already heard the comments I have made about that. Certainly, we will not allow the rights and the autonomy of the people of Hong Kong to be sacrificed on the altar of bankers' bonuses. We urge all businesses to look

very carefully at how they respond. They are, of course, going to be nervous about any potential retaliatory measures that may be taken by Beijing. In any event, we are very clear on the path that we are taking.

As I have said before, we want a good relationship with China. It is very important that we have a balanced, open debate about this in the House, recognise the opportunities of a good relationship with China, but be clear-eyed, as this Government are, about the risks and what we do to protect against them.

Tom Tugendhat (Tonbridge and Malling) (Con): I thank again—I am getting into a bad habit here—my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary for an extremely good policy change. This makes the fifth, by my count, that he has backed the Foreign Affairs Committee on, following the strategic alignment of the Department, the BNOs, the Magnitsky protocols generally, and foreign ownership control overseas. This is actually claiming credit slightly for his work, because he was so instrumental in many of those things during his time on the Back Benches.

Given my right hon. Friend's time before even entering the House as a human rights lawyer, may I ask why he has not yet made an announcement on the abuse of the Uyghur Muslim population in western China—action that his opposite number in the United States, or rather the US Treasury, has already taken, and that has been campaigned on so forcefully by my hon. Friend the Member for Rutland and Melton (Alicia Kearns) and my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith)?

May I also ask what my right hon. Friend's view is of article 38 and the extraterritoriality of the jurisdiction of the security law, the implications for British, Canadian, Australian and New Zealand judges sitting on the Court of Final Appeal, and whether he has discussed that with his opposite numbers? Of course, the application of Chinese law to a common law jurisdiction could make the position of those judges untenable, and it is really for him to advise them on how to act.

Dominic Raab: I thank my hon. Friend, the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his and the Select Committee's full support for the action the Government have taken; there is plenty of credit to go around. The reality is that we have taken, I think, a proportionate approach and one that recognises the severity of what is happening in Hong Kong, but also, in the way I have described, seeks to have a balanced—and to telegraph a balanced—message to the Government in Beijing that our relationship is there, with good will and with respect for international obligations, to be a positive one.

My hon. Friend asks about Xinjiang. We have made very clear our position. Indeed, we led, for the first time in the United Nations Human Rights Council, on a statement on the situation on human rights in both Hong Kong and Xinjiang. Twenty-seven countries in total signed the statement, and it was the first time that has been done.

My hon. Friend asks about judges on the Supreme Court in Hong Kong. That is something we obviously keep under careful review, given the need—and, indeed, the commitment in the joint declaration and the Basic Law—for the autonomy of the judiciary as well as the autonomy of the legislators to be respected, so we will discuss that with our international partners.

[*Dominic Raab*]

Finally, my hon. Friend asks about extraterritoriality. It is not entirely clear, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, quite how that will work in practice—whether it would just apply to Hong Kong residents when they are outside the country or whether, indeed, it is intended to apply to non-Chinese and non-Hong Kong nationals. That is one of the factors, among others, that informed our approach to the suspension of extradition.

Alyn Smith (Stirling) (SNP): I also thank the Foreign Secretary for advance sight of his statement, and I commend him for its tone and the content. He picks up on the Opposition's change of tone, and there has been something of a change in the Government's position as well of late. I think we should all recognise that this is evolving fast.

I associate the SNP with supporting both the measures in the statement, which I think is proportionate and fair. We also want a positive relationship with China—it is a key partner in renewable energy, as the Foreign Secretary rightly says—but it is making things increasingly difficult with its actions particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and with one belt, one road; over Hong Kong, the South China sea, the situation in Taiwan, of course, and Xinjiang; and with commercial piracy and industrial espionage. There is lots of cause for concern about the actions of the Chinese state, so we do support these measures.

I will, however, press the Foreign Secretary on three further points. First, on the Magnitsky sanctions, I accept fully that this has to be done properly, but it could be done properly faster. I think there is a need to accelerate, particularly in the case of the Uyghur situation, proportionate sanctions there.

On the suspension of the extradition treaty, this is not something to be celebrated. The breakdown of criminal and judicial co-operation will make the fight against organised crime, which is prevalent in Hong Kong and London, harder, so what comes next? Will this be done on a case-by-case basis, or are we looking to evolve some new arrangement to deal with that pressing problem, because it is and will remain a pressing problem?

On students, which is where this debate will get to quite quickly, Stirling University in my constituency and universities up and down the UK, including in Scotland, welcome thousands of Chinese students. We value academic freedom and we are glad to see them here, but that is precisely the academic freedom that the state of China is looking to take advantage of. Could guidance be provided to universities about the implications of having so many Chinese students in their institutions from both a security and a financial perspective, and is any analysis under way of the Confucius institutes, which I believe do need a bit more attention than they have had today?

Dominic Raab: I thank the hon. Gentleman and welcome his support on the two measures that we have announced today.

The hon. Gentleman asks about the Magnitsky sanctions. I made this point to the hon. Member for Wigan (Lisa Nandy). I welcome the full and eager support for the regime that the Government have just introduced, but with cross-party support, which we welcome. I just

call for a note of caution on speed. It is very important that these targeted sanctions are done right, not quick. If we do them too quickly, they will be legally challenged. Not only would they then be ineffective, but we would risk, as I said to the hon. Lady, giving a propaganda coup to the very individuals whom we are seeking to hold to account.

On extradition, the approach we have taken, and I set it out quite deliberately, was that we are suspending—not just wholesale terminating, but suspending—the extradition treaty arrangements, so that it is clear that they could be resuscitated in the future. As I also made clear, we would need to have clear, adequate and robust safeguards to protect against the potential abuses that we see in the national security legislation before that could even be contemplated. That is the approach that we would consider.

The hon. Gentleman also referred to my comment about there being a different tone on the Opposition Benches. I hope he does not mind my noting that it was not that long ago that the Scottish Government's China engagement strategy called for Scotland to be seen as the “preferred” trade and investment partner in China. I sense that there is a slight nuance in position in 2020.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith (Chingford and Woodford Green) (Con): I unreservedly welcome my right hon. Friend's statement; he has taken the right decision. We have had good cause to suspend the extradition treaty, and I will now withdraw my amendments to the Extradition (Provisional Arrest) Bill, although I suspect that that has not been keeping him awake at night.

I associate myself with the comments made by my hon. Friend the Member for Tonbridge and Malling (Tom Tugendhat) on the Uyghurs. The Foreign Secretary is right that he has to be careful on the legal elements of what he does with regard to sanctions on individuals, now that we have the Magnitsky changes. The Inter-Parliamentary Alliance on China published a report on the forced sterilisation of the Uyghur women a few weeks ago, and there is lots of evidence of the officials who are involved in that. May I, along with many of my hon. Friends and Opposition Members, encourage him to do what he can to get officials to look at that urgently, so that we may force sanctions on those responsible for what is happening to the Uyghur, and on Hong Kong—people such as Carrie Lam and her predecessor, Mr Leung?

Dominic Raab: I thank my right hon. Friend for his support for these measures and for withdrawing his amendments; I appreciate his magnanimity in that regard. On the Magnitsky sanctions, he raises two different issues: their potential application in relation to, first, Hong Kong and, secondly, Xinjiang. We, of course, have a process for gathering all the evidence on those potential cases. The national security legislation is newly enacted, so that will take some time, but he is right to point to that. I have been reading over the weekend reports by Amnesty International in 2019 and 2020 on the range of abuses in Xinjiang, reports by Human Rights Watch between 2018 and 2020 on the mass detention and political indoctrination, and the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination report in 2018 on the massive internment camps with no rights. We are looking at this carefully. As he rightly notes, it is important to assess this carefully, and it is a question of

not only whether the abuses took place but whether individual responsibility can be ascribed to someone on whom we wish to impose a visa ban or asset freeze.

Mr Alistair Carmichael (Orkney and Shetland) (LD): It seems wrong to be welcoming a suspension of extradition and exports, but backward steps though these may be, they are necessary, and my party will support them. Never mind the restrictions on exports—when will the Government start looking at the materials that we are importing from China, in particular those manufactured by Hikvision? It is some of the most intrusive surveillance technology to be found anywhere in the world, it is used widely in Xinjiang province, and it is now being purchased and installed by public and private authorities up and down this country. Will the Government look at that in a joined-up way?

On the subject of Xinjiang province, the world is watching, and what we are seeing is horrific. There was the drone footage at the weekend. Last week there was the interception of a shipment of human hair. I know that “genocide” is a term of art in law, and the Foreign Secretary is right to be cautious about its use, but it would make an enormous difference to tackling the issues in Xinjiang province if he would admit from the Dispatch Box that there are a growing number of adminicles of evidence that that is absolutely what is happening.

Dominic Raab: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for his typically focused and well considered remarks, and for his support. In relation to UK regulation and the regime that applies to imports, we have a strong and rigorous scheme in place, and the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy will of course look at any individual cases that he wishes to raise. We are joined up—he asked about this—via the National Security Council and the other structures in a more closely integrated way, and covid-19 has encouraged that more broadly across the board.

On the definition of genocide, I have worked on war crimes since well before becoming a Member of this House, and the real challenge of it is the question of deliberate intention that is ascribed to it. As important as that is—it does bring with it legal implications that help in respect of accountability—the reality is that it can also distract from the fact that we are increasingly confident that there is a strong case to answer, as the Chinese ambassador was unable to do yesterday on “The Andrew Marr Show”, in respect of systematic human rights abuses. Frankly, the legal label on it is to me secondary to the plight of the victims who are suffering under it.

Ms Nusrat Ghani (Wealden) (Con): I welcome the Foreign Secretary’s statement, as we develop a new relationship with China. He mentioned Uyghurs just once in his statement, but he knows that the whole House is concerned about the human rights abuses taking place in Xinjiang. If there is enough evidence for the Americans to apply sanctions on officials in Xinjiang, can the Foreign Secretary have sight of that evidence to see whether we can do the same here? He of course repeatedly states that “genocide” is a legal term and we need international courts to apply it, but when it comes to the UN and China, the UN is a busted flush. Will the Foreign Secretary consider convening an independent inquiry so that we can collect evidence to see whether genocide is taking place in Xinjiang?

Dominic Raab: I thank my hon. Friend for the points that she has made. Of course, one of the points about the Magnitsky regime that we have introduced is that we have already put in place a co-ordination mechanism so that we can more regularly and generically co-ordinate with our Five Eyes partners and share information. There was quite a significant overlap—although not exclusively; it is the UK regime—in the designations that we have already made. We are putting in place that co-ordination. It is a reasonable point to make.

On genocide, I can only repeat the points that I have made before, but I have been clear that this is a gross violation of human rights and China does need to be answerable to and accountable for it. My hon. Friend talked about setting up an inquiry to examine the evidence and to glean it; we have to be realistic about what China would allow into Xinjiang. In the absence of that access, it is very difficult to see how we could do that. It is of course available to all the Select Committees in this House—as well as to the Government in their efforts to assess the evidence—to look at that independently of Government and, indeed, the United Nations.

Navendu Mishra (Stockport) (Lab): Anyone who saw the footage on “The Andrew Marr Show” yesterday would have found it chilling. In the light of that footage, when the Foreign Secretary meets Secretary of State Pompeo tomorrow, will he raise the implementation of the Magnitsky sanctions on Chinese officials implicated in the persecution of the Uyghur people in Xinjiang? Does the Foreign Secretary agree that imposing sanctions on the individuals involved should be an absolute priority?

Dominic Raab: I have already raised with Mike Pompeo, as well as with my other Five Eyes partners, not just the Magnitsky sanctions regime that we have put in place but the designations. We have also given due consideration to co-operation on future evidence. It is important that there is an evidence-based approach, although there is of course political accountability, and we will carefully gather and assess the evidence.

In answer to the hon. Gentleman’s question about priorities, we have set out, through a policy note published in the Library of the House, the criteria that we will apply and the policy approach. That stresses the nature of the violations, their severity and our ability to hold to account the individuals at the right levels—sufficiently senior—so that we send the right message.

Bob Seely (Isle of Wight) (Con): I agree with so much of what the Secretary of State is saying about the need for balance, about the criticality of China and about respect for what it has achieved, but the signal truth is that the China we hoped for is not the China that we are now getting. We need a much more significant reset in our relationship in respect of not only Hong Kong but foreign lobbying, foreign investment, espionage—industrial or otherwise—human rights and our alliances and defence posture. Will the Secretary State confirm whether we are approaching all these issues piecemeal or whether there is a wider reset? If there is a wider reset, will he explain how the Government are interacting with parliamentarians and outside experts, and how that more comprehensive reset is going to be presented to Parliament so that we can all get to debate it and contribute to it?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is an assiduous follower of China; I know that he takes a very close interest in it. On what the right balance is, he has mentioned all the areas of challenge. We could talk about universities, freedom of expression—there are many—but, for balance, it is important to say that there are also areas of co-operation. China is one of the biggest investors—the biggest investor, I think—in renewable technology. If we are to shift the dial significantly on climate change, China will have to be a constructive and, indeed, positive partner, with which to engage.

More strategically, my hon. Friend asked how the measures that we take fit a broader strategy. We are considering that all the time not just through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office channels, but through the National Security Council. With the integrated review, of course, he and other hon. Members will get precisely the opportunity to scrutinise the more strategic, big picture.

Feryal Clark (Enfield North) (Lab): I welcome the Foreign Secretary's announcement on BNOs, but will he outline the steps that his Government are taking to guarantee that young pro-democracy activists who do not have BNO passport holder status will be afforded the same visa rights, extensions and protections as BNO passport holders?

Dominic Raab: As I have said, we have made a very clear, bespoke offer to BNO holders. Further details will be set out by the Home Secretary. She has already made some comments about the potential gap in years, but I will allow her to set out the full detail and then the House can scrutinise it properly.

Mr Andrew Mitchell (Sutton Coldfield) (Con): I very much welcome both the tone and the content of what my right hon. Friend has said today. He is surely right to emphasise the importance of co-operation wherever we can and not of confrontation wherever possible. After all, we have more in common with China when it comes to climate change negotiations than we do currently with the United States. Will he emphasise to the Chinese authorities that the Magnitsky legislation and the human rights measures that he has so ably and rightly introduced are not aimed at the Chinese per se, but at human rights abusers, corrupt officials and business people wheresoever they may be?

Dominic Raab: My right hon. Friend is absolutely right. I welcome and thank him for his support. When the Magnitsky sanctions were originally debated, the Russian Government said that the measure was solely aimed at Russia and when it was originally debated, discussed and enacted in the US, there were different Bills in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. We were very clear in the model that we adopted that this would be a universal mechanism, that it would allow us to target the individuals, whether they were state or non-state actors, and that it did not involve us, as a wider economic embargo or sanctions would do, in punishing the individual people of the country. This is a very bespoke, forensic tool, but it gives effect to exactly what he describes.

Peter Grant (Glenrothes) (SNP) [V]: History teaches us that we cannot stay silent in the face of what is happening to China's Uyghur community. That warning would be stark from anyone, but coming from the

Holocaust Educational Trust, it should send a chill through all of us. Will the Secretary of State give an assurance that the Government will miss no opportunity to remind the Chinese Government that wholesale abuses of human rights are not an internal matter for China any more than they are an internal matter for anyone and that, where there is evidence, as there clearly now is, of large-scale breaches of human rights conditions in China, then the rest of the world has not only a right, but an absolute duty, to step in to protect the citizens of China, as we would protect the citizens of any other country on earth?

Dominic Raab: The hon. Gentleman is absolutely right. As I have said, we respect China as a leading member of the international community and as a permanent member of the Security Council, with not just rights but the obligations that go with that. The commitment to international human rights law reflected under the UN charter of customary international law is incredibly important. We raised this issue with the Chinese Government—I raised it with my Chinese opposite number in Beijing. We have also raised, for the first time, the issue in relation to Xinjiang and Hong Kong in the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva.

Jerome Mayhew (Broadland) (Con): When the Communist party of China decided to breach the Sino-British Joint Declaration, it knew that it put at risk extradition treaties from countries that value the rule of law. Does my right hon. Friend agree that, while we continue to welcome China's development as a leading economic power, the rules-based international system protects us all and must be defended?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. The UK has a strong reputation as a promoter and guardian of the international rule of law, and that is a good guide or lodestar for our relationship with China. That is why not only has the UK grounded our response to China in relation to Hong Kong in the obligations freely assumed by the Chinese Government reflected in the joint declaration, but other countries are doing the same.

Graham Stringer (Blackley and Broughton) (Lab): The measures the Foreign Secretary has announced in the Commons today are supported by all parts of the House, I am sure, but I thought his preamble was a little optimistic. It is clear that in international organisations China has the objective of subverting those organisations, rather than either trying to change the rules or obeying them. Will he be more explicit about how he intends to work with China, given its attitude of undermining the World Health Organisation, the World Trade Organisation and other international bodies?

Dominic Raab: I make no apology for being stubbornly optimistic about global Britain, including in our relations with China, but of course it requires China to live up to its international obligations. The hon. Gentleman makes an important point about not allowing a vacuum to appear in multilateral institutions. We are discussing that with our US partners, our European partners and across the board. He gave a few examples; the most obvious recent example of concern is intellectual property theft, where there was a Chinese candidate to lead the World Intellectual Property Organisation, and there

was a groundswell of diplomatic activity to support the Singaporean candidate for precisely that reason. We need not only to uphold the rule of international law, but to work closely with all like-minded partners to support the multilateral institutions.

David Johnston (Wantage) (Con): I strongly support the measures announced today. Will my right hon. Friend confirm that when the inevitable pressure, both public and private, comes from China, we will stand behind the measures for as long as the national security law remains in its current form?

Dominic Raab: Absolutely. In taking these measures, we recognise that China will respond. That is why I was clear that we are taking well reasoned, focused and proportionate measures in response to China's actions in Hong Kong. We are clear that, in relation to Hong Kong and more generally, we will not buck and bow. We will look for the positive, but prepare in terms of the resilience of our economy, our security and, indeed, our values.

Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab): I welcome strong action over Hong Kong and the Uyghurs and to secure our critical national infrastructure, but I am concerned by reports over the weekend that the Government told Huawei that the exclusion from our 5G network was at the behest of the United States. Does the Secretary of State agree that when we take such action to defend our national security, we should say so clearly, and that it can never be in our interests to be seen to be hiding behind President Trump, particularly as we leave the European Union and seek new partnerships?

Dominic Raab: I thank the hon. Lady for her support for the measures we are taking today. It was clear in the original decision on Huawei that we wanted to reduce reliance on high-risk vendors; it is equally clear—we have to be honest about it—that we had to take the measures that we took based on technical necessity, following US sanctions and their impact on the supply chain. We have been clear and honest about that, but there is a much broader challenge for us and our international partners, which is diversifying supply chains and telecoms providers so that we can build up greater diversity of high-trust vendors in the field, and that is what we have focused on.

Chris Clarkson (Heywood and Middleton) (Con): If we are for human rights, we must be for human rights everywhere. If we are for the rule of law, we need to be for the rule of law everywhere. In welcoming today's decisive actions in relation to Hong Kong, may I ask my right hon. Friend for an assurance that our commitment to pro-democracy campaigners and oppressed minorities across China does not end here?

Dominic Raab: Of course, freedom of religion and freedom of expression are not only under threat in Hong Kong and Xinjiang. There is a broader issue, which we continue to raise with China and international partners in the relevant multilateral forums.

Afzal Khan (Manchester, Gorton) (Lab) [V]: I hope the Foreign Secretary has noted that almost every hon. Member has touched on the persecution of Uyghurs,

which is pointing towards a demographic genocide. Well over 1 million Uyghurs are detained in camps and they have been subjected to some of the most atrocious forms of torture. The Chinese Government are now taking draconian measures with the aim of curbing this Muslim population. So will he agree to meet the civil society groups that have evidence of human rights abuses in China against the Uyghurs ahead of the next round of designations under the Magnitsky sanctions, and will he raise this issue with Secretary of State Pompeo tomorrow?

Dominic Raab: The hon. Gentleman is right to join others in expressing concerns. I made it clear that we regard what is happening in Xinjiang as a gross violation of human rights. I have already referred to the reports from Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. A report by 11 UN special rapporteurs in November 2019 also raised the issues of not only arbitrary detention, but enforced disappearance and torture. We will look very carefully at all that evidence.

Neil O'Brien (Harborough) (Con): I strongly welcome this statement. Whether it is the pictures of Uyghur Muslim children who have been separated from their parents, the horrifying footage of Uyghurs in chains being herded off the trains and into the camps, or the news that the Chinese Government are selling the hair of Uyghurs on the internet, I am sure that the Foreign Secretary will feel deeply that many of these things are reminiscent of the darkest moments of 20th century history. Does he agree that as we work across Whitehall to think about all our different points of leverage on the Government in Beijing, we must recognise, first, that they are on a path of increasing aggression externally and increasing repression internally? Does he agree that we must also recognise that some things we do to have the most leverage over them may also be in our economic interest, be that restricting takeovers of companies in this country or restricting their ability to extract technology from our universities? Does he agree that the only way to stand up to a regime that is becoming more and more bullying is to confront it now?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend makes a range of good points, and we will, of course, continue to look at all of them in the round. I share his concern about what we are hearing in some of those reports and the harrowing echoes of what we have seen in the past. He is right to say that we need to use every potential lever we have to try to positively moderate or change the behaviour of China. We also need to be realistic about the size and scale of China, and, whatever the debate in this House, about the likely appetite and disposition of not just Europeans and north Americans, but the non-aligned countries in the UN. We will be at our strongest when we unite people together.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): China stands condemned in the world court of rights for its abuse of Christians and Uyghur Muslims, and this week is the 21st anniversary of China's persecution of the Falun Gong, whose followers have been subjected to commercial organ harvesting with the knowledge of the state of China—there is a strong World Health Organisation evidential base on this. So will the Foreign Secretary

[Jim Shannon]

consider imposing travel bans and asset freezes against those involved in serious human rights violations in China against the Falun Gong?

Dominic Raab: As I mentioned, the challenge will be evidential, in terms of establishing not just the abuses, but the individuals responsible. We are deeply concerned about the persecution of Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Falun Gong practitioners and others on the grounds of religion or belief in China, including, given the new national security legislation, the risk that that grip gets only tighter.

Dr Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (Con): For as long as China's gross abuses go largely uncensored by the UN Human Rights Council, will my right hon. Friend ensure that the UK will continue to oppose resolutions made under item 7 at the UN Human Rights Council? That item seems grossly disproportionate, given that it singles out Israel for special attention, against its undeniably poor record, while China continues systemic, appalling institutional abuse against the Uyghur people and nobody at the UN Human Rights Council has anything to say about it.

Dominic Raab: I remember well from my right hon. Friend's time as a Minister what a champion of human rights he was. The approach we will take is to hold the countries and the Governments to account for the worst human rights abuses and so far as we can—he will remember this from his time dealing with the UN—mitigate and avoid the politicisation of those by Governments and others who wish to subvert human rights more generally.

Margaret Ferrier (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (SNP) [V]: The decision to suspend extradition arrangements is a necessary step in protecting human rights, given the serious curtailing of freedom that has taken place as a result of the imposition of the new national security law in Hong Kong. Can the Foreign Secretary update the House on the FCO's recent engagement with civil society organisations in Hong Kong? What steps will he take under the Global Human Rights Sanctions Regulations 2020 to designate sanctions against officials responsible for human rights violations in both Hong Kong and China?

Dominic Raab: I think I have already answered the question about Magnitsky sanctions. We will assess the evidence; I do not want to prejudge any future designations, but we will look at that very carefully. We also are engaged and in touch with various civil society movements in relation to both Hong Kong and more broadly, and the Minister for Asia is meeting Nathan Law later today. That is one illustration of the engagement we have had.

Craig Mackinlay (South Thanet) (Con): By taking this welcome step to suspend extradition to Hong Kong, we are saying clearly that we have little confidence in the judicial processes of China. Will my right hon. Friend assure me that he will be looking at other extradition treaties that this country has to make sure that there are no halfway house routes that China might exploit to get citizens with whom it disagrees back to Hong Kong or China to face questionable charges?

Dominic Raab: Certainly, all the recent extradition treaty arrangements that we have already have an inbuilt safeguard to mitigate against that potential risk. I hope that gives my hon. Friend the reassurance he needs.

Holly Lynch (Halifax) (Lab): I very much welcome the announcement made by the Foreign Secretary today. I was alarmed, like many others, to hear the Chinese ambassador to the UK this weekend, when asked about forced mass sterilisations, say that he

“cannot rule out single cases”.

The Foreign Secretary has already said that he will be looking to work with international partners on further establishing that evidence base of human rights abuses against the Uyghur people in particular. Can he go further and explain exactly what conversations he has had so that we can further inform our decision making and further actions?

Dominic Raab: I agree with the hon. Lady; I think the whole House—every individual—will share the disgust and the horror at the idea that, anywhere, there is any number of cases of forced sterilisation. The testimony that we saw on “The Andrew Marr Show” yesterday was truly harrowing—I had certainly not seen anything of that nature before.

The hon. Lady asks, quite rightly, about how we are trying to assess the evidence base. We need to bear in mind two factors: first, the evidential points that I have already mentioned and, secondly, the balance of international opinion. We can work with our traditional partners, which is really important, but we also need to build up a groundswell of wider support among like-minded partners and countries—particularly those that share our values, but maybe in the region or more broadly—that feel vulnerable to pressure from China. That is a challenge. The way the debate is viewed in some of those countries and by some of those Governments is different from the way it is seen here, so we need to be smart about the way we approach this so we gain consensus and build up a groundswell of support for the measures we have taken. I believe that in the approach we have taken on Hong Kong, grounded in the joint declaration and the very specific obligations that have been violated, we are in the best position to do that.

Mr Tobias Ellwood (Bournemouth East) (Con): May I very much welcome the much more robust attitude that we are seeing from the Front Bench? My right hon. Friend speaks about China's economic rise, but I believe that that has coincided with a demise in a collective sense of duty and responsibility of the west. For decades, we have turned a blind eye to China's democratic deficit and its human rights violations in the hope that it would mature into a globally responsible citizen, but that clearly has not happened. So, given its actions in the South China sea and given its veto, which it constantly uses at the United Nations, as well as the fact that it ignores WTO advice and is ensnaring so many poorer countries into debt, is this now the turning point where we drop the pretence that China shares our values? I very much welcome the statement today, but it is tactical. Can we have a strategic overhaul of our foreign policy in relation to China?

Dominic Raab: Of course, under previous Administrations, my right hon. Friend was a Foreign Office Minister during that period, but I recognise that he was always assiduous and loyal during that process.

Mr Ellwood: That's why I'm on the Back Benches now.

Dominic Raab: I couldn't possibly comment, but he makes a reasonable strategic point and of course the integrated review is an opportune moment to address it.

Mr Speaker: I am going to run this for another five minutes and Members are going to make others miss out.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op) [V]: The catalogue of human rights abuses by the Chinese authorities is nothing new, and the extension of the national security law in Hong Kong is just the next step. While the suspension of extradition and export controls is necessary, why has it taken so long to reach this point, and how will the UK Government act more swiftly in formulating a strategic plan with international counterparts to make sure all those who are experiencing human rights abuses in Hong Kong and across mainland China are protected?

Dominic Raab: The national security legislation was only introduced on 30 June. We are now towards the mid to end of July. Not only did we move to extend a path to citizenship to BNO passport holders and those with eligibility, but we have now taken these further steps on extradition and the arms embargo. All these things need to be thought through carefully and require legal preparation. I believe we have moved swiftly, reasonably and proportionately.

Scott Benton (Blackpool South) (Con): I strongly welcome today's announcement and thank my right hon. Friend for his statement. Does he agree that China must adhere to international law if it wishes to be treated as a leading member of the international community?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is right. That is the relationship and the way we want to calibrate the relationship—looking for positives, militating against risk and guided by international obligations, multilateral but also directly bilateral, which, in the case of Hong Kong, China freely assumed and is now in clear and serious violation of.

Daniel Zeichner (Cambridge) (Lab): The Secretary of State will be aware of the important financial contribution that Chinese students make to our universities and research sector in particular. What plans do the Government have should those numbers fall? Perhaps more importantly, what can he do to reassure Chinese students and those of Chinese origin in this country that they are safe and welcome here and what can he do to tackle Sinophobic racism?

Dominic Raab: I am very grateful to the hon. Gentleman for raising this point. I made it clear in my statement that we value the contribution that travelling Chinese make, both touristically and in terms of universities. This is also a timely opportunity to tell the British-Chinese

community here, who are among the most hard-working, productive and socially engaged members of our communities, how welcome they are and that we will have no truck in this House—certainly not on the Government Benches—with this descending into jingoism or any racism against them. They are incredibly important members of our community and society.

Stephen Metcalfe (South Basildon and East Thurrock) (Con) [V]: I thank my right hon. Friend for his robust statement. Does he agree that the national security law is not only to the detriment of the people of Hong Kong but doing great damage to China itself, and that that needs to be pointed out to China?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend is right. In relation to Hong Kong, it is proving how counterproductive this step is, not just for the residents there, but for the broader people of China, given the economic, financial and reputational issues at stake.

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green): I welcome the Government's new measures on Hong Kong, but I want to press the Foreign Secretary on the gross human rights abuses in Xinjiang. We said that never again would the world stand by while a state set out to eliminate an entire culture, yet it is happening again. As well as accelerating the Magnitsky sanctions on Chinese officials, will he accept that giving out investment opportunities in new nuclear to the state-owned CGN is giving out the wrong signal and that, if he wants to be able to demonstrate real seriousness about gross human rights abuses, he could start by reviewing that policy?

Dominic Raab: I share the hon. Lady's horror and shock at the appalling human rights abuses in Xinjiang and more broadly. Of course, we carefully assess not just individual investment decisions but the integrity and resilience of the processes, and we keep that under constant review.

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): Could we make a study of essential technologies where dependence on China would leave us very vulnerable and then have a strategy for developing those at home or with our allies?

Dominic Raab: My right hon. Friend is right, particularly in relation to 5G, but there are the other areas, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Alex Norris (Nottingham North) (Lab/Co-op): The Government rejected an amendment to the Medicines and Medical Devices Bill that was designed to stop human tissue involuntarily harvested in China entering the UK market. I have since met the Minister for Asia, and I am pleased by his commitment to this. In the light of what the Foreign Secretary has said today, will he make a commitment that, if those amendments are reintroduced in the other place, the Government will look at them seriously anew?

Dominic Raab: Yes, we will certainly look at them very carefully.

Richard Graham (Gloucester) (Con): In suspending our extradition treaty with Hong Kong, has the Foreign Secretary decided that one country, two systems in

[Richard Graham]

Hong Kong is dead, in which case it would be wrong for UK and Commonwealth judges to play such an important role in the Court of Final Appeal, or has he decided to wait to see how China implements the security law while working to preserve other aspects of the joint declaration—particularly Hong Kong’s independent rule of law, under which our judges have played such an important role in the CFA?

Dominic Raab: My hon. Friend raises an excellent point. We will watch very carefully to see whether and the extent to which the new national security legislation impinges on the judicial autonomy that, under the Basic Law and joint declaration, should be afforded to Hong Kong. We will consult widely across Government but also with the judiciary about what further steps we take in the light of that.

Mr Speaker: In order to allow the safe exit of hon. Members participating in this item of business and the safe arrival of those participating in the next, I suspend the House for four minutes.

4.35 pm

Sitting suspended.

Coronavirus Response

4.39 pm

The Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (Matt Hancock): With permission, Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like to make a statement on our action against coronavirus.

Thanks to the perseverance of the British people and the hard work of those on the frontline, this virus is on the back foot. For over three weeks now, the number of new cases each day has been below 1,000, and daily hospital admissions are down to 142. Because of this success in slowing the spread of the virus, on Friday, the Prime Minister was able to set out a conditional timetable for the further easings of the restrictions.

Throughout the reopening, we have acted carefully and cautiously, always vigilant, and we have been able to deliver on our plan. We have protected the NHS. We have cautiously replaced the national lockdown with local action. Thanks to our action against hundreds of local outbreaks, and thanks to NHS Test and Trace working well, NHS Test and Trace has now asked 180,000 people to self-isolate—that is up to 180,000 potential chains of transmission broken by this brilliant new service. What is more, in the hundreds of thousands of tests it delivers every single day, the vast—vast—majority test negative. That provides assurance to hundreds of thousands of people who can go back to work and sleep easy.

NHS Test and Trace is a brand new service. Putting together a massive service of this kind, at this pace, has been a remarkable job—almost unprecedented. I would like to thank the remarkable leadership of Baroness Harding for spearheading the programme and Tom Riordan, who has driven our vital work with local authorities. Everybody in this country who loves freedom should join me in thanking all those who work in NHS Test and Trace, in Public Health England, and in local public health operations for successfully delivering on our plan of moving from a national lockdown to local action. The plan is working.

I would like, if I may, to set out the next stages in this plan. We refuse to be complacent about the threat posed by the virus, and we will not hesitate to put the brakes on if we need to. Our goal is that this should be done through as targeted local action as possible, like we did in Leicester, where we can now start to ease the restrictions. On Friday, we published our framework for containing and controlling future outbreaks in England. From Saturday, local authorities have had new powers in their areas so that they can act with more vigour in response to outbreaks. They can now close specific premises, shut outdoor public spaces, and cancel events. Later this week, we will publish indicative draft regulations that clearly set out the suite of legislative powers that Ministers may need to use to intervene at a local level.

As I pledged to the House on Thursday, we are publishing more data and sharing more data with local bodies. I bow to no one in my enthusiasm for the good use of data in decision making. Properly used, data is one of the best epidemiological weapons that we have. From last month, local directors of public health have had postcode-level data about outbreaks in their area. From today, as I committed to the House last week, we are going further and putting enhanced levels of data in

the hands of local directors of public health too. Of course, high-quality testing is the main source of our data, and having set targets radically to expand testing over the past few months—which have had exactly the desired effect, as each one has been met—so we are now setting the target for the nation of half a million antigen tests a day by the end of October, ahead of winter. I am sure that, as a nation, we will meet this challenge too.

The need for extra testing is not, of course, the only challenge that winter will bring. We know that the NHS will face the usual annual winter pressures, and on top of that, we do not yet know how the virus will interact with the cold weather. So we will make sure that the NHS has the support it needs. We have massively increased the number of ventilators available to patients across the UK, up from 9,000 before the pandemic to nearly 30,000 now; we have now had an agreed supply of 30 billion pieces of personal protective equipment; and we will be rolling out the biggest ever flu vaccination programme in our country's history.

To support this, I have agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer the funding necessary to protect the NHS this winter too. We have already announced £30 billion for health and social care, and we will now provide a further £3 billion on top of the £1.5 billion capital funding announced a fortnight ago. This applies to the NHS in England. Those in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will also receive extra funding. This means that the NHS can keep using the extra hospital capacity in the independent sector and that we can maintain the Nightingale hospitals, which have provided so much reassurance throughout the pandemic, at least until the end of March. We have protected the NHS through this crisis, and that support will help us to protect it in the months ahead.

We all know that in the long term, the best solution to this crisis would be a vaccine, and I am delighted to say that Britain continues to lead the world on that. Two leading vaccine developments are taking place in this country, at Oxford and Imperial, and both are supported by Government funding and the British life science industry. Today, Oxford published an encouraging report in *The Lancet*, showing that its phase 1 and 2 trials are proceeding well. The trial shows that the Oxford vaccine produces a strong immunity response in patients, in both antibody production and T-cell responses, and that no safety concerns have been identified. That promising news takes us one step closer to finding a vaccine that could save lives around the world.

The UK is not just developing world-leading vaccines; we are also putting more money into the global work for a vaccine than any other country. With like-minded partners we are working to ensure that whoever's vaccine is approved first, the whole world can have access. We reject narrow nationalism. We support a global effort, because this virus respects no borders, and we are all on the same side.

This morning I held a global conference call with other health leaders, including from Germany, Australia, Canada, Switzerland, the United States, and others, to discuss the need for global licensing access for any successful vaccine. Here at home, as well as our investment in research, we are working hard to build a portfolio of the most promising new vaccines, no matter where they are from. We have already secured 100 million doses of the Oxford vaccine, if it succeeds, and today I can tell

the House that the Government have secured early access to 90 million further vaccine doses—30 million from an agreement between BioNTech and Pfizer, and 60 million from Valneva. We are getting the deals in place, so that once we know a vaccine is safe and effective, we can make it available for British citizens as soon as humanly possible.

Another long-term solution to eliminating this virus and its negative effects is through developing effective treatments, and it was British scientists, backed by UK Government funding, who led the first robust clinical trial to find a treatment that was proved to reduce the risk of dying from covid: dexamethasone. We now have preliminary results from a clinical trial of another treatment known as SNG001, which was created by the Southampton-based biotech firm Synairgen. Initial findings based on a small cohort suggest that SNG001 may substantially reduce the chance of someone developing severe disease, and it could cut hospital admission time by a third. The data still need to be peer reviewed, and we are supporting a further large-scale trial, but the preliminary results are a positive sign.

In the fight against this virus, our world-renowned universities, researchers and scientists are indispensable, so that we can develop the vaccines and treatments that will tackle this virus for the long term. We have a plan, our plan is working, and the measures I have set out today will help to protect the NHS, support our treatments and vaccines, and take our country forward together. I commend this statement to the House.

4.48 pm

Jonathan Ashworth (Leicester South) (Lab/Co-op): I thank the Secretary of State for advance sight of his statement. Before I move to the substance of his remarks, will he tell the House whether it is true that the chief nursing officer was dropped from the Downing Street press conferences because she refused to stick to the No. 10 line on supporting Dominic Cummings? Did the Secretary of State really acquiesce in the silencing of the chief nursing officer at the height of this pandemic?

We in this House would all be immensely proud if a British vaccine and British drug led the world away from this deadly disease, and this is encouraging and exciting news. Will the Secretary of State ensure that there is equitable access to a vaccine when it is developed? He has my commitment that when a vaccine is available, I will stand shoulder to shoulder with him in taking on poisonous anti-vax propaganda. However, we also have to understand that there have been many false dawns in the history of infectious disease, so what happens if a vaccine does not become available? What scenario planning is the Health Secretary doing, should we be confronted with that awful prospect?

On Friday, the Prime Minister suggested that it could all be over by Christmas and that people must start returning to work by 1 August, but the chief scientific adviser said on Thursday that there was “absolutely no reason” for people to stop working from home, so will the right hon. Gentleman now publish an explanation of the scientific basis for the change in guidance with respect to home working?

On Thursday in the House, the Health Secretary insisted that we went into lockdown on 16 March, having previously told the House on 2 June that “lockdown began on 23 March.”—[*Official Report*, 2 June 2020; Vol. 676, c. 704.]

[Jonathan Ashworth]

The CSA revealed that SAGE advised the Government to lock down ASAP on 16 March, and Professor Ferguson has said that had lockdown been implemented sooner, we would have saved thousands of lives. The Prime Minister understandably wants to avoid a second lockdown—we all do—but if SAGE advises again on the need for a second lockdown, will it be implemented immediately, and on what criteria will he judge whether a second national lockdown is needed?

Last week, the Prime Minister also suggested that social distancing could be eased in November, predicated on a low prevalence of the virus. Can the Health Secretary define what low prevalence means, and is that the only threshold we need to meet if social distancing is to be removed by Christmas? There were no details last week about when relatives could visit care homes, even though the Secretary of State said on 9 July that an announcement was imminent. He will know that this is causing huge anxiety and upset for many families. Can he give us clarity today on when relatives can visit their loved ones in care homes?

The Prime Minister did indeed announce extra NHS funding, which is welcome, but there was no extra funding for social care. Can the Health Secretary tell us whether social care will get any more resources for this winter? We have always said—and we agree with him—that mass testing is the way in which we have to live with this virus and avoid going into a second lockdown, so we welcome the commitments to increased testing. We also know that local lockdowns may well be necessary in the future—indeed, that is the Government’s preferred response to outbreaks—but it is vital that local areas receive patient-identifiable test data on a daily basis. Why did he tell the House last week that local authorities were getting that data when in fact they were not? I think he is announcing today that they will start getting that data—he refers to “enhanced” data—but local areas could have possibly avoided lockdowns and outbreaks earlier had they had that data.

Local areas still need more clarity. In Leicester, we still do not know what metrics will be used to decide whether Leicester will be released from lockdown. Can the Health Secretary confirm, with respect to Leicester, that given the infection rate there and in neighbouring Oadby and Wigston, a decision on their future will be taken at the same time? And given that we are talking about local lockdowns—we will study the regulations carefully—will he deliver on his promise to provide support for businesses that are subject to a local lockdown, such as in Leicester?

