

Monday
17 July 2023

Volume 736
No. 191



HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT

PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Monday 17 July 2023

House of Commons

Monday 17 July 2023

The House met at half-past Two o'clock

PRAYERS

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Oral Answers to Questions

EDUCATION

The Secretary of State was asked—

Skills and Apprenticeships: Funding

1. **Siobhan Baillie** (Stroud) (Con): What steps her Department is taking to fund skills and apprenticeships. [905997]

4. **Sara Britcliffe** (Hyndburn) (Con): What steps her Department is taking to fund skills and apprenticeships. [906000]

9. **Royston Smith** (Southampton, Itchen) (Con): What steps her Department is taking to fund skills and apprenticeships. [906005]

The Secretary of State for Education (Gillian Keegan): As I am sure everybody knows, I will never get tired of flying the flag for apprenticeships and skills. This Government are investing record levels of funding, with an additional £3.8 billion in skills over this Parliament. That includes an extra £1.6 billion for 16-to-19 education, and increasing investment in apprenticeships to £2.7 billion by 2024-25. That supports our commitment to create a world-leading skills system that is employer-focused, high quality, and fit for the future.

Siobhan Baillie: This Government's schools, colleges and businesses around the country are working hard to show young people that going to university is not the only route to success, and there are now so many study options, which the RHA, the Federation of Small Businesses, and lots of Stroud businesses are talking to me about all the time. What is my right hon. Friend doing to reform the existing apprenticeship levy to work better for small businesses and students?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend, and I am proud of all the work we have done on apprenticeships. We removed the limit on the number of apprentices that small businesses can take on, and we continue to pay 100% of training costs for the smallest employers, and allow levy payers to transfer 25% of their funds to support small and medium-sized enterprises. We spent 99.6% of the apprenticeship budget in 2021-22, which has helped to support 8,940 apprenticeship starts in my hon. Friend's constituency since 2010. To continue that progress and ensure that everyone knows what

apprenticeship opportunities are available, we are working with UCAS so that for the first time ever, young people will be able to use UCAS to search and apply for apprenticeships alongside degrees, making it easier for young people to find the right opportunity for them.

Sara Britcliffe: I thank the Secretary of State for visiting BAE Systems recently in Lancashire. Accrington and Rossendale College in my Hyndburn and Haslingden constituency has been successfully rolling out the T-level programme, but to ensure that young people in my constituency have the skills they need in areas such as technology and engineering, further capital investment is needed to ensure that it can continue to provide state-of-the-art facilities. Will my right hon. Friend confirm whether there will be further waves of the T-level capital fund?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend for her question and for joining me on that visit, which I think was eye-opening for both of us. The Nelson & Colne College group, which includes Accrington and Rossendale College in my hon. Friend's constituency, has benefited from capital investment of more than £6 million since 2010, including funding to improve the condition of its estate and support the delivery of T-levels and technical education. Most recently, it benefited from further investment as one of our 108 T-level capital projects, working towards delivering engineering and manufacturing T-levels. We will continue to support the roll-out of T-levels.

Royston Smith: The Secretary of State will know that levelling up is about not geography but opportunity, and what better opportunity can we give our young people than a first-class education? Southampton has put in a bid for a university technical college. Will my right hon. Friend confirm that she has seen our bid and will look favourably on it, and will she update the House on when we are likely to hear whether we have been successful?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend for his continuous campaigning on this subject. I do not know how many meetings we have had, but I see his passion to get a UTC in Southampton. I recently met Becky Smith, one of the fantastic former students of UTC Portsmouth, who is now a degree apprentice studying mechanical engineering at the University of Chichester in my constituency. She was full of praise for her time at UTC Portsmouth. We are currently considering the applications we have received. I have seen them all, and I have been through them in great detail in the latest free school wave, including Portsmouth's bid for a new UTC in Southampton. We hope to announce the successful applications very soon.

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): Hospitality and tourism is an industry worth £3.5 billion a year to Cumbria, and it is our biggest employer. Apprenticeships are an important way into a career within that sector. The problem is that T-levels are a useful stepping stone into apprenticeships, yet the Government have again kicked into the long grass the T-level on catering, having already taken out the hospitality element of that. Will the Secretary of State meet me and representatives from Cumbria Tourism, so we can talk about how she can change that policy, and so that more young people can enter that important profession?

Gillian Keegan: I am happy to meet the hon. Gentleman. As he will know, I always have a laser-like focus on quality, and if the quality is not good enough then I will not release the apprenticeship, the apprenticeship standard or the T-level. Too often we have had low-quality qualifications in this country, and it is important that we work with a vast array of businesses to ensure that we get the quality system that they demand and that will be good for all our young people.

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): May I beg the Minister to pay attention to the fact that good apprenticeships and good training in any town and city must come from a blend of good universities—I think most of our universities are good—with local further education colleges? Will she take a leaf out of Tony Blair's book, when he said in a recent important speech that what we need is more high-class universities and more polytechnics made up from the new former FE colleges?

Gillian Keegan: As usual, we are ahead of the Opposition. We have already invested in 21 institutes of technology, which are where a group of colleges and universities work with employers in the area. They are a great addition to the landscape, along with all the other technical qualifications and skills training that we have introduced since 2010.

Margaret Ferrier (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (Ind): I welcome the funding made available to the space systems engineering degree apprenticeship and the opportunities that will provide young people in the UK's growing space industry. What plans do Ministers have to fund similar apprenticeships in other emerging sectors?

Gillian Keegan: It was a great pleasure to go to the space park in Leicester to launch the space systems engineering level 6 degree apprenticeship, on top of the level 4 space engineering apprenticeship, which I launched previously. There are many different routes into the space industry, which is important and something that we are good at in the UK. Any employers or employer groups wishing to develop an apprenticeship standard could work with the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education. We have worked with more than 5,000 employers in the past few years, and we have built more than 670 apprenticeship standards, none of which existed before we started the programme in 2012.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Minister.

Mr Toby Perkins (Chesterfield) (Lab): New research from the House of Commons Library has shown that the amount of the apprenticeship levy paid by employers that has been allocated to the apprenticeship budget has fallen from 89% in 2017 to just 77% in the most recent year. The truthful answer to the question from the hon. Member for Stroud (Siobhan Baillie) is that the Secretary of State is doing nothing to reform the apprenticeship levy, as she believes it is working perfectly. Can the Minister confirm that any employer that, like the hon. Member for Stroud, wants greater flexibility in the levy should vote Labour in the next general election?

Gillian Keegan: There is nothing that would make me give such drastic advice. The truth about the apprenticeship levy is that 99.6% of it will be spent this year. We can look in the rear view mirror, and there are some reports

going back over time that show some underspend in the levy, but they are back over time. We are now spending 99.6% of the levy. Perhaps what the hon. Gentleman has not appreciated is that some of the funding goes to the devolved Governments.¹ If we examine the apprenticeship system in Wales and Scotland, it is not a patch on what we have introduced in England.

Persistent Absence from School

2. **Esther McVey** (Tatton) (Con): What steps she is taking to support severely absent pupils with their attendance. [905998]

3. **Mr Robin Walker** (Worcester) (Con): What steps she is taking to tackle persistent absence in secondary schools. [905999]

The Secretary of State for Education (Gillian Keegan): School attendance is important for not just a child's education but their wellbeing and life chances, and it is a personal priority. We have: rolled out the daily attendance data tool; launched the attendance action alliance group of system leaders, which includes representatives from health, policing and social care; expanded the attendance hub support; and, deployed expert advice to work with local authorities. Termly persistent absence fell by a fifth from summer last year to spring this year, with 350,000 fewer persistently absent pupils, but we know we still have more to do, and it is a top priority for me.

Esther McVey: Does the Secretary of State agree that shutting schools during covid lockdowns was a disaster for children and their mental health and has led to an explosion in severely absent rates? Will she make sure that cannot happen again by classifying all education settings, including schools, colleges and universities, as essential infrastructure, to ensure they remain open during national emergencies?

Gillian Keegan: Schools were not shut during lockdown. Many of our fantastic teachers were still teaching key cohorts, supporting our NHS and the most vulnerable, such as those with special educational needs, but I fully share my right hon. Friend's concerns about the impact that the pandemic has had on attainment, attendance and mental health. She knows we are working hard to recover, making almost £5 billion available for recovery. I can assure her that we will always seek to minimise the disruption to education in emergency situations. We all have a lot to learn from the experience during the pandemic, including the impact on children of all the decisions that we took, which were led by medical advice.

Mr Speaker: I call the Chair of the Education Committee.

Mr Walker: It is good to hear the Secretary of State prioritising getting children into school. Alongside her welcome funded pay offer, which will hopefully see an end to disruptive strikes, a real drive to reduce persistent absence and increase attendance would be welcome. A long-standing recommendation of the Education Committee is a statutory register of children not in school, which she is well aware of and has told us is a priority. May I therefore urge her to rapidly adopt the private Member's Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for Meon Valley (Mrs Drummond) so that we can get on with delivering on that priority?

1. [Official Report, 20 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 15MC.]

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend for his Committee's work on this issue, which really is important. We have a world-class education system, but we need children in school to be able to take advantage of that. As he knows, my Department remains committed to legislating for statutory local authority registers of children not in school and will do so at the next suitable legislative opportunity when parliamentary time allows. I will work closely with my hon. Friend the Member for Meon Valley (Mrs Drummond) on how we can best introduce that.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I thank the Secretary of State very much for her responses. It is obvious that she is committed to making things better. In the light of the covid home-schooling period during which parents may have forgotten the importance of socialisation as well as academic education, many may need reminding of the legal obligation to educate children. Has the Department considered tidying up the intervention period to allow early intervention and discussion with parents where possible before any action is taken?

Gillian Keegan: We are very much taking a supportive approach. We know that there are complex reasons why some children are missing school—some have lost their confidence and are anxious about school and how far they are behind—so we are taking a focused approach. We have leads in local authorities working closely with schools, and we are measuring the impact of all the things we are doing, which includes attendance hubs, as well as looking to support parents to get their children back into school, where we know their outcomes will be so much better.

Maths Attainment: Primary Schools

5. **Bob Blackman** (Harrow East) (Con): What progress her Department has made on improving standards of attainment in mathematics in primary schools. [906001]

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): Ofsted's report on school maths, published last week, stated:

"In the last few years, a resounding, positive shift in mathematics education has taken place in primary schools."

In the 2019 TIMSS international survey of maths attainment for year 5 pupils, England achieved its highest ever score and rose from 10th out of 49 countries in 2015 to eighth out of 58 countries.

Bob Blackman: It is clearly good news that 73% of young people are achieving or exceeding the expected grades at the standard assessment tests. Measures have been taken to catch up after covid, which is really good news, but it is important that we lay the foundations in primary schools so that young people love mathematics and can continue to work on it until they are 18. What measures is my right hon. Friend taking to ensure that?

Nick Gibb: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. In addition to expanding the successful maths hubs programme to deliver teaching for mastery to 75% of primary schools by 2025, we are increasing delivery of the mastering number programme for reception to year 2, which helps students achieve fluency with number bonds, to 8,000 schools by 2024. We will also extend the programme into years 4 and 5 to bolster fluency in times tables.

Childcare

6. **Samantha Dixon** (City of Chester) (Lab): What steps she is taking to help ensure the availability of high-quality childcare. [906002]

7. **Mr Gagan Mohindra** (South West Hertfordshire) (Con): What steps her Department is taking to increase the number of childcare places. [906003]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Education (Claire Coutinho): At the spring statement, we announced the single largest investment in childcare in England ever. By 2027, the Government will be spending in excess of £8 billion, doubling the amount that we do now and helping working families with their childcare costs.

Samantha Dixon: Good-quality childcare is essential to a child's early development, to parents and to the economy. The owners of the Best Friends Day Nursery and the Spinney Day Nursery in Chester have told me of the real struggle faced by so many nurseries across the country, despite the Government's latest funding announcement. Many have been forced to close, including five nurseries in the Hoole area alone in five years. What more will the Government do to alleviate the situation set out by my constituents?

Claire Coutinho: As I have mentioned, we are putting the single largest ever investment into childcare over the next few years, to provide funding to settings such as the one she mentioned. We are also looking at things such as workforce, which we know can be a challenge, making sure that we remove barriers to additional routes to entry.

Mr Mohindra: South West Hertfordshire is home to lots of young couples, particularly those who have moved out of London to start their families. Could the Minister tell the House how her Department is supporting new parents as they return to work?

Claire Coutinho: That is a huge priority for this Government. The funding that we are setting out will provide parents with support worth, on average, £6,500 a year from maternity leave right up to primary school. We are doing additional work to support things such as wraparound care.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Minister.

Helen Hayes (Dulwich and West Norwood) (Lab): Across the early years sector, nurseries and childminders are raising concerns that the Government have no coherent plan for the expansion of the early years workforce to meet the requirements of an expanded offer. The only ideas on the table so far are the relaxation of ratios and a reduction in the proportion of level 2 qualified staff—plans that the Sutton Trust has found could lead to worse outcomes for children. Why are this Government so uninterested in the quality of childcare and the outcomes that high-quality early years education delivers for children?

Claire Coutinho: The Government care about education standards. That is seen across every single result across the board, whether reading or maths results. It is this Government who care about education standards. Over 90% of our early years providers are rated good or outstanding. We will do everything we can to keep them that way.

Bullying in Schools

8. **Dame Andrea Leadsom** (South Northamptonshire) (Con): What recent steps her Department has taken to tackle bullying in schools. [906004]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Education (Claire Coutinho): All children should have access to a calm, safe and supportive school environment. In addition to school behaviours policies that must include measures to prevent bullying, we have provided more than £3 million in funding between August 2021 and March 2024 to five anti-bullying organisations supporting schools in tackling bullying.

Dame Andrea Leadsom: I congratulate my hon. Friend for all her work tackling bullying. So many constituents write to me about the problems their children are experiencing. How are the behaviour hubs making a difference in schools and tackling the bullying that is so prevalent, particularly as a result of online harms and social media, which are all too frequent?

Claire Coutinho: We are confident that the behaviour hubs programme is helping schools to create calm, understanding and positive environments by spreading best practice. The behaviour hubs programme is being evaluated and impact assessed. We will publish an interim report in 2024. I would be delighted to discuss those findings with my right hon. Friend.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): Last week I introduced by ten-minute rule Bill on bullying and respect at work. It is not just children who experience bullying in the school environment but teachers and other staff. Will the Minister look at my Bill, which will establish a legal definition of bullying at work and a route to employment tribunal to protect the people who are looking after our children in our schools?

Claire Coutinho: I have not seen the hon. Lady's Bill, but I would be happy to take a look and have a discussion with her.

Recruitment and Retention

10. **Grahame Morris** (Easington) (Lab): What steps she is taking to support the recruitment and retention of teachers in the further education sector. [906006]

22. **Mary Kelly Foy** (City of Durham) (Lab): What recent estimate she has made of the number of teachers leaving the teaching profession. [906021]

The Secretary of State for Education (Gillian Keegan): Our teachers do an incredible job and inspire children every day. Last week, we accepted the independent pay review body's recommendations in full, giving schoolteachers their largest pay award for 30 years of at least 6.5%. I also announced funding for the further education sector to address key priorities, including teacher recruitment and retention. To help us get more of the top talent into teaching, we are delivering on our 2019 manifesto commitment to raise the starting salary for teachers to a minimum of £30,000. That is a competitive salary that will help us to continue to build on the record numbers of teachers in our schools in England.

Grahame Morris: The further education sector is facing a teaching crisis, not fully addressed by the pay review body. In my constituency, East Durham College has had two teacher vacancies in engineering and a computer science position unfilled for 18 months. Barriers to recruitment include high workload, qualification reform, excessive assessment and a huge pay disparity compared with comparable work in industry. Could the Secretary of State tell us what steps she is taking to ensure that further education teaching is an attractive and viable career?

Gillian Keegan: I very much care about further education and ensuring that it has the funding. That is why, as of last week, we are investing an additional £185 million in the financial year 2023-24 and £285 million in 2024-25 to drive forward skills delivery in further education. The Government do not set pay for the FE sector. However, I have been clear that I expect that funding, which is new funding, to go to the frontline. I hope the investment will support the FE sector to address its recruitment and retention challenges. In addition, we introduced bursaries of £29,000 for STEM—science, technology, engineering and maths—subjects, and the Taking Teaching Further programme is working with industry and paying £6,000 to attract those from industry who want to spend their second career in FE teaching.

Mary Kelly Foy: We have seen a significant increase in the number of teachers leaving the profession in Durham. They are burnt out and their unmanageable workloads are made harder by support staff redundancies in schools where there is an absence of furniture and equipment, with children even carrying chairs between lessons so that there is somewhere to sit. One teacher said to me, "It is like being a baker with no flour, a delivery driver without a van, an IT specialist without a computer." When will the Department provide the absolute basics for our schools in Durham?

Gillian Keegan: We are going even further than the basics, because we will be funding education higher than we have ever funded it in our history. It will be £60 billion next year. But I do take workload seriously. As part of our discussions with the unions, we have agreed to set up a workload taskforce, which has a target to remove five hours from the school working week in addition to the five hours we have already reduced. Last year, more teachers entered the profession than left it: 47,954 entered the profession and 43,997 left it. If we look at the averages, the leavers rate has been stable since 2010, but we are investing more in our education system than ever before.

Mr Mark Francois (Rayleigh and Wickford) (Con): One particularly challenging area of work for teachers is special needs education. There are many who want to work in that field, but in Essex our special needs schools are unfortunately already full to bursting. That is why, today, I am launching a campaign for a new special needs school in south Essex. I met the Minister for Schools, my right hon. Friend the Member for Bognor Regis and Littlehampton (Nick Gibb) in advance and he was very helpful. Will the Secretary of State and the Schools Minister work with me and Essex County Council to try to get us the additional special needs places in Essex that parents and special needs children so desperately need?

Gillian Keegan: I absolutely agree with my right hon. Friend. This is something we have already announced: we will invest £2.6 billion in building more special schools. We are getting another one in Sussex and many hon. Members are getting more special educational needs schools in their areas. We would be very happy to work with him and Essex County Council to ensure the right provision in Essex for all children who have additional needs.

Dame Maria Miller (Basingstoke) (Con): I pay tribute to all the staff and teachers at my local FE college, Basingstoke College of Technology for all the work they do to ensure that young people in my constituency are ready for work. The reform of BTECs is causing some uncertainty when it comes to staffing for the future in the college. Will my right hon. Friend join me and headteacher Anthony Bravo for a meeting to discuss those concerns, so that we can continue to ensure that the young people of Basingstoke are work-ready in large numbers?

Gillian Keegan: Yes, I am always happy to meet my right hon. Friend and her college. I have had many meetings on this subject. We are focused on ensuring that high quality T-levels are introduced across the country in all colleges, so that young people can access them. We are also looking, side by side, to see what BTEC qualifications will sit alongside A-levels as part of our level 3 offer.

Foster Care Placements

11. **James Morris (Halesowen and Rowley Regis) (Con):** What steps her Department is taking to help increase the number of foster care placements. [906007]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Education (Claire Coutinho): We know that we need more foster carers. That is a really important part of our plan, “Stable Homes, Built on Love”, to reform the care system. We are investing £27 million in recruitment and retention over the next two years. We have also increased the national minimum allowance for foster parents by 12.4% as part of those plans.

James Morris: Does my hon. Friend agree that foster carers can play a vital role in improving the health and wellbeing of a looked-after child, and that we need to encourage more people to go into foster caring by removing unnecessary bureaucratic barriers so that we can build a network of foster carers across the country to improve the life chances of children in care?

Claire Coutinho: This is a big priority for me. Some children end up in children’s homes when they should have ended up with foster carers, so we need to recruit more. As I have said, we are making a significant investment in recruitment and retention so that we can keep some of our brilliant, experienced foster carers as well as attracting more into the system.

Reading Standards: Primary-age Children

13. **Sally-Ann Hart (Hastings and Rye) (Con):** What steps her Department is taking to improve standards of reading of primary age children. [906009]

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study was published in May this year. England had come fourth among 43 countries that tested children of the same age, nine and 10-year-olds. In 2012 we introduced the phonics screening check, testing six-year-olds for their progress in reading and phonics.¹ In that year, 58% of pupils reached the expected standard; by 2019, just before the pandemic, the proportion had risen to 82% following a transformation in the teaching of phonics in nearly all primary schools.

Sally-Ann Hart: Will my right hon. Friend join me in thanking the National Literacy Trust and Bloomsbury Publishing for including a number of schools in Hastings and St Leonards in their pioneering new reading programme, which is specifically aimed at persuading more children to read for pleasure, and will he encourage parents and carers to engage in a programme that is a vital part of their children’s development?

Nick Gibb: I recently met Jonathan Douglas of the National Literacy Trust, and I thank the trust for its enormous contribution to raising the profile of reading for pleasure in schools. Its new programme—which, as my hon. Friend said, it launched in partnership with Bloomsbury—involves working with seven Brighton Academies Trust schools throughout Hastings to encourage more children to read for pleasure.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Minister.

Stephen Morgan (Portsmouth South) (Lab): In its White Paper for schools, published last year, the Government’s headline ambition was for 90% of pupils leaving primary school to meet the expected standards in reading, writing and maths. Why does the Minister think that, since that pledge, tens of thousands more children have been leaving primary school without meeting those standards?

Nick Gibb: As the hon. Gentleman will know, owing to the pandemic we did see a fall in writing and maths standards. Reading standards rose, and then fell by two points this year. However, reading standards today are broadly similar to those before the pandemic, and since 2010 both reading and maths have improved enormously in primary schools throughout the country. I am confident that we will meet the 90% target by 2030.

Mr Speaker: I call the Scottish National party spokesperson.

Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran) (SNP): We cannot talk about attainment at any level without also taking into account child poverty. The link between undernourishment and lower reading standards and, therefore, attainment across the board is irrefutable. When children are hungry, they cannot focus on learning. The Scottish Government are currently rolling out free school meals for all primary school children. When will the Minister take decisive steps to combat child poverty and emulate the actions of the Scottish Government?

Nick Gibb: Under this Government, the number of children receiving free school meals has increased hugely. About a third of children are now eligible for either benefits-related free school meals or the universal infant free school meals introduced by our 2010 Government.

1. [Official Report, 20 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 15MC.]

However, the hon. Lady should be careful when talking about reading and education standards, because standards in this country have risen significantly, and I am not sure that the same can be said for Scotland.

Local Secondary School Provision: Sittingbourne and Sheppey

14. **Gordon Henderson** (Sittingbourne and Sheppey) (Con): Whether her Department is taking steps to ensure that secondary age children in Sittingbourne and Sheppey constituency are able to attend a local school. [906010]

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): My hon. Friend and I have discussed education provision on the Isle of Sheppey many times over the years. Given the inadequate Ofsted grading for Oasis Academy Isle of Sheppey, the school is now being removed from the Oasis Community Learning trust to a strong multi-academy trust.

Gordon Henderson: I welcome that response from my very right hon. Friend.

Currently, 1,000 children a day are bussed from the Isle of Sheppey to Sittingbourne schools because parents do not want to send their children to the Isle of Sheppey academy, which means that all Sittingbourne secondary schools are over-subscribed and many children in the town cannot get into their local schools. As my right hon. Friend said, the Department is in the process of transferring the academy to a new multi-academy trust, but with the end of the summer term fast approaching, island parents have no idea whether that transfer will happen, or, if it does, what form it will take. As my right hon. Friend knows, I have been working with the Department on secondary education problems on the Isle of Sheppey for many years, and I know that officials are doing their best, but what can he do to speed up the process and end the current uncertainties?

Nick Gibb: I pay tribute to my very hon. Friend for his passion for improving standards in schools in his constituency. The transfer of the Isle of Sheppey academy to a new multi-academy trust is a priority for the Department. A strong preferred sponsor has been found, and a proposal is being developed by them. Once those plans are completed, they will be put to parents before a final decision is taken by the trust and the Department on the academy transfer.

Student Visa Eligibility: Impact on Higher Education Sector

15. **Joanna Cherry** (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): What recent discussions she has had with the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the potential impact of changes to the eligibility criteria for student visas on the competitiveness of the higher education sector. [906011]

The Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education (Robert Halfon): As part of our commitment to have at least 600,000 students study in the UK every year, we have worked closely with the Home Office to strike the right balance between acting decisively on migration, being fair to the taxpayer and protecting our

position as a world leader in higher education. We fully expect Britain to remain an attractive destination for students across the world.

Joanna Cherry: I thank the Minister for his answer. My constituency of Edinburgh South West is home to two leading universities: Heriot-Watt and Edinburgh Napier. Research by Universities UK shows that the constituency's net economic benefit from international students is £170.8 million. The Government plan to massage the net migration figures by making the UK less attractive to international students. That is going to harm the economy in my constituency, Scotland's economy and our educational institutions. Can the Minister tell me: is that an example of the Union delivering for Scotland?

Robert Halfon: I am not quite sure what problem the hon. and learned Lady is trying to solve. I mentioned to her that our target was 600,000 international students; we have surpassed that—679,000 international students are coming to our country, which is something we are proud of. But as I said, we have to be fair to not only international students and universities but the taxpayer, who bears the cost of the infrastructure. But I agree with the hon. and learned Lady that international students have a huge impact on the economy, of up to £37 billion-plus.

Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown (The Cotswolds) (Con): Time after time, we find that every Government Department is short of young graduates with digital skills. Will my right hon. Friend think about making an application to the Home Office to encourage more visas to be granted to students who want to take digital degrees in this country?

Robert Halfon: My hon. Friend is learned in these matters, but they are for the Home Office. We are developing our digital skills at home with amazing digital apprenticeships. Half of our 670 apprenticeship standards are in STEM subjects, and there are T-levels and higher technical qualifications in digital. We are spending on the digital skills that our local people need. We have to give them the skills they need as well.

Institutional Partnerships: Further and Higher Education

16. **Alex Sobel** (Leeds North West) (Lab/Co-op): What steps she is taking to increase partnerships between further education colleges and higher education institutions to help increase learning opportunities. [906012]

The Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education (Robert Halfon): We are transforming tertiary education by building state of the art prestigious institute of technology colleges, backed by £300 million and led by further education and higher education businesses. We have also introduced the lifelong loan entitlement—it is in the House of Lords at the moment. That will allow higher and further education to collaborate, offering short courses and the transfer of courses between FE and HE institutions.

Alex Sobel: Last week, I met representatives of the National Farmers Union at the Great Yorkshire Show. We discussed the great need for new skills and a skilled workforce in areas such as agro-ecology. What work is his Department doing to link specialist agricultural colleges with the non-specialist FE and HE sector?

Robert Halfon: The hon. Gentleman makes an important point. We have good land colleges and we are doing everything we can to support them. There are two institute of technology colleges in Yorkshire, although not in his area. I am sure that he will be pleased with the investment of £88 million in his area into FE, sixth form and the university technical college, as well as a grammar school. We are doing a lot of work on agricultural T-levels as well.

Sir David Evennett (Bexleyheath and Crayford) (Con): What steps is my right hon. Friend taking to work with employers, local authorities and jobcentres to ensure that as many adults as possible are aware of the opportunities available to them to learn and upskill?

Robert Halfon: My right hon. Friend speaks with huge wisdom. We are transforming careers advice through the National Careers Service, which is advising people on adult skills. We are spending hundreds of millions of pounds on boot camps and on more than 400 free level 3 courses. Our apprenticeship scheme offers hundreds of different apprenticeships. Through careers advice and our skills offer, we are ensuring that adults get the skills they need.

Martin Docherty-Hughes (West Dunbartonshire) (SNP): As a working-class kid from the constituency I now represent, I am not sure where I would be today if not for the opportunity I had to study for a so-called “Mickey Mouse degree” at university. After today’s media push and the Government’s apparent crackdown on students, how does the Minister expect us to believe that this is not just a ruse to protect the privileges of the Timothies and Tabithas of the home counties, as opposed to working-class kids?

Robert Halfon: The hon. Gentleman could not be more wrong. Why is it right to send somebody to a higher education institution, taking out a significant loan of £9,250 each year, to take a course that leads either to poor completion, poor continuation or poor progression? This Government are stopping that by imposing recruitment caps on such courses. I am proud that record numbers of disadvantaged students are going to university. More disadvantaged students are going to university than ever before.

Jonathan Gullis (Stoke-on-Trent North) (Con): Parents and pupils across Stoke-on-Trent North, Kidsgrove and Talke wait anxiously to find out the result of the fantastic bid made by the further education City of Stoke-on-Trent Sixth Form College and the higher education Staffordshire University for a free school to unleash the digital skills, in particular, that we want to see in Stoke-on-Trent. Will my right hon. Friend lobby the Schools Minister and the Secretary of State not only to make sure this is announced soon, but to make sure it is delivered quickly so that we get the school places we so desperately need?

Robert Halfon: I was very pleased to visit Staffordshire University, which is a model university that offers a brilliant policing degree apprenticeship scheme, among others. The Secretary of State is listening carefully to the bid, and I am sure she will make the announcement shortly.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Minister.

Matt Western (Warwick and Leamington) (Lab): The introduction of the lifelong loan entitlement, which we all support, will inevitably require greater collaboration between higher education and further education providers, but under the current regulatory system, as the lines between HE and FE blur, we are seeing significant regulatory duplication and increased burden. This acts as a brake on partnership. Does the Minister not recognise the need to streamline the regulatory system to foster collaboration ahead of, rather than after, the introduction of the LLE?

Robert Halfon: The hon. Gentleman is absolutely right that the lifelong loan entitlement of up to £37,000 will be transformative for millions of people across the country, enabling them to take short or modular courses at a time of their choosing. We are looking at regulation across the higher education and further education sector, and we are doing all we can to reduce it, but I recognise some of the issues he raises.

Tuition Fees: Social Mobility

17. **John Mc Nally** (Falkirk) (SNP): What assessment her Department has made of the potential impact of tuition fees on the social mobility of young people. [906014]

The Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education (Robert Halfon): The introduction of tuition fees has not led to fewer disadvantaged young people going into higher education. As I have already highlighted, the 18-year-old entry rate for disadvantaged students in England increased from 14.4% in 2011 to 25.1% in 2022. We saw record numbers of disadvantaged students going into higher education in 2022, with the rate for students on free school meals going up from 20% to 30%.

John Mc Nally: I thank the Minister for that answer but, in the last academic year, English students graduated with £30,000 more debt, on average, than their Scottish counterparts. Despite this, both the Government and the Labour party refuse to follow the Scottish Government’s lead by abolishing tuition fees in England. With more than 16,000 undergraduates dropping out of higher education this year, will this Government admit that their policies are pushing students into debt, and often out of university?

Robert Halfon: Actually, we are being fair both to students and to all those taxpayers who do not go to university. I might point out that low-income students living away from home will qualify for more living cost support over the coming year than low-income students in Scotland.

Miriam Cates (Penistone and Stocksbridge) (Con): The new Labour dream of 50% of young people going to university has left many saddled with debt, a third of graduates unable to find graduate jobs and more than half of graduates never earning enough to repay their student loans, so I warmly welcome the Prime Minister’s announcement today of a reduction in the number of low-value degrees, which benefit neither students nor taxpayers. Will the Department look to go further by identifying whole universities that could be transformed into higher technical and vocational institutions, which

would give far more young people the opportunities and training they really need for the productive jobs of the future?

Robert Halfon: My hon. Friend is absolutely right, in the sense that the Labour party was all about quantity over quality, and we are about quality, high standards and a good education. We are already doing a lot of what she wants, because we are introducing institutes of technology, which are collaborations between higher education and further education that provide flagship skills and teach higher technical qualifications, with 21 across the country. They are doing exactly what she wants us to do.

Topical Questions

T1. [906022] **Jamie Stone** (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD): If she will make a statement on her departmental responsibilities.

The Secretary of State for Education (Gillian Keegan): This week, I have accepted the independent review body's recommendation in full, so our fantastic teachers will receive their highest pay award for 30 years—it will be at least 6.5%. From September, we will have delivered on our manifesto commitment by raising teachers' starting salaries to £30,000. To support our school leaders, we are providing an extra £525 million this year and a further £900 million in 2024-25. This is not just about schools, because we will also be investing £185 million and £285 million in our further education colleges over the same period. All four unions have recommended the pay award, and it is fully funded. I hope that teachers will join them, so that we can bring an end to strike action and get our teachers doing what they do best: teaching the next generation.

Jamie Stone: UK students who have been offered opportunities to study abroad are waiting for funding decisions under the Turing scheme. Clearly, for students from less well-off families this is tough, as visas and accommodation have to be paid in advance. Will the Secretary of State, out of the kindness of her heart and to a man from the highlands, give a commitment to bring forward these decisions next year, to make the Turing scheme more accessible to all students, regardless of their background?

Gillian Keegan: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his question. The Turing scheme is a great success. Disadvantaged students will take up two thirds of the international study and work opportunities from September, with students going to 160 different countries. It is a remarkable scheme, given that it has been introduced so quickly. It is a new demand-led scheme, but I will work with the sector to make improvements to it and make sure that people are funded in time.

T3. [906024] **Mrs Sheryll Murray** (South East Cornwall) (Con): I attended a meeting of the all-party parliamentary group on fisheries, which I normally chair, where a keenness was expressed to encourage young people to have an interest in a career in fishing at the education stage. I have heard similar pleas from farmers. What more can the Department do to make that a reality?

The Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education (Robert Halfon): My hon. Friend is a true fisherman's friend, although a lot sweeter tasting than the lozenges, I might add. She will be pleased to know that high-quality apprenticeship standards in agriculture and a level 2 fisher apprenticeship are available. We are promoting apprenticeships, including in agriculture, in our schools, and through the apprenticeship support and knowledge programme, and the Careers & Enterprise Company.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Secretary of State.

Bridget Phillipson (Houghton and Sunderland South) (Lab): Ministers have known since last year that strike action by teachers was likely, yet after months of refusing to talk, it was only last week that the Secretary of State finally settled the dispute. Will she take this opportunity to apologise to parents for the completely needless and avoidable disruption to their children's education for which she is responsible?

Gillian Keegan: Since I came into this job at the end of October, the unions asked for an extra £2 billion and I delivered it; families asked for childcare and I delivered it; the School Teachers Review Body asked for 6.5% for teachers and I delivered it; and that had to be funded, and I have delivered it. I have worked to deliver every day in this job, whereas the hon. Lady cannot even decide whether she will accept 6.5% or not.

Bridget Phillipson: Last week, the Institute for Fiscal Studies said that ending private schools' tax breaks will raise up to £1.5 billion in additional revenue, confirming that Labour's plans are fiscally credible. We would use that money to invest in 6,500 new expert teachers and better mental health support for all our young people. Will the Secretary of State distance herself from the discredited claim of the private schools' lobby, do the right thing and adopt Labour's plan to drive up standards in our schools?

Gillian Keegan: Labour has never driven up a standard in our schools. Most of our private schools are nothing like Eton or Harrow; they are far smaller and they charge a lot less. Many cost the same as a family holiday abroad, and there are plenty of parents who choose to forgo life's luxuries to give their children those opportunities. The IFS also said:

"The effect might be larger over the medium to long run... There is still lots of uncertainty around these estimates."

Labour's tax hikes are nothing more than the politics of envy. As Margaret Thatcher once said:

"The spirit of envy can destroy; it can never build."

T4. [906025] **Andy Carter** (Warrington South) (Con): Will the Minister update my constituents on the progress being made towards opening a new free school in Warrington, to provide better and more appropriate education for young people with autism and other special educational needs?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Education (Claire Coutinho): We recently changed the location of the Warrington free school from the Bruche Primary School to a better suited site at Padgate, with the

agreement of the local authority and the trust. We are now working with all parties to begin design preparation work and the school is on track to open in September 2025.

Mr Speaker: I call the spokesperson for the Scottish National party.

Patricia Gibson (North Ayrshire and Arran) (SNP): Today, headteachers in England have spoken of an unprecedented struggle to recruit teachers, because teachers in England feel undervalued and underpaid. To combat this, when will the UK Government match the offer made by the Scottish Government, which will see most Scottish teachers' pay rise by 14.6% by January 2024, delivering a starting salary of £39,000, which is much more than the £30,000 that the Secretary of State has boasted about today for teachers in England?

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): In England, standards are rising. We have a record number of teachers in our profession: 468,000 teachers, which is some 27,000 more than in 2010. We value education in this country, standards are rising and they will continue to rise, provided we have a Conservative Government.

T5. [906026] **Simon Jupp** (East Devon) (Con): I was pleased to welcome Department for Education officials to Tipton St John Primary School in my constituency of East Devon recently. Thanks to the Department, the school has the funding it needs and now has priority status in the school rebuilding programme. That is thanks to the Conservative Government. Will my right hon. Friend meet me to discuss the project's great progress so far?

Nick Gibb: I would be delighted to meet my hon. Friend. Progress is being made in identifying and securing a site on which to relocate the school. Officials continue to work with Devon County Council and the diocese of Exeter. I thank my hon. Friend for his support in progressing the discussions. The next step is for site appraisals to take place on potential new locations, and officials will continue to keep my hon. Friend informed.

T2. [906023] **Tahir Ali** (Birmingham, Hall Green) (Lab): A record 40,000 teachers in England resigned last year; teacher vacancies have doubled in the last two years; and agencies and underfunded training programmes are struggling to send qualified teachers to schools. Amy Lassman, the headteacher of Nelson Mandela Primary School, an outstanding primary school in my constituency, tells me that that is affecting students the most, with many failing their classes. Will Ministers tell us what they intend to do to narrow the attainment gap and raise standards, when we have fewer and fewer teachers?

Nick Gibb: We continue to raise standards in our schools, as the hon. Gentleman will know. He should not talk down the profession. This is an exciting time to join teaching. It is an honour to be able to work with children and to shape the next generation. This year, 47,000 people came into teaching, a number that is broadly similar year on year, because this is a good profession to join and there is a Government that will support the teaching profession.

T7. [906028] **Henry Smith** (Crawley) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Education for visiting the Busy Bees nursery in my constituency of Crawley earlier this month, and for the £204 million of investment that the Government are putting into childcare providers. Does that not demonstrate that the Conservative Government are now delivering for working parents?

Gillian Keegan: I know that my hon. Friend has done a lot of work in this sector. It was wonderful to visit Busy Bees and the fantastic team who work there. As well as the £204 million increase for providers, we have announced a £289 million investment to develop our universal wraparound childcare offer. We are the party of working parents. Labour has flip-flopped repeatedly on childcare, announcing vague policies in the autumn, which it quickly backtracked on. Its new plan, which I hear is to be means-tested, would snatch away childcare from thousands of hard-working parents. We are rolling out the largest investment in childcare in our history; Labour cannot even keep to its word.