It now appears that Blackburn is overtaking Leicester in terms of infection rates, so what does the Health Secretary make of the remarks of the director of public health in Blackburn, who said at the weekend that Test and Trace is failing and, in his words, is

“contributing to the increased risks of Covid-19”

because half of contacts are not reached? Nationally, 71% of people are being contacted, not the 80% that is needed for it to be effective. Indeed, in the Serco call centre element of Test and Trace, only 53% of cases are contacted, and a smaller proportion of contacts are identified in the most deprived areas. We still do not have an app either, despite the right hon. Gentleman’s promises, with Whitehall sources now briefing that he has a “tendency to overpromise and only sometimes deliver”.

What a wicked, unfair thing to say about the Health Secretary! Seriously—which bit of all this is actually world beating, other than possibly the £10 billion price tag?

Today’s vaccine news is encouraging, but we still have a long way to go. We need mass testing and we welcome the Health Secretary’s commitments on that front, but will he also undertake to expand the rapid testing consortium, so that more British suppliers can be involved? Many complain about test kits and say the regulator takes ages when they give their test kits to be signed off and that emails go unanswered. We need an effective tracing regime. Rather than the ad hoc system we have at the moment, with all that money going to privatised firms, why does he not put local directors of public health in charge, backed up with primary care? We need to be preparing now for the second wave. We already have one of the highest excess death rates in the world. Lessons need to be learned. I hope the Secretary of State is learning them.

Matt Hancock: The hon. Gentleman was doing so well when he was supporting what we are saying. I am grateful to him for support on what we are doing on vaccines. I am also grateful to him for his offer to stand shoulder to shoulder against the anti-vaccination movement. Those who promulgate lies about dangers of vaccines that are safe and have been approved are threatening lives. We should all in this House stand shoulder to shoulder against the anti-vax movement.

The hon. Gentleman asks what happens if there is no vaccine. If there is no vaccine—no vaccine can be guaranteed—then the next best thing is good treatment. We have the first treatment here in the UK, dexamethasone, and we have promising news of another today. We put all the support we can behind finding treatments. In fact, the UK recovery trial is the biggest—I would argue, the most effective—treatment clinical trial for covid-19 in the world. From the start, we backed our science. We supported our science, and with the help of the NHS we are able to do scientific research here with great rigour.

The hon. Gentleman mentioned the SAGE advice from March about lockdown. The SAGE advice that the CSA was referring to was implemented. That was precisely the point I was making on Thursday and I did so very straightforwardly. It was implemented straight away. If he looks at that SAGE advice and what happened, that is what he will find. I seem to remember that at the time he supported the action. Maybe now he is looking in the rear-view mirror. He should spend a bit more time looking forward, not backwards.

On social distancing, as on Leicester, the hon. Gentleman asked about the data and thresholds. We use all our data. We use all the data available to make these judgments. We do not put numerical thresholds on any particular figure. We use all data and we make judgments based on them. He also asked about data being made available to local authorities. On Thursday last week, I said I wanted to provide more data to local authorities and was going to provide more data to local authorities. We have done that today. We had provided patient-identifiable information based on postcode-level testing. We are now able to provide full information, including the name and address of those who tested positive, to local authorities where they have signed a data protection agreement.

The hon. Gentleman talked about the effectiveness of NHS Test and Trace. He needs to stop for a moment and recognise the enormous impact of NHS Test and Trace, and the 180,000 people it has been in contact with to advise them to isolate. On Blackburn, yes, it is hard sometimes in certain areas to find all the contacts, so we will be sharing with the local area the information on those whom NHS Test and Trace has not been able to contact, so that local directors of public health will be able to support the action there. Again, I think his tone on that, sniping from the sidelines, ill becomes that enormous effort and the previous work he did to support those measures across party lines.

Finally, the hon. Gentleman asks what we have learned. I would say that the thing he needs to learn—I have certainly learned it—is that things go best when we get the work of the public sector and the private sector coming together. He does not even believe his own attempt to divide us, but uses his argument just to play to his base. Honestly, there are more important things going on. We have set out a direction. We are going as hard as we can down that direction of travel, and we have announced to the House further action in that direction of travel. He should get alongside.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): Order. If questions and answers can be as concise as possible, we will hopefully get many more Members in.

Jeremy Hunt (South West Surrey) (Con): This may be the last coronavirus statement before the summer break, so I congratulate the Health Secretary on his stamina over the past six months and in particular on his decision to introduce the 100,000 tests target in April, which I think will be seen as a turning point in our battle against the virus.

The central challenge we now face is that according to the latest figures and as the Secretary of State knows, about 1,700 people a day are being infected by the virus and about 400 a day are going into NHS Test and Trace, which is about a quarter. As we think about how to prevent a second wave, will he give the House some details as to how we are going to bridge that gap so that we can go into our Christmas holiday with the same cautious optimism as we are going into our summer one?

Matt Hancock: Yes. That is a really important point, and we monitor those data all the time. I am glad to say that the latest data are a little bit better than my right hon. Friend suggested, but the point is still important. The main cause of the gap is people who are asymptomatic and therefore do not know they have the virus and do not come forward for testing. We are going to ramp up our communications to make clear that, if in doubt and if people think they might have the symptoms, they should come forward and get a test. We are also going to ramp up our asymptomatic testing of high-risk groups, which he and I have had exchanges about before. I am grateful for what he said about the 100,000 testing target. Of course, he will recognise that I am as delighted as he will be that the Prime Minister set me a new target on Friday to hit half a million by the end of October, so there is my summer sorted.

Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire) (SNP) [V]: I, too, welcome the progress being made regarding vaccine development by research centres and companies across

the UK, including Valneva in Scotland, but a widely available vaccine is still some way off. In the meantime, avoiding the social and economic impact of repeated local lockdowns depends on driving down community transmission. Professor Dominic Harrison, public health director of Blackburn with Darwen Council, has highlighted that only half of contacts are being traced by the central system and called to be given information in individual covid cases so that their contacts can be traced and isolated in the short window before they, too, become infectious.

In the covid statement last Thursday, I again raised the issue of delays in providing individual test results to local public health teams. The Health Secretary said he could not answer so many questions from me, so he chose not to answer any. To make it simple, I will ask only one. Postcode information was utterly insufficient, so by what date can he guarantee that every single director of public health in England will receive the identifiable details of all new positive cases on a daily basis?

Matt Hancock: If they have signed a data protection agreement, today.

Mrs Heather Wheeler (South Derbyshire) (Con): My South Derbyshire constituents have strong links with Burton and Leicester. In light of the recent spikes in the covid virus there, what steps is my right hon. Friend taking to ensure that local authorities have the necessary powers to take local action to control the virus? Does he agree that localised action will be key to managing the virus as we move forward?

Matt Hancock: Yes, I agree strongly with my hon. Friend, who makes the point very clearly. No matter the level of new infections in any area, having better and better data helps us give more support to those who have coronavirus. Whether it is an outbreak with large numbers, as we saw for instance in Leicester and some other cities, where there is clear concerted action with support from national Government to go in and root it out, or whether it is an area with very low levels of background infections, like her own, where the local authority having the data will allow it to support the few positive cases, better data will help the co-ordination of the national and local response. We have said all along that tackling the virus is best done by the national level and local level working together, and I am really pleased that we are able to get this increased data out to increase that co-ordination still further.

Kerry McCarthy (Bristol East) (Lab): I want to thank the Health Secretary for two things while I have the chance: the deal on Kaftrio for cystic fibrosis patients, which is so important to so many of them; and for meeting my constituent, Jake Osborne, recently to talk about access to the drug Spinraza—I hope we have some news on that soon. However, for people with such conditions who have been shielding for the last few months, there is still a great deal of uncertainty, concern and confusion about whether it is safe for them to go outside and about what they can actually do, especially when other people are breaking social distancing, not wearing masks and so on. What reassurance can he give that people will be safe if they tentatively put a foot outside?

Matt Hancock: I pay tribute to the hon. Lady's campaigning on these issues. We have worked closely together to bring really positive news on the treatments

[*Matt Hancock*]

for cystic fibrosis on which she has campaigned so strongly. She also made the case very clearly on Spinraza, which I have since discussed with NHS England. It is, of course, NHS England's statutory responsibility to take a decision, but I discussed it with NHS England, as I committed to do so to her and her constituent, Jake.

I say to all those in the shielding category that we have recommended that shielding restrictions come to an end at the end of this month because it is clinically advised that the levels of new infections are low enough that it is safe to do so. It is safe to do so. I plead with those who are shielding to listen to this clinical advice, because we also know that staying at home and not seeing other people has downsides to health too. If anyone wants proof that we will not take this step unless we are confident that it is safe, we have paused the end of shielding in Leicester exactly because rates of infection are higher—to keep people safe. People can be assured that it is safe, from the end of this month, for those in the shielding category to go out into the community, taking the precautions that everybody should take.

Joy Morrissey (Beaconsfield) (Con): May I congratulate my right hon. Friend on the significant drop in hospital admissions? As we continue to come to grips with this virus, does he agree that local response and local action is key to preventing and containing future spikes? Will he join me in praising the excellent work of Buckinghamshire clinical commissioning group and our local authority, which worked together to create a joint action plan to keep admission rates low?

Matt Hancock: I am pleased to congratulate all those working in Buckinghamshire—the council, the CCG and the other parts of the NHS—on their work to keep Buckinghamshire safe. The number of infections across Buckinghamshire is very low now, and we want to keep it that way.

I also take this opportunity to answer part of the question from my hon. Friend the Member for South Derbyshire (Mrs Wheeler) that I did not answer. More powers, as well more data, will be available to local areas to take more local action themselves, without having to refer up to the Secretary of State to use my powers. Of course, national Government hold further powers for significant action, which we have had to use just the once, but we will give local areas more powers, as well as more data, to be able to grip this issue locally.

Dr Luke Evans (Bosworth) (Con)[V]: I am grateful to my right hon. Friend for his announcement today and congratulate the scientists looking into the research that will hopefully solve this covid problem. On Friday, he announced a review into Public Health England deaths data, which is incredibly important. Does he have any indication of how inaccurate that data may be? If so, how is that impacting future planning for the covid response?

Matt Hancock: I do not have anything further to add yet. The problem was that anybody who had had covid at any point and then subsequently died, whether or not from covid, was being counted in this data. Right at the start of the crisis, that was a perfectly reasonable approach

to take, but clearly it needs to be reviewed. It is likely that the number of deaths has been overestimated on this measure, hence the urgent review, and I hope to have more information this week.

Kate Osborne (Jarrow) (Lab): We know that, for some, the recovery from coronavirus can be long and often bring with it debilitating symptoms, including fatigue, headaches and pain. What additional support is the Department giving GPs to ensure that they have the necessary resources to care for patients who are suffering with long-term symptoms and to help them come to terms with this, cope and readjust where necessary?

Matt Hancock: The hon. Lady asks a very important question. There is increasing evidence that there are some long-term, debilitating consequences of having had covid for a minority of people, and for that minority—which includes at least one Member of this House—it is very substantial. We have therefore started a whole NHS service to support people recovering from covid who have long-term symptoms. Primary care is, of course, an important part of the service that the NHS provides.

Jason McCartney (Colne Valley) (Con): Up to last Friday, the rates of covid-19 infection had dropped in Kirklees over the previous seven days, but we have had recent outbreaks, raising fears among my constituents of local lockdowns. Does my right hon. Friend agree that timely postcode-level data will assist Kirklees Council's director of public health and all its officers, who have been doing an excellent job, so that they can continue to target the outbreaks with local measures in our community?

Matt Hancock: Yes, that is exactly the plan. They got that data at postcode level last week, and they will now get even more detail, including the identities of people who have tested positive, so that they can support them and work with NHS Test and Trace yet more effectively. Kirklees has been proactive in how it has managed the outbreaks it has had so far. It had outbreaks about a month ago, which it got right on top of, and it is working very hard in the current circumstances.

Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran) (SNP) [V]: Yesterday saw the single largest daily recorded number of global covid cases, as well as a protest against masks on the streets of London and an illegal rave attracting thousands of people outside Bath. How can the Secretary of State persuade people to get behind his Government's public safety message?

Matt Hancock: I am glad to say that the vast majority of people respond positively to the public health messages that we have been putting out throughout, and it is a very important part of the policy.

Mark Pawsey (Rugby) (Con): The Secretary of State reminded us of the importance of a vaccine. I was interested to hear on the radio as I drove into Parliament today a representative of a drug company saying that we might have a vaccine by October and a doctor based at a university telling us that today is a great day. Does the Secretary of State agree?

Matt Hancock: I am cautiously optimistic. The team are optimistic. My job is not to speculate on the likelihood of the Oxford vaccine coming off. It is to make sure that, should it come off, we are ready.

Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD): The £3 billion for the NHS is, of course, welcome, and the Secretary of State has rightly spoken passionately about protecting the NHS, but may I respectfully remind him that he is the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care? I have real concerns about social care being overwhelmed if there is a second surge, with hospitals having to discharge people into the community quickly, as we have seen with the first wave. What further package of support will he announce for social care?

Matt Hancock: Of course it is important to support social care as well, as we have financially right from the start. The vast majority of discharges from hospital were into the community, with care packages. Social care is a very important part of this issue. We announced the money for the NHS last week, but we continue to look at what we can do to support social care too.

Andy Carter (Warrington South) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend for the update that he has given today. I particularly welcome the news with regard to the vaccine programme. I wonder whether he can provide us with a little more detail about the work being undertaken on the risk of getting the virus again. How long does he think it will be until we know whether having antibodies will give us some form of immunity?

Matt Hancock: We are undertaking that research into immunology. It is incredibly important for people, like me, who have had the disease to know the likelihood of getting it again and of transmitting it again. Both are very important for obvious reasons—one for personal health; the other for public health—but it is not just about the antibody response; is also about the T-cell response. Both of those are different parts of the immune system responding. We are making progress in our understanding of that, but not yet enough to be able to recommend that people who have had the disease, or have antibodies, act in any different way from the rest of the community.

Tonia Antoniazzi (Gower) (Lab): On 26 June, there was a letter to the Secretary of State from the co-chairs of the all-party parliamentary group on access to medical cannabis under prescription about the desperate plight of epileptic children due to covid. On 9 June, there was an urgent email to the Under-Secretary of State following a meeting at the suggestion of the Secretary of State in this House on 2 June. On 22 May, there was a joint letter from eight cross-party chairs of cancer APPGs about an urgent need for a covid national cancer recovery plan. I have received no replies to any of that correspondence. Does the Secretary of State just not like me, or does that point to a bigger issue with his Department?

Matt Hancock: We have spoken about that in this House. It is absolutely true that during the peak of the crisis the Department was working incredibly hard and absolutely flat out, and we are now working hard to catch up on our correspondence.

Bob Blackman (Harrow East) (Con) [V]: As part of the reopening of pubs, cafés and restaurants, they are being encouraged to open in the open air. That has implications for people who do not smoke. I understand that the Government will issue guidance for smoke-free areas outside pubs, restaurants and cafés. Can my right

hon. Friend confirm that his Department will be consulted on those proposals, that they will be issued before Parliament rises, and that they will be the subject of parliamentary scrutiny?

Matt Hancock: I can certainly confirm that we will be consulted on those proposals as they are brought forward. I have not yet seen them. I know that work is ongoing, and I think that they are incredibly important. It is important that parliamentarians such as my hon. Friend, who have a long and proud history of fighting smoking and the consequences of it on people's health—not only the health of smokers but of others—can ensure that those considerations are brought to bear as we bring the proposals forward. He knows what I think.

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op) [V]: I thank the Secretary of State. He will know that I have reputation in the past for being a bit hard on him, but in recent weeks he and his team have been very supportive when there have been challenges in my part of the world. I thank him sincerely for his and his team's actions and good communication.

There is a news story today that there is a rise in infections in France, so this dreadful virus is still there. Does the Secretary of State agree that more firm leadership on the importance of wearing masks is very important, and will he take my assurance that the anti-vaxxers have to be confronted? I have just seen statistics that a quite high percentage of NHS employees are very resistant to getting the flu jab in the winter. That is a great challenge. Together, does he agree that we can face it down?

Matt Hancock: Yes, I like the new Barry—he is like the old Barry, before he got very cross with me over Brexit. Welcome back; it is really nice to see you. If I may, I will make this clinical point, which I normally avoid: it is also really good for your blood pressure.

We have been working really hard with Huddersfield and the local authorities in the hon. Gentleman's part of the world to bring the virus under control. It has been a real team effort and an example of how things should be done working together. I appreciate the hon. Gentleman's words on that. I hope that the whole local team will see that this is a big cross-party effort and that there is not some sort of fake attempt to create division. This is everybody working together to try to tackle this virus, and that is how it should be.

On the latter point, I agree with the hon. Gentleman very strongly about tackling the anti-vax movement, and he is right to raise that. He is also right that this is not just about the covid vaccine, but the flu vaccine too. We are moving to make sure that a far higher proportion of people in the NHS get the flu vaccine. This winter, the expectation will be that every single person who works in the NHS will get the flu vaccine, unless there is a very good, essentially clinical, reason. Making that happen is a big part of the work I am doing with Simon Stevens and the NHS leadership, to drive that through.

Dr James Davies (Vale of Clwyd) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend for his statement. He referred to an additional £3 billion for the NHS to help keep the temporary Nightingale hospitals open over the winter, should they be needed, and to keep non-covid sites available for routine healthcare. Will he confirm how that funding relates to Wales?

Matt Hancock: Yes—and I imagine that you might have an interest in this too, Mr Deputy Speaker. The extra funding announced on Friday by the Prime Minister of course also means that we will be increasing the funding that goes to Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. We can provide a high-quality response to this disease only if we have the financial firepower to support the NHS and the action necessary. That is only possible because we have one United Kingdom. Scotland will receive an extra £250 million with which to tackle the disease; Wales will receive an extra £150 million and Northern Ireland an extra £90 million. That means that across the UK we can fight the disease better because we are all part of the same UK.

Ms Angela Eagle (Wallasey) (Lab): Earlier this month, Baroness Harding told a House of Lords Select Committee that people were unwilling to self-isolate because of financial pressures. We also now learn that Test and Trace does not make the same inroads in poorer areas, where the pressure not to self-isolate because of financial pressures is higher, as it does in more well off areas. Can I again ask the Secretary of State to make an announcement about sick pay and access to extra help for those who need to self-isolate but who perhaps cannot really afford to do so?

Matt Hancock: The hon. Lady makes an important point, but the No. 1 cause of people not self-isolating is that they have coronavirus without symptoms and do not get a test. That is where we need the most effort. However, I hear the point that she is making, and I will take it away.

John Howell (Henley) (Con): Is my right hon. Friend aware that co-trimoxazole is receiving tests against covid in Bangladesh and that the increasingly good results from there and India will be published very shortly? When are we likely to see it in use here?

Matt Hancock: I will immediately look into the proposal; I would be surprised if my scientists were not already across the trial. If there is a positive signal from that trial, we will make sure that we will absolutely bring it forward.

Vicky Foxcroft (Lewisham, Deptford) (Lab) [V]: Today, I wrote to the Chancellor and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy on the need for more support for those high-risk people who are currently shielding. Does the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care agree that it is essential that those currently shielding have faith in Government advice? If so, will he commit to publishing a full risk assessment for each category on the shielding list before 1 August? Now is the time to use the full capacity of Government communication to reassure people; will the Secretary of State do that?

Matt Hancock: I very much agree with the hon. Lady's sentiments; the challenge is that the number of different groups within shielding is essentially as big as the number of people who are shielding. We have taken the approach that individuals will get individual clinical advice on what is right for them. That is the best way forward.

Andrew Selous (South West Bedfordshire) (Con): A young couple contacted me over the weekend to ask why it is that any number of people without restriction can spend the whole evening eating and drinking in a pub, yet as from 1 August only 30 can go to a wedding reception. Can the Secretary of State give people in their position any comfort?

Matt Hancock: The explanation is that in the pub they will have to be socially distanced at 2 metres, or 1 metre plus mitigation. Unfortunately, this virus is still at large, so having very large groups of people in a situation where it is absolutely normal to be in very close contact is a risk. These are all judgments and unfortunately that is one of the judgments that we have had to make.

Catherine West (Hornsey and Wood Green) (Lab): Covid, long-covid and lockdown are creating a tsunami of mental health crises. My local mental health trust has lost four black and minority ethnic workers in the line of duty on the national health service frontline. What is the plan to provide a comprehensive mental health strategy that meets the challenge, particularly for young people or for people who never thought they would ever have a mental health crisis, and to meet the workforce challenge so that we have a plan in the autumn for what is going to be a very difficult emotional time for people who have had covid or lockdown stress?

Matt Hancock: There is undoubtedly a challenge in respect of people who have not come forward during lockdown and are presenting now with severe mental health problems. I am working on that with both the NHS and the Royal College of Psychiatrists. There is good news: for non-pharmaceutical treatments, there is evidence that they are better done by telemedicine. Psychiatry can be better done by telemedicine, which helps, but obviously that does not help at the most serious end of cases of mental ill health, and that is something we are working very hard on.

Caroline Nokes (Romsey and Southampton North) (Con): I am sure it will come as no surprise to my right hon. Friend that some of the solutions come from Southampton. I commend Synairgen's work on the treatment it is producing. I wish to ask my right hon. Friend specifically about vaccinations. It is crucial not just that we put the anti-vax argument to bed but that he provides reassurance to those who might be anxious about a vaccination for covid. Can he provide any information on what plans he has for a reassurance programme?

Matt Hancock: Yes—we are planning to provide exactly the reassurance that my right hon. Friend seeks, in two ways. First, the essential point is that we will not approve a vaccine until we are clinically confident that it is safe. We would never approve a vaccine unless we were clinically confident that it was safe.

Secondly, we will also have a communications campaign. To answer a point that was raised earlier but to which I did not respond at the time, we have already published a plan for the order in which people will have access to the vaccine, starting with the most vulnerable. In essence, it consists of going down by age through those with comorbidities and health and social care workers. We have

to make sure that we reassure people and that we assure them that we are doing the roll-out in a clinically valid way.

Finally, on Southampton, my right hon. Friend is an assiduous representative of the environs of Southampton. When Southampton is doing well, Romsey is undoubtedly part of Southampton. In this case, Southampton is doing very well; let us hope that it continues.

Mr Ben Bradshaw (Exeter) (Lab): Does not the fact that local public health directors are getting access to the individual data that they need to avoid another local lockdown only from today, and only if they sign a data protection agreement, illustrate that the Government's slow and over-centralised approach has been a problem? Why would a local public health director not sign such an agreement?

Matt Hancock: I doubt any would not, but we have to ensure that people are assured that their data will be used sensitively. On the timing, we have been constantly improving this throughout the process. Some people complain that everything is not done by yesterday. Well, we put this together in a matter of a few months. The right hon. Member would do far better standing up and supporting the work to put together this amazing programme in a few short weeks, rather than sniping from the sidelines.

Sara Britcliffe (Hyndburn) (Con): As my right hon. Friend will know, my neighbouring constituency of Blackburn now has the highest infection rate in the country and my constituency of Hyndburn and Haslingden is served by Blackburn Hospital. My constituents are rightly very concerned. As a local lockdown seems very possible, can he assure me that the Department will engage with me and local authorities closely to provide the guidance and advice needed?

Matt Hancock: Yes, absolutely. My hon. Friend is quite right to say this. She has already been in contact and making sure she represents Lancashire and the needs of people across her area and across Lancashire. I absolutely commit to doing that and to working with MPs in all those areas that are affected across the country. I know how concerning this is to constituents in an area with a much higher rate, or close to an area with a much higher rate. A case in point has been the MPs in Leicester and across Leicestershire, with whom we have worked closely to try to tackle this problem. I know that my hon. Friend will do a fantastic job looking out for the interests and needs of her constituents.

Charlotte Nichols (Warrington North) (Lab): Mercifully, our R rate in Warrington is low, but I am concerned about surrounding areas that many of my constituents commute to for work and that local authorities have not been getting patient-identifiable data, which would help them to quickly identify and address workplace outbreaks. I welcome the Secretary of State's assurance that local authorities will be in receipt of this information from today, but what powers will they have to co-ordinate data sharing with each other to sit alongside this?

Matt Hancock: Yes, if a local authority—say, an upper-tier local authority—gets the data and wants to conclude a further data-sharing agreement with a lower-tier local authority, that is absolutely open to them.

Stuart Anderson (Wolverhampton South West) (Con): I pay tribute to the hard work and sacrifices of the amazing people of Wolverhampton. Will my right hon. Friend stand with me in this and ensure that, whenever they need testing, they can easily still get access to it?

Matt Hancock: I stand with my hon. Friend and the people of Wolverhampton in saying that, if they need more testing, they will get more testing, but right now I know for sure that anybody in Wolverhampton who needs a test can get one if they have symptoms. If in doubt, get a test because that is the most important thing people can do to help control the virus across the country.

Martyn Day (Linlithgow and East Falkirk) (SNP) [V]: Independent SAGE has estimated another 27,000 deaths in the UK by spring without a second wave of the virus, if the UK Government continue with their current approach, so will the Secretary of State agree to follow the example of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and pursue a strategy of eliminating the virus, rather than accepting the terrible projected death toll that living with the virus will cause?

Matt Hancock: Those projections did not take into account the actions that the UK Government are undertaking.

Laura Farris (Newbury) (Con): I welcome the news today about the successful trial of the Oxford vaccine. The question on my constituents' lips is: when will that be available on the market? I know my right hon. Friend cannot give those assurances, but could he assist my constituents first by saying when the trial is due to end, and secondly by giving assurances that the route to market for a successful vaccine will be as quick as that for dexamethasone?

Matt Hancock: On the first point, I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. Friend the clarity that she understandably seeks on behalf of her constituents, because it is a scientific question. As the rate of new infections has fallen, so the clinical trials have had to be a bit longer, because they are trying to prove a negative: that if someone has had the vaccine, they do not then get the disease. As a result, AstraZeneca has taken the vaccine around the world and put trials in countries where there is a much higher rate of infection. The rule with clinical trials is that, as soon as a trial comes to a conclusion that is beyond reasonable scientific doubt, the results are brought forward immediately. It is not a trial with a specific end date; it is a trial that runs until it is concluded scientifically, one way or the other. I hope that explanation—well, it is not as good as a date, but I hope that people accept it.

On the second point, my hon. Friend is absolutely right. We have been working hand in glove with these brilliant scientists, and we should put it on the record, even though it might take me an extra 30 seconds to say it, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency has done an amazing job. Alongside the scientists, it has made sure the trials are designed so that it can approve the results as soon as the results come forward—essentially, in parallel, rather than afterward, which is the norm. The MHRA has played a blinder; it is one of the reasons that the UK is at the forefront in vaccines and treatments. That means the vaccine will be available as soon as humanly possible as soon as the science is proven.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I thank the Secretary of State for his commitment and dedication. Can he give detail on the difference between reporting statistics that allowed coronavirus to be recorded as the cause of death on the death certificate of a constituent of mine who had end stage heart failure and a mild dose of coronavirus, with no symptoms, which led to a closed casket being required and potentially to misleading statistics? Does he agree that we need to be clear about whether someone simply had coronavirus or died directly because of complications of coronavirus?

Matt Hancock: Teasing out the answer to that question is a difficult statistical task, but the broad point the hon. Gentleman makes is the right one. We are seeking to tackle this disease, coronavirus, and we have to measure that; at the same time, of course, we need to continue to tackle all the other diseases and to make sure that the consequences of those diseases are measured properly. It is a significant challenge that faces many countries around the world, and that is why scientists are somewhat sceptical about over-analysis and international comparisons of deaths data, as proven by the need for the urgent review I put in place last week.

Greg Clark (Tunbridge Wells) (Con): As my right hon. Friend knows, if we are to suppress the virus, we need an agile and vigorous response. Six weeks ago, I asked him to ensure that tests were available to elderly residents not only of care homes but in sheltered accommodation and retirement villages. Three weeks ago, he told me that they “will be rolled out over the coming three to four weeks”.—[*Official Report*, 29 June 2020; Vol. 678, c. 117.]

Can he confirm whether that is now complete, or will be by the end of the week?

Matt Hancock: I will bring the answer to that question to the Science and Technology Committee, which my right hon. Friend chairs, tomorrow. I commissioned an answer to precisely that question ahead of that appearance and was hoping that he would ask a different question today, but I have been found out.

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green): A test, trace and isolate system that holds public trust is vital, so can the Secretary of State explain why he considered the data protection impact assessment optional? How will he deal with mistakes that come to light, such as contact tracers sharing patient details on social media, as reported by *The Sunday Times*? In short, how will he increase trust in this essential system, given that bullish statements are no substitute for due diligence?

Matt Hancock: I will not be held back by bureaucracy. We made three data protection impact assessments, which cover all the necessary. I saw the report saying that we should have done one to cover all three, but we did the three and I think that will do the trick.

Lee Anderson (Ashfield) (Con): At the start of the pandemic, I raised the issue of care homes potentially losing revenue due to covid and running the risk of closing down. My right hon. Friend advised me at the time that no care home in Ashfield would close. Will he please update the House on the extra support given to care homes and advise whether any have closed due to financial constraints caused by covid?

Matt Hancock: We have worked very hard to support the social care sector, and, exactly as the hon. Member for Twickenham (Munira Wilson) asked, making sure that we get that financial support in is important. Of course, in the first instance, the local authority is responsible for ensuring that there are care homes available to put people in. I am very happy to look into the specific details of Ashfield and to write to my hon. Friend to make sure he gets a proper answer to his question.

Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab): Before asking the people of Newcastle or any city to undertake a local lockdown, the Government must provide clear national guidance, good local data and better local resources. Eighty per cent. of those traced are reached by local authority and public health teams; surely they deserve a greater proportion of the 18,000 tracers recruited nationally. Covid-19 was made a notifiable disease on 5 March, with a legal requirement to notify local authorities, yet the Secretary of State tells us he is only just sorting out the data protection issues of that now.

Matt Hancock: On the hon. Lady’s first point, of course it is a big team effort. She is quite right to raise the three areas that she raises, and that is exactly what we are delivering on: making sure that people have high-quality data; making sure that if we need to put in more resources, such as more testing, we do that; making sure that money goes to local directors of public health, which we have done; and making sure that we get high-quality links between the two. We are making progress exactly against how she sets it out.

If, in addition, the hon. Lady seeks a threshold—a figure—at which point a local lockdown is triggered, we are not going to do that. The reason we are not going to do that is that we have to take everything into account, including local circumstances. For instance, last week the number of cases in Herefordshire shot up—on some counts, it became one of the places with the most cases in the country—but we know that that was confined on one farm, so it was far better to tackle that one farm than to shut down the whole of Herefordshire. That is a clear example of why this simplistic call for a single threshold is not the right approach. The right approach is a scientific approach, using all the available data and people’s judgment.

Alexander Stafford (Rother Valley) (Con): The Secretary of State will know that many people in Rother Valley do not own cars and that public transport is often woeful, so will he support putting mobile testing units in Maltby and Dinnington so that everyone who needs a test can get a test?

Matt Hancock: I will look precisely at putting mobile testing units in Maltby and Dinnington and look, again, at the local data, along with the local authority, to see what we can do.

Debbie Abrahams (Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Lab) [V]: I, too, welcome the Health Secretary’s change of heart and his assurance that complete pillar 2 testing data will be sent to local public health departments each day and not each week. The delay has inhibited local public health departments’ ability to contact and trace covid-infected people, letting the virus spread in some areas. Given that many of us have been asking for these data for a number of weeks now, what is his assessment

of the number of people who have been infected as a result of the delay, the impact on public confidence, and the hit that local economies will take because of these failures?

Matt Hancock: We have been building the Test and Trace system and improving the data that flows from it and underpins it all the way through this crisis, and I am glad that the hon. Lady is pleased by the continued progress that we are making. That is the way to look at this. We have been building this extraordinary service at extraordinary pace, and I am really glad we are able to get more.

Ms Nusrat Ghani (Wealden) (Con): I welcome the Health Secretary's statement and share his concerns that we do not know how the virus will react when we enter our cold weather season. Wealden constituents are already concerned about winter flu. When he has the data on cold weather and the virus, will he ensure that it is shared with East Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust, East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council so that we can prepare and be resourced to deal with both covid and winter flu?

Matt Hancock: I will do better than that: when we get scientific evidence on the impact of cold weather on this virus, we will publish it.

Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab) [V]: I hope the Secretary of State is aware of the tragic case of Kelly Smith, who sadly died when her cancer treatment was stopped during the covid lockdown. The Government's aspiration to get cancer services back to normal by the end of the year is simply not acceptable. Too many cancers are incurable within a few weeks. Will he address this issue, and will he look at transforming radiotherapy services, which have emerged as being highly effective as a cancer treatment and can be delivered even if there is a second spike in the pandemic?

Matt Hancock: Yes, the hon. Gentleman is absolutely right about the importance of this. We are getting cancer services back up and running as fast as possible. The idea that we are waiting until the end of the year before doing anything is completely wrong. We are going as fast as we can. During the peak, some of the services did have to be stopped for clinical reasons. My heart goes out to those whose treatment was stopped because

of covid and who died of cancer. The judgments were made on an individual clinical basis as to whether it was safer to go ahead with the treatment or to stop it, because, of course, many treatments for cancer are much more dangerous when there is a high volume of infectious disease. I understand that that explanation will be of no comfort to Kelly's family and friends who mourn her, but I also understand why the NHS made that decision and I support them in the decision that it made. We must get this going again as fast as possible. This is something on which I am working very closely with the NHS. In fact, I had a meeting on it only last week. I also entirely agree on the point about radiology services, too.

Aaron Bell (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con): I invite the Secretary of State to join me in congratulating two Staffordshire organisations: one in the private sector and one in the public sector. The private sector firm is Cobra Biologics in my constituency of Newcastle-under-Lyme. It was one of the first manufacturers of the Oxford vaccine, and had scaled up to increase production even before AstraZeneca came on board. The public sector firm is the Staffordshire Resilience Forum. Thanks to its hard work and the hard work of the people of Staffordshire, they have now been able to downgrade a major coronavirus incidence. Although, of course, we cannot drop our guard completely, the situation is now currently stable and under control, and that, I think, illustrates our response to coronavirus.

Matt Hancock: I pay tribute to the public health services, the NHS and the councils across Staffordshire that have worked so hard to get this virus under control and have really got it right down in Staffordshire, including in Newcastle-under-Lyme, which my hon. Friend regards as the finest part of Staffordshire. The first point that he makes is also absolutely valid and something that I will consider going forward.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): I thank the Secretary of State for his statement today. Please take care when leaving the Chamber. The House is suspended for three minutes.

5.47 pm

Sitting suspended.

Virtual participation in proceedings concluded (Order, 4 June).

Points of Order

5.50 pm

Conor McGinn (St Helens North) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Last Friday, after a term like no other, primary schools in St Helens and across England finished for the summer. In recent years, my son, like over 2 million other reception and year 1 pupils, received a piece of fruit or a vegetable every day as part of a welcome public health initiative introduced in 2004, the school fruit and vegetable scheme. However, the Government suspended the scheme in March because of the covid-19 lockdown.

I submitted a written parliamentary question to the Department of Health and Social Care on 29 June about the status of this scheme. I received a reply on 6 July, saying I would receive a further answer shortly. I have heard nothing since. Given the imminent parliamentary recess, can you, Mr Deputy Speaker, advise me how I might get Ministers to provide some clarity for 16,000 schools, local authorities, growers, suppliers, and parents and pupils that this important initiative will be restored when schools return in September?

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): I thank the hon. Member for his point of order and for giving the Chair notice of it. Those on the Treasury Bench will have heard the point that he has just made. Indeed, the Speaker has stressed how important it is that all Departments answer questions that have been given to them as quickly as is possible. I hope they take this opportunity to do so, particularly over the next couple of days, but clearly, if he does not get a response, he still has, as does every other Member here, the opportunity to write to the Departments and the Secretaries of State, even during recess.

Alex Cunningham (Stockton North) (Lab): On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Ofgem, the energy regulator, has this week confirmed that it will not introduce a short-haul tariff for gas transportation in October, when the pricing regime comes into play. That will have a huge impact on energy intensive industries on Teesside and across the country that are based near gas terminals. The extra costs could even threaten the very existence of some of those companies.

I know that Ministers have been in touch with Ofgem, but can you tell me, Mr Deputy Speaker, whether you have had any indication at all that a Minister from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy is planning to come to the House to make a statement on the impact of this decision and how Government might be able to help?

Mr Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. Member for his courtesy in giving me notice of the point of order he has just made. He has made an important point, but I have had no indication that a Minister intends to make a statement. Should that alter, it will be communicated to him and the House in the usual way.

Trade Bill

Consideration of Bill, not amended in the Public Bill Committee

New Clause 5

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY OTHER AUTHORITIES

“(1) A public authority specified in subsection (3) may disclose information for the purpose of facilitating the exercise by a Minister of the Crown of the Minister’s functions relating to trade.

(2) Those functions include, among other things, functions relating to—

- (a) the analysis of the flow of traffic, goods and services into and out of the United Kingdom;
- (b) the analysis of the impact, or likely impact, of measures or practices relating to imports, exports, border security and transport on such flow;
- (c) the design, implementation and operation of such measures or practices.

(3) The specified public authorities are—

- (a) the Secretary of State;
- (b) the Minister for the Cabinet Office;
- (c) a strategic highways company appointed under section 1 of the Infrastructure Act 2015;
- (d) a port health authority constituted under section 2 of the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984.

(4) A person who receives information as a result of this section may only use the information for the purpose of facilitating the exercise by a public authority of the authority’s functions relating to trade (which include, among other things, functions of a kind referred to in subsection (2)).

(5) A person who receives information as a result of this section may further disclose the information, but only with the consent of the public authority that disclosed the information under subsection (1) (which may be general or specific).

(6) This section does not limit the circumstances in which the information may be disclosed under any other enactment or rule of law.

(7) A disclosure under this section does not breach—

- (a) any obligation of confidence owed by the person disclosing the information, or
- (b) any other restriction on the disclosure of information (however imposed).

(8) But nothing in this section authorises the making of a disclosure which—

- (a) contravenes the data protection legislation (save that the powers conferred by this section are to be taken into account in determining whether a disclosure contravenes that legislation), or
- (b) is prohibited by any of Parts 1 to 7 or Chapter 1 of Part 9 of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016.

(9) A Minister of the Crown may by regulations made by statutory instrument amend this section for the purpose of specifying a public authority in, or removing a public authority from, subsection (3).

(10) A statutory instrument containing regulations under subsection (9) (whether alone or with other provision) may not be made unless a draft of the instrument has been laid before, and approved by resolution of, each House of Parliament.

(11) In this section—

“the data protection legislation” has the same meaning as in the Data Protection Act 2018 (see section 3 of that Act);

“public authority” means an authority exercising functions of a public nature.”—(*Greg Hands.*)

This new clause would allow named public authorities to share information for the purpose of facilitating the exercise of a Minister’s functions relating to trade.

Brought up, and read the First time.

5.53 pm

The Minister for Trade Policy (Greg Hands): I beg to move, That the clause be read a Second time.

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

Government new clause 6—*Offences related to disclosure under section (Disclosure of information by other authorities).*

New clause 1—*Report on proposed free trade agreement—*

“(1) This section applies (subject to subsection (2)) where the United Kingdom has authenticated a free trade agreement (“the proposed agreement”), if —

- (a) the other party (or each other party) and the European Union were signatories to a free trade agreement immediately before exit day, or
- (b) where the proposed agreement was authenticated by the United Kingdom before exit day, the other party (or each other party) and the European Union were signatories to a free trade agreement on the day the proposed agreement was authenticated by the United Kingdom.

(2) This section applies only if the proposed agreement is not binding on the United Kingdom as a matter of international law unless it is ratified by the United Kingdom.

(3) Before the United Kingdom ratifies the proposed agreement, a Minister of the Crown must lay before Parliament a report which gives details of, and explains the reasons for, any significant differences between—

- (a) the trade-related provisions of the proposed agreement, and
- (b) the trade-related provisions of the existing free trade agreement.

(4) Subsection (3) does not apply if a report in relation to the proposed agreement has been laid before Parliament under section [Report to be laid with regulations under section 2(1)]2.

(5) The duty imposed by subsection (3) applies only at a time when regulations may be made under section 2(1)(see section 2(7)).

(6) In this section a reference to authenticating a free trade agreement is a reference to doing an act which establishes the text of the agreement as authentic and definitive as a matter of international law.

(7) In this section—

- “the existing free trade agreement” means the free trade agreement referred to in subsection (1) (a) or (b);
- the “trade-related provisions” of a free trade agreement are the provisions of the agreement that mainly relate to trade.”

This new clause reinserts a Government amendment made to the Trade Bill in 2018 and requires a Minister to lay a report before Parliament before the UK ratifies a new free trade agreement with a country that (before exit day) had a free trade agreement with the EU. The report must explain any significant differences between the proposed new agreement and the existing agreement with the EU.

New clause 2—*Reporting requirement not to apply in exceptional cases—*

“(1) Section [Report on proposed free trade agreement] does not apply to a free trade agreement if a Minister of the Crown is of the opinion that, exceptionally, the agreement needs to be ratified without laying before Parliament a report which meets the requirements of subsection (3) of that section.

(2) If a Minister determines that a free trade agreement is to be ratified without laying before Parliament a report which meets the requirements of section [Report on proposed free trade agreement] (3), the Minister must, as soon as practicable after the agreement is ratified, lay before Parliament—

- (a) a report which meets those requirements, and
- (b) a statement indicating that the Minister is of the opinion mentioned in subsection (1) and explain why.”

This new clause provides that the reporting requirement under section [Report on proposed free trade agreement] would not apply if a Minister takes the view that, exceptionally, the agreement should be ratified without the reporting requirement being met.

New clause 3—*Report to be laid with regulations under section 2(1)—*

“(1) This section applies where a Minister of the Crown proposes to make regulations under section 2(1) for the purpose of implementing a free trade agreement to which the United Kingdom and another signatory (or other signatories) are signatories.

(2) A draft of the statutory instrument containing the regulations may not be laid before Parliament unless, at least 10 Commons sitting days before the draft is laid, a Minister of the Crown has laid before Parliament a report which gives details of, and explains the reasons for, any significant differences between—

- (a) the trade-related provisions of the free trade agreement to which the United Kingdom and the other signatory (or other signatories) are signatories, and
- (b) the trade-related provisions of the existing free trade agreement.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply if, at least 10 Commons sitting days before a draft of the statutory instrument containing the regulations is laid, a report in relation to the agreement has been laid before Parliament under section [Report on proposed free trade agreement](3).

(4) In this section—

“Commons sitting day” means a day on which the House of Commons begins to sit;

“the existing free trade agreement” means the free trade agreement to which the European Union and the other signatory (or other signatories) were signatories immediately before exit day;

the “trade-related provisions” of a free trade agreement are the provisions of the agreement that mainly relate to trade.”

This new clause reinserts a Government amendment made to the Trade Bill in 2018 and requires a Minister to lay a report before Parliament at least 10 Commons sitting days before regulations implementing a new free trade agreement are laid in draft under clause 2(1). The report is required to explain any significant differences between the new agreement and the existing agreement with the EU.

New clause 4—*Parliamentary approval of trade agreements—*

“(1) Negotiations towards a free trade agreement may not commence until the Secretary of State has laid draft negotiating objectives in respect of that agreement before both Houses of Parliament, and a motion endorsing draft negotiating objectives has been approved by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(2) Prior to the draft negotiating objectives being laid, the Secretary of State must have—

- (a) consulted with each devolved authority on the content of the draft negotiating objectives, and
- (b) produced a sustainability impact assessment including, but not limited to, an assessment of the impact on food safety, health, the environment and animal welfare.

(3) The United Kingdom may not become a signatory to a free trade agreement to which this section applies unless a draft of the agreement in the terms in which it was to be presented for signature by parties to the agreement has been laid before, and approved by, a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(4) Before either House of Parliament may be asked to approve by resolution the text of a proposed free trade agreement, the Secretary of State must—

- (a) consult with each devolved authority on the text of the proposed agreement, and
- (b) lay before both Houses a report assessing the compliance of the text of the proposed agreement with any standards laid down by primary or subordinate legislation in the

United Kingdom including, but not limited to, legislation governing or prescribing standards on food safety, health, the environment and animal welfare.

(5) In this section—

“devolved authority” has the meaning given in section 4(1) of this Act, and

“free trade agreement” means any agreement which is—

- (a) within the definition given in section 4(1) of this Act, and
- (b) an agreement between the United Kingdom and one or more partners that includes components that facilitate the trade of goods, services or intellectual property.”

New clause 7—*Import standards*—

“(1) A Minister of the Crown may not lay a copy of an international trade agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 unless the agreement—

- (a) includes an affirmation of the United Kingdom’s rights and obligations under the SPS Agreement, and
- (b) prohibits the importation into the United Kingdom of agricultural and food products in relation to which the relevant standards are lower than the relevant standards in the United Kingdom.

(2) In subsection (1)—

“international trade agreement” has the meaning given in section 2(2) of this Act;

“relevant standards” means standards relating to environmental protection, plant health and animal welfare applying in connection with the production of agricultural and food products;

“SPS Agreement” means the agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, part of Annex 1A to the WTO Agreement (as modified from time to time).”

This new clause would ensure that HMG has a duty to protect the quality of the domestic food supply by ensuring that imported foodstuffs are held to the same standards as domestic foodstuffs are held to.

New clause 8—*International trade agreements: public health services*—

“(1) A Minister of the Crown may not lay a copy of an international trade agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 if any provision of the agreement—

- (a) would have the effect of, or could reasonably be expected to have the effect of, altering the way in which a service is provided by a specified body,
- (b) would have the effect of, or could reasonably be expected to have the effect of, opening any part of a specified body to foreign investment,
- (c) would open part or all of a specified body to market access but without any accompanying provision for the UK Government to reduce the level of market access in future,
- (d) does not specify sectors or subsectors of a specified body to which the agreement would enable market access,
- (e) includes investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms in relation to a specified body, or
- (f) includes changes to mechanisms for the pricing of medical or pharmaceutical products for purchase by a specified body.

(2) The specified bodies, for the purpose of subsection (1), are—

- (a) NHS England,
- (b) NHS Wales,

(c) a health board in Scotland, a special health board in Scotland or the Common Services Agency established by section 10 of the National Health Service (Scotland) Act 1978, and

(d) HSCNI.

(3) In subsection (1), “international trade agreement” has the meaning given in section 2 of this Act.”

This new clause would ensure that HMG has a duty to restrict market access to healthcare services, including medicines and medical devices.

New clause 9—*International trade agreements: climate and environmental goals*—

“(1) An appropriate authority may not take action in relation to an international trade agreement unless nothing in the international trade agreement restricts the ability of that or any other appropriate authority to take action in pursuit of the UK’s climate and environmental goals.

(2) In subsection (1) “action in relation to an international trade agreement” means—

- (a) laying the agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 (treaties to be laid before Parliament before ratification),
- (b) making regulations under section 2 for the purposes of implementing or facilitating the implementation of the agreement, or
- (c) making subordinate legislation under any other enactment for those purposes.

(3) In subsection (2) “laid”—

- (a) where the appropriate authority is a Minister of the Crown, means laid before Parliament;
- (b) where the appropriate authority is the Scottish Ministers, means laid before the Scottish Parliament;
- (c) where the appropriate authority is the Welsh Ministers, means laid before Senedd Cymru; and
- (d) where the appropriate authority is a Northern Ireland department, means laid before the Northern Ireland Assembly.

(4) In conducting trade negotiations and in other related activity a Minister of the Crown—

- (a) must give priority to nations that are fully implementing relevant multilateral environmental agreements; and
- (b) must take all reasonable steps to facilitate the achievement of the UK’s climate and environmental goals (including, in particular, by pursuing where appropriate the introduction, amendment or application of rules within the World Trade Organisation and other international trade forums).

(5) In subsection (4) “trade negotiations” means—

- (a) negotiations with a view to entering into an international trade agreement; or
- (b) negotiations in connection with the implementation or alteration of an international trade agreement, or otherwise connected with international trade.

(6) In subsection (4) “relevant multilateral environmental agreements” means, so far as geographically applicable, any of—

- (a) the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change done at New York on 9 May 1992 and Paris Agreement done at Paris on 12 December 2015,
- (b) the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity done at Rio de Janeiro on 5 June 1992 (including its protocols),
- (c) the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora 1973,
- (d) United Nations Convention for the Law of the Sea 1982,
- (e) the Aarhus Convention 1998,
- (f) the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution 1979,

- (g) the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR) Convention 1992, or
- (h) the Basel Convention 1992.

(7) The Secretary of State must lay before Parliament in each financial year a report about compliance with subsection (4).

(8) In this section “the UK’s climate and environmental goals” means—

- (a) the target of achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050;
- (b) any other target set under or for purposes connected with any enactment (including devolved legislation and retained EU law) relating to the environment or climate change;
- (c) any target to which the UK is committed by virtue of being party to a relevant multilateral environmental agreement; and
- (d) the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.”

This new clause aligns the UK’s trade policy with the UK’s climate and environmental agenda. It would ensure that the negotiation of trade agreements facilitates the achievement of the UK’s domestic climate and environmental goals and would help prevent trade agreements from restricting action in pursuit of these goals.

New clause 10—Availability of agreement texts—

“(1) The text of any proposed international trade agreement which is being negotiated shall, so far as it is agreed or consolidated, be made publicly available within ten days of the close of each round of negotiations.

(2) Every—

- (a) document submitted formally by the United Kingdom government to the negotiations, and
- (b) agenda for each new round of negotiations

shall be made publicly available by the Secretary of State.

(3) All other documents relating to the negotiations and not falling within the descriptions provided in subsections (1) and (2) shall be made publicly available by the Secretary of State, subject to subsection (4).

(4) The Secretary of State may withhold from publication any document of a kind falling within the description in subsection (3) but must publish a statement of the reasons for doing so.

(5) In the case of any document withheld under subsection (4), the Secretary of State shall provide full and unfettered access to that document to—

- (a) any select committee of either House of Parliament to which, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, the proposed agreement is relevant, and
- (b) any other person or body which the Secretary of State may authorise.

(6) In the case of a document to which access is provided under subsection (5), the Secretary of State may specify conditions under which the text shall be made available.

(7) The Secretary of State shall maintain an online public register of all documents published under subsections (1), (2) and (3) or withheld under subsection (4).”

This new clause would give select committees access to more confidential negotiating documents and would provide a process for further transparency of negotiating texts beyond that.

New clause 11—Import of agricultural goods after IP completion day—

“(1) After IP completion day, agricultural goods imported under a free trade agreement may be imported into the UK only if the standards to which those goods were produced were as high as, or higher than, standards which at the time of import applied under UK law relating to—

- (a) animal health and welfare,
- (b) protection of the environment,
- (c) food safety, hygiene and traceability, and
- (d) plant health.

(2) The Secretary of State must prepare a register of standards under UK law relating to—

- (a) animal health and welfare,
- (b) protection of the environment,
- (c) food safety, hygiene and traceability, and
- (d) plant health

which must be met in the course of production of any imported agricultural goods.

(3) A register under subsection (2) must be updated within seven days of any amendment to any standard listed in the register.

(4) “Agricultural goods”, for the purposes of this section, means anything produced by a producer operating in one or more agricultural sectors listed in Schedule 1.

(5) “IP completion day” has the meaning given in section 39 of the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020.”

This new clause would set a requirement for imported agricultural goods to meet animal health and welfare, environmental, plant health, food safety and other standards which are at least as high as those which apply to UK produced agricultural goods.

New clause 12—Review of free trade agreements—

“(1) The Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament a review of the operation and impacts of each free trade agreement to which this Act applies.

(2) Each such review shall be laid before Parliament no later than five years from the day on which the agreement comes into force.

(3) A further review of the operation of each agreement shall be laid no later than five years after the day on which the previous such review was laid before Parliament.

(4) Each review shall be conducted by a credible body independent of government and shall include both qualitative and quantitative assessments of the impacts of the agreement, including as a minimum—

- (a) the economic impacts on individual sectors of the economy, including, but not restricted to—
 - (i) the impacts on the quantity and quality of employment,
 - (ii) the various regional impacts across the different parts of the UK,
 - (iii) the impacts on small and medium-sized enterprises, and
 - (iv) the impacts on vulnerable economic groups;
- (b) the social impacts, including but not restricted to—
 - (i) the impacts on public services, wages, labour standards, social dialogue, health and safety at work, public health, food safety, social protection, consumer protection and information, and
 - (ii) the government’s duties under the Equality Act 2010;
- (c) the impacts on human rights, including but not restricted to—
 - (i) workers’ rights,
 - (ii) women’s rights,
 - (iii) cultural rights and
 - (iv) all UK obligations under international human rights law;
- (d) the impacts on the environment, including but not restricted to—
 - (i) the need to protect and preserve the oceans,
 - (ii) biodiversity,
 - (iii) the rural environment and air quality, and
 - (iv) the need to meet the UK’s international obligations to combat climate change;
- (e) the impact of any investor-state dispute settlement which forms part of the agreement;

- (f) the impacts on animal welfare, including but not restricted to the impacts on animal welfare in food production, both as it relates to food produced in the UK and as it relates to food imported into the UK from other countries; and
- (g) the economic, social, cultural, food security and environmental interests of those countries considered to be developing countries for the purposes of clause 10 of the Taxation (Cross-border Trade) Act 2018, as defined in Schedule 3 to that Act and as amended by regulations.

(5) The elements of the review to be undertaken under (4)(f) must be sufficiently disaggregated so as to capture the full range of impacts on different groups of developing countries, and must include both direct and indirect impacts, such as loss of market share through trade diversion or preference erosion.”

This new clause would introduce a review of the functioning of each FTA to which the UK is a signatory to be brought forward after five years and again after a further five.

New clause 13—Role of Joint Ministerial Committee—

“(1) The Joint Ministerial Committee is to be a forum—

- (a) for discussing—
 - (i) the terms upon which the United Kingdom is to commence negotiations with respect to any international trade agreement;
 - (ii) proposals to amend retained EU law for the purposes of regulations made under section 1 or section 2;
- (b) for seeking a consensus on the matters set out in subsection (1)(a) between Her Majesty’s Government and the other members of the Joint Ministerial Committee.

(2) Before Her Majesty’s Government concludes an international trade agreement, the Secretary of State must produce a document for consideration by the Joint Ministerial Committee setting out—

- (a) Her Majesty’s Government’s objectives and strategy in negotiating and concluding an international trade agreement;
- (b) the steps Her Majesty’s Government intends to take to keep the Joint Ministerial Committee informed of progress in reaching an international trade agreement;
- (c) the steps Her Majesty’s Government intends to take to consult each member of the Joint Ministerial Committee before entering into an international trade agreement and for taking the views of each member into account.

(3) Before concluding an international trade agreement the Secretary of State must produce a document setting out the terms of the proposed agreement for consideration by the Joint Ministerial Committee.

(4) In this section, “the Joint Ministerial Committee” means the body set up in accordance with Supplementary Agreement A of the Memorandum of Understanding on Devolution, between Her Majesty’s Government, the Scottish Government, the Welsh Government and the Northern Ireland Executive Committee.”

This new clause would put on the face of the Bill a joint ministerial committee, and give it powers to discuss international trade issues with the devolved Administrations.

New clause 14—Animal welfare and sentience—

“Regulations may only be made under section 2(1) if the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are compatible with—

- (a) any provision in UK law (including retained EU law) relating to animal welfare standards and the welfare of animals in the production of food; and
- (b) any obligations relating to animal sentience by which the UK is bound, or any principles relating to animal sentience to which the UK adheres.”

This new clause would ensure that any animal welfare or sentience regulations arising from trade agreements are aligned with existing commitments in UK and retained EU law.

New clause 15—Statement on equalities legislation—

“(1) This section applies where a Minister of the Crown proposes to make regulations under section 2(1).

(2) Before a draft of the statutory instrument containing the regulations is laid before either House of Parliament, the Minister must make a statement as to whether the statutory instrument would, if made, modify any provision of equalities legislation.

(3) If a Minister expresses a view in a statement under subsection (2) that the draft statutory instrument would, if made, modify any provision of equalities legislation, the Minister must explain in the statement what the effect of each such modification would be.

(4) If the Minister fails to make a statement as required by subsection (2), the Minister must make a statement explaining why.

(5) A statement under this section must be made in writing and published in such manner as the Minister making it considers appropriate.

(6) In this section, “equalities legislation” means the Equality Act 2006, the Equality Act 2010 and any subordinate legislation made under either of those Acts.”

This new clause would oblige the government to publish a statement outlining whether any equalities legislation would be modified by the proposed regulations.

New clause 16—UK participation in EU and EEA organisations—

“(1) The Secretary of State must seek to negotiate an international trade agreement with the EU which will enable the United Kingdom to continue to co-operate closely with the bodies listed in subsection (2).

(2) The bodies are—

- (a) the European Medicines Agency;
- (b) the European Chemicals Agency;
- (c) the European Aviation Safety Agency;
- (d) the European Maritime Safety Agency.”

This new clause would oblige the Secretary of State to negotiate close cooperation with the four mentioned agencies.

New clause 17—International trade agreements: health or care services—

“(1) Regulations under section 2(1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement only if the conditions in subsections (2) and (3) are met in relation to the application of that agreement in any part of the United Kingdom.

(2) The condition in this subsection is that no provision of that international trade agreement in any way undermines or restricts the ability of an appropriate authority—

- (a) to provide a comprehensive publicly funded health service free at the point of delivery,
- (b) to protect the employment rights or terms and conditions of employment for public sector employees and those working in publicly funded health or care sectors,
- (c) to regulate and maintain the quality and safety of health or care services,
- (d) to regulate and control the pricing and reimbursement systems for the purchase of medicines or medical devices, or
- (e) to regulate and maintain the level of protection afforded in relation to patient data, public health data and publicly provided social care data relating to UK citizens.

(3) The condition in this subsection is that the agreement—

- (a) explicitly excludes application of any provision within that agreement to publicly funded health or care services,

- (b) explicitly excludes provision for any Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) clause that provides, or is related to, the delivery of public services, health care, care or public health,
 - (c) explicitly excludes the use of any negative listing, standstill or ratchet clause that provides, or is related to, the delivery of public services, health care, care or public health,
 - (d) contains explicit recognition that an appropriate authority (within the meaning of section 4) has the right to enact policies, legislation and regulation which protects and promotes health, public health, social care and public safety in health or care services, and
 - (e) prohibits the sale of patient data, public health data and publicly provided social care data.
- (4) For the purposes of this section—
- “negative listing” means a listing only of exceptions, exclusions or limits to commitments made by parties to the agreement;
- “ratchet” in relation to any provision in an agreement means any provision whereby a party, if (after the agreement has been ratified) it has unilaterally removed a barrier in an area where it had made a commitment before the agreement was ratified, may not reintroduce that barrier, and
- “standstill” in relation to any provision in an agreement means any provision by which parties list barriers which are in force at the time that they sign the agreement and undertake not to introduce any new barriers.”

This amendment would aim to protect the NHS and publicly funded health and care services in other parts of the UK from any form of control from outside the UK.

New clause 18—Trade agreements: approval—

“A Minister of the Crown must not make regulations to implement an international trade agreement unless—

- (a) a statement on the terms of the agreement has been approved by the House of Commons on a motion moved by a Minister of the Crown,
- (b) a statement on the terms of the agreement has been approved by the House of Commons on a motion moved by a Minister of the Crown,
- (c) a motion relating to that statement has been approved by a resolution of Senedd Cymru,
- (d) a motion relating to that statement has been approved by a resolution of the Scottish Parliament, and
- (e) a motion relating to that statement has been approved by a resolution of the Northern Ireland Assembly.”

This new clause would require the UK Government to secure the approval of both Houses of Parliament and the devolved Parliaments of Scotland and Wales, and the Northern Ireland Assembly before implementing any international trade agreement agreed after the passing of the Bill.

New clause 19—Involvement of judicial systems in trade disputes—

“(1) The United Kingdom may only become a signatory to an international trade agreement if the condition in subsection (3) is satisfied.

(2) The Secretary of State may not lay a copy of an international trade agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 unless the condition in subsection (3) is satisfied.

(3) Legal proceedings brought against the United Kingdom under investment protection provisions included in an international trade agreement must be heard by the courts and tribunals system of the United Kingdom.”

This new clause would provide protection for UK firms, public bodies and the Government in the event of proceedings under investment protection provisions such as the Investor-State Dispute Scheme (ISDS).

New clause 20—Multilateral investment tribunal—

“(1) The United Kingdom may only become a signatory to an international trade agreement if the condition in subsection (3) is satisfied.

(2) The Secretary of State may not lay a copy of an international trade agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 unless the condition in subsection (3) is satisfied.

(3) The condition under this subsection is that an international trade agreement must include a commitment by all parties to the agreement to pursue with other trading partners the establishment of a multilateral investment tribunal and appellate mechanism for the resolution of investment disputes.”

This new clause would ensure that a multilateral investment process would be used to adjudicate on investor disputes.

New clause 21—Human rights and economic impact assessments—

“(1) Before laying a copy of an international trade agreement before Parliament under section 20(1) of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010, the Secretary of State must lay before Parliament an impact assessment taking account of short and long-term human rights and economic impacts of that agreement on different sectors including, but not limited to—

- (a) gender,
- (b) age
- (c) race and
- (d) class.

(2) The Secretary of State must lay before Parliament reviews of each international trade agreement which has come into effect from January 2021.

(3) A review under subsection (2) must include an assessment of short and long-term economic and human rights impacts on different sectors including, but not limited to—

- (a) gender,
- (b) age
- (c) race and
- (d) class.

(4) Reviews under subsection (2) must be laid within two years of the day on which the agreement to which they relate comes into effect, and at intervals of no more than two years thereafter.”

This new clause would ensure that the HMG has a duty to commit to undertaking human rights impact assessments of all trade deals before and after implementation, taking account of short and long-term economic impacts across different sectors, including but not limited to gender, age, race and class.

Amendment 11, in clause 1, page 1, line 16, at end insert—

“(1A) No regulations under subsection (1) may be made until the Secretary of State has entered into negotiations with other parties to the GPA with the objective of enabling greater labour market interventions and compliance with ILO standards in any UK procurement contract to which the GPA applies, and

- (a) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has been achieved either in full or in part, or
- (b) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has not been achieved.”

This amendment would require the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations to secure greater labour rights in procurement contracts that the GPA applies to, and to report back on the outcome of these negotiations.

Amendment 12, page 1, line 16, at end insert—

“(1A) No regulations under subsection (1) may be made until the Secretary of State has entered into negotiations with other parties to the GPA with the objective of securing greater environmental exceptions and carbon considerations in any UK procurement contract to which the GPA applies, and

- (a) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has been achieved either in full or in part, or
- (b) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has not been achieved.”

This amendment would require the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations to secure greater environmental protections in procurement contracts that the GPA applies to, and to report back on the outcome of these negotiations.

Amendment 13, page 1, line 16, at end insert—

“(1A) No regulations under subsection (1) may be made until the Secretary of State has entered into negotiations with other parties to the GPA with the objective of securing greater scope for UK small and medium-sized enterprises in any UK procurement contract to which the GPA applies, and

- (a) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has been achieved either in full or in part, or
- (b) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has not been achieved.”

This amendment would require the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations to secure greater access for SMEs in procurement contracts that the GPA applies to, and to report back on the outcome of these negotiations.

Amendment 14, page 1, line 16, at end insert—

“(1A) No regulations under subsection (1) may be made until the Secretary of State has entered into negotiations with other parties to the GPA with the objective of securing improvements to public health as a consequence of any UK procurement contract to which the GPA applies, and

- (a) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has been achieved either in full or in part, or
- (b) the Secretary of State has made a statement to the House of Commons that the objective has not been achieved.”

This amendment would require the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations to secure improvements to public health in procurement contracts that the GPA applies to, and to report back on the outcome of these negotiations.

Amendment 1, in clause 2, page 2, line 10, leave out “is a signatory” and insert

“was a signatory on 31 December 2019”.

The most recent EU FTA which was rolled over, was in December 2019. This amendment would provide that any further FTA entered into would not come under the EU FTA roll over provisions of Clause 2.

Amendment 29, page 2, line 14, at end insert—

“(2A) Regulations under subsection (1) to make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement may only be made if—

- (a) the requirements under subsection (3) and under paragraph 4(1) to (1D) of Schedule 2 have been met;
- (b) the requirements under subsection (4) and under paragraph 4(1) to (1D) of Schedule 2 have been met; or
- (c) the provisions of section [Parliamentary approval of trade agreements] have been complied with and the requirements under subparagraphs 4A(1) to (1D) of Schedule 2 have been met.”

This amendment would put in place a structure for greater Parliamentary scrutiny of proposed international trade agreements.

Amendment 15, page 2, line 15, leave out subsections (3) and (4) and insert—

“(3) Paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 shall apply to any regulations under subsection (1) which make provision for the purpose of implementing a free trade agreement if the other signatory (or each other signatory) and the European Union were signatories to a free trade agreement immediately before exit day.

(4) Paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 shall apply to any regulations under subsection (1) which make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement other than a free trade agreement if the other signatory (or each other signatory) and the European Union were signatories to an international trade agreement immediately before exit day.

(4A) Paragraph 4A of Schedule 2 shall apply to any regulations under subsection (1) which make provision for the purpose of implementing any international trade agreement not falling within subsection (3) or subsection (4) above.”

This amendment would apply the provisions of the Bill to trade agreements other than EU rollover trade agreements, allowing the Bill to act as a framework for a future trade policy.

Amendment 16, page 2, line 15, leave out subsections (3) and (4) and insert—

“(3) Regulations under subsection (1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing a free trade agreement only if the other signatory (or each other signatory) and the European Union had ratified a free trade agreement with each other immediately before exit day.

(4) Regulations under subsection (1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement other than a free trade agreement only if the other signatory (or each other signatory) and the European Union had ratified an international trade agreement with each other immediately before exit day.”

This amendment would mean that a trade agreement would need to be ratified before regulations could be made to implement it.

Amendment 17, page 2, line 23, at end insert—

“(4A) Regulations under subsection (1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement only if the provisions of that international trade agreement do not conflict with, and are consistent with—

- (a) the provisions of international treaties ratified by the United Kingdom;
- (b) the provisions of the Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 2015;
- (c) the primacy of human rights law;
- (d) international human rights law and international humanitarian law;
- (e) the United Kingdom’s obligations on workers’ rights and labour standards as established by but not limited to—
 - (i) the commitments under the International Labour Organisation’s Declaration on Fundamental Rights at Work and its Follow-up Conventions; and
 - (ii) the fundamental principles and rights at work inherent in membership of the International Labour Organisation;
- (f) women’s rights and are in accordance with the United Kingdom’s obligations established by but not limited to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women;
- (g) children’s rights and are in accordance with the United Kingdom’s obligations established by but not limited to the Convention on the Rights of the Child; and
- (h) the sovereignty of Parliament, the legal authority of UK courts, the rule of law and the principle of equality before the law.”

This amendment would ensure that regulations made under the Bill can only be made if the trade agreement which the regulations would implement does not contravene the UK’s international commitments with specific reference to human rights and related treaties, and must respect the sovereignty of parliament.

Amendment 18, page 2, line 23, at end insert—

“(4A) Regulations under subsection (1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement only if the provisions of that international trade agreement do not conflict with, and are consistent with the United Kingdom’s environmental obligations in international law and as established by but not limited to—

- (a) the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;
- (b) the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); and
- (c) the Convention on Biological Diversity, including the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.”

This amendment would ensure that regulations made under the Bill can only be made if the trade agreement which the regulations would implement does not contravene the UK’s environmental obligations.

Amendment 19, page 2, line 23, at end insert—

“(4A) Regulations under subsection (1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement only if the provisions of that international trade agreement do not in any way restrict the ability—

- (a) to make public services at a national or local level subject to public monopoly;
- (b) to make public services at a national or local level subject to exclusive rights granted to private operators; and
- (c) to bring public services at a national or local level back into the public sector for delivery by public sector employees.”

This amendment would ensure that regulations made under the Bill can only be made if the trade agreement which the regulations would implement does not contravene the ability of a UK government to take public services back into public ownership.

Amendment 20, page 2, line 23, at end insert—

“(4A) Regulations may only be made under subsection (1) if—

- (a) the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are consistent with standards for food safety and quality as set and administered by—
 - (i) the Department of Health;
 - (ii) the Food Standards Agency;
 - (iii) Food Standards Scotland; and
 - (iv) any other public authority specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State;
- (b) the Secretary of State is satisfied that mechanisms and bodies charged with enforcement of standards for food safety and quality have the capacity to absorb any extra requirement which may arise from the implementation of the agreement;
- (c) the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are consistent with policy to achieve reduction in the risk of disease or contamination as set and administered by—
 - (i) the Department of Health;
 - (ii) the Food Standards Agency;
 - (iii) Food Standards Scotland; and
 - (iv) any other public authority specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State;
- (d) the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are consistent with achieving improvements in public health through any food policy priorities set and administered by—
 - (i) the Department of Health;
 - (ii) the Food Standards Agency;
 - (iii) Food Standards Scotland; and
 - (iv) any other public authority specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State;
- (e) the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are compliant with policy to achieve targets for farm antibiotic reduction set by the Veterinary Medicines Directorate;
- (f) the provisions of the international trade agreement to which they relate are compliant with retained EU law relating to food standards and the impact of food production upon the environment; and

- (g) any food or food products to which the provisions of the international trade agreement apply meet standards of labelling, indication of provenance, and packaging specified by the Food Standards Agency or Food Standards Scotland.”

This amendment would ensure that regulations made under the Bill can only be made if the trade agreement which the regulations would implement enshrines UK standards in legislation and adheres to UK standards of food production and food safety.

Amendment 21, page 2, leave out lines 27 and 28.

This amendment would remove Henry VIII powers from the Bill.

Amendment 10, page 2, line 33, at end insert—

“(6A) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of the Scottish Ministers (within the meaning given in paragraph 6 of Schedule 1), unless the Scottish Ministers consent.

(6B) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of the Welsh Ministers (within the meaning given in paragraph 7 of Schedule 1), unless the Welsh Ministers consent.

(6C) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of a Northern Ireland department (within the meaning given in paragraph 8 of Schedule 1), unless a Northern Ireland devolved authority (within the meaning of paragraph 9 of Schedule 1) gives consent.”

This amendment would ensure that the consent of a devolved government is required for regulations under section 2(1) if those regulations contain matters which are within the remit of the devolved government.

Amendment 22, page 2, line 34, leave out subsections (7) and (8) and insert—

“(7) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) in relation to an agreement which meets the criteria in subsection (3) or (4) after the end of the period of five years beginning with IP completion day.”

This amendment would bar any extension to the five-year window for making regulations to implement EU rollover agreements.

Amendment 23, page 2, line 34, leave out subsections (7) and (8) and insert—

“(7) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) in relation to an agreement which meets the criteria in subsection (3) or (4) after the end of—

- (a) the period of five years beginning with IP completion day (“the initial five year period”), or
- (b) such other period as is specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State in accordance with subsection (8).

(8) Regulations under subsection (7)(b) may not extend the initial five year period or any subsequent period beyond the day which falls ten years after IP completion day.”

This amendment would limit any extension of the window to a maximum of ten years.

Amendment 2, page 2, line 35, leave out “five” and insert “three”.

This amendment reinserts a Government amendment made to the Trade Bill in 2018. It proposes to reduce, from five years to three, the time period during which a) EU FTAs can be rolled over and b) previously rolled over FTAs can be reamended.

Amendment 3, page 2, line 36, leave out “five” and insert “three”.

Amendment 4, page 2, line 39, leave out “five” and insert “three”.

This amendment reinserts a Government amendment made to the 2018 Trade Bill in 2018. If the Government decides to extend the period to make regulations under Clause 2, any such period should not be more than three years.

Amendment 5, page 2, line 41, leave out “five” and insert “three”.

Amendment 27, in clause 4, page 3, line 26, at end insert—

““international agreement that mainly relates to trade, other than a free trade agreement” means a strategic partnership agreement or mutual recognition agreement that is ancillary to a free trade agreement, or an investment agreement”.

This amendment defines what is meant by international agreement that mainly relates to trade, reducing ambiguity.

Amendment 28, in clause 6, page 4, line 22, at end insert “and

(c) analysis of the impact of any exercise by the Secretary of State of the power under section 15 of the Taxation (Cross-border Trade) Act 2018 (as amended by section 94 of the Finance Act 2020) to vary an amount of import duty if he or she considers that it is appropriate to do so.”

This amendment would oblige the TRA to give advice on the impact of the Secretary of State’s actions in reducing import duty under the powers in the current Finance Bill.

Government amendments 6 to 9.

Amendment 24, in schedule 2, page 11, line 26, leave out from “section 1(1)” to the end of line 27 and insert “may not be made unless a draft of the instrument has been laid before, and approved by a resolution of, each House of Parliament.”

This amendment would specify an affirmative resolution procedure for regulations under section 1 (1) (Regulations relating to the UK’s membership of the GPA).

Amendment 25, page 13, line 25, at end insert—

“4A (1) A statutory instrument containing regulations of a Minister of the Crown acting alone under section 2(1) in respect of an international trade agreement which does not meet the criteria under section 2(3) or section 2(4) may not be made except in accordance with the steps in subparagraphs (1A) to (1D).

(1A) The Minister shall lay before Parliament—

- (a) a draft of the regulations, and
- (b) a document which explains why the Secretary of State believes that regulations should be made in terms of the draft regulations.

(1B) The Minister may make an order in the terms of the draft regulations laid under subparagraph (1A) if—

- (a) after the expiry of a period of 21 sitting days after the draft regulations are laid, no committee of either House of Parliament has recommended that the regulations should not be made, and
- (b) after the expiry of a period of 60 sitting days after the draft regulations are laid, the draft regulations are approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament.

(1C) If a committee of either House of Parliament recommends that the regulations should not be made, the Secretary of State may—

- (a) lay before Parliament revised draft regulations, and
- (b) after the expiry of a period of 40 sitting days after the revised draft regulations are laid, make a motion for a resolution in each House of Parliament for approval of the revised draft regulations.

(1D) If a motion under subparagraph (1C)(b) is approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament, the Secretary of State may make the regulations.”

This amendment would establish a form of super-affirmative procedure for scrutiny of regulations implementing all trade agreements covered by the bill. The procedure would apply to agreements other than EU rollover trade agreements if amendments extending the application of the bill were agreed to.

Amendment 26, page 13, leave out lines 33 to 35 and insert—

“(3) A statutory instrument containing regulations of a Minister of the Crown acting jointly with a devolved authority under section 2(1) in respect of an agreement which falls within the description in section 2(3) or section 2(4) may not be made unless a draft of the instrument has been laid before, and approved by a resolution of, each House of Parliament.

(3A) A statutory instrument containing regulations of a Minister of the Crown acting jointly with a devolved authority under section 2(1) in respect of an agreement which falls within the description in section 2(4A) may not be made except in accordance with the steps in subparagraphs (1) to (1D) of paragraph 4A.”

This amendment would extend the super-affirmative procedure under Amendment 25 to regulations where the Minister was acting jointly with a devolved authority.

Amendment 31, page 15, line 21, leave out subsection (3) and insert—

“(3) No person may be appointed as a non-executive member of the Authority under subparagraph (1)(b) unless—

- (a) the Secretary of State has first consulted the Chair of the Authority on the proposed appointment, and
- (b) the International Trade Committee of the House of Commons has consented to the appointment.”

This amendment would establish a procedure for appointing non-executive members of the Trade Remedies Authority other than the Chair.

Amendment 30, page 15, line 22, at end insert—

“(3A) In making any proposal under subparagraph (3), the Secretary of State must ensure that there is on the Authority a representative of—

- (a) producers,
- (b) trade unions,
- (c) consumers, and
- (d) each of the United Kingdom devolved administrations.”

This amendment would ensure that the Trade Remedies Authority includes, among its non-executive members, representatives of stakeholder bodies potentially affected by its recommendations.

Greg Hands: It is a pleasure to open consideration on Report of the Trade Bill and to speak to new clause 5. This is all legislation that contains key measures that will deliver for UK businesses and consumers across the country, providing continuity and certainty. Amendments have been tabled by the Government and from across the House, and with the permission of the House I will outline the Government’s position on these more than 50 different amendments, and on other amendments tabled, before we hear from hon. and right hon. Members.

On Government new clauses 5 and 6, together with amendments 6, 7 and 9, the Government have been consistently clear that the priority for the UK’s existing trade relationships as we leave the EU is continuity. Our partner countries are clear on that too, and this Bill is about continuity. But it is about more than simply transitioning agreements. It is about ensuring that businesses—UK and partner-country businesses—can continue to benefit from smooth-operating borders once we have become a wholly independent trading nation at the end of the transition period.

The Government have set out our ambition to have a world-leading border by 2050. This will support our aim to make the UK a globally attractive place to do business as we move forward. To achieve that ambition, the Government need to make better use of the data we currently hold, and new clauses 5 and 6 are aimed at doing just that. Unlocking the full potential of the data, without placing any additional burden on businesses, will not only allow us to achieve our vision for the future, but benefit those business and consumers who

depend on a frictionless border to ensure continuity of our trading relationships today. The smooth flow of traffic, goods and trade after the end of the transition period and during the introduction of import controls will support the manufacturing sector, especially those using the just-in-time methodology and individuals who enjoy using the online sector.

New clause 5 creates a new legal gateway so that Government data can be used, first, to ensure continuity of trade by safeguarding existing trading relationships in countries both in the EU and in the rest of world so they are not frustrated by friction at the border for goods and services at the end of the transition period; secondly, to provide better services to UK businesses and consumers by supporting the effective management of the end-to-end border process; and, thirdly, to underpin the delivery of a world-leading border—protecting the UK, protecting revenue and growing international trade.

This is an amendment that external border industry stakeholders are very supportive of; indeed, they have been calling for exactly this type of action for a long time. I want to be clear to the House on a number of important issues in relation to the new clause. First, this all relates to existing data; there are no new powers for data collection in these Government amendments. Secondly, it is discretionary and specific: it does not create a data-sharing free-for-all between public authorities. The new clause is carefully drafted to limit the data that can be shared to only that related to trade functions. These are functions that, in the main, are the responsibility of the Secretary of State for International Trade or the Minister for the Cabinet Office. If the information is not required for trade functions, it cannot be requested under the gateway. Before any data can be disclosed, the public authority making the disclosure must also be satisfied that it has complied with its own existing data protection obligations—most notably under the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulation.

The Government recognise that there may be concerns about what happens to the data once it has been passed to the Cabinet Office, the Department for International Trade or other Departments. I want to assure all Members of the House that no data will be made available or sold to third parties outside Government—a concern which I know a number of colleagues have raised in the past—nor will it be used to monitor citizens or businesses, or to target individuals to be stopped at the border. These measures are, as I have said, about making sure that border flow is maintained, and that traffic, goods and services are free to flow with as little friction as possible.

Furthermore, new clause 6 makes it an offence to disclose unlawfully any personal data shared under the amendment. The Government have also tabled amendments 6 to 9, which make minor changes to the existing clause 8. These amendments are to enable Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs data to be shared with all Ministers of the Crown, where HMRC is satisfied that the data may be shared for the Minister's functions relating to trade. The current drafting enables HMRC to share data with the Secretary of State for the same purpose. The practical effect of the amendments is to enable HMRC to share data with the Cabinet Office, which is not headed by a Secretary of State.

New clauses 1 to 3 seek to replicate the effects of Government amendments brought forward to the 2017-19 Trade Bill. Over the course of this legislation, and its 2017-19 version, I have had constructive discussions with my hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly) regarding the purpose of the Government's continuity programme. I would like to thank him for his work and the interactions he has had with me, particularly on the important issue of transparency. His efforts have directly changed the Bill through inserting the use of the affirmative procedure when exercising the power in clause 2, and ensuring that Parliament has transparency in relation to continuity agreements through the laying of parliamentary reports, alongside signed agreements setting out significant changes with the underlying EU agreement.

As Members across the House know, the purpose of our continuity programme is to provide certainty to businesses and consumers by retaining the preferential trading arrangements from which the UK benefits as a signatory to trade agreements that the EU had signed with third countries before exit day. That is why we have now concluded 20 continuity agreements with 48 countries, accounting for £110 billion of UK trade in 2018, which represents 74% of the trade with countries with which we were seeking continuity before the withdrawal agreement was signed. Each of those agreements has been accompanied by a parliamentary report, and I can confirm that we will continue to publish reports for all continuity agreements yet to be signed. As those parliamentary reports make clear, our continuity programme has remained true to its mandate: replicating our existing trade relationships. Let me repeat that standards have not been lowered in these 20 agreements. Unsafe food will not be entering our market, and our right to choose how we deliver public services has been protected.

6 pm

New clause 3 would stipulate that the parliamentary reports must be published at least 10 sitting days before any statutory instruments are made under this power. As I explained to colleagues in Committee a few weeks ago, and as I think we all know, trade negotiations have a habit of going down to the wire. I have only to remind colleagues of the negotiations surrounding the EU withdrawal agreement as evidence of that fact—although I should point out, before I get people too excited, that that particular negotiation is not included in the scope of this Bill. As such, it is possible that we may not be able to sign continuity agreements until shortly before the transition period ends. That may make it very difficult to leave a period of 10 sitting days before any SIs are brought forward if we want continuity agreements to enter into force on day one after the transition period.

Mr Jonathan Djanogly (Huntingdon) (Con): I thank the Minister for his earlier comments. He talks about continuity agreements, but are they still continuity agreements? For instance, the agreement with Japan looks like it will be very different from the one that the EU had, and Canada is saying that it is not going to have the same agreement; it wants to see what we get with the EU first. Why does he still call them continuity agreements? Is this clause not looking at a position that we had two years ago? Should we not now move on?