Mr Speaker: I say gently to the Secretary of State that I was very generous at the beginning, but that does not carry on all the way through topicals. I want you to set a good example in this school classroom.

T6. [906027] **Samantha Dixon** (City of Chester) (Lab): What steps is the Secretary of State taking to improve the development of children's early speech and language skills, especially in schools such as the wonderful Chester Blue Coat Primary School where 39 languages are spoken?

Claire Coutinho: I thank the hon. Lady for that question. This is really important. We are trying to make sure that all staff in early years settings are better equipped. We will be setting out a practice guide specifically on early years speech and language, as well as working with the NHS on better diagnostics.

T8. [906029] **Jason McCartney** (Colne Valley) (Con): Labour-run Kirklees Council has been sitting on millions of pounds of unspent section 106 infrastructure payments, much of which has been allocated for local schools. In the meantime, I have a local school that has a leaky roof. It is impairing the teachers' ability to teach the children. May I please ask the Minister what is happening with the latest round of condition improvement funding to help with school repairs?

Nick Gibb: I welcome my hon. Friend's question. We have spent £15 billion since 2015 on repairs and maintenance of our school estate. We intend to announce any successful appeals from the latest condition improvement fund round this month, as CIF typically opens for applications each autumn. Eligible schools with an urgent condition need that cannot wait until the next round may of course apply for the urgent capital support.

T9. [906030] **Rachael Maskell** (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): The mental wellbeing of young people and children is really important. Last week, I met staff from Ebor Academy Trust and our mental health trust to talk about how better provision can be put in place. Labour has committed to ensuring that we have mental health professionals in our schools, but in this school it was the teaching assistants providing most of the care. How are we ensuring that teaching assistants are properly rewarded?

Claire Coutinho: Rates for teaching assistants are set by the local authority. Teaching assistants are highly regarded by all of us. As the hon. Lady says, they provide important pastoral care alongside the mental health support that we are rolling out via the mental health support teams.

T10. [906031] **John Penrose** (Weston-super-Mare) (Con): Higher education already publishes outcomes data, so students choosing courses can compare what their chances of employment and earning power will be for each course at each college or university and make fully informed decisions. Does the Minister accept that publishing outcomes for further education alongside higher education not only shows students the best courses and colleges, but puts FE and HE on an equal footing for the first time and pushes those offering low-value FE and HE qualifications to either shape up or close down?

Robert Halfon: I know that my hon. Friend is a champion of his brilliant Weston College, which is an example of the greatness of our FE colleges. He will be pleased to know that the DFE publishes outcomes data on further education, which shows statistics on the employment, earnings and learning outcomes of further education learners. We are introducing a data dashboard, which is in the direction of travel in which he wants to go.

Mike Amesbury (Weaver Vale) (Lab): Despite statutory guidance to reduce the costs of school uniforms, far too many schools are requiring four and up to five branded items. What more will the Minister do to intervene to ensure that schools abide by the law?

Nick Gibb: I thank the hon. Member for his private Member's Bill that, with the Government's support, enabled us to put the guidance on a statutory footing. About 61% of headteachers are aware of that guidance and are taking action to implement it. If parents are still concerned that the school uniform is too expensive, they can raise it with the school and go through the school's complaints process.

Chris Loder (West Dorset) (Con): In the absence of any Ofsted oversight or regulation of multi-academy trusts, will my right hon. Friend tell me what mechanism is in place for a school to escalate concerns over the pooling of pupil grant funding, especially in a situation where a multi-academy trust gives a school considerably less money than the Education and Skills Funding Agency allowance for that school?

Nick Gibb: Academy trusts can pool their general annual grant to deliver key improvements and efficiencies across the academies in the trust. The academy trust handbook requires consideration of each school's needs and an appeals mechanism, which can be escalated to the ESFA.

Christine Jardine (Edinburgh West) (LD): In my constituency of Edinburgh West this week, students are graduating, some of them with unclassified results, because of a dispute involving marking. This is making it difficult for those wishing to do masters or PhDs, particularly foreign students who have been told that they will have to reapply for visas. Are the Department

for Education and the Home Office looking at ways of facilitating those students taking up the places that they have been offered without the classification and avoiding that problem with the visas?

Robert Halfon: UK Visas and Immigration will consider exercising discretion, and will hold graduate route applications made before the applicant results have been received, provided that the results are received within eight weeks of the application being made. Students who do not know when they will receive their results due to the boycott will be able to extend their permission while they wait for their results. They will be exceptionally exempt from meeting academic progression requirements. I will write to the hon. Lady with fuller details.

Tom Hunt (Ipswich) (Con): Recently I visited Rushmere Hall Primary School in Ipswich, which is doing a fantastic job to support all neurodiverse pupils, particularly dyslexic pupils; however, its head spoke of a need for all regular teachers to have a better base understanding of neurodiversity, not just new specialists. In the special educational needs and disabilities improvement plan, the Government committed to that. I would like an update on how far we are getting with delivering that in practice.

Claire Coutinho: I thank my hon. Friend, who I know is an amazing campaigner on this issue. We are doing a lot to progress the support in schools, making sure that we have access to a specialist workforce and that teachers have proper training. We will set out a best practice guide on autism specifically, for which we have seen a big rise in need.

Douglas Chapman (Dunfermline and West Fife) (SNP): The price of school meals has increased by more than a third in some parts of the UK, yet the Government, and indeed the Labour Front Benchers, will not commit to universal free school meals for primary school-age children. The Scottish Government are rolling out free school meals across all primary schools. The question is when this Government will take the lead from the Scottish Government and act decisively to help struggling families.

Nick Gibb: Record numbers of pupils in England are now eligible for a free school meal. Under universal infant free school meals, all infant pupils get a free meal. A third of children in our schools are receiving a free school meal. We believe very strongly, however, that we should focus the funding on the children in the greatest need. We keep the issue under review, but our focus is always on the most disadvantaged.

Mrs Flick Drummond (Meon Valley) (Con): My hon. Friend the Member for Worcester (Mr Walker), the Chair of the Education Committee, mentioned my Children Not in School (Register) Bill, which passed its First Reading with support from colleagues across all parties and both Houses. The Schools Minister himself said before the Select Committee last month:

"It is important that we know where children are and can make sure that they are safe."

Therefore, is it not critical that the Government work with me to expedite the Bill, as an existing and ongoing legislation vehicle that the Government can use without any further delay?

Gillian Keegan: As I have pointed out, we do intend to legislate for the children not in school measures and put attendance on a statutory footing when the legislative timetable allows, looking at the sitting Fridays that are left within this period. The Department is currently running a call for evidence on improving the support for children missing from education, and that evidence will be used to inform future policy.

Andrew Bridgen (North West Leicestershire) (Reclaim): Does the Secretary of State think that something might be going seriously wrong when children in our junior schools are being indoctrinated by gender ideology at the same time as senior Members of this House appear unable to define what a woman is?

Gillian Keegan: I can assure my hon. Friend that I am more than capable of defining what a woman is. It is true that some schools are asking for guidance in this area, so we intend to bring forward guidance. I am working with my right hon. Friend the Equalities Minister to bring that forward in the near term.

Saqib Bhatti (Meriden) (Con): Last week, 14 officers from West Midlands police were recognised at the Police Bravery Awards for forming a human chain and breaking through the ice as Fin, Tom, Jack and Sam fell through in sub-zero temperatures at Babbs Mill lake in Kingshurst. I thank the Minister for his time on this previously. What progress has been made in revising the relationships, health and sex education curriculum guidelines specifically on understanding the implications of cold water shock on the body?

Nick Gibb: What happened to my hon. Friend's constituents is tragic. Swimming and water safety are in the national curriculum, and the Government are updating the school sport and activity action plan, which will set out actions to help all pupils take part in sport and keep fit, including swimming and water safety. The plan will be published this year to align with the timing of the Government's new school sport strategy.

Valerie Vaz (Walsall South) (Lab): The Secretary of State told the media at the weekend that she had found the money for the pay settlement from an underspend in the Department. Can she tell the House exactly where she found the money and what policies have not been delivered?

Gillian Keegan: I am delighted to. We have a constructive relationship with the Treasury, whether on childcare, school funding or extra budgeting, and in this particular case what we have done, as I have done many times in my 30-year business career, is to go through every line of the budget. We spend £100 billion on education, so there are a lot of things in that budget, and we have

gone through it and checked every single assumption. Some are demand led and some depend on the roll-out of certain projects. We have protected the frontline and reprioritised; what has changed is that the Treasury has allowed us to keep that money to reprioritise—*[Interruption.]* It is an answer. The right hon. Lady may not understand, because she does not—

Mr Speaker: Order. I am not sure the Secretary of State is understanding me, either. When I say these are topicals, I mean that—*[Interruption.]* Order. No, I am sorry; if you do not want Members on your side of the House to get in, please say so, because that is what is going to happen, and it is totally unfair to the people who are waiting. Let us play by the rules—that is what we expect from all of us.

Andrew Jones (Harrogate and Knaresborough) (Con): I recently visited the impressive National STEM Learning Centre in York and was fortunate enough to be able to observe some of its work. I would be delighted if my right hon. Friend could visit, but in the interim, can she detail what professional support is available for teachers in their continuing professional development?

Nick Gibb: We have engaged in an extensive reform of teacher training, introducing what we call the golden thread: a higher level of requirements in initial teacher training and a two-year early career framework for teachers just starting off in their career. Those standards will mean that in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and in all subjects, teachers are better prepared to enter the profession.

Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD): The chairs of the governing bodies of 19 primary and secondary schools across the London Boroughs of Richmond and Kingston upon Thames have today written to the Education Secretary, requesting an urgent meeting to discuss the crippling funding and recruitment challenges they face. Will she agree to meet them?

Nick Gibb: Of course the Secretary of State will agree, as she has just said to me. We are spending record amounts of funding on schools. The Secretary of State achieved an extra £2 billion in the autumn statement last year and we are now spending £59.6 billion on school funding.¹ We have recruited 2,800 more teachers this year than last year and we have a record number of teachers in the profession, at 468,000, but of course I am happy to talk to the hon. Lady and the teachers in her constituency to discuss their particular concerns.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Order. I am sorry, we have taken too much time on questions. You will have to do without.

1. *[Official Report, 20 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 16MC.]*

Higher Education Reform

3.37 pm

The Secretary of State for Education (Gillian Keegan):

With permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to announce the publication of the Government's higher education reform consultation response. This country is one of the best in the world for studying in higher education, boasting four of the world's top 10 universities. For most, higher education is a sound investment, with graduates expected to earn on average £100,000 more over their lifetime than those who do not go to university.

However, there are still pockets of higher education provision where the promise that university education will be worthwhile does not hold true and where an unacceptable number of students do not finish their studies or find a good job after graduating. That cannot continue. It is not fair to taxpayers who subsidise that education, but most of all it is not fair to those students who are being sold a promise of a better tomorrow, only to be disappointed and end up paying far into the future for a degree that did not offer them good value.

We want to make sure that students are charged a fair price for their studies and that a university education offers a good return. Our reforms are aimed at achieving that objective. That is why the Government launched the consultation in 2022, to seek views on policies based on recommendations made by Sir Philip Augar and his independent panel. The consultation ended in May 2022, and the Department for Education has been considering the responses received. I am now able to set out the programme of reforms that we are taking forward.

I believe that the traditional degree continues to hold great value, but it is not the only higher education pathway. Over the past 13 years, we have made substantial reforms to ensure that the traditional route is not the only pathway to a good career. Higher technical qualifications massively enhance students' skills and career prospects, and deserve parity of esteem with undergraduate degrees. We have seen a growth in degree-level apprenticeships, with over 188,000 students enrolling since their introduction in 2014. I have asked the Office for Students to establish a £40 million competitive degree apprenticeships fund to drive forward capacity-building projects to broaden access to degree apprenticeships over the next two years.

That drive to encourage skills is why we are also investing up to £115 million to help providers deliver higher technical education. In March, we set out detailed information on how the lifelong learning entitlement will transform the way in which individuals can undertake post-18 education, and we continue to support that transformation through the Lifelong Learning (Higher Education Fee Limits) Bill, which is currently passing through the other place. We anticipate that that funding, coupled with the introduction of the LLE from 2025, will help to incentivise the take-up of higher technical education, filling vital skills gaps across the country.

Each of those reforms has had one simple premise: that we are educating people with the skills that will enable them to have a long and fulfilling career. I believe that we should have the same expectation for higher education: it should prepare students for life by giving them the right skills and knowledge to get well-paid jobs. With the advent of the LLE, it is neither fair nor

right for students to use potentially three quarters of their lifelong loan entitlement for a university degree that does not offer them good returns. That would constrain their future ability to learn, earn and retrain. We must shrink the parts of the sector that do not deliver value, and ensure that students and taxpayers are getting value for money given their considerable investment.

Data shows that there were 66 providers from which fewer than 60% of graduates progressed to high-skilled employment or further study fifteen months after graduating. That is not acceptable. I will therefore issue statutory guidance to the OfS setting out that it should impose recruitment limits on provision that does not meet its rigorous quality requirements for positive student outcomes, to help to constrain the size and growth of courses that do not deliver for students. We will also ask the OfS to consider how it can incorporate graduate earnings into its quality regime. We recognise that many factors can influence graduate earnings, but students have a right to expect that their investment in higher education will improve their career prospects, and we should rightly scrutinise courses that appear to offer limited added value to students on the metric that matters most to many.

We will work with the OfS to consider franchising arrangements in the sector. All organisations that deliver higher education must be held to robust standards. I am concerned about some indications that franchising is acting as a potential route for low quality to seep into the higher education system, and I am absolutely clear that lead providers have a responsibility to ensure that franchised provision is of the same quality as directly delivered provision. If we find examples of undesirable practices, we will not hesitate to act further on franchising.

As I have said, we will ensure that students are charged a fair price for their studies. That is why we are also reducing to £5,760 the fees for classroom-based foundation year courses such as business studies and social sciences, in line with the highest standard funding rate for access to HE diplomas. Recently we have seen an explosion in the growth of many such courses, but limited evidence that they are in the best interests of students. We are not reducing the fee limits for high-cost, strategically important subjects such as veterinary sciences and medicine, but we want to ensure that foundation years are not used to add to the bottom line of institutions at the expense of those who study them. We will continue to monitor closely the growth of foundation year provision, and we will not hesitate to introduce further restrictions or reductions. I want providers to consider whether those courses add value for students, and to phase out that provision in favour of a broad range of tertiary options with the advent of the LLE.

Our aim is that everyone who wants to benefit from higher education has the opportunity to do so. That is why we will not proceed at this time with a minimum requirement of academic attainment to access student finance—although we will keep that option under review. I am confident that the sector will respond with the ambition and focused collaboration required to deliver this package of reforms. I extend my wholehearted thanks to those in the sector for their responses to the consultation.

This package of reforms represents the next step in tackling low-quality higher education, but it will not be the last step. The Government will not shy away from

further action if required, and will consider all levers available to us if these quality reforms do not result in the improvements we seek. Our higher education system is admired across many countries, and these measures will ensure that it continues to be. I commend this statement to the House.

Mr Speaker: I call the shadow Secretary of State.

3.44 pm

Bridget Phillipson (Houghton and Sunderland South) (Lab): I thank the Secretary of State for advance sight of her statement.

Today's statement tells us several stories about this Government. It tells a story about their priorities: why universities, and why now? It tells a story about their analysis: what they think is wrong and what they think is not. It tells a story about their competence: why these changes, when their own regulator has used a different approach for so long? It tells a story about their prejudice, about why they continue to reinforce a binary choice for young people: either academic or vocational, university or apprenticeship. Above all, it tells a story about values—about the choice to put caps on the aspirations and ambitions of our young people; about Ministers for whom opportunity is for their children, but not for other people's children; about a Government whose only big idea for our world-leading universities is to put up fresh barriers to opportunity, anxious to keep young people in their place. It tells you everything you need to know about the Tories that this is their priority for our young people.

This is the Tories' priority when we are in the middle of an urgent crisis in this country; when families are struggling to make ends meet; when patients are facing the biggest waiting lists in NHS history; when children are going to school in buildings that Ministers themselves acknowledge are "very likely" to collapse; and when a spiral of low productivity, low growth, and low wages under the Tories is holding Britain back. It is because the Prime Minister is weak and he is in hock to his Back Benchers that we are not seeing action on those important priorities. Instead, after more than 13 years in power, the Government have shown what they really think of our universities, which are famous across the world, are core to so many of our regional economies and were essential to our pandemic response: that they are not a public good, but a political battleground.

The Government's concept of a successful university course, based on earnings, is not just narrow but limiting. I ask the Secretary of State briefly to consider the case of the right hon. Member for Richmond (Yorks) (Rishi Sunak). The Prime Minister has a degree in politics from one of our leading universities, yet his Government lost control of almost 50 councils this year, he was the second choice of his own party, and now he is on track to fail to deliver on the pledges he set himself publicly. Does the Secretary of State believe that the Prime Minister's degree was in any sense a high-value course?

Let us be clear what today's announcement is really about. Many of our most successful newer universities—the fruits of the determination of successive Governments, Labour and Conservative, to spread opportunity in this country—often draw more students from their local

communities. Many of those areas are far from London, far from existing concentrations of graduate jobs. Many of those students come from backgrounds where few in their family, if any, will have had the chance to go to university. Many of those young people benefit from extra support when they arrive at university to ensure they succeed. We on the Labour Benches welcome the success of those universities in widening participation and welcoming more young people into higher education, yet today, the Secretary of State is telling those young people—including those excited to be finishing their studies this year—that this Government believe their hard work counts for nothing. Can the Secretary of State be absolutely clear with the House, and tell us which of those universities' courses she considers to be of low value?

The Secretary of State is keen to trumpet her party's record on apprenticeships, but let me set out what this Government's record really is. Since 2015-16, apprenticeship starts among under-19s have dropped by 41%, and apprentice achievements in that age group are down by 57%. Since the Secretary of State entered this place, the number of young people achieving an apprenticeship at any level has more than halved, failing a generation of young people desperate to take on an apprenticeship.

Lastly and most importantly, the values that this Government have set out today are clear: the Conservatives are saying to England's young people that opportunity is not for them and that choice is not for them. The bizarre irony of a Conservative Government seeking to restrict freedom and restrict choices seems entirely lost on them. Labour will shatter the class ceiling. We will ensure that young people believe that opportunity is for them. Labour is the party of opportunity, aspiration and freedom. Let us be clear, too, that young people want to go to university not merely to get on financially, but for the chance to join the pursuit of learning, to explore ideas and undertake research that benefits us all. That chance and that opportunity matter too. Our children deserve better. They deserve a Government whose most important mission will be to break down the barriers to opportunity and to build a country where background is no barrier. They deserve a Labour Government.

Gillian Keegan: As usual, the hon. Lady has more words than actions. None of those actions was put in place either in Wales, where Labour is running the education system, or in the UK when it was running it in England. We have always made the deliberate choice of quality over quantity, and this is a story of a consistent drive for quality, whether that is through my right hon. Friend the Schools Minister having driven up school standards, so that we are the best in the west for reading and fourth best in the world, or through childcare, revolutionising the apprenticeship system—none of that existed before we put it in place—and technical education and higher education.

I was an other people's child: I was that kid who left school at 16, who went to a failing comprehensive school in Knowsley. I relied on the business, and the college and the university that I went to. I did not know their brand images and I knew absolutely nobody who had ever been there. I put my trust in that company, and luckily it did me very well. Not all universities and not all courses have the trusted brand image of Oxford and Cambridge, which I think is where the hon. Lady went,

[Gillian Keegan]

along with my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister. I have worked with many leaders all over the world in my many years in business, and the Prime Minister is a world-class leader.

On apprenticeships, it is a case of quality always over quantity. What we found, and this is why I introduced the quality standards, is that, yes, the numbers were higher, but many of the people did not realise they were on an apprenticeship, many of the apprenticeships lasted less than 12 months and for many of them there was zero off-the-job training. They were apprenticeships in name only, which is what the Labour party will be when it comes to standards for education.

Mr Speaker: I call the Father of the House.

Sir Peter Bottomley (Worthing West) (Con): I thank the Secretary of State. Those of us with long memories know that we either ration places by number or we give people choice. If she is giving people the choice of being able to discriminate between the courses and universities on offer, I congratulate her, as I do especially on the lifetime learning and the degree apprenticeship expansion, which has already happened, with more to come.

However, can I also speak up for those who either got fourth-class degrees or failed to take a degree at all, including two of the three Governors of the Bank of England who went to King's and who came out without a degree? Rabi Tagore left university, and many other poets, painters, teachers or ministers of religion—whether rabbis, imams or ministers in the Christian Church—do not show up highly on the earnings scale, but they might show up highly in their contributions to society. Can my right hon. Friend please make sure that she does not let an algorithm rate colleges, courses or universities?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend for his remarks, and I very much agree that this is about choice—the lifelong loan entitlement, degree apprenticeships and all of the other choices—and about people understanding that there are many different routes to success in life. We have asked the Office for Students to look at earnings, because I realise that is difficult and that some jobs will not earn people more. However, for his information, five years after graduating from some courses, people are earning less than £18,000. That is less than the minimum wage, and it is not acceptable.

Valerie Vaz (Walsall South) (Lab): May I ask the Secretary of State, because she has not actually spelled this out, what is a low-value degree?

Gillian Keegan: In relation to low-value degrees, an example of the quality provisions we have introduced for the Office for Students is B3, which is about: whether students continue in their degree, because clearly if they drop out, it is not of much value; whether they complete their degree, because clearly if they do not complete it, it is of zero value; and whether they get a job or progress into higher education afterwards. Those are the three quality measures we look at. Right now, the Office for Students is looking at 18 providers and two specific areas—business and management, and computer science—because there is a massive range in what people

can expect to earn from jobs having followed one course or others, all of which seem to have the same name. There are quality issues, and we want to make sure that they are thoroughly investigated. The Office for Students is doing that.

Mr Speaker: I call the Chair of the Education Committee.

Mr Robin Walker (Worcester) (Con): I welcome the focus on both choice and policy that my right hon. Friend has focused on in her statement. The Education Committee will want to look at the detail of the proposals, and at the kind of courses that are affected. It is crucial that in launching this approach, she recognises that all our universities are selling a premium product. All our universities are high-quality institutions, and it would be wrong to discriminate against different universities in the system when, after all, they are all funded on the same fundamental basis.

Gillian Keegan: I agree with my hon. Friend and I am proud of our university sector. It is much admired all over the world, but we must ensure that specific courses in all institutions offer the quality that people expect. When people invest in these degrees they will come out with £40,000 or £50,000 of debt, and it is important first that they know that, and secondly that they know what they are investing in, and what return they will get on that investment.

Mr Barry Sheerman (Huddersfield) (Lab/Co-op): May I beg the Secretary of State not to throw the baby out with the bath water? Everybody wants good-quality degrees, and we all want degrees to lead to good, fulfilling occupations, but some of us are worried about the comments that were made in an interview this morning by the Secretary of State's ministerial colleague that we have four or five of the best universities in the world, as if all the other 120 universities were rubbish. That is not the case. We have diverse universities and great courses. I ask her please not to throw the baby out with the bath water and do great damage to our higher education system.

Gillian Keegan: I agree with the hon. Gentleman. We have an excellent university system with excellent universities. Four out of the top 10 are world-class, but if we broaden that to the top 100, many others would appear in that list. We have a good university sector, which is why it is most important that we protect the brand image. It is also very popular abroad, and every year more than 600,000 students choose to come here, which is more than to almost every other country in the world. Why? It is because they know they will get quality, and it is very important for the sector that that quality is maintained.

Kit Malthouse (North West Hampshire) (Con): I know the Secretary of State takes a more than purely transactional view of higher education, and I am with the Father of the House in hoping that in her reforms there will be protections for degrees that do not offer an immediate commercial advantage, such as theology, philosophy or the study of poetry. I also hope that within her reforms there will be protections to allow universities to innovate and introduce new courses. Our university sector has obviously been at the forefront of

driving forward British intellectualism and thinking, and not allowing universities to experiment with courses that may not immediately fulfil the criteria that she is proposing, or indeed forbidding or deterring them from doing so, would set us back in world terms. Will she reassure us that innovation will still be encouraged?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my right hon. Friend for all the work that he did in this area. Yes, I understand the difficulty of choosing a blunt number or tool. That is why I have asked the Office for Students to consider how such things could be used and what approaches we need to ensure that we do not throw the baby out with the bath water, or end up with unintended consequences. On innovation, I am absolutely encouraging all our universities to innovate, working with businesses. The pace of technological change across the world and what is to come in the future is immense, and I want our universities to work with our further education colleges, training providers, businesses and others, to ensure that we innovate and give everybody the best opportunities for the future.

Munira Wilson (Twickenham) (LD): There is no clearer sign of a Government who are out of ideas and have run out of steam than when they re-announce policies and badge them as new. The Office for Students already has these powers, and has already capped four specific providers. Rather than putting down our universities and capping our young people's aspirations, why does the Secretary of State not invest in them by restoring maintenance grants, and finally signing the dotted line on Horizon membership?

Gillian Keegan: Not all the things I have brought forward today have already been announced. The information on foundation degrees is new, and the work we are doing with the OfS is also new. We have asked the OfS to consider the impact of recruitment limits, and how those can be introduced. I personally think this is an important set of reforms. We need to make sure that we have access to these fantastic courses at our universities so that through programmes—such as Horizon, when we complete those negotiations—we can continue to offer the very best in science from this country.

Esther McVey (Tatton) (Con): I very much welcome this statement to limit the number of students that universities can recruit to courses that are failing. The Secretary of State has my full support. Can she tell me whether this measure will also apply to foreign students? At the very least, will foreign students be barred from bringing dependants with them to do these courses?

Gillian Keegan: The quality of the courses on offer applies to everybody. If we change the quality for domestic students, it will then be the same quality for international students, which is important because of the size of the international student sector, which brings about £25 billion to £30 billion to our economy every year. We have already addressed the issue of dependants for taught master's courses in our recent changes to migration visas.

Daniel Zeichner (Cambridge) (Lab): The Secretary of State has confirmed that the Office for Students already had the powers to enforce on student outcome provisions,

so this announcement is just narrow politicking. Hidden in the UCAS figures last week was the fact that home student applications are falling in this country. Can the Secretary of State confirm that this Government's policy is now one of narrowing participation?

Gillian Keegan: Absolutely not, no. I am delighted that the hon. Gentleman has asked this question, because our policy is about widening participation and making sure that education is high-quality. It is also about making sure that there are more degree apprenticeships. There are now 180,000, which did not exist before. There are now 180,000 more people who can do what I did, as the only degree apprentice in the House of Commons. It is a fantastic route into the workplace. We also have higher technical qualifications and boot camps. There is so much investment that has all happened under this Conservative Government.

Sir Bill Wiggin (North Herefordshire) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that the shadow Secretary of State, the hon. Member for Houghton and Sunderland South (Bridget Phillipson), missed the opportunity to condemn the disgusting and cruel University and College Union marking boycott? Will my right hon. Friend use these reforms to protect young people to ensure that this never happens again and that universities such as Cambridge and Exeter can issue degrees?

Gillian Keegan: It is important. Young people have suffered already a lot during covid. They have invested in their degree and put all the hard work in. It is only right that they should have their degrees marked. This is a dispute between universities and their lecturers, but we are urging them to make sure they prioritise all those who will be graduating this year.

Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP): I welcome the announcement today, because for far too long, some universities cynically sold courses to students even though they knew the outcomes were poor in qualifications and employment opportunities. Does the Minister accept that it was her party that allowed the increase in fees, was aware of the mismatch sometimes between courses and the needs of the economy, and did nothing to cap those courses? Does she not recognise that some people will be rather cynical that the tsunami of announcements we are getting now is more to do with the by-elections, rather than the ability to deliver between now and a general election?

Gillian Keegan: Absolutely not. I have been working on this policy with many former Ministers, even since I was the Apprenticeships and Skills Minister. We have been working on this for a long time to make sure we get it right. When a working-class kid who will come out with £50,000 of debt puts their trust in an institution, they have to put their trust in the system and it is vital that the system delivers for them. If they have £50,000 of debt and no better job prospects, that is not a system delivering for them.

Sir Julian Lewis (New Forest East) (Con): Would it not benefit university courses' quality more if university administrators were paid a lot less and university lecturers were paid rather more?

Gillian Keegan: My right hon. Friend puts his finger on a debate that is going on in our universities right now, and I know it is part of the discussions between university lecturers and university management.

Dr Rupa Huq (Ealing Central and Acton) (Lab): I have been around the block—Oxbridge, red brick, ex-poly—long enough to know that this statement reeks of academic snobbery and desperation. In cultural studies, people can legitimately analyse Mickey Mouse as a subject of academic inquiry—I have ex-students who did that who are now earning more than any of us in here. When will the Government address the things that our constituents really want to be dealt with, such as crippling student debt and the massively reduced and minimal contact hours that the covid generation got?

Gillian Keegan: The hon. Lady will be delighted about the data that we now have. If students having done those courses go on to earn more—I do not know what her judgment is on those institutions—that will be absolutely fantastic; that is all that we expect. I have two business and management degrees and know business well, having spent 30 years in it, but if people cannot get a good business job after doing a business and management degree, I would suggest that was not a good-quality degree. One must recognise that.

Chris Green (Bolton West) (Con): My right hon. Friend is right to celebrate Britain's international higher education success, but does she agree that any changes made must recognise the tremendous success of the 2,000 workers at the University of Bolton, which has shot up *The Guardian's* best university guide league table now to be placed in the top 40?

Gillian Keegan: My hon. Friend makes an excellent point, and I know that he is a big champion of the University of Bolton, which I was delighted to meet recently. It is quite interesting that a lot of former polytechnics and newer universities are working and collaborating so well with businesses, offering more degree apprenticeships and more flexible courses, and storming up the league tables.

Barbara Keeley (Worsley and Eccles South) (Lab): I am concerned that many university degrees that lead young people into the creative sector will be squeezed under the Government's plans. Industry leaders have warned that limiting student numbers based on graduate earnings fails to account for the working patterns of graduates in the creative industries, and particularly the arts, where people do not immediately earn high salaries. The salaries in those professions do not reflect their importance to national wellbeing and the contribution that the arts make to our national income. What assessment has the Department for Education made of the damage that this latest policy will do to those arts and humanities subjects that have already been relentlessly cut back under Conservative-led Governments?

Gillian Keegan: I am a huge supporter of our creative and arts industries, which are among our largest, and we are very successful in them. I work with them a lot to ensure that we can deliver even broader apprenticeship routes, because they are difficult industries to get into. I have asked the Office for Students to consider how to

do this reform to ensure that we consider things like the creative arts and other routes, which sometimes take longer to get into but offer a different aspect of learning. That is why we have not just introduced a blunt tool. I will continue to work with our fantastic creative sector.

Vicky Ford (Chelmsford) (Con): I congratulate my right hon. Friend and the Department on their focus on excellence. This morning, I attended the graduation ceremony of students from Anglia Ruskin University in Chelmsford. It was so moving, because, for the first time in history, students graduated as medical doctors in Essex. Our investment five years ago in five new medical schools across the country is a shining example of a Conservative Government investing for future needs. Will she work with me to try to double the number of medical students and encourage a degree apprenticeship for doctors, and will she congratulate our new doctors?

Gillian Keegan: I know that my right hon. Friend is a huge champion of Anglia Ruskin University. I am delighted about the number of medical doctors and the new medical schools, which, as she said, were introduced under this Government. When I was the Apprenticeships and Skills Minister, one of the last things I did, and which I am most proud about, was to get a medical doctors apprenticeship standard built, and I am delighted that that is being rolled out from September. I look forward to Anglia Ruskin offering that as well.

Mike Amesbury (Weaver Vale) (Lab): I was the first in my family to get a university degree—I hope that I am not the last. Will the Secretary of State confirm that the Tory party is the party of the blockers—blocking aspiration and opportunity in higher education as well as the building of affordable houses?

Gillian Keegan: No, I think that the hon. Member has got it completely wrong. Under the Conservatives, an 18-year-old from a disadvantaged background is 86% more likely to go to university than they were in 2010. Under Labour, the richest students were seven times more likely to go to university than the poorest 40% in society.

Jonathan Gullis (Stoke-on-Trent North) (Con): I welcome the Secretary of State's plans, but I want higher education reform to go further. A recent paper by the New Conservatives included an excellent suggestion to extend the closure of the student dependant route to students enrolled on one-year research master's degrees. Would she support that?

Gillian Keegan: My hon. Friend knows that we have already looked at that in careful detail. It is kept under review, and we recently made changes to the taught course route.

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): Of course students deserve high-quality education at university. They also deserve to be cared for during what is, for most of them, their first time away from home. Does the Secretary of State agree with me, and with the families of young people who have tragically taken their own lives at university, that higher education institutions should do more to look out for and protect those students, including by having a statutory duty of care?

Gillian Keegan: I completely agree. That is why the Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education, my right hon. Friend the Member for Harlow (Robert Halfon), has asked all universities to sign up to the mental health charter.

Tom Hunt (Ipswich) (Con): A key stakeholder is the British taxpayer, who ends up picking up a £1 billion bill for people who cannot pay back their student debt. Bricklayers, roofers and carpenters—there are not enough people in Britain to do those jobs. Does the Education Secretary agree that we should promote those opportunities and routes in our school system? No one should turn up their nose at those jobs; they offer a good pathway to a good wage, and we should promote them.

Gillian Keegan: My hon. Friend makes a very good point. Lots of people are surprised by how much they can earn in some of those trades, whether welding, bricklaying or plumbing. There have been, and there will always be, fabulous apprenticeships and full-time courses to make sure everyone can reach those careers.

Mick Whitley (Birkenhead) (Lab): The most important factor in determining graduate outcomes remains the student's socioeconomic background. The average student from a working-class background goes on to earn less after graduating than their wealthier peers with the same degree. Does the Minister concede that the Government's insistence on degrading the value of degrees and restricting access to higher education will only compound those deep structural inequalities that define our education system? Does the Minister accept that many young people in my constituency will consider those plans an attempt to put them back in their place and out of university?

Gillian Keegan: I was in exactly the same place as the people in his constituency—in fact, in the same city—so I do not accept that at all. We are upgrading the options for people from working-class backgrounds and upgrading the quality of degrees. I would not be here if I had not had the options I had, which included an apprenticeship, FE college and a part-time degree at Liverpool John Moores University. That was high quality. Everybody who puts their trust in the system should get the same.

Andrew Jones (Harrogate and Knaresborough) (Con): I support my right hon. Friend's comments on the UCU marking ban, which is so hurtful to students. The latest UCAS data shows a record number of 18-year-olds from the most disadvantaged areas accepted on to a course, and that the entry rate gap between the most advantaged and disadvantaged areas now stands at 2.1, a record low. That is great, but there is more work to be done. Will my right hon. Friend continue to focus on closing that gap?

Gillian Keegan: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. We are continuing to close that gap, and we have made unbelievable progress—more in the last 13 years than ever in this country. We will continue to make sure that working class people get access to all high-quality routes into the workplace.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): The Government should address the reasons why some courses are struggling, not the consequences. Higher education funding is in crisis, and that is having an impact on the

function of universities, not least the post-1992 universities. Will the review by the Office for Students look at the higher education funding model? How will it address the real symptoms that she is talking about?

Gillian Keegan: The hon. Lady makes an interesting point, but at the moment the OfS has 18 providers under investigation for poor quality. There are many more providers, and we have a standard fee. It will look at contextual aspects such as demographics, socioeconomics and mature students. It looks at all that in context, but there are 18 providers out of a much larger number.

Greg Smith (Buckingham) (Con): The Secretary of State has my full support for the measures she has announced this afternoon. On that key mission of ensuring that students pay a fair price and get a good return for their university education, does she agree that more institutions should follow the example of the University of Buckingham, which offers fantastic two-year undergraduate degrees with staggered start points throughout the year?

Gillian Keegan: Yes. The University of Buckingham has taken an excellent leadership position and its two-year degree is very much welcomed by many people. We will introduce the lifelong loan entitlement, which will revolutionise how and when people go to university, what type of courses they take, for what period of time, and how they make those decisions over their entire career and lifetime.

Helen Morgan (North Shropshire) (LD): Many of my constituents study or have obtained degrees from Harper Adams University, just up the road. Those degrees are at the cutting edge of agriculture and the key challenge facing all of us, which is how to feed the planet in a sustainable way. Their degrees and the likely careers they go into are classified by the Office for National Statistics as “unprofessional”. Will the Secretary of State consider reviewing the data and taking a really hard look at how those occupations are classified, because some of my constituents would miss out on a really important opportunity to do a high-class and important degree?

Gillian Keegan: I thank the hon. Lady. Harper Adams University is a fantastic university. It does a fantastic range of courses, more and more looking at agri-tech, the technology within agriculture. I am sure it offers fantastic high quality to its students. There have been discussions about the professions and how the data is organised, so I will look at that. A number have raised that concern, not just those in agriculture.

Holly Mumby-Croft (Scunthorpe) (Con): It seems absolutely right to me that those who choose to go to university should expect a good-quality, good-value education they can put to good use throughout their lives. My right hon. Friend mentions apprenticeships. Will she say a little more about what we can do to ensure parity of esteem between degree and apprenticeship routes?

Gillian Keegan: I thank my hon. Friend for all her support and I know she is a keen proponent of apprenticeships in her area. A lot of it is now about awareness—the apprenticeships are fantastic; I knew 35 years ago that they were fantastic, but I think now everybody knows

[Gillian Keegan]

how fantastic they are—through putting them on UCAS and, from next year, having people able to apply through UCAS. We will also have a centralised site, so that all the apprenticeships are together and people can look at the vast array of careers they can access—670 different routes into pretty much every career you can think of. It is about awareness. I thank all my hon. Friends who have apprenticeship fairs and do a lot to make people aware of these fantastic choices.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I thank the Secretary of State for her statement outlining that university courses which fail to deliver good outcomes, with high dropout rates and poor employment prospects, will be subject to strict controls. That is great news for families who struggle to pay the money for courses which end up with no benefit. What discussions has she had with the universities in Northern Ireland, Queen's University Belfast and Ulster University? Will she confirm that this approach will be UK-wide, and that the postal and trade sea border will not extend to an education sea border?

Gillian Keegan: I think the hon. Gentleman knows that this policy is devolved, but I work very closely with my ministerial counterparts in all devolved nations. We share information and best practice, and there are collaborative discussions, too. I will make sure I share this with them, as well.