Greg Hands: Let me be clear: we are talking about continuity. My hon. Friend can judge us not just by what I say but by our actions. Of the 20 reports that we have published, five have been called for debate in the other place, and not a single one of those debates has resulted in a motion of regret. He is right about one thing, and that is on Japan. I will come on to examine this shortly, but Japan is different. We have been clear that that will lead to an enhanced free trade agreement based on the original EU agreement, which is why we have put in place different and more considerable scrutiny arrangements for the Japan agreement than for the rest of the continuity programme.

We want continuity agreements to enter into force on day one to avoid a cliff edge for both businesses and consumers. I remind colleagues that all continuity agreements will be subject to the CRaG—Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010—ratification procedure. That already provides for a period of 21 sitting days in which agreements, and the parliamentary reports and explanatory memoranda published alongside them, can be scrutinised by parliamentarians before they are formally ratified. I will now address amendments 1 to 5 in the name of my hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon, as well as amendments 22 and 23.

Mr Djanogly *rose*—

Barry Gardiner (Brent North) (Lab): Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I will give way to the hon. Member for Brent North (Barry Gardiner)—it is great to see him back in trade.

Barry Gardiner: The Minister talks of CRaG as if it is a process under which this Parliament has any power. He knows that it is the Government who enable Parliament to have a debate whereby it could vote against what is tabled under the CRaG process. He must look again at the way in which real scrutiny and accountability can be brought to bear in the way that the hon. Member for Huntingdon suggests.

Greg Hands: It is good to see the hon. Gentleman back. I remember that he was originally a Blairite Minister in Tony Blair's Government, and it has been really instructive to see the journey that he has been on over some time. I saw him take the seat in the extreme corner of the Chamber earlier and thought, "Not only has he taken on the views of the right hon. Member for Islington North (Jeremy Corbyn), but he has now even taken his previous seat." The hon. Gentleman voted for CRaG in 2010, as did I. [*Interruption.*] We both voted for CRaG in 2010. CRaG allows Parliament to block a trade deal. It allows Parliament to block international treaties. That was the intention—his Government designed it in that way to give Parliament the ability to block an international agreement, and that remains the case today.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Greg Hands: I will make a little bit more progress.

As I have said, the other place has held debates on six of the agreements, and not one carried a motion of regret. We have also retained the affirmative resolution procedure for regulations that are required to implement single agreements. The Government recognise that there

may be concerns that the power in clause 2 could be used to implement completely new agreements with continuity countries, both now and in the future, with inadequate opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny. In Committee we heard suggestions that some of the upcoming continuity agreements, such as those with Canada and Singapore, will go beyond continuity, and will therefore require a more comprehensive scrutiny process—my hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon made that point.

Let me reassure hon. Members that we view the underlying EU agreements as sufficient, and we are not seeking to enhance those deals or go beyond continuity. These will be technical changes to make the agreements function in a UK-specific context. The Government acknowledge that the UK-Japan agreement, although based on the EU's existing agreement with Japan, will be an enhanced agreement, and that is an exception.

Jonathan Gullis (Stoke-on-Trent North) (Con): With ceramics being the fourth-largest export to Japan and its industry, does the Minister see an enhanced trade deal with Japan as an opportunity, rather than listening to the doomsayers on the Opposition Benches?

Greg Hands: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. All my interactions, and those of the Secretary of State, with the ceramics industry and with MPs who represent key ceramics constituencies, indicate that the Japan deal is extremely important for this country. I am disappointed that the Opposition parties seem to have no enthusiasm for the continuity of our trade with Japan, or its enhancement.

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I will not give way just now. We are committed to additional scrutiny arrangements for any deal with Japan. We believe that the current sunset provisions in the Bill strike the right balance between flexibility for negotiators and the ability to keep agreements operable, and that they provide sufficient constraints and scrutiny to Parliament.

The Government are aware that during the 2017-19 Trade Bill there was uncertainty and concern in Parliament about the nature of the Government's continuity programme—indeed, I can testify to that, because I was the Minister at the time—and that is why we have tabled a number of amendments to the Bill. There is, however, a crucial change in circumstance since the previous Bill, because Parliament can now see that we have not strayed beyond our mandate to deliver continuity. The transition agreements have not resulted in new or enhanced trading obligations, standards have not been reduced in any way, and our right to choose how we deliver public services has been protected.

Richard Fuller (North East Bedfordshire) (Con): In that context, I understand why there is limited scrutiny for small trade deals, and the Minister has spoken about enhanced scrutiny for the Japan deal. He will know, however, that for many constituents, the US trade deal and the China trade deal will raise the most concerns. Can he give us some assurance that the process of increased scrutiny in Parliament will be higher for those deals than for the ones mentioned earlier?

Greg Hands: I absolutely give my hon. Friend that assurance, and I will come on to discuss those deals in a moment, although they are not within the scope of the current Bill.

My hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon has tabled new clause 4 on new trade agreements, and that gives me the opportunity to stress the importance that the Government place on parliamentary scrutiny, and the commitments we have made in that space. The House will know that the negotiation and entering into of international agreements is a prerogative power of the Executive. The new clause would give Parliament veto rights over our negotiating objectives.

The Constitution Committee in the other place reported on that issue in 2019, and stated:

“This would impinge inappropriately on the Government’s prerogative power and limit the Government’s flexibility in the negotiations.”

I agree, and as the House will know, there are already rigorous checks and balances on the Government’s power to negotiate and ratify new agreements through the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010. *[Interruption.]* The right hon. Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) is fond of heckling, but she voted for that Act.

Aaron Bell (Newcastle-under-Lyme) (Con): I concur entirely with what the Minister is saying. Is it not the case that if we allow further parliamentary scrutiny, we will not get the best deal from these negotiations, and that at present this is the Westminster-style democracy with the greatest parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals?

Greg Hands: My hon. Friend is absolutely correct that our scrutiny offer compares very favourably with Australia’s and New Zealand’s and is at least equal to Canada’s. He is right in other regards as well. Some of these amendments would obligate the Government to publish the text after the end of each negotiating round. At the moment, we publish a written ministerial statement. The idea that we publish the interim text with the United States so that Australia, New Zealand, Japan and all our partners could see it when this Government—this country—are undergoing simultaneous negotiation with different partners is not a sensible way of proceeding.

Barry Gardiner: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I am going to make more progress.

This Government understand the desire of Parliament to have effective scrutiny of our FTA programme. That is why we have gone above and beyond the baseline provided by CRaG in committing to publishing comprehensive information ahead of entering into negotiations with partner countries. We have already done this—

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Greg Hands: I am going to make progress.

We have already done this for the US, for Japan, for Australia and for New Zealand. This has included publishing negotiating objectives and initial economic assessments. We have also committed to laying final impact assessments once negotiations have concluded and we know the content of the proposed agreement in its entirety.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Greg Hands: I am going to make some more progress.

In addition, the Government have committed to providing regular updates to Parliament on the progress of negotiations. We have already adopted a similar approach for Japan, because that is an enhanced agreement. There is an important distinction that new clause 4 does not make, requiring, as it does, the roll-over agreements not yet signed to be subject to the same scrutiny as new agreements, even though the original EU-third party agreement has been subject to both EU and UK scrutiny.

Matt Rodda (Reading East) (Lab): Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I am going to make more progress.

For new trade agreements, the Government have already committed to working closely with the relevant scrutiny Committees in both Houses throughout negotiations. This includes providing confidential briefings, as appropriate, to keep them apprised. This approach is in line with the recommendations of the former Member for Blackburn, Jack Straw—who served in government with the hon. Member for Brent North—and who said in his evidence to the Lords Constitution Committee that

“it should be for the negotiators to decide how much privacy and confidentiality there should be”

during negotiations

“and certainly not others”.

Finally, when negotiations have concluded, we will work with the relevant Select Committee to ensure, where practical, that there is time for the Committee to produce a report on the final agreement before it is laid in Parliament under CRaG.

Tim Farron: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I am not going to give way further during this section of my speech.

Similarly—this is an important point—if the Committee were to recommend a debate on an agreement prior to ratification, the Government would of course consider that request, subject to parliamentary timetabling. Taken together, this means that Parliament will have comprehensive information, including economic assessments, on our agreements prior to negotiations commencing, at key points during negotiations, and at the conclusion of talks.

Finally on this point—this is extremely important—international agreements cannot themselves alter domestic law, and any changes to UK legislation would need to be scrutinised by Parliament in the normal way. We are strongly committed to transparency, as demonstrated by the steps we have taken to provide comprehensive information to the public and Parliament at the start.

Tim Farron *rose*—

Greg Hands: I will put the hon. Gentleman out of his misery and give way.

Tim Farron: I just want to make a point about the nature of the scrutiny. A few weeks ago, the Government rightly came forward with the Trade and Agriculture Commission to add weight to the scrutiny of trade deals with regard to animal welfare, environmental standards

[*Tim Farron*]

and labour standards. What can the Minister do to give more assurance to farmers, in particular, that these deals will not lead to an undermining of their business and their standards, and put that into the Bill to ensure that those cannot then be let down?

Greg Hands: I thank the hon. Gentleman for that intervention, which allows me to say that the National Farmers Union has been incredibly welcoming of this proposal. Minette Batters said that it is

“a hugely important development in ensuring UK farming’s high standards of animal welfare and environmental protection are not undermined in future trade deals.”

There are three crucial things. First, we have a strong manifesto commitment to have no compromise on Britain’s standards of animal welfare, food safety and the environment. Secondly, we are transposing the EU rules into UK law to take effect on 1 January. The third thing is simply this: it would be for Parliament, if it so wanted, to block any such changes—if anybody thought they would introduce any of these controversial products, Parliament would be able to block that.

6.15 pm

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green): Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: No, I will make some progress. The Government are strongly committed to transparency, as demonstrated by the steps we have already taken.

New clause 12 proposes a review of free trade agreements every five years after entry into force. We have already established regular dialogue with the International Trade Committee, and that is perhaps the best forum to provide information and assessment of the UK’s wider trade environment and trade relationships to Parliament.

New clause 18 seeks to give Parliament and the devolved legislatures binding votes on, or vetoes over, international agreements, which would be to fundamentally undermine the royal prerogative and, worse, limit our flexibility to negotiate the deals that will best serve the interests of UK consumers and communities.

Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP): I accept the Minister’s point that for devolved Parliaments to be able to undermine a national trade deal would be wrong. However, will he give us some guidance on the position for Northern Ireland? We may find ourselves having not continuity deals, but new deals, and we could be excluded from some of the benefits of those deals. How will he make an assessment? How will he enable the devolved Administration to have an input into decisions made on those deals if we find that we are disadvantaged by being excluded from them?

Greg Hands: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for that intervention. The first thing to say is that I have regular dialogue with his colleague the Minister for the Economy. I am meeting her tomorrow—indeed, I am meeting her twice—to talk about these issues. I reiterate that Northern Ireland remains part of the UK customs area and will benefit from UK free trade agreements. We have been absolutely categorical on both those points. As I say, new clause 18 seeks to give Parliament a veto

over those arrangements and to ensure that the Government seek approval from the devolved legislatures on the final agreement. I am in regular contact with the Ministers for the devolved Administrations on these issues.

I will now address new clauses 7 to 9, and others in relation to standards. In answer to the intervention from the hon. Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale (Tim Farron), let me say that we have already given cast-iron commitments, during debate on this Bill and the Agriculture Bill, that we will not be diluting standards in any area, or in any way, following the UK’s departure from the EU.

Peter Aldous (Waveney) (Con): I acknowledge the undertakings that the Government have given on agriculture and food production, but will the Minister also assure me that future UK trade policy will be fully aligned with our climate change and environmental policies? Will he also assure me that in striking new trade deals we will, at all times, promote low-carbon industries such as offshore wind and will not undermine UK businesses that are working hard to lower their own carbon footprint?

Greg Hands: I absolutely give my hon. Friend those assurances. The Government’s climate change agenda—indeed, the whole country’s agenda—is incredibly important for us at the Department for International Trade. We have put a lot of time and effort into promoting our capability and capacity in things such as offshore wind. I am regularly saying to international investors and trade partners that the UK now has the largest offshore wind capacity in the world. This is something we are seeking to export and it is something trade agreements can be helpful in. We are working with some of our key partners on these aspects of trade agreements, but they can also be something that the whole of government can work together on.

Caroline Lucas: Will the Minister give way?

Greg Hands: I am going to make some progress. Let me address matters related to animal welfare, food standards and food safety. I recognise the strength of feeling that those issues generate among colleagues in all parts of the House, but as I have told the House on many occasions, as have the Secretary of State and my Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs colleagues, this Government will stand firm in trade negotiations. We will always do right by our farmers and aim to secure new opportunities for the industry, and we will not dilute our high environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety standards.

Steve Brine (Winchester) (Con): There is not just concern on both sides of the House; my right hon. Friend knows that there is a lot of concern out there among the public and our constituents. We have heard commitments from the Front Bench, and when I was food safety Minister I gave those commitments too, around domestic food standards. Many people want it set out in black and white in the Bill. I suspect that the Minister will go on to say why he will resist new clause 7, for instance, so what assurance can he give me, my constituents and many others who will be listening to the debate that that is not necessary because those standards are protected in law, not just in word?

Greg Hands: I thank my hon. Friend for that intervention, which allows me to explain the difference. Some of the amendments seek to dynamically align other people's methods of production with those that we use in the UK. Yes, we will have, and maintain, exceptionally high standards of domestic production, domestic products and import controls, and we can influence our trading partners.

However, I cannot put into legislation a dynamic regulatory alignment playing field for our trading partners. That would be impractical and it would render inoperable most of our existing trade agreements, and potentially render impossible doing a future trade agreement with the European Union. If all these trading partners had to sign up to dynamically aligning their standards with the UK, that would make it extremely challenging not just to keep our existing trade agreements but to do trade agreements with partners in the future.

Caroline Lucas: Will the right hon. Member give way?

Greg Hands: I will not, because I have gone on for long enough.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Nigel Evans): Order. May I assist by indicating that so many people want to take part on Report that those who have indicated that they wish to speak and are on the call list should be thinking about four minutes? I call the Minister.

Greg Hands: I have much more to say, in relation to 50 different amendments, but I appreciate that there are a large number of other speakers, so I will call it a day there in order to allow other people their say. I think I have covered the main areas, outlining why we have the requirements in new clauses 5 and 6 on data, why we are confident of our robust approach to parliamentary scrutiny, using the CRaG process and enhanced things that we have introduced to ensure that Parliament gets the information and has the say that it needs, and finally our absolute commitment to not compromising on standards for food safety, animal welfare and the environment.

Bill Esterson (Sefton Central) (Lab): International trade has rarely been more important. It is critical as we forge a new place in the world outside the European Union. It is also critical to how we recover from the pandemic, as it has the power to deliver prosperity at home and abroad, especially in the developing world as we aim towards the sustainable development goals. We will support the Government where they are right and challenge where they are wrong.

There are three key areas to which our amendments to the Trade Bill refer: social, environmental and democratic. First, on social, the Bill has profound implications for workers' rights, human rights, public services and the economy. Secondly, on environmental, as my right hon. Friend the Member for Islington South and Finsbury (Emily Thornberry) reminded us on Second Reading, international trade agreements have a massive impact on our ability to tackle the climate and environment emergency. Meanwhile, food production and animal welfare standards are matters of enormous concern to farmers and consumers alike. Thirdly, on democratic, the complete absence of scrutiny runs like the Sant Andreas fault through the Bill. [HON. MEMBERS: "San Andreas."] Thank you—the San Andreas fault.

Craig Williams (Montgomeryshire) (Con): Will the hon. Member give way on that point?

Bill Esterson: I will give way in a moment. Our amendments attempt to rectify the Bill's serious shortcomings and the lack of accountability. We were promised a modern framework for international trade negotiations in the Queen's Speech. The Bill was supposed to be the opportunity to deliver that framework. It does not. The Bill gives Ministers powers to make changes to retained EU law upstairs in a Committee of 17 MPs after a maximum debate of 90 minutes. These powers are retained for up to 10 years. That is quite some grab by the Executive—and it is far from the whole story, either.

The final text of an agreement depends on the Government granting debates to the Opposition during a 21-day period: something that did not always happen in the last Parliament. It relies on the Opposition using their limited opportunities to determine the agenda for such a debate. The Government should be holding the debate and a vote in both Houses as a matter of course. New clause 4 is an opportunity to address some of the democratic deficit in the Bill.

Only half of the 40 agreements covered by the Bill have been signed. We are told by the Minister that they have already been scrutinised by the European Union. But these are not the simple matters of continuity that the Minister would have us believe. Only three out of 20 existing mutual recognition agreements have been signed with Switzerland, our third largest non-EU trading partner. South Korea has only signed a temporary agreement and wants to start again, and a number of the remaining 20 are going to be completely new. Japan—new agreement; Turkey, our 10th largest non-EU trading partner is in a customs arrangement with the EU and is waiting for the UK to sign a free trade agreement with the EU. Canada is in no hurry to negotiate at all. As I said, these are far from being simple matters of continuity, which is why they need proper scrutiny.

Barry Gardiner: Does my hon. Friend share with me the sense that the Government have told us that they needed the Bill to be able to produce these roll-over agreements? Yet the Minister has stood at the Dispatch Box today and said that we have concluded 20 of these roll-over agreements. In fact, they have managed to do that without this Bill having passed into law. Is not what he is saying absolutely relevant? It is these future agreements that we need legislation for, and it should be proper legislation that sets out the framework under which this Parliament scrutinises what is going on.

Bill Esterson: My hon. Friend is absolutely right, and I pay tribute to his time as the shadow Secretary of State and the work he did on scrutinising and opposing this Bill first time around. He is also absolutely right to say that what we have heard already from the Minister just bears out everything that we have been saying for the past three years.

As I say, these are not simple matters of continuity. That is why we need proper scrutiny. The problems do not end there. The Bill will put in place the framework for a new generation of new agreements, including those with the United States and Australia, and the controversial so-called comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-pacific partnership: CPTPP.

Craig Williams *rose*—

Bill Esterson: The hon. Gentleman has been very patient, so I give way to him.

Craig Williams: I thank the shadow Minister for giving way.

I am a member of the International Trade Committee, which of course has cross-party membership; I wonder why the hon. Gentleman cheapens that Committee by saying that there is no scrutiny. I welcome the involvement from the Government to date. I ask the hon. Gentleman directly: prior to the CRaG protocol Act, how many trade deals did this place vote on while the power rested in Brussels?

Bill Esterson: As the hon. Gentleman knows from being on the International Trade Committee, CRaG was part of the process that we had as EU members. I will come to that in more detail a bit later.

Caroline Lucas: I just note that, as a member of the European Parliament's trade committee, I had far more powers of scrutiny over trade agreements as an MEP than I have ever had as an MP here. However, does the hon. Gentleman share my concern that the Government's refusal to bar imports from producers that produce to lower environmental or animal welfare standards spells real disaster for our farmers? If they are going to get undercut by cheaper produce that does not meet the same standards, how on earth can they make a living if they have to meet higher standards, and therefore probably higher costs as well?

6.30 pm

Bill Esterson: The hon. Lady anticipates some things I am going to say a bit later. What she says is entirely consistent with what I said about the environmental aspects of the Bill.

There is widespread recognition across society that parliamentary scrutiny is essential in international trade agreements. The hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly) and his colleagues deserve credit for their sterling efforts to build consensus. Their new clause 4 has many elements of good scrutiny practice that a modern, confident, outward-looking country should want to adopt: scrutiny of, and a vote on, the negotiating mandate; assessment against domestic standards; consultation with the devolved Administrations; and a vote on the deal by both Houses. These are a good place to start. We can also learn from good practice elsewhere. For example, a very different approach is taken in the United States, where advisory committees have access to negotiating texts, trade unions are represented as well as employers and confidentiality agreements ensure that consultation is at an appropriate level. The result is that agreements can be amended, as with the recent United States-Mexico-Canada agreement, of which a strengthening of the labour chapter is intended to end union busting in Mexico.

How do we compare? Oh dear. So-called expert trade advisory groups—ETAGs—in this country are completely different. The Government do not tell us the criteria for membership or who the members are, and trade unions are excluded from a number of groups that were not set up to scrutinise trade deals. Talk now of a room-next-door

approach has raised concerns because of the over-restrictive nature of the non-disclosure agreements, which, as drafted, would prevent sensible consultation and analysis of the text, even by the existing self-selecting and very limited memberships of the ETAGs.

Catherine West (Hornsey and Wood Green) (Lab): Does my hon. Friend accept that we can learn through failure as well? One reason that the transatlantic trade and investment partnership failed was the lack of involvement of trade unions, industry and a number of different partners until right at the last minute, when people were asked to vote on something that they had not been brought along with.

Bill Esterson: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. I shall come to TTIP as an example of how not to carry out scrutiny and of why it is so important to have that wider engagement.

Jonathan Gullis: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Bill Esterson: I will give way a little later, if the hon. Gentleman does not mind, because a lot of Members are waiting to speak. This talk of a room-next-door approach has raised concerns because of the over-restrictive nature of the NDAs. The chaotic way in which the Government plan to create their room-next-door system sounds more like a sketch by Mr Michael Spicer than how a responsible Government might engage with scrutiny.

Jonathan Gullis: Will the hon. Gentleman give way on the scrutiny point?

Emily Thornberry (Islington South and Finsbury) (Lab): On the Michael Spicer point?

Bill Esterson: I do not know if Michael Spicer is talking to the hon. Gentleman or not; we will find out in a moment.

Jonathan Gullis: The shadow Minister talks about scrutiny and refers to trade unions. However, if we have trade unions at the table, who will scrutinise the trade unions to ensure that they are not pushing their own agenda from their own sector on a UK-wide deal? How will we ensure their impartiality if they are beholden to a militant number of members? As we know, not every trade union member is politically motivated or engaged.

Bill Esterson: It is a shame that the hon. Gentleman has taken up other hon. Members' time in the debate with such rubbish. The Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 is the only formal parliamentary process in place for agreements not covered by the Bill, including with the United States. That is not scrutiny, is it?

Matt Western (Warwick and Leamington) (Lab): Just to backtrack a moment, I remind my hon. Friend of the claims made by the Minister in his opening remarks, when he claimed we would enjoy better scrutiny than countries such as Australia and New Zealand, which I think is disputable. There was an exceptional omission, which was the United States. Should that not concern everyone?

Bill Esterson: Absolutely. We compare very badly with the scrutiny in the United States, some of which I have already described. My hon. Friend is right to make the comparison. Is it not ironic that we are in the middle of trade talks with the United States, where they have full scrutiny and we do not? While we are stuck with CRaG, in the United States debates and votes will take place in Congress, alongside the engagement with business and the unions that I described earlier.

Let us remind ourselves that CRaG was introduced as part of our scrutiny process while we were EU members, because trade agreements were an EU competence. The process included full scrutiny in the European Parliament—scrutiny that has not been replaced by an equivalent system. The hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas) reminded us of her experience performing exactly that role.

The Minister wrote to MPs last week. I think he read out quite a lot of his letter in his speech. He told us last week that legislation will be debated and scrutinised by Parliament in “the usual way”. The usual way? There is no “usual way”, because the usual process only worked alongside the scrutiny carried out for us in the European Parliament. Despite what the Minister says, CRaG on its own makes no sense unless the Government wish to avoid scrutiny.

Today’s amendments to the Bill are similar to those passed in March 2019. The Minister is fond of telling us how vital it is that the Bill passes, so why did the Government not accept the amended Bill last year? It could have saved a lot of trouble.

Emily Thornberry: And time.

Bill Esterson: And time. What possible reason can the Government have for wanting to avoid scrutiny, and why on such important areas? Perhaps there are some clues in the topics covered by the various amendments. The threat to our NHS is right at the top of the list. Investor-state dispute settlement was a scandal that came to prominence during the TTIP negotiations. Let us look at some examples of the threat posed by ISDS. The Portuguese Government were sued using ISDS when the Lisbon metro was returned to public ownership. ISDS clauses in bilateral investment treaties are being used now to prepare a series of cases against the UK Government for pausing construction contracts during the pandemic.

ISDS is not the only issue. Standstill clauses prevent Governments from returning privatised public services to the public sector. Ratchet clauses require further services to be privatised. Then there are negative lists, which require Governments to specify exactly which services are to be exempt from privatisation, with everything else up for grabs. The Prime Minister told us he favours a social insurance system in his *Daily Telegraph* article, so when Ministers tell us not to worry about the NHS, it simply will not wash.

Statements alone are worthless. It is very simple: the detailed text of all agreements must include cast-iron commitments, because it is not just the Prime Minister who wants to hand over our NHS to the healthcare corporations; it is his friend the US President, and it is in the US negotiating objectives, which refer to “full market access for US products”.

They want access to NHS medicines and more, and they are not shy about saying so.

Scrutiny matters, nowhere more so than in the protection of our NHS in international trade agreements. That is why our new clause 17 is so important. Ministers say that they want export opportunities for our farmers in the United States and Australia. Export opportunities? Really? Ministers are missing the point. Farmers have to survive first. If food imports are allowed with lower production, welfare standards and costs, farmers will struggle to stay in business. They will be undercut. As trade representative Lighthizer warned us, on issues such as agriculture

“this administration is not going to compromise.”

There is no ambiguity in Mr Lighthizer’s commitment not to compromise, is there? The idea that farmers will make up for domestic sales by exporting more is a fantasy. The magical thinking of Ministers will not stand up to scrutiny—that is, of course, if scrutiny is ever allowed.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): Northern Ireland producers in the agrifood sector export 75% of their products, so it is really important for us to have more markets and more markets will come across the world. Mash Direct, in the agrifood sector in my constituency, already exports its various vegetable and potato products to the United States. So there are markets that we can grab and take forward to get more jobs and employment. Northern Ireland will do better because of that.

Bill Esterson: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for raising that point about Northern Ireland. When the Bill was published, the Government were sticking to the mantra that there would be no border. How the new arrangements will operate in Northern Ireland and the impact on the UK is exactly why there needs to be proper scrutiny of the agreements and their impacts.

The Trade and Agriculture Commission is advisory, not regulatory. It has no teeth. It is not representative. It does not report to Parliament. It cannot enforce import standards and it will be gone again in six months’ time anyway. It cannot stop changes to food standards if the Government agree them in a trade deal with the US because it does not have any teeth. The hon. Member for Tiverton and Honiton (Neil Parish) said that he had been led up the garden path by the Government on the Agriculture Bill. The Government should lead him and his colleagues back down again, accept his new clause 4 and our new clause 11, and guarantee them in primary legislation. Mega-farms in the United States and Australia stand to benefit from any lowering of animal welfare and production standards. When we banned sow stalls in the UK, we had to admit pork from countries that had not caught up with our standards. What happened? Half our pig farmers went bust. If we were to accept chemical-washed chicken, our poultry industry would go bust, too. It must not happen again.

Public health, animal welfare and food production are inextricably connected. Hormones in animal feed may cause cancer in people. Industrial farming techniques affect the environment and global warming. In the middle of a global pandemic, minds should be concentrated. The use of antibiotics in farming is linked to the ability of diseases to jump between species. A coalition of businesses, unions, consumers, environmentalists and civil society is warning of a democratic deficit. The coalition is headed by the International Chamber of Commerce, which states:

“We no longer live in a world where trade can be treated separately from our international commitments on issues such as

[Bill Esterson]

climate action, digitisation or building a more resilient health system. The public need to feel confident that trade decisions and processes are working for them and the Bill is a good opportunity to embed a more transparent, consensus based, democratic approach that clearly demonstrates a net benefit to all. It's an opportunity to set a new gold standard."

Steve Brine: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Bill Esterson: I am not going to take any more interventions because I am about to finish.

I said at the start that the Bill is really about social responsibility, environmental protection and democracy. The lack of scrutiny threatens to leave the NHS wide open to pharmaceutical giants and to undermine farmers and consumers. Chemical washes of chicken, hormones in beef, ractopamine in pork and GM crops are banned in the UK. What is wrong with keeping it that way? If the Government are saying, "We are going to do it anyway", what is the objection to putting it all in primary legislation? The trouble is that we all know what is really going on here: they do not want to put protections for our NHS farmers and consumers in law or take the action needed on the climate crisis, because they have no intention of keeping their promises.

6.45 pm

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. In case the House is not already aware, after the next speaker, we will have a time limit of four minutes on Back-Bench speeches, which, of course, does not apply to Mr Stewart Hosie.

Stewart Hosie (Dundee East) (SNP): There are four significant flaws with this legislation: the absence of devolved consent, real protections for the NHS, the preservation of food standards and meaningful parliamentary scrutiny. I believe that our amendment 10 and new clauses 7 and 8 deal with the first three, and that new clause 4, tabled by the hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly), deals with the final issue.

I wish to speak to amendment 10 and new clauses 7 and 8, which are in my name, and I will start, slightly in reverse order, with amendment 10. It relates to the powers of the devolved Administrations, or as I said in Committee,

"more accurately, the ability of the UK Government to make regulations under subsection (1), which makes provisions within devolved competencies, without the consent of Scottish or Welsh Ministers or a Northern Irish devolved authority."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee, 23 June 2020; c. 237.*]

It strikes me as fundamental that if we are to genuinely respect the devolved settlement in the UK, Ministers must self-evidently gain the consent of the devolved Administrations before making changes to regulations that directly affect them, possibly in a negative way, or in a way that runs counter to those Governments' policy objectives.

I am aware that in the previous Trade Bill, under consideration between 2017 and 2019, there was a problematic provision for regulation-making powers to be available to the UK Government, but the good news is that those provisions have been removed from this Trade Bill. It is the case, however, that there remains no statutory obligation for the UK Government to even

consult, let alone seek the consent of, Scottish Ministers before exercising the powers in this Bill in devolved areas.

I know that the Minister has said that these powers would not normally be used without seeking consent, and his predecessor did offer a number of non-legislative commitments to the Scottish Trade Minister Ivan McKee in March. I am genuinely pleased that the Minister, during the Bill Committee, committed to honouring those non-legislative commitments. He said:

"I restate the commitments made by my right hon. Friend, when he was a Minister, in his March letter to the Scottish Minister Ivan McKee",

and that is genuinely very welcome. However, he went on to say, in opposing what was then amendment 8 and similar Labour new clauses that dealt with the same issues:

"In short, we are already delivering the engagement envisaged by proposed new clause, and we have achieved that while continuing to observe the important constitutional principles enshrined in the devolution settlements."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee, 23 June 2020; c. 240-241.*]

I disagree. Giving the UK Government the ability to directly effect devolved powers without the statutory requirement to even seek consent is not observing the devolved settlement.

Jim Shannon: Our trading ability is something that concerns each and every one of us across the whole United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Would the hon. Gentleman be prepared to support new clause 4, which would give the authority to the devolved Assemblies and the Scottish Parliament, and further, would mean that proposals came to the Floor of the House for ratification? Surely supporting new clause 4 would be a step to making that happen.

Stewart Hosie: I am more than happy to support new clause 4, not least because I have signed it, but it is a slightly different thing. Ensuring parliamentary scrutiny, about which I shall say a little more later, is important, but it is different from the seeking of consent from those Administrations whose policy direction may be affected by a UK Government decision.

When we debated the identical new clause in Committee, the Minister went on to say that

"this proposed new clause would give the devolved Administrations a statutory role in the reserved area of international trade negotiations, which would be constitutionally inappropriate."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee, 23 June 2020; c. 241.*]

He was partly right, in that it would give the devolved Administrations a statutory role, but only in so far as the provisions of a trade deal affected devolved competences. That is not constitutionally inappropriate; it is a matter of good administration and respect.

The Minister's key argument against what was proposed was that it was not "practical". He said:

"It would lock us and the"—
devolved Administrations—

"into prescribed ways of working under the existing intergovernmental memorandum of understanding, a document last updated in 2013."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee, 23 June 2020; c. 241.*]

Well, that may be an argument for revisiting the MOU, and it might also be an argument to say that the Government should adhere to the terms of the MOU

under any circumstances, but it is a strange argument for opposing this amendment. Surely it is better to base negotiations on an agreed framework, or better still an agreed statutory framework, rather than to leave them to chance, make up the rules on the hoof and give an impression of UK Government acting in an arbitrary way.

The Minister's key argument was as follows:

"As parts of these agreements touch on devolved matters, this legislation will create concurrent powers. We have sought to put in place concurrent powers to provide greater flexibility in how transitional agreements are implemented".

So far so good; however, he went on to say:

"This approach permits greater administrative efficiency, reducing the volume of legislation brought through the UK Parliament and through the devolved legislatures."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee*, 23 June 2020; c. 241.]

It cannot be right that the UK Government intend to legislate, or can legislate, in areas of devolved competence for the sake of administrative efficiency. There are far bigger and wider principles at stake than that.

Let me turn to new clause 7, tabled in my name. We know that trade deals can put pressure on food standards and lead to the importation of low-standard food. For example, the US Administration has made it clear that they want the UK to lower its food and animal welfare standards. The new clause includes a ban on the importation of food that is produced to standards lower than that in the UK. We know that the US and other countries have far lower animal welfare standards and adopt practices—including chlorine-washed chicken, hormone-fed beef and the use of various pesticides and GM crops—that are illegal in the UK for health and environmental reasons. None of that is a great surprise to anyone in the House. We believe that the quality of Scotland's food and drink produce and, indeed, of food and drink produced elsewhere in the UK, and the related standards, are essential to the maintenance of our established international reputation in those areas.

Steve Brine: I wonder whether the people in Scotland, like the people in England and in my constituency in Winchester, might not be way ahead of the politicians. Ultimately, will not the consumer decide? Just recently, we heard Waitrose make it clear that it would not be selling any imported product that was produced to a lower standard than we currently enjoy in this country, with its new boss citing chlorine-washed chicken. I just wonder whether the public might be ahead of us on this already.

Stewart Hosie: I want to be careful in how I answer that. I hope the hon. Gentleman understands that perhaps those who can afford to shop in Waitrose—the Minister boasted in Committee that he was Waitrose fan—have a choice; perhaps somebody who is counting every penny and does not have access to anything other than the cheapest food is not in the position to make the same choice.

In effect, new clause 7 would do two things: it would affirm the UK's rights and obligations under the SPS agreement—that is, the application of the sanitary and phytosanitary measures in annex 1A of the WTO agreement; and it would prohibit the import of food into the UK if standards in the exporting country were lower than those in force in the UK. I do not think there is anything contentious about that.

It is not just campaign groups like the Trade Justice Movement that back this. It is not just Scottish Land and Estates and the National Farmers Union that back measures like this one. The British Medical Association has weighed in, saying:

"The Bill presents an opportunity for the UK to present itself as a global leader on standards on food imports for the benefit of human, animal and plant health, and the environment. To fulfil this opportunity, it is vital that our current high standards are upheld and protected in any trade deals."

It suggests that new clauses 7 and 11 should be backed in order to achieve that.

It is also necessary to have this on the face of the Bill because the Government's approach to protecting food standards is slightly confused. In Committee, the Minister said:

"This Bill is about...continuity... Imports under continuity agreements must continue to comply with our existing import standards."

I welcomed that. However, he added:

"Decisions on those standards are a matter for the UK and will be made separately from any trade agreements."—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee*, 25 June 2020; c. 305-6.]

There is the point of concern, right there. The UK could, if it wished, lower standards, opening the door to all sorts of imports. Let us make sure that that is not possible, at least in the roll-over arrangements, by including the UK's obligations under the WTO phytosanitary agreement in the Bill. That is important because although the purported objectives of the Bill are about roll-overs, the definition of "trade agreement" is very wide and the long title does not restrict its use only to roll-overs.

New clause 8 would ensure that the UK Government have a duty to restrict market access to healthcare services, including medicines and medical devices. We tabled the new clause precisely because trade deals potentially have a negative impact on health services. While the UK Government have repeatedly pledged that the NHS is not on the table in trade negotiations, leaked documents detail conversations between UK and US negotiators and reveal that health services have been discussed, including the US probing the UK's "health insurance system", and the US has made clear its desire for the UK to change its drug pricing mechanism. The new clauses therefore include specific carve-outs for the NHS, all relevant services and regulation, meaning that it would be illegal for the Government to conclude a trade agreement that altered the way that NHS services are provided, or liberalised further, or opened up to particular sorts of foreign investment.

There could be no use of negative listing 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 what services count as health services. For example, digital services may seem irrelevant to health, but NHS data management and GP appointment systems are increasingly digitised. There could be no standstill or ratchet clauses, because these provisions mean that after the trade deal has been signed, parties are not allowed to reduce the level of liberalisation beyond what it was at the point of signature.

There are many examples of real-world potential impacts; I will give just one. The Scottish Government had private cleaners in the NHS and quite a high degree of hospital-acquired infection. The private cleaners were replaced by NHS cleaners, and the level of hospital

[*Stewart Hosie*]

acquired infection fell dramatically. Had a ratchet been in effect, let alone ISDS, it might not have been possible to do that, with detrimental mortality and morbidity consequences for real patients.

The clause also states that there should be investor-state dispute settlement clauses in trade agreements. They only allow private investors to challenge Government policy when it affects their profits. The BMA piled in to this debate, as well, saying:

“The Bill must rule out Investor Protection and Dispute Resolution mechanisms which undermine the supremacy of UK courts and risk deterring, delaying or blocking public health improvement measures.”

We have seen examples around the world of where that has happened. It is fundamentally quite wrong for large corporations to be able to use ISDS-type arrangements to sue Governments simply for taking steps to protect the wellbeing of their citizens, or for enacting public health measures that they believe to be right and for which they may well have an electoral mandate.

Barry Gardiner: The hon. Gentleman is making a fine speech. Does he agree that it seems a considerable irony that those Government Members who were so determined that this country should not be subject to any supranational court system should hereby, in an ISDS clause, enable our Government to be sued by foreign companies in specialist supranational courts in a way that is not even accessible to our own domestic companies?

7 pm

Stewart Hosie: Yes, and I made that point. It is wrong for these provisions to be available only to investors in the way that has just been described. If we want a supranational body that adjudicates, arbitrates and works, let us have the UK Government put some pressure on their friends in the United States and get the WTO appellate body back up and running and functioning again. That would be the best thing for trade around the world.

New clause 8 would also instruct that there should be no changes to drug pricing mechanisms, which could also happen through intellectual property and non-patent exclusivities. That would be bad news for patients, taxpayers, health boards and trusts around the country, and our view is that trade deals should not be used to facilitate it.

In opposing a new clause like this one in Committee, the Minister said that

“the NHS is not, and never will be, for sale to the private sector”.
Fine. He said:

“We have always protected our right to choose how we would deliver public services in trade agreements, and we will continue to do so.”

Fundamentally, his argument was that “however laudable” the new clause was, it was “unnecessary”. He went on to explain that the UK already had

“rigorous checks and balances on the Government’s power to negotiate and ratify”
trade agreements

“via the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010”.—[*Official Report, Trade Public Bill Committee, 25 June 2020; c. 315.*]

There are two big issues that jump out, given what the Minister said—and I have it in full if he wants to re-read it. First, there is absolutely no practical reason why protections for the NHS demanded by the public

should not be included in the Bill. Secondly and more importantly, because the so-called “rigorous checks and balances” in CRAg amount to little more than a take-it-or-leave-it choice at the end of the negotiations, the need to protect the NHS from the outset in legislation is paramount.

I commend amendment 10 and new clauses 7 and 8 to the House, and I hope—time permitting—that we can press new clause 7 and amendment 10 to a vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. We now have a time limit of four minutes.

Theresa Villiers (Chipping Barnet) (Con): I rise to support the Bill because I believe that removing unnecessary barriers to trade can boost jobs and growth, but I hope that the Minister and the Government will consider seriously whether changes can be made to strengthen parliamentary oversight, whether via the amendments we are considering today or in the other place.

I was one of 18 Conservative MPs to back new clause 2 of the Agriculture Bill. I did so because I believe our trade policy should be consistent with our values. The Government were elected on a manifesto with stronger commitments on the environment and animal welfare than any of their predecessors, but maintaining our domestic rules on animal welfare and environmental stewardship of land will have less and less real-world impact if more and more of our food is imported from countries with lower standards and fewer qualms about these matters than we have.

I would therefore like to hear the Minister confirm this evening that the Government will keep in place the import ban on chicken washed in disinfectant and will not at any stage ask this Parliament to remove it from the statute book. I hope that he will say the same about the ban on beef from cattle whose growth has been artificially boosted by hormones. We know that in the United States, many of them are intensively reared on feedlots containing thousands of animals fed off soy production, contributing to deforestation in the Amazon basin.

The reality is that more or less every country in the world reflects sensitivities over food in its approach to trade policy for the good reason that food security is crucial to any society. I warmly thank the Minister and the International Trade Secretary for agreeing to establish a commission to consider how we can secure the economic advantages of free trade agreements without undermining our world-class food standards. Those standards would be undermined if we allowed an unrestricted tariff-free influx of food produced using methods that would be illegal in this country. A good deal with the United States, a mutually beneficial deal, could see tariffs coming down even in sensitive sectors such as beef so long as incoming food complies with animal welfare and environmental standards that are equivalent to our own. Many US producers are perfectly capable of doing that, and it should not be beyond the wit of man to develop a certification and compliance system.

Contrary to what some have claimed, this is not a rerun of the debates on the corn laws, and it is a caricature to suggest that those of us raising concerns have somehow been captured by producer interests as our Victorian forebears in this House were. All I am asking is that we do not sell ourselves short in this country.

The UK is the third biggest market for groceries in the world. Even conditional access to that market is a valuable prize. Just because we would like a trade deal with the US does not mean that we should give it everything that it wants. There is so much that we can offer our trading partners in the US and in other countries, and is it so unreasonable to say that, when it comes to food, there are limits to liberalisation?

Fleur Anderson (Putney) (Lab): This Trade Bill is fatally flawed. It could have been a bold statement about our future trade deals in which we used our independence from the EU, whatever we feel about it, to build in high environmental and food standards, workers and consumer rights, and commitments to achieving sustainable development goals and human rights and to modernise our trade rules in conjunction with constructive, modern, democratic scrutiny. Instead, this Bill is stripped of any of those. I urge Members to vote for new clause 4, which will enable the people's elected representatives here in this House and in the devolved Administrations to say what is important for the British people.

High standards should be written into trade agreements from the start to the finish of negotiations and ensure that, for example, secret deals do not end up with selling off the NHS to the highest bidder. Chlorinated chicken could be just the start. These are not the words of doomsayers or baseless concerns; more than 400 NHS and senior public health professionals have signed an open letter, demanding legal guarantees in post-Brexit trade legislation to provide specific protections for the health service in any future trade negotiations, such as those with the US. US trade deals are already under way in secret, but even in the US both Houses of Congress get a guaranteed vote on trade agreements, and America's process for public consultation prior to negotiation is impressively far-reaching in contrast with this Bill. The British public are being sold out by this Bill. What are the Government afraid of? What are the Government planning to do? What desperate deals will be struck to get a deal done, but on worse terms?

In my own constituency, 39% of jobs are in sectors identified as being severely impacted by a no-deal Brexit, or a bad deal with the EU. I am extremely angry, as are my constituents that, as an MP, I will have very little say over preventing this. Food standards are also a very huge concern to my constituents who are deeply worried that decades of progress in animal welfare, hygiene, husbandry and environmental management are going to be stripped away. Farmers and consumers will be worse off.

I am very disappointed that the Bill went through several days of scrutiny in the Committee, which I was a member of, without any changes whatsoever, and today we have just a few minutes of parliamentary debate starting in the late afternoon on only one day before the Bill goes to the next stage. In Committee, we heard evidence about how much stronger our trade negotiators could be if they had the backing of parliamentary red lines written into our legislation, but we were told over and over again by the Minister that proposals for parliamentary scrutiny of food standards, environmental standards and workers' rights were not necessary.

Steve Brine: Will the hon. Lady give way?

Fleur Anderson: I only have a few seconds left.

If the planned negotiations will include all those rights and standards, that should be guaranteed by being written into parliamentary legislation. If the Government are planning to agree a bargained down, watered down race to the bottom, I can see why they would reject these amendments. That is why we should all be very worried about our future and about this Trade Bill.

Robert Courts (Witney) (Con): It is a great honour to speak in this debate, having spoken briefly on Second Reading and sat on the Bill Committee and being a member of the International Trade Committee. We had a wide-ranging, well-informed and constructive debate in Committee, and it is good to see so many of its members speaking in the debate.

I would like to address a number of points, including the clauses relating to the NHS and to scrutiny, but because of the time limit, I will confine myself to just one, which is standards, and in particular new clause 11. Simply put, new clause 11 would allow the import of agricultural goods into the UK

“only if the standards to which those goods were produced were as high as”

the standards that apply under UK law. On the face of it, that sounds reasonable because it just seeks to ensure what we already have. Nobody has any difficulty with that—everybody here wants to maintain the high production standards, animal welfare standards and environmental standards that we have. That is why the Government have been absolutely clear that they will do precisely that. That is why the Minister stood on a manifesto commitment to do exactly that. That is why I stood on a manifesto commitment to do exactly that, as did all my hon. Friends.

There are a number of misunderstandings, which I will briefly address. We have already heard a number of times from Opposition Members about chlorine-washed chicken and hormone-treated beef, and I am sure we will hear about it again before the end of the debate. Those are already illegal in UK law. They are illegal because they are in European Union law, and European Union law is put into UK law by the terms of the withdrawal agreement. When Opposition Members plaintively say, “Why won't the Government just put this in primary legislation?” the answer is because it is already there. If it were to be removed, the Government would have to bring something to the House and get us to vote on it—they would have to change the law, and we have all expressed our view about that. That prohibition is already there, so new clause 11 is simply unnecessary.

New clause 11 seeks to go further than maintaining our high import standards. It is crucial that we distinguish between import standards, which is the safety of food brought into this country, and safety standards, which is the way that they are produced domestically. The new clause seeks to have us say to all our trade partners, “We want to go further than ensuring that we import safe food. We want to reach into your domestic legislation and tell you exactly how you produce that food.” No self-respecting independent country will want to do that.

Barry Gardiner: That is patently false. All the new clause does is to say, “If you want to produce food to export into our market, it must be produced to these standards.” It does not in any way seek to impose legislation in the United States or anywhere else that would govern the way in which they can produce food.

Robert Courts: I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman on the wording of the new clause. It talks about “standards which at the time of import applied under UK law”, which means that the same standards have to apply in the foreign law, so it goes far further than what is intended by the Bill. No country is going to accept dynamic alignment imposed on it by us, any more than we would accept it. We cannot say to Mr Barnier, “We do not want to accept dynamic alignment from you, but by the way, we want you to accept dynamic alignment from us, because you’ve got to mirror the standards we have in our domestic legislation.”

7.15 pm

These amendments are intended simply to kill trade, because nobody wanting a trade deal would accept such terms. Trade deals that allowed food to be imported from the poorest areas of the world, in particular in the developing world, would be impossible. The amendments would obviously kill off any prospect of any trade deal with anybody else. They would kill off our existing trade deals that the Minister is trying very hard to roll over with this Bill, and they might even render it impossible to secure a trade deal with the European Union. These are, therefore, trade-killing amendments. They are wholly unnecessary, and I urge the House to reject them.

Caroline Lucas: It is extremely interesting to follow the hon. Member for Witney (Robert Courts), who seems to be labouring under a completely false set of perceptions. First, the standards referred to in new clause 11, and indeed in many of these amendments, are the standards for products exported from country A to us here in country B. We are not making any comment about the products that are circulating within that country. We are simply saying that, if we want our farmers not to use sow stalls, for example, it makes no sense not to apply such conditions to the imports of food coming from countries that are using those standards. If our standards imply higher costs and we do not have some way of moderating the goods coming in from countries that are not imposing those standards, our farmers will be undercut. I really wish he would get his facts straight before standing up and saying that these amendments do not make sense, because they do.

I stand to speak to new clause 9, tabled in my name. New clause 9 stipulates that no international trade agreement may be ratified or implemented if it restricts the UK’s ability to pursue its climate and environmental goals. It requires the Government to make full implementation of multilateral environmental agreements by all participating nations the priority during trade negotiations, and to prioritise facilitating action to that end at the World Trade Organisation. It requires regular reporting on compliance with the above. Overall, it would ensure that the Government’s trade policy is in line with their international climate obligations and domestic environmental targets.

The Trade Bill should have been an opportunity to provide a clear direction of travel on the UK’s new trading status. It should have set out a democratic, environmentally and socially just framework for a new, pioneering and independent trade policy. The Conservative election manifesto promised that the Conservatives would not

“compromise on our high environmental protection, animal welfare and food standards.”

Yet, as we have seen, the gap between reality and rhetoric is a yawning gulf. We do not want yet more warm words and nice rhetoric. What we want are some red lines in the negotiations, and the way to get them is to write them into this Bill. That is all that those on the Opposition side of the House are asking for.

Instead, what we have with this Trade Bill is the same rehashed, controversial proposal from before the general election. It is one that fails completely to take account of the long-standing climate and nature crises or, indeed, of the covid-19 pandemic that has happened since. The UK’s objectives for trade deals must change to keep up. They must prioritise action to tackle the climate crisis, sustainable food supply chains, decent work and, as has been so sharply highlighted, universal and affordable access to medical supplies.

As it stands, this Bill risks undermining the UK’s social, labour, environmental and agricultural standards. It fails to ensure that imported products adhere to at least equivalent standards. I therefore welcome all the amendments that have the same objectives as my new clause 9, which would provide us with a framework for protecting the standards that keep us safe. This is not an academic discussion, as we know. We know that the US Administration have made it very clear that they want the UK to lower its food standards to allow the export of products currently banned in the UK, and that is why we need to be on our guard.

Steve Brine: I am listening to the hon. Member carefully, as I always do, but we are dealing in facts. She said, following my hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Robert Courts), that we should deal in facts; for the record, I thought he dealt in facts beautifully. Does she accept the point that the Food Standards Agency, for which I used to be responsible as a Minister, would have to propose any change in lowering regulatory standards—let us say, for instance, in how one washes chicken. It would have to propose such a regulatory change, which would have to be bought through these Houses of Parliament. Does she accept that as a fact?

Caroline Lucas: I am happy to accept that as a fact, but does the hon. Gentleman accept that the unwillingness of this Government to put their objectives into the Bill is causing massive concern? Thousands of people are writing to the Minister to say that they are deeply, deeply concerned, so why not put them in the Bill? Unless they are there, we are not going to take them seriously. *[Interruption.]* I am sorry; I just do not think that people are going to believe warm words; they want such things in the Bill.

We need to be listening to those people who are contacting the Minister. That includes, as we have heard before, not just the National Farmers Union, but many other organisations and many people from civil society. We also need to be listening to the science.

I want to end by speaking to the issue of climate change and the fact that all our policy arrangements going forward need to be aligned to the essential fact of not exceeding the threshold of 1.5°. This year, 2020, is on course to be the warmest ever. Aligning trade policy with environmental and climate objectives is not just something that would be good to do; it would be reckless and perilous to do anything else. Despite the hype of a brave new post-Brexit world, this Trade Bill

perpetuates the status quo. It is totally unfit for purpose from the point of view of standards; democratic scrutiny; secret courts that can also undermine values of the kind we want enshrined in trade Bills going forward.

Craig Williams: It gives me great pleasure to rise in this debate and I welcome the fact that the Minister sailed the Bill through Committee unamended. I say to the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas) that the rhetoric, facts and a couple of other statements that she made simply all mix together and I am afraid that I agree fundamentally with my hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Robert Courts). The fact that she wants something in the Bill that is already the law of the land gives excellent credence to what rhetoric is.

Caroline Lucas: One of the reasons that I want things in the Bill is that they might otherwise be changed through statutory instruments, which might not even see the sides of this Chamber. We want them in the Bill so we can have the debate here in this Chamber.

Craig Williams: The hon. Lady, I know, understands the process of this House probably better than me, and a statutory instrument sailing through this place without a vote on the Floor would mean a dereliction of duty by those on the Opposition Benches. I know as well as she does that it would be easy to facilitate such a vote. Not only that, but those on the Treasury Bench have been absolutely clear.

In the short time I have, I want to echo my right hon. Friend the Member for Chipping Barnet (Theresa Villiers), with whose thoughtful contribution at the start of the debate I agreed very much. I also pay tribute to my hon. Friend the Member for Tiverton and Honiton (Neil Parish), the Chair of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee. I think he is the grandfather of the commission we now have for trade and agriculture, although I do not want to age him. My hon. Friend did more to engage me with my farmers than the National Farmers Union has done in a decade. I suspect that was done in 10 minutes amending the last Bill, rather than what the NFU tried to do in an ongoing dialogue.

Fay Jones (Brecon and Radnorshire) (Con): My hon. Friend and constituency neighbour mentions the commission. We were lobbied by many of our farmers who urged us to set up that commission. The Government have listened. Does he agree that that is evidence of this Government listening to farmers and upholding our manifesto commitment?

Craig Williams: I dare not disagree with my parliamentary neighbour. I very much welcome the commission and I say to those on the Treasury Bench that it is welcomed by my farmers and my agricultural community. The membership of that commission gives a certain amount of comfort to the farmers I engage with daily in representing one of the largest agricultural communities in this country.

I want to focus for a second on what my hon. Friend the Member for Witney said around the subject of chlorinated chicken, which has become a lightning rod, a focus stone. I re-emphasise that there is an import ban in place; there is a law of the land in place that that cannot be imported into this country, and it would be an incredibly brave Government, Treasury Bench and Chief Whip who ever brought that issue to this House.

It seems to be Opposition Members, over and over again, who are trying to charge the whole debate emotionally with that product, despite the full knowledge that it is illegal to import it into this country. That brings shame on them for trying to whip the issue in such a fashion.

Charlotte Nichols (Warrington North) (Lab): The horsemeat scandal revealed significant vulnerabilities in the traceability of our food supply chain. Given that pork and horsemeat found their way into what was meant to be beef, does the hon. Gentleman not accept that we risk a similar scandal in future if additional protections for consumers against chlorine-washed chicken and hormone-fed beef are not written into the Bill?

Craig Williams: I have won the argument on chlorinated chicken and we have moved on to another product. I say to the hon. Lady that working with the Government, as I am with the Secretaries of State for both DEFRA and International Trade, on traceability, accountability and labelling, is the right thing to be doing—not making cheap political points in what is one of the most essential debates and Bills for this country right now.

I was trying to get to a point about the scrutiny in this place. As a member of the International Trade Committee, I commend our illustrious SNP Chair, who has brought real teeth and scrutiny to the process. The willingness of the Secretary of State and our negotiators to brief the Committee in private session has been extremely welcome.

The fact is that we have the CRaG procedure, which has been talked about at length—I see some Members starting to smile on the Opposition Benches. It would be an Opposition who really could not use the process to full advantage who could not bring a vote against any kind of trade deal that came forward. For anything to be able to be snuck through, there would have to be a complete dereliction of the Opposition's duties—never mind the Back Benchers on the Government side, who will hold our Government to account, as is our job.

Having spoken to the Minister on the Treasury Bench at length on these issues, I feel safe in the knowledge that the trade deals that we are doing will be welcomed in my farming and agricultural community. The deals will open up not just markets that that community wants, such as lamb to the United States of America—the second largest importer of that meat in the world. They are already opening up the beef market, which has been lying dormant for so many decades and they will enable the import of products of a reasonable standard. Consumers in my constituency and across the United Kingdom can take huge comfort from the import bans in place in the law, which will not be removed.

I know that there is a time limit and that other Members want to speak. I commend the Treasury Bench for their engagement with our farming community, with me and with the International Trade Committee. I commend the Bill unamended.

Ben Lake (Ceredigion) (PC): It is a pleasure to follow my constituency neighbour, the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire (Craig Williams). I begin on a point of consensus, for I fear that we might diverge a little as I proceed.

I am sure that the hon. Gentleman will agree with me that trade is an important part of the Welsh economy. It was worth £17.5 billion in 2019 alone. While the

[Ben Lake]

Government pursue trade deals across the world to explore new opportunities, the hon. Gentleman will also agree with me, I think, that they should not squander the opportunities on our doorstep. Although Wales is a proud global partner, we cannot escape the fact that at present more than 60% of Welsh exports are destined for our friends—and, hopefully, our continued close trading partners—in the European Union. I hope that negotiations with the EU will conclude without there being new barriers to that trade or additional costs for our businesses.

I am certain, however, that the UK's approach to trade with other members of the global community must champion the interests of each of the UK nations—an objective far more likely to be realised successfully if all four Governments of the UK play a role in formulating trade mandates and scrutinising negotiations as well as ratifying agreements.

I commend the remarks of the hon. Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie), who eloquently detailed the Bill's deficiencies in this regard; I add only that the Government should guarantee the democratic rights of the devolved Administrations in the Bill as well as offering legal protections to our public services and strengthening some of the safeguards when it comes to parliamentary scrutiny of standards.

Unfortunately, as it stands, the Bill in my opinion denies the role that the Welsh Parliament has in articulating Wales's interests. That is why Plaid Cymru has tabled new clause 18, to ensure that all four nations must consent to any trade deal struck in their name. We will also be supporting new clause 4, in addition to the amendments tabled by the hon. Member for Dundee East, which would ensure not only that that deficiency is addressed, but that UK parliamentary oversight is strengthened.

7.30 pm

There has been much debate in recent months about the issue of standards, especially those of agricultural and food imports. I put it on record that I welcome the establishment of the trade and Agriculture Commission, but I am concerned that a six-month remit will mean that such a valuable forum will not play a constant role in UK trade policy. I would appreciate the Minister addressing concerns conveyed to me as to how precisely the work of the commission will feed into some of the negotiations already under way. With Welsh food and drink exports worth more than £530 million in 2018 alone, Members will appreciate why international trade is such an important part of Wales's rural economy and why these concerns will feature heavily in some of my rural communities.

Before I conclude, I wish to add to the comments made by the hon. Gentleman about the need to reform the investor-state dispute mechanism. That is particularly important as we deal with the global socioeconomic consequences of covid-19. I welcome moves recently by the European Commission, as well as by some of the candidates to be director general of the World Trade Organisation, seeking to explore new multilateral investment courts to replace the investor-state dispute settlement system. I hope the Government will consider engaging constructively in those discussions. I hope the House will support new clause 4 and the amendments he tabled, as

I believe they will improve future UK trade policy and the integrity and our democratic engagement in those negotiations.

Katherine Fletcher (South Ribble) (Con): I say to the hon. Member for Ceredigion (Ben Lake) that it is a pleasure to follow such a thoughtful contribution—indeed, let me say *diolch yn fawr* to all three Welsh MPs who have just spoken.

I rise to add my voice to calls for more trade and more opportunities for business in global Britain, especially those close to my heart in South Ribble and wider Lancashire. This Bill allows for more than 40 existing trade agreements with other countries to be kept in place, for us to access a £1.3 trillion global procurement market and for us to protect vital industries from product dumping by overseas actors. Finally, we clear up the rules on sharing data in customs environments, all of which are vital to the health of our domestic and export businesses. This useful and practical Bill tidies up the details on laws currently with the EU and adding them to the UK's statute book.

I also rise to put to rest the concerns I have heard from many of the good people of South Ribble who have been worried by some of the noise and misunderstandings around the Bill.

Marco Longhi (Dudley North) (Con): Does my hon. Friend agree that Opposition Members wish simply to sow doubt among the public about the NHS? We have had 10 years in which to privatise it, but we have not done so. The last time it was privatised was in 2006, with Tony Blair's independent sector treatment centres. Does she agree that there is a certain amount of hypocrisy coming from those on the Opposition Benches?

Katherine Fletcher: My hon. Friend is entirely correct on that. Having been part of the Bill Committee in the past weeks, I have had the opportunity to hear at length the arguments made on this Bill and on today's amendments. I have listened hard to the details and drawn my own judgments. The advocacy for new amendments is strong and their proponents on the Opposition Benches articulate them well. They express fears that, at first glance, seem reasonable, but they are fears and not realities. I worry that Opposition Members are seeking to conflate what is actually in the Bill with fears about what could be in the Bill and wider conversations about trade. I know I am relatively new to this House, but that does not make sense to me. So what are the actualities of this piece? There is much noise about Parliament voting on future trade deals—we can do that, more so than is the case in other countries such as Australia and New Zealand. The CRAg process allows us to vote on trade deals and if we change our own law on trade, we will vote on that in this place too.

In reference to new clause 4, I must draw on my business background. As anyone who has negotiated any type of deal before knows, if you are at a table and have to say, "I agree but I have to get 650 other people to agree", it rather ties your hands in the negotiation. Let us trust our elected Government to act in the best interests of global Britain, and as hon. Friends have mentioned, trust those on these Back Benches to hold them to account. Should it be needed, there is still a backstop. If we, as a Parliament, need to block a trade

deal after negotiation, we can. If it changes our laws, it will need a vote in this place, and FTAs cannot, by their nature, unilaterally change UK law. This is similar to Canada's system, and it is forging on with trade deals and doing all right.

I have had much correspondence from the people of South Ribble raising concerns about our farmers and their wonderful, quality produce. People say, "You need to reassure constituents. There is concern that if a clear and explicit Government commitment to uphold food standards is not included in the Trade Bill, existing food law, including retained law, could easily be changed." If I were in their shoes listening to that, I would be worried too. Let me put their fears to rest. We will not remove the UK's current food standards. For example, hormones and chlorine in food are banned now and will remain banned—full stop. The current standards are in EU law and will be rolled over when we leave the transition period. We have promised to keep import standards in place, and we will. For those concerned about having a say, should they ever be changed, that will be voted on here in the UK Parliament.

If we put food standards rules into this Bill and ask those overseas to adhere to them, then we are asking those abroad to abide by our law. That is something we would not and do not accept from other countries, and our friends abroad will almost certainly say, "No thanks. That will put a restriction on trade that will hurt us—let's not." To put it another way, putting food standards regulation into a Bill rolling EU law into UK law is a bit like putting a frock on a frog: it will look more than a bit out of place down at the negotiating pond, and people will be disappointed when they kiss it and it does not turn out to be a protectionist princess. There is a right place to protect the UK's food standards when products are imported, and we will, but it is not this Bill.

Sarah Olney (Richmond Park) (LD): It is always a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for South Ribble (Katherine Fletcher), as I recall I did when she made her maiden speech. I rise to speak in support of new clause 4 tabled by the hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly), who I know is scheduled to speak immediately after me and will doubtless give a detailed account of the reasons for it. In anticipation of that, I wish to set out why the Liberal Democrats support it.

From 1 January 2021, the UK will be setting out on its own for the first time in nearly 40 years in developing its own independent trade policy and negotiating its own trade agreements. The implications of this step on everyday life in the UK are huge, and possibly not yet fully appreciated. Trade negotiations are complex and delicate. Securing access to international markets for one sector may mean conceding international access to our domestic markets for another. Securing preferential treatment on tariffs for some of our goods may mean relaxing import controls on something else.

We have a complex economy currently disrupted by the need to beat the coronavirus, and on the verge of major change as we transition away from carbon-emitting activity. Technological change offers both threat and opportunity. We must also consider that our economy is imperfect in its distribution of wealth and opportunity, and look for ways to address this challenge. Increasingly, the UK is being called on to stand up for the defence of fundamental human rights and liberal democracy and

use the powers at its disposal to effect change internationally. Our trade policy and agreements touch on all those urgent challenges. How can we best leverage our economic advantages to deliver current and future prosperity for UK citizens and influence peaceful progress abroad?

To determine that those decisions are best made behind closed doors without consultation or discussion is an assault on our very idea of what Parliament is for. We need to balance all the competing pressures from different economic sectors and geographical regions, fully considering the impact on different groups of workers, and determine whether we prioritise climate commitments over economic growth. How can that be done effectively without recourse to Parliament? The British people deserve to have their interests properly represented when these questions are being asked and for the answers given by Ministers to be put on the public record and judged accordingly.

I also speak in support of new clause 9 tabled by the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas) and supported by the Liberal Democrats because we recognise the urgency of taking action against the very real threat of climate change. It is essential that we enshrine that urgency in our trade legislation, so that negotiating partners know, before the first papers are exchanged, that they must comply with our environmental goals. Our economy is transitioning away from carbon emissions, in accordance with the democratic mandate to achieve net zero carbon by 2050, and that progress must be underpinned in every trade agreement we negotiate. Our commitment to net zero cannot be traded away in pursuit of other goals.

The Liberal Democrats have also tabled amendments that relate to dispute resolution and human rights. Dispute resolution is fundamental to ensuring that democratic decision making that relates to the expenditure of taxpayers' money, or regulation of food standards, cannot be undermined by law suits from foreign corporations. At this stage, the UK Government should rule out any use of investor-state dispute settlement procedures from UK trade deals, to safeguard our ability to determine our own regulatory environment, without the threat of sanction from foreign investors. That is fundamental to ensuring that our NHS remains free at the point of use for all UK citizens, and that we set our own standards on animal welfare and food quality.

Earlier I referred to the UK's powers to effect change internationally, and to how we can use our trade agreements as leverage. We have been forcefully reminded of our need to use those powers to influence foreign partners to respect human rights, thanks to recent events in Hong Kong and China. It would send a powerful message to the Chinese regime, and to others around the world who hope to trade with us, if we enshrined in law our commitment to upholding human rights as a non-negotiable element of our trade deals. That message will be compelling only if we lead by example, and that example starts with parliamentary oversight of negotiating mandates and trade deals. I implore colleagues to support new clause 4 this evening.

Mr Djanogly: I speak to the new clauses tabled in my name, and those of others, concerning the scrutiny of free trade agreements. Simply put, today the House must address the question of whether, post Brexit, the UK will have less scrutiny of free trade agreements than

[Mr Djanogly]

we had before Brexit. That is the current Government proposal, which I suggest flies in the face of the claim that we leave the EU to take back control. The Government have split FTAs into two categories. First, and in the Bill, are all trade agreements that the EU signed with third countries before Brexit, which the Government wish to roll over to become agreements with the UK. Secondly, and not in the Bill, there are FTAs with any other countries, such as the US.

New clause 4 suggests a new scrutiny process for all FTAs. It will still be the Executive that negotiate FTAs, but Parliament would get a yes/no vote on the negotiating objectives and, importantly, on the final draft agreement, as happens in the US and Japan. Not only has such a provision not ended up in the Bill, but the Government's position has seemingly reverted to us having less scrutiny than we had as a member of the EU. For the past 40 years, the EU has negotiated our trade deals, and as part of the EU scrutiny process, a yes/no vote would be taken by the EU Parliament on the draft FTA, prior to signature.

Neil Parish (Tiverton and Honiton) (Con): Does my hon. Friend welcome the commitment from our Government on welfare and the environment, and all the conditions in the Bill? Does he find it somewhat confusing that the Government will not accept new clause 4? Surely scrutiny is fine, because they are going to do exactly what they said they will do.

Mr Djanogly: I absolutely agree. In January 2018, on Second Reading of the 2017-19 Bill, the then Secretary of State stood up and said that he would be looking for a new approval process and take soundings on that, but that has simply not happened. As things stand, there is no longer a parliamentary veto, and no formal scrutiny committee has yet been established, despite US negotiations having started.

The important point of a parliamentary veto is not that it is often used, but rather, as seen in other Parliaments, that it encourages the Executive to seek consensus on their negotiating mandate, and keeps legislators in touch during negotiations through regular discourse and discussion. A wise Executive will naturally wish to avoid an unnecessary bust-up just before signing an FTA. Of course, that is where it all went wrong with the TTIP negotiations between the US and the EU, because the US Congress and the EU Parliament were disclosing information to their respective elected representatives that was not provided to UK parliamentarians.

Richard Fuller: My hon. Friend is mentioning very large trade deals. Does he mean that the crux of this oversight is really required with those big trade deals, such as those with the US, China, and the trans-Pacific partnership?

Mr Djanogly: New clause 4 does deal with all trade deals, but obviously the amount of scrutiny would be proportionate.

7.45 pm

As a result of the disclosures, and with the inevitable leaks, the whole debate surrounding thousands of lines of deal negotiations on TTIP was reduced to accusations

of selling the NHS and Brits being forced to eat American chlorinated chicken. I totally take the point of my hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Robert Courts) that that was a false accusation. One might have thought that the UK Government had learned their lesson from that TTIP experience.

The Bill needs to provide a statutory framework that encourages the Government to take early-stage consultation and ongoing soundings through the course of FTA negotiations, in order that business, digital, farming, environmental and international development representatives, and other citizens, feel that they are being listened to, with similar rights to their counterparts in the country with which we are negotiating. Sadly, that is not currently the Government's position.

The Minister constantly suggests that the CRaG process, allowing a short delay mechanism before ratification, is adequate. This is the same CRaG process that was implemented by Labour in 2010 at a time when the UK had the EU parliamentary veto. By the way, it is also the same process that was described in 2019 by the Lords Constitution Committee as "anachronistic and inadequate."

The Minister suggests that the Trade Committee could be utilised to provide scrutiny for proposed new FTAs, a plan that I totally support. Let us assume that the trade development Department, and therefore its Committee, will survive a rumoured merger with the Foreign Office. Even so, and despite negotiations with the US and Japan having already started, no such detailed arrangements with the International Trade Committee have yet been agreed. We know that from an on-the-record letter sent from the Chair of the Committee to the Secretary of State on 18 June. If the position has changed, the Minister should take this opportunity to put that on the record.

I am not suggesting that MPs should be able to impede Government negotiations on FTAs. Nor am I saying that MPs should be able to amend draft FTAs. However, proper scrutiny means that we need legislation that provides for Parliament to approve FTAs on a yes or no basis before they are signed, which is why, without having received any Government offer to redress the issue, I shall ask that new clause 4 is voted on this evening.

I have many amendments and not very much time, but I shall get in what I can. Amendment 1 questions whether the time has come, or actually came at the start of this year, to draw a line under the 20 potential roll-over agreements not yet activated. The last roll-over signed was with Kosovo, just before Brexit, and since then it has become clear that most potential roll-over countries wish to see what we do with the EU first, such as Canada.

Japan has offered a quick deal, but that will not be a roll-over deal, as it appears that we are being offered something less than the EU's deal with Japan. However, under this legislation the Japan deal will still be treated as a roll-over for scrutiny purposes. That somewhat undermines the Government's main contention to date that a light scrutiny regime for roll-overs is appropriate as the deal has already been scrutinised by the EU Parliament. I do not just mean Japan. The clause 2 powers may have been suitable before Brexit, when the Bill was drafted in 2017, but I suggest that they should now be looked at again.

Catherine West: I rise to speak to new clauses 17 and 11, and on the principles of workers' rights, national health service protection, and environmental and human rights. First, in relation to workers' rights, we could not imagine a trade deal with such a country as Colombia when we know that the International Trade Union Confederation rates it as the most dangerous place to be a trade unionist. That means that the lives of many Members in the Chamber, who may be members of a trade union, could be at risk. To begin a trade deal with such a country without even mentioning workers' rights seems to me to be absolutely ridiculous.

The problem with the Bill is how silent it is. It is silent on workers' rights, as I have said. It is silent on the real protection of the NHS. We have had some reassurance on the NHS, but in particular I am worried about medicines and the cost of medicines, and about our data. We know that the national health service, unified as it is, provides the most fantastic data for research and for pharmaceutical companies. My fear is that, if we do not have more protection in the Bill, it will be open to those companies, through whichever country they are based in, to have a kind of values-free trade negotiation, which we as MPs will not be able to scrutinise effectively, and they could end up using our data, which, given the extent, longevity and detail of that data, is probably the best health data in the world. I therefore seek reassurances from the Minister on that specific point.

On environmental concerns, in leaving the European Union, we are leaving the gold standard of environmental protections, but it would be easy to write that protection in and lead on that in this Bill. Instead, the Bill is almost values free in terms of the importance of the environment. After covid, climate change and dealing with the climate emergency are probably the biggest concerns of our generation.

Many Members have mentioned the gold standard of food. I would also say that not everybody can afford to shop at Waitrose, which is the supermarket that has said that it will not buy low-quality goods. Many people will not be able to afford not to buy the cheapest food, particularly following the economic crash we are entering, the worst recession for 200 years, so we have to see the Bill in that context.

Barry Gardiner: Does my hon. Friend agree that many people who go to restaurants or to fast-food outlets will have no way of knowing the provenance of the food that they are consuming? It is not simply a matter of labelling in the supermarkets.

Catherine West: My hon. Friend makes such an important point. It is one that I will not repeat.

On the question of our role in this place, surely the past four years have taught us that people want us to be here to make these decisions. Tucking away a bit of legislation in the Library for 21 days is not what we are here for, and nor is running upstairs to an SI when we are in the middle of all-party group and all the rest. We need to have proper scrutiny in this place and the Select Committee needs to have an enhanced role. Having enjoyed my time on the International Trade Committee, I feel very strongly that it should have a key role in ratifying the role of the Trade Remedies Authority Commissioner. If that six-month commission continues, the Committee should also have a role in appointing

its head. I will be lobbying very hard with colleagues who represent very rural seats—unlike Hornsey and Wood Green, which is one of the most urban seats—to have a proper commissioner continue in that role. Why have it for six months? Let us have it forever. Let us have the International Trade Committee ratifying those two appointments. Let us also have a trade union voice and an industry voice on the TRA. If there is one thing that we have learned from covid, it is how well the TUC has worked and how well the CBI has worked together. They have led our Government and told them what to do on covid. Why cannot they do that with the Trade Bill?

We can get on. We can move forward together, but we must try to militate against this strong executive model that we have been saddled with by having these other checks and balances in place. We can do that through this Bill tonight and by supporting the sensible cross-party clauses, which share a lot of support. Let us try to enjoy that consensus building because we are in a new chapter. Let us not spoil it by having an inferior Trade Bill that is silent on the key issues of the day that concern us, be they human rights in China, environmental standards, which we have had a legacy of from our 40 years in the European Union, or the important question of what we are doing here as MPs.

Paul Girvan (South Antrim) (DUP): It is an honour to follow the hon. Member for Hornsey and Wood Green (Catherine West). The Bill is an opportunity for us to take a nimble approach to doing business for the future for our country. I say an “opportunity”. In listening to some Members tonight, I see it as probably a hindrance, because they will seek every opportunity to frustrate the Bill and to make it more difficult to drive it through. There is talk of reporting back on every single deal that is being done. I am not an advocate of playing cards or anything like it, but definitely that is showing your full hand, which is not a wise thing to do. I am not saying that you should be playing poker, but I have been in business and I know what it is like: you do not let your enemies, or those with whom you are doing business, know what you are doing, and you can work out a deal every way.

However, we have concerns about many areas. We have had a very strong lobby in relation to our agrifood and agricultural industry, especially from those involved in the fishing industry.

Jim Shannon: Does my hon. Friend agree that our fishing industry similarly needs the Trade Bill, to show our strength of purpose and ability to stand outside EU rules and regulations and stand upon the quality of goods and services we are ready, willing and able to provide throughout the world? The fishing sector can grow if it is given the opportunity.

Paul Girvan: I agree with my hon. Friend about our fishing industry. We have a fantastic product. I have eaten in many countries around the world, and I understand why they would want to buy Northern Ireland produce—it is the best in the world. You will know that if you have had a soda farl from Northern Ireland; I know of some previous Secretaries of State who can bear that out.

We have had the agrifood sector lobbying us. Many in our farming sector lobbied us about changes that they wanted to be made to the Agriculture Bill, which went through the House recently. We see this as a second

[Paul Girvan]

opportunity to give protection. I understand that some say we already have protection within legislation. I do not always say that it is important to gold-plate things, but sometimes we have to reinforce the stance that we are taking. That has to happen, and it is important that we support our farmers.

Carla Lockhart (Upper Bann) (DUP): Does my hon. Friend agree that the devolved Administrations play a key role in any future trade policy, and that given Northern Ireland's dependence on agriculture, it is vital that this Government listen to the devolved regions?

Paul Girvan: I am a great Unionist. I believe that we are part of the United Kingdom and we should be working together to ensure that we get the best bang for our buck, to use an American term, as a United Kingdom. That is vital.

We already have protection in some areas. I come from an engineering background. We lead the world in electrical standards. Many other countries manufacture a lot more, but we lead in electrical safety. We set those safety standards. We make sure that goods coming into our country are made to those standards. Sony makes the monitors that we have in the Chamber. It makes specific monitors that are only for the UK, because we have such stringent electrical standards. It has the flexibility to do that. There are farms in Europe and throughout the world that make food to sell into our market that is bespoke, just to suit our market. That can be done, and it is being done. I want to make sure that we give our farmers and our industry an opportunity to export on to the world stage, so that our product is sold. We can use this Bill to do that.

Sammy Wilson: Northern Ireland farmers export to 70 countries in the world, many of which have lower standards than the rest of the United Kingdom. The goods are valued because of the standard of the product. Apart from the fact that there will be a requirement to change primary legislation, is that not yet another indication that there is no incentive for us to lower standards, because we would lose those markets that we are exporting to?

Paul Girvan: I agree with my right hon. Friend. We do not want to lower our standards. We do not want a race to the bottom. We want to bring others up to the standard that we have set. We have set the bar fairly high, but by setting the bar so high, we have additional cost, which makes it more difficult for us to compete on the world stage. It is vital that we address that through whatever measures we have to put in place, with subsidy for our farming, to ensure that our product is still viable and economically possible for the housewife to buy—I used the wrong term; I apologise. We have to ensure that those who are buying their basket of fruit in a supermarket will be able to get the best value for it.

I support the Bill, but I also support new clauses 4 and 7, because they address some of the concerns that we as a nation have and Northern Ireland in particular has.

Neil Parish: It is a great pleasure to speak after the hon. Member for South Antrim (Paul Girvan). Agriculture and fisheries are very important in this country, including in Northern Ireland, and as we go forward and do trade deals, family farms and family fishing are important.

8 pm

I very much welcome the Secretary of State's putting in place the Trade and Agriculture Commission, especially as it is to be led by Tim Smith, who I believe will be an independent chair of that commission. I assure the House that we will make sure that whatever findings with which the commission comes forward will be heard on the Floor of the House. We will make sure, too, that we will hold Ministers and the Government to account on our future trade policy.

I believe that the Government are honourable in putting into our manifesto a real commitment to the environment, animal welfare and trading visions as we move forward in our new trade policy, but we must always reinforce that and make sure that it happens. Our Prime Minister is keen on getting trade deals with the whole of the world, and I very much welcome that—I am not one of the old corn laws farmers who want to make protection part of the new trade system—but when we are negotiating, let us make sure that happens, because in that great moment of trying to bring about a trade deal, agriculture, food and the environment might not be quite as high up the list of importance as they should be. The City of London and all these other matters are hugely important to this country, but so too are our welfare standards for food production.

It is about not only welfare conditions and environmental conditions but the cost of production. If the cost of production is lower in other countries and animal welfare standards are lower, that will put our farmers out of business. Sonny Perdue, the US Secretary of Agriculture, went on Radio 4 and said that animal welfare is protectionism and told us to let our farmers compete. Well, we know what he means by that. I do not actually disagree with him: I disagree with his method of farming and with what is going on in the United States, with higher density of population in poultry and hormones in beef, but it is quite right for him to be able to argue that those are the standards in America so we should lower our standards to compete. I would say to Sonny Perdue, "Why don't you raise your standards in America and compete with us?", but I suspect that that is not going to happen. That is why we have to go into trade negotiations with our eyes open and make sure that we get a good deal.

Trade agreements are good for our economy, provided that the agreement is right. We can get a trade agreement just for the sake of a trade agreement—so that we can tick that particular box, tick off that country and say we have a great trade agreement—but it will be a great trade agreement only if it is actually good for what we produce and for what the other country produces. I accept that we can get more lamb into America, and that will be a very good thing, but what if we do trade deals in future with countries such as Brazil? What does Brazil do? It ploughs up the savannah, it grows soya, cereals and sugar, and it pushes cattle into the rainforest and knocks it down to produce beef.

Let us be absolutely clear as we move forward and let us keep the trade and food commission in place, because it will give the Government the right information that they and our trade negotiators need to enter into trade negotiations and deliver a deal that is right for all people and all industry in this country.

Anna McMorris (Cardiff North) (Lab): The standards, protections and rights that we have all come to enjoy are put at risk by this Bill. The rules that govern trade must strike at the heart of the values that we expect of ourselves and each other. Trade policy must therefore be transparent and subject to thorough parliamentary scrutiny, and it must respect all the nations of the UK. On that, the Bill fails.

Now more than ever, as this country builds back better, we must ensure that the health of people and the planet are protected; that standards, workers' rights and welfare rights are raised; and that our society becomes more resilient and sustainable. There can be no rolling back of rights, no undercutting of protections, no selling out of our values and no compromise on standards.

At a time when we face so many crises—on three fronts: health, climate and the economy—all aspects of Government policy must be aimed at mitigating and eradicating those crises. However, despite the rhetoric, the Government yet again fail. Neither the environment nor climate are even mentioned in the Bill. The world's poorest already bear the heaviest burden of climate breakdown. Trade policy must be rebalanced, putting justice and fairness at the heart of future agreements. There must be recognition from the Government that their lax approach on the environment in trade policy will lead to the promotion of cheaper but drastically higher-carbon and poorer-quality imported goods. That is bad for business, bad for people and bad for jobs, with UK producers, creators and innovators being undercut, and it will be a disaster for our environment.