Brendan Clarke-Smith (Bassetlaw) (Con): I wholeheartedly support what the Secretary of State said today. Does she agree that degrees should provide value for

money and lead to better employment prospects and career development, as thankfully happened with my studying politics at Nottingham Trent University, not just a certificate and a debt, as developed under the previous Labour Administration who introduced fees and then did their best to devalue them?

Gillian Keegan: My hon. Friend is right. Labour has flip-flopped on fees, with several different policies in that area. We are fully committed to building up our university higher education sector and we continue to do that. It is admired across the world, but it is most important that every degree is a quality degree that leads to good outcomes.

Siobhan Baillie (Stroud) (Con): The Secretary of State is right: the Labour party has not just flip-flopped on its position on tuition fees, but is now coming across as not wanting parents and young people to have the best possible information about their options. I am working with the think-tank Policy Exchange on reforming the apprenticeship levy. As it has identified, if the public sector apprenticeship target of 2.8% was met in all areas, we could create 25,000 additional apprenticeships. Will my right hon. Friend look at that and at whether we can change the procurement contract rules, because we will need these new opportunities as we go forward?

Gillian Keegan: As my hon. Friend knows, I fully support giving more and more people access to apprenticeships. We are currently spending 99.6% of the budget, which does not leave much room for further flexibilities over and above what we have already introduced. The Labour party's policy of halving the apprenticeship levy will result only in fewer opportunities: it is a terrible policy and they should flip that policy, because it is a flop.

Points of Order

4.19 pm

Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP): On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Sir James Duddridge (Rochford and Southend East) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Is your point of order on the same subject, Sir James?

Sir James Duddridge *indicated assent*.

Mr Speaker: In that case, I will come to you after I have heard the first one.

Sammy Wilson: This evening a Committee was meant to discuss the draft Postal Packets (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2023, which relate to part of the implementation of the Windsor framework agreement. The Delegated Legislation Committee has already criticised the Government for the way in which they have rushed these regulations, for the lack of information given, and for their inability to answer the questions that it had asked about the legislation. Today the Government decided that half the Conservative Members on the Committee, who were selected and approved by this House, were to be removed because it was felt that they might be too critical and ask too many questions. Is it in order for Committee members who have been selected by the House to be removed in this manner, especially when that is designed to stifle debate and when, indeed, one can only conclude that the Government's actions would make the North Korean leader blush at the lack of democratic process?

Mr Speaker: I am not sure about that.

Sir James Duddridge: Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. I was one of those who was thrown off the Committee. I had been asked by the House to join it, and I did the right thing in reviewing the paperwork.

At the outset, I did not know that the draft Postal Packets (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2023 were particularly controversial, but when I had done the research and found that they were, I told my Whip that I had some concerns. All the consultation had come out against the legislation, the Democratic Unionist party was concerned about it, and it did not deliver on Brexit. I said that I would probably want to probe and query it—as is my right as a Member of Parliament—and perhaps even vote against it. I was asked whether I would like to be replaced; I said no. I was asked whether I would like to take the week off; I said no. This morning I found that I had been replaced because the Government had thought that the sitting might continue for as long as 90 minutes, and that that might be inconvenient for me, so they had found someone who could take the time. I then discovered that other hon. Members were in the same position. This will go on for the full 90 minutes: we will make sure of that. I suspect that other Members who are in the Chamber will be present.

May I ask you two questions, Mr Speaker? First, can time be found for us to debate this substantive issue, which rides a coach and horses through Brexit, on the Floor of the House? Secondly, have you received any indication from Ministers that they will not be introducing the statutory instrument at 6 pm?

Mr Mark Francois (Rayleigh and Wickford) (Con): Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: I do not want this to continue for too long. I do need to answer. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will be brief.

Mr Francois: I will be brief, Mr Speaker.

The members of the Committee were nominated by the Committee of Selection in the normal way last week. So far so good, but when I checked with the Chairman of the Committee of Selection, I learned that he had not been informed of the changes, which had been made by the Whips and not by the Committee. This is basically a sixth-form politics stunt, which came about because the Government feared that the people concerned would vote against that element of the Windsor framework. Why have our Government been reduced to this?

Gavin Robinson (Belfast East) (DUP) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: I am now going to bring in Gavin Robinson—but I think we all know the answer, by the way.

Gavin Robinson: Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. Clearly the purpose of a Delegated Legislation Committee is to fast-track matters that contain no controversy, and this exchange alone would suggest that there are issues worthy of exploration. We have heard the suggestion that the Committee would sit for 90 minutes, but we know that within two hours the Chamber will be incredibly busy with Divisions. There is no practical or reasonable prospect of the Committee's dealing substantively with these issues affecting the Windsor framework. I should appreciate it, Sir, if you could deal with that in your response.

Mr William Wragg (Hazel Grove) (Con) *rose*—

Mr Speaker: Finally, I call Mr Wragg.

Mr Wragg: Further to that point of order, Mr Speaker. Could you confirm that any Member is entitled to go along to a Delegated Legislation Committee to speak?

Mr Speaker: You have answered it. I think all those who raised the point of order know the real answer without me going into it; I am grateful to at least two of them for giving me notice.

Although I accept that it can cause inconvenience, I can confirm that late changes to the membership of Delegated Legislation Committees can be made in the way that has been described. In any case, any Member of the House, whether nominated or not, may attend and speak at any meeting of a Delegated Legislation Committee. That may help, but the Members concerned did not need me to give the answer. They will know or can think about the reasons why they are not on the Committee. The answers to the two questions from the hon. Member for Rochford and Southend East (Sir James Duddridge) are no and no.

Stella Creasy (Walthamstow) (Lab/Co-op): On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I hope this is slightly less controversial.

Mr Speaker: So do I!

Stella Creasy: I feel I am letting people down when it comes to drama.

Mr Speaker, have you had any notice from the Government of any intended statements, either written or spoken, about the future of the regulation of “buy now, pay later” lenders? Some 8 million people in this country are struggling to pay a “buy now, pay later” bill because they are borrowing to fund the effects of inflation and the cost of living crisis. They have no protection from the financial ombudsman. In 2020, the Government agreed to legislate on the matter and we have been waiting since then for regulations. Yet now there are press reports—not reports to this House—suggesting that the whole thing is going to be scrapped and rethought, leaving millions of people open to harm from illegal loan sharks. What notice have you had of the matter, Mr Speaker?

Mr Speaker: I have not had any such indication from the Government. I am sure that the hon. Lady’s points will have been noted on the Government Benches. I hope they will be taken on board. Let us see where we go from there.

Illegal Migration Bill

Consideration of Lords message

Clause 1

INTRODUCTION

4.26 pm

The Minister for Immigration (Robert Jenrick): I beg to move, That this House disagrees with Lords amendments 1B, 7B and 90D.

Mr Speaker: With this it will be convenient to discuss: Lords amendment 9B, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 23B, and Government motion to disagree.

Amendments 36A and 36B, and Government motions to insist, and Lords amendments 36C and 36D, and Government motions to disagree.

Lords amendment 33B, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 56B, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 102B, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendment 103B, and Government motion to disagree.

Lords amendments 107B and 107C, and Government motions to disagree.

Robert Jenrick: Last Tuesday, this House voted 18 times—more times than on any other day on any other piece of legislation—and 18 times it voted to support this Bill.

Mr William Wragg (Hazel Grove) (Con): Will the Minister give way?

Robert Jenrick: I will first make a few opening remarks.

This House sent back to the House of Lords its 20 amendments to the Bill, many of which simply drove a coach and horses through the fabric of the legislation. We brought forward reasonable amendments where it was sensible to do so and it is disappointing, to say the least, that some of those have been rejected. I welcome the fact that the 20 issues that we debated last week have now been whittled down to nine, but the issue now before us is whether the clearly expressed views of this House, the elected Chamber—not just in the votes last week, but throughout the earlier passage of the Bill—should prevail.

We believe that inaction is not an option, that we must stop the boats and that the Bill is a key part of our plan to do just that. The message and the means must be absolutely clear and unambiguous: if people come to the UK illegally, they will not be able to stay here. Instead, they will be detained and returned to their home country or removed to a safe third country. There is simply no point in passing legislation that does not deliver a credible deterrent or provide the means to back it up with effective and swift enforcement powers.

We cannot accept amendments that provide for exceptions, qualifications and loopholes that would simply perpetuate the current cycle of delays and endless late and repeated legal challenges to removal. I listened carefully to the debate in the other place, but no new arguments were forthcoming and certainly no credible alternatives were provided.

Sir William Cash (Stone) (Con): I thoroughly endorse what my right hon. Friend says. This is a matter of extreme national interest, as is reflected in the votes of constituents throughout the country. They feel very strongly about these matters. Does he not agree that it is time for their lordships to take note of the fact that the British people want this legislation to go through? They want progress, given the extreme difficulties this is presenting to the British people.

Robert Jenrick: I strongly endorse my hon. Friend's comments. This is an issue of the highest importance to the people we serve in this place. Of course there is a legitimate role for the other place in scrutinising legislation, but now is the time to move forward and pass this law to enable us to stop the boats.

Sir Edward Leigh (Gainsborough) (Con): I wonder whether my right hon. Friend has noted the remarks of Lord Clarke, who is not a particularly vicious right-wing creature. He said this Bill is entirely necessary and that we have to get on with it.

I also wonder whether my right hon. Friend has looked at today's remarks by Lord Heseltine.

Lord Clarke and Lord Heseltine seem to have come up with a sensible option. We should go ahead with this Bill. We have to have much better European co-operation and, really, we have to build a wall around Europe. [*Interruption.*] And we have to do much more—this is what the Opposition might like—in terms of a Marshall plan to try to remove the conditions of sheer misery that cause people to want to leave these countries in the first place.

Robert Jenrick: I read the remarks of the noble Lord Clarke, and I entirely agree with his point, which is that, having listened to the totality of the debate in the House of Lords, he had not heard a single credible alternative to the Government's plan. For that reason alone, it is important to support the Government.

I also agree with Lord Clarke's broader point that this policy should not be the totality of our response to this challenge. Deterrence is an essential part of the plan, but we also need to work closely with our partners in Europe and further upstream. One initiative that the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary and I have sought to pursue in recent months is to ensure that the United Kingdom is a strategic partner to each and every country that shares our determination to tackle this issue, from Turkey and Tunisia to France and Belgium.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith (Chingford and Woodford Green) (Con): I completely agree with my right hon. Friend. I believe that the Bill should go through, as we have to do something about the deaths in the channel, which is an important moral purpose.

I bring my right hon. Friend back to Lord Randall's amendment on modern slavery. We agree quite a lot on this issue, and the Government have said that they will

do stuff in guidance, so Lord Randall has taken the words spoken by my right hon. Friend at the Dispatch Box and put them on the face of the Bill—this amendment does exactly what my right hon. Friend promised the Government would do in guidance. The Government have not issued the guidance in detail, which is why the amendment was made. Why would we vote against the amendment today when my right hon. Friend's words and prescriptions are now on the face of the Bill?

Robert Jenrick: First, the Lords amendment on modern slavery goes further by making the scheme, as we see it, much more difficult to establish. There are a number of reasons but, in particular, we think the complexity of the issue requires it to be provided for in statutory guidance rather than on the face of the Bill, in line with my assurances made on the Floor of the House. One of those assurances is particularly challenging to put in statutory guidance—where an incident has taken place in the United Kingdom, rather than an individual being trafficked here—and that is the point Lord Randall helpfully tried to bring forward.

We are clear that the process I have set out should be set out in statutory guidance, because the wording of the amendment is open to abuse by those looking to exploit loopholes. Those arriving in small boats would seek to argue that they have been trafficked into the UK and that the 30-day grace period should apply to them, on the basis that they qualify as soon as they reach UK territorial waters. The proposed provision is, for that reason, operationally impossible and serves only to create another loophole that would render the swift removal we seek impossible or impractical. The statutory guidance can better describe and qualify this commitment, by making it clear that the exploitation must have occurred once the person had spent a period of time within the UK and not immediately they get off the small boat in Kent. For that reason, we consider it better to place this on a statutory footing as guidance rather than putting it in the Bill.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): The Democratic Unionist party is concerned about the trafficking of children and young people. My question is a simple one. We see economic migrants who are fit and healthy but none the less make that journey, and we see those who have had to leave their country because they have been persecuted, discriminated against or been subjected to brutal violence, or because their family members have been murdered. My party and I want to be assured that those who flee persecution have protection within this law, because we do not see that they do.

Robert Jenrick: We believe that they do, because at the heart of this scheme is the principle that if an individual comes to the UK illegally on a small boat, they will be removed back home if it is safe to do that—if they are going to a safe home country such as Albania. In determining that the country is safe, for example, as in the case of Albania, we would have sought specific assurances from it, if required. Alternatively, they will be removed to a safe third country, such as Rwanda, where, again we would have sought sufficient assurances that an individual would be well-treated there. As the hon. Gentleman can see in the courts at the moment, those assurances will be tested. So it is not the intention of the UK Government to expose any genuine victim of

[Robert Jenrick]

persecution to difficulties by removing them either back home and, in the process, enabling their refoulement, or to a country in which they would be unsafe. We want to establish a significant deterrent to stop people coming here in the first place, bearing in mind that the overwhelming majority of the individuals we are talking about who would be caught by the Bill were already in a place of safety. They were in France, which is clearly a safe country that has a fully functioning asylum system.

Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green): Let me take the right hon. Gentleman back to the criticism he was making of the other place, because if the elected House is about to break international law, it is entirely fitting that the other place should try to prevent that from happening. The Minister has stood at the Dispatch Box telling us that this Bill is about deterrence, whereas the Home Office's own impact assessment has said:

"The Bill is a novel and untested scheme, and it is therefore uncertain what level of deterrence impact it will have."

As a raft of children's charities have pointed out, once routine child detention was ended in 2011 there was no proportional increase in children claiming asylum. So will he come clean and accept that this Bill absolutely will have the effect, even if it does not have the intention, of meaning that people trying to escape persecution will not be able to come here, because there are not sufficient safe and legal routes?

Robert Jenrick: I am not sure exactly what the hon. Lady's question was. If it was about access to safe and legal routes, let me be clear, as I have in numerous debates on this topic, that since 2015 the UK has welcomed more than 500,000 individuals here—it is nearer to 550,000 now—for humanitarian purposes. That is a very large number. The last statistics I saw showed that we were behind only the United States, Canada and Sweden on our global United Nations-managed safe and legal routes, and we were one of the world's biggest countries for resettlement schemes. That is a very proud record. The greatest inhibitor today to the UK doing more on safe and legal routes is the number of people coming across the channel illegally on small boats, taking up capacity in our asylum and immigration system. She knows that only too well, because we have discussed on a number of occasions one of the most concerning symptoms of this issue, which is unaccompanied children who are having to stay in a Home Office-procured hotel near to her constituency because local authorities do not have capacity to flow those individuals into safe and loving foster care as quickly as we would wish. That issue is exactly emblematic of the problem that we are trying to fix. If we can stop the small boats, we can do more, as a country, and be an even greater force for good in the world.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): Will the Minister set out how my constituent will be protected? He is Albanian and has been subjected to modern slavery by gangs from Albania. He has three bullet holes in his body and, if he returns, perhaps those gangs will give him more. How will he be protected?

Robert Jenrick: The existing arrangement that we have secured with Albania—incidentally, Albania is a signatory to the European convention against trafficking—

enables us to safely return somebody home to Albania, with specific assurances to prevent them being re trafficked to the United Kingdom and to enable them to be supported appropriately upon arrival.

On the broader issue of modern slavery, the Bill makes a number of important protections when we establish the scheme. If they are party to a law enforcement investigation, their removal from the country will be stayed. We have said that we will bring forward statutory guidance, giving them a 30-day period, allied to the period set out in ECAT, to come forward and work with law enforcement, which is extendable if that enforcement activity goes on for some time. We would then only remove that person either back home to a safe country, such as Albania, or to a country, such as Rwanda, where we have put in place appropriate procedures to ensure that that Government, in turn, looks after them.

I point the hon. Lady to the judgment in the Court of Appeal that made some criticisms of the Government's approach, but did not say that the arrangements in Rwanda with respect to modern slaves were inappropriate; it supported the Government in that regard. We will clearly put in place appropriate procedures to ensure that victims, such as the one she refers to, are properly supported.

Tom Hunt (Ipswich) (Con): Many opponents of the Bill seem to support uncapped safe and legal routes. The reality of that would be that potentially over 1 million people could get the ability to come here. Does the Minister agree that those proposing that should be open and honest about it, and explain what the dramatic consequences would be for public services and community cohesion in this country?

Robert Jenrick: I completely agree. Anyone who feels that this country has sufficient resource to welcome significant further numbers of individuals at the present time, should look at the inbox of the Minister for Immigration. It is full of emails and letters from members of the public, local authorities and Members of Parliament, on both sides of the House, complaining that they do not want to see further dispersal accommodation and worrying about GP surgery appointments, pressure on local public services and further hotels. I understand all those concerns, which is why we need an honest debate about the issue.

That is why, at the heart of the Bill, there is not only a tough deterrent position for new illegal entrants, but a consultation on safe and legal routes, where we specifically ask local authorities, "What is your true capacity?" If we bring forward further safe and legal routes, they will be rooted in capacity in local authorities, so that those individuals are not destined to be in hotels for months or years, but go straight to housing and support in local authorities. That must be the right way for us to live up to our international obligations, rather than the present situation that, all too often, is performative here, and then there are major problems down the road.

Let me reply to issues other than modern slavery in the amendments before us. On the issue of detention, we believe that a necessary part of the scheme, provided for in the Bill, is that there are strong powers. Where those subject to removal are not detained, the prospects of being able to effect removal are significantly reduced, given the likelihood of a person absconding, especially towards the end of the process.

We have made changes to the provision for pregnant women, which I am pleased have been accepted by the Lords, and unaccompanied children, but it is necessary for the powers to cover family groups, as to do otherwise would introduce a gaping hole in the scheme, as adult migrants and the most disgusting people smugglers would seek to profit from migrants and look to co-opt unaccompanied children to bogus family groups to avoid detention. That not only prevents the removal of the adults, but presents a very real safeguarding risk to children.

On unaccompanied children, we stand by the amendments agreed by the House last week. They provided a clear differentiation between the arrangements for the detention of adults and those for the detention of unaccompanied children. The amendments agreed by this House provide for judicial oversight after eight days' detention where that detention is for the purpose of removal.

4.45 pm

On the standards of accommodation, I have been clear that unaccompanied children, including those whose age is disputed, will be detained only in age-appropriate accommodation, and that existing secondary legislation—the Detention Centre Rules 2001—sets out important principles governing the standards of such accommodation.

Last week, some Members asked whether unaccompanied children would also receive age-appropriate care while in detention. The answer to that is an emphatic yes. The operating standards for immigration removal centres contain provisions around the treatment of children, including requirements on the education and play facilities that must be provided for children.

Vicky Ford (Chelmsford) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend for making it clear that, if there is any doubt about the age of an unaccompanied child, they will be treated as a child. I also thank him for saying that, if a child is detained, it will be in an age-appropriate centre. However, on the issue of what is age-appropriate, I will just say that I have looked at the operating standards to which he referred. It is an 82-page document. It has no mention of unaccompanied children. It talks about who looks after the locks and hinges and where the tools and the ladders are to be stored, but there is nothing about how we keep these children happy, healthy and safe from harm. I point him instead to the guidance for children's care homes and ask him gently if we could update the rules on detention centres to make sure that they look more like the rules we have for safeguarding children in care homes.

Robert Jenrick: My right hon. Friend makes a number of important points. The guidance is very detailed, but I am sure that it would benefit from updating. Therefore, the points that she has made and that other right hon. and hon. Members have made in the past will be noted by Home Office officials. As we operationalise this policy, we will be careful to take those into consideration. We are all united in our belief that those young people who are in our care need to be treated appropriately.

Let me turn now to the Lords amendment on modern slavery—I hope that I have answered the comments of my right hon. Friend the Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith). This seeks to

enshrine in the Bill some of the assurances that I provided in my remarks last week in respect of people who are exploited in the UK. However, for the reason that I have just described, we think that that is better done through statutory guidance. In fact, it would be impractical, if not impossible, to do it through the Bill.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: The point that my right hon. Friend made earlier is that, somehow, those people will be able to get into the UK and make a false claim. However, the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 already provides for that, so anyone found to have made a false claim will be disqualified, and disqualified quite quickly. The critical thing is to prosecute the traffickers. That way, we can stop them trafficking more people on the boats. My worry is that this provision will put off many people from giving evidence and co-operating with the police for fear that they may still be overridden and sent abroad while they are doing it and then be picked up by the traffickers. Does he give any credence to the fear that this may end up reducing the number of prosecutions of traffickers as a result?

Robert Jenrick: I understand my right hon. Friend's position, and it is right that he is vocalising it, but we do not believe that what he says is likely. The provision that we have made in the statutory guidance that I have announced will give an individual 30 days from the positive reasonable grounds decision to confirm that they will co-operate with an investigation in relation to their exploitation. That should give them a period of time to recover, to come forward and to work with law-enforcement. That is a period of time aligned with the provisions of ECAT, so we rely on the decision of the drafters of ECAT to choose 30 days rather than another, potentially longer, period. That is an extendable period, so where a person continues to co-operate with such an investigation, they will continue to be entitled to the support and the protections of the national referral mechanism for a longer period.

Sir Iain Duncan Smith: I just want to make it clear that under the new regulations, the Secretary of State can still feasibly decide that, even if someone is co-operating, they do not need to remain in the UK for that. That is the critical bit: they live under the fear that they can be moved somewhere else to give that evidence. Does the Minister not agree that that will put a lot of people off giving evidence?

Robert Jenrick: I hope that that is not borne out. It is worth remembering that we will not remove anyone to a country in which they would be endangered. We would be removing that person either back to their home country, if we consider it safe to do so, usually because the country is an ECAT signatory and has provisions in place, or to a safe third country such as Rwanda, where once again we will have put in place significant provisions to support the individual. I hope that that provides those individuals with the confidence to come forward and work with law enforcement to bring the traffickers to book.

Vicky Ford: I am particularly interested in the arrival of unaccompanied children in this country, because obviously the Minister has tightened up the eight-day period for them on exit. I believe that he just agreed with me that the standards for age-appropriate accommodation

[Vicky Ford]

in detention centres need to be updated to look more like those for children's homes. Is he prepared to concede that no unaccompanied child should be put in such a detention centre until that update of the rules has been undertaken?

Robert Jenrick: I understand the point that my right hon. Friend makes, but I am not sure that that is necessary, because the Detention Centre Rules 2001 are very explicit in the high standards expected. They set the overall standard, and underlying them will no doubt be further guidance and support for individuals who are working within the system. If there is work to be done on the latter point, we should do that and take account of her views and those of others who are expert in this field, but the Detention Centre Rules are very explicit in setting high overarching standards for this form of accommodation. That is exactly what we would seek to live up to; in fact, it would be unlawful if the Government did not.

Vicky Ford: In a children's home, we would expect there to be the right to access a social worker and advocacy, and for the child to have the care that they particularly need. We would expect Ofsted to oversee that, not prison inspectors.

Robert Jenrick: I am grateful for those points. Social workers will clearly be at the heart of all this work, as they are today. Every setting in which young people are housed by the Home Office, whether it be an unaccompanied asylum-seeking children hotel, which we mentioned earlier, or another facility, has a strong contingent of qualified social workers who support those young people. I am certain that social workers will be at the heart of developing the policy and then, in time, operationalising it.

Their lordships have attempted but failed to smooth the rough edges of their wrecking amendments on legal proceedings, but we need be in no doubt that they are still wrecking amendments. They would tie every removal up in knots and never-ending legal proceedings. It is still the case that Lords amendment 1B would incorporate the various conventions listed in the amendment into our domestic law. An amendment shoehorned into the Bill is not the right place to make such a significant constitutional change. It is therefore right that we continue to reject it.

Stuart C. McDonald (Cumbernauld, Kilsyth and Kirkintilloch East) (SNP): Will the Minister give way?

Robert Jenrick: I will not, because I need to close my remarks; this is a short debate.

Lords amendment 9B continues to undermine a core component of the Bill: that asylum and relevant human rights claims are declared inadmissible. The Lords amendment would simply encourage illegal migrants to game the system and drag things out for as long as possible, in the hope that they would become eligible for asylum here.

Lords amendment 23B brings us back to the issue of the removal of LGBT people to certain countries. The Government are a strong defender of LGBT rights across the globe. There is no question of sending a

national of one of the countries listed in the amendment back to their home country if they fear persecution based on their sexuality. The Bill is equally clear that if an LGBT person were to be issued with a removal notice to a country where they fear persecution on such grounds, or indeed on any other grounds, they could make a serious harm suspensive claim and they would not be removed—

Patrick Grady (Glasgow North) (SNP): Will the Minister give way?

Robert Jenrick: I will not, because I need to bring my remarks to a close now. They would not be removed until that claim and any appeal had been determined. As I said previously, the concerns underpinning the amendments are misplaced and the protections needed are already in the Bill.

On safe and legal routes, Lords amendment 102B brings us to the question of when new such routes come into operation. The amendment again seeks to enshrine a date in the Bill itself. I have now said at the Dispatch Box on two occasions that we aim to implement any proposed new routes as soon as is practical, and in any event by the end of 2024. I have made that commitment on behalf of the Government and, that being the case, there is simply no need for the amendment. We should not delay the enactment of this Bill over such a non-issue.

Lords amendment 103B, tabled by the Opposition, relates to the National Crime Agency. Again, it is a non-issue and the amendment is either performative or born out of ignorance and a lack of grasp of the detail. The NCA's functions already cover tackling organised immigration crime, and men and women in that service work day in, day out to do just that. There is no need to change the statute underlying the organisation.

Finally, we have Lords amendment 107B, which was put forward by the Archbishop of Canterbury. This country's proud record of providing a safe haven for more than half a million people since 2015 is the greatest evidence that we need that the UK is already taking a leading international role in tackling the refugee crisis. This Government are working tirelessly with international and domestic partners to tackle human trafficking, and continue to support overseas programmes. We will work with international partners and bring forward proposals for additional safe and legal routes where necessary.

However well-intentioned, this amendment remains unnecessary. As I said to his grace the Archbishop, if the Church wishes to play a further role in resettlement, it could join our community sponsorship scheme—an ongoing and global safe and legal route that, as far as I am aware, the Church of England is not currently engaged with.

This elected House voted to give the Bill a Second and Third Reading. Last Tuesday, it voted no fewer than 17 times in succession to reject the Lords amendments and an 18th time to endorse the Government's amendments in lieu relating to the detention of unaccompanied children. It is time for the clear view of the elected House to prevail. I invite all right hon. and hon. Members to stand with the Government in upholding the will of the democratically elected Commons, to support the Government motions and to get on with securing our borders and stopping the boats.

Stephen Kinnock (Aberavon) (Lab): On Tuesday, I described the way in which this Government have “taken a sledgehammer to our asylum system”.—[*Official Report*, 11 July 2023; Vol. 736, c. 218.]

I outlined the massive and far-reaching costs and consequences of 13 years of Tory incompetence and indifference. I described this bigger backlog Bill as a “shambolic farce” that will only compound the chaos that Ministers have created. I urged the Government to accept the amendments proposed by the other place and to adopt Labour’s pragmatic, realistic and workable five-point plan to stop the boats and fix our broken asylum system.

I set out how the Bill’s unworkability centres on the fact that it orders the Home Secretary to detain asylum seekers where there is nowhere to detain them. It prevents her from processing and returning failed asylum seekers across the channel to their country of origin, instead forcing her to return them to a third country such as Rwanda. However, Rwanda can take only 0.3% of those who came here on small boats last year. The Rwanda plan is neither credible nor workable, because the tiny risk of being sent to Kigali will not deter those who have already risked life and limb to make dangerous journeys across the continent.

Yet here we are again today, responding to the realisation that, in their typically arrogant and tin-eared fashion, Ministers are once again refusing to listen. They are once again closing their eyes and ears to the reality of what is happening around them and choosing to carry on driving the car straight into a brick wall. But we on the Labour Benches refuse to give up. We shall continue in our attempts to persuade the Government to come to their senses. I shall seek to do that today by setting out why the arguments that the Immigration Minister has made against the amendments from the other place are both fundamentally flawed and dangerously counterproductive.

5 pm

Laura Farris (Newbury) (Con): If the principle of removal to a safe third country is not an adequate deterrent, why was that principle the flagship of the last Labour Government’s immigration policy in the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002? What was the point of section 94—its most controversial provision—if it was not about the swift removal of failed asylum seekers?

Stephen Kinnock: The crucial point is that for a deterrent to be effective, it has to be credible. A deterrent based on a 0.3% risk of being sent to Rwanda is completely and utterly incredible. The only deterrent that works is a comprehensive returns deal with mainland Europe. If someone knows that, were they to come here on a small boat, they would be sent back to mainland Europe, they will not come and they will not pay €5,000 to the people smuggler. The only way to get that deal is to have a sensible and pragmatic negotiation with the European Union based on *quid pro quo*—give and take. That is the fundamental reality of the situation in which we find ourselves, but unfortunately those on the Conservative Benches keep closing their ears to that reality.

Laura Farris: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for giving way again—I will not take long. Does he not accept that, in reality, there is no such thing as a returns

deal with mainland Europe? The reason the Dublin convention was such a disaster and never resulted in us removing more people than we took in was that it was so incredibly difficult to get European countries to accept removals and make that happen. It is just an unworkable suggestion.

Stephen Kinnock: Surely the hon. Lady sees the direct connection between us crashing out of the Dublin regulation because of the utterly botched Brexit of the Government she speaks for, and the number of small boat crossings starting to skyrocket. There is a direct correlation between crashing out of the Dublin regulation and skyrocketing small boat crossings. I hope that she will look at the data and realise the truth of the matter.

Tim Loughton (East Worthing and Shoreham) (Con): We have had this conversation before. The hon. Gentleman knows that when we were covered by Dublin—before we came out of it through Brexit—there were more than 8,000 requests for people to be deported back to an EU country, and only 108 of those requests, or about 1.5%, were actually granted. So there was not some golden era when it worked under Dublin; it was not working then, and it certainly will not work now.

Stephen Kinnock: The hon. Gentleman is right, we have had this conversation before, and he consistently refuses to listen to the fact that the Dublin regulation acted as a deterrent, so the numbers that he talks about were small. The number of small boat crossings was small when we were part of the Dublin regulation. We left the Dublin regulation, and now the number is large—it is not rocket science. There is a clear connection, a correlation, a causal link between the two.

Sir Robert Buckland (South Swindon) (Con): The hon. Gentleman is being very generous with his time. The reason the small boats problem has grown exponentially is that we dealt with the lorries issue. We closed the loophole when it came to lorries and the channel tunnel in particular, and that is why people are now resorting to small boats. It is nothing to do with Dublin. Surely those are the facts.

Stephen Kinnock: I simply say to the right hon. and learned Gentleman that last year, we had 45,000 people coming on small boats and goodness knows how many on lorries—of course, those coming by clandestine means in the back of a lorry are far more difficult to detect than those coming on small boats, so the small boats crisis is, by definition, far more visible. It is true that that juxtaposition and the new arrangements have had a positive impact, but we still do not know how many are coming. I have been to camps in Calais and spoken to many who are planning to come on lorries rather than on small boats—not least because it is a far cheaper alternative. The reality is that a very large number of people are coming to our country through irregular means, but it is also clear that that number was significantly smaller when we were part of the Dublin regulation. That is because it was a comprehensive deterrent, compared with the utterly insignificant power of the Rwanda programme as a deterrent.

Alexander Stafford (Rother Valley) (Con): Will the hon. Member give way?

Stephen Kinnock: I will make a little bit of progress, and then I will allow the hon. Gentleman to intervene.

I will turn first to Lords amendment 1B, intended to ensure that the Bill is consistent with international law, which Labour fully supports. Last week, the Minister deemed the same amendment unnecessary, because:

“It goes without saying that the Government obey our international obligations, as we do with all pieces of legislation.”—[*Official Report*, 11 July 2023; Vol. 736, c. 198.]

That comment was typical of the Minister’s approach. He is constantly trying to calm his colleagues’ nerves by fobbing them off with that sort of soothing statement, but we all know that he does not really believe a word of it. He knows that the very first page of the Bill states that the Government are unable to confirm that it complies with our legal obligations. He also knows that the Government are more than happy to break international law—just look at how they played fast and loose with the Northern Ireland protocol. If the Minister really thinks that we will simply take his deeply misleading words at face value and trust him and his colleagues to uphold our legal obligations, he has another think coming.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): Order. I think that the hon. Gentleman did not mean to use the phrase “deeply misleading”. Knowing that he is an honourable gentleman, I suggest that he might want to use a slightly different phrase—“inadvertently misleading”, perhaps?

Stephen Kinnock: I thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Would “misleadingly soothing” work?

Madam Deputy Speaker: It will do for the time being.

Stephen Kinnock: As always, Madam Deputy Speaker, you are very gracious.

The late, great Denis Healey famously advised that when you are in a hole, you should stop digging. [HON. MEMBERS: “Quite right!”] Hang on. He would certainly have approved of Lords amendment 9B, which goes right to the heart of the fundamental unworkability of this bigger backlog Bill and seeks to prevent it from becoming the indefinite limbo Bill.

Let us be clear: the current state of affairs represents both a mental health crisis for asylum seekers and a financial crisis for British taxpayers, who are already shouldering an asylum bill that is seven times higher than it was in 2010, at £3.6 billion a year. Indeed, the mid-range estimate for the hotels bill alone is greater than the latest round of levelling-up funding, and three times higher than the entire budget for tackling homelessness in this country. The only people who benefit from the inadmissibility provisions in the Bill are the people smugglers and human traffickers, who are laughing all the way to the bank. As such, it is essential that this House votes in favour of Lord German’s amendment, which seeks to ensure that inadmissibility can be applied to an asylum seeker only for a period of six months if they have not been removed to another country.

A major concern throughout the passage of the Bill has been its utter disregard for the mental wellbeing of unaccompanied children. Many of those children will have had to see their loved ones suffer unspeakable acts of violence, yet despite the Government’s concession, the Bill will mean that when they arrive in the UK, they will be detained like criminals for up to eight days

before they can apply for bail. We are clear that that is unacceptable, and are in no doubt that the Government’s amendment is yet another example of their liking for performative cruelty. We urge the Minister to accept the compromise of 72 hours contained in Lords amendments 36C and 36D.

Alexander Stafford: Will the hon. Member give way?

Stephen Kinnock: Sorry, I meant to let the hon. Gentleman in earlier.

Alexander Stafford: I thank the hon. Member for giving way. The best thing for any person’s mental health, especially children, is to not put them on a dangerous small boat across the channel. Does the hon. Member agree that the best thing for any child’s mental health is for them to not make that dangerous journey, but instead use one of the many legal and safe routes? This Bill and its clauses will make sure that fewer children make that awful journey.

Stephen Kinnock: The hon. Gentleman is absolutely right that the only people who benefit from the small boat crossings are the people smugglers and human traffickers—that has to be brought to an end. Where we fundamentally disagree is about the means. Labour believes that the deterrence of the Rwanda scheme simply will not work, for the reasons I have already set out, and that the solution lies far more in pragmatism and quiet diplomacy, working with international partners to get the returns deal that I talked about, than in all the performative cruelty that is at the heart of this Bill.

Likewise, the Government should show some humility and support Lords amendment 33B, which states that accompanied children should be liable for detention only for up to 96 hours. This is a fair and reasonable compromise, given that Lords amendment 33 initially set the limit at 72 hours.

While we are on the subject of children, how utterly astonishing and deeply depressing it was to hear the Minister standing at the Dispatch Box last week and justifying the erasure of Disney cartoons on the basis of their not being age-appropriate. Quite apart from the fact that his nasty, bullying, performative cruelty will have absolutely no effect whatsoever in stopping the boats, it has since emerged that more than 9,000 of the children who passed through that building in the year to March 2023 were under the age of 14. Given that a significant proportion of those 9,000 would have been younger still, I just wonder whether the Minister would like to take this opportunity to withdraw his comments about the age-appropriateness of those cartoons.

Robert Jenrick *indicated dissent.*

Stephen Kinnock: No. Well, there we have it. This whole sorry episode really was a new low for this Minister and for the shameful, callous Government he represents.

We also support Lords amendment 23B, a compromise in lieu of Lords amendment 23, which seeks to protect LGBT asylum seekers from being removed to a country that persecutes them for their sexuality or gender. The Minister last week claimed that that was unnecessary because there is an appeals process, but why on earth would he put asylum seekers and the British taxpayer

through an expensive and time-consuming appeals process when he could just rule out this scenario from the outset?

Nothing illustrates more clearly the indifference of this Government towards the most vulnerable people in society than their treatment of women being trafficked into our country for prostitution. I have already described this Bill as a traffickers charter—a gift to the slave drivers and the pimps—because it makes it harder for victims to come forward and therefore more difficult for the police to prosecute criminals. The Immigration Minister last week repeated the false claim that the UK Statistics Authority recently rebuked him for. It was his second rebuke this year by our national statistics watchdog for inaccurate claims made to this House. Thankfully, the right hon. Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May), who is not in her place today, called him out on it. She correctly pointed out that the proportion of small boats migrants claiming to be victims of modern slavery stands at just 7%. This was a profoundly embarrassing moment for the Minister, but I do hope he will now swallow his pride, listen to the wise counsel he is receiving from those on the Benches behind him and accept Lords amendment 56B in the name of Lord Randall.

Robert Jenrick: The hon. Member is right that I misspoke when citing those statistics on an earlier occasion, but in fact the statistics were worse than I said to the House. What I said was that, of foreign national offenders who are in the detained estate on the eve of their departure, over 70% made use of modern slavery legislation to put in a last-minute claim and delay their removal. However, it was not just FNOs; it was also small boat arrivals. So the point I was making was even more pertinent, and it is one that he should try to answer. What would he do to stop 70% of people in the detained estate, who we are trying to get out of the country, putting in a frivolous claim at the last minute?

Stephen Kinnock: Sir Robert Chote of the UK Statistics Authority said clearly that the figure is only 20%, not 70%. I do not know whether we want to invite Sir Robert to clarify those points himself, but the rebuke the Minister received from the UK Statistics Authority was pretty clear.

It is vitally important that the Minister's position on this is not used as the basis for a policy that could cause profound harm to vulnerable women while feeding criminality in the United Kingdom. I therefore urge him to reflect on what he is trying to achieve, the proportionality of his actions and the unintended consequences he may be facilitating. Lords amendment 56B states that victims of trafficking who have been unlawfully exploited in the UK should be protected from the automatic duty to remove and should continue to be able to access the support currently available to them, but only for the duration of the statutory recovery period, which was set by the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 at 30 days.