First and foremost, the UK's future trade agreements must be compatible with our commitment to keep global warming to a maximum of 1.5°C by the end of this century. Trade policy must have embedded at its legal core the Paris climate agreement and the UN sustainable development goals. Only then can we guarantee a base commitment over trade policy that will be legally binding and will work progressively towards the kind of high recovery that we desperately need.

The Bill is also detrimental to food standards, the future prosperity of the UK's agriculture sector and animal welfare rights. This is the week of the Royal Welsh show, when farmers and food experts come together in Llanellwedd to celebrate our great produce. Those farmers have really helped to put food on our tables during this crisis, but the Bill does nothing to help them—it will only weaken them. Despite UK Government promises to farmers and food producers that we would accept no watering down of standards, the Government continue to pursue the prospect of agricultural market access for the United States, where we know quality falls well below that of the UK. A selling-out of our farmers and appeasement over action—that is what we get with this Government.

This is window-dressing scrutiny while Government machinery continues to proceed down the same calamitous path. Far from handing power to Wales, the Bill will hollow out the right to regulate the standard of goods.

Anthony Mangnall (Totnes) (Con): It is always unsettling when I speak in the Chamber and my colleagues seem to leave and the Whips come in. I reassure them that I am on their side this time. I commend the Bill in its entirety.

I listened carefully to Members from across the House as they raised concerns over food standards and scrutinising the quality of our trade deals, but we must take the Bill alongside the Environment Bill and the Agriculture Bill, and the Fisheries Bill when it comes through this place. The Agriculture Bill took the steps that many in this House and in this debate have been calling for. On welfare standards, the Government have moved to a position where they are performing a consultation on labelling, which I assure hon. Members does not yet go far enough for me; I will be hot on their heels in making sure that we have an extensive labelling system for agricultural produce that is sold in the UK and that goes through restaurants and supermarkets.

However, the Government have also committed to a commission—I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Tiverton and Honiton (Neil Parish) that its six-month remit should be extended—which actually gives us the opportunity to scrutinise and to uphold the standards of our food and the welfare standards of our imports. That is important, and I do not think it can be expressed enough. It is what the NFU called for and it is what the NFU got, which we should be very clear about. That commitment is there in black and white in the Agriculture Bill, and it is exactly what the Opposition want, so to keep going on and on that we are lowering our standards is a fallacy.

Reading the Bill and looking at the amendments, I see that one of the benefits is recognising the export potential. We are trying in my constituency to take the benefits of Brixham fish or oceanographic technology manufactured in Totnes and export it across the world and open up new markets for it. The Bill allows that.

I am afraid that my colleagues from Northern Ireland pipped me to the post by mentioning the fishing sector, but there is a huge opportunity in the Bill. We can now open up new markets in the far east. The Bill allows us to do that, and we must support it in its entirety. I should also add that in doing so, we can start allowing ourselves to strengthen the Union.

I have listened to Members from Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland talk about their produce and exporting it around the world, and it is time to revamp and strengthen the Board of Trade, listening to what is the best of each of those areas and then helping export it to the international community. That will not only strengthen the Union, which I am sure all Members of the House will agree about, but allow us to be able to reach those markets.

Anna McMorris: Does the hon. Gentleman believe that weakening devolution and taking back powers from the devolved Administrations means strengthening the Union, because I do not?

Anthony Mangnall: That is exactly why the Board of Trade was reintroduced by my right hon. Friend the Member for North Somerset (Dr Fox). When he reintroduced the Board of Trade, it was about enhancing and developing a conversation with the devolved Administrations to make sure we were listening to what was in their areas and taking them forward to the international markets. It is no good saying we are not listening and not working together, because that is exactly what we are doing.

[Anthony Mangnall]

The Bill covers a number of significant areas where we will be able to reopen and reinvigorate our export markets. Through that, we will be able to reinvigorate those sectors that we hold dear in this country and uphold the standards that are so important. I commend the Bill.

Mary Kelly Foy (City of Durham) (Lab): This Trade Bill is deeply flawed. I have been contacted by countless constituents and campaigns, each highlighting a different failing of the Bill. It seems that everyone is opposed to it, except for the Government.

While the Government may argue that the Bill simply allows for continuity, the reality is that it sets a precedent for future trade legislation. Its main failing is the lack of parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals. That the Bill is essentially designed to allow for a new trade framework after we leave the European Union makes that failing deeply ironic. When people voted to take back control, I suspect they meant for the people and Parliament, not Ministers and unelected advisers. To be honest, the idea that we should trust the power to approve trade deals to Ministers is laughable.

Last month, we debated the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government having overruled his own inspector in favour of his friend and party donor, despite admitting an apparent bias. On top of that, we have Government contracts seemingly being handed out to businesses with links to Ministers and advisers. Parliament has a right to scrutinise and debate every aspect of government, especially in matters as important as trade deals. The fact that Government Members do not appear to agree with that is deeply worrying, although not surprising.

However, it is not just the lack of scrutiny that is the problem, but the lack of protections. It is no secret that the US Government want a trade deal where the NHS is on the table along with our higher food standards. It is also no secret that there are those in government who would sell off our NHS as soon as they thought they could get away with it. These last few months, the NHS and its staff, along with other key workers, have been all that have stood between Britain and complete devastation. They have given their energy, their health and, in some cases, even their lives. Rather than thanking them with applause and praise, let us start by having a Trade Bill that ensures the NHS is off the table by enshrining that measure in law.

Then there is the issue of food standards. My inbox is full of constituents worried that this Government are so desperate for a US trade deal that they will water down food standards, allowing for chlorine-washed chicken and hormone-treated beef to be sold on the shelves of British shops. No doubt the Government will say that is scaremongering, but I ask them to explain to the farmers and voters in my constituency why they will not place food standards guarantees in the Bill. Finally, the Bill lacks any guarantee of workers' rights, human rights or environmental protections. They are vital to protecting our planet, and to improving living and working conditions across the world. They must be a condition of any trade deal and must be included in the Bill.

8.15 pm

In order to approve the Bill, the Government are asking us to trust their judgment. Unfortunately for them, we on the Labour Benches have actually seen where that judgment takes us. Based on my inbox, the public do not trust the Government to negotiate these types of deals. The Government insist that the NHS is not on the table in the trade deal, that any trade deal must meet existing British food standards and that they intend to uphold workers' rights and environmental protections. If that is the case, they should accept the Opposition's amendments today and commit those pledges in law. If they do not, we have proof of what we already suspect: that they are ready to sell off to the highest bidder.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. After the next speaker, the time limit on Back-Bench speeches will be three minutes. That does not apply to Kate Osborne, who has four minutes.

Kate Osborne (Jarrow) (Lab): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Ahead of today's debate, and like my hon. Friend the Member for City of Durham (Mary Kelly Foy), I received hundreds of emails from constituents asking me to ensure that the NHS is kept off the table in any trade negotiations. I share their concerns. We know that the United States and Donald Trump expect a trade deal very much on their own terms. We also know that for the President of the United States the interests of corporate America come first and that he will demand that the NHS pays higher prices for US drugs in a trade deal with the UK.

Over 60% of my constituency of Jarrow voted in favour of leaving the European Union in 2016, but they did not expect it to lead to our NHS being controlled from outside the UK. Over the past few months, the NHS has coped tremendously throughout the peak of the coronavirus pandemic, even though it has not been properly funded for years—over 10 years—owing to the Government's unnecessary and unwelcome programme of austerity. The coronavirus pandemic has demonstrated the importance of healthcare being accessible to all. However, as the Bill currently stands, it gives no protection to our NHS. We know that our NHS has already been turned into a market, making services vulnerable to being included in the deal unless they are clearly and comprehensively excluded. I can see no evidence so far that the Government want to ring-fence the NHS and keep it out of trade discussions.

The Bill also gives no role for Parliament to review or oversee trade agreements, weakening parliamentary democracy. Those on the Government Benches argue that the UK has taken back control of its trade policy, but do they not find it ironic that, compared with what is being proposed now, there was more parliamentary scrutiny and democratic oversight of trade policy when we were part of the European Union?

We also need to ensure that both public health and social care data relating to UK citizens are protected. Research by Global Justice Now concluded that the United States wants its companies to have unrestricted access to UK data, including NHS health records. The value of that health data is estimated to be about £10 billion a year. The Bill in its current form gives free

rein to UK data being moved to servers in America. That could mean that the NHS would be unable to analyse its own health data without paying royalties and could find itself buying back, at considerable expense, diagnostic tools, medical technologies and expertise, even when they have been created from freely exported NHS data.

It is not just the NHS that is at risk. The Bill, as it currently stands, says nothing about climate change, human rights or workers' rights. We need to ensure that any Bill passed protects the employment rights or terms and conditions of employment for public sector employees and those working in publicly funded health or care sectors. Failure to protect our NHS will be yet another broken promise from Boris Johnson that insults us all, but particularly the sacrifices made by our wonderful NHS and care staff. Failing to protect our NHS will mean that instead of a pay rise and a stronger NHS, we will get more US companies profiteering from our ill health. However, it is not too late to put in place strong protections for our NHS, and I call on the Government to commit to protecting our health service so that it cannot be subjected to yet more privatisation through trade deals.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. Members might wonder why I am persistently calling those on the Opposition side of the House and no one on the Government side of the House. I will pre-empt a point of order by explaining that because of the rigid system that we are currently operating, when someone pulls out of speaking, I have no flexibility to go on to the next person on the other side of the House. Therefore, we will have another speaker from the Opposition—I call Navendu Mishra.

Navendu Mishra (Stockport) (Lab): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. With Britain heading out of the EU on 31 December, it appears that the Government are determined that everything must go in their post-Christmas sale, from food standards to our environmental commitments. This should be an opportunity to improve and strengthen existing trade deals and use them to provide an even better return for this country. Instead, we are faced with the prospect of everything being on the table and sold to the highest bidder, as President Trump stated on his visit to the UK last year. As we know from the leaked documents that the Labour party was able to obtain last year, the US is seeking full market access to even the jewel in Britain's crown: the national health service—and that is just what we know from the papers that were not heavily redacted.

Food standards should be sacred. We do not want chlorine-washed chicken in a can or, for that matter, meat treated with growth hormones, or pork from animals that have been injected with drugs to make them leaner. We should also reject the long list of foods being produced in the United States by dangerous and cruel methods, regardless of whether higher taxes are applied to them, because even those tariffs will be scrapped within just 10 years, as the International Trade Secretary has stated, further enabling the US to secure comprehensive access to our food markets while at the same time achieving the ultimate goal of “reducing or eliminating tariffs”.

More than a million members of the public have signed a petition to protect food standards, but to date it appears that the Government have taken little notice. It is little wonder, therefore, that they are now facing the rebellion by their Back Benchers. There must be proper scrutiny of this process and Parliament should have a veto on any trade deal. Both this place and the other place should have a say over whether to approve any new deal that is agreed with any other country. Why should we leave ourselves at the mercy of the word of this Government, who cannot be trusted to deliver anything, without legislative guarantees and beholden to US food trade associations, which have enormous lobbying power and one goal in mind—profit? It should not be left to big business to challenge laws and regulations simply because they inhibit foreign investment.

Like human rights, the issue of climate change should be central to our future considerations of trade policy, but worryingly there is no mention of it in the Trade Bill, and the record for different countries, when it comes to environmental protections, is not suggested as a consideration in negotiating future trade agreements with them. New trade agreements must be compatible with our commitment to stop global warming passing the point of no return. We cannot simply trade away our commitments on climate change in pursuit of trade deals. Indeed, it should be quite the opposite: trade agreements should be used to improve environmental standards abroad and ensure that climate justice and fairness are at the heart of future trade deals. The Government must think again before selling their standards for a quick buck.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): As three Government Back Benchers in a row have failed to appear in the Chamber, we will go straight to Carla Lockhart.

Carla Lockhart (Upper Bann) (DUP): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is vital that as we shape our future trade policy, we do it in a way that maximises the benefits of our new-found independence but does not sacrifice key industries in the UK. In the context of an economy facing the greatest challenges in my lifetime due to covid-19, we are certainly not in a place where we can sacrifice any industry, let alone the backbone of our economy: our agriculture industry.

It is not too long ago that the Agriculture Bill was debated in this House. In my contribution to that debate, I made clear the importance of protecting British farming and the high standards that it upholds in any future trade agreement. The opportunity to enshrine all that is good about our agriculture industry in that Bill was not taken at that time. That was deeply regrettable and caused much concern among my constituents.

In this Bill we have another opportunity—an opportunity to make it clear to the farmers and agrifood businesses that have been an essential component of the national effort against coronavirus that they will not be sacrificed in any future trade agreements. Indeed, we ought to be exploring how we can help the industry to thrive in coming years and to share in the benefits of life outside the EU. To do that, the fundamental building block is standards. In the context of our agriculture industry,

[Carla Lockhart]

future trade policy must respect the high production standards in terms of animal welfare and environmental protection to which our farmers adhere. We know that comes at considerable cost to local farmers and that overseas farmers have significant cost-of-production advantages due to lower regulatory requirements. In simple terms, if the UK market is flooded with substandard products, it will result in the demise of the industry.

To that end, the establishment of a Trade and Agriculture Commission is very welcome, and I thank the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland for ensuring that the voice of Northern Ireland is heard on the commission by appointing Mr Victor Chestnutt, the incoming president of the Ulster Farmers Union. In addition to that forum, however, we need to ensure that Parliament has a strong voice and a meaningful say in the shape of future trade agreements in relation to mandating, negotiating principles and approval of any such deals. Our role should be proactive, not passive. That is why we support new clause 4. Parliament's role must be enhanced ahead of negotiations; it should be for Parliament to scope out the critical negotiating objectives; to ensure that the interests of all parts of the UK are actively considered and prioritised, the devolved Administrations should also have a meaningful role.

We recognise the important provision the new clause makes for sustainability impact assessments, such as of environmental effect, the impact on animal welfare and health concerns. That ensures compliance with current—

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. The hon. Lady has exceeded her time by quite a long way. I call Antony Higginbotham.

Antony Higginbotham (Burnley) (Con): It is a pleasure to follow the hon. Member for Upper Bann (Carla Lockhart). Having spoken on Second Reading and been a member of the Public Bill Committee on the Bill, it is a pleasure to speak today. I intend to speak mainly about new clause 4, but first I want to say that it is worth the House remembering that this is a continuity Bill, designed to give confidence and continuity to the hundreds of thousands of businesses in this country that export to many, many countries, from Switzerland to South Korea to Chile, that they can continue to do so. I also want to voice my agreement with everything my hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Robert Courts) said about how many of the amendments tabled, particularly those to do with standards, are actually anti-trade measures that will do nothing to support our exporters and everything to kill off trade.

In relation to new clause 4, it is important that we remember and that our constituents are aware that Members of Parliament already have and will continue to have the ability to scrutinise international treaties that the Government negotiate. The Constitutional Reform and Governance Act gives all Members of Parliament those powers, so under the law as it already stands, if we are not happy with the contents of an international treaty, it will not be ratified. Also, I cannot subscribe to the view that Parliament needs to be more involved in negotiations, because I, like all of my constituents in

Burnley and Padiham, watched the scenes in this place not that long ago when Parliament tried to be involved in negotiations, and instead of helping, it hindered them. This place was paralysed and the country was paralysed. Votes held on options were not helpful at all. I do not want to see that happen again, and in December my constituents voted to end the paralysis and embrace the new opportunities that are available to us.

When we were a member of the European Union, no MP in this place was involved in trade agreements, but since January the Secretary of State for International Trade and all her ministerial team have made sure that we are involved, with consultations on the parameters of free trade agreements and objectives published in advanced. Members of this House have engaged not just through parliamentary questions but directly. I have been able to speak to Ministers about the objectives we have, the benefits they will bring to my constituents and where my concerns are, and I have every intention of continuing to do so.

I will support this Bill and vote against the amendments. We need to embrace the opportunities and move with speed if we are going to embrace the new world.

8.30 pm

Deidre Brock (Edinburgh North and Leith) (SNP): I rise to speak in particular to SNP amendment 10 and new clause 7, in the name of my hon. Friend the Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie). I cannot quite work out whether the Government have not noticed the potential problems with the quality of imported foods or whether they just do not care. Frankly, having listened to this debate, I think it is the latter.

We hear so many platitudes, but when the chance to do something concrete came up during the Agriculture Bill, Ministers turned it down. Yes, pressures from farmers after that led to a commission to advise on a food imports framework of sorts. The hon. Member for Montgomeryshire (Craig Williams), who is no longer in his place, said its membership provided comfort to his farmers. That commission, though, has among its members Shanker Singham, a former lobbyist and favourite of various Ministers who is on record arguing that we should accept chlorine-washed chicken, hormone-injected beef and genetically modified crops from the US.

Mr Singham is not the only representative of the Institute of Economic Affairs on the commission; Lockwood Smith is also part of the IEA. That is important because the IEA is in favour of a hard Brexit and of lowering food and environmental standards to satisfy countries such as the US, China and India in trade deals. We know that because it published a paper on it in 2018 and got censured by the Charity Commission for its trouble.

Then there is the chair of the commission, Tim Smith, a former Tesco employee who said shortly after he was appointed that concerns about food standards were alarmist. I was alerted to that by the Department for International Trade; astonishingly, its Twitter account was used to publicise a link to the article. There are some who do not think the commission is there to provide safeguards for our food standards. They worry it is there to draw a veil of decency over the indecency of the Government's position.

We were told the passage of during the Agriculture Bill that the proper place for provisions on the quality of imported food would be the Trade Bill, yet here we are debating the Trade Bill and the Government are intent on throwing those safeguards out of the window rather than enshrining them in legislation. Those are actions in bad faith and they should not be allowed to stand.

In Committee, the Minister said that Food Standards Scotland and the English Food Standards Agency will ensure that food imports comply with our standards. How? How will they do that? Will they have teams inspecting the production chains in other countries, as the EU does? How will the animal husbandry and production standards of other nations be monitored to prevent unsuitable food from ending up on our plates?

The White Paper on an internal UK market shows that the Government have no intention of letting Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland do anything to protect their people. Under those plans, lower standards introduced by England's Government will have to be swallowed by the rest of us. Frankly, I do not fancy swallowing anything they offer.

Professor Michael Keating of the Centre on Constitutional Change makes it clear in his response to the White Paper that he considers it a power grab from the devolved Administrations for the purpose of negotiating low-standard international trade deals. The Minister underlined that when he said that involving the devolved Administrations in trade deals would be “constitutionally inappropriate”. I disagree.

Greg Smith (Buckingham) (Con): I start by declaring an interest: my wife's family are farmers. I have listened carefully to the debate and studied all the amendments, and I feel that there has been significant mission creep among the amendments. As my hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Antony Higginbotham) said a few moments ago, people seem to have forgotten what the Bill is actually about. The Bill is about those all-important continuity trade agreements that are vital for British farmers, British exporting businesses and the United Kingdom as a whole. The Bill categorically is not about new free trade deals, important as those are—and I am delighted to see colleagues from the Department for International Trade busy negotiating them.

When it comes to scrutiny, I very much welcome everything that my right hon. Friend the Minister said in opening the debate about the lengths to which the Government have gone to ensure that differences in any continuity agreements are laid before Parliament and how, likewise, where trade deals are likely to be different—where the Government have an ambition to get a better deal, such as with Japan—greater lengths are taken.

On farming, agriculture and our food standards, I cannot put it better than my hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Robert Courts). He pointed out to this House that, as we leave the European Union, those all-important food standards will be transferred from EU law into British law, and the only way that that law could be changed is by this House. So it is a false argument to suggest that there needs to be an amendment to this Bill to change fundamentally what this Bill is about to secure the standards that the Prime Minister has committed to and that were in the manifesto that I and all Members on the Government side of the House

stood on. My right hon. Friend the Minister has repeated that on many occasions, as indeed did my right hon. Friend the Member for Bournemouth West (Conor Burns), who did so much to get this Bill back before the House of Commons.

When I heard the Opposition spokesman, the hon. Member for Sefton Central (Bill Esterson), who is not now in his place, talk about this earlier, I felt he had a very one-sided view of the argument, in that it was all about protectionism and the domestic market. Of course, the domestic market is important to all our farmers, but there are opportunities for international trade out there, such as the lifting of the ban on British beef into America, which is worth £66 million. Through trade, our farming can be assured and prosperous for the future.

Liz Twist (Blaydon) (Lab): I have a sense of *déjà vu*, because it is just under 18 months ago that we had a debate in this Chamber on future trade agreements—there were a lot fewer of us in here then. We discussed the very issues that we are talking about today, and it seems that the Government have not listened substantially to the concerns that were raised then. In the time I have available, I want to talk briefly about a number of those concerns, because hundreds of my constituents have written to me about them over the last few days, and they have written to me about them time and again.

The first is the NHS and the need to ensure that it is protected from international competition. I will be supporting new clause 17, because it is essential that our NHS remains our NHS and we are able to protect it from competition. We already have some competition, and we need to make sure that the NHS is not open to the highest bidder. People actually want that written into the Trade Bill to ensure that that cannot happen.

The same goes for environmental and food safety standards. We have talked about chlorine chicken and we have heard something about the environment, but there are a whole range of issues. Animal welfare issues are at the heart of these concerns. It is not just about chlorine-washed chicken or more detail; people are concerned also about the impact of trade deals on the environment. This Bill is a lost opportunity. We could be using this Bill to be creative, and to ensure that we safeguard our environment. For example—an issue I have raised in other places sometimes—there is the issue of deforestation and ensuring that we can protect the forests through our trade deals. The hon. Member for Winchester (Steve Brine), who is not in his place, said earlier, “Aren't the public ahead of us on this?” Indeed, the public are ahead of us on consumer protection, and they are saying to us that these safeguards need to be written into the Bill.

Finally, we have talked a bit during the debate about labour standards, and I am particularly concerned that in this Bill the Government should be protecting the trade and agreements we have with less developed countries and ensuring that fair trade and other trading agreements with them are safeguarded as an important part of their development.

On scrutiny, a great deal has been said. I certainly will be supporting new clause 4. There is huge concern—and people should not underestimate this—that deals will be signed off behind closed doors. Frankly, statutory instruments—and we have all been in loads of those Committees in recent days—are not the answer.

[Liz Twist]

We need proper debate and scrutiny. These are the concerns that Members have raised, and this is a missed opportunity.

Jo Gideon (Stoke-on-Trent Central) (Con): I am excited by the possibilities for our future as an independent trading nation, and I support the Bill and our listening Government in taking us forward. The Bill is about necessary data gathering for future improvements, cheerleading, safeguarding and the effective communication of helpful information. It is not about protectionism or feather-bedding. The balance is to enable British exports that can compete against the world marketplace for goods and services to do so on a level playing field.

I believe that the Bill helps to get the balance right. For example, it is quite right that the Government intend to join the Agreement on Government Procurement as an independent party on substantially the same terms as we had under EU membership. The GPA provides UK businesses with access to public procurement opportunities worth some £1.3 trillion per year—opportunities for which they are willing and able to compete fairly. Of course, GPA partner access to UK public contracts will ensure taxpayers and consumers get the best value for money on major contracts, which in turn maintains the imperative for UK firms to stay innovative and competitive.

An important part of the balance is to ensure opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises, not just the mega companies. The UK rightly pursues an active SME participation procurement policy, and as an independent party in the GPA we will have the opportunity to engage others on sustainable procurement, social value and workforce considerations.

When exporters do everything right, and when they produce great goods and services at the right price and in accordance with all the relevant rules, the last thing they want to face is competition that has circumvented the rules and is artificially supported, so another part of getting the balance right is to ensure that remedies are available when needed. I welcome the Trade Remedies Authority, which will have important work to do in ensuring continuity of remedial action, not least for Stoke-on-Trent's ceramics.

I applaud the Department's determination to secure an ever-increasing number of continuity agreements. It is important for business confidence that we make as seamless a transition into becoming an independent trading nation as possible, while signposting that the door is open to better trade agreements with various partners in the years to come. The Bill provides both continuity for agreements and remedies inherited from our membership of the EU and for the future independent free-trading policy that we wish to strike. The Bill protects our national standards for our workforce, animal welfare, the environment, our NHS and our SMEs. It is a solid first step into the world for global Britain. I will be pleased to support it tonight.

Ruth Cadbury (Brentford and Isleworth) (Lab): When I spoke in an earlier debate on global Britain, I was accused of

“supping from the cup of pessimism”—[*Official Report*, 30 January 2020; Vol. 670, c. 1035.]

when I spoke about Britain's future outside the European Union. Yet what Members from both sides of the House want is what is best for our country, our economy, our environment, and the safety and wellbeing of everyone living and working here. Many of my constituents have written to me about those concerns, but they also expect me, as their elected representative, to be in the Parliament that has a say, with full accountability—not merely to receive a report once a deal is done. As the Lords EU Committee has warned,

“mere accountability after the fact”

does not make for meaningful parliamentary scrutiny. There is parliamentary scrutiny in the US, Germany, Australia and New Zealand, and we will have less control than we had as members of the EU.

Oversight is not merely a lofty concept; it has real-world implications. Others have mentioned threats to the NHS, food safety, environmental standards and so on, and I share those concerns, but I will give another example: car safety standards. A major reason that the US has triple the number of road deaths per million compared with the UK is because as EU members our cars are safer than those sold in the US. Our cars have front and side impact T-bone protection, which gives protection for car occupants. We also have requirements for much safer car fronts. Remember bull bars? We are not allowed to have them anymore. They are still prevalent in the US, killing and maiming children, pedestrians, cyclists and so on. New cars sold in the EU will have collision avoidance systems, to further protect pedestrians and cyclists. This Trade Bill risks cars imported from outside the EU presenting serious risks to the safety of UK road users. Can the Minister guarantee that no vehicles will be imported into the UK after these trade deals are done unless it meets recently agreed EU vehicle safety standards?

Investor-state dispute settlements have been used by corporations to get rid of plain packaging on cigarettes, scrap bans on fracking, overturn bans on certain medications and stop compensation payments after oil spills. Without transparency, those with the deepest pockets win, we lose our consumer, environmental and social rights and our planet is further threatened. Will the Minister confirm that there will be no ISDS clauses in any trade deal signed by the UK?

8.45 pm

Ben Everitt (Milton Keynes North) (Con): This Trade Bill represents a unique opportunity for us in the challenging circumstances that we face as a country due to the global pandemic and its economic impact. The only way to put it in context is to say that these are the most challenging circumstances we have faced in the last three quarters of a century, but we will come out of this, and we will come out of it stronger. We cannot deny that we are entering a period of unprecedented economic disruption, not just here but around the world. We came together to protect our NHS and save lives, but now we must expand our reach to protect jobs, livelihoods and our economy. We must look beyond our borders.

I back British businesses. In the UK, we have a reputation for high-skilled, high-tech jobs. We can put ourselves in the global fast lane. We can be the most productive and the most innovative nation on earth. The deals enabled by this Bill will be great for Great Britain. There are fantastic opportunities ahead of us,

not only in markets that we have explored but in new and fast-growing markets around the world. For example, through the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, we can look at markets that are growing more quickly and more explosively, doing fantastic things with data, robotics and technology—things that we cannot do now and through which we can leverage our exit from the European Union to propel the UK on to the global stage.

This is our call to arms. This is our opportunity to seize the chances of being an independent, sovereign nation. We can go global with this Bill. We can stand by and back our local businesses to really make an impact on the global scale.

Abena Oppong-Asare (Erith and Thamesmead) (Lab): Today will be a historic day that we can hopefully look back on and say, “As a Parliament, we did the right thing.” Today we have the opportunity to vote to protect our food standards and farming industry, to prioritise the environment and animal welfare, to stand up for workers’ rights and to safeguard our NHS from future trade agreements. Perhaps the Government think that the public are not interested in trade negotiations or are willing to just take the Government’s word that the NHS will be protected and that workers’ rights will not be undermined in future. I can confirm that the public are indeed interested and are not willing to accept any lowering of standards in future trade agreements.

A huge number of my constituents have contacted me in the last few days to voice their concerns over the Trade Bill. The main concern raised by constituents is the lack of oversight that Parliament will have of future trade agreements if the Bill is to pass in its current form. One constituent asked me, “Why should our nation be faced with this democratic deficit?”

I thank the hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly) for tabling new clause 4, which will ensure proper parliamentary scrutiny of trade deals. I am pleased that he has recognised the flaws in his party’s Bill, as well as the importance of parliamentary scrutiny as we leave the EU and forge new deals with different countries. However, other areas of the current Bill are not fit for purpose, and it must be amended to offer security for workers in my constituency, to address the concerns of businesses that will be impacted, and to give the wider public confidence that the Government are serious about tackling climate change.

With the Government currently in talks with the US regarding future trade negotiations, my constituents are rightly concerned that UK food and animal welfare standards are at risk. The Government have said that our current standards will not be undermined by future negotiations, and if that is the case, I urge Members to protect standards by voting for new clause 11. That new clause will ensure that agricultural goods imported to the UK under a free trade agreement must meet the standards applicable under UK law. That will include meeting UK standards on animal health and welfare, the protection of the environment, food safety, hygiene, traceability and plant health. The new clause will give the public confidence that agricultural products must meet hygiene and welfare standards, and ensure that the British agricultural industry is not undermined by lower quality international imports.

The Government have said that the NHS is not for sale, and that the public should not be worried about the security of our NHS in future trade deals. Unfortunately, however, the Government’s word is not enough for my constituents. I ask Members to think about today, and be able to say that they did all they could to protect high standards and the public health service that we treasure.

Theo Clarke (Stafford) (Con): I had the privilege of sitting on the Committee of this historic Bill, and I have scrutinised it line by line. I believe that new clauses 5 and 6 strengthen the Bill, as they create the right balance by allowing trade to be conducted efficiently, as well as providing my constituents in Stafford with the protections they deserve. Trade is not an abstract concept; it affects our daily lives. International supply chains are important for so many of the products that we use every day, which is why it is crucial to get the Bill right.

From the Perkins engines made in Staffordshire to the generators produced by General Electric at its sites in Stafford, such factories are a vital link in international supply chains, and they provide jobs in my constituency that are reliant on trade. We must not forget JCB, whose site at Hixon helps to produce the instantly recognisable yellow tractors that are found on so many sites all over the world, not only contributing to the British economy, but helping to promote British businesses and our expert engineering overseas.

The Bill, including new clauses 5 and 6, provides a framework for more prosperous long-term trading opportunities, and it also gives us short-term certainty—something we are all looking for in these unprecedented times. The Secretary of State for International Trade recognises how important trade is for the farming sector, and I am grateful that she was kind enough to visit me in Stafford early this year, and take part in a roundtable with my local farmers. Now that Britain has the opportunity to create its own trade policy, it is vital that we strike the balance between encouraging imports of goods that we need, while also incentivising manufacturing and production on home soil, to sell in Britain and export across the globe.

Britain has some of the highest food standards in the world, which we should be proud of from both a farming and animal welfare perspective. Many of my constituents contacted me to say that they are extremely concerned that the Bill potentially allows for food standards to be lowered, and I recognise why some Members of the House will support new clause 4. Having sat on the Bill Committee, however, I was able to raise that matter directly with the Minister, my right hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea and Fulham (Greg Hands), and I was grateful for his personal assurances that there will be no compromising of our standards on food safety, animal welfare, and the environment. Combined with the new Trade and Agriculture Commission that the Secretary of State and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs have set up to support the NFU, I am reassured that the Government are upholding their manifesto commitment on food standards.

Sammy Wilson: I know that I have a very short time so I just want to make one point very quickly. I am disappointed that the Government could not find any place in this Bill to give a written assurance that Northern Ireland will be able to participate fully in the international

[Sammy Wilson]

trade deals that we will strike across the world when we leave the EU. That is because they cannot give the assurance that the Northern Ireland protocol will not stop us benefiting from goods that will come into the United Kingdom as a result of trade deals or, indeed, will not make the process of selling abroad so expensive that it puts us at a disadvantage when it comes to selling in other parts of the world. We believe that we have an economy that is competitive, but it is not competitive, because we are tied through the Northern Ireland protocol to the single market and to the European customs territory, and therefore treated differently from the rest of the United Kingdom. The assurances that the Minister gives verbally cannot, unfortunately, override the compelling legal commitments in the withdrawal agreement.

Greg Hands: With the leave of the House, I would like to respond to what has been a wide-ranging and often well-informed debate.

This Bill is mainly about continuity, but also about sending a clear message that we welcome traders—that we are network Britain, not fortress Britain. On standards, I remind the House that none of the 20 continuity agreements that Parliament has ratified has eroded standards in any way. Not one domestic standard in relation to animal welfare, the environment, human rights or labour has been eroded by any of those agreements.

Let me try to deal quickly with four of the myths propagated by the Opposition. First, on ISDS and protection for investment, this is in the UK's interests. The UK has never lost a case in any of these tribunals, but for 40 years UK companies, with jobs at stake, have brought these cases. Eighty of the cases—about 1,000 overall—were brought by UK companies and UK investors directly, with UK jobs at stake. That is why this can be very important for UK business and for the jobs of our constituents in making sure that businesses operating abroad are protected.

The second myth relates to devolution. We have been clear that we would not usually legislate in devolved areas without the consent of devolved authorities and never without consulting them. The hon. Member for Dundee East (Stewart Hosie) referred to convenience. If it is more convenient for the UK to legislate for all four nations, then that is a sensible thing.

In terms of standards, we have seen new clause 11, and new clause 7 is even more extreme. New clause 11 wants to make sure that no goods can enter the UK unless they have been produced at standards

“as high as, or higher than, standards which at the time of import applied under UK law”.

That could have massive unforeseen consequences. The Opposition think they are talking about chlorinated chicken and hormone-treated beef, but are they actually able to look people in the eye and say that cocoa from the Ivory Coast has been produced to at least as high environmental standards as in the UK? Are they able to say that beans from Egypt are being produced to at least as high labour standards? Are they able to say that tea from Sri Lanka comes with the same high labour standards? I think they are putting a lot of this country's existing trade at risk.

The fourth key myth is about the NHS. The NHS remains protected and will never be on the table at any trade deal, and that includes the prices we pay for drugs.

We have had excellent speeches from my hon. Friends the Members for Tiverton and Honiton (Neil Parish), for Totnes (Anthony Mangnall), for Burnley (Antony Higginbotham), for Buckingham (Greg Smith), for Stoke-on-Trent Central (Jo Gideon), for Milton Keynes North (Ben Everitt) and for Stafford (Theo Clarke), from my right hon. Friend the Member for Chipping Barnet (Theresa Villiers), and from my hon. Friends the Members for Witney (Robert Courts), for Montgomeryshire (Craig Williams), for South Ribble (Katherine Fletcher) and for Huntingdon (Mr Djanogly). I thank them for their contributions and the Opposition for theirs.

The Bill is very important in securing the continuity of up to 40 EU trade agreements, the establishment of a Trade Remedies Authority to protect UK businesses and jobs from unfair trade practice, and access to the £1.3 billion global market in Government procurement.

We should accept new clause 5 and related amendments to allow better sharing of data. We should reject the other amendments, which are either unnecessary, such as new clause 4, or, in cases such as new clauses 7 and 11, potentially deeply damaging for this country's economy.

Question put and agreed to.

New clause 5 accordingly read a Second time, and added to the Bill.

9 pm

Proceedings interrupted (Programme Order, 20 May).

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

New clause 6

OFFENCES RELATED TO DISCLOSURE UNDER SECTION (DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY OTHER AUTHORITIES)

“(1) If a person discloses information in contravention of section (*Disclosure of information by other authorities*)(5) which relates to a person whose identity—

- (a) is specified in the disclosure, or
- (b) can be deduced from it,

the person who disclosed the information commits an offence.

(2) It is a defence for a person charged with an offence under this section to prove that the person reasonably believed—

- (a) that the disclosure was lawful, or
- (b) that the information had already lawfully been made available to the public.

(3) A prosecution for an offence under this section—

- (a) may be brought in England and Wales only with the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions;
- (b) may be brought in Northern Ireland only with the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Northern Ireland.

(4) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable—

- (a) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, to a fine or to both, or
- (b) on summary conviction—
 - (i) in England and Wales, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months, to a fine or to both;
 - (ii) in Scotland, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months, to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum or to both;

- (iii) in Northern Ireland, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months, to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum or to both.”—(*Greg Hands.*)

This new clause would make it an offence to disclose identifiable personal information in breach of subsection (5) of clause (Disclosure of information by other authorities).

Brought up, and added to the Bill.

New clause 4

PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

“(1) Negotiations towards a free trade agreement may not commence until the Secretary of State has laid draft negotiating objectives in respect of that agreement before both Houses of Parliament, and a motion endorsing draft negotiating objectives has been approved by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(2) Prior to the draft negotiating objectives being laid, the Secretary of State must have—

- (a) consulted with each devolved authority on the content of the draft negotiating objectives, and
- (b) produced a sustainability impact assessment including, but not limited to, an assessment of the impact on food safety, health, the environment and animal welfare.

(3) The United Kingdom may not become a signatory to a free trade agreement to which this section applies unless a draft of the agreement in the terms in which it was to be presented for signature by parties to the agreement has been laid before, and approved by, a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(4) Before either House of Parliament may be asked to approve by resolution the text of a proposed free trade agreement, the Secretary of State must—

- (a) consult with each devolved authority on the text of the proposed agreement, and
- (b) lay before both Houses a report assessing the compliance of the text of the proposed agreement with any standards laid down by primary or subordinate legislation in the United Kingdom including, but not limited to, legislation governing or prescribing standards on food safety, health, the environment and animal welfare.

(5) In this section—

“devolved authority” has the meaning given in section 4(1) of this Act, and

“free trade agreement” means any agreement which is—

- (a) within the definition given in section 4(1) of this Act, and
- (b) an agreement between the United Kingdom and one or more partners that includes components that facilitate the trade of goods, services or intellectual property.”—(*Mr Djanogly.*)

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The House divided: Ayes 263, Noes 326.

Division No. 78]

[9 pm

AYES

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

Campbell, rh Sir Alan	Harris, Carolyn
Carden, Dan	Hayes, Helen
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair	Healey, rh John
Chamberlain, Wendy	Hendrick, Sir Mark
Champion, Sarah	Hendry, Drew
Chapman, Douglas	Hill, Mike
Charalambous, Bambos	Hillier, Meg
Cherry, Joanna	Hoare, Simon
Clark, Feryal	Hobhouse, Wera
Collins, Damian	Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
Cooper, Daisy	Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Cooper, Rosie	Hollern, Kate
Cooper, rh Yvette	Hopkins, Rachel
Corbyn, rh Jeremy	Hosie, Stewart
Cowan, Ronnie	Howarth, rh Sir George
Coyle, Neil	Hudson, Dr Neil
Crawley, Angela	Huq, Dr Rupa
Creasy, Stella	Hussain, Imran
Cruddas, Jon	Jardine, Christine
Cunningham, Alex	Jarvis, Dan
Daby, Janet	Johnson, Dame Diana
Davies-Jones, Alex	Jones, Darren
Day, Martyn	Jones, Gerald
De Cordova, Marsha	Jones, rh Mr Kevan
Debonnaire, Thangam	Jones, Ruth
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh	Jones, Sarah
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Kane, Mike
Docherty-Hughes, Martin	Keeley, Barbara
Dodds, Anneliese	Kendall, Liz
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Khan, Afzal
Doogan, Dave	Kinnock, Stephen
Dorans, Allan	Kyle, Peter
Dromey, Jack	Lake, Ben
Duffield, Rosie	Lammy, rh Mr David
Eagle, Maria	Lavery, Ian
Eastwood, Colum	Law, Chris
Edwards, Jonathan	Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Efford, Clive	Lewis, Clive
Elliott, Julie	Lewis, rh Dr Julian
Elmore, Chris	Linden, David
Eshalomi, Florence	Lloyd, Tony
Esterson, Bill	Lockhart, Carla
Farron, Tim	Long Bailey, Rebecca
Farry, Stephen	Lucas, Caroline
Fellows, Marion	Lynch, Holly
Ferrier, Margaret	MacAskill, Kenny
Fletcher, Colleen	Madders, Justin
Flynn, Stephen	Mahmood, Shabana
Foxcroft, Vicky	Malhotra, Seema
Foy, Mary Kelly	Maskell, Rachael
Freeman, George	Matheson, Christian
Furniss, Gill	Mc Nally, John
Gale, rh Sir Roger	McCabe, Steve
Gardiner, Barry	McCarthy, Kerry
Gibson, Patricia	McCartney, Jason
Gill, Preet Kaur	McDonagh, Siobhain
Girvan, Paul	McDonald, Andy
Glindon, Mary	McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
Grady, Patrick	McDonald, Stuart C.
Grant, Peter	McDonnell, rh John
Gray, Neil	McFadden, rh Mr Pat
Green, Kate	McGinn, Conor
Greenwood, Lilian	McGovern, Alison
Greenwood, Margaret	McLaughlin, Anne
Griffith, Nia	McMahon, Jim
Gwynne, Andrew	McMorrin, Anna
Haigh, Louise	Mearns, Ian
Hamilton, Fabian	Miliband, rh Edward
Hanna, Claire	Mishra, Navendu
Hanvey, Neale	Monaghan, Carol
Hardy, Emma	Moran, Layla
Harman, rh Ms Harriet	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
 Parish, Neil
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 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
 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
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 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 Ayes:

**Jeff Smith and
 Liz Twist**

NOES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, 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
 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
 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
 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
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 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
 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
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, Lucy
 Freer, Mike
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 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
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 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
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig

Mackrory, Cheryl
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 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
 Patel, rh Priti
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Prentis, Victoria
 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
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stewart, Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Streeter, Sir Gary
 Stuart, Graham
 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
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 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
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Michael Tomlinson and
Eddie Hughes

Question accordingly negated.