On Second Reading, the right hon. Member for Maidenhead argued that the Bill as drafted would

“drive a coach and horses through the Modern Slavery Act, denying support to those who have been exploited and enslaved and, in doing so, making it much harder to catch and stop the traffickers and slave drivers.”—[*Official Report*, 28 March 2023; Vol. 730, c. 886.]

We strongly agree with her concerns and wholeheartedly support Lords amendment 56B, which I remind the Minister goes no further than to maintain the status quo of the basic protections and support currently available to all victims of trafficking and exportation.

I will now turn to the amendments that are underpinned by Labour's five-point plan: end the dangerous small-boat crossings, defeat the criminal gangs, clear the backlog, end extortionate hotel use, and fix the asylum system that the Conservatives have spent 13 years destroying.

5.15 pm

Sir Edward Leigh: Presumably it is the hon. Gentleman's most devout hope if he takes power in 15 months' time, but charming as he is, it is a mystery to me why he thinks when he asks President Macron to take these people back, he will do so. Of course he won't! Nothing will happen. May I gently suggest that, if there is a Labour Government, they will quietly adopt this Bill once it is an Act?

Stephen Kinnock: I will come to that in my comments, but as the right hon. Gentleman will know, any negotiation requires give and take, quid pro quo. As I said in response to one of his hon. Friends, to get that deal with the European Union we of course have to do our bit and take our fair share, and that will be the negotiation that my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Holborn and St Pancras (Keir Starmer) will be leading on when he becomes Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, following the next general election.

We are determined that the National Crime Agency will be strengthened so that it can tackle the criminal gangs upstream. Too much focus by this Government has been on slashing tents and puncturing dinghies along the French coastline, whereas Labour has set out its plan for an elite unit in the NCA to work directly with Europol and Interpol. The latest amendment from Lord Coaker, Lords amendment 103B, attempts to strengthen the NCA's authority, and we support it without reservation. We are also clear that there is a direct link between gaining the returns agreement that we desperately need with the EU, and creating controlled and managed pathways to asylum, which would allow genuine refugees to reach the UK safely, particularly if they have family here. Conservative Members refuse to make that connection, but we know it is in the interests of the EU and France to strike a returns deal with the UK, and dissuade the tens of thousands of asylum seekers who are flowing through Europe and ending up on the beaches of Calais. The EU and its member states will never do a deal with the UK unless it is based on a give-and-take arrangement, whereby every country involved does its bit and shares responsibility.

Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Ind): On his visit to Calais, the hon. Gentleman will have met people who were trying to get to this country. Did it strike him how utterly desperate many of them were, and how they are fleeing from wars in Afghanistan, Libya, Iraq and other places? Does he think that we have to address the wider issue of the reasons why people are fleeing and searching for asylum, not just in Europe but all over the world?

Stephen Kinnock: I thank the right hon. Gentleman. As he rightly points out, the key point is that these people are already fleeing desperate situations and have

[Stephen Kinnock]

risked life and limb to get as far as they have. The idea that a 0.3% chance of being sent to Rwanda acts as a deterrent is clearly for the birds. In addition, he makes important points about the need for international co-operation, and finding solutions to these problems alongside our partners across the channel.

Alexander Stafford: The hon. Gentleman clearly thinks that the Rwanda plan will not work or be a deterrent, but why not give it a go? If he is so confident that it will not work, let it get through. It could have got through months ago, and he could have come back to the House and proved us wrong. At the moment it comes across as if the hon. Gentleman and the Labour party are scared that it might work, and that is the problem.

Stephen Kinnock: I suppose the answer to the hon. Gentleman's question is that if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it probably is a duck, and the Rwanda plan is so clearly and utterly misconceived, misconstrued and counter-productive. Labour Members like to vote for things that are actually going to work, which is why we simply cannot support that hare-brained scheme.

With the Minister last week reiterating a deadline of December 2024—18 months from now—to lay out what safe and legal routes might look like, and by stating that those routes will not deal with the challenges facing Europe directly, he appears to be reducing the chances of getting the returns deal with the EU that we so urgently need. Let us not forget that this Government sent Britain tumbling out of the Dublin regulations during their botched Brexit negotiations, and it is no surprise that small boat crossings have skyrocketed since then. This Government must prioritise getting that returns deal. We therefore support Lords amendment 102B, which demands that the Government get on with setting out what these safe and legal routes might look like, not only to provide controlled and capped pathways to sanctuary for genuine refugees, but to break that deadlock in the negotiations with the EU over returns.

I note that the Minister loves to trot out his lines about the Ukraine, Hong Kong and Afghan resettlement schemes, but he neglects to mention that there are now thousands of homeless Ukrainian families, and we have the travesty of thousands of loyal-to-Britain Afghans who are set to be thrown on the streets at the end of August. More than 2,000 Afghans are stuck in Pakistan with the right to come here, but they are not being allowed to do so. He simply must fix those resettlement schemes.

Robert Jenrick: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman for giving way, because this is an important point that all Members of the House should appreciate. The No. 1 reason why we are struggling to bring to the UK those people in Pakistan—we would like to bring them here, because we have a moral and historical obligation to them—is that illegal immigrants on small boats have taken all the capacity of local authorities to house them. If the hon. Gentleman truly wanted to support those people, he would back this Bill, he would stop the boats, and then he would help us to bring those much-needed people into the United Kingdom.

Stephen Kinnock: It beggars belief that the Immigration Minister says that, when he speaks for a party that has allowed our backlog to get to 180,000, costing £7 million a day in hotels. He should just get the processing system sorted out. The Conservatives downgraded the seniority of caseworkers and decision makers in 2013 and 2014. Surprise, surprise, productivity fell off a cliff, as did the quality of decisions. That is the fundamental problem, but we have to recognise that these Afghans have stood shoulder to shoulder with our defence, diplomacy and development effort in Afghanistan, and we owe them a debt of honour and gratitude.

Robert Jenrick: Does the hon. Gentleman know how many asylum seekers are housed in his constituency, or would he like me to tell him? It is none. There are no asylum seekers accommodated in Aberavon. If he would like us to bring in more people, whether on safe and legal routes, or on schemes such as the Afghan relocations and assistance policy, he should get on the phone to his local council and the Welsh Government this afternoon.

Stephen Kinnock: The Minister is talking absolute nonsense. I am proud of the fact we have many Syrians in our constituency. We have Ukrainians in our welcome centre. Discussions are ongoing between the Home Office and the Welsh Government. The incompetence of his Government means that they are not managing to house them. Wales is ready to have that dialogue with the Home Office.

Rachael Maskell: I find it a shocking admission from the Minister—we are fighting for the relatives of people in Afghanistan whose lives are at risk—that these Afghans are being blocked by him because he is not making available those safe routes to bring them to constituencies such as York, where we welcome refugees.

Stephen Kinnock: I completely agree with my hon. Friend. There are real concerns about the safety and security of those Afghans now in Pakistan. It is possible that they will be sent back. It is up to the Home Office to facilitate their transfer to the United Kingdom under ARAP and the Afghan citizens resettlement scheme, but like so many things with this Home Office, it is just a catastrophic failure of management.

In trotting out the lines about the schemes that I mentioned, the Minister conveniently ignores the fact that none of those schemes help those coming from other high grant-rate countries in the middle east and sub-Saharan Africa. Neither he nor the Home Secretary have been able to answer questions from their own Back Benchers on that precise point.

The final point of our plan is to tackle migration flows close to the conflict zones where they arise through targeting our aid spending. That is a longer-term mission, but it is no less important than any of the other steps we need to take to meet these migration challenges. I therefore see no reason for the Government not to support Lords amendment 107B in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which would instruct the Government to develop a 10-year plan to manage migration.

I have lost count of the number of times we have come to the Chamber to debate the Government's latest madcap Bill or hare-brained scheme. Not one of those Bills has helped to stop a single boat, and the Government

have sent more Home Secretaries to Rwanda than they have asylum seekers. They are wasting their own time and the time of the House, and they really are trying the patience of the British people. It really is desperate stuff, and it has to stop.

In stark contrast to the hopeless, aimless and utterly self-defeating thrashing around that has come to define the Government's approach to the asylum crisis, Labour recognises that there is a way through: a route based on hard graft, common sense and quiet diplomacy. It comes in the form of the Labour party's comprehensive plan, based on core principles, with a commitment to returning asylum processing to the well managed, efficient, smooth-running system we had prior to the catastrophic changes brought in by Conservative Ministers in 2013, which downgraded decision makers and caseworkers, leading to poorer results. With that, we have a commitment to go further in fast-tracking applications from low grant-rate countries so that we can return those with no right to be here, and fast-tracking applications from high grant-rate countries so that genuine refugees can get on with their lives and start contributing to our economy, enriching our society and culture. A third, key principle is the need for international co-operation, as I have set out.

This is not rocket science; it is just sensible, pragmatic, serious governance. It is working in the United States, where the Biden Administration are winning the battle. They have introduced a combination of swift consequences for those who cross the border illegally; orderly paths and controls on which migrants can apply for asylum and where they do so; sensible, legal pathways for high grant-rate nations; and strong co-operation with Mexico. The result is that they are bringing numbers down significantly and quickly. The challenge is not over yet, and we would not see President Biden being foolish enough to go boasting at the border, but that shows that progress can be made.

The Labour party is not interested in performative cruelty, chasing headlines or government by gimmick. We have a plan that will stop the boats, fix our broken asylum system and deliver for the British people. In contrast, the Conservative party has run out of ideas and run out of road. It should get out of the way so that we can get to work.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): We have only one hour left for the remainder of the debate, so I have to impose an immediate time limit. I was going to say six minutes, but I will have to say five minutes.

Tim Loughton: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is always an experience to follow the hon. Member for Aberavon (Stephen Kinnock). It was once said that someone who had just met his father had just spent half an hour having a five-minute conversation with him. We have just had a half-hour speech, but I am afraid that we did not get five minutes of anything remotely new in that.

Stephen Kinnock: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Is it in order to raise my father and what he might or might not have said when he is not in the Chamber to defend himself?

Madam Deputy Speaker: It would be better not to do so. There is no hard and fast rule, since the right hon. and noble Gentlemen is no longer a member of this Chamber.

Tim Loughton: I will happily withdraw that, Madam Deputy Speaker, if I can have my minute back. I declare an interest as the chairman of a safeguarding board of a children's company.

I was rather surprised to read in papers over the weekend that, according to the briefings, my right hon. Friend the Member for Maidenhead (Mrs May) and I are some sort of ringleaders against the Bill. May I make it absolutely clear that I support the Bill and want it to go through as quickly as possible, and that I support the Rwanda scheme? Objecting to some of the Bill's trafficking measures is about protecting victims and prosecuting traffickers, not undermining the Bill. Greater safeguards on how we look after children who have arrived here would not undermine the Bill; they would strengthen it. Safeguards to ensure that safe and legal routes are in place for genuine asylum seekers would not undermine the Bill; they would strengthen and justify the measures against those who are gaming the system, to whom we do not have a duty of care.

In my limited time, I want to concentrate on the amendment tabled by Baroness Mobarik. I also thank Baroness Stroud and Lord Randall for the amendments on trafficking and safe and legal routes. The fact is that the Government's amendments to clause 12 will give a child on their own in the UK the chance to apply to be bailed from detention after eight days, but that will apply only if they were detained to be removed, to be united with family or to be returned to their home country. That will not apply to all unaccompanied children when they first arrive in the UK; it will impact on only a small group of children. Other separated children not subject to removal will be detained for at least 28 days, and there is still no statutory limit on detention for any separated child.

Under the Government's proposals, separated children affected by the Bill can still be indefinitely detained. That is the truth of the matter. It is imperative to include a time limit on child detention in the Bill. If the Government intend to detain children for the shortest possible time, they can reinforce that message by enshrining a time limit in the primary legislation, as we have asked for all along. Although the Minister has given some concessions, we are still not there.

5.30 pm

The Government still do not explain what would constitute an age-appropriate detention facility. At the same time, they have introduced broad new powers to allow the Home Secretary to designate a place as an immigration detention centre. It is worrying to read that the Government are still unclear on the status of separated children who are detained, and claim that they will not require support from local authorities under the Children Act 1989. Those children should, therefore, have access to support and rights afforded under the Act. It is concerning to see the effective creation of a two-tier system, where a group of children might be denied protections just because of their immigration status and mode of arrival, despite the fact that they are all entitled to protections under the Children Act.

The Minister has said that he wants to detain children for the shortest possible time. I agree, so any codifying of that would surely be a beneficial win. We need reassurances on the type of detained accommodation: accommodation that meets children's home standards and is subject to the same sort of inspections as children's homes.

I missed the Minister's friendly chats over the weekend, which I have enjoyed for the past few weekends. I am not sure why I was missed out. He did, however, send round some clarifying points, but they do not clarify the still too many outstanding questions. He has said:

"Where there is no dispute that someone is under 18, they will be transferred to the local authority accommodation estate as quickly as possible."

How quick? Where does it say that? He has also said:

"Where there is doubt about whether a person is indeed under 18 as they claim to be, they will be treated as a child while an age assessment is undertaken."

Where? How? He has said:

"Such a person will be detained in age-appropriate accommodation, as the law already provides."

Where will that happen? He has also said:

"If no such accommodation is available, they will not be detained and instead will be transferred to a local authority as soon as possible."—[*Official Report*, 11 July 2023; Vol. 736, c. 201-202.]

Good. Where does it say that in the legislation? That is a problem.

The Minister has quoted various inspection reports of Yarl's Wood, going back to 2008, in defence of what the Government are trying to do. That inspection report said:

"The plight of detained children remained of great concern...an immigration removal centre can never be a suitable place for children and we were dismayed to find cases of disabled children being detained and some children spending large amounts of time incarcerated... Any period of detention can be detrimental to children and their families, but the impact of lengthy detention is particularly extreme."

It also said that centre was "brighter and better decorated" that on the last visit—clearly, some cartoons were still on the walls there. The problem is that there have been concessions, but there are still too many unanswered questions. We need those extra assurances.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): I call the Scottish National party spokesperson.

Stuart C. McDonald: We should oppose all nine Government motions, which is precisely what my SNP colleagues and I will do this evening. Let me say again that this Bill is so appalling that the House of Lords should stop it in its tracks. However, Baroness Jones was the one speaker who had the guts to say:

"we should be stubborn about not allowing the Bill to go through."—[*Official Report, House of Lords*, 12 July 2023; Vol. 831, c. 1814.]

As I asked last week, if the Lords will not consider halting this Bill, which Bill will it be? This Bill is about locking up kids, forcing trafficking victims back to their exploiters, mass detention, closure of the UK asylum system and the trashing of international laws. If the Lords will not use their powers to block this Bill—a Bill that also runs totally contrary to what was in the 2019 Conservative manifesto—what is the point of their powers, and what is the point of the House of Lords? Let us hope that we can salvage something from these final proceedings.

On Lords amendment 1B, if the Bill is consistent with our international obligations, the Government cannot have any objections to the amendment. On the other hand, if, as the Government have at other times argued, it wrecks the Bill to have to be read consistently with international law, then the problem is with the Bill, not the amendment. That is a good reason in itself for the whole Bill to be stopped in its tracks. The revisions to the amendment mean that arguments about allegedly incorporating international laws have been addressed, despite the completely unsubstantiated assertion from the Minister. We have heard lots of strong words about protecting a dualist system of law, but given that the Government could not even make the normal human rights compatibility statement, we need strong action to protect fundamental human rights and the rule of law.

The grouped amendments 7B and 90D are also important in upholding the rule of law. They preserve judicial oversight, so that illegal decisions by the Government can be properly challenged before they are implemented. It really is as simple and fundamental as that. The Government keep talking about loopholes, but access to courts, the rule of law and fundamental rights are not loopholes; they are fundamental principles that we should be upholding.

Lords amendment 9B is another crucial amendment. It now includes safeguards to assuage the usual Government concerns about gaming the system, but retains the vital protection that if a person cannot be removed to Rwanda even after six months, they will then have their case assessed here. It simply preserves the status quo and is an essential protection. It remains an appalling prospect that people who are refugees will be left in limbo forever by the Government; never allowed to have their claim heard here and never able to contribute, even if removal is a near impossible prospect.

Indeed, it is also ludicrous that there will be people with totally unfounded claims for asylum who will get to remain here in limbo, often at considerable taxpayer expense, because of the Bill. The Bill stops unfounded claims being dealt with, just as it stops well-founded claims being dealt with. The end result is that thousands of people will need to be detained and accommodated in perpetuity. Many more will disappear underground, as they will have no reason to stay in touch with the Home Office. It is the end of the UK's contribution to the refugee convention. Again, if the Government are not willing to move on that, their lordships should hold up the whole Bill.

On mass and limitless detention of children in inappropriate accommodation, of course we continue to support all efforts to curtail the horrendous new powers and to limit the extraordinary harm that we know—and the Home Office knows—detention causes to them. We therefore support Lords amendments 36C, 36D and 33B. As I said last week, the Government's amendments in lieu really represent a pathetic non-concession. A theoretical right for some kids detained for removal to seek bail after eight days is just not remotely acceptable. At the very least, we need short, hard and fast limits, and those limits should be automatic and not dependent on a child being able to navigate the bail system and accessing the legal support that would be required to do that. And the time limits should apply to all kids, whether accompanied or not, and regardless of which particular powers they were detained under.

The Government make claims about creating incentives to play by the rules, but, as with most of their claims, they offer absolutely no evidence. There is no suggestion, for example, that the introduction of strict time limits by David Cameron's Government had the impact suggested here. It is just another myth.

As Members on both sides have said, the Bill is a serious threat to victims of modern slavery and trafficking, and yet again it totally ignores devolved powers on this subject. Those being exploited are the ones who will suffer, not the traffickers, whose power over their victims will only be enhanced by the withdrawal of any route to safety for those they are exploiting. We therefore support Lords amendment 56B and anything that will undo some of the damage that the Bill will do to modern slavery and trafficking provisions. Without 56B, the damage the Bill will do to slavery and trafficking laws across the UK is yet again sufficient to justify holding up the whole Bill.

On Lords amendment 23B and protections for LGBT people, we fully support everything Lord Etherton said in support of his amendments. Put the fact that these countries are not safe for LGBT people on the face of the schedule. Anything that builds on the flimsy and almost certainly unworkable system of "suspensive claims" should be welcomed. LGBT people should not have to go through that process in the first place. If the Government are committed to safe legal routes, they should have no problem with Lords amendment 102B. On the archbishop's amendments 107B and 107C, a 10-year strategy is utterly sensible—indeed, it is essential. Long-term thinking is as necessary for issues surrounding forced migration as other pivotal challenges such as climate change.

Ultimately, the amendments can only add a little polish to an odious Bill that is utterly beyond redemption. It should be stopped in its tracks entirely and any parties that still send people to the relic of a second Chamber should be using their influence to see that that happens. Otherwise, this is all just for a show and very vulnerable people will suffer as a result.

Sir John Hayes (South Holland and The Deepings) (Con): Edmund Burke said that what matters

"is not what a lawyer tells me I may do; but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I ought to do."

In considering the Government's response to the Lords amendments, it is important to re-emphasise that the Bill is about fairness; about affirming the integrity of our nation by defending our borders from those who seek to arrive here illegally. We must have the power to remove those entrants from our country. To do so is just and fair. It is what the British people expect, what they voted for in 2019, and what they chose in the Brexit referendum.

Considering the arguments made in the other place, I was struck by the absence of a credible alternative to the Government's proposal; there seems little sense there of the need to control our borders, stop the boats, save lives, and to make our immigration system fairer, more reasonable and more just. Sadly, much of the debate on the amendments in the other place has been characterised by a combination of denial and detachment from the popular will—denial about the urgency of the problem, and detachment from the sentiments expressed by my constituents and the constituents of other Members on both sides of this Chamber. Those arriving in small boats must be detained securely and removed swiftly,

and it must be a straightforward process, for only through that process will we deter more people from arriving.

Joanna Cherry (Edinburgh South West) (SNP): Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

Sir John Hayes: I will not, because of the time—I apologise to the hon. and learned Lady.

As the Minister has made clear, the Government's response to Lords amendments 1B, 7B and 90D is rooted in the understanding that those amendments are unnecessary. The Government take our international obligations very seriously. Indeed, all three Appeal Court judges agreed that the Government's commitments were in tune with and compatible with international law.

As for the motion to disagree with Lords amendment 23B, we must keep this matter in perspective. There is no evidence whatsoever that the vast majority of people coming to this country in small boats, or indeed a significant number of them, are seeking shelter from persecution because of their sexuality, and it is a distortion to pretend otherwise. In respect of the motion to disagree with Lords amendment 102B, this business of "safe and legal routes" is, again, a distraction, and a detachment from the urgency of this problem. The amendment is unnecessary and seems to constitute legislative grandstanding, for under section 1 of the Crime and Courts Act 2013, the functions of the National Crime Agency already extend to combating all types of organised crime, including organised immigration crime.

Finally, let me deal with the motion to disagree with Lords amendments 107B and 107C, which propose the Archbishop of Canterbury's "ten-year strategy". I approve of having the Lords Spiritual in the other place. They are otherworldly—the Lord Bishops understandably take a view about an infinite, eternal future. However, those of us who are elected and answerable to the people directly have to deal with this world, here and now; and in this world; people demand that we control our borders, and they do so justly and reasonably.

Sam Tarry (Ilford South) (Lab): Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

Sir John Hayes: I will not give way because I wish to finish promptly, as you would expect me to do, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The great Tory Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli said:

"The secret of success is constancy to purpose."

This Minister and the Home Secretary have been constant in their purpose of controlling our borders. Let us have less sanctimony and more common sense; less self-righteousness and more selfless commitment to the people's will; less soul-searching and more heartfelt advocacy of the interests of hard-working, law-abiding, decent, patriotic Britons who support this Bill and oppose the Lords amendments.

Mr Alistair Carmichael (Orkney and Shetland) (LD): I regard the right hon. Member for South Holland and The Deepings (Sir John Hayes) as a friend in the true

[Mr Alistair Carmichael]

sense of the word, but I say that it is a pleasure to follow him this evening—not least because it means that he has stopped talking.

There is a real sense of *déjà vu* about this debate, and not just because of the proceedings in relation to this Bill. We have heard all these arguments before, almost word for word. Everything that the Minister said at the Dispatch Box this afternoon had been heard in relation to what is now the Nationality and Borders Act 2022—and what progress has been made as a consequence of that? None.

I followed closely your exchange with the shadow Immigration Minister, Madam Deputy Speaker, in relation to the question of the Minister being misleading. I should say that I do not think for one second that the Minister was in any way misleading. I cannot speak for his intention, of course—only he knows about that—but I certainly was not misled. To any reasonable-minded person, it must surely be obvious what the Government are about today.

5.45 pm

Look at the broader context. Net migration figures are going up and up, and today there has been an announcement that construction workers are to be added to the shortage occupation list—something that runs contrary to virtually every piece of rhetoric that we have heard from Government Back Benchers and the Treasury Bench.

What we have here is a piece of doubling down at the expense of some of the most vulnerable people in the world. The Minister spoke about late and repeated challenges—well, to have a late or repeated challenge, there would have to be some decisions first: there must be a decision before it can be challenged. As of 28 March, there were 137,583 applications outstanding in the system. This Government have failed to manage migration—whether asylum or the economic migration that our economy so desperately needs. That is why we are here today: this is a nakedly political attempt to deflect attention away from the failure to deal with our system properly.

It is unfortunate that the right hon. Member for Chingford and Woodford Green (Sir Iain Duncan Smith) is not here. He made the point perfectly that the modern slavery amendments under consideration today would simply put the Minister's own words into force in the Bill. When Conservatives were in opposition, they used to shout about that all the time; they seem to have lost their appetite for it in recent times. The comments of the hon. Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) about the detention of children were absolutely on point. We all saw for ourselves—I certainly did—the human consequences and harsh realities of the detention of children when that was part of our immigration system. It beggars belief that we should be returning to that.

The question of safe and legal routes is again a classic example of the Government saying to us that we can have jam tomorrow but not today. How is it that the high politics have to be in the Bill but the actual practical workable solutions, which will, to borrow the Minister's three-word slogan, actually "stop the boats", are somehow too difficult? They always have to be left—not because they are practically or administratively

too difficult but because they do not fit the unpleasant political rhetoric and narrative on which the Government rely to speak to a base that, frankly, should be confronted and not appeased. That is why my party will vote against the Government motions to disagree and we urge their lordships to stick to their guns.

Sir Edward Leigh: The Minister can relax; I am not going to bang on about RAF Scampton—not least because I have put in for the Adjournment debate on Thursday when I can deal with it in more detail. I just ask the House to accept that my constituents are, more than any others in the country, victims of this farce—this debacle—of trying to house 2,000 people in one place. That is not good for the people and it will overwhelm our social services.

There is now an argument to be had about the future of the House of Lords. There is no point in our having these endless debates about whether it should be elected or not. It should be a proper revising Chamber. When it is given a Bill such as this, its attitude should be, "How can we improve it? How can we make it work better? How can we remove these legal glitches, which will have unintended consequences?" It seems to me that so much of the debate in the House of Lords and so many of the amendments have just been designed to drive a coach and horses through the Bill and to give human rights lawyers even greater chances to develop ever more legal arguments to stop anybody from being deported.

I have some sympathy with what the right hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland (Mr Carmichael) said. What is a bit of a mystery to me is that we went through this whole process last year. We had the ping-pong on the Nationality and Borders Bill. We got it through Parliament and were told that it would solve the problem—but we still have the same problem. I prophesise that, actually, this Bill will become law. The Labour party does not want to set a precedent for the unelected House of Lords to block legislation, so it will give in and the House of Lords will deliver the Bill. It will become an Act of Parliament, and I have a horrible feeling that, this time next year, we will be in exactly the same position. Can we rely on the Supreme Court to agree that people should be deported to Rwanda?

What are we going to do? Is it crueller to detain people as soon as they arrive or to do nothing and have a tragedy in the channel? Is it cruel to continue letting people smugglers get away with what they want? Of course, I have enormous sympathy with what my hon. Friend the Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) says about children, but the trouble is that so many of these people who claim to be children are not children—they have to be assessed. One of the problems we face at Scampton is that there are so many of these people, 20% of the population coming into the camp, which means there will have to be an army of social workers to determine whether they are children.

I have enormous sympathy for persecuted LGBT people, but the truth is that the moment we create an exception saying that we cannot deport a person to an African country with a dodgy record on LGBT, everyone will claim to be LGBT—of course they will. I would do the same. If I were coming from Iraq, I would say I am a Christian. If I were coming from Syria, I would say I am gay. This is the problem we face. Every time we try to do anything, human rights lawyers drive a coach and horses through all our efforts.

So what are we going to do? I have said for two or three years now that the only solution—I suspect the Government will be dragged into this within a year—is to have a derogation, if necessary a temporary derogation during a national crisis, from the refugee convention, which prevents us from detaining people who claim to be asylum seekers. We will also have to have a derogation from the European convention on human rights.

I am a member of the Council of Europe, and I value the work of the Council of Europe, but the European Court of Human Rights is not a supreme court like our Supreme Court. It is not a supreme court like the American Supreme Court. It is a fundamentally political body, appointed on political grounds.

Until we have freedom of manoeuvre to have a real deterrent that tells the world, “If you land illegally on our shores, you will be detained and, ultimately, you will either have to go back where you came from or be deported,” we will never stop this problem. It is all right for the Labour party to talk about safe and legal routes, and about what it will try to do, but we all know that that did not work for the Dublin convention and it will not work if Labour takes power. President Macron will not suddenly change his mind. He will not take anyone back. We will be in this exact position in 15 months’ time if there is a Labour Government, and I predict that, if there is a Labour Government, they will simply leave this Act on the statute book pretty well unamended.

My constituency is a victim of all this, so what is the House going to do? This is utterly debilitating. We cannot go on like this. Please, can we have a plan?

Caroline Lucas: It is sadly not a pleasure to follow the right hon. Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh). Talking about leaving or having derogations from human rights law is exactly what is wrong with the Government’s approach to this issue and what is wrong with this vile Bill.

With overwhelming support from across the political spectrum, and backed by Conservative peers and by religious leaders, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the other place is absolutely right to have inflicted a string of defeats on this vile, illegal Bill.

Lords amendment 1B, in the name of Baroness Chakrabarti, should be easy for any decent Government to accept, because it simply asks for compliance with the rule of law, which is the bedrock of our democracy. But the Government are attacking that foundation, forced to admit on the face of this immoral Bill that they are unable to say it is compatible with the 1950 European convention on human rights. By moving a motion to disagree to Lords amendment 1B, the Government are seeking to deny UK judges the right to interpret this law and to check it against compliance with the UK’s obligations under no fewer than five international conventions that we should be defending, not undermining.

The Minister in the other place tried to argue that a previous version of this amendment was trying to incorporate international law into domestic law and that, in doing so, it was an unacceptable change to our legal framework. I do not think that that is what the previous version did, but, for the avoidance of doubt, in this version Lords amendment 1B is explicit in calling for the interpretation of international law to ensure

compliance with our international obligations. Indeed, Ministers will be aware of the contribution from Lord Hope, who served as deputy president of the Supreme Court and last week said that this amendment is a

“pure interpretation provision...entirely consistent with the way the courts approach these various conventions...it is entirely orthodox and consistent with principle.”—[*Official Report, House of Lords*, 12 July 2023; Vol. 831, c. 1817.]

Adhering to the refugee convention, the European convention on human rights, and other international laws we have signed up to should be non-negotiable. What a terrible state of affairs it is that the Government want to vote down an amendment seeking compliance with the rule of law.

The Government’s argument is that stripping vulnerable people of asylum and other human rights will stop other vulnerable people falling into the hands of the people traffickers. That is both morally bankrupt and utterly bogus. It is morally bankrupt because human rights are not earned or contingent on a person’s conduct or character, or on whether upholding those rights might affect someone else’s actions. Human rights are attached to a person by virtue of their humanity. Vulnerable people, including children, are being punished because of presumed future actions of adults. Furthermore, by disagreeing with Lords amendment 1B, Ministers face the charge of hypocrisy, as they disrespect international law and undermine migrants’ rights at a time of unprecedented international turmoil. Just last week, the Prime Minister was at a NATO summit absolutely saying that we need to uphold international law against the grotesque breaches by Putin in Ukraine. Yes, we do need to do that, but let us have a little moral consistency.

As well as being immoral, the Government’s argument about a deterrent effect is bogus and un evidenced. The Home Office’s own impact assessment, published just last month, is peppered with caveats about how undeliverable this policy is. It includes an admission that:

“The delivery plan is still being developed.”

The lack of evidence on deterrence in that document is glaring. It says that the Bill is “novel and untested”, so we do not know what impact it will have on deterrence. As I said earlier, a raft of children’s charities have pointed out that once routine child detention was ended in 2011, there was no proportional increase in children claiming asylum. Beyond that, there is a strong evidence to show that it is the precisely the hostility towards refugees exemplified by this Bill and the Government’s rejection of Lords amendments to it that fuels the grim and terrible trade in small boats that they claim they are against.

So any Member who votes to block the Lords amendments should admit that in doing so, they degrade the rule of law, dehumanise vulnerable refugees, attack our modern slavery laws, put LGBT refugees at grave risk, and that their approach will lead to the unconscionable mass detention and treatment of children, with no stated time limit to that detention—it is sickening. I will be voting to uphold the Lords amendments, because this Bill shames and degrades our country, our democracy and this House.

Jeremy Corbyn: I want to speak mainly about Lords amendment 1B, and to follow up on the remarks made by the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas) and the right hon. Member for Gainsborough (Sir Edward Leigh). I heard him make exactly the same argument in the Council of Europe,

[Jeremy Corbyn]

when, to the consternation of most of its members, he argued that Britain had to criticise and walk away from the European court of human rights because one case was found against Britain. Many more cases have been found against almost every other country that signed up to the European convention on human rights and, therefore, the Court.

I support Lords amendment 1B because it gives some protection under the 1950 European convention, the 1951 UN convention and the conventions on statelessness, on the rights of the child and on action against trafficking. The Lords amendment will mean that any decision has to be taken in accordance with those conventions. If the Government are opposing those, what message are they giving, other than that they have no respect for international law and for the conventions we helped to write and sign up for, and that they want to walk away from them? Walking away from them will mean that we have no regard for the rights of people seeking asylum if the European Court of Human Rights finds us to be wanting in that respect. Therefore, should any other country want to walk away from the European convention on human rights, for example, Turkey, Poland or Hungary, all of which have issues with their legislation in respect of the convention, we will be in no position to criticise anybody ever again. The idea that this country is facing a crisis so severe and so serious that we have to walk away from conventions that were hard fought for and have served the human rights of people across Europe very well is simply ridiculous. On a global scale, the numbers of people involved are enormous, because of economic stress around the world, wars, environmental degradation and destruction, and human rights abuse. That is why people seek asylum.

6 pm

The Opposition spokesperson, my hon. Friend the Member for Aberavon (Stephen Kinnock), made it clear that he had been to Calais. I have also been to Calais and talked to people there. They are utterly desperate, which is why they are trying to seek a place of safety. People who have sought a place of safety in this country and been granted permanent residence here have made an enormous contribution to our society. They are working in education, health, transport and the care sector. We have a massive labour shortage in almost every industry, so it seems to me rather odd that we are preventing people who have been granted at least the opportunity to apply for asylum in this country the chance to work and make a contribution to the society they have chosen to come to.

Other countries have far larger numbers of asylum seekers than we do. Germany has taken in far more asylum seekers than this country has, as has Italy. Outside Europe, where all the discussion is taking place, it is usually the poorest countries neighbouring a conflict that have to take in very large numbers of people. For example, Bangladesh has taken in well over 1 million Rohingya people from Myanmar because of the activities of the Myanmar army, and there are other examples around the world.

There has to be a global response. The answer is not to put up barbed wire, have surveillance, use gunboats and all the rest of it; surely the answer is some degree of

international co-operation that recognises our obligation to all people around the world, as a global community, and that does something about the causes and sources of people seeking asylum, rather than the approach that the Bill takes.

I suspect the Bill will end up being completely ineffective. Possibly, nobody will ever be removed to Rwanda—I hope that is the case. I would rather we stopped it here and now, and at least passed amendment 1B. That would give those whose duty it is to protect people's rights a recognition of the conventions that we have signed up to and have spread around the world, saying how good we are at signing up to those conventions. Let us stick to our word, and stick to those conventions.

Dame Diana Johnson (Kingston upon Hull North) (Lab): As we did not have the opportunity for pre-legislative scrutiny of the Bill and it is being pushed through Parliament very quickly, I am pleased that the Lords have sent back amendments so that we can look again and consider the unintended consequences of parts of the Bill.

I will speak to the amendments on modern slavery. Evidence presented to the Home Affairs Committee revealed the urgent need to open up more escape routes for trafficking victims, including ending the current industrial-scale sexual exploitation, with women advertised on pimping websites up and down the land, in every Member's constituency, on websites such as Vivastreet, which allows women to be raped multiple times a day. Under this legislation, if those women come forward to the authorities, they will not be offered help and assistance but will be detained and removed. Removing those modern slavery protections will do nothing towards doing what we all want to happen: to bring the organised crime groups orchestrating that abuse to justice. So I support Lords amendment 56B to maintain the status quo.

Secondly, I am disappointed that the Lords amendments on children have not been accepted. Children constitute a small minority of those making the crossing in small boats, often arriving frightened, frequently traumatised and always vulnerable. Such were the concerns of the Home Affairs Committee about the current treatment and experience of children who claim asylum in the UK that we recommended the Government commission an independent end-to-end review of the asylum system as it applies to and is experienced by children. However, instead of that, the Government are hurrying through a Bill to reduce children's rights. No one in this House would want such treatment for their own children, which is why I support Lords amendments 33B, 36C and 36B remaining in the Bill.

Thirdly, a year ago the Home Affairs Committee published the results of our inquiry into channel crossings and identified a slew of robust measures that the Government could deploy to stop small boat crossings and create a fair and efficient asylum system. They included the creation of safe and legal routes and international initiatives by the National Crime Agency to combat people smugglers, both of which are the subject of Lords amendments under discussion today.

Stopping the people smuggling gangs will require a raft of carefully crafted, costed and evidence-based strategies, such as the ones put forward by the Home Affairs Committee. It is for that reason that I firmly support Lords amendment 102B on safe and legal

routes, Lords amendment 103B on the National Crime Agency, Lords amendments 107B and 107C on a 10-year strategy and Lords amendment 23B on removal destinations for LGBT people and other persons. These measures and the Bill as a whole must be implemented in accordance with our international obligations, as is set out in amendment 1B.

Patrick Grady: A constituent contacted me recently and said that I seemed to be speaking an awful lot in the Chamber about immigration and asylum issues. I suppose that that is correct, but then that is because the Government allocate so much time in the Chamber to immigration and asylum issues. This is the third major piece of primary legislation on immigration since 2015. However, the majority of constituents—hundreds of constituents—who get in touch with me on each of these pieces of legislation tell me just how disappointed, if not horrified, they are at the Tory UK Government's attitude to people who come here seeking refuge.

In rejecting all the Lords amendments before us today, the Government are showing just how hostile an environment they want to create—not just for asylum seekers, but for almost anyone who wants to make their home here in the UK. The fact that they will not accept Lords amendment 1B, which is a considerably softer version of what we discussed last week, demonstrates that. If the Government are truly committed to the international conventions listed in the amendment—particularly the 1951 refugee convention—they really should have no problem agreeing that they will form part of the interpretation of the Act when it comes into force.

I have also heard from constituents who want to ensure that LGBTQ people who arrive here from places where they can face imprisonment for simply being who they are cannot be removed to those countries. That is what the Lords are seeking to achieve in Lords amendment 23B. Accepting that amendment would save time and public money because otherwise, by the Minister's own admission, claimants would have to make suspensive claims against removal to their country of origin. That is what the Minister says he wants to avoid. He wants to avoid loopholes and needless court cases. In that case, he should support Lords amendment 23B.

The amendments that seek to protect children from indefinite detention and that maintain human trafficking protections speak for themselves, as does the Government's insistence on rejecting those amendments. The Government keep asking those of us who are opposed to the Bill for alternative proposals for dealing with irregular arrivals, and these are clearly outlined in Lords amendment 102B and in the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's amendments 107B and 107C. The Minister keeps saying that he wants to establish safe and legal routes. Well, that is what Lords amendment 102B will require him to do. I have met many asylum seekers through the Maryhill Integration Network and elsewhere who would much prefer to have come here from Eritrea, Iran or other countries that have been mentioned today through a safe and legal route, rather than the risks, costs and desperation of coming on lorries and boats.

The archbishop's proposals for the development of a strategy on refugees and human trafficking are perhaps the most straightforward and easily implementable of

all the clauses and amendments so far. The Government regularly accept amendments requiring them to publish strategies and reviews on all kinds of legislation. Perhaps they do not want to support this one because the transparency and accountability that would come with requiring the Government to undertake a long-term analysis and make a long-term plan in response to global population flows would reveal the true hollowness of the rest of their proposals—the inhumanity and the self-defeating implications of the hostile environment.

Millions of people will be on the move in the coming years and decades. They will be fleeing wars that we have financed and climate change that we have helped to cause. Experiences in southern Europe and the American midwest this week suggests that they will not just be moving from the southern hemisphere either. Nobody is saying that the United Kingdom should have completely open borders and take unlimited numbers of migrants, but we have to be prepared to take our fair share, just as other countries welcomed refugees fleeing famine and clearances on these islands not that many generations ago.

If Government Ministers and Back Benchers truly respect the role that the House of Lords is supposed to play in the UK constitution, they really ought to listen to the messages that their lordships are sending today and will send in the days to come. As it stands, people in Glasgow North and across Scotland are listening to the rhetoric of the Conservative Government and deciding that they want no more of it. They will be seeking the safe and legal route to independence as soon as possible.

Beth Winter (Cynon Valley) (Lab): I will begin by putting on the record my complete opposition to this horrendous Bill in its entirety. It is cruel and inhumane. It will put people at serious risk of further exploitation. It is stoking division within our society, and it undermines constitutional principles and human rights.

We are here today to focus on amendments, so I will briefly say that I support all the Lords amendments before us, particularly Lords amendment 1B, which others have already spoken about, in the name of my friend Baroness Chakrabarti. The amendment sets out the Bill's intention to comply with a host of human rights conventions, including those with regard to the protection of human rights and the rights of the child, and against trafficking human beings.

It is vital that we underline our commitment to human rights, and, to quote the First Minister of Wales, Mark Drakeford,

“provide a warm welcome to all of those who seek sanctuary”.

That is particularly important as accommodation sites that have been identified by the Home Office for asylum seekers become targets for protests by the far right. That is happening in Wales at the moment. Amendment 1B is a modest and uncontroversial amendment. The Lords have backed it twice. More than 70 organisations have stated their support. The Government must yield and stop voting it down. If the Government are, as they say, confident that the Bill is compatible with the UK's international law obligations, there is nothing to fear from the amendment.

I also support Lords amendment 102B in the name of Baroness Stroud, a Conservative peer, which provides for a duty to establish safe and legal routes. This is, again,

[Beth Winter]

a modest and uncontroversial amendment that could make an unsupportable Bill slightly better. We need to go much further. We need to expand safe routes, as organisations such as the Refugee Council, Care4Calais and the Public and Commercial Services Union have argued, in line with the amendment. We also need to tackle the backlog with a fair, humane and speedy processing system.

The Government have lost control over the asylum system. Their “stop the boats” rhetoric will not stop the boats because people are genuinely seeking asylum from war and poverty, and nobody would go on a boat, risking their life, unless they were desperate. We should be welcoming people to our country. What is contained in the Bill does not represent the type of country that I want to live in, or that I want my children or grandchildren to live in. What I and millions of others want is a country and society that is based on care, compassion, kindness, generosity, respect, inclusivity and, yes, solidarity.

I support today’s Lords amendments, which should be accepted, but if the Bill is passed this week, I and many others in this House—and, more importantly, outside it—will continue to oppose and campaign against this appalling piece of legislation at every opportunity.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Eleanor Laing): I have to reduce the time limit to four minutes. I call Claudia Webbe.

Claudia Webbe (Leicester East) (Ind): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The provisions of the Bill are inhumane and punitive. It has not improved with the Government’s amendments sent to the other place, which the other place has rightly rejected, proposing their own counter-amendments.

The Government remain determined to allow themselves to detain and deport even unaccompanied children; to disqualify many refugees from even attempting to apply for asylum or to appeal against unjust decisions; and to give the Home Secretary sweeping powers to make new rules or apply them as the Government see fit. Even if every amendment proposed by the Lords was passed, this would remain an odious Bill, and one that shames this House and shames this country, but the latest Lords amendments would at least mitigate some of the worst harms of the legislation—legislation that the Home Secretary cannot even say is legal under international law.

6.15 pm

For those reasons, I support all the amendments sent back to this House by the other place, but I wish to speak particularly on the following. First, the Government have rejected an amendment that would place a statutory duty on them to provide safe and legal routes for refugees to reach the UK to apply for asylum, on the basis that they have already said that they will introduce such routes. However, a promise to do something is not the same as a legal obligation to do it, and it is clear that this Government can barely be trusted to comply with their legal obligations, let alone their promises, as can be seen in the unlawful deportation of members of the Windrush generation and the very fact that safe and legal routes do not already exist.

We know the Government can provide safe and legal routes when they wish to. We are talking about people fleeing war, conflict and torture, with British-made bombs forcing desperate people to flee their homes. I am surprised to hear the Minister admit that the Government are holding up refugees in Pakistan who have fled Afghanistan and who need to be here, and I believe it to be unlawful. If the Government are serious in intending to establish safe and legal routes for those seeking asylum, they have no need to fear or avoid taking upon themselves a legal duty to do so. Promises of a better tomorrow are no substitute. This is not a non-issue. I therefore put on record my support for Lords amendment 102B.

Secondly, this month more than 150 children’s charities, faith leaders, medical bodies and others wrote to the Government to demand that they scrap plans to detain refugee children—an abhorrent notion that disgraces this House and brings dishonour on the UK. It is a deeply inhumane and harmful provision of this Bill. The idea of detaining children, especially indefinitely, has horrified even some members of the Conservative party. Earlier this year, the hon. Member for East Worthing and Shoreham (Tim Loughton) said that the Bill

“amounts effectively to indefinite detention of children of any age anywhere that the Home Secretary considers it appropriate.”—*[Official Report, 28 March 2023; Vol. 730, c. 945.]*

The Prime Minister has called this Bill decent and humane. It is clearly neither. I therefore support Lords amendments 36C, 36D and 33B, which would restrict the detention of children.

John McDonnell (Hayes and Harlington) (Lab): I want to apologise to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I do not think I indicated clearly enough that I wanted to speak. Thank you for your generous dexterity in finding time for me.

I want to say one simple thing about the assurances given so far on the detention of children: they are not sufficient. There are large numbers of children who will be detained. The definition of age-appropriate and child-appropriate accommodation is not clear enough.

I remind the House of my experience with Harmondsworth detention centre in my constituency before 2014, when we legislated to prevent children being detained in detention centres. That detention centre was also meant to be age and child-appropriate, but what happened? It simply had a wing with a school and so on, and children were locked up in there for months on end. We saw the reports of individual civil society organisations that assessed the mental health implications of the detention of children at that stage.

So far, the Minister has told me that there is no Government intention to detain children in detention centres again, but, as I said to him before, intention is not good enough. We need legislation to prevent that from happening again. My fear is that, under pressure, Government Ministers will decide that there will be some appropriate decoration of some sections of Harmondsworth and it will be opened up for children again.

I was a house father at a children’s home in Hillingdon. It was one of the traditional children’s homes, run effectively as a family unit. I pursued my own career, and my wife was the house mother in charge and I was

the house father. It was like a large fostering unit, basically, and we took in children who had been detained in Harmondsworth. Even before it was of the prison style that it is now, those children were, I believe, scarred for life. I did not think that we would ever return to locking children up in that way. The children we looked after often came to us after they had been lost within the system while their cases were being processed over a long time. They were often separated from their families, who came through other routes. I think the damage was a scandal of this country's treatment of human beings.

That was why, from 2010 until 2012, we ran a campaign—across all religious groups, and with civil society organisations such as the Children's Society—and published report after report. David Cameron came forward heroically and said, "We will never detain children again," and we legislated for that in 2014. We are now going back to detaining children almost indefinitely for some categories. We have not got the assurances that we need about where they will be detained or about the care, comfort and succour that they will have to support them. As a result, if we allow this legislation to go through, it will be a stain upon this House and upon society overall for a long time to come.

I ask Members to think again. We now go back into ping-pong with the other House, which is calling simply for a realistic time limit on the detention of children so that they are not damaged beyond repair in the way they were 10 years ago. I do not think that a simple amendment to set a time limit on children suffering in detention when they arrive in this country is an awful lot to ask of the Government. They often come from countries where they have suffered enough; we should not impose even more suffering on them.

Robert Jenrick: With the leave of the House, let me say a few words to close this short debate.

As I said at the outset, when we met and voted 18 times last week, we supported the Bill time and again. In each of those 18 votes, we in this democratically elected Chamber voted to stop the boats, secure our borders and enable this important Bill to move forward. Now is the time for the other place, which is, at its heart, as a number of colleagues have said—

Stuart C. McDonald: Will the Minister give way?

Robert Jenrick: I will not—we have heard from the hon. Gentleman a number of times.

The other place is ultimately a revising Chamber, and it is now time for it to support the Bill. Today's debate has, like some of the others, been short on new arguments and completely short of any credible alternative. I go back to the arguments made in the other place by many distinguished Members of that House and former Members of this House, most notably the noble Lord Clarke, who said clearly that he was not able, having listened to the debate for hour after hour, to discern a single credible alternative to the Government's plan. It is incumbent on those who want to vote against the Bill to bring forward alternatives, but we have not heard a single one.

I used to say that Labour Members do not have a plan to stop the boats, but that is not true. They do have a plan, but it is one that is so dangerously naive that it is a recipe for even more crossings and even greater misery. They would create a massive pull factor by giving

economic migrants crossing the channel from a safe place such as France the ability to work sooner. They would attempt to grant their way out of the problem and sacrifice the remaining integrity of the system. They would create bespoke country-specific routes for every instance of instability in the world, which would impose more and more pressures on local communities.

Is it not the most telling fact in this debate that today, in the shadow Immigration Minister's own town of Aberavon, there is not a single asylum seeker? If Members want more asylum seekers, they should have the honesty to have them in their own constituency. From the letters I receive from Labour MPs, I assume that they would house asylum seekers even more expensively than we do today, with no regard to the taxpayer. I am not clear how they would remove illegal migrants when their own leader, the right hon. and learned Member for Holborn and St Pancras (Keir Starmer), campaigned to close an immigration removal centre, tens of Labour MPs have opposed the reopening of two other centres, and the Labour party's own membership recently voted to abolish them altogether.

The fact is that as its Members vote against the Bill today, Labour's message to the law-abiding people of this country—from Stoke to Blackpool to Peterborough—when it comes to illegal migration is quite simply "Put up with it." Its message to the British families who have to wait longer for social housing or GP appointments is "Tough luck", and its message to the hard-working taxpayer faced with the ever-rising costs of the system is "Cough up." It is only the Conservative party that can see the fundamental injustice of illegal migration—that it ultimately affects the poorest people in society the most—and has the determination to fix it. That is why the Bill is so important, and it is why the Lords now need to back it.

Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendments 1B, 7B and 90D.

The House divided: Ayes 298, Noes 213.

Division No. 298]

[6.25 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim	Bhatti, Saqib (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)
Afriyie, Adam	Blackman, Bob
Aiken, Nickie	Blunt, Crispin
Aldous, Peter	Bone, Mr Peter (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)
Allan, Lucy (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Bottomley, Sir Peter
Anderson, Lee	Bowie, Andrew
Anderson, Stuart	Braverman, rh Suella
Andrew, rh Stuart	Brereton, Jack
Ansell, Caroline	Bridgen, Andrew
Argar, rh Edward	Bristow, Paul
Atkins, Victoria	Britcliffe, Sara
Bacon, Gareth	Browne, Anthony
Bacon, Mr Richard	Bruce, Fiona
Bailey, Shaun	Buchan, Felicity
Baillie, Siobhan	Buckland, rh Sir Robert
Baker, Duncan	Burghart, Alex
Baker, Mr Steve	Butler, Rob
Baldwin, Harriett	Cairns, rh Alun
Barclay, rh Steve	Carter, Andy
Baynes, Simon	Cartlidge, James
Benton, Scott	Cash, Sir William
Beresford, Sir Paul	Cates, Miriam
Berry, rh Sir Jake	Caulfield, Maria

Chalk, rh Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Double, Steve
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Francois, rh Mr Mark
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael

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

Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Mr Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David

Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jacob Young and
Julie Marson

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah

Barker, Paula
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan

Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet

Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah

Paisley, Ian
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo

Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Colleen Fletcher and
Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendments 1B, 7B and 90D disagreed to.

6.40 pm

More than two hours having elapsed since the commencement of proceedings on the Lords message, the proceedings were interrupted (Programme Order, 11 July).

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

Clause 4

DISREGARD OF CERTAIN CLAIMS, APPLICATIONS ETC

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

The House divided: Ayes 307, Noes 208.

Division No. 299]

[6.40 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan

Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Sir Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella

Brereton, Jack	Fletcher, Mark	Largan, Robert	Richardson, Angela
Bridgen, Andrew	Fletcher, Nick	Latham, Mrs Pauline	Roberts, Mr Rob
Brine, Steve	Ford, rh Vicky	Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea	Robertson, Mr Laurence
Bristow, Paul	Fox, rh Dr Liam	Leigh, rh Sir Edward	Robinson, Gavin
Britcliffe, Sara	Francois, rh Mr Mark	Levy, Ian	Robinson, Mary
Browne, Anthony	Frazer, rh Lucy	Lewer, Andrew	Ross, Douglas
Bruce, Fiona	Freeman, George	Lewis, rh Sir Brandon	Rowley, Lee
Buchan, Felicity	Freer, Mike	Lewis, rh Sir Julian	Russell, Dean
Buckland, rh Sir Robert	French, Mr Louie	Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian	Rutley, David
Burghart, Alex	Fuller, Richard	Loder, Chris	Sambrook, Gary
Butler, Rob	Fysh, Mr Marcus	Logan, Mark (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Saxby, Selaine
Cairns, rh Alun	Garnier, Mark	Longhi, Marco	Scully, Paul
Carter, Andy	Ghani, Ms Nusrat	Lopez, Julia (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Seely, Bob
Cartlidge, James	Gibb, rh Nick	Lopresti, Jack	Selous, Andrew
Cash, Sir William	Gibson, Peter	Lord, Mr Jonathan	Shannon, Jim
Cates, Miriam	Gideon, Jo	Loughton, Tim	Shapps, rh Grant
Caulfield, Maria	Glen, rh John	Mackinlay, Craig	Simmonds, David
Chalk, rh Alex	Goodwill, rh Sir Robert	Mackrory, Cheryl	Smith, rh Chloe
Chishti, Rehman	Gove, rh Michael	Mackrory, Cheryl	Smith, Greg
Chope, Sir Christopher	Graham, Richard	Mackrory, Cheryl	Smith, Henry
Churchill, Jo	Gray, James	Macleane, Rachel	Smith, rh Julian
Clark, rh Greg	Grayling, rh Chris	Mak, Alan	Smith, Royston
Clarke, rh Sir Simon	Green, Chris	Malthouse, rh Kit	Solloway, Amanda
Clarke, Theo (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Green, rh Damian	Mangnall, Anthony	Spencer, Dr Ben
Clarke-Smith, Brendan	Griffith, Andrew	Mann, Scott	Spencer, rh Mark
Clarkson, Chris	Gullis, Jonathan	Mayhew, Jerome	Stafford, Alexander
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Halfon, rh Robert	Maynard, Paul	Stephenson, rh Andrew
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse	Hall, Luke	McCartney, Jason	Stevenson, Jane
Colburn, Elliot	Harper, rh Mr Mark	McCartney, Karl	Stevenson, John
Collins, Damian	Harris, Rebecca	McVey, rh Esther	Stewart, rh Bob
Costa, Alberto	Harrison, Trudy	Mercer, rh Johnny	Stewart, Iain
Coutinho, Claire	Hart, Sally-Ann	Merriman, Huw	Stride, rh Mel
Crabb, rh Stephen	Hart, rh Simon	Metcalfe, Stephen	Stuart, rh Graham
Crosbie, Virginia	Hayes, rh Sir John	Millar, Robin	Sunderland, James
Crouch, Tracey	Heald, rh Sir Oliver	Miller, rh Dame Maria	Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
Daly, James	Heapey, rh James	Milling, rh Dame Amanda	Syms, Sir Robert
Davies, rh David T. C.	Heaton-Harris, rh Chris	Mills, Nigel	Thomas, Derek
Davies, Gareth (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Henderson, Gordon	Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew	Tolhurst, rh Kelly
Davies, Dr James	Henry, Darren	Mohindra, Mr Gagan	Tomlinson, Justin
Davies, Mims	Higginbotham, Antony	Moore, Damien	Tomlinson, Michael
Davis, rh Mr David	Hinds, rh Damian	Moore, Robbie	Tracey, Craig
Davison, Dehenna	Holden, Mr Richard	Mordaunt, rh Penny	Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
Dinenage, Dame Caroline	Hollinrake, Kevin	Morris, Anne Marie	Trott, Laura
Dines, Miss Sarah	Hollobone, Mr Philip	Morris, David	Tugendhat, rh Tom
Djanogly, Mr Jonathan	Holloway, Adam	Morris, James	Vara, rh Shailesh
Docherty, Leo	Holmes, Paul	Morrissey, Joy	Vickers, Martin
Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.	Howell, John	Mortimer, Jill	Vickers, Matt (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)
Donelan, rh Michelle (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Howell, Paul	Morton, rh Wendy	Villiers, rh Theresa
Double, Steve	Huddleston, Nigel	Mullan, Dr Kieran	Walker, Sir Charles
Drax, Richard	Hudson, Dr Neil	Mumby-Croft, Holly	Walker, Mr Robin
Drummond, Mrs Flick	Hughes, Eddie	Mundell, rh David	Wallace, rh Mr Ben
Duddridge, Sir James	Hunt, Jane	Murray, Mrs Sheryll	Wallis, Dr Jamie
Duguid, David	Hunt, Tom	Murrison, rh Dr Andrew	Warman, Matt
Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain	Jack, rh Mr Alister	Nici, Lia	Watling, Giles
Dunne, rh Philip	Javid, rh Sajid	O'Brien, Neil	Webb, Suzanne
Eastwood, Mark	Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil	Offord, Dr Matthew	Whately, Helen
Edwards, Ruth	Jenkin, Sir Bernard	Opperman, Guy	Wheeler, Mrs Heather
Ellis, rh Sir Michael	Jenkinson, Mark	Paisley, Ian	Whittaker, rh Craig
Elphicke, Mrs Natalie	Jenrick, rh Robert	Pawsey, Mark	Whittingdale, rh Sir John
Eustice, rh George	Johnson, Dr Caroline	Penning, rh Sir Mike	Wiggin, Sir Bill
Evans, Dr Luke	Johnson, Gareth	Penrose, John	Wild, James
Evennett, rh Sir David	Jones, Andrew	Philp, rh Chris	Williams, Craig
Everitt, Ben	Jones, rh Mr David	Pow, Rebecca	Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
Fabricant, Michael	Jones, Fay	Prentis, rh Victoria	Wilson, rh Sammy
Farris, Laura	Jones, rh Mr Marcus	Pritchard, rh Mark	Wood, Mike
Fell, Simon	Jupp, Simon	Pursglove, Tom	Zahawi, rh Nadhim
Firth, Anna	Kawczynski, Daniel	Quin, rh Jeremy	
Fletcher, Katherine	Keegan, rh Gillian	Quince, Will	
	Knight, rh Sir Greg	Randall, Tom	
	Kniveton, Kate	Redwood, rh John	
	Kruger, Danny	Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob	
	Lamont, John	Richards, Nicola	
			Tellers for the Ayes:
			Julie Marson and
			Jacob Young

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 Debonnaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahon, Jim

McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel
Tellers for the Noes:
Mary Glindon and
Colleen Fletcher

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 9B disagreed to.

After Clause 6

RESTRICTIONS ON REMOVAL DESTINATIONS: LGBT AND OTHER PERSONS

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

The House divided: Ayes 300, Noes 212.

Division No. 300]

[6.52 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Sir Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin

Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinéage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Double, Steve
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben

Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, rh Gillian

Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Paisley, Ian
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim
Tellers for the Ayes:
Julie Marson and
Jacob Young

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)

McMahon, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Roberts, Mr Rob
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Wragg, Mr William
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
 Colleen Fletcher and
 Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.
Lords amendment 23B disagreed to.

Clause 10

POWERS OF DETENTION

Motion made, and Question put, That this House insists on its amendments 36A and 36B and disagrees with Lords amendments 36C and 36D.—(Robert Jenrick.)

The House divided: Ayes 289, Noes 220.

Division No. 301]

[7.3 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Sir Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)

Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Double, Steve
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Firth, Anna

Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Griffith, Andrew
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, rh Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea

Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cheryl
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Morrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Rees-Mogg, rh Sir Jacob
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Roberts, Mr Rob
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim
Tellers for the Ayes:
Julie Marson and
Jacob Young

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir

Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Chishti, Rehman
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fell, Simon
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, rh Damian
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)

McMahon, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Wragg, Mr William
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel
Tellers for the Noes:
Colleen Fletcher and
Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Amendments 36A and 36B insisted upon, and Lords amendments 36C and 36D disagreed to.

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

The House divided: Ayes 300, Noes 208.

Division No. 302]

[7.14 pm

AYES

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

Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Choqe, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinénage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Double, Steve
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Edwards, Ruth
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike

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

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

Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Jacob Young and
Julie Marson

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike

Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry

Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGinn, Conor
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin

Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat

Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Colleen Fletcher and
Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 33B disagreed to.

Clause 21

PROVISIONS RELATING TO REMOVAL AND LEAVE

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 56B.—(Robert Jenrick.)

The House divided: Ayes 282, Noes 227.

Division No. 303]

[7.25 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Barclay, rh Steve
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Beresford, Sir Paul
 Berry, rh Sir Jake
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy

Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris

Griffith, Andrew
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, rh Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherylyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott

Marson, Julie
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob

Selous, Andrew
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Steve Double and
Ruth Edwards

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burgon, Richard

Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Chishti, Rehman
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Doyle-Price, Jackie
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, rh Damian
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate

Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sultana, Sarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Wragg, Mr William
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
 Colleen Fletcher and
 Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.
Lords amendment 56B disagreed to.

After Clause 58

DUTY TO ESTABLISH SAFE AND LEGAL ROUTES

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 102B.—(Robert Jenrick.)

The House divided: Ayes 284, Noes 226.

Division No. 304]

[7.36 pm

AYES

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

Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinéage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duguid, David
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Griffith, Andrew
 Grundy, James
 Gullis, Jonathan
 Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heappey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, rh Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Langan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw

Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe

Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sunderland, James
 Swaney, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Steve Double and
Ruth Edwards

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Ady*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia

Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan

Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Chishti, Rehman
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Crouch, Tracey
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fell, Simon
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, rh Damian
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart

Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Paisley, Ian
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke

Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Loughton, Tim
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Paisley, Ian
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke

Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Wragg, Mr William
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:

Mary Glindon and
 Colleen Fletcher

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 102B disagreed to.

After Clause 60

ORGANISED IMMIGRATION CRIME ENFORCEMENT

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 103B.—(Robert Jenrick.)

The House divided: Ayes 297, Noes 214.

Division No. 305]

[7.48 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Brine, Steve
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity
 Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartlidge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Chishti, Rehman
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon

Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Crouch, Tracey
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinena, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Ford, rh Vicky
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fuller, Richard
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter
 Gideon, Jo
 Glen, rh John
 Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
 Gove, rh Michael
 Graham, Richard
 Gray, James
 Grayling, rh Chris
 Green, Chris
 Green, rh Damian
 Griffith, Andrew
 Gullis, Jonathan

Halfon, rh Robert
 Hall, Luke
 Harper, rh Mr Mark
 Harris, Rebecca
 Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 Higginbotham, Antony
 Hinds, rh Damian
 Holden, Mr Richard
 Hollinrake, Kevin
 Hollobone, Mr Philip
 Holloway, Adam
 Holmes, Paul
 Howell, John
 Howell, Paul
 Huddleston, Nigel
 Hudson, Dr Neil
 Hughes, Eddie
 Hunt, Jane
 Hunt, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jayawardena, rh Mr Ranil
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kawczynski, Daniel
 Keegan, rh Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Brandon
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherylyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie

Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Morrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew

Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Ruth Edwards and
Steve Double

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Ady*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret

Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas

Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahon, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess

Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
 Colleen Fletcher and
 Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 103B disagreed to.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): In Division No. 304, four Members nodded through the No Lobby were not included. So the result should have been: Ayes 284, and Noes 226.

After Clause 60

TEN-YEAR STRATEGY ON REFUGEES AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Motion made, and Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendments 107B and 107C.—
(Robert Jenrick.)

The House divided: Ayes 292, Noes 215.

Division No. 306]

[7.59 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim
 Afriyie, Adam
 Aiken, Nickie
 Aldous, Peter
 Allan, Lucy (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Anderson, Lee
 Anderson, Stuart
 Andrew, rh Stuart
 Ansell, Caroline
 Argar, rh Edward
 Atkins, Victoria
 Bacon, Gareth
 Bacon, Mr Richard
 Bailey, Shaun
 Baillie, Siobhan
 Baker, Duncan
 Baker, Mr Steve
 Baldwin, Harriett
 Baynes, Simon
 Benton, Scott
 Bhatti, Saqib (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Blackman, Bob
 Blunt, Crispin
 Bone, Mr Peter (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Bottomley, Sir Peter
 Bowie, Andrew
 Bradley, Ben
 Braverman, rh Suella
 Brereton, Jack
 Bridgen, Andrew
 Bristow, Paul
 Britcliffe, Sara
 Browne, Anthony
 Bruce, Fiona
 Buchan, Felicity

Buckland, rh Sir Robert
 Burghart, Alex
 Butler, Rob
 Cairns, rh Alun
 Carter, Andy
 Cartledge, James
 Cash, Sir William
 Cates, Miriam
 Caulfield, Maria
 Chalk, rh Alex
 Chope, Sir Christopher
 Churchill, Jo
 Clark, rh Greg
 Clarke, rh Sir Simon
 Clarke, Theo (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Clarke-Smith, Brendan
 Clarkson, Chris
 Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey
 Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse
 Colburn, Elliot
 Collins, Damian
 Costa, Alberto
 Coutinho, Claire
 Crabb, rh Stephen
 Crosbie, Virginia
 Daly, James
 Davies, rh David T. C.
 Davies, Gareth (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Davies, Dr James
 Davies, Mims
 Davis, rh Mr David
 Davison, Dehenna
 Dinenage, Dame Caroline
 Dines, Miss Sarah
 Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
 Docherty, Leo
 Donelan, rh Michelle (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Dowden, rh Oliver
 Drax, Richard
 Drummond, Mrs Flick
 Duddridge, Sir James
 Duguid, David
 Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
 Dunne, rh Philip
 Eastwood, Mark
 Ellis, rh Sir Michael
 Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
 Eustice, rh George
 Evans, Dr Luke
 Evennett, rh Sir David
 Everitt, Ben
 Fabricant, Michael
 Farris, Laura
 Fell, Simon
 Firth, Anna
 Fletcher, Katherine
 Fletcher, Mark
 Fletcher, Nick
 Fox, rh Dr Liam
 Frazer, rh Lucy
 Freeman, George
 Freer, Mike
 French, Mr Louie
 Fysh, Mr Marcus
 Garnier, Mark
 Ghani, Ms Nusrat
 Gibb, rh Nick
 Gibson, Peter

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

Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cherilyn
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw
 Metcalfe, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Morrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee

Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel
 Stuart, rh Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin
 Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wiggin, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wood, Mike
 Young, Jacob
 Zahawi, rh Nadhim

Tellers for the Ayes:
Steve Double and
Ruth Edwards

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Addy*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive

Black, Mhairi
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Byrne, rh Liam
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debonnaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dodds, Anneliese
 Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodge, rh Dame Margaret
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel
 Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Kyle, Peter
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 Lynch, Holly
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorris, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex
 O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi

Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Paisley, Ian
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Rees, Christina
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Robinson, Gavin
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Shannon, Jim
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick
 Whittome, Nadia
 Williams, Hywel
 Wilson, Munira
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Winter, Beth
 Wishart, Pete
 Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel
Tellers for the Noes:
Mary Glindon and
Colleen Fletcher

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendments 107B and 107C disagreed to.

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 83H(2)), That a Committee be appointed to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing with their amendments 1B, 7B, 90D, 9B, 23B, 33B, 56B, 102B, 103B, 107B and 107C;

That Robert Jenrick, Scott Mann, Shaun Bailey, James Sunderland, Stephen Kinnock, Gerald Jones and Patrick Grady be members of the Committee;

That Robert Jenrick be the Chair of the Committee;

That three be the quorum of the Committee.

That the Committee do withdraw immediately.—
(Fay Jones.)

Question agreed to.

Committee to withdraw immediately; reasons to be reported and communicated to the Lords.

SOCIAL HOUSING (REGULATION) BILL [LORDS] (PROGRAMME) (NO. 2)

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

That the following provisions shall apply to the Social Housing (Regulation) Bill [Lords] for the purpose of supplementing the Order of 7 November 2022 (Social Housing (Regulation) Bill [Lords]: Programme):

Consideration of Lords Message

(1) Proceedings on the Lords Message shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion one hour after their commencement.

Subsequent stages

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

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

Question agreed to.

Social Housing (Regulation) Bill [Lords]*Consideration of Lords message***Clause 21**

STANDARDS RELATING TO COMPETENCE AND CONDUCT

8.12 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (Dehenna Davison): I beg to move,

That this House does not insist on its amendment 13 to which the Lords have disagreed, and agrees with the Lords in their amendment 13B in lieu.

We are bringing the Bill back to the House for what I hope is the final time, to get this vital legislation on to the statute book. It seeks to enable the biggest change in social housing regulation in a decade and to drive the change that is so desperately needed in the social rented sector.

When the Bill was last before the House, we made important amendments to clauses on competency and conduct standards in relation to mandatory qualifications. They made provision to require senior housing managers and senior housing executives of registered providers to have, or be working towards, appropriate-level housing management qualifications. We subsequently tabled amendment 13B in the other place to ensure that relevant managers employed by organisations that deliver housing management services on behalf of a registered provider are also captured by the legislation, as was our original policy intention.

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I have no doubt that we all welcome and support professionalism from those who check the regulations. I am always perplexed that we do not have the same regulations in Northern Ireland. Is it the Minister's intention to ensure with the appropriate body in Northern Ireland that professionalism can also be effective there?

Dehenna Davison: The hon. Gentleman is, as ever, a fantastic champion for Northern Ireland and its people. We will, of course, continue to have conversations with the relevant bodies in Northern Ireland, because it is important that social housing, wherever it is provided within the United Kingdom, is up to the appropriate standard. I know he will continue to champion that cause.

In closing, I would just like to put on record one final time my and my Department's heartfelt thanks to Grenfell United and all other stakeholders for their strong constructive engagement on this critical legislation. I hope that, following today, we will see it on the statute book incredibly soon.

Matthew Pennycook (Greenwich and Woolwich) (Lab): I intend to be brief, because the sole amendment we are considering is entirely uncontentious.

As you will no doubt recall, Madam Deputy Speaker, the Opposition welcomed the concession the Government made in the other place last year with regard to professional training and qualifications, and the resulting addition of clause 21 to the Bill. Having pressed in Committee for that clause to be strengthened, we also welcomed the Government's amendment to it, which was tabled on Report earlier this year on the basis that it largely assuaged our concerns. We support Lords amendment 13B in lieu

of Commons amendment 13, as do the relevant trade bodies and tenant groups including Grenfell United and Shelter, whom we once again commend for the role they played in convincing the Government to incorporate qualification requirements in the Bill.

Lords amendment 13B is a technical amendment that has three main effects. First, it will ensure that the qualification requirements in clause 21 capture relevant managers working for organisations which deliver housing management services on behalf of a registered provider. Secondly, it will ensure that contractual agreements between registered providers and delegated services providers and relevant sub-agreements contain terms stipulating that their relevant managers should have, or be working towards, a specified qualification in housing management, thus enabling registered providers to take action against delegated services providers that are not compliant. Thirdly, the amendment expands on definitions of services providers and specific roles, and provides for consultation before setting a standard and before giving a direction to set a standard.

We agree with their lordships that the changes are necessary if we are to ensure that the sector as a whole delivers high-quality professional services of the kind social tenants deserve and rightly expect. I want to put on record our thanks to my noble Friend, Lady Hayman of Ullock for bringing the need for this amendment to the Government's attention and for her efforts more generally to improve the Bill in the other place.

It is our sincere hope that once the House has agreed this minor but necessary change today, this important and urgently needed piece of legislation can quickly receive Royal Assent so that we can overhaul the regulation of social housing and better protect the health, safety and wellbeing of social tenants across the country.

Question put and agreed to.

Strikes (Minimum Service Levels) Bill

Consideration of Lords message

Schedule

MINIMUM SERVICE LEVELS FOR CERTAIN STRIKES

8.17 pm

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business and Trade (Kevin Hollinrake): I beg to move, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 2D.

This House has been asked these questions before and twice this House has said no with an overwhelming majority. We are asked to consider for a third time an amendment that significantly expands on previous versions that have already been rejected. Members of the other place referenced the report of the International Labour Organisation's committee of experts as a reason to reconsider. However, I should note that this ground has already been well covered by both Houses. It was argued that Lords amendment 2D requires Ministers to do what the ILO is requesting: to undertake consultation when considering introducing regulations to implement minimum service levels. The Bill already requires Ministers to do just that, as they have done in undertaking public consultations on their intentions to bring forward minimum service levels to passenger rail services, ambulance services and fire and rescue services. Impact assessments were published alongside those consultations and final impact assessments will be published alongside the regulations the Government bring forward for approval in Parliament in due course.

My colleague Lord Callanan was right to say in the other place that the ILO did not say that the legislation was not compatible with ILO conventions. It simply said that it should be compatible and that we should ensure that it is. As stated in Parliament when introduced and throughout its passage, the Bill is compatible with the UK's international obligations. The Government will continue to uphold their international obligations as the minimum service regulations are introduced.

Lords amendment 2D also seeks to ensure that the "reasonable steps" that unions should take to make sure that their members comply are considered as part of the consultations that are required before minimum service regulations are made. Members will recall that when this House last considered the Bill, I confirmed that the Government were willing to consider whether there was a case for providing further detail on the reasonable steps that unions must take under new section 234E to ensure that identified workers comply with a work notice given by an employer. In the light of the recommendations from the Joint Committee on Human Rights and points raised in both Houses during the Bill's passage, the Government accept that further detail would give unions more legal certainty and foresight with regard to their obligations than the Bill provides in its current form. The Government will therefore introduce a statutory code of practice on the reasonable steps that must be taken, using existing powers under section 203 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992. These powers enable the Secretary of State to issue a code of practice to promote the improvement of industrial relations.

Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op): Will the Minister spell out exactly how trade unions are to comply with and enforce a code that is outwith their jurisdictions in making workers go into work?

Kevin Hollinrake: The code of practice will be consulted on so that all parties are clear about what the obligations of the unions will be. We expect them to be quite straightforward. They have been debated at length, along with various ideas about how this might operate.

Rachael Maskell *rose*—

Kevin Hollinrake: I want to end my speech shortly, but I will give the hon. Lady one last chance to intervene.

Rachael Maskell: As has been pointed out on numerous occasions, the measures that the Minister is trying to introduce are outside the jurisdictions of trade unions, which therefore do not have the powers to implement them.

Kevin Hollinrake: As I have said, we intend to consult with all parties to make sure that they have a chance to comment on what reasonable obligations a union might be required to take. I think that it is pretty straightforward, and, indeed, unions will be familiar with the code of practice on picketing that was issued under section 203 of the 1992 Act. This code will be subject to statutory consultation, including consultation with ACAS, and to the approval of Parliament. The consultation will give trade unions, employers and any other interested parties an opportunity to contribute to practical guidance on the steps that a union must take in order to make it as practicable, durable and effective as possible.

Alan Brown (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (SNP): If the Minister is so willing to consult, why is he rejecting an amendment which confirms that there should be a consultation?

Kevin Hollinrake: We are not happy with a number of other parts of the amendment. We are proposing a measure that we have already proposed in earlier debates. It is, of course, up to those in the other place to decide how they take their amendments forward, but we believe that this is fair. We are satisfied that it is an effective way to provide for clarity, and that the individual consultations for specific minimum service levels in relevant services required by Lords amendment 2D are not needed. The real impact of the amendment would be a delay in the implementation of minimum service levels, given the additional and lengthy consultation and parliamentary requirements which we strongly suspect are its purpose. Unnecessary delays in the protection of the lives and livelihoods of those whom we have been elected to represent cannot be justified.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): I call the shadow Minister.

Justin Madders (Ellesmere Port and Neston) (Lab): I draw the House's attention to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests.

Let me repeat, at the outset, our opposition to the Bill and our intention to repeal the Act that it will become should we be in a position to do so in the future. It is one of the most illiberal, unconscionable and ultimately destructive pieces of legislation produced by any Government. We believe that the right to withdraw labour is a fundamental right, a human right, and one

that should not be extinguished. Even if some Conservative Members cannot see past their hostility to trade unions and past the easy headlines, they should see that what they are asking their constituents to do is distinctly un-British, because it infringes on individual freedoms that ought to be—even for Conservative Members—a basic part of any open and democratic society.

Freedom matters, and valuing freedom sometimes means that we protect another person's freedom to do something even if we do not personally agree with the particular course of action. But our objections are based not just on principles, but on practicalities. Ultimately, we do not think that the Bill will work. The Bill is counterproductive because it will not quell the concerns of many people in the sectors that have taken industrial action. Taking away the right to strike will not take away people's concerns. We cannot legislate away people's legitimate grievances about their working conditions. Because the Bill is so ill defined and poorly thought through, Parliament must have a proper opportunity to consider its ramifications.

The measures set out in Lords amendment 2D attempt to address some of those issues. The amendment also provides yet another opportunity for us to raise our concerns about the Government's lax approach to proper scrutiny during the Bill's progress so far. Let us go back to when the Bill was first published. It is surely a basic expectation of Government that they should provide an impact assessment before asking hon. Members to vote on a Bill. But no—we were asked to trust the Government that the matter was in hand and that all would be fine. We said it at the time and we say it again: that approach is completely unacceptable.