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.

New Clause 11

IMPORT OF AGRICULTURAL GOODS AFTER IP COMPLETION DAY

“(1) After IP completion day, agricultural goods imported under a free trade agreement may be imported into the UK only if the standards to which those goods were produced were as high as, or higher than, standards which at the time of import applied under UK law relating to—

- (a) animal health and welfare,
- (b) protection of the environment,
- (c) food safety, hygiene and traceability, and
- (d) plant health.

(2) The Secretary of State must prepare a register of standards under UK law relating to—

- (a) animal health and welfare,
- (b) protection of the environment,
- (c) food safety, hygiene and traceability, and
- (d) plant health

which must be met in the course of production of any imported agricultural goods.

(3) A register under subsection (2) must be updated within seven days of any amendment to any standard listed in the register.

(4) “Agricultural goods”, for the purposes of this section, means anything produced by a producer operating in one or more agricultural sectors listed in Schedule 1.

(5) “IP completion day” has the meaning given in section 39 of the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020.”—
(Bill Esterson.)

This new clause would set a requirement for imported agricultural goods to meet animal health and welfare, environmental, plant health, food safety and other standards which are at least as high as those which apply to UK produced agricultural goods.

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The House divided: Ayes 251, Noes 337.

Division No. 79]

[9.14 pm

AYES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane	Buck, Ms Karen
Abrahams, Debbie	Burgon, Richard
Ali, Rushanara	Byrne, Ian
Ali, Tahir	Cadbury, Ruth
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena	Cameron, Dr Lisa
Amesbury, Mike	Campbell, rh Sir Alan
Anderson, Fleur	Carden, Dan
Ashworth, Jonathan	Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
Bardell, Hannah	Chamberlain, Wendy
Barker, Paula	Champion, Sarah
Beckett, rh Margaret	Chapman, Douglas
Begum, Apsana	Cherry, Joanna
Benn, rh Hilary	Clark, Feryal
Betts, Mr Clive	Cooper, Daisy
Black, Mhairi	Cooper, Rosie
Blackford, rh Ian	Cooper, rh Yvette
Blackman, Kirsty	Cowan, Ronnie
Blake, Olivia	Coyle, Neil
Blomfield, Paul	Crawley, Angela
Bonnar, Steven	Creasy, Stella
Brabin, Tracy	Cruddas, Jon
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben	Cryer, John
Brennan, Kevin	Cunningham, Alex
Brock, Deidre	Daby, Janet
Brown, Alan	Davies-Jones, Alex
Brown, Ms Lyn	Day, Martyn
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas	De Cordova, Marsha
Bryant, Chris	Debbonaire, Thangam

Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 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
 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
 Jardine, Christine
 Jarvis, Dan
 Johnson, Dame Diana
 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
 Madders, Justin
 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
 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
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 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
 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

Adams, Nigel
 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
 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

Thomas-Symonds, Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, 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
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

NOES

Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Burns, rh Connor
 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
 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
 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
 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
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 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
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 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, Julian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kruger, Danny
 Kwarteng, rh Kwasi
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Andrea
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 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, Cheryl
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 May, rh Mrs Theresa
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 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
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Prentis, Victoria
 Purslove, 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, Henry
 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
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunak, rh Rishi
 Sunderland, James
 Swaney, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Throup, Maggie
 Timpson, Edward
 Tolhurst, Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 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
 Zahawi, Nadhim
Tellers for the Noes:
Eddie Hughes and
Michael Tomlinson

Question accordingly negated.

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.

New Clause 17

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS: HEALTH OR CARE SERVICES

(1) Regulations under section 2(1) may make provision for the purpose of implementing an international trade agreement only if the conditions in subsections (2) and (3) are met in relation to the application of that agreement in any part of the United Kingdom.

(2) The condition in this subsection is that no provision of that international trade agreement in any way undermines or restricts the ability of an appropriate authority—

(a) to provide a comprehensive publicly funded health service free at the point of delivery,

(b) to protect the employment rights or terms and conditions of employment for public sector employees and those working in publicly funded health or care sectors,

(c) to regulate and maintain the quality and safety of health or care services,

(d) to regulate and control the pricing and reimbursement systems for the purchase of medicines or medical devices, or

(e) to regulate and maintain the level of protection afforded in relation to patient data, public health data and publicly provided social care data relating to UK citizens.

(3) The condition in this subsection is that the agreement—

(a) explicitly excludes application of any provision within that agreement to publicly funded health or care services,

(b) explicitly excludes provision for any Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) clause that provides, or is related to, the delivery of public services, health care, care or public health,

(c) explicitly excludes the use of any negative listing, standstill or ratchet clause that provides, or is related to, the delivery of public services, health care, care or public health,

(d) contains explicit recognition that an appropriate authority (within the meaning of section 4) has the right to enact policies, legislation and regulation which protects and promotes health,

public health, social care and public safety in health or care services, and

(e) prohibits the sale of patient data, public health data and publicly provided social care data.

(4) For the purposes of this section—

“negative listing” means a listing only of exceptions, exclusions or limits to commitments made by parties to the agreement;

“ratchet” in relation to any provision in an agreement means any provision whereby a party, if (after the agreement has been ratified) it has unilaterally removed a barrier in an area where it had made a commitment before the agreement was ratified, may not reintroduce that barrier, and

“standstill” in relation to any provision in an agreement means any provision by which parties list barriers which are in force at the time that they sign the agreement and undertake not to introduce any new barriers.—(Bill Esterson.)

This amendment would aim to protect the NHS and publicly funded health and care services in other parts of the UK from any form of control from outside the UK.

Brought up.

Question put, That the clause be added to the Bill.

The House divided: Ayes 251, Noes 340.

Division No. 80]

[9.28 pm

AYES

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

Burgon, Richard	Harris, Carolyn
Byrne, Ian	Hayes, Helen
Cadbury, Ruth	Healey, rh John
Cameron, Dr Lisa	Hendrick, Sir Mark
Campbell, rh Sir Alan	Hendry, Drew
Carden, Dan	Hill, Mike
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair	Hillier, Meg
Chamberlain, Wendy	Hobhouse, Wera
Champion, Sarah	Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
Chapman, Douglas	Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
Cherry, Joanna	Hollern, Kate
Clark, Feryal	Hopkins, Rachel
Cooper, Daisy	Hosie, Stewart
Cooper, Rosie	Howarth, rh Sir George
Cooper, rh Yvette	Huq, Dr Rupa
Corbyn, rh Jeremy	Hussain, Imran
Cowan, Ronnie	Jardine, Christine
Coyle, Neil	Jarvis, Dan
Crawley, Angela	Johnson, Dame Diana
Creasy, Stella	Jones, Darren
Cruddas, Jon	Jones, Gerald
Cryer, John	Jones, rh Mr Kevan
Cunningham, Alex	Jones, Ruth
Daby, Janet	Jones, Sarah
Davies-Jones, Alex	Kane, Mike
Day, Martyn	Keeley, Barbara
De Cordova, Marsha	Kendall, Liz
Debonnaire, Thangam	Khan, Afzal
Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh	Kincock, Stephen
Docherty-Hughes, Martin	Kyle, Peter
Dodds, Anneliese	Lake, Ben
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Lammy, rh Mr David
Doogan, Dave	Lavery, Ian
Dorans, Allan	Law, Chris
Dromey, Jack	Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
Duffield, Rosie	Lewis, Clive
Eagle, Maria	Linden, David
Eastwood, Colum	Lloyd, Tony
Edwards, Jonathan	Lockhart, Carla
Efford, Clive	Long Bailey, Rebecca
Elliott, Julie	Lucas, Caroline
Elmore, Chris	Lynch, Holly
Eshalomi, Florence	MacAskill, Kenny
Esterson, Bill	Madders, Justin
Farron, Tim	Mahmood, Shabana
Farry, Stephen	Malhotra, Seema
Fellows, Marion	Maskell, Rachael
Ferrier, Margaret	Matheson, Christian
Fletcher, Colleen	Mc Nally, John
Flynn, Stephen	McCabe, Steve
Foxcroft, Vicky	McCarthy, Kerry
Foy, Mary Kelly	McDonagh, Siobhain
Furniss, Gill	McDonald, Andy
Gardiner, Barry	McDonald, Stuart C.
Gibson, Patricia	McDonnell, rh John
Gill, Preet Kaur	McFadden, rh Mr Pat
Girvan, Paul	McGinn, Conor
Glindon, Mary	McGovern, Alison
Grady, Patrick	McLaughlin, Anne
Grant, Peter	McMahon, Jim
Gray, Neil	McMorris, Anna
Green, Kate	Mearns, Ian
Greenwood, Lilian	Miliband, rh Edward
Greenwood, Margaret	Mishra, Navendu
Griffith, Nia	Monaghan, Carol
Gwynne, Andrew	Moran, Layla
Haigh, Louise	Morden, Jessica
Hamilton, Fabian	Morgan, Stephen
Hanna, Claire	Morris, Grahame
Hanvey, Neale	Murray, Ian
Hardy, Emma	Murray, James
Harman, rh Ms Harriet	Nandy, Lisa

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
 Phillips, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 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

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
 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 Ayes:
Jeff Smith and
Bambos Charalambous

NOES

Adams, Nigel
 Afriyie, Adam
 Ahmad Khan, Imran
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy
 Amess, Sir David
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, 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
 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 Mr Geoffrey
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 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
 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
 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
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 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, John
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 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
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 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, Karl
 McPartland, Stephen
 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
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir
 Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Prentis, Victoria
 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, Henry
 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
 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
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 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
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Michael Tomlinson and
Eddie Hughes

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.

Clause 2

IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Amendment proposed: 10, page 2, line 33, at end insert—

“(6A) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of the Scottish Ministers (within the meaning given in paragraph 6 of Schedule 1), unless the Scottish Ministers consent.

(6B) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of the Welsh Ministers (within the meaning given in paragraph 7 of Schedule 1), unless the Welsh Ministers consent.

(6C) No regulations may be made under subsection (1) by a Minister of the Crown, so far as they contain provision which would be within the devolved competence of a Northern Ireland department (within the meaning given in paragraph 8 of Schedule 1), unless a Northern Ireland devolved authority (within the meaning of paragraph 9 of Schedule 1) gives consent.”—(*Stewart Hosie.*)
Member's explanatory statement: This amendment would ensure that the consent of a devolved government is required for regulations under section 2(1) if those regulations contain matters which are within the remit of the devolved government.

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The House divided: Ayes 244, Noes 345.

Division No. 81]

[9.44 pm

AYES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane	Chamberlain, Wendy
Ali, Rushanara	Champion, Sarah
Ali, Tahir	Chapman, Douglas
Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena	Charalambous, Bambos
Amesbury, Mike	Cherry, Joanna
Anderson, Fleur	Clark, Feryal
Antoniazzi, Tonia	Cooper, Daisy
Ashworth, Jonathan	Cooper, Rosie
Bardell, Hannah	Cooper, rh Yvette
Barker, Paula	Corbyn, rh Jeremy
Beckett, rh Margaret	Cowan, Ronnie
Begum, Apsana	Coyle, Neil
Benn, rh Hilary	Crawley, Angela
Betts, Mr Clive	Creasy, Stella
Black, Mhairi	Cruddas, Jon
Blackford, rh Ian	Cryer, John
Blackman, Kirsty	Cunningham, Alex
Blake, Olivia	Daby, Janet
Blomfield, Paul	Davies-Jones, Alex
Bonnar, Steven	Day, Martyn
Brabin, Tracy	De Cordova, Marsha
Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben	Debbonaire, Thangam
Brennan, Kevin	Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
Brock, Deidre	Docherty-Hughes, Martin
Brown, Alan	Dodds, Anneliese
Brown, Ms Lyn	Doogan, Dave
Brown, rh Mr Nicholas	Dorans, Allan
Bryant, Chris	Dromey, Jack
Buck, Ms Karen	Duffield, Rosie
Burgon, Richard	Eagle, Maria
Byrne, Ian	Eastwood, Colum
Cadbury, Ruth	Edwards, Jonathan
Cameron, Dr Lisa	Efford, Clive
Campbell, rh Sir Alan	Elliott, Julie
Carden, Dan	Elmore, Chris
Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair	Eshalomi, Florence

Question accordingly negated.

Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 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
 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
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kane, Mike
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Khan, Afzal
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Lake, Ben
 Lammy, rh Mr David
 Law, Chris
 Lewell-Buck, Mrs Emma
 Lewis, Clive
 Lloyd, Tony
 Long Bailey, Rebecca
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 Madders, Justin
 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
 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
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owatemi, Taiwo
 Owen, Sarah
 Peacock, Stephanie
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 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
 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
 Thomson, Richard
 Thornberry, rh Emily
 Timms, rh Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Turner, Karl
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt

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

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 Ayes:
David Linden and
Owen Thompson

NOES

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
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenege, 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
 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
 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
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Girvan, Paul
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 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
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 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
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 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
 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
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John

Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Prentis, Victoria
 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
 Loder, Chris
 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, Henry
 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
 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
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 Tucker, 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
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Noes:
Michael Tomlinson and
Eddie Hughes

Question accordingly negated.

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.

Clause 8

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY HMRC

Amendments made: 6, page 5, line 21, leave out “the Secretary of State” and insert “a Minister of the Crown”.

This amendment would allow HMRC to share information with Ministers of the Crown rather than just the Secretary of State. In practical terms, it would allow sharing with the Cabinet Office, which is not headed by a Secretary of State.

Amendment 7, page 5, line 21, leave out “Secretary of State’s” and insert “Minister’s”.

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 6.

Amendment 8, page 5, line 24, at end insert—

“(1A) Those functions include, among other things, functions relating to—

- (a) the analysis of the flow of traffic, goods and services into and out of the United Kingdom;

- (b) the analysis of the impact, or likely impact, of measures or practices relating to imports, exports, border security and transport on such flow;
- (c) the design, implementation and operation of such measures or practices.”

This amendment would specify some Ministerial functions relating to trade—in particular those of the Minister for the Cabinet Office.

Amendment 9, page 5, line 43, after “legislation” insert

“(save that the powers conferred by this section are to be taken into account in determining whether a disclosure contravenes that legislation)”.—(*Greg Hands.*)

This amendment seeks to clarify the interaction between the power to share information and the data protection legislation.

Question put (Order, 20 May), That the Bill be now read the Third time.

The House divided: Ayes 335, Noes 243.

Division No. 82]

[10.1 pm

AYES

Adams, Nigel
 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
 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
 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
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 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
 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
 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
 Gideon, Jo
 Gillan, rh Dame Cheryl
 Glen, John
 Goodwill, rh Mr Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Grant, Mrs Helen
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Griffiths, Kate
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Hammond, Stephen
 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
 Hoare, Simon
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, rh Jeremy
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkyns, Andrea
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, rh Boris

Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnston, David
 Johnson, Gareth
 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
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 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, 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
 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
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, Chris
 Pincher, rh Christopher
 Poulter, Dr Dan
 Prentis, Victoria
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 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, Henry
 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
 Stuart, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 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
 Truss, rh Elizabeth
 Tugendhat, Tom
 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
 Zahawi, Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Michael Tomlinson and
Eddie Hughes

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
 Byrne, Ian
 Cadbury, Ruth
 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
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Doogan, Dave
 Dorans, Allan
 Dromey, Jack
 Duffield, Rosie
 Eagle, Ms Angela
 Eastwood, Colum
 Edwards, Jonathan
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Eshalomi, Florence
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Fletcher, Colleen
 Flynn, Stephen
 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
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, rh Mr Kevan
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 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
 Madders, Justin
 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
 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
 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
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 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
 Spellar, rh John
 Starmer, rh Keir
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Streeting, Wes
 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
 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.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

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.

Business without Debate

PROXY VOTING (DURATION OF PILOT)

Ordered,

That—

(1) the Resolution of 28 January 2019 (Proxy Voting (Implementation)), as amended by the Order of 16 January 2020 (Proxy voting (duration of pilot)) shall apply as if, for the words “18 months” in paragraphs (4) and (6), there were substituted “20 months”; and

(2) notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of the temporary standing order (Voting by proxy) of 28 January 2019 as amended, any certificate of eligibility issued by the Speaker on Thursday 27 or Friday 28 August shall have effect as if it had been published in the Votes and Proceedings for Wednesday 22 July.—
(David Duguid.)

COMMITTEES

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):
 With the leave of the House, we will take motions 3 to 6 together.

Ordered,

BACKBENCH BUSINESS COMMITTEE

That Nickie Aiken be discharged from the Backbench Business Committee and Mr Gareth Bacon be added.

HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

That Daniel Kawczynski be discharged from the Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee and Ian Levy be added.

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

That Anthony Mangnall and Gary Sambrook be discharged from the Procedure Committee and James Gray and Douglas Ross be added.

WOMEN AND EQUALITIES COMMITTEE

That Nickie Aiken be discharged from the Women and Equalities Committee and Elliot Colburn be added.—*(Bill Wiggin, on behalf of the Committee of Selection.)*

Endangered Species: Developing Countries

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(David Duguid.)

10.15 pm

Chris Grayling (Epsom and Ewell) (Con): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to bring forward this debate. You will know that there has been a lot of talk about the positive environmental impact of lockdowns around the world and how wildlife in some areas has flourished. It is true that some species have benefited from the absence of humans in many places, but the opposite is also true; many of our most engendered species and precious habitats now face real crisis because of the economic impact of the virus. As tourists disappear, the financial position of local communities deteriorates in areas that are vital for our biodiversity, so the door is opened for poachers and land grabbers, giving them the opportunity to act illegally with little resistance.

Areas of special scientific and environmental interest in poorer countries such as Madagascar rely on tourism to fund conservation. To take one example, the Ranomafana national park, home to 12 rare species of lemur, currently generates no income at all for those who work there to keep its work going. The consequence has been an upsurge in deforestation and poaching. Security and patrols of parks have had to be scaled back due to the lockdown and the costs. There are fewer tourists and guides around on routine tours around national parks, which provide a deterrent to poachers. None of that is happening right now, so of course the opportunity is there for people who want to break the law and to commit acts that we would all regard as barbaric. Local people who benefited from the income that tourism brought them now have to turn to other sources of income as well. There is a strong correlation between the rise in poaching rates and local poverty.

The international wildlife trade was already the fifth most lucrative transnational trade before this, worth around £17 billion internationally every year. Of course, the support services, the international tourism, the travellers who arrive and the money that flows into those local economies have been decimated by the pandemic, leaving so many important areas with no income, with no warning at all. For example, the annual income of the not-for-profit African Parks, which manages 17 parks, has been reduced by \$7.5 million, with an expectation that it will take several years to get back to pre-pandemic levels.

The consequence is heartbreaking. Botswana has seen at least six endangered rhinos killed during the pandemic, with at least nine killed in South Africa and dozens deliberately de-horned to try to prevent further poaching. However, it is not only the highest-profile species in Africa. In Cambodia, three of the roughly 300 giant ibis left in the wild were poached in April. In Colombia, between March and April, five jaguars, one puma and one ocelot were killed in its north-western region alone.

Along with increased poaching has come an upsurge in illegal forest clearance. Nepal has seen logging more than double in five of its most important national parks, which is really important terrain for the Bengal tiger. Compared with April 2019, April 2020 saw 64% more land cleared in Brazil, and 2019 was already the highest

year for deforestation. The World Wide Fund for Nature reports a 150% increase in deforestation in March in 18 at-risk countries, equating to an area of around 6,500 sq km, seven times the size of Berlin. Indonesia has been the worst affected, followed by the Congo and Brazil. Between January and March alone, Amazon deforestation was up 51% compared with last year—roughly the size of New York City—and in April, it was up 71%.

It is not just the places that we hear most about. To give just one example, in May in Thailand, eight men were arrested for removing a rosewood tree from a wildlife sanctuary. That tree alone was worth \$70,000. As with poaching, a pause on patrols of nature reserves in indigenous territories, combined with mass job losses, are seen as driving the increase in illegal logging.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on securing the debate. The press and the media are full of these stories. I noticed over the weekend one story that said that non-governmental organisations do not have the finances anymore to pay for rangers to protect the wild animals. Does he intend to ask the Minister perhaps to look at helping and financing the NGOs, so that they can pay the rangers to police the parks and thereby preserve and protect the animals?

Chris Grayling: The hon. Gentleman makes an important point, which I will come on to, but that is indeed one of the things that I would like this country to do.

We have a significant aid budget in this country. Although we have financial pressures at home and although there are particular challenges, even with the level of our aid budget, which is linked to our national income, the fact is that we need to act on these threats both for the short term and the long term. In the short term, improving the support that we provide for conservation projects, as the hon. Gentleman rightly says, can help communities affected by job losses from coronavirus. It can help to prevent local people from turning to poaching and illegal trafficking to make up for lost income. We need to prevent those crimes from being, frankly, the only way that someone can keep their family on the straight and narrow and keep them alive and fed. Of course, this matters for the long term as well, because biodiversity gains and sustainable development projects will contribute to global efforts to reduce carbon emissions to keep global temperatures down, so we also have to make sure that we look after conservation for all our futures.

That is why my message to the Minister tonight is this: I want the Government to ensure that the support that we provide for conservation projects and—in particular, right now, when ecotourism is non-existent—for habitat restoration is sustained and increased in the coming years. Habitat restoration is one of the things we can do now that has those short and long-term impacts. I want us to step up the support that we provide to projects that restore the rainforest and other forest areas. I know that it can be done—I have seen it done. Helping poorer countries to restore not just forest areas, but, for example, mangrove swamps, can have direct economic benefits for the surrounding communities through poverty alleviation, improving food security and, of course, providing opportunities for recreation and tourism, and in some places the moderation of extreme events.

Equally importantly, however, spending money restoring natural habitats provides a refuge for endangered species and reduces the risk to biodiversity. Again, take the example of Madagascar: around 80% to 90% of Madagascar's animal and plant species are exclusive to the island. It is a real garden of Eden still, but it has lost over a fifth of its tree cover since 2001, driven primarily by agricultural expansion. That process of habitat loss needs to be reversed. If we invest in land restoration and helping the local population to diversify what they do, everyone benefits. That is where our aid budgets can play a dual role in helping to alleviate poverty and creating economic opportunity, but also—crucially—looking after biodiversity and natural terrain.

As the Minister knows, we have a good track record as a country. It is not as though we are doing nothing in this area; we are actually doing plenty. The UK has contributed to the creation of nature protection zones across the world equivalent to the size of Brazil. Partnership work in Indonesia to protect the Sumatran tigers has helped to create 16,000 jobs. To counter deforestation and boost forest and biodiversity conservation, the Department for International Development's Partnerships for Forests is supporting the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and local conservation partners in Liberia to develop a market for forest-friendly Gola cocoa.

However, I think that now is still the time for us to step up to the plate even more. I know that this year, the drop in GDP will affect our aid budgets, but they have also been rising steadily in recent years, so we have the scope to focus more effort on conservation projects. It is in our national interest to do so.

Andrew Rosindell (Romford) (Con): I commend my right hon. Friend for securing this debate, which is extremely relevant and vital at this time. Does he agree that the aid budget should be used around the world but particularly in some of our British overseas territories, which have a huge amount of biodiversity and many endangered species that need our support? Perhaps that should be one of our Government's first priorities.

Chris Grayling: Absolutely, because we have a political and national duty to help our overseas territories. Of course, there are important ties between the overseas territories and some of the conservation organisations in this country, with which my hon. Friend does so much important work and which face significant challenges right now.

We need to do two things. First, we need to step up our support for projects that specifically support endangered species and provide support against poaching. The reality in many of the national parks is that the disappearance of tourists means there are fewer people around to deter poaching and more people who are under severe economic pressures. Whether it is in respect of the projects that support orangutans in Borneo or those that look after the rhino and other endangered species in Africa, now is our moment to demonstrate our real commitment to protecting the world's most endangered animals.

Secondly, we need to put extra support into protecting and restoring forest areas and other natural habitats. I have personally seen in Borneo how an area that 20 years ago was a palm oil plantation can be turned into a forest teeming with wildlife. It can be done and we can

play a big part in that. We are doing great work in places such as the Congo basin, but now is the time to build on and expand that work.

Let me address the Minister with his Foreign Office hat on as well as his DFID one. We know from the current crisis, and from previous outbreaks of SARS and MERS in the past few years, just how vulnerable we are to zoonotic diseases making the jump to humans. We already know the risks of disease from endangered species such as pangolins—the most trafficked animals in the world—and far too many other animals that are taken into the illegal wildlife trade and that pose a real risk to all of us on this planet. We have to use all our diplomatic skills and resources to encourage change around the world after this pandemic.

Humanity cannot go on treating wildlife in the way in which it does today. People in this country—all of us in this Chamber—have a part to play. For example, we should seek always to buy products from sustainable sources. Right now, though, the most important thing is for the Minister and his Department to make sure that they put all the support they can into projects that will help endangered species today and, in doing so, contribute to helping not just to secure short-term benefit and to tackle a short-term crisis, but to ensure, over the longer term, that we secure a better future for our planet.

10.27 pm

Anthony Mangnall (Totnes) (Con): I am very conscious of the time, so I will be extremely brief and say that I agree with everything that my right hon. Friend the Member for Epsom and Ewell (Chris Grayling) said.

First, I took part in the efforts to push through the domestic Ivory Bill, which the House passed in 2018, so I agree entirely on the need to protect flora and fauna around the world and the example that the United Kingdom can set. I ask the Minister politely when we might be able to implement the Ivory Act 2018. I know that it has recently been caught up in some legal wranglings, but it would be very effective and send a clear message on the UK's determination to tackle this issue.

Secondly, it is also relevant to expand on what we did with that Act to take on the walrus, narwhal and hippo trades, which are blighting black markets around the world.

Thirdly, my right hon. Friend talked about poaching. We have the opportunity, with our official development assistance budget and our troops who serve overseas, to help those communities and those tourist economies and to help to protect the wildlife that we hold so dear.

10.28 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (James Duddridge): I am grateful to my right hon. Friend the Member for Epsom and Ewell (Chris Grayling) for securing this debate, particularly at this crucial time. I will work closely with the noble Lord Hague of Richmond of the other place, who was until recently known to this neighbourhood. I am grateful for the other contributions, in particular that of my hon. Friend the Member for Totnes (Anthony Mangnall), whom I shall look to update on the situation in relation to the Ivory Act 2018.

On the effect of the international pandemic on the tourism sector more generally and on development issues, it is still early on, but I share my right hon. Friend's

[James Duddridge]

analysis that covid has had a detrimental impact on those areas, both directly and indirectly. Tourism is a major source of employment, Government revenue and foreign exchange earnings. Clearly, this will be a loss to local community, local non-governmental organisations, anti-poaching schemes. It will also be a loss to individuals within that community, who may turn to more short-term revenue-generating activities, particularly around deforestation. We should be very alert to those issues.

I have been asked to look at how NGOs can assist in tackling poaching. I am certainly more than willing to do that, but I would also highlight the role the Ministry of Defence has played in anti-poaching matters. I am meeting the MOD this week on broader African issues and I will be more than happy to raise that broader concept. However, the underlying economics are the key to making sure that local communities understand the role of biodiversity, but still have a sustainable economic route to tackling their poverty.

Covid is still evolving. We do not know what the full situation and implications will be, but we do know there is an opportunity to build back a more resilient, healthy and greener world as we emerge from this terrible situation. The pandemic has been a stark reminder of what we have known for a long time. My right hon. Friend the Member for Epsom and Ewell refers to it as the relationship between humanity and nature. Where it breaks down it has a profound effect. We have been very much reminded of that during this crisis. Coming out of the crisis, we need to be very careful to bear that in mind.

Biodiversity is clearly essential for all life on earth, including our own. It is also vital for our economies. It underpins global efforts for broader and sustainable development. Protecting endangered species and restoring habitats, which my right hon. Friend talked about in particular, matters not only to us but to developing countries. Over 1 billion people depend on forests for their daily living, both for fuel in a sustainable way and food. Over 1 billion people depend on fish as their main source of protein, so these issues are directly important to them.

The science and evidence are clear that global biodiversity is in catastrophic decline. My right hon. Friend mentioned a number of very clear examples of that. Unfortunately, the figures paint a very concerning picture. Three quarters of land-based environments and two thirds of marine environments have been significantly altered by human activity, such as the exploitation of nature directly through pollution and through changes in land and sea use. One million animals and plant species are now at risk of extinction. My right hon. Friend rightly mentioned the orangutan. There is the maritime example of the Antarctic blue whale and he also mentioned lemur. A third of lemur species are at threat of extinction.

My own bailiwick at the Foreign Office and Department for International Development is Africa, but my right hon. Friend rightly points out that this is not just an African issue, but a global issue, mentioning countries such as Cambodia and Colombia. Really, there is either a problem in the country or the country should be stepping up to the issue, so it is a global issue. The Government feel that the UK should be a force for good. It is in the national interest to sort out these issues, as well as it being altruistic and the right thing to do.

Andrew Rosindell: The Minister mentions being a force for good. Britain is always a force for good, but we are particularly a force for good when it comes to conservation in the work of British zoos and aquariums. I urge the Minister to ensure that the Government continue to support their work, as part of the global conservation effort.

James Duddridge: I thank my hon. Friend for that intervention. His campaigning activity, I think, led directly to changes in Government policy. I have not yet been back to Colchester Zoo—I think that is our nearest shared zoo, if we go towards my end of the patch—but I look forward to doing so again. They are also an important part of educating our children on the importance of biodiversity. Not all of us can go to Madagascar and see the beauty of that country. In fact, if we all did go it would be somewhat counterproductive in terms of air miles.

Barry Gardiner (Brent North) (Lab): I have listened to all the contributions to the debate with great interest. Earlier, the situation in the overseas territories was adverted to. For the UK, 95% of our biodiversity is in the overseas territories, yet 95% of the funding we give for biodiversity goes domestically, within this country. The Foreign Office has always maintained a good relationship with the authorities in the overseas territories, but they have said that although it is their responsibility to act, they do not have the funding. Will the Minister look at that relationship of responsibility and funding? Ultimately, the responsibility under the convention on biological diversity is the UK's, even though we try to work closely with the governing authorities in the overseas territories.

James Duddridge: The two hon. Members make two important interlocking points, the hon. Member for Brent North (Barry Gardiner) on the absolute importance of the area, and my hon. Friend the Member for Romford (Andrew Rosindell) on our absolute responsibility to assist the overseas territories. Having previously had ministerial responsibility for the overseas territories, I am apprised of that and of the issue of marine diversity in particular, although not exclusively. We have done a lot on that, but I am happy to pass on the hon. Members' observations to Baroness Sugg, who is examining the relationship with the overseas territories in that regard. We would be open to doing more within our extended family, which is an obvious place to start, rather than in other areas outside that close family.

We have doubled our international climate finance to £11.6 billion over the next five years. We are helping more generally with reform in broader areas such as land use, agriculture and forest governance to help farmers in developing countries, so that they can develop sustainably without damaging the environment. One of the figures I was briefed on, which I had to check several times because it seemed too enormous to be true, is that we lose the equivalent of 30 football pitches of forested area every single minute. My right hon. Friend the Member for Epsom and Ewell talked about Berlin and other geographical areas; I am not desperately familiar with the size of Berlin, but I know the size of a football pitch, so that figure really brought home to me the importance of this subject. It is easy to talk about the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Congo basin, but they are a long way away and the DRC is a

damn big country, bigger than many of us can conceive, but we can understand the more discrete area of a football field.

We are not just stopping bad things happening, but trying to reverse the changes. We are working to conserve and restore mangrove forests, which my right hon. Friend mentioned. That work, covering 180,000 hectares of biodiverse forest, will improve the livelihoods of 80,000 people in coastal areas and avoid the production of nearly 8 million tonnes of carbon emissions. It is not about merely stopping a trajectory, but about undoing some of the harm.

It is important that we do not operate independently. This is a global issue. We are supporting the global environment facility, which was specifically set up on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth summit to tackle some of the most pressing problems. We led the last replenishment, contributing £250 million, making us the third largest donor. We should be proud that we do that. We can always do more and we press to do more, but when we do some good, we should celebrate it. Since its inception, the facility has supported the management of over 3,300 protected areas covering 860 million hectares, and in totality the projects have reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 27 billion tonnes.¹

We are committed to doing even more, investing more of our aid programme in protecting biodiversity and using our own expertise to help in this crucial work. My right hon. Friend rightly presses me on the financial side. We are reviewing the whole Government portfolio in the light of covid and working closely with Her Majesty's Treasury and other ODA Departments to make sure that all we do is done in a coherent and strategic way. Although I cannot make commitments tonight on the Floor of the House, I can point to the UK's commitment to double international climate finance to at least £11.6 billion for the period 2021-26. That should reassure him as to our direction of travel.

Mention was made of endangered species and what we are doing to protect them. We are fully committed to the convention on international trade in endangered species and the convention on the conservation of migratory species of wild animals—the only global convention specialising in the conservation of migratory species, their habitats and their migration routes. We are funding conservation activities in the Kavango–Zambezi transfrontier conservation area in southern Africa, which I know slightly better than the other parts of the world mentioned by my right hon. Friend. That is helping to unlock green corridors and benefiting wildlife and communities, and we will do more.

In the coming months we will use every opportunity to advocate and leverage our impact and influence at a global level on the issue of biodiversity. As co-hosts of COP, we want to amplify the linkages between biodiversity and tackling climate change. We are establishing a joint dialogue between consumers and producer countries, to enable a transition regarding deforestation-free commodity production, driving UK action and green supply chains.

We are advocating to secure the protection of our planet's ocean and land resources by 2030, to help curb climate change, support livelihoods, and safeguard a planet for all. In 2021 we have the convention on biological diversity—COP15—alongside COP26. Having had to delay COP26, in the next 18 months we have an opportunity to deal with some of these issues.

The Ivory Act received Royal Assent in 2018, and there was an appeal to the Court of Appeal which, quite rightly, upheld the Government's position. There is now a challenge to the Supreme Court—my hon. Friend the Member for Totnes rightly raised that issue, and although we very much want to move ahead, we will be delayed slightly by that challenge. I would be more than happy to discuss the issue with him.

Jim Shannon: One story in the media over the weekend that I was aware of is that across the whole of Africa some criminal gangs have been involved in wildlife crime. Those gangs are mostly constituted of those of Chinese origin. Can the Minister offer any help to assist countries legally to make those involved in wildlife crime be held accountable?

James Duddridge: The hon. Gentleman is right, and the problems of organised crime are deep. These are not disorganised or opportunistic cases, and as well as anti-poaching measures, this is about fundamental policing and community-based activities. This is not necessarily just through NGOs and the MOD; it is about good old-fashioned policing and community engagement.

It is important that all communities benefit from biodiversity, and that benefit is most obvious through preservation and caring for the community. That is where the loss of tourism that my right hon. Friend the Member for Epsom and Ewell referred to is so important, because a direct contribution was made by people going to those areas to enjoy the beauty of biodiversity. Those communities then received money, both directly through employment for people and their families, and funding for anti-poaching work, but also through a broader contribution from greater sustainability, and ensuring local buying in the communities. As with a lot of development and diplomacy, this is not something that the UK does unto others; this is something that we do with global partners, in partnership with those countries.

We have a stark choice for our shared future. This is not just about nature; this is about humanity. Covid has demonstrated that link, and my right hon. Friend has directly pointed to that shared interest between biodiversity and humanity. We must seize the opportunity to reshape our economies, build back better, and reset our relationship with nature. Let us not waste it.

Question put and agreed to.

10.44 pm

House adjourned.