The Bill had been trailed in the press for months before it was published, so not to have the impact assessment ready at the same time was a failure of basic competence. When it finally appeared, we could see why the Government were so keen to keep it under wraps. The Regulatory Policy Committee said that it was not fit for purpose—it could just as easily have been talking about the Government—and no wonder, given that the assessment contains statements that undermine both the purpose and execution of the Bill.

The impact assessment states that the Bill

“could mean a general increase in tension between unions and employers. This may result in more adverse impacts in the long term, such as an increased frequency of strikes for each dispute.”

When Ministers told us on Second Reading that the Bill would reduce the disruption caused by strikes, what they apparently did not know was that the Government's own impact assessment would say that it could, in fact, have the opposite effect. The impact assessment also says, on at least half a dozen occasions, that assumptions are being made about the level of service that would be required. That is the point of the Lords amendment: unless we have some idea about what these minimum service levels will be—in the six months since the Bill was published, Ministers have not come to the Dispatch Box and told us—we are legislating in a vacuum.

The point has not been lost on the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee, which wrote in its assessment that

“there is nothing in the Bill saying what those minimum service levels are. We shall only know when Ministers make regulations after the Bill is enacted. This is small comfort to Parliament, which is considering the matter right now.”

The Committee's recommendation was that the Government should publish indicative draft regulations alongside the Bill. As it rightly points out,

"the Government must have some idea how they propose to exercise these powers."

It is no surprise that the impact assessment got a red rating. Of the 861 Bills assessed by the Regulatory Policy Committee since its creation, just 2.9% have been given a red rating. When legislation represents such a fundamental departure from past practice, the importance of impact assessments increases rather than decreases.

If this all sounds familiar to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is because it is. Only last week the High Court said, in relation to the consultation process for the regulations that allow agency workers to break strikes, that "this is not a case in which the evidence is that the proposal had obvious and undisputed merit based on cogent evidence, and enjoyed strong support from representative bodies in the sector". It could have been talking about this Bill—no doubt, in time, it will be.

The pattern is familiar. The Government decide the policy, although "policy" is probably too strong a word. The Government decide the headline that they want to create, rush through ill-thought-out legislation and then ignore all the voices that point out principled and practical objections. That is to treat democracy with contempt. Parliament is not a rubber-stamping process to agree whatever the Government of the day decide. When Parliament is starved of its ability to properly scrutinise legislation, that impacts on fundamental human rights, as it does in this case. It should come as no surprise that there is pushback from the other place requiring that a robust process be followed.

The amendment is important because the International Labour Organisation's conference committee on the application of standards called on the Government to ensure that existing and prospective legislation is in conformity with the convention that governs freedom of association and the protection of the right to organise. I would not have thought that is too much to ask of a modern liberal democracy. In fact, I am rather ashamed that the ILO has had to point it out at all.

All this amendment does is what the ILO is asking the Government to do anyway, which is to undertake genuine consultation before implementing minimum service regulations. This means that, when regulations are published, they would include an impact assessment and there should be genuine consultation on the regulations, including on the protection for workers named in work notices and the reasonable steps a trade union needs to take to ensure compliance.

8.30 pm

The amendment would also ensure that the relevant Secretary of State consults with the ILO and lays before Parliament any advice it gives, as well as laying a report from the relevant Joint Committee on all the actions required under this amendment. This is important, not just because the ILO thinks it is needed but because it fills some of the holes in the process so far. Indeed, it may address some of the important questions that still need answering.

Right now, under this Bill, trade unions can receive huge fines if their members go on strike when they are asked not to do so by their employer, yet there is no

information in the Bill on what a trade union will need to do to avoid that liability. Imagine if the Government presented a Bill that had the potential for businesses to receive a seven-figure fine but said nothing about what those businesses needed to do to comply. There would be uproar from Members on both sides of the House, and they would be right to be concerned. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

The Minister has belatedly said that a new code of practice will be brought forward, which is an improvement on the Government's previous position that it is for the courts to decide what should be reasonable steps. We are the legislators; we are the ones who are meant to shape and determine Acts of Parliament. We should not leave it to judges to try to work it out, possibly years down the line. Such ambiguity could be very costly for trade unions, and it certainly is not a recipe for improved industrial relations. Given the Government's track record on providing detail on the various steps in this Bill, I have little confidence that a code of practice will provide any comfort at all. It is the epitome of this "headline first, detail later" Government, and it is just one of the many reasons why the Bill should be abandoned altogether. At the very least, it is a good reason to support the amendment.

Of course, the Minister has said that the Government are consulting on the regulations—and they are, after a fashion. So far, though, consultation has been limited to only half the areas for which the Bill legislates, and those areas do not really deal with the fundamental questions that have been raised. Can the Minister at least tell us the basis on which these particular service areas were identified as the ones on which to commence consultation?

The responses to the consultations have not been published. Does the Minister agree that we should have sight of the responses before the Bill passes? Do any of the responses say, for example, that minimum service levels are unworkable? Is there anything in the responses that he thinks Parliament ought to be aware of before we vote on the Bill again? Can he even tell us the total number of responses to each consultation, and the breakdown and proportion of responses from service users, employers and unions?

Ultimately, these consultation papers still do not tell us what a minimum service level will look like. Even for the railways, for which the Government have been looking to set a minimum service level the longest—arguably since the last general election—they do not have a concrete plan. And on pages 8 and 11 of the ambulance service impact assessment, there are statements that show the folly of this legislation, because it states in black and white that a minimum service level could lead to a poorer service than is currently agreed voluntarily.

The only thing we have learned from these consultation documents is that even the Government do not think the Bill will deliver what they say it will deliver. There is nothing on the reasonable steps a trade union must take, nothing on what happens to a worker who is sacked for failing to comply with a work notice, even if they have not received it, and nothing on how any of this will actually help to resolve industrial disputes.

John McDonnell (Hayes and Harlington) (Lab): I am sorry to interrupt my hon. Friend when he is in full flow but, as he is developing his argument on the need for

[John McDonnell]

consultation and impact assessments, has he been able to clarify with the Government what happens if an employer refuses to comply? In London, for example, the buses are contracted out, and individual bus companies have had individual disputes. If the Government instruct there to be a minimum service level but the employer does not want to sour industrial relations in the long term and therefore refuses to comply, what then happens?

Justin Madders: That is a very good question. My understanding—no doubt the Minister can correct me if I am wrong—is that it is still up to the employer to determine what work notices it issues, which makes the Bill a little ludicrous.

All these consultation papers, all these impact assessments, and we are still legislating in the dark.

Rachael Maskell: My hon. Friend has just made a valid point, because when NHS Employers and the NHS Confederation came before the Select Committee on Health and Social Care, they said that they did not want any of this legislation. Presumably, following that logic, they will not have to issue minimum service level terms for a strike.

Justin Madders: I thank my hon. Friend for her intervention. That is why it would have been so interesting to see what the consultation responses were to the draft regulations, because those might have told us whether employers were saying, “Don’t do this; we don’t think it is going to work.” We know that a long list of employers’ organisations are opposed to this Bill, and I will come on to that in a moment. They understand that, ultimately, it is not going to help industrial relations but will sour them.

In summary, the Bill’s impact assessment turns up late and is inadequate; no pre-legislative scrutiny or evidence sessions for the Bill took place; the Committee stage is rushed through in one day; and subsequent consultations are incomplete and leave many questions unanswered. Yet the Government still say that this Lords amendment is not necessary. The evidence to date and the opinion of the ILO say otherwise. I referred to the fact that the ILO is not alone in expressing concerns about the Bill. Many organisations have expressed alarm, including the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Joint Committee on Human Rights, NHS Providers, the rail industry, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, the TUC, and the Welsh and Scottish Governments. The Transport Secretary and the Education Secretary have also done so, and I could give more names, but I have only an hour for this debate and so I will leave it there.

When we have the shameful spectacle of the ILO calling this Bill out, Members need to think again. By rejecting this Lords amendment, the Government are, in effect, saying one of two things: either they do not know whether they break international law; or they do know but they just do not care. We ought to care, we ought not to be trailing behind in workplace protections, and we ought not to be mentioned in the same breath as Turkmenistan. We ought to be leading from the front, as an exemplar for other countries to follow and a leader on the international stage that says, “Yes, good workplace rights and strong trade unions are a key

component in any prospering modern economy, and the right to withdraw your labour is a fundamental one.” However, this Bill is the hallmark of a weak Government who have run out of steam, have nothing left to offer but division and want to silence the very people who keep this country going—shame on them.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): I call the Scottish National party spokesperson

Alan Brown: It is a pleasure to follow the shadow Minister, the hon. Member for Ellesmere Port and Neston (Justin Madders). I agree with all his comments, but I hope that Labour stays resolute on this. If it comes into government, we do not want to see another U-turn, given what we heard at the weekend.

The Minister put forward the myths again about how this Bill is about saving lives and livelihoods. I do not know how he can talk about saving livelihoods, as he is bringing forward a Bill that is going to allow workers to be sacked more easily. Workers’ livelihoods are at stake because of the Bill and the intentions behind it. I would like to put on record my thanks to the Lords for the fight they have brought on this, but I am a wee bit disappointed that the Lords amendment is only about the consultation. Even if we manage to defeat the Government tonight, the Lords amendment does not provide any additional proper protections for the unions or the workers, because it is all about consulting. At least consulting would draw out some transparency, because the Government would need to publish responses and allow the House or a Joint Committee to debate those. In itself, however, the amendment does not provide any additional protections.

Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab): Does it not speak volumes about the way in which this Government conduct their business that they go through a consultation process and are not prepared to publish the results of that consultation? What have they got to hide?

Alan Brown: That is a fair point. Obviously, I cannot answer on what the Government have to hide, other than to say that we know about a raft of answers that show how unworkable and prejudiced this Bill is.

Subsection 5(b) in the amendment is about consulting the ILO. The Government keep telling us that this Bill brings the legislation in the UK into line with international norms, but it clearly does not; the ILO has said that the UK already has some of the most draconian strike legislation, even before this Bill. So there is no doubt that the Government are frightened to consult the ILO because they are frightened about the answers that will come back and the evidence about how draconian this really is that will be put into the public domain when it is published.

As I say, it looks as if the Lords are going to back down after this. There is no more scheduled business to allow further consideration of the Lords message, which suggests they are not going to push the amendment beyond that. That is disappointing, especially given that the Government have tried to argue before that this is a manifesto commitment. The actual manifesto commitment was to require a minimum service for transport. That commitment is not as wide ranging, so the Lords would be completely justified in continuing to resist for as long as possible.

As the shadow Minister said, because the amendment is to consult, as opposed to what was set out in previous amendments, unions are still at risk of facing big fines. Unions are still going to comply, effectively helping employers disrupt strikes and single out workers. Worst of all, workers can now get sacked for not complying with a work notice that they have not received.

Why the Government would not even consult and publish an impact assessment on that is beyond me. Again, they know that it allows employers to unfairly discriminate, pick out the awkward squad, then discipline and sack them, with no recourse to a tribunal. Welcome, Madam Deputy Speaker, to 21st century authoritarian Britain, where sacking workers like that brings the UK in line with Russia and Hungary, not the international norms, although the Minister and Government try to tell us otherwise.

I will be voting against the Government motion to disagree with the Lords. I hope the Lords do not give up the fight, but I am frightened they will. That is why we want away from this Union, because it is certainly not working for anybody.

Richard Burgon (Leeds East) (Lab): The Minister has let the cat out of the bag in relation to the Government's attitude to this dreadful Bill and to amendment 2D from the other place. The Minister objected to Lords amendment 2D because it would delay the implementation of the Bill. Let us be clear: the Bill makes history for all the wrong reasons. It is the biggest attack on the role of our trade unions in our democracy for many a long year. Why are the Government so desperate to rush the Bill through? One almost thinks they cannot stomach the idea of even a small delay because they want it to be presented at the Conservative party conference as a bit of red meat to the party faithful—classic anti-trade union politics and trade union bashing.

Let us think about where we are in terms of industrial relations. The Bill, which the Government do not want to consult on properly, comes shortly after over 100,000 nurses in this country voted to take strike action—the result in that recent ballot was that 84% of nurses who cast a vote did so to take strike action. However, because of the Government's dreadful Trade Union Act 2016, an 84% vote in favour of strike action does not count, is worthless and does not result in strike action, because the turnout was 43%.

The Government helped drive down the turnout by not allowing people to vote by electronic ballot. The former Prime Minister, the right hon. Member for South West Norfolk (Elizabeth Truss), who made such a mess of this country in her short tenure, was elected by electronic ballot of Conservative party members. Not allowing people to vote by electronic means reveals the contempt the Government have for the biggest voluntary organisations in our society—the trade union movement. They will not even give workers in our country the modern dignity of being allowed to vote online or in the workplace.

The Government object to Lords amendment 2D and do not want to consult on it. Is that any wonder? The greater the consultation that takes place in relation to this abhorrent Bill, the more it becomes clear that the Bill is a complete offence. Let us be clear: the Bill, which the Government do not want to have a proper consultation on, requires trade unions to take reasonable steps to get

their own members to break trade union picket lines. This Bill requires trade unions to completely change their function in our democratic society. It is the job of a trade union to persuade trade union members to honour a strike vote, not to break a strike. We see the hand of this authoritarian Government attempting to extend into our trade unions, trying to try to use them as a tool of the state to do the bidding of a Conservative Government, or the bidding of employers. The Bill is rotten and it is no wonder that the Government do not want to consult on it. Any fair-minded person, whatever their politics, would realise that that is not the function of trade unions in our society. We have heard Ministers boasting about how this will result in people being sacked if they do not comply with the requirement to go to work.

Kevin Hollinrake *indicated dissent.*

8.45 pm

Richard Burgon: The Minister shakes his head. If what I am saying is not true, why does he not take that measure out of the Bill, so that workers cannot be sacked for not complying with work notices? That is in the legislation. I shall be charitable to the Minister. Having listened to him in a number of debates, I sometimes thought that he did not realise quite how pernicious the Bill was, but I think that others in the Conservative party do; they know exactly what they are doing.

This anti-trade union Bill, which the Government do not wish to consult on properly, comes hot on the heels of the criminalisation of peaceful protest, which is a democratic right in our society, and hot on the heels of voter ID, when what we should be doing is making it easier for people to vote in our society, not harder. This is an anti-trade union piece of legislation that shames the Government. People can see through it.

The Government cannot even pretend to be up for proper consultation by accepting Lords amendment 2D. They know what the ILO thinks of it, they know what our colleagues in the other place think of it, and they know what the British people think of it. That is why the next Labour Government will repeal this rotten piece of legislation, if indeed it passes, and bring in an important suite of workers' rights, because workers and trade unions in this country have had enough of being treated like dirt for the past 13 years. Let us stop this race to the bottom in workers' rights, and instead build a democratic system—a democratic system where we can be proud of the workers' rights in our country.

Mick Whitley (Birkenhead) (Lab): May I draw the attention of the House to my entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests?

The Lords have been set an unenviable task in attempting to amend a piece of legislation as ill-conceived as this one. As a lifelong opponent of the principle of an unelected second Chamber, I am surprised to find myself now commending the thoughtfulness and diligence that the other place has demonstrated in its many sittings concerning this legislation. It has been a breath of fresh air when compared with this Government's recklessness in attempting to rush the Bill through Parliament.

I rise in support of Lords amendment 2D. Its purpose is simple: to ensure that perhaps the most significant piece of trade union legislation to be considered by this House in more than a century is subject to appropriate

[Mick Whitley]

scrutiny before it is added to the statute book. I wish to repeat the comments that I made when we considered the Lords amendments on 22 May. I said that no number of amendments could ever salvage this Bill. It is rotten to the core. It targets a right that should be sacrosanct in any democracy—the right to withdraw our labour.

In sectors such as education and health, the provisions of the Bill will hobble the ability of working people to fight for the dignity and fairness that we all deserve in the workplace, and make the trade unions themselves unwilling accomplices in undermining the effectiveness of their own industrial action.

Worse still, in sectors such as air traffic control or nuclear decommissioning, minimum service regulations will, in effect, amount to a ban on taking any strike action at all. Ministers have repeatedly insisted that their policies towards the trade union movement conform with international standards and our treaty obligations. That was not the view taken by the High Court last week when it quashed the Government's law allowing employers to bring in scab labour to break strikes. The court's verdict was damning: that the Government's approach was so unfair as to be "unlawful" and, indeed, "irrational".

Despite the claims made by this Government that the International Labour Organisation supports minimum service standards, the director general of the ILO has made an unprecedented intervention in voicing his concern about the effects of the Bill on workers and of the Government's strategy of imposing minimum service requirements on workers instead of encouraging them to be negotiated between unions and management.

Most embarrassingly of all for the Government, the Bill has been slammed by their own independent Regulatory Policy Committee as being not fit for purpose. The question that all of us should be asking is why the Bill was not withdrawn the moment the RPC slapped it with a red rating in February. Why are we still debating proposals that have been condemned by not only my friends in the trade union movement but a vast swathe of trade associations and the business community? Their verdict is astoundingly clear: they do not think the Bill will work. They are concerned, with good cause, that it will make industrial relations in this country worse. They simply do not want the Bill.

The answer is simple. The Government are aware of their impending electoral oblivion. They are intent on driving through reforms that will realise their decades-long dream of a world in which workers are stripped of all their rights and left helpless at the whims of their employers. It is about time for a little more candour from those on the Government Benches.

Kevin Hollinrake: I thank all Members for their contributions to the debate. I think that it is time to agree to disagree with some of the points that have been made by Opposition Members. The Bill is compatible with our international obligations, which the Government will continue to uphold. We have announced a new code of practice, which will provide the clarity that Opposition Members have been asking for throughout the Bill's passage. I encourage the other place to take note of the strong view of this House, and that its will should be respected.

Question put, That this House disagrees with Lords amendment 2D.

The House divided: Ayes 302, Noes 205.

Division No. 307]

[8.51 pm

AYES

Afolami, Bim	Crabb, rh Stephen
Afriyie, Adam	Crosbie, Virginia
Aiken, Nickie	Crouch, Tracey
Aldous, Peter	Daly, James
Allan, Lucy (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Davies, rh David T. C.
Anderson, Lee	Davies, Gareth (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)
Anderson, Stuart	Davies, Dr James
Andrew, rh Stuart	Davies, Mims
Ansell, Caroline	Davis, rh Mr David
Argar, rh Edward	Davison, Dehenna
Atkins, Victoria	Dinenage, Dame Caroline
Bacon, Gareth	Dines, Miss Sarah
Bacon, Mr Richard	Djanogly, Mr Jonathan
Bailey, Shaun	Docherty, Leo
Baillie, Siobhan	Donaldson, rh Sir Jeffrey M.
Baker, Duncan	Donelan, rh Michelle (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)
Baker, Mr Steve	Dowden, rh Oliver
Baldwin, Harriett	Drax, Richard
Barclay, rh Steve	Drummond, Mrs Flick
Baynes, Simon	Duguid, David
Benton, Scott	Duncan Smith, rh Sir Iain
Bhatti, Saqib (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Dunne, rh Philip
Blackman, Bob	Eastwood, Mark
Blunt, Crispin	Ellis, rh Sir Michael
Bone, Mr Peter (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Elphicke, Mrs Natalie
Bottomley, Sir Peter	Eustice, rh George
Bowie, Andrew	Evans, Dr Luke
Bradley, Ben	Everitt, Ben
Braverman, rh Suella	Fabricant, Michael
Brereton, Jack	Farris, Laura
Bridgen, Andrew	Fell, Simon
Brine, Steve	Firth, Anna
Bristow, Paul	Fletcher, Katherine
Britcliffe, Sara	Fletcher, Mark
Browne, Anthony	Fletcher, Nick
Bruce, Fiona	Ford, rh Vicky
Buchan, Felicity	Fox, rh Dr Liam
Buckland, rh Sir Robert	Frazer, rh Lucy
Burghart, Alex	Freer, Mike
Butler, Rob	French, Mr Louie
Cairns, rh Alun	Fuller, Richard
Carter, Andy	Fysh, Mr Marcus
Cartlidge, James	Garnier, Mark
Cash, Sir William	Ghani, Ms Nusrat
Cates, Miriam	Gibb, rh Nick
Caulfield, Maria	Gibson, Peter
Chalk, rh Alex	Gideon, Jo
Chishti, Rehman	Glen, rh John
Chope, Sir Christopher	Goodwill, rh Sir Robert
Churchill, Jo	Gove, rh Michael
Clark, rh Greg	Graham, Richard
Clarke, rh Sir Simon	Gray, James
Clarke, Theo (<i>Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones</i>)	Grayling, rh Chris
Clarke-Smith, Brendan	Green, Chris
Clarkson, Chris	Green, rh Damian
Clifton-Brown, Sir Geoffrey	Griffith, Andrew
Coffey, rh Dr Thérèse	Grundy, James
Colburn, Elliot	Gullis, Jonathan
Collins, Damian	Halfon, rh Robert
Costa, Alberto	Hall, Luke
Coutinho, Claire	Harper, rh Mr Mark
	Harris, Rebecca

Harrison, Trudy
 Hart, Sally-Ann
 Hart, rh Simon
 Hayes, rh Sir John
 Heald, rh Sir Oliver
 Heapey, rh James
 Heaton-Harris, rh Chris
 Henderson, Gordon
 Henry, Darren
 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, Tom
 Jack, rh Mr Alister
 Javid, rh Sajid
 Jenkin, Sir Bernard
 Jenkinson, Mark
 Jenrick, rh Robert
 Johnson, Dr Caroline
 Johnson, Gareth
 Jones, Andrew
 Jones, rh Mr David
 Jones, Fay
 Jones, rh Mr Marcus
 Jupp, Simon
 Kearns, Alicia
 Keegan, rh Gillian
 Knight, rh Sir Greg
 Kniveton, Kate
 Kruger, Danny
 Lamont, John
 Largan, Robert
 Latham, Mrs Pauline
 Leadsom, rh Dame Andrea
 Leigh, rh Sir Edward
 Levy, Ian
 Lewer, Andrew
 Lewis, rh Sir Julian
 Liddell-Grainger, Mr Ian
 Loder, Chris
 Logan, Mark (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Longhi, Marco
 Lopez, Julia (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Lopresti, Jack
 Lord, Mr Jonathan
 Loughton, Tim
 Mackinlay, Craig
 Mackrory, Cheryl
 Maclean, Rachel
 Mak, Alan
 Malthouse, rh Kit
 Mangnall, Anthony
 Mann, Scott
 Marson, Julie
 Mayhew, Jerome
 Maynard, Paul
 McCartney, Jason
 McCartney, Karl
 McVey, rh Esther
 Mercer, rh Johnny
 Merriman, Huw

Metcalf, Stephen
 Millar, Robin
 Miller, rh Dame Maria
 Milling, rh Dame Amanda
 Mills, Nigel
 Mitchell, rh Mr Andrew
 Mohindra, Mr Gagan
 Moore, Damien
 Moore, Robbie
 Mordaunt, rh Penny
 Morris, Anne Marie
 Morris, David
 Morris, James
 Morrissey, Joy
 Mortimer, Jill
 Morton, rh Wendy
 Mullan, Dr Kieran
 Mumby-Croft, Holly
 Mundell, rh David
 Murray, Mrs Sheryll
 Murrison, rh Dr Andrew
 Nici, Lia
 Nokes, rh Caroline
 Norman, rh Jesse
 O'Brien, Neil
 Offord, Dr Matthew
 Opperman, Guy
 Pawsey, Mark
 Penning, rh Sir Mike
 Penrose, John
 Philp, rh Chris
 Pow, Rebecca
 Prentis, rh Victoria
 Pritchard, rh Mark
 Pursglove, Tom
 Quin, rh Jeremy
 Quince, Will
 Randall, Tom
 Redwood, rh John
 Richards, Nicola
 Richardson, Angela
 Robertson, Mr Laurence
 Robinson, Gavin
 Robinson, Mary
 Ross, Douglas
 Rowley, Lee
 Russell, Dean
 Rutley, David
 Sambrook, Gary
 Saxby, Selaine
 Scully, Paul
 Seely, Bob
 Selous, Andrew
 Shannon, Jim
 Shapps, rh Grant
 Simmonds, David
 Skidmore, rh Chris
 Smith, rh Chloe
 Smith, Greg
 Smith, Henry
 Smith, rh Julian
 Smith, Royston
 Solloway, Amanda
 Spencer, Dr Ben
 Spencer, rh Mark
 Stafford, Alexander
 Stephenson, rh Andrew
 Stevenson, Jane
 Stevenson, John
 Stewart, rh Bob
 Stewart, Iain
 Stride, rh Mel

Stuart, rh Graham
 Sturdy, Julian
 Sunderland, James
 Swayne, rh Sir Desmond
 Syms, Sir Robert
 Thomas, Derek
 Tolhurst, rh Kelly
 Tomlinson, Justin
 Tomlinson, Michael
 Tracey, Craig
 Trevelyan, rh Anne-Marie
 Trott, Laura
 Tugendhat, rh Tom
 Vara, rh Shailesh
 Vickers, Martin
 Vickers, Matt (*Proxy vote cast by Mr Marcus Jones*)
 Villiers, rh Theresa
 Walker, Sir Charles
 Walker, Mr Robin

Wallis, Dr Jamie
 Warman, Matt
 Watling, Giles
 Webb, Suzanne
 Whately, Helen
 Wheeler, Mrs Heather
 Whittaker, rh Craig
 Whittingdale, rh Sir John
 Wigg, Sir Bill
 Wild, James
 Williams, Craig
 Williamson, rh Sir Gavin
 Wilson, rh Sammy
 Wood, Mike
 Wragg, Mr William
 Young, Jacob

Tellers for the Ayes:
Steve Double and
Ruth Edwards

NOES

Abbott, rh Ms Diane (*Proxy vote cast by Bell Ribeiro-Ady*)
 Abrahams, Debbie
 Ali, Tahir
 Allin-Khan, Dr Rosena
 Amesbury, Mike
 Anderson, Fleur
 Antoniazzi, Tonia
 Ashworth, rh Jonathan
 Bardell, Hannah
 Barker, Paula
 Beckett, rh Margaret
 Begum, Apsana
 Benn, rh Hilary
 Betts, Mr Clive
 Blackford, rh Ian
 Blake, Olivia
 Bradshaw, rh Mr Ben
 Brennan, Kevin
 Brock, Deidre
 Brown, Alan
 Brown, Ms Lyn
 Brown, rh Mr Nicholas
 Bryant, Sir Chris
 Buck, Ms Karen
 Burgon, Richard
 Butler, Dawn
 Cadbury, Ruth
 Callaghan, Amy (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Cameron, Dr Lisa
 Campbell, rh Sir Alan
 Carmichael, rh Mr Alistair
 Chamberlain, Wendy
 Champion, Sarah
 Chapman, Douglas
 Cherry, Joanna
 Clark, Feryal (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Cooper, rh Yvette
 Corbyn, rh Jeremy
 Cowan, Ronnie
 Coyle, Neil
 Creasy, Stella
 Cruddas, Jon
 Cryer, John
 Cunningham, Alex
 Daby, Janet
 Dalton, Ashley
 David, Wayne
 Davies-Jones, Alex
 Day, Martyn
 De Cordova, Marsha
 Debbonaire, Thangam
 Dhesi, Mr Tanmanjeet Singh
 Dixon, Samantha
 Docherty-Hughes, Martin
 Dods, Anneliese
 Dorans, Allan (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Eagle, Dame Angela
 Eagle, rh Maria
 Eastwood, Colum
 Efford, Clive
 Elliott, Julie
 Elmore, Chris
 Esterson, Bill
 Farron, Tim
 Farry, Stephen
 Fellows, Marion
 Ferrier, Margaret
 Flynn, Stephen
 Foord, Richard
 Fovargue, Yvonne
 Foxcroft, Vicky
 Foy, Mary Kelly
 Furniss, Gill
 Gardiner, Barry
 Gibson, Patricia
 Grady, Patrick
 Grant, Peter
 Green, Sarah
 Greenwood, Lilian
 Greenwood, Margaret
 Griffith, Dame Nia
 Gwynne, Andrew
 Haigh, Louise
 Hamilton, Mrs Paulette
 Hanna, Claire
 Harman, rh Ms Harriet
 Harris, Carolyn
 Hayes, Helen
 Hendry, Drew
 Hobhouse, Wera
 Hodgson, Mrs Sharon
 Hollern, Kate
 Hopkins, Rachel

Hosie, rh Stewart
 Howarth, rh Sir George
 Huq, Dr Rupa
 Hussain, Imran
 Jardine, Christine
 Johnson, rh Dame Diana
 Johnson, Kim
 Jones, Darren
 Jones, Gerald
 Jones, Ruth
 Jones, Sarah
 Keeley, Barbara
 Kendall, Liz
 Kinnock, Stephen
 Lake, Ben
 Lavery, Ian
 Law, Chris
 Lewis, Clive
 Linden, David
 Lloyd, Tony (*Proxy vote cast by Chris Elmore*)
 Lucas, Caroline
 MacAskill, Kenny
 MacNeil, Angus Brendan
 Madders, Justin
 Malhotra, Seema
 Maskell, Rachael
 Mc Nally, John
 McCabe, Steve
 McCarthy, Kerry
 McDonald, Andy
 McDonald, Stewart Malcolm
 McDonald, Stuart C.
 McDonnell, rh John
 McFadden, rh Mr Pat
 McGovern, Alison
 McKinnell, Catherine
 McLaughlin, Anne (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 McMahan, Jim
 McMorrin, Anna
 Mearns, Ian
 Miliband, rh Edward
 Mishra, Navendu
 Morden, Jessica
 Morgan, Helen
 Morgan, Stephen
 Morris, Grahame
 Murray, Ian
 Newlands, Gavin
 Nichols, Charlotte
 Nicolson, John (*Proxy vote cast by Brendan O'Hara*)
 Norris, Alex

O'Hara, Brendan
 Olney, Sarah
 Onwurah, Chi
 Oppong-Asare, Abena
 Osamor, Kate
 Osborne, Kate
 Oswald, Kirsten
 Owen, Sarah
 Pennycook, Matthew
 Perkins, Mr Toby
 Phillips, Jess
 Phillipson, Bridget
 Pollard, Luke
 Powell, Lucy
 Qaisar, Ms Anum
 Qureshi, Yasmin
 Rayner, rh Angela
 Reeves, Ellie
 Reeves, rh Rachel
 Reynolds, Jonathan
 Ribeiro-Addy, Bell
 Rimmer, Ms Marie
 Rodda, Matt
 Russell-Moyle, Lloyd
 Shah, Naz
 Sharma, Mr Virendra
 Sheerman, Mr Barry
 Slaughter, Andy
 Smith, Alyn
 Smith, Cat
 Smith, Jeff
 Sobel, Alex
 Spellar, rh John
 Stephens, Chris
 Stevens, Jo
 Stone, Jamie
 Stringer, Graham
 Sultana, Zarah
 Tami, rh Mark
 Tarry, Sam
 Thomas, Gareth
 Thomas-Symonds, rh Nick
 Thompson, Owen
 Thomson, Richard
 Timms, rh Sir Stephen
 Trickett, Jon
 Twist, Liz
 Vaz, rh Valerie
 Wakeford, Christian
 Webbe, Claudia
 West, Catherine
 Western, Matt
 Whitford, Dr Philippa
 Whitley, Mick

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

Yasin, Mohammad
 Zeichner, Daniel

Tellers for the Noes:
Colleen Fletcher and
Mary Glindon

Question accordingly agreed to.

Lords amendment 2D disagreed to.

Ordered, That a Committee be appointed to draw up a Reason to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to their amendment 2D;

That Kevin Hollinrake, Mike Wood, Alexander Stafford, Jane Stevenson, Justin Madders, Christian Wakeford and Alan Brown be members of the Committee;

That Kevin Hollinrake be the Chair of the Committee;

That three be the quorum of the Committee.

That the Committee do withdraw immediately.—
(Stuart Anderson.)

Committee to withdraw immediately; reason to be reported and communicated to the Lords.

Business without Debate

DELEGATED LEGISLATION

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton):
 With the leave of the House, I will put motions 5, 6 and 7 together.

Motion made, and Question put forthwith (Standing Order No. 118(6)),

EXITING THE EUROPEAN UNION (NORTHERN IRELAND)

That the draft Equipment and Protective Systems Intended for Use in Potentially Explosive Atmospheres Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2017 (Amendment) (Northern Ireland) Regulations 2023, which were laid before this House on 6 June, be approved.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

That the draft Industrial Training Levy (Engineering Construction Industry Training Board) Order 2023, which was laid before this House on 7 June, be approved.

IMMIGRATION

That the draft Immigration and Nationality (Fees) (Amendment) Order 2023, which was laid before this House on 6 June, be approved.—*(Stuart Anderson.)*

Question agreed to.

Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority

[*Relevant documents: First Report 2023 of the Speaker's Committee for the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, Appointment of IPSA Board Member (former high judicial office holder), HC 1443*]

9.6 pm

The Leader of the House of Commons (Penny Mordaunt): I beg to move,

That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that His Majesty will appoint Dame Laura Cox to the office of ordinary member of the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority with effect from 1 August 2023 for the period ending on 31 July 2028.

The Speaker's Committee for the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority has produced a report—its first report of 2023—in relation to the motion. I have no doubt that Members will have studied that report closely and will know of Dame Laura's background. I note that the recruitment panel considered Dame Laura an eminently appointable candidate.

IPSA is quite rightly independent of Parliament and Government, but as all Members will know and understand, it has an incredibly important role in regulating and administering the business costs of hon. Members and deciding their pay and pensions. I hope that the House will support this appointment and wish Dame Laura well in this important role, and I commend the motion to the House.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): I call the shadow Leader of the House.

9.7 pm

Thangam Debbonaire (Bristol West) (Lab): I rise to support the motion in the name of the Leader of the House, and to say that Dame Laura Cox has brought a great deal to this House. She has challenged us; she has worked with us; she has reviewed the independent complaints and grievance system, thereby strengthening our system of accountability for bullying and sexual harassment; and she has come to know us well. I believe she will be a good critical friend. She has been duly well appointed, and I support the motion.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I call the Scottish National party spokesperson.

9.8 pm

Deidre Brock (Edinburgh North and Leith) (SNP): The SNP pays tribute to Sir Robert Owen, who left the IPSA board in April, and wishes him the best for the future. We welcome the appointment of Dame Laura Cox to fill the vacancy: with her extensive and esteemed judicial career and dedication to equality and human rights, she will bring invaluable experience to the role.

In 2018, as has been mentioned, Dame Laura led the independent inquiry into bullying and harassment of House of Commons staff, and was involved in selecting the chair and members of the Independent Expert Panel, so she has an in-depth knowledge of this place. I note that the appointments panel recognised her "strong understanding" of IPSA, its challenges, and the political landscape in which it operates. The panel also highlighted Dame Laura's proven track record of making "difficult

decisions" under "intense public scrutiny". I have no doubt that she will be an exceptional addition to the IPSA board, and the SNP supports the motion.

9.9 pm

John Spellar (Warley) (Lab): As regularly on these occasions, I say to the House that I have no particular knowledge of the individual concerned or any animus towards them, but I have huge concerns about the process.

I hope that, when the Leader of the House is looking at rigorous analysis and making tough decisions about IPSA, she looks, for example, at why it has expensive offices in the Strand in London when nearly all the staff seem to be working from home, and why the experience of individual Members in dealing with IPSA staff is that they are not facilitators of the work of hard-pressed and hard-worked Members of Parliament, but most of the time—with one or two individual exceptions, but certainly as an institution—are just incredibly obstructive. It creates a huge amount of unnecessary and bureaucratic work not just for Members of Parliament, but for our members of staff. I know that this is echoed across the Chamber from the number of Members who come up to me after speeches such as this to say so, many of whom may even have been watching in their offices while grinding through their IPSA returns.

I very much object to the process. The Parliamentary Standards Act 2009, which was brought in in haste and in response to a crisis—and in a panic, I would argue—specifies that at least one of the members of IPSA

"must be a person who has held (but no longer holds) high judicial office".

Why? What does the requirement to have held high judicial office or to have been an eminent barrister have to do with deciding how efficiently to deal with people's expenses? I would argue that somebody from one of the big corporations, who actually understands something about running a salaries and expenses scheme, might be a lot better at doing that, but such a person is not specified. I suspect that someone who has been a trade union official or a convener in a major company would have a much better idea about how to run such a system efficiently and effectively than someone who has never had such responsibility. I note that this individual has been a head of chambers, which would give them some understanding, but not of dealing with several hundred people in the way that IPSA has to do.

One of the problems we seem to have at the moment—this is what I want to highlight to the House—is that we have now erected a new priesthood. I find it very interesting that people complain about having bishops of the Church of England in the House of Lords, but almost everything now has to be allocated to a senior judge. These people have a lot of training and many of them are extremely intelligent, but that does not make them the only people in this country who have good judgment, are able to assess a case or are able to run something. Almost everything now seems to be delegated to the lawyers and to the judiciary. I find it really rather amusing, entertaining and slightly surprising from the Conservative party, given that its supporting newspapers are regularly castigating the judiciary on their front pages, that for everything that relates to this House, it somehow seems to allocate them a special place and a special privilege.

[John Spellar]

When we look through appointments not just to this board, but to the boards of so many public bodies that come before this House, time and again the only people who are chosen are the great and the good from various non-governmental organisations that get awards—that is another tick in a box—or those who have served on a number of quangos. It is not someone who is actually running a business day to day, someone who is doing the real job of working as a nurse or a doctor in a hospital, or a figure from the car industry, for example. None of those people gets a look in, because we hand over this process to search consultants who keep fishing in the same pool. We need to call that out and say that there is a great wealth of talent in this country. Our class system, time and again, ignores that pool of talent in all walks of life, and we have even institutionalised it in the legislation setting up the IPSA board.

So I end as I began—had we been closer to 10 o'clock, I might have felt the need to expand further, but we are not—by saying that this is nothing to do with the individual concerned. It is really to do with a self-perpetuating system that is basically about looking after chums, and it is about time we changed it.

Question put and agreed to.

Liaison Committee

Motion made, and Question proposed,

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 145, the Liaison Committee shall have power to appoint specialist advisers in relation to its inquiry on Strategic thinking in Government.
—(*Penny Mordaunt.*)

9.15 pm

Sir Christopher Chope (Christchurch) (Con): Since I objected to this motion going through on the nod the other night, I am surprised that my right hon. Friend the Leader of the House is moving it formally instead of trying to explain the background to this move. We have always had the system in this House that the Liaison Committee comprises those Members who have been appointed by the House to be Chairs of Select Committees, and those Chairs meet together to comprise the Liaison Committee.

The Liaison Committee is set up under Standing Order No. 145. An appointment was made in this Parliament by the former Member for Uxbridge, Boris Johnson, who as Prime Minister listened sympathetically to representations made by my hon. Friend the Member for Harwich and North Essex (Sir Bernard Jenkin), saying that he had not been appointed successfully to be elected to a Select Committee, and would it not be wonderful to break with precedent and create a new post for somebody who was not already a Select Committee Chair, but who would become Chair of the Liaison Committee.

I have no objection to the decision that the former Prime Minister took in appointing my hon. Friend as Chair of the Liaison Committee, but I am concerned that now, with his having been appointed to that Committee, we are engaged in a bit of mission creep. Standing Order No. 145 specifies:

“A select committee shall be appointed, to be called the Liaison Committee”,

and its role shall be

“to consider general matters relating to the work of select committees, to give such advice relating to the work of select committees as may be sought by the House of Commons Commission, and to report to the House its choice of select committee reports to be debated on such days as may be appointed by the Speaker in pursuance of paragraph (15) of Standing Order No. 10 (Sittings in Westminster Hall).

The committee may also hear evidence from the Prime Minister on matters of public policy.”

We know that that is essentially the high-profile role of the Liaison Committee—to try to hold the Prime Minister to account. My hon. Friend, as Chair of that Committee, played a significant role in trying to hold the former Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, to account.

John Spellar (Warley) (Lab): Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will correct me. Is it right that we have a joint strategic Committee—I cannot remember its exact name, but if I had known this subject was coming up I would have looked it up—which I think is chaired by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby South (Margaret Beckett)? Surely strategic issues, and strategic security and so on, should be within the remit of that Committee under our current structure.

Sir Christopher Chope: The right hon. Gentleman is absolutely right. We are not short of Committees in this House, and the purpose of Standing Order No. 145 was

to set up a Liaison Committee—whether that is a useful exercise is for others to judge. It was approved and set up in the Standing Orders, but now, without vigilance on our part, we will find that that Liaison Committee is becoming almost like a Select Committee in its own right, and carrying out its own inquiries—inquiries that could be carried out by any of the other individual Select Committees. Now, in the motion on the Order Paper, it is seeking funding for the appointment of special advisers to facilitate its work. It seems to me that the case for this measure has not been made. I am sorry, as I said earlier, that my right hon. Friend the Leader of the House did not make the case at the beginning of this debate, instead of waiting to respond to the debate later.

Referring again to Standing Order No. 145, it states:

“The committee shall report its recommendations as to the allocation of time for consideration by the House of the estimates on any day or half day which may be allotted for that purpose; and upon a motion being made that the House do agree with any such report the question shall be put forthwith and, if that question is agreed to, the recommendations shall have effect as if they were orders of the House.

Proceedings in pursuance of this paragraph, though opposed, may be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business.”

Sub-paragraphs (4) to (6) of that Standing Order state:

“The committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to sit notwithstanding any adjournment of the House...and to report from time to time.

Unless the House otherwise orders, each Member nominated to the committee shall continue to be a member of it for the remainder of the Parliament.

The committee shall have power to appoint two sub-committees, one of which shall be a National Policy Statements sub-committee.”

The Standing Order then sets out what that sub-committee could be comprised of and what it would do. I am not aware of any such sub-committee on national policy statements having yet been appointed, but if I am wrong about that, I am sure I will be corrected by my right hon. Friend the Leader of the House. The Liaison Committee also has the power to set up another sub-committee if it so wishes. Each sub-committee has requirements about a quorum and the fact that it needs to report minutes of evidence and so on.

It is clear from reading that Standing Order that the Liaison Committee has a limited remit. It is particularly designed to ensure that, because the Prime Minister does not answer and will not give evidence to other Select Committees, he comes along regularly to the Liaison Committee and he is held to account there.

That is all very well, so why have we ended up where we are today? On the Order Paper, the motion states:

“notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 145”—
the one to which I have been referring—

“the Liaison Committee shall have power to appoint specialist advisers”—

in the plural—

“in relation to its inquiry on Strategic thinking in Government.”

It may well be that there is a shortage of strategic thinking in government and that that inquiry into the shortage of strategic thinking is required, but I am surprised that that inquiry is being conducted by the Liaison Committee, when any of the other Select Committees would be able to inquire into that issue in relation to their remits.

The Liaison Committee has set up that inquiry on strategic thinking in government, and it wants to have special advisers appointed, and I imagine paid out of the public purse, to provide advice to the Committee, which is, as I emphasise, a Select Committee in name, but not by nature. This is an example of mission creep.

I had the privilege of speaking earlier to my hon. Friend the Member for Harwich and North Essex, the Chairman of the Liaison Committee, who drew to my attention the press release issued by the Liaison Committee on 22 June this year. It states:

“The Liaison Committee is launching an inquiry into select committee scrutiny of strategic thinking across Whitehall.”

In other words, it is trying to find out whether Select Committees are up to the task of scrutinising strategic thinking across government. That would be fair enough, one might think. However, when one looks at the small print, the Chair’s comments and the terms of reference, one finds that, far from being an inquiry into Select Committee scrutiny of strategic thinking across Whitehall, this is an inquiry into strategic thinking across Whitehall—nothing to do with the Select Committees, for which the Liaison Committee has been specifically established.

John Spellar: The hon Gentleman is generous in giving way once again. I have been listening to him expand on that point. Would it not be more appropriate for such an inquiry to be conducted by the Public Accounts Committee, which has inevitably undertaken similar studies into thinking because of the resource consequences that arise from strategic thinking, or the lack thereof? Was that not the appropriate route?

Sir Christopher Chope: That, in my view, would be wholly appropriate. Why does the National Audit Office, which feeds into much of the Public Accounts Committee’s work, not get involved if it thinks that this is a big issue? Incidentally, today, the National Audit Office reported on the Government’s hospital building programme, and I found in the small print that Christchurch hospital is no longer part of the 40 hospitals being built—it has been withdrawn from the programme and will be added to a future programme. That is rightly criticised by the National Audit Office, and that is a current example of why we need proper scrutiny.

To return to what the Liaison Committee says it wants to do in this new inquiry, the Chair’s comments are:

“Major events such as Brexit, covid-19 and Ukraine demonstrate the need for long-term planning and delivery across multiple departments and across the duration of several Parliaments, as well as the importance of successful collaboration with our international partners. As the pace of events over recent years have shown, the Government needs to be more agile in its ambition—and it should also be coordinated across departments and sustainable over time.

Select committees provide a mirror to Government policy and practice. Their work has demonstrated the value of cross-party checks and balances on departmental strategic thinking. This inquiry by the Liaison Committee will consider how select committees can improve scrutiny of strategic thinking in government as the UK confronts the major questions we face in the near and longer-term future. Better scrutiny of strategic thinking by Parliament will contribute to better strategic thinking within Government.”

I am sorry that I was not able to précis that, Madam Deputy Speaker; that is one of the issues we have, as a Parliament and with the Government—there is too much verbosity in these sorts of announcements—but be that as it may.

[*Sir Christopher Chope*]

I then looked at the terms of reference, expecting that they would be exclusively directed to strategic thinking in Select Committees and the Select Committee's control over strategic thinking in government, but the call for evidence—Members and others are told that they must send in written evidence by Friday 15 September—states:

“The Committee is looking for evidence on: Examples of best practice of strategic thinking in Government, including: how well Government identifies strategic opportunities as well as strategic risks and threats; how effectively Government uses internal and external challenge; how feedback loops”—

whatever those are—

“are used to ensure that lessons from delivery are fully considered when developing future strategic plans;”

and

“how No. 10 and the Cabinet Office should best lead on these issues across government”.

That is one item. The second item is:

“What government should publish or explain about its overall strategic concept.”

John Spellar: Surely, the section that the hon. Gentleman has just read out—there may be more of it—is in the remit of the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee?

Sir Christopher Chope: Absolutely. I do not know—perhaps we will find out later—the extent to which the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee has been consulted on this and has agreed that, on Government strategic thinking, it will have its role usurped by the Liaison Committee. I am sure that all will be revealed in due course. If my hon. Friends want to intervene on these issues, I will be happy to take interventions.

The next item of the terms of reference is:

“What additional machinery of Government, knowledge and skills are necessary to support strategic thinking and effective strategy and delivery, both within individual departments, and across two or more departments, and how strategy and strategic thinking can be sustained by building consensus between the main parties”.

The fourth item on which evidence can be given is:

“Which governments around the world demonstrate best practice in strategic thinking”.

That is an opportunity for some overseas visits, no doubt, to go and see which Governments across the world are demonstrating best practice in strategic thinking.

The next item of the terms of reference—the sixth—contains the first reference to Select Committees:

“How Select Committees consider strategic questions, including any recent examples of scrutiny of Government strategic plans and/or their delivery; and elements of Government strategy- and delivery that are repeatedly identified by Select Committees as effective or as deficient”.

At least that item on which evidence is sought is relevant to the purported nature of the inquiry. The next item in the terms of reference is:

“The engagement of individual departments, and Whitehall as a whole, with Select Committees on strategic challenges, including through the provision of information necessary for effective scrutiny.”

The next one is:

“What additional resources”—

more taxpayer's money is going into this, I can see—

“parliamentary procedure, knowledge and skills are necessary to support effective Select Committee scrutiny of strategic thinking and effective strategy-making, as well as monitoring implementation of any Government action in response”.

This is a great one:

“How other parliaments around the world are engaging with the strategic thinking of their respective governments.”

Well, what an inquiry. It could take years, could it not? Woe betide whoever is appointed a special adviser under the terms of the motion before us. They will need to be handsomely remunerated, will they not, for the time and effort they put into the inquiry? They will have a global remit.

I speak as a member of two Select Committees—the Procedure Committee and the Environmental Audit Committee. The Environmental Audit Committee is cross-cutting and looks at the effect of the Government's environmental policies across a whole range of areas. The Liaison Committee seems to be creating a new cross-cutting Select Committee covering public administration, strategic thinking, oversees democracy and so on. I want to hear the justification for that, what the cost is likely to be and how this idea ever got a start. Was it discussed by the Liaison Committee? Did it agree those very wide terms of reference? Did it think through the implications? In supporting the motion, has the Leader of the House thought through exactly what that strategic thinking is all about?

Sir Jacob Rees-Mogg (North East Somerset) (Con): I apologise for not being in the Chamber for the start of the debate, but I have been listening to my hon. Friend carefully on the television.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): Order. Can I just say to the right hon. Gentleman that it is absolutely customary to be in at the start of a speech if the right hon. Gentleman is going to intervene?

Sir Jacob Rees-Mogg: This is such an important debate and my hon. Friend is raising such an important point about the fundamentals of the Liaison Committee. Do I understand from what he is saying that the Committee would need to change its name if it takes on those responsibilities, because its job is simply liaison, not to go further than that?

Sir Christopher Chope: Absolutely. That is why I am worried about the mission creep. We have the Liaison Committee proposal set out in the press release to which I have been referring, but it bears little resemblance to the motion on the Order Paper, which states that

“the Liaison Committee shall have power to appoint specialist advisers in relation to its inquiry on Strategic thinking in Government.”

Its inquiry purports to be on the ability of Select Committees to scrutinise strategic thinking across Government, which is completely different. As anybody who has been listening to the terms of reference will know, it is not limited to strategic thinking across our Government, but restricted to strategic thinking across all Governments that are members of the United Nations. So it has an enormously wide remit.

I must say that I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Harwich and North Essex, the Chair of the Committee, on his imagination and breadth of vision.

He could have a job for life fulfilling this important role. But our job in questioning matters like this, which are put on the Order Paper and would otherwise go through on the nod, is to say, “Well, hang on a minute, what are we about? Have the members of the rest of the Select Committees thought about the implications, the costs and the dangerous precedent that is being set?” It is only in this Parliament that we got the exception to have a Chair of the Liaison Committee who is not already a Chair of another Select Committee, but how will the members of the Liaison Committee be able to give their time and devotion to this particular subject?

John Spellar: For example, I am a member of one of the Committees that very much deals with strategy and strategic thinking: the Defence Committee. I am not aware—I may have missed it—that there has been any reference to that Committee on whether it thinks this move is appropriate or not.

Sir Christopher Chope: Well, there we have it, Madam Deputy Speaker. And I see my hon. Friend the Member for Harwich and North Essex, the Chair of the Liaison Committee, at the Bar of the House. I do not know whether he intends to participate in this debate.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): The hon. Gentleman ought to know that it is very difficult for the Member who has just come in to participate in the debate, when he has already been speaking for nearly 25 minutes. I had assumed that he had informed the hon. Member that he was going to refer to him.

Sir Christopher Chope: Madam Deputy Speaker, I was talking to my hon. Friend the Chair of the Committee earlier on today and he gave me—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am not sure that quite counts as informing him that you were going to mention him in a debate, but I assume that that is what you are indicating.

Sir Christopher Chope: I am indicating that I am referring to him in the debate, because he indeed gave me the Liaison Committee terms of reference and the press release, including the quote from himself. Since he is the Chair of the Liaison Committee, I am rather surprised that he has not made himself available to participate in this debate, particularly given that it is all about a much more important role for that Committee, which he has the privilege of chairing. I had not realised, Madam Deputy Speaker, when I rose to my feet at the beginning of this debate, that my hon. Friend was not actually in his place. I now see that he is not in his place but at the Bar of the House. But because of what you said—the debate perhaps started earlier than he expected—he will not now be able to participate in it and will have to rely on the Leader of the House to put the case, which he would otherwise be able to put himself, as to why this proposal does not amount to an expensive and unnecessary mission creep on the part of the Liaison Committee.

It is, in my view, probably unique to this Parliament that we have a Chair of the Liaison Committee who is not already the Chair of another Committee. I wonder how the members of the Liaison Committee, all of whom are Chairs of other Committees, will physically

be able to get to grips with the enormous subject of the quality of strategic thinking across the world, because that is what we are talking about.

Sir Bill Wiggin (North Herefordshire) (Con): The House will know that I am second to none in my admiration for my hon. Friend, but I actually am a member of the Liaison Committee, and I think that—in drawing his comments to a close—he will, like me, welcome any progress in strategic thinking in Government, and particularly in this Government.

Sir Christopher Chope: I am all in favour of more strategic thinking, and I know that my hon. Friend is a great exemplar of it. He has deployed that talent over many years in the House, and continues so to do. But I am disappointed, in a sense, that in his intervention he did not address the issue of mission creep, and why this subject cannot be dealt with by the Public Administration Committee or by other Select Committees that have already been set up under the rules of the House. He did disclose to us that he is a member of the Liaison Committee, although he did not say how enthusiastic he is about being able to participate in the evidence gathering and the consideration of the evidence that is gathered in conjunction with this particular remit of setting out the inquiry on strategic thinking in Government.

It often happens that towards the end of a Parliament the Government are trying to think beyond the next general election, and perhaps, in proposing this motion, my hon. Friend the Chair of the Liaison Committee is thinking beyond this Parliament to the next. Perhaps he is thinking that the Liaison Committee in that Parliament may have some unfinished business in relation to its inquiry on strategic thinking, and that the specialist advisers will be champing at the bit, wanting their remuneration to be extended to an inquiry that will continue—dare one say, *ad infinitum*? Maybe; I do not know. But I think that something like this should not go through the House without Members having been alerted to its potential consequences and implications, which is why I have spoken about the motion in this way.

John Spellar: I thank the hon. Gentleman for giving way again; he is being very generous. According to his reading on the background of the Committee, does it intend to hold hearings and evidence sessions, and would that mean that all the Select Committee Chairs would have to attend weekly sessions in order to hear the evidence and then prepare the report?

Sir Christopher Chope: That is a very good point. The Committee is specifically calling for written evidence. Normally, when Select Committees call for written evidence and that evidence comes in, they decide that the most compelling evidence should probably be supplemented by oral evidence from those who have submitted the written evidence. It is, I presume, implicit in the fact that the Committee has invited written evidence that it will also receive oral evidence and will cross-examine, or question, some of the people who have submitted that written evidence, whether it be from Members of the Australian Parliament, the Canadian Parliament or the Hungarian Parliament. Who knows, but I imagine that they will be holding oral evidence sessions. As the right hon. Member for Warley (John Spellar) implies, if an oral evidence session is not within the remit of the one

[*Sir Christopher Chope*]

of the specific Sub-Committees of the Liaison Committee, to which I referred earlier, there will be a need for a quorum and for people to be there paying close attention to the evidence.

Where are we going? This is essentially a new Select Committee that is being expanded to cover everybody else's areas of responsibility so that it can have a grandiose role. It is not sufficient for it to be able to hold the Prime Minister to account and allocate questions to the Prime Minister among Liaison Committee members—now we are getting into the whole area not of the role of Select Committees in holding the Government to account on their strategic challenges, but of the strategic challenges in toto.

In summary, what I am really saying is that I despair. I despair that this proposal has reached the stage it has. I look forward to hearing an explanation from the Leader of the House about why she thinks this is a good move. I hope that she will be able to explain how our fears and concerns about dangerous precedents can be allayed. Strategic thinking is perhaps just the start of a takeover bid by the Liaison Committee of almost all the other subjects that are the remit of individual Select Committees at the moment. Who knows? In the absence of any contribution from the Chair of the Liaison Committee himself, we depend on the knowledge that the Leader of the House has gained from the briefing that she has no doubt received, as I did, from the Liaison Committee.

I am all in favour of strategic thinking and of scrutinising the Government's strategic thinking, but I do not think that this is the right way forward.

Sir Bernard Jenkin (Harwich and North Essex) (Con): On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. May I, through you, apologise for not having been present from the start of these proceedings? I was not expecting this business to be debated this evening; I should have been more alert, as my hon. Friend the Member for Christchurch (Sir Christopher Chope) has been, to the possibility that it would be.

I would not consider it appropriate to try to catch your eye to make a contribution to this debate, Madam Deputy Speaker—unless you deemed it appropriate.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): I did say that if the right hon. Gentleman wanted to make a contribution, he should have been here at the beginning. May I clarify whether he was told that he would be referred to in the debate?

Sir Bernard Jenkin: I do not think we need to make an issue of that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I was going to say that if the right hon. Gentleman had not been told, it would be perfectly reasonable for him to make a contribution. In the circumstances, I am prepared to allow him to make a one-minute contribution.

9.48 pm

Sir Bernard Jenkin: I am most grateful, Madam Deputy Speaker; I appreciate the courtesy being extended to me.

First, I should reiterate that there is support among all the Select Committee Chairs for the inquiry. Secondly, the issue is about the effectiveness of Select Committee scrutiny. Many Select Committees find it difficult to obtain information about long-term challenges facing this country, particularly if they are cross-departmental issues. The Select Committee's inquiry will be concentrating on that. Thirdly, there is ample precedent for Liaison Committee inquiries into the effectiveness of the Select Committee system. That is what the Liaison Committee exists to do and it is firmly within its remit. We are confining ourselves to that.

Sir Christopher Chope: I am delighted to hear from my hon. Friend that the Liaison Committee will confine itself to that but, in that case, why are the terms of reference calling for written evidence by 15 September so widely set that they cover—I will not repeat all those points, Madam Deputy Speaker—which Governments around the world demonstrate best practice in strategic thinking? There are also references to strategic thinking about Select Committees—

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): Order. I want to call the Leader of the House, so I do not want the hon. Gentleman to read out a list.

Sir Bernard Jenkin: I am most grateful to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and to my hon. Friend the Member for Christchurch (Sir Christopher Chope), who is talking about the context of the inquiry. How can we conduct the inquiry in a vacuum, without reference to what happens in other countries, what other Parliaments are doing to scrutinise long-term strategic thinking, and what other Governments are doing in response? There is a strong public interest in this, and I have held a very close interest in the subject matter, which he generously acknowledges.

This is not a threat to Select Committees. The Chairman of the Defence Committee, on which the right hon. Member for Warley (John Spellar) sits, has supported this inquiry, and I hope he will take part. We do not imagine that we will have a great number of oral evidence sessions, because Select Committee Chairs are so busy. Much of this will be conducted on a desktop basis through written evidence, rather than through oral evidence sessions.

I hope that clarifies it for the House, and I am most grateful to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for allowing me to make a contribution under these circumstances.

9.51 pm

The Leader of the House of Commons (Penny Mordaunt): I thank all Members who have taken part in the debate.

I tabled today's motion following a request from the Chairman of the Liaison Committee, with the blessing of the Liaison Committee. I am facilitating that request.

On mission creep, the Chairman of the Liaison Committee has set out why the inquiry is taking place, but hon. Members should note that the change we are making limits the appointment of special advisers to this particular inquiry. The appointment will be made within the current budget envelope.

Members may be interested to know that, as the shadow Leader of the House will verify, the Commission discussed the work of Select Committees at its last

meeting—those minutes have been published—and the Finance Committee is taking a greater role in scrutinising the work of Select Committees and ensuring value for money.

We are not here to debate the merits of this particular inquiry, although hon. Members will know the previous work of the Chairman of the Liaison Committee in this area. What we are here to decide is whether the Committee should have a special adviser to assist it in this particular inquiry.

I commend the motion to the House.

Question put and agreed to.

Business without Debate

TRANSPORT

Ordered,

That Chris Loder be discharged from the Transport Committee and Sara Britcliffe be added.—(*Sir Bill Wiggin, on behalf of the Committee of Selection.*)

Covid-19 Pandemic: Fiscal Policies

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(*Mike Wood.*)

9.54 pm

Mary Kelly Foy (City of Durham) (Lab): The austerity programme has been one of the most damaging policies our country has seen in decades, and one statistic demonstrates its complete failure: there were more than 300,000 excess deaths between 2012 and 2019. More than 300,000 people died as a result of austerity—they were human beings, with families and friends. Like us, they had aspirations and dreams, but now they are gone, perhaps because of decisions made in Departments and in this House. That is an injustice; after all, the first duty of the British Government is to keep their citizens safe and the country secure. Were those 300,000 people kept safe? Evidently, they were not. That is the sort of statistic that future generations will read and wonder how on earth we could have allowed it to happen.

The subject of my debate is fiscal policies and the covid-19 pandemic, but what I want to get at is the extent to which austerity left us unprepared for the pandemic. I started with that statistic to present the situation in Britain prior to the outbreak of the virus. My speech will discuss healthcare, and the Minister may think, “What’s this got to do with the Treasury?”. I hope that I can convince him on that by saying that our health services require money from his Department, because what matters about cuts is their effects.

It is clear that the austerity programme hollowed out our welfare state, including the NHS. To be ready for a pandemic, we need a strong healthcare system, but we just did not have that in 2020. I was outraged by former Prime Minister David Cameron and former Chancellor George Osborne at the covid inquiry. They denied that their austerity programme had any impact on the pandemic, and it was especially chilling watching George Osborne. Their justification for austerity is at odds with scientific evidence and opinion, which I shall outline.

In their expert evidence to the covid-19 inquiry last month, Professor Clare Bambra and Professor Sir Michael Marmot stated that austerity policies post-2010 had an adverse effect on health inequalities; that health inequalities narrowed in the period of higher public expenditure, from about 2000 to 2010, but widened again post 2010—

Jim Shannon (Strangford) (DUP): I commend the hon. Lady for securing this debate. She is right to say that covid has affected health, but it has also affected finance. Does she agree that covid-19 will have rippling effects upon finances for years to come, and that many people are now grappling with the reality of prices increasing at a greater rate than wages? Does she also agree that the Government must take hold of the financial market once again with a firm grasp and with a strategy to help families in my constituency and hers, and indeed across this great United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland?

Mary Kelly Foy: I thank the hon. Gentleman for that intervention, and I will come on to that issue in my speech. He is completely right that there will be an ongoing impact on future generations not only from covid, but from the impact on the public purse.

[Mary Kelly Foy]

The scientific research also found that between 2000 and 2010, geographical inequalities such as infant mortality rates and life expectancy were reduced, but they then increased after 2010. Why did that happen? It was about money. By 2019-20, after a series of austerity Budgets, health spending was about £50 billion below what it should have been had it matched previous Government commitments. This far surpasses the much-vaunted cash injection of £20 billion between 2019 and 2024 as part of the NHS long-term plan. That level was too little, too late for what was to come.

The results of austerity are not hard to find right across the NHS, with one of the more tangible measures being bed capacity. Between 2010-11 and 2019-20, the average daily total of available beds contracted by 8.3%—nearly 13,000 beds. Britain had less than half the number of critical care beds relative to its population than the average in OECD European Union nations.

Austerity also meant years of pay caps and pay freezes. In other words, there were pay cuts, in real terms, for NHS workers. They were earning thousands of pounds less in real terms in 2019 than in 2010.

10 pm

Motion lapsed (Standing Order No. 9(3)).

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—(Mike Wood.)

Mary Kelly Foy: Look at the situation with the Nightingale hospitals. They were a good idea in theory, but there were not enough workers available. It was like a sketch in “Yes Minister”—a hospital with no patients, only in this case there were no workers either.

Since the coalition Government’s Health and Social Care Act 2012, which threw all the pieces of the NHS up into the air, no single entity has been responsible for workforce planning. Consequently, staffing over the past decade has been poor and disjointed, and there has been a lack of the staffing projections needed to ensure we have enough health workers to meet demand. So work became more intense, with more turnover and more burnout. This was before the pandemic and should have been a warning signal to the Government.

Let us not forget the removal of the nurses’ bursaries in 2016, which led to a decline in nursing applications in the ensuing years. That has contributed to nursing numbers not keeping pace with demand. In the first quarter of 2019-20, the number of nursing vacancies increased to over 40,000. I know the Government U-turned on that, but why did it happen in the first place?

Staff shortages put enormous pressure on NHS workers. I do not want to be too sentimental, but I do not know how they did it during the pandemic. The demands put on those workers were enormous and the fortitude and resilience of NHS workers was remarkable. In addition, a lack of personal protective equipment caused them huge levels of stress, risking their mental and physical health. How about we start showing a bit of gratitude by giving them the pay rise they have asked for?

Public health, which is such a vital part of our defences, has been the victim of a toxic combination of austerity and ill thought through structural change.

As a result, we went into the pandemic with public health services that were ill equipped to handle the arrival of covid.

As part of the coalition Government’s 2012 reforms, public health functions were separated from the NHS and put into local authorities, which I and other members of the health system welcomed. Between 2015 and 2020, the local authority public health grant fell by around a quarter in real terms. Between 2016 and 2019, Public Health England’s budget was cut by 12%. Restructuring of the workforce resulted in experience bleeding away. The number of people working in public health was not enough to meet demand. By 2021, England needed almost 60% more public health specialists to reach levels recommended by the Faculty of Public Health. The voice and influence of public health specialists has been increasingly stifled, and the value placed in their expertise diminished.

Britain was severely on the back foot when the pandemic hit us in early 2020. The NHS was operating without enough staff, there were not enough beds and our buildings were outdated. The failure to ensure that the NHS was properly staffed and resourced in the decade leading up to the pandemic meant that when the pandemic arrived, there was no capacity to meet the increase in demand.

Sickness absence from covid shrunk an already depleted workforce, and the need to separate groups of patients limited capacity further. That meant drastic measures such as pausing nearly all routine care in hospitals, redeploying staff and registering medical students early. There is no doubt that both staff and patients were put in harm’s way because of the historic underfunding, under-resourcing and austerity.

Can the Government say that they were not warned? No, they cannot. MPs, trade unions and even the United Nations all warned the Government. When the UN said that the results of the austerity experiment were “crystal clear”—that our social security net had been torn asunder by austerity—the Government said that they regretted the “overtly political tone” of the UN’s report. Cameron and Osborne’s project failed on its own terms: the books were not, as they often told us, balanced. In fact, we are all worse off because of their actions. History will not absolve them, because, with austerity, there is always a price to pay. Thousands of people are dead, and our welfare state was pushed to the brink. Austerity severely impacted our response to the pandemic, and it must never happen again. The Government have several fiscal events until the next election, and they can change things if they want to.

10.5 pm

The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Andrew Griffith): I congratulate the hon. Member for City of Durham (Mary Kelly Foy) on securing this evening’s debate.

In debating the Government’s fiscal policies, as in so many things, it is all important to set out the context. When the Government were first elected, it was in the immediate wake of the global financial crisis. It was also after we inherited a situation that had led to the Labour Chief Secretary to the Treasury leaving a note—we all remember that note—that said, “There is, I am afraid, no money left.”

In the years preceding the covid-19 pandemic, the Government’s fiscal strategy—the only fiscal strategy—was to reduce the deficit and debt that Labour had left us.

As a long-standing finance director myself before coming to this place, I know that Government need to live within their means and show responsibility when entrusted with people's hard-earned money. That was the time to repair the nation's finances—before a storm would strike. When the deficit reached 7.5% of GDP in 2008-09, Government decisions supported its reduction to 2.7% of GDP by 2019-20. That approach developed the financial buffers to help absorb the impact of future economic shocks, such as we saw in the pandemic. Yet despite that period, and rather belying what the hon. Lady said, we have still been able to provide departmental spending today that will be around £75 billion a year more, in real terms, by 2027 than in 2010.

It is no wonder, then, that at the time when we took that approach, it received the support of Parliament. It was in line with the recommendations then for best practice. For example, the 2017 fiscal risks report of the independent Office for Budget Responsibility said that

“the public finances need to be managed prudently during more favourable times to ensure that when these shocks do crystallise they do not put the public finances onto an unsustainable path.”

That was why, when the pandemic hit, we were well placed to borrow to provide quick, decisive and consistent support to households and businesses throughout the country, which at that time had significant support from Members on both sides of the House. Estimates from the International Monetary Fund showed that the UK's discretionary fiscal expansion in response to covid-19—the support that we gave households—was one of the largest and most comprehensive financial support packages globally.

To fund that response, we had to borrow an additional £313 billion—a huge amount of money—across 2021 and 2022, but we could not have done that had we not made the difficult decisions. Had we not acted, the cost to the country would have been far higher. Members will remember the support that we provided, including the furlough scheme, which supported nearly 12 million jobs in total, holding our economy together in incredibly tough times. I note that some 420,000 of those jobs were in the north-east, and that since the pandemic has ended the north-east has had the third-highest increase in employee numbers relative to pre-pandemic levels. The economy in the north-east has been one of the fastest growing.

I also note that, as is sadly so often the case on such occasions, the hon. Member for City of Durham had no alternative plans to lay out. I do not know whether she agrees with the North of Tyne Mayor, Jamie Driscoll, who today said, in respect of the right hon. and learned Member for Holborn and St Pancras (Keir Starmer):

“You've U-turned on so many promises...in fact, a list of broken promises too long to repeat in this letter.”

I do not know whether she has seen the letter from Jamie Driscoll, or whether she agrees with the right hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Angela Rayner) or the right hon. and learned Member for Holborn and St Pancras on an issue like the two child policy. Our policy is clear. I do not think that it is appropriate for the Opposition to hold two policies simultaneously in respect of the two child policy.

When we look back on the pandemic, and on our fiscal approaches both during and in the run-up to it, the Government believe that we can be confident that we acted responsibly. We took difficult decisions on the back of the financial situation that we inherited, allowing us, when that terrible pandemic broke above our heads, to protect livelihoods up and down the country, and ensuring that we could afford to do so and could bounce back afterwards, as we have done subsequently. That was, and remains, sound, responsible fiscal policy.

I understand that not every Member of this House will agree with the decisions taken. I hope that the hon. Member for City of Durham will recognise that many people on both sides of this House did their best in those most difficult times.

Mary Kelly Foy: I am quite surprised and confused. I gave statistics about how many deaths there were, and specialists across the board, including the United Nations, have pointed out the damage done by the austerity programme. I have no idea why you mentioned the two child limit. It would have been really helpful if you had stuck to the point of my debate.

Madam Deputy Speaker (Dame Rosie Winterton): Order. The hon. Lady knows that she must not address the Minister directly.

Andrew Griffith: I will not delay us on the two child policy—the Labour party's two-policy policy. Perhaps it was a detour too far for the hon. Lady. I made that point just to illustrate that these are difficult decisions for those on both sides of the House, as it turns out.

I recognise the hon. Lady's passion and congratulate her again on securing the debate. It is clearly a topic that she rightly feels strongly about, and I apologise if I have not fully addressed all her concerns. It is of course a topic that the independent inquiry is addressing, and I, and I expect the House, look forward to hearing the outcome of that inquiry in due course.

Question put and agreed to.

10.13 pm

House adjourned.

Westminster Hall

Monday 17 July 2023

[SIR MARK HENDRICK *in the Chair*]

Teaching Assistant Pay

[*Relevant document: Summary of public engagement by the Petitions Committee, on pay for teaching assistants, reported to the House on 12 July, HC 73.*]

4.30 pm

Tonia Antoniazzi (Gower) (Lab): I beg to move,

That this House has considered e-petition 620264, relating to pay for teaching assistants.

It is an honour to serve under your chairship, Sir Mark. Some 88,410 people signed this petition, including 178 in my constituency. The Petitions Committee received 22,506 responses to its survey, of which 84% were teaching assistants and 3% were former teaching assistants. Some 5% were teachers or headteachers, while 4% were other staff who work in a school. Some 2% were close friends or family members of a teaching assistant, and 1% were parents or guardians of a school-age child.

This issue is particularly close to my heart, because before I was elected as the Member of Parliament for Gower, I was a secondary school teacher, and I have worked with dozens of teaching assistants over my career, which also included eight years working in the north-west of England in four different schools. I know at first hand how invaluable the support that they provide is in not just running a classroom, but supporting pupils to achieve their full potential. I have also seen how their roles over the years have been dismissed and devalued—the last in the list when it comes to progression and development, but the first roles to be cut when budgets are. There is an expectation of unpaid after-hours work just to fill the gaps left by schools when they are cutting budgets and when public services are being cut more broadly, and they provide key pastoral care and wellbeing support. In far too many cases, they must provide physical support when they are neither trained nor remunerated for that work.

The petition calls for the work that teaching assistants do to be reflected in their pay. Before I discuss the issue specifically, I will tell hon. Members more about the work that teaching assistants do, as it is clear that the role they play in our schools is not fully understood. In fact, the Government's own "Opportunity for all: strong schools with great teachers for your child" White Paper published in March 2022 used the phrase "teaching assistant" only twice, and it failed to mention their pay or progression. Teaching assistants take on a variety of roles, from ensuring that students have nutritious meals in school to delivering structured interventions to help pupils to progress, working and planning closely with classroom teachers and senior leaders. They play a key role in tackling inequalities and improving attainment, especially for those pupils who are falling behind, or who have additional special learning or mental health needs or behavioural issues.

Research by the Education Endowment Foundation found that teaching assistants who provide one-to-one or small, group-targeted interventions can result in

pupils achieving between four and six additional months' progress on average. A 2019 research project for the Department for Education found that senior leaders placed a high value on the capacity of teaching assistants to improve classroom management and other staff workload pressures. Those same senior managers reported that budget restraints saw teaching assistants being forced to do more and more without corresponding increases in pay.

Teaching assistants are doing that work in an increasingly challenging environment. The impact of the pandemic is still being felt strongly in schools and across communities, with the crisis in children's mental health and wellbeing being one of the starkest reminders to us all. There has been a 77% rise in the number of children needing specialist treatment for a severe mental health crisis from April to October 2021, compared with April to October 2019; in that context, the care and attention provided by teaching assistants is more vital than ever before.

Research by the University of Portsmouth, commissioned by Unison, found that the covid period "remade" the teaching assistant role, and that the changes are likely to be long lasting. The role has become even more varied, intense and emotionally demanding, with more support being given to parents and carers, and more backfilling for specialist staff; add to that the fact that there is a desperate lack of places in specialist schools, and the role of a teaching assistant has become more and more complex. There are also many parents who wish for their child to have mainstream education and not be put in a specialist educational environment. Therefore, the role of a teaching assistant, as I have seen at first hand, is key for inclusivity in all classrooms and schools across the United Kingdom.

A Unison survey found that many teaching assistants were expected to provide medical as well as educational support. Twenty seven per cent reported providing physical therapy, 65% reported supporting pupils with toileting and soiling incidents—and that was not just in primary schools—and 7% were providing assistance with both catheters and colostomy bags. While they provide that essential support, the survey found that 48% of teaching assistants do not feel valued as a member of staff by their school. There is a real concern about the experiences of teaching assistants that we cannot ignore.

A study by the University of Roehampton found that teaching assistants were kicked, punched and spat at by pupils, with one interviewee experiencing a spinal injury and forced to take early retirement; that is not the first such case that I have heard of throughout my career. Some teaching assistants reported that violent students were given lesser sanctions for attacking them than they would receive for attacking teachers or senior managers. The prevalence of physical violence against teaching assistants, many of whom are women, risks normalising violence against women to children who are present, as well as being entirely unacceptable to classroom staff. One teaching assistant responding to the Committee's survey said:

"The amount of children coming into mainstream schools with behavioural problems is increasing and some are very violent which is hard to cope with physically and mentally. It also has an impact on the rest of the children in the class as it disrupts their learning, and they also get very distressed. It falls on TAs to work with these children without any training. It's unfair on staff and children as there is no support for us."

[Tonia Antoniazzi]

Working in such conditions, it cannot be surprising that nearly 50% of those surveyed by Unison are actively looking for better paid work. I know from my own experience that many of the women I worked with who were teaching assistants moved on to other work or had numerous jobs. Teaching assistants are some of the lowest paid public sector workers, sitting at the bottom of local government pay scales. The majority of local authorities use the National Joint Council pay spine, and although academy trusts are not obligated to use that scale, some do. The bottom end of the NJC pay spine is lower than the living wage. The mean salary of full-time and part-time teaching assistants in state-funded schools in England from 2020 to 2021 was only £19,000. One respondent to the Committee's survey highlighted the reality of the pay for teaching assistants:

"Poor pay is now a real concern. Due to my hours being term time only and this is pro rata over the year. I actually only bring home around £14k which is a very poor salary in today's situation."

The average take-home salary for a teaching assistant is £14,211.

It is an issue that depends on the person's sex. Many women who are mothers find that working as a teaching assistant will fit in with their children and be convenient. But we do not want it to be a job of convenience; it has to be a job with pay progression that also offers the right work environment. As I said, 92% of teaching assistants are women, and the chronic undervaluing of what is perceived as women's work has created a situation where key workers find themselves below the poverty line. Is it any wonder that, along with nearly half of teaching assistants looking for new roles with better pay, 28% are having to take on second or third jobs to make ends meet, and 43% have had to borrow money from family?