1. [Official Report, 22 July 2020, Vol. 678, c. 14MC]

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)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Ronnie Cowan (Inverclyde)	Patrick Grady
Debbie Abrahams (Oldham East and Saddleworth)	Jim McMahon	Mr Geoffrey Cox (Torridge and West Devon)	Alex Burghart
Imran Ahmad Khan (Wakefield)	Stuart Andrew	Neil Coyle (Bermondsey and Old Southwark)	Mark Tami
Tahir Ali (Birmingham, Hall Green)	Mark Tami	Angela Crawley (Lanark and Hamilton East)	Patrick Grady
Dr Rosena Allin-Khan (Tooting)	Mark Tami	Stella Creasy (Walthamstow)	Mark Tami
Victoria Atkins (Louth and Horncastle)	Stuart Andrew	Tracey Crouch (Chatham and Aylesford)	Caroline Nokes
Mr Richard Bacon (South Norfolk)	Stuart Andrew	Janet Daby (Lewisham East)	Mark Tami
Siobhan Baillie (Stroud)	Stuart Andrew	Geraint Davies (Swansea West)	Chris Evans
Hannah Bardell (Livingston)	Patrick Grady	Mr David Davis (Haltemprice and Howden)	Stuart Andrew
Mr John Baron (Basildon and Billericay)	Stuart Andrew	Dehenna Davison (Bishop Auckland)	Stuart Andrew
Margaret Beckett (Derby South)	Clive Efford	Martyn Day (Linlithgow and East Falkirk)	Patrick Grady
Sir Paul Beresford (Mole Valley)	Stuart Andrew	Marsha De Cordova (Battersea)	Rachel Hopkins
Jake Berry (Rossendale and Darwen)	Stuart Andrew	Caroline Dinéage (Gosport)	Caroline Nokes
Mr Clive Betts (Sheffield South East)	Mark Tami	Martin Docherty-Hughes (West Dunbartonshire)	Patrick Grady
Mhairi Black (Paisley and Renfrewshire South)	Patrick Grady	Dave Doogan (Angus)	Patrick Grady
Ian Blackford (Ross, Skye and Lochaber)	Patrick Grady	Ms Nadine Dorries (Mid Bedfordshire)	Stuart Andrew
Bob Blackman (Harrow East)	Stuart Andrew	Jack Dromey (Birmingham, Erdington)	Mark Tami
Kirsty Blackman (Aberdeen North)	Patrick Grady	Philip Dunne (Ludlow)	Jeremy Hunt
Mr Peter Bone (Wellingborough)	Stuart Andrew	Colum Eastwood (Foyle)	Conor McGinn
Steven Bonnar (Coatbridge, Chryston and Bellshill)	Patrick Grady	Ruth Edwards (Rushcliffe)	Stuart Andrew
Andrew Bridgen (North West Leicestershire)	Stuart Andrew	Florence Eshalomi (Vauxhall)	Mark Tami
James Brokenshire (Old Bexley and Sidcup)	Stuart Andrew	Dr Luke Evans (Bosworth)	Stuart Andrew
Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudoun)	Patrick Grady	Sir David Evennett (Bexleyheath and Crayford)	Stuart Andrew
Ms Lyn Brown (West Ham)	Mark Tami	Michael Fabricant (Lichfield)	Stuart Andrew
Richard Burgon (Leeds East)	Zarah Sultana	Marion Fellows (Motherwell and Wishaw)	Patrick Grady
Conor Burns (Bournemouth West)	Stuart Andrew	Margaret Ferrier (Rutherglen and Hamilton West)	Patrick Grady
Dr Lisa Cameron (East Kilbride, Strathaven and Lesmahagow)	Patrick Grady	Vicky Foxcroft (Lewisham, Deptford)	Mark Tami
Sir William Cash (Stone)	Leo Docherty	George Freeman (Mid Norfolk)	Theo Clarke
Sarah Champion (Rotherham)	Mark Tami	Marcus Fysh (Yeovil)	Stuart Andrew
Douglas Chapman (Dunfermline and West Fife)	Patrick Grady	Sir Roger Gale (North Thanet)	Caroline Nokes
Damian Collins (Folkestone and Hythe)	Stuart Andrew	Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran)	Patrick Grady
Rosie Cooper (West Lancashire)	Mark Tami	Preet Kaur Gill (Birmingham, Edgbaston)	Mark Tami
Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North)	Bell Ribeiro-Addy	Dame Cheryl Gillan (Chesham and Amersham)	Stuart Andrew
		Mary Glendon (North Tyneside)	Mark Tami
		Mrs Helen Grant (Maidstone and The Weald)	Stuart Andrew
		Peter Grant (Glenrothes)	Patrick Grady
		Neil Gray (Airdrie and Shotts)	Patrick Grady
		Margaret Greenwood (Wirral West)	Mark Tami
		Andrew Griffith (Arundel and South Downs)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy	Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Kate Griffiths (Burton)	Aaron Bell	Julie Marson (Hertford and Stortford)	Stuart Andrew
Andrew Gwynne (Denton and Reddish)	Mark Tami	Rachael Maskell (York Central)	Mark Tami
Robert Halfon (Harlow)	Lucy Allan	Stuart C. McDonald (Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East)	Patrick Grady
Fabian Hamilton (Leeds North East)	Mark Tami	John McDonnell (Hayes and Harlington)	Cat Smith
Claire Hanna (Belfast South)	Liz Saville Roberts	Anne McLaughlin (Glasgow North East)	Patrick Grady
Neale Hanvey (Kirkcaldy and Cowdenbeath)	Patrick Grady	John Mc Nally (Falkirk)	Patrick Grady
Ms Harriet Harman (Camberwell and Peckham)	Mark Tami	Stephen McPartland (Stevenage)	Stuart Andrew
Sir Oliver Heald (North East Hertfordshire)	Stuart Andrew	Ian Mearns (Gateshead)	Mark Tami
Sir Mark Hendrick (Preston)	Mark Tami	Johnny Mercer (Plymouth, Moor View)	Stuart Andrew
Mike Hill (Hartlepool)	Mark Tami	Stephen Metcalfe (South Basildon and East Thurrock)	Stuart Andrew
Simon Hoare (North Dorset)	Fay Jones	Nigel Mills (Amber Valley)	Stuart Andrew
Dame Margaret Hodge (Barking)	Wes Streeting	Carol Monaghan (Glasgow North West)	Patrick Grady
Mrs Sharon Hodgson (Washington and Sunderland West)	Mark Tami	Anne Marie Morris (Newton Abbot)	Stuart Andrew
Adam Holloway (Gravesham)	Maria Caulfield	David Morris (Morecambe and Lunesdale)	Stuart Andrew
Sir George Howarth (Knowsley)	Mark Tami	Grahame Morris (Easington)	Mark Tami
Dr Neil Hudson (Penrith and The Border)	Stuart Andrew	James Murray (Ealing North)	Mark Tami
Imran Hussain (Bradford East)	Judith Cummins	John Nicolson (Ochil and South Perthshire)	Patrick Grady
Dan Jarvis (Barnsley Central)	Mark Tami	Dr Matthew Offord (Hendon)	Rebecca Harris
Mr Ranil Jayawardena (North East Hampshire)	Stuart Andrew	Brendan O'Hara (Argyll and Bute)	Patrick Grady
Andrea Jenkyns (Morley and Outwood)	Stuart Andrew	Guy Opperman (Hexham)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Caroline Johnson (Sleaford and North Hykeham)	Stuart Andrew	Kate Osamor (Edmonton)	Nadia Whittome
Dame Diana Johnson (Kingston upon Hull North)	Mark Tami	Kirsten Oswald (East Renfrewshire)	Patrick Grady
Barbara Keeley (Worsley and Eccles South)	Mark Tami	Sarah Owen (Luton North)	Alex Norris
Afzal Khan (Manchester, Gorton)	Mark Tami	Jess Phillips (Birmingham, Yardley)	Mark Tami
Sir Greg Knight (East Yorkshire)	Stuart Andrew	Dr Dan Poulter (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich)	Peter Aldous
Mrs Pauline Latham (Mid Derbyshire)	Mr William Wragg	Lucy Powell (Manchester Central)	Mark Tami
Ian Lavery (Wansbeck)	Mary Kelly Foy	Yasmin Qureshi (Bolton South East)	Mark Tami
Chris Law (Dundee West)	Patrick Grady	Christina Rees (Neath)	Mark Tami
Clive Lewis (Norwich South)	Rosie Duffield	Ellie Reeves (Lewisham West and Penge)	Mark Tami
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger (Bridgwater and West Somerset)	Stuart Andrew	Naz Shah (Bradford West)	Mark Tami
Tony Lloyd (Rochdale)	Mark Tami	Mr Virendra Sharma (Ealing, Southall)	Mark Tami
Mark Logan (Bolton North East)	Stuart Andrew	Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield)	Mark Tami
Rebecca Long Bailey (Salford and Eccles)	Cat Smith	Alec Shelbrooke (Elmet and Rothwell)	Stuart Andrew
Julia Lopez (Hornchurch and Upminster)	Lee Rowley	Tommy Sheppard (Edinburgh East)	Patrick Grady
Mr Jonathan Lord (Woking)	Stuart Andrew	Royston Smith (Southampton, Itchen)	Robert Courts
Kenny MacAskill (East Lothian)	Patrick Grady	Jo Stevens (Cardiff Glasgow Central)	Mark Tami
Shabana Mahmood (Birmingham, Ladywood)	Mark Tami	Sir Gary Streeter (South West Devon)	Stuart Andrew

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
Alison Thewliss (Glasgow Central)	Patrick Grady
Gareth Thomas (Harrow West)	Mark Tami
Richard Thomson (Gordon)	Patrick Grady
Jon Trickett (Hemsworth)	Olivia Blake
Karl Turner (Kingston upon Hull East)	Mark Tami

Member eligible for proxy vote	Nominated proxy
David Warburton (Somerton and Frome)	Stuart Andrew
Dr Philippa Whitford (Central Ayrshire)	Patrick Grady
Hywel Williams (Arfon)	Ben Lake
Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire)	Patrick Grady
Mohammad Yasin (Bedford)	Mark Tami

Written Statements

Monday 20 July 2020

BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

Vaccine Taskforce

The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Alok Sharma): I am today updating Parliament on the work of the Vaccine Taskforce in securing a vaccine against covid-19.

Tackling this virus is the biggest challenge that this country has faced in peacetime history. Today I am announcing the recent steps that the Vaccines Taskforce has taken towards making a successful covid-19 vaccine available as soon as possible to the UK population and the wider world.

I can inform the House that we have signed agreements with the BioNTech/Pfizer alliance and Valneva to purchase their vaccines. This is part of our strategy to procure a portfolio of promising vaccine candidates, giving us the best chance of securing a successful one at the earliest opportunity. Demand for a successful vaccine will be high and placing these orders early will give us access to the doses we need if and when any of these candidates prove to be safe and effective in clinical trials and receive regulatory approval.

I am also announcing that the Government have issued a letter of intent in advance of entering an agreement to secure an antibody that may be used as a therapeutic treatment in support of the wider vaccination programme. The antibody, manufactured by AstraZeneca, is currently in clinical trials and could be available for use by the second quarter of 2021, if those trials are successful.

Clinical trials play a vital part in the vaccine development process. Today, the Government are also launching the NHS covid-19 vaccine research registry. This new website will enable people in the UK to volunteer for future vaccine studies planned in the UK, playing their part in our national effort to ensure a covid-19 vaccine is available as soon as possible.

[HCWS387]

Contingencies Fund Advance

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Nadhim Zahawi): I hereby give notice of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy's intention to seek an advance from the Contingencies Fund of £5,070,000,000 to provide funding for the Nuclear Liabilities Fund (NLF).

The funding will be used to increase the NLF's public sector assets, by making £5.07 billion available to the NLF in the form of a deposit in the national loans fund. This offers an alternative investment opportunity to the NLF, which otherwise would re-allocate moneys within the next month into investments in its privately held asset portfolio. Such re-allocation would increase public sector net debt, and so this alternative funding arrangement avoids this immediate negative fiscal impact. The payment to the NLF is fiscally neutral.

The trustee directors of the NLF have a fiduciary duty to ensure the NLF remains on track to be sufficient to meet certain future decommissioning liabilities. Parliamentary approval for additional capital of £5,070,000,000 will be sought in a supplementary estimate for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. Pending that approval, urgent expenditure estimated at £5,070,000,000 will be met by repayable cash advances from the Contingencies Fund.

The cash advance will be repaid upon receiving Royal Assent on the Supply and Appropriation Bill.

[HCWS388]

Unified Patent Court

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Amanda Solloway): I am tabling this statement for the benefit of right hon. and hon. Members to bring to their attention the UK's withdrawal from the Unified Patent Court system.

Today, by means of a note verbale, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has withdrawn its ratification of the agreement on a Unified Patent Court and the protocol on privileges and immunities of the Unified Patent Court, dated 23 April 2018, in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man, and its consent to be bound by the protocol to the agreement on a Unified Patent Court on provisional application, dated on 6 July 2017, (collectively "the agreements").

In view of the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union, the United Kingdom no longer wishes to be a party to the Unified Patent Court system. Participating in a court that applies EU law and is bound by the CJEU would be inconsistent with the Government's aims of becoming an independent self-governing nation.

The agreements have not yet entered into force. However, in order to ensure clarity regarding the United Kingdom's status in respect of the agreements and to facilitate their orderly entry into force for other states without the participation of the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom has chosen to withdraw its ratification of the agreements at this time. The United Kingdom considers that its withdrawals shall take effect immediately and that it will be for the remaining participating states to decide the future of the Unified Patent Court system.

[HCWS395]

TREASURY

Public Service Pensions: Survivor Benefits

The Chief Secretary to the Treasury (Steve Barclay): The Government are committed to providing public service pensions that are fair for public sector workers and for taxpayers. The Government's position remains that benefit entitlements should normally be determined based on the rules applicable at the time the member served, to maintain fairness for active scheme members and the taxpayer.

Following the Walker v Innospec Supreme Court ruling, the Government decided that in public service schemes, surviving male same-sex and female same-sex spouses and civil partners of public service pension

scheme members will, in certain cases, receive benefits equivalent to those received by widows of opposite sex marriages. The exception to this is in specific schemes where, in the past, improvements in female members' survivor benefits have involved female members making employee contributions or increasing them.

A case brought in the Employment Tribunal against the Secretary of State for Education (Gavin Williamson) earlier this year highlighted that these changes may lead to direct sexual orientation discrimination within the Teachers' Pension Scheme, where male survivors of female scheme members remain entitled to a lower survivor benefit than a comparable same-sex survivor.

The Government have concluded that changes are required to the Teachers' Pension Scheme to address the discrimination. The Government believe that this difference in treatment will also need to be remedied in those other public service pension schemes, where the husband or male civil partner of a female scheme member is in similar circumstances.

Departments responsible for the Administration of affected schemes will consult on and take forward changes as soon as possible. Schemes will notify their members of changes and any actions they need to take.

[HCWS397]

DEFENCE

Service Complaints Ombudsman: Annual Report 2019

The Minister for Defence People and Veterans (Johnny Mercer): The Ministry of Defence (MOD)'s formal response to the Service Complaints Ombudsman's (SCO) annual report for 2019 on the fairness, effectiveness and efficiency of the Service complaints system has today been placed in the Library of the House.

The ombudsman's report assessed the fourth year of operation of the reformed service complaints system, which was implemented on 1 January 2016, and the work of her office in 2019. The response sets out MOD's comments and approach to each of the ombudsman's new recommendations, the observations that she has made and includes a summary of our position on recommendations made in previous annual reports.

The MOD values the strong independent oversight that the ombudsman brings to the service complaints process, and remains committed to having a system in which our personnel can have confidence. This will include progressing outstanding recommendations and observations, together with improvements identified in Air Marshal Wigston's report in April 2019 on inappropriate behaviours.

Attachments can be viewed online at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2020-07-20/HCWS392/>.

[HCWS392]

DIGITAL, CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT

Community Match Challenge

The Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (Oliver Dowden): On 8 April, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a £750 million funding package for the voluntary, community and social enterprise

(VCSE) sector. I wish to set out to the House the details of how £90 million from this package will be allocated.

We are all aware of the vital role that the VCSE sector plays in our society, and this has especially been the case in the past few months. Charities and community organisations have been at the frontline of the coronavirus outbreak, providing trusted support to people and communities.

Through the coronavirus community support fund, £200 million is already being allocated largely to small and medium sized charities in England by the National Lottery Community Fund.

We are now inviting the philanthropists, foundations and grant makers to put forward new funding, which the Government will match on a pound for pound basis.

The Government will match up to £85 million of funding from strategic funders such as philanthropists and charitable foundations. This funding is intended for beneficiary groups that are the most vulnerable and the hardest hit by covid-19. We expect awards to be made principally to charitable grant makers providing aid to small and medium-sized charities. We anticipate funding applications in the £5 million to £20 million range. This innovative approach will build on the expertise of philanthropists and foundations by supporting the charities that they believe will have the highest impact in the areas that we want to focus on, while giving charities longer-term recovery support by allowing the non-Government portion of the match funding to be spent beyond March 2021.

We believe that this approach will stimulate further donations and ensure that a further £85 million of philanthropic funding from those who wish to support their communities during these challenging times will go to charities, further increasing support to the sector.

An additional £4.8 million is also being allocated to the Voluntary and Community Sector Emergencies Partnership to strengthen its support to the voluntary and community sector, and its co-ordinating role with Government and statutory agencies, as they continue to respond to covid-19.

Applications close at midnight on 2 August 2020 and details can be found at the fund website here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-match-challenge-and-voluntary-and-community-sector-emergencies-partnership>.

[HCWS396]

EDUCATION

School Funding

The Minister for School Standards (Nick Gibb): Today I am confirming provisional funding allocations for 2021-22 through the schools, high needs and central school services national funding formulae (NFF). The allocations distribute the second year of the multi-billion school funding settlement that the Secretary of State for Education announced to Parliament on 3 September 2019. Core school funding is increasing by £2.6 billion in 2020-21, and will increase by £4.8 billion and £7.1 billion in 2021-22 and 2022-23 respectively, compared with 2019-20. In addition, we continue to fund the recent increase in pension costs for teachers, worth £1.5 billion a year.

These allocations, which are part of the annual funding cycle, will provide schools and local authorities with certainty of future funding. In addition to this core funding, schools can apply for exceptional funding to cover specific unavoidable costs incurred by schools due to coronavirus—covid-19—between March and July that cannot be met from existing resources. Schools will also benefit from the £1 billion catch-up package for the 2020-21 academic year to directly tackle the impact of the disruption that covid-19 has caused. This includes a catch-up premium worth £650 million to support schools to make up for lost teaching time for all pupils, and a new £350 million tutoring fund for disadvantaged pupils. Guidance on the allocation and use of that funding will be published today.

The funding factors used in the 2021-22 NFF remain the same, but we have made two technical changes, which are detailed in the NFF policy document also published today:

Funding from the teachers' pay grant and the teachers' pension employer contribution grant, including the supplementary fund, has been added to the formulae from 2021-22. This will simplify the allocation of this funding—worth almost £2 billion a year—recognising that these grants are part of schools' core budgets and providing reassurance to schools and local authorities that the funding will continue to be provided.

The 2019 update to the income deprivation affecting children index has been incorporated so that deprivation funding allocated through the formulae is based on the latest data. School funding through the NFF is increasing by 4% overall in 2021-22. The NFF will distribute this funding based on schools' and pupils' needs and characteristics.

The main features in 2021-22 are:

The funding floor will ensure that every school is allocated at least 2% more pupil-led funding per pupil compared to its 2020-21 NFF allocation.

The key factors in the NFF will increase by 3%, providing a significant increase to those schools already attracting their NFF allocations.

The minimum per pupil funding levels will ensure that every primary school receives at least £4,000 per pupil, and every secondary school at least £5,150 per pupil, delivering on the Government's pledge to level up the lowest funded schools.

Funding to cover additional teachers' pay and pensions costs, previously funded through separate grants, has additionally been reflected in all schools' allocations. This means that a further £180 and £265 respectively will be added to the minimum per pupil amounts above.

Additional funding for small and remote schools will increase in 2021-22, with primary schools attracting up to £45,000, compared to £26,000 previously, as a first step towards expanding the support the NFF provides for such schools from 2022-23.

High needs funding will increase by a further £730 million, or 10%, in 2021-22—that follows the substantial increase this year and brings the total high needs budget to over £8 billion. The high needs NFF will ensure that every local authority receives a further increase of at least 8% per head of population, compared to this year, with some authorities receiving up to 12%. This vital extra resource will help local authorities to manage their cost pressures in this area. The Government are continuing to pursue a cross-departmental review of the special educational needs and disability (SEND) system to see what further improvements are necessary to ensure that it supports children and young people with SEND as effectively as possible.

In addition, the Department will start negotiations with some of those local authorities with the highest dedicated schools grant (DSG) deficits about supporting them to reduce their deficits over time.

Central schools services funding in 2021-22 will increase by 4% for the ongoing responsibilities that local authorities continue to have for all schools. In line with the process introduced for 2020-21 to withdraw funding over time based on the commitments local authorities entered into before 2013-14, funding for historic commitments will decrease by 20% for those local authorities in receipt of this funding.

The provisional NFF allocations published today will be updated, based on the latest pupil data, to produce final allocations in December that local authorities will receive through the DSG.

Local authorities will continue to use that funding to determine final allocations for all local mainstream schools. In the light of the need to focus efforts on meeting the challenges of covid-19, we are not changing local authorities' role in the distribution of school funding in 2021-22. The Government will, later this year, put forward their proposals to move to a hard NFF in future, which will determine schools' budgets directly rather than through local formulae set independently by each local authority. This will level up the school funding system so that all schools across the country are funded on a comparable basis. We will consult widely with local authorities, schools and others to make this transition carefully.

[HCWS393]

FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

Sanctions and anti-Money Laundering Act 2018: Report on Regulations

The Minister for Asia (Nigel Adams): My noble Friend the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon) has made the following written ministerial statement:

Today the "Report on Regulations Made under Section 32 of the Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Act 2018" will be laid in Parliament.

The report details the two regulations laid under section 1 of the Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Act 2018 during the reporting period from 23 May 2019 to 22 May 2020, and states the relevant human rights purposes of those regulations.

In addition to the actions set out in the report, the Government established the global human rights sanctions regime on 6 July by laying regulations in Parliament. These regulations enable the Government to impose sanctions in response to serious human rights violations or abuses around the world. The Government made immediate use of the powers provided by the Global Human Rights Sanctions Regulations 2020, implementing 49 designations on a range of people and entities.

[HCWS394]

EFTA States and Switzerland: Future Relationship

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Wendy Morton): The Government are pleased to announce that we have moved into formal negotiations on our future relationships with both the EEA EFTA states (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) and Switzerland from the beginning of July.

The Government have already been working closely with all four non-EU states on a range of issues related to our future relationship. We have successfully delivered a number of agreements, including the EEA EFTA separation agreement signed in January this year, which broadly mirrors provisions in the EU withdrawal agreement on citizens' rights and a small number of other relevant separation issues. With the Swiss, we have concluded and signed agreements in five key areas; trade; air services; road transport; insurance; and citizen's rights.

The EEA EFTA states and Switzerland are important European economic partners, with bilateral trade totalling approximately £27 billion with the EEA EFTA states and around £39 billion with Switzerland in 2019. We also enjoy close co-operation with these countries across a range of areas outside of trade, which is why the Government are seeking to agree measures that span across the entire breadth of our relationship.

EEA EFTA states

Negotiations with the EEA EFTA states will continue to take place alongside those we are conducting with the EU. In some areas, our future relationship with these states will be closely tied to the UK's future relationship with the EU by virtue of their participation in the EU single market, via the EEA agreement, and other EU-led initiatives. In others, these countries have the flexibility to agree bespoke bilateral arrangements. The ongoing negotiations will need to take account of this, but we are clear in our aim of protecting the close levels of existing co-operation we have with these key European partners, and building ambitious future facing agreements befitting our close relationship with them.

A successful UK-EEA EFTA future relations dialogue took place on 16 July. We will be publishing further details of these negotiations on the Government's website soon, providing further details on the scope of the arrangements we are seeking to agree.

Switzerland

Over the last three years, a dedicated high-level UK-Swiss continuity dialogue has proven highly successful in advancing vital work to uphold our excellent relations with the Swiss in the context of our EU exit. The continuity arrangements we have reached with Switzerland have given vital certainty to citizens and businesses alike. The Government are seeking to build on these strong foundations in the future: we are now convening a new UK-Swiss future relations dialogue to open the next chapter in our relations.

Our first UK-Swiss future relations dialogue took place on 1 July. The Government are taking a sequenced approach to our joint endeavours with Switzerland before the review clause in our trade continuity agreement activates in 2021. First, we will aim to resolve residual separation issues as far as is possible. Secondly, we will also aim to address issues that are dependent on our negotiations with the EU or indeed related negotiations. Thirdly, we will begin exploring new bilateral opportunities where we can make progress together in 2020.

Sequencing

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office is working with other Government Departments to secure the delivery of these negotiations. The Department for International Trade continues to be responsible for all trade and economic arrangements. In non-trade areas, Departments

responsible will seek arrangements which deliver on UK interests and provide maximum coverage across the full scope of our relationship with these countries.

The Government are aiming to bring some of the agreements negotiated with these states into effect by the end of the transition period in line with our approach to EU negotiations. Further details on the progress of these negotiations will be made available to Parliament as they develop. Indeed, our future relationship with these key partners is a Government priority.

[HCWS390]

HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Building and Fire Safety

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Robert Jenrick): I would like to update Parliament on the Government's progress in overhauling the building and fire safety system, as part of our unwavering commitment to ensuring that people, and the buildings they live in, are safe.

Building safety

We must never forget the 72 people who lost their lives as a result of the Grenfell Tower tragedy. Countless lives were torn apart by that tragedy, and we owe it to the deceased, the bereaved, the survivors, and the residents of all high-rise buildings to ensure that we do all we can to prevent a repeat of events like that fateful night occurring again.

We promised to overhaul the system and to establish a national building safety regulator at its heart. Today I am pleased to be making a significant step towards that fundamental reform by publishing the draft Building Safety Bill for pre-legislative scrutiny, before the final Bill is brought forward to Parliament.

The Bill will establish the regulator in the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and give it significant powers to improve safety and performance across the built environment, especially in higher-risk buildings.

These reforms will improve safety and performance standards across all buildings. However, certain buildings warrant even closer oversight because the potential for significant consequences should a fire spread or the structure fail. It is right that we have a more stringent regime where the risk is deemed greatest, to protect the greatest number of people. Initially the scope of the more stringent regime will apply to multi-occupied residential buildings of 18 metres or more in height or more than six storeys, whichever is reached first. We have designed the new regime so its scope can be changed if the evidence base or operational experience suggest it should.

The Bill will provide a stronger framework to make sure those responsible for managing building safety risks in higher-risk buildings are held to account, with stronger enforcement powers and sanctions where those rules are not followed. It will also ensure that the residents of high-rise buildings have a stronger voice, alongside giving them better access to safety information about their building, clarifying their rights and providing recourse to raise safety concerns directly to the regulator.

The draft Bill applies to England only with the exception of the policies to require developers to belong to a New Homes Ombudsman scheme, strengthen the oversight of the construction products regulatory regime, and allow the Architects Registration Board (ARB) to monitor the competence of architects. Further detailed analysis of the territorial extent is provided in the explanatory notes.

Building safety financing

The Government are clear that it is unacceptable for leaseholders to have to worry about the cost of fixing historic safety defects in their buildings that they did not cause.

The draft Bill proposes a new building safety charge, which will give leaseholders greater transparency around costs incurred in maintaining a safe building. We want these to be fair and proportionate, which is why I have deliberately included numerous powers in the Bill that will enable us to limit the building safety costs that can be re-charged to leaseholders.

This is a topic that we are particularly committed to developing further throughout the process of scrutiny and as the Bill is finalised for introduction. I have asked Michael Wade, senior adviser to the Cabinet Office, to accelerate this work with leaseholders and the financial sector. We must remove barriers to fixing historic defects and identify financing solutions that protect leaseholders from unaffordable costs; but we must also ensure that the bill does not fall on tax payers. We will update on any further measures required before the final Bill is introduced to Parliament.

Establishing the building safety regulator

As I announced in January, the HSE is establishing the regulator in shadow form, and I am today announcing that I have set aside £16.4 million in this financial year for HSE to recruit the people and develop the capabilities that will enable the regulator to hit the ground running once its powers come into effect.

HSE has a strong track record of improving safety and fostering a safety-first culture within the construction and major hazards industries, and will draw on years of experience to deliver results quickly and effectively. As shadow regulator, HSE is playing an increasingly important role in the Government's building safety programme: it is supporting work on how to identify higher-risk buildings; supporting work by the National Fire Chiefs Council to assess the fire risk in every high-rise residential building by end 2021; and supporting work with early adopters in the construction industry, social landlords and local government to trial the new regime, and to promote culture change across the industry. I am today announcing that HSE will also take over as chair of the Joint Regulators' Group, which advises the Government on ways to strengthen the regulatory regime; and will take over the Independent Expert Advisory Panel, which advises the Government on fire safety in high-rise residential buildings.

Over coming months, the shadow regulator will engage with and advise residents, building owners, the construction industry and other regulators on how the new system will operate, what it will mean for them, and what they should do now to make their buildings safe and prepare for the new regime. In the autumn, we will kick off work to appoint the first national chief inspector of buildings, who will lead the new regulator.

We, and the public, expect industry to manage building safety risks now and prepare to fulfil their duties when this new regime comes into effect. The public expects and demands industry to implement these reforms with conviction and speed. The new Building Safety Regulator stands ready to work hand in hand with industry to bring about a culture change that prioritises residents and their safety.

Fire safety reforms

The Home Office is also today publishing a fire safety consultation, which sets out proposals to strengthen the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005—the fire safety order—and improve compliance for all regulated buildings; implement the Grenfell Tower Inquiry phase 1 report recommendations for multi-occupied residential buildings which require a change in law; and, seeks views on the effectiveness of the arrangements for consultation and information sharing between building control bodies and fire and rescue authorities in relation to building work. This is alongside a commitment to overhaul the fire safety order's supporting guidance.

Proposals for multi-occupied residential buildings, mostly high-rise buildings, include prescribing in law the frequency of checks of fire doors; that responsible persons (RPs) carry out inspections of other key fire-fighting equipment, not just lifts designed to be used by firefighters; and that RPs provide information to residents including in relation to fire safety—including evacuation and other specific information—in an accessible format.

Our proposals go beyond the Grenfell Tower Inquiry's recommendations in several areas. In others, our proposals prioritise residents' safety in a way that is practical, proportionate and effective to the risks the inquiry has identified. The Government want to listen to the views of those who have experience of these matters, including those who have been personally affected by the Grenfell Tower tragedy. The proposals set out in the Home Office consultation will further deliver the Government's objective to improve building and fire safety in all regulated premises where people live, stay or work.

Construction products

The Bill also enables us to progress our commitment to radically strengthen oversight of the regulatory regime for construction products. The Bill will make sure a wider range of construction products are subject to strengthened safety regulations. It will also strengthen the powers available to the Government, paving the way to create a new national regulatory function that will have oversight of the construction products regulation. The Government are developing options for how this new national regulatory function could be implemented.

Other housing measures

The draft Bill also contains measures to protect the rights of all new build home buyers by requiring developers to belong to the New Homes Ombudsman. It also includes new measures that will make access to redress swifter and more effective for all social housing residents.

Pre-legislative scrutiny

These are extensive reforms that it is incumbent on us all to get right. The Building Safety Bill is a large and complex piece of legislation, reflecting the scale of the reforms needed. In this spirit, I am publishing the Bill in draft form to ensure it receives the due and proper consideration it deserves through pre-legislative scrutiny

from Parliament, from industry, from regulatory bodies, and from residents. I want to thank those that have helped shape the legislation so far, including those who contributed to the “Building a Safer Future” consultation and who have engaged in various forums with my Department. I now encourage colleagues from across both Houses to engage wholeheartedly in strengthening these proposals so that together we can further improve the legislation and deliver greater safety for residents.

I will deposit copies of the draft Building Safety Bill, delegated powers memorandum and impact assessment in the Libraries of both Houses. A copy of the full fire safety consultation and its impact assessment will also be deposited in the Libraries of both Houses.

[HCWS391]

TRANSPORT

Crossrail: Annual Update

The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Chris Heaton-Harris): Over the past year, several milestones have been reached on the Crossrail project and work continues despite the new challenges presented by covid-19.

When complete, the Elizabeth line will be transformative, reducing overcrowding, delivering spacious new trains, adding significant additional rail capacity to London and the south-east, and delivering a huge boost to the recovering UK economy. Its benefits will be vast and long lasting.

Important progress is being made on taking the Crossrail project towards completion and for its transition to Transport for London (TfL), the future Elizabeth line operator.

In December last year, TfL Rail commenced operating services between Paddington and Reading using the new UK built class 345 trains, marking another important stage in the delivery of the Elizabeth line. This year, the higher capacity nine carriage trains are being introduced along this part of the route.

The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) has approved the new trains to run in passenger service between Paddington and Heathrow airport, paving the way for a future increase in services to four trains per hour, adding important extra service capacity to the local rail network. Final testing and driver training is taking place with Bombardier and MTR Elizabeth Line ahead of the services being introduced.

Over the past year, Crossrail Limited (CRL) has made further progress on the final completion of the new central section. Signalling and train software testing has progressed and a number of assets including completed shafts and portals together with the new custom house station have now been handed over to TfL. All the stations in the central section are now ready for the trial running of services, with the exception of Bond Street, which requires further work.

Network Rail (NR) works on the eastern and western sections of the route have continued to progress over the past year with the delivery of the enhanced ticket halls and access improvements on the surface section progressing at Ilford and Romford; Acton main line, Ealing Broadway, West Ealing, Southall, Hayes and Harlington and West Drayton, with step-free access being prioritised where possible.

In March this year, future Elizabeth line stations Hanwell, Iver, Langley, and Taplow were also provided with step-free access from street to platform.

Together, these milestones represent key steps forward in the operational development of the railway.

But there have been challenges as well.

In January, CRL announced that it planned to open the central section of the railway in summer 2021 and the full Elizabeth line by mid-2022, citing challenges with completing the software development and the safety assurance processes preventing it from meeting its previously planned opening window. Progress was further affected by the safe stop announced on March 24, when CRL ceased all physical work at its construction sites, including Network Rail’s station upgrade works, as a result of the covid-19 crisis and in line with TfL’s decision to pause work on project sites, though essential, business critical and remote assurance work continued.

In November last year and before the impact of covid-19, CRL announced that it would not be able to deliver the railway within the funding package originally announced by the Department and the Mayor of London in December 2018, and that it would require between £400 to £650 million in additional funding.

The further schedule delays and cost increases to this project since the last annual update are very disappointing. A revised funding package will now need to be developed for Crossrail that is fair to UK taxpayers, with London as the primary beneficiary bearing the cost.

Works have now restarted as part of Crossrail’s recovery plan with sites operating within the framework of Public Health England’s safety guidelines, with CRL intensely focused on achieving the next key programme milestone—commencement of the intensive testing of the railway, known as trial running.

CRL is currently in the process of updating its cost and schedule forecasts in the light of its recovery plan, including assessing the impact on its opening schedule, and will make a further update on this shortly.

A further update to the overall costings for Network Rail’s programme show that the Crossrail on network works require an extra £140 million of funding with the cost of the surface works package now standing at just under £3 billion. The additional costs, which were assessed before the covid-19 crisis, are the result of some station and power upgrade work taking longer than planned.

The Department will continue to work with its joint sponsor, TfL, to closely scrutinise the project, supporting its delivery as soon as is safely possible and to deliver the vital assurance and safety certification that is required before passenger services can commence.

The Department will also work with TfL to oversee the effective review and evolution of Crossrail’s future governance arrangements to make sure the right decisions are taken as the project moves towards completion, and that it successfully transitions to TfL operations as soon as possible. CRL together with both sponsors remain committed to ongoing transparency with regard to the project.

During the passage of the Crossrail Bill through Parliament, a commitment was given that an annual statement would be published until the completion of the construction of Crossrail, setting out information

about the project's funding and finances. Further details on CRL's funding and finances in the period to 29 May 2020 are set out in the table below. The relevant information is as follows:

Total funding amounts provided to Crossrail Limited by the Department for Transport and TfL in relation to the construction of Crossrail to the end of the 354 period 22 July 2008 to 29 May 2020—excluding recoverable VAT on land and property purchases.	£14,164,813,354
Expenditure incurred—including committed land and property spend not yet paid out—by Crossrail Limited in relation to the construction of Crossrail in the period 30 May 2019 to 29 May 2020—excluding recoverable VAT on land and property purchases.	£1,014,218,000
Total expenditure incurred—including committed land and property spend not yet paid out—by Crossrail Limited in relation to the construction of Crossrail to the end of the period 22 July 2008 to 29 May 2020—excluding recoverable VAT on land and property purchases.	£14,972,678,000
The amounts realised by the disposal of any land or property for the purposes of the construction of Crossrail by the Secretary of State, TfL or Crossrail Limited in the period covered by the statement.	£16,000,000

The numbers above are drawn from CRL's books of account and have been prepared on a consistent basis with the update provided last year. The figure for expenditure incurred includes moneys already paid out in the relevant period, including committed land and property expenditure where this has not yet been paid. It does not include future expenditure on contracts that have been awarded.

[HCWS389]

Transport for London: Extraordinary Funding and Financing

The Secretary of State for Transport (Grant Shapps): I wrote to the House on 18 May 2020, to share details of the extraordinary funding and financing agreement reached with Transport for London (TfL). That package of support, which was agreed between the Government, the Mayor and TfL, included a number of conditions, and I am today writing to update Parliament on two of those.

To help avoid such drastic action in the future, work has been under way on the Government-led review of TfL's future financial position and structure, and we have now published the terms of reference for that review.

I am pleased to also announce the appointment of the two Government special representatives to attend the TfL board: Andrew Gilligan and Clare Moriarty. They will also be able to attend TfL's finance and programme investment committees. These positions required a specific skillset and have therefore been made through direct ministerial appointment.

Clare Moriarty is a former civil servant and has been permanent secretary for the Department for Exiting the European Union and for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and she was previously director general, Rail Executive and director general for corporate services in the Department for Transport.

Andrew Gilligan advises the Prime Minister on transport matters and worked closely with TfL for three years, acquiring detailed knowledge of its operations, as former cycling commissioner for London.

[HCWS398]

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Application: Update

The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Andrew Stephenson): I have been asked by my right hon. Friend, the Secretary of State for Transport (Grant Shapps), to make this written ministerial statement. This statement concerns the application made under the Planning Act 2008 for the proposed construction by Highways England of a continuous dual carriageway on the A303 linking the Podimore Roundabout and the Sparkford Bypass.

Under section 107(1) of the Planning Act 2008, the Secretary of State must make his decision within three months of receipt of the Examining Authority's report unless exercising the power under section 107(3) to extend the deadline and make a statement to the House of Parliament announcing the new deadline. The Secretary of State received the Examining Authority's report on the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Development Consent Order application on 12 September 2019 and the deadline for a decision was previously extended from 12 December 2019 until 17 July 2020 to allow for further work to be carried out.

The deadline for the decision is to be further extended to 20 November 2020, an extension of four months, to enable further information to be provided by the applicant and interested parties on outstanding concerns raised by the Examining Authority and consideration of that provided information before determination of the application by the Secretary of State.

The decision to set a new deadline is without prejudice to the decision on whether to give development consent.

[HCWS399]

Petition

Monday 20 July 2020

OBSERVATIONS

HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Impact of COVID-19 on Luton Borough Council

The Petition of residents of Luton,

Declares that the COVID-19 crisis has radically impacted upon the operation of London Luton Airport, resulting in a significant drop in commercial income, which in turn has impacted upon Luton Borough Council's provision of vital services; notes that in 2018-19 London Luton Airport Ltd paid £20.2 million in dividends to Luton Borough Council to support its funding of vital services; further notes that Luton is facing a £49 million impact on its 2020-21 budget due to the reduction in revenue from its airport, a drop in council tax and business rates, and other costs due to the crisis; further notes that Luton Borough Council has been forced to produce an emergency budget to find savings of £22 million this financial year; and further notes that a related Change.org petition calling for additional funding to Luton for essential services has over ten thousand signatures.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urge the Government to review the level of support provided to Luton Borough Council to ensure there is no reduction in vital services.

And the petitioners remain, etc.—*[Presented by Rachel Hopkins, Official Report, 7 July 2020, Vol. 678, c. 943.]*

[P002586]

Observation from The Minister of State, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Mr Simon Clarke):

The Government recognise the additional costs and pressures finances councils are facing as a result of the current covid-19 crisis. We have made available a £4.3 billion package of support for expenditure pressures, including £3.7 billion of un-ringfenced grants and the £600 million infection control fund. Of this £3.7 billion, Luton Borough Council has received £13.4 million, on top of a £9 million increase in core spending power this financial year even before emergency funding.

As part of the Secretary of State's recent announcement, we also confirmed that we will extend the period over which councils must manage shortfalls in local tax income relating to 2020-21, from one to three years, and we will announce further details of how we will support local authorities to manage tax losses at the comprehensive spending review later in the year.

The Government also announced that a further component of its comprehensive approach to support councils in addressing their income losses will be a co-payment scheme to cover irrecoverable sales, fees and charges income in 2020/21. The scheme compensates for irrecoverable income losses experienced by local authorities above the level they could have been expected to plan for. The scheme applies to income which is defined as a sale, fee or a charge and is attached to local service delivery, for example, car parking income or receipts from owned cultural assets. The scheme will not compensate for lost commercial investment income. This is because commercial income losses are more complicated in nature, and Government recognise that there are a complex set of variables relating to commercial income sources including recoverability.

We recognise that some councils with strategic investments, such as airports, are put in an exceptional position by this crisis. We will continue to work closely with Luton Borough Council to help them navigate through what is undoubtedly a difficult situation, as they support their communities through this national emergency.

Ministerial Correction

Monday 20 July 2020

BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

UK Internal Market: White Paper

The following is an extract from the response to the statement made by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy on 16 July 2020.

Mr Wragg: I welcome my right hon. Friend's statement. It is patently obvious that a Unionist and a nationalist cannot agree on a constitutional settlement, but it is none the less perfectly possible to have constructive conversations and good working relationships through proper channels. With that in mind, will he undertake to speak to his Cabinet colleagues to ensure that Lord Dunlop's review is published?

Alok Sharma: My hon. Friend raises an important point. The review conducted by Lord Dunlop is, I understand, set to come to the Prime Minister in the autumn. I am sure that we will review it and look forward to it with some interest.

[Official Report, 16 July 2020, Vol. 678, c. 1712.]

Letter of correction from the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, the right hon. Member for Reading West (Alok Sharma):

An error has been identified in the response I gave to the hon. Member for Hazel Grove (Mr Wragg) on 16 July 2020.

The correct response should have been:

Alok Sharma: My hon. Friend raises an important point. The review conducted by Lord Dunlop **was, I understand, received by** the Prime Minister in the autumn. **The Government will be responding in due course.**

ORAL ANSWERS

Monday 20 July 2020

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	1811	HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—continued	
Covid-19: High Streets	1817	Planning Reforms: Environmental Standards	1823
Families in Temporary Accommodation	1813	Renters Reform Bill	1816
Housing Associations: House Building	1822	Residential Buildings: Cladding	1821
Housing: Environmental Standards	1820	Second Home Ownership.....	1824
Housing Infrastructure Projects	1816	Shared Prosperity Fund	1811
Leasehold and Commonhold Reform	1822	Topical Questions	1825
Local Authorities: Covid-19 Prevention	1818	Town Centre Investment	1813

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Monday 20 July 2020

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY	81WS	FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE	86WS
Contingencies Fund Advance	81WS	EFTA States and Switzerland: Future Relationship.....	86WS
Unified Patent Court	82WS	Sanctions and anti-Money Laundering Act 2018: Report on Regulations	86WS
Vaccine Taskforce	81WS		
DEFENCE	83WS	HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	88WS
Service Complaints Ombudsman: Annual Report 2019	83WS	Building and Fire Safety	88WS
DIGITAL, CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT	83WS	TRANSPORT	91WS
Community Match Challenge	83WS	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Application: Update..	94WS
		Crossrail: Annual Update	91WS
EDUCATION	84WS	Transport for London: Extraordinary Funding and Financing.....	93WS
School Funding.....	84WS	TREASURY	82WS
		Public Service Pensions: Survivor Benefits	82WS

PETITION

Monday 20 July 2020

	<i>Col. No.</i>	<i>Col. No.</i>
HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	11P	
Impact of COVID-19 on Luton Borough Council.	11P	

MINISTERIAL CORRECTION

Monday 20 July 2020

	<i>Col. No.</i>
BUSINESS, ENERGY AND INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY	11MC
UK Internal Market: White Paper	11MC

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
Monday 27 July 2020**

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

Monday 20 July 2020

Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 1811] [see index inside back page]
Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

China [Col. 1831]
Statement—(Dominic Raab)

Coronavirus Response [Col. 1850]
Statement—(Matt Hancock)

Trade Bill [Col. 1870]
Further considered; read the Third time and passed

Endangered Species: Developing Countries [Col. 1965]
Debate on motion for Adjournment

Written Statements [Col. 81WS]

Petition [Col. 11P]
Observations

Ministerial Correction [Col. 11MC]

Written Answers to Questions [The written answers can now be found at <http://www.parliament.uk/writtenanswers>]