The impact of low pay is amplified by the cost of living crisis, particularly where we find ourselves today. In response to a 2022 survey by the GMB, one teaching assistant said:

"It is very stressful trying to manage bills and food costs. We now wear extra layers and use hot water bottles as we are extremely worried about finding the money to pay the bills and not get into debt."

Members of the GMB report that they regularly pay for essential items such as food and toilet paper for their schools and pupils out of their own pockets. I saw that happening in all my teaching jobs—before covid and before I was in this place.

Only 4% of respondents to the survey agreed with the statement "my pay is keeping up with the cost of living," because it is not. Sixty-six per cent said that they could not afford necessities for themselves each month, and 73% said they could not afford necessities for their families. This response from one teaching assistant really sums up the issue:

"We work at home unpaid to prepare resources, do research and training. We often stay late and arrive early also unpaid. I would like our pay to reflect the role we do. I am a mother of three. Myself and my husband work full time... I eat less to feed my children, I go without clothes, haircuts and non-essentials to make sure my children have all they need."

Low wages do not only impact current teaching assistants. The disparity between these wages and other comparable work means that schools are struggling to

attract and retain new teaching assistants. The Education Research, Innovation and Consultancy Unit has warned that there is a

"new emergency over TA recruitment and retention",

which the Minister will be aware of. In 2020, it was reported that vacancy rates were higher for teaching assistants than for any other occupation, and 90% of teaching assistants who responded to the Committee's survey said that they had considered leaving the role. One respondent, who is a headteacher, said:

"Teaching assistants are one of the most important resources in my school. I am losing highly skilled, trained, experienced TAs who are leaving to take up posts in supermarkets and other work which is paid better."

That is not to undermine the value of retail work, but it does highlight the impact of low wages on retaining—as another respondent said—"amazing teaching assistants".

Recent research by SchoolDash found that support staff vacancies are up by 85% compared with before the pandemic. Numerous other employers, from supermarkets to warehouses, are now offering variations on term-time only contracts in a direct attempt to recruit school support staff on more competitive terms than schools can offer. It should not be a competition. In addition to low pay, school support staff are cut off from career development opportunities as they are ineligible for careers programmes, scholarships and the new national professional qualifications, which currently apply only to teachers, school leaders and special educational needs co-ordinators.

The decisions we make about our education system should be driven by what is best for pupils, and teaching assistants have an enormous positive impact on their attainment and experience. Teaching assistants are proven to improve classroom behaviour, which is especially true for children who are all too often let down by mainstream education. Teaching assistants are reported to be effective at lowering exclusion rates for particular groups where they are often deployed to provide personal learning support, including pupils identified with special educational needs and disabilities, those with poor mental health, and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children. Despite that, teaching assistants are not eligible for the SEN allowance afforded to teachers. According to the Department for Education's own review of academic evidence, 91% of primary school teachers and 75% of secondary school teachers were very or fairly confident about the positive impact of support staff on pupils' learning, and other studies have found that teaching assistants can have a positive effect on children in their care.

Our schooling system is severely underfunded, with real-terms pay cuts, the closing of services and crumbling buildings; this is what we have to show for a decade of under-investment in the future of our children. In the long term, our education system needs a radical new approach to funding, but as a first step towards that much-needed reform I can think of no better place to start than improving the salary and recognition of teaching assistants.

I close my remarks with a quote from a teacher in response to the Committee's survey:

"[Teaching assistants] are all too often the only reason a student will stay in school. Their nurturing nature and patience is priceless, their ability to break down work so a student can understand is phenomenal. Pay them what they deserve!"

4.45 pm

Mr Robin Walker (Worcester) (Con): I do not plan to speak at length but am happy to speak briefly. I very much welcome the hon. Member for Gower (Tonia Antoniazzi) making the case for teaching assistants, and I should declare a family interest: I am the brother of a teaching assistant who works in special educational needs setting. I recognise the incredibly important work that teaching assistants do, which the hon. Lady has encapsulated well.

We would all like to see everyone in the education system better paid for what they do and their activities recognised, but I want to highlight the specific challenge, particularly for our special educational needs schools, when it comes to funding teaching assistants. In the recently announced pay offer, which I strongly welcome, we saw an improvement to the usual situation in that the offer covers not just schools, but further education; that is very welcome. The challenge, though, is that when successive Governments have funded teachers' pay, they have not provided the same support for schools when it comes to teaching assistants' pay. Even the lower increases that we have seen through the local authority pay bands have not been funded by the Treasury and the Department for Education in the same way that the teachers' pay increases have over the years. That has increased the pressure on schools, particularly special educational needs schools, such as Fort Royal Primary School in my constituency, which have to—quite rightly, in order to meet need—employ a large number of teaching assistants.

I know that the Minister for Schools, my right hon. Friend the Member for Bognor Regis and Littlehampton (Nick Gibb), will quite rightly point out that the Government have more than doubled high needs funding—I welcome that and know there is significantly more money going into the area—but that doubling of funding is in response to demand and to what the Children's Minister, my hon. Friend the Member for East Surrey (Claire Coutinho), has acknowledged is a rising level of need in our schools. I speak in this debate to urge my right hon. Friend the Schools Minister to consider how, particularly with our special educational needs schools, but also with our mainstream schools that are supporting more and more children with SEN, we can ensure that pay awards reach teaching assistants and, crucially, that they are fully and properly funded; otherwise, we will have a situation where, in order for schools to meet their commitments to teachers' pay and other areas they want to support through investment, they unfortunately have to cut back on the very important work of teaching assistants.

I join the hon. Member for Gower in recognising the quality, quantity and range of teaching assistants' work, and the important role they play in supporting inclusion. The Education Committee has looked at the issue of persistent absence in school, and we have found that inclusion is crucial. Making sure that children's needs are met is a crucial part of ensuring they can continue to attend school. I do not pretend that this is an easy area; on one small point of defence—the White Paper, which I co-wrote, did mention the work of teaching assistants in a couple of areas, as hon. Lady pointed out, but it also talked about apprenticeships and degree apprenticeships, which are a real opportunity to build a route of progression for teaching assistants. I have seen

some very interesting schools that have found teaching assistants, sports assistants and meal assistants who are able and excited to move up into the teaching profession, and those schools have provided support for them to do so and a route for further progression. I would love the Government to look at what further routes of progression could be built for teaching assistants so that more of them can go on—perhaps when the children have grown up and flown the nest, as is the case for my sister—into a career in teaching.

4.49 pm

Tim Farron (Westmorland and Lonsdale) (LD): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship this afternoon, Sir Mark. I congratulate the hon. Member for Gower (Tonia Antoniazzi) on an excellent speech, and I thank the people who signed the petition. Some 1,000 or more in Cumbria signed the petition, which might reflect the fact that we are a community of many schools, not least because of the rural nature of much of Cumbria, which means that many of those schools are very small. In my visits around Westmorland in recent weeks and months, I have been to primary schools with as many as 450 children, as few as 13 and all points in between. The value of teaching assistants in each of those schools—a primary school, a high school and a special educational needs school—is immense, and it is important that we recognise that.

One thing I hope we can achieve in this debate—I hope that we can achieve much more—is to put on record the collective gratitude of Members on both sides of the House to people who choose to enter this profession. The value of teaching assistants is immense. They assist—as one might expect from the title of the profession—teachers to teach. If a teacher is dealing with, say, 30 children of a range of abilities, teaching assistants allow them to focus on the delivery of the subject matter, and teaching assistants get alongside those children, whether they are ahead, behind or in the middle of the pack. As we have heard, that is of enormous and transformational value in terms of children's ability to succeed later in life. Particularly at primary school level, teaching assistants help children to get a love of learning and understand how to learn independently, at least to some small degree, so they can go on to learn with a greater level of maturity once they get to higher education.

Teaching assistants' qualities are immense, their value is immense and they are not well paid, as we have heard. The hon. Member for Gower read out a number of powerful statistics, and I hope that people pay attention to them. Perhaps the most powerful is that although the median or average wage of a teaching assistant is around £19,000 a year, many of them are term time only—some of them by their own choice and some of them because of the school's budgetary constraints—which means that their average income is just over £14,000.

That will have an ever bigger impact in the more expensive places to stay, so I want to make a particular case for the Minister to bear in mind how things are for us in Westmorland and Furness. In our community, the average house price is more than 12 and a half times the average household income. In the last three years, the long-term private rented sector has almost evaporated into Airbnb. Along with the steady rise of second home ownership, which has gobbled up the housing market in much of the lakes and the dales, that means that there is

[Tim Farron]

basically no housing that is even remotely affordable or available for people on anything other than a staggering salary.

That affects not just teaching assistants but people working in care, hospitality and tourism, and every other profession. We have a massive workforce crisis, which is seen very clearly, school by school, when it comes to teaching assistants. Westmorland and Furness Council receives no provision, and neither do other councils similar to ours, to acknowledge the vast gap between average wages and average house prices and rental prices. That means that we are starved of a workforce, so we are very grateful for every person who chooses to work in the profession.

We have also heard, rightly, about the issue of career progression. If someone does not feel that there is a way through their profession into a higher level of qualification—potentially even becoming a qualified teacher at some point—their morale and the ability to retain those people in the profession will be affected. We see that school by school and, I am sure, constituency by constituency: people who have great qualities and the ability to add even more value to their communities are being stymied, reaching a glass ceiling and therefore leaving the profession altogether.

We of course see people leaving education because of salaries. In particular, in my community that is because there is great pressure on our workforce for a variety of reasons—I have mentioned housing, but there are others. Nearly two thirds of the hospitality and tourism businesses in my patch are operating below capacity, because they do not have enough staff. That means that those who have the wherewithal can therefore increase their terms and conditions and salaries—that is great—but teaching assistants, care workers and others are the pool of labour that is being redistributed into the private sector away from teaching assistant and care assistant roles, and we are suffering as a consequence.

I have been to lots of schools recently. In the past few weeks, I have been to many of the schools in Kendal, Brough, Tebay, Kirkby Stephen, Appleby, Great Asby, Clifton, Witherslack, Shap, Windermere, Crosby Ravensworth, Kirby Lonsdale and Crosthwaite. The No. 1 issue that they raise—and I think that this will be obvious to most Members present—is that of salary, pay and where that money comes from. There has been no central or local authority funding to address rising energy costs. Teachers' pay awards are overdue and insufficient, yet schools have not been funded to pay for them, either. The current pay offer looks like 6.5% but more than half of that will have to come from within school budgets. They cannot find the money. What can schools do? They cannot put prices up or increase their commercial revenue. They will, of course, pay the teachers their pay award, but that will mean having to cut other staff—which very often means teaching assistants. I am afraid that it looks like schools are having to pit teachers' pay awards against having teaching assistants. These folk, who are on low wages but do immense work, are being let go. I cannot think of a single school in my part of Cumbria that is not at least contemplating doing that.

I ask the Minister to think very carefully about the impact on children of having demoralised teaching assistants who are either taking second and third jobs

just to keep themselves going or, more likely, leaving the profession altogether. What does that mean for the quality of education? What does it mean for the stress levels of the teachers left behind to deal with large classes without any help whatsoever? What does it mean for children with special educational needs? We know how long it takes these days to get an education, health and care plan. Schools and teaching assistants have to carry the load before an EHCP is provided, and even when one is provided it is the schools that have to come up with the first £6,000 of the cost. Teaching assistants spend time with those children with the greatest level of need. If we want them to thrive, we need to invest in them, and that means paying people enough to keep them in their profession for a long time.

In conclusion, if the Minister is going to take this issue seriously and do more than pay lip service to how much we value teaching assistants, he will ensure that schools are adequately funded to provide the pay rises that they are being asked to make. That will enable them to keep their current staff and pay them properly. The huge cost of living disparities in authorities such as mine mean that many people, including teaching assistants, are being lost to the workforce. The Minister should therefore also arrange a special alteration to the formula for Westmorland and Furness so that our schools can pay teaching assistants adequately and they can afford a place to live. Finally, as has been said by Members on both sides of the House, we ought to be retaining teaching assistants by valuing them, creating a career structure and ensuring that the options on the table include the ability to progress directly into the training profession. In the end, we must value our teaching assistants not just through what we say but through what we do.

4.58 pm

Stephen Morgan (Portsmouth South) (Lab): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Mark. I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Gower (Tonia Antoniazzi) for opening the debate. I also thank all those who have signed the petition for bringing this pressing matter to our attention.

I pay tribute to all teaching assistants and school support staff across the country for their hard work and dedication. The essential support that they provide is invaluable in shaping the lives and futures of our children. As a former teacher, my hon. Friend spoke with insight and expertise about the challenges that teaching assistants face and the invaluable role that they play in schools, tackling inequalities, supporting children who are falling behind, improving progress, helping with mental health interventions. I am also very grateful to her for basing her contribution on research and evidence, especially from the University of Portsmouth, in particular on the conditions caused by the pandemic, including the concerning levels of physical assault. I thank her again for securing this debate and for her excellent speech.

The quality of teaching is the most important influence on improving children's outcomes and delivering to them a high-quality education. As we know, teaching assistants are an essential part of that, offering supervision and encouragement to pupils, supporting teachers and assisting classroom management, and organising and assisting with extracurricular activities, as well as helping at breaks and lunchtimes. TAs help to create an environment

that is conducive for effective teaching and learning, and they are a fundamental part of our education system. I also pay tribute to the extraordinary dedication of teaching assistants during the covid pandemic, supporting vulnerable children and the children of key workers. It is difficult to see how our school system would have managed without them.

Unfortunately, despite the integral role that they play, TAs and the wider teaching profession have been consistently overlooked and undervalued by this Government. According to a survey this year by the National Education Union, three out of every four TAs are routinely working out-of-contract hours and nearly half of TAs undertake cover supervision.

Increasingly, we hear stories of TAs leaving the profession to take up better-paid jobs elsewhere, as my hon. Friend the Member for Gower stated earlier. Even more worryingly, support staff are turning increasingly to food banks, as confirmed by the charity Education Support in *The Times Educational Supplement* today, to cope with the cost of living crisis. Yet despite these struggles, many teaching assistants are still helping struggling pupils from their own pocket with food, uniform and school supply costs, as I have seen at first hand from visiting schools across the country.

It is no surprise that school support staff vacancies have almost doubled since the start of the pandemic, with schools being forced to turn to supply teaching assistants from recruitment agencies to fill those vacancies, which eats further into their tight budgets. Indeed, recent analysis by my party has found that schools have spent £8 billion on such fees since 2010.

Support staff shortages hit those areas with more poorer pupils the hardest, as they often include schools with the largest class sizes and the most need for individualised support. The loss of school support staff also disproportionately impacts students with special educational needs, as we heard earlier, because they rely on vital one-to-one support and are often in need of additional pastoral care. Since 2010, TAs have been pushed into responsibilities that go way beyond their contract and job description, often picking up the pieces for overstretched teachers, acting as cover or stepping in for school nurses.

Cuts to youth services and wraparound services since 2010 have also placed a heavy burden on schools. And in the midst of a mental health crisis among our young people, TAs are often out of their depth and overwhelmed. Morale in the sector is not helped when senior Government Ministers describe school support staff in derogatory terms or when the Education Secretary refuses to confront reality and says that reports of teaching assistants leaving for supermarket jobs are “untrue”. When we factor in the increased stress alongside the erosion of pay and conditions, it is not a mystery why many teaching assistants are looking elsewhere for work.

Although the Government do not directly determine the pay of TAs in all schools, they are responsible for investing in authorities and schools that often decide the pay scale. Also, the Government’s inability to grow the economy or run our public services effectively has had a clear impact. In schools, budgets remain below 2010 levels and when budgets are extremely tight, teaching assistants—much to the regret of school leadership—are often the first jobs to be cut.

The impact of these cuts are felt across the school, but they are mostly felt by those children who need the most support, which is likely to be part of the reason why the attainment gap is widening at all stages of children’s learning and is now at its widest in a decade.

Labour is determined to fix this. We will do so by tackling head-on the recruitment and retention crises with school leaders, ensuring that every child has world-class teaching; by valuing rather than belittling the teaching profession, supporting teaching staff to develop as experts in their field; and by recognising and respecting the work of our school support staff, who deliver crucial learning support, especially for children who face the greatest barriers to engaging with education. We will once again make teachers and TAs feel valued and appreciated for the work that they do.

We will work with schools and school leaders to tackle the workloads, expanding the workforce to deliver optimal support for pupils and alleviate strain on staff, which will also be aided by reforming Ofsted. The next Labour Government will provide better working conditions for all workers, including teaching assistants. We want to learn from other professions how they structure pay, progression and ongoing training, to attract and retain the workforce. Our new deal for working people will ensure fair pay and job security for all. We will value every worker and ensure that their skills and expertise are acknowledged and appreciated. We will also provide better training and support structures, to ensure that workers are not pushed out of bounds of their contract.

To ensure that children receive the best possible education, it is crucial that we stand behind those who support them. Teaching assistants deserve to be treated fairly and paid fairly. They deserve to be respected, trusted and appreciated by a Government who recognise the sacrifices that they have made and continue to make to support the children across the country who face the greatest barriers to learning. What they do not deserve is to be overstretched and undervalued by a Government who do not prioritise their needs. The impact of that adversarial attitude on children’s learning has been clear to see.

Therefore, I hope that the Minister, in his response today, will outline what his Department is doing to tackle the growing number of vacancies among school support staff, to retain the excellent teaching assistants currently supporting children across our country’s schools and to once again make the role of teaching assistant valued and respected, as it was under the last Labour Government. I look forward to hearing the Minister’s response and I would like to take this opportunity to thank all speakers for contributing to today’s debate.

5.6 pm

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): It is a pleasure to take part in the debate under your chairship, Sir Mark. I congratulate the hon. Member for Gower (Tonia Antoniazzi) on her well informed and passionate speech opening this debate on the petition relating to pay for teaching assistants. I would like to start by saying that the Government recognise teaching assistants as a valuable part of the school workforce. We appreciate the dedication of our teaching assistants and know the valuable contribution that they make, alongside excellent teachers, to pupils’ education.

[Nick Gibb]

The Department recently published data on the number of teaching assistants through the school workforce census, which showed that there are now 281,000 full-time equivalent teaching assistants in schools. That represents an increase of 5,300 since 2021. Teaching assistants now make up three in 10 of the school workforce overall, accounting for 37% of the nursery and primary workforce, 14% of the secondary workforce and 52% of the special school workforce.

We know that when teaching assistants are well trained and well deployed, they can improve pupil attainment. Evidence from the Education Endowment Foundation shows that teaching assistants can add up to four months' improvement in pupil progress when delivering one-to-one or small group support using structured interventions, as the hon. Member pointed out in her opening speech. That is why we set out in the SEND and AP Green Paper our intention to develop a longer-term approach for teaching assistants, to ensure that their impact is more consistent across the system and that they can specialise in interventions that are proven to work.

Tonia Antoniazzi: I hope the Minister will indulge me. When I was teaching, I had a young man in my classroom called Jac Richards, who was a wheelchair user and non-verbal; he used an Eyegaze. He was well supported by his teaching assistants, Hayley and Joanne, and learnt French from year 7 to year 11. Unfortunately he was unable to sit the GCSE exam, but the gift they gave him in preparing and supporting me to prepare resources for an Eyegaze to teach a young man French was absolutely magic. Also, he participated fully, and this was a mainstream 11-to-16 school. When I say "fully", I mean he was able to come on the trips to France and everything. That is how magic his experience was in school: he was able to be in my classroom and to participate. That is how wonderful teaching assistants are, and I hope that the Minister hears more examples like that, because it really was an honour and a privilege to be able to teach Jac thanks to them.

Nick Gibb: I am delighted that the hon. Member was able to put that on the record. I hope that the teaching assistants she mentioned will see that in *Hansard*. We want those examples to be more consistent right across the country, so the Department already provides support for teaching assistants through a number of programmes, including training to improve maths for teaching assistants through the maths hubs, and to support them to identify and meet the needs of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities through the universal services programme. We are also pioneering innovative practice through the "Early Language and Support for Every Child" pilot to trial new ways of working to better identify and support children with speech, language and communication needs in early years and primary schools.

The Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education, IfATE, recently published a revised level 3 teaching assistant apprenticeship developed by employers, which became available for delivery from 6 May this year. Schools will be able to access up to £7,000 of levy funding to train and upskill teaching assistants. Of course, schools are free to set terms and conditions for

teaching assistants and support staff according to their own circumstances. Local government employees, including school support staff, are covered by the National Joint Council terms and conditions, known as the green book. Most schools, including academies, use the local government pay scales in conjunction with the green book. Local government pay scales are set through negotiation between the Local Government Association, representing the employer, and local government trade unions, such as Unison, Unite and GMB, which represent the employee. Central Government have no formal role in those matters.

Currently, a generous offer is on the table for employees covered by local government pay scales. The offer for 2023-2024 is a flat cash uplift of £1,925 from 1 April 2023. That is the same uplift agreed for the 2022-23 pay deal. If accepted, it would equate to an increase of 9.42% this year for those on the lowest pay scale and an increase of £4,033, or 22%, over the two years since April 2021. We also know that schools can and do pay teaching assistants more than those on the lowest pay scale, currently earning £20,441 per annum. It is disappointing that the unions have rejected that offer, which would provide certainty for staff who are waiting to see an increase in the size of their pay packets. I hope that the pay award can be settled without the use of strike action, as we know that that will impact children's education and cause disruption for parents.

The Government understand the pressures that people face with the cost of living, which is why we are providing £94 billion of support to households with higher costs across the 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years—equivalent to £3,300 per household on average. Points have been raised in the debate about the ability of schools to pay for teaching assistants, particularly in the light of the recent pay award. The Government are committed to providing a world-class education for all children and have invested significantly in schools to achieve that. The 2022 autumn statement announced an additional £2 billion in each of the 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years, over and above totals announced in the spending review in 2021.

In response to the issues raised by the hon. Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale (Tim Farron), let me say that the pay award announced last week is fully funded. Last week, we announced an additional £525 million this year to support schools with a teachers' pay award, and with a further £900 million in 2024-25. That means that funding for mainstream schools and special needs is more than £3.9 billion higher this year compared with last year. That is on top of the £4 billion cash increase last year—an increase of 16% over those two years. We submitted detailed evidence of the schools cost to the pay body, the School Teachers' Review Body, and set out that the first 3.5% of the pay award is already funded by a £3.5 billion increase in school funding, which also included a very pessimistic assumption about energy costs that the hon. Gentleman also mentioned. The extra 3%—between 3.5% and 6.5%—is the funding that I just announced of £525 million this year and £900 million next year. The unions have acknowledged that the pay award has been properly funded.

Next year, school funding will be more than £59.6 billion—the highest ever level of school funding and the highest ever level in real terms and in real terms per pupil, as measured by the Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Schools are expected to use their core budgets to pay for staff, including teaching assistants, and they may use local government pay scales when setting pay. The Department's affordability calculation for schools takes account of the latest pay offer to teaching assistants.

The petition highlighted the importance of teaching assistants supporting children with special educational needs and disabilities. I reiterate the importance of teaching assistants' support to those pupils, and outline our commitment to ensuring that such pupils receive the support they need. High needs funding for children and young people with complex special educational needs and disabilities will rise to £10.1 billion in this financial year, 2023-24; that is an increase of over 50% on the 2019-20 allocations. On top of that funding, special and alternative provision schools will receive an additional £50 million in 2023-24 through the teachers' pay annual grant to support schools with their staffing costs.

Schools are expected to meet additional support costs of up to £6,000 per pupil with SEND from their core budgets. They can then seek additional funding from local authorities' high needs budgets, and local authorities usually assess the need for extra funding through the education, health and care needs assessment process. If a pupil has an EHC plan, the local authority has a duty to secure their special educational provision, which will often include a teaching assistant. If the cost of that provision exceeds £6,000 per pupil, it will be paid for from the local authority's high needs budget, which, as I have said, has increased considerably over the last few years. On 2 March, we published the SEND and AP improvement plan in response to the Green Paper. This outlines the Government's mission for the special educational needs and alternative provision system to fulfil children's potential, to build parents' trust and to provide financial stability.

As I outlined earlier, we intend to develop a longer-term approach for teaching assistants to ensure that their impact is consistent across the system and the different responsibilities they take on. We want teaching assistants

to be well trained and to be able to develop specific expertise—for example, in speech and language interventions. As a first step, we have commissioned a research project to develop our evidence base on current school approaches, demand and best practice. That research is being conducted by YouGov and CFE Research, with findings due by the end of the year.

The Government value teaching assistants and the role they play alongside excellent teachers. We recognise the positive impact they can have on pupil outcomes when they are well deployed and well trained. I have set out that we will be developing a longer-term approach to ensure that this is the case and that the impact of teaching assistants is more consistent across the system. The first step we are taking is to improve our evidence base through the research project that is currently in the field. Schools are best placed to recruit and pay teaching assistants according to their own needs, which is why central Government do not have a role in setting pay for teaching assistants or other school support staff. Many schools, including academies, pay teaching assistants according to local government pay scales, and if the pay offer for local government employees is accepted for 2023-24, it would see the lowest paid earning 22% more than they did in April 2021.

5.18 pm

Tonia Antoniazzi: I will keep my comments brief. I believe that there is a need for reform: our teaching assistants deserve better, and there should be a real focus on recruitment and retention. I appreciate that I am from Wales, but the issues are similar across the United Kingdom, so we should all stand together, work together, and look to improve recruitment and retention, and pay, for those who play a vital role in our schools.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House has considered e-petition 620264, relating to pay for teaching assistants.

5.19 pm

Sitting adjourned.

Written Statements

Monday 17 July 2023

BUSINESS AND TRADE

Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry: Interim Report

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business and Trade (Kevin Hollinrake): The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry is led by retired high court judge Sir Wyn Williams who has over 28 years' judicial experience. Sir Wyn is tasked with ensuring there is a public summary of the failings which occurred with the Horizon IT system at the Post Office leading to the prosecution and conviction of postmasters, with 86 having those convictions quashed to date, and the incorrect repayment of shortfalls by thousands more. The inquiry will look to establish a clear account of the implementation and historic failings of the system starting from its roll-out in the late 1990s.

Today the Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry has published an interim report, which has been laid before the House. The report can be found at:
www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk.

Government will review this report and consider how to respond to its content in due course.

I would like to thank Sir Wyn Williams and to everyone in his team for their ongoing work and commitment to delivering the inquiry's work on these issues. It is vital that we establish the facts behind this scandal and learn the lessons so that something like this can never happen again.

[HCWS950]

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership: Accession Protocol

The Secretary of State for Business and Trade (Kemi Badenoch):

Introduction

The UK officially signed its accession protocol to the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-pacific partnership (CPTPP) on 16 July 2023. This trade agreement contains some of the world's largest and most dynamic economies. Our membership will take the agreement from 11 to 12 members and represents the first expansion of this high-standards trade agreement.

The agreement will act as a gateway to the wider Indo-Pacific and Americas region, bringing new opportunities for British businesses, supporting jobs across the whole UK and shaping the future of international trading rules.

The Indo-Pacific region will account for the majority of global growth in coming decades and be home to around half the world's middle-class consumers. On the UK joining, the CPTPP membership will account for around £12 trillion in GDP, a number which will grow as new members join. Economies including Costa Rica, Uruguay and Ecuador have formally applied, and the

Republic of Korea, Thailand and the Philippines have expressed an interest in doing so. As the first acceding country, we have placed ourselves in an ideal position to benefit from future expansion of the agreement.

Geopolitical benefits

Accession to the agreement will send a powerful signal that the UK is using our post-Brexit freedoms to boost the economy. It will secure our place as the second largest economy in a trade grouping dedicated to free and rules-based trade while taking a larger role in setting standards for the global economy.

Becoming a member will see us deepening our multilateral relations and strengthening our trading links in the Indo-Pacific region. We will work closely with our partners to develop the agreement, creating further benefits for all its members.

As CPTPP grows, the UK will help shape its development to fight unfair and coercive trading practices that threaten the future of international trade. British businesses will benefit from enhanced access to more markets while trading under fair rules that allow them to compete and thrive on the global stage.

Our status as an independent trading nation is putting the UK in an enviable position. Membership of this agreement will be a welcome addition to our bilateral free trade agreements with over 70 countries.

Gains for businesses and consumers

In an historic first, joining CPTPP will mean that the UK and Malaysia are in a free trade agreement together for the first time, giving British business better access to a market worth £330 billion. Manufacturers of key UK exports will be able to make the most of tariff reductions to this thriving market. Tariffs of around 80% on whisky will be eliminated within 10 years and tariffs of 30% on cars will be eliminated within seven years.

In addition, over 99% of current UK goods exports to economies in the agreement will be eligible for zero tariff trade. The agreement's provisions will also help facilitate trade by ensuring that customs procedures of CPTPP parties are efficient, consistent, transparent and predictable.

Beyond goods exports, the UK's world-leading services firms will benefit from modern rules which ensure non-discriminatory treatment and greater levels of transparency. In key sectors, UK companies will not be required to establish or maintain a representative office in a CPTPP territory. This will make it easier for them to provide services to consumers in other CPTPP countries.

The deal we have struck will also open up new opportunities in the Government procurement markets of CPTPP members, including in Malaysia, Singapore and Japan.

Business travel will be easier under the agreement. Britons travelling to CPTPP members for work purposes will enjoy greater certainty on trips for short-term work meetings. Professionals going to Peru and Vietnam for short-term business will be able to stay for six months. That is double the amount of time for previous agreements.

UK consumers are also set to benefit from tariff reductions on imports. These tariff reductions could lead to cheaper prices, better choice and higher quality. Products such as fruit juices from Chile and Peru, and Mexican honey and chocolate, to name but a few, could all cost less.

Defending UK interests in negotiations

We have ensured that joining will not compromise our high animal and plant health, food safety or animal welfare standards. We have also maintained our right to regulate in the public interest, including in areas such as the environment and labour standards. Furthermore, we ensured that the NHS was kept off the table throughout the course of discussions, as in all of our free trade agreement negotiations. We have also ensured that UK producers will be protected. We have reduced import tariffs in proportion to the market access we have received and kept safeguards where necessary. Market access increases will be staged over time for certain products, ensuring that farmers have time to adjust to new trade flows. Permanent limits on tariff-free volumes have been agreed on some of the most sensitive products that can be exported to the UK. This includes on beef and pork.

Conclusion and next steps

Following signature, the Government will now take the necessary steps to ratify the agreement. The Secretary of State will write to the Trade and Agriculture Commission to commission its advice on the agreement.

The Government have now published the accession protocol and related market access schedules, as well as relevant side letters, an impact assessment and a draft explanatory memorandum. With the publication of the accession protocol, the agreement text has now been presented to Parliament, but the Government will not commence the pre-ratification scrutiny process under the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 for a period of at least three months. This will ensure there is appropriate time for the relevant Select Committees to consider the agreement in advance. Legislation necessary to implement the agreement will be brought forward, and duly scrutinised by Parliament, when parliamentary time allows.

Joining CPTPP marks a key step in the development of the UK's independent trade policy. It will deepen our relations with a strategically vital region and offer exciting new opportunities for British businesses and consumers.

[HCWS953]

CABINET OFFICE**Public Procurement Regime: Draft Regulations Consultation Part 2**

The Parliamentary Secretary, Cabinet Office (Alex Burghart): Further to my statement on 19 June 2023, I am today launching the second part of a public consultation on the draft implementing regulations that will form part of a new procurement regime. This consultation, which is highly technical and not seeking views on policy development, has been split into two parts. My previous statement launched the first part of the consultation which will remain open until 28 July 2023.

The second part of the consultation, announced today, focuses on the transparency provisions and notices that will be used by contracting authorities to fulfil their legal requirements under the Bill. It also includes information on the proposed approach to transitional arrangements for procurements already under way at the time that the new regime enters into force and the

position on other legislation that will need to be amended in order for the full provisions of the Bill to take effect. We are also using this opportunity to consult on a proposal to use the power in the Bill at clause 120 to amend Bill provisions for private utilities with respect to the Preliminary Market Engagement notice, in line with our aim of minimising burdens on these private businesses.

The consultation we are publishing today, and laying in Parliament, gives everyone an opportunity to help shape public procurement for the future and I wish to encourage all involved in public procurement to have their say.

[HCWS949]

TREASURY**South Yorkshire Advanced Manufacturing Investment Zone**

The Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury (Gareth Davies): On Friday, the Government and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority announced the creation of a new South Yorkshire investment zone focused on advanced manufacturing, building on the region's long-standing research strengths and existing commercial operations in the area. Local communities and businesses across South Yorkshire, including in the Sheffield-Rotherham corridor, Barnsley and Doncaster, will benefit.

The Government also announced that Boeing, Spirit AeroSystems, Loop Technologies and the University of Sheffield Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC) have partnered to support the first investment within the zone, leading a portfolio of major new R&D projects into the future of aerospace. This investment will be worth over £80 million partially funded from the joint public-private sector Aerospace Technology Institute programme.

The South Yorkshire investment zone will be co-designed with the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Hallam University. By harnessing the region's local sector strengths, significant innovation assets and existing talent, the Investment Zone will catalyse further investment to boost productivity and deliver sustainable growth that benefits local communities. The investment zone will increase commercial opportunities in areas that have historically under-performed economically through a total funding envelope of £80 million over 5 years. It is expected that the investment zone will support more than £1.2 billion of private investment and the creation of more than 8,000 jobs by 2030.

The Government will continue to work with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority, the University of Sheffield, Sheffield Hallam University and other local partners to co-develop the plans for their advanced manufacturing investment zone, including agreeing priority sites and specific interventions to drive cluster growth, over the summer ahead of final confirmation of plans.

[HCWS957]

DEFENCE**Camp Bagnold: Gifting to the UN**

The Secretary of State for Defence (Mr Ben Wallace): I have today laid before the House a departmental minute describing the provision of infrastructure worth

£4,226,970 to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilisation Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) in Gao, Mali.

MINUSMA is a UN-led, non-combat mission to support the political processes in Mali and to carry out a number of security related tasks, for which the UK contribution, since December 2020, was the Long Range Reconnaissance Group (Mali) (LRRG(M)).

The security and political situation in Mali has deteriorated significantly since the UK review of MINUSMA at the start of 2022. There have been two coups in the past two years and the transitional Government of Mali (TGoM), which seized power in 2021, has continued to delay democratic transition and has routinely failed to address the numerous security and humanitarian issues it is facing. The TGoM has also behaved in a way that is constraining MINUSMA's delivery against its mandate. On 14 November 2022 the Government announced they were withdrawing their forces from Mali.

The UK Ministry of Defence intend to gift the Camp Bagnold infrastructure, with a value of £4,226,970, for \$1(US) to UN MINUSMA. The gifting transfers all ownership rights of the camp to the UN, including any future responsibility for the remediation and disposal of the site.

On the 16 June 2023 the TGoM asked MINUSMA to leave Mali "without delay". Despite this, we still intend to gift the Camp to the UN MINUSMA. Given the fast-moving situation on the ground we request special urgency to lay a departmental minute in Parliament for four sitting days before recess. This is necessary to allow us to meet the UN MINUSMA request that any contract to transfer the ownership of the camp must be signed before 31 July 2023.

Attachments can be viewed online at:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2023-07-17/HCWS959/>.

[HCWS959]

Armed Forces Compensation Scheme Quinquennial Review and Independent Review of Veterans Welfare Services for Veterans

The Minister for Defence People, Veterans and Service Families (Dr Andrew Murrison): The following joint statement is released on behalf of myself and the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, the right hon. Member for Plymouth, Moor View (Johnny Mercer).

We are pleased to announce the completion and publication of both the Armed Forces Compensation Scheme Quinquennial Review 2022-23 and the independent review of UK Government Welfare Services for veterans.

The Armed Forces Compensation Scheme (AFCS) provides compensation for injury or illness caused or made worse by service; or where death is caused by service in the UK Armed Forces on or after 6 April 2005. Quinquennial reviews ensure that the scheme is scrutinised and remains fit for purpose; this is the second of these quinquennial reviews.

We informed the House on 2 March 2023 that we had commissioned an additional review into the role, scope and breadth of UK Government welfare provision for veterans, including by the Ministry of Defence under the Veterans UK banner. This is the first time these have been considered in the round since the launch of the

strategy for our veterans and corresponding Veterans Strategy Action Plan, and the creation of the Office for Veterans' Affairs.

These reviews will help us to build on positive work already being undertaken across Government under the strategy for our veterans, including the Ministry of Defence's (MOD) £40 million digitisation project, which will significantly improve customer service and the process for managing claims within MOD.

We welcome both reviews and are grateful to the review teams for the considerable amount of work that has gone into both reports. The MOD and Office for Veterans' Affairs, along with other stakeholders, will now consider the recommendations of both reports in full, and the Government's response to each will be published later in the year.

We are placing copies of these reviews in the Library of the House.

The attachments are:

UK Government Services for Veterans Review (Independent Review of UK Government Welfare Services for Veterans.pdf).

Annex D Public Bodies Review Programme (Annex D Public Bodies Review Programme- Veterans Advisory and Pensions Committees_.pdf).

AFCS Quinquennial Review 2023 (Armed Forces Compensation Scheme Quinquennial Review 2023.pdf).

Attachments can be viewed online at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2023-07-17/HCWS956/>.

[HCWS956]

EDUCATION

Minimum School Week

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): In March 2022, the Government announced in the Schools White Paper 'Opportunity for All' that to give every pupil the opportunity to achieve their full academic potential, all mainstream, state-funded schools would be expected to deliver a minimum school week of 32.5 hours by September 2023.

Most schools already have a school week of at least this length, and others will have plans in hand to meet the minimum expectation by September 2023. However, in recognition of the pressures currently facing schools, the Government have decided to defer the deadline to September 2024. The Government are encouraging schools that are planning to increase their hours from this September to continue to do so.

The Government have today published guidance and case studies:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/length-of-the-school-week-minimum-expectation> to support those schools that are not yet meeting the minimum expectation.

[HCWS948]

School Funding: Provisional 2024-25 Allocations

The Minister for Schools (Nick Gibb): Today I am confirming provisional funding allocations for 2024-25 through the schools, high needs and central school

services national funding formulae (NFFs). Core schools funding includes funding for both mainstream schools and high needs. This is increasing by over £1.8 billion in 2024-25—from over £57.7 billion in 2023-24 to over £59.6 billion in 2024-25. This is on top of the over £3.9 billion increase in the core schools budget in 2023-24.

The core schools funding increase for both this year and next year includes the additional funding for schools' teacher pay costs, through the teachers' pay additional grant (TPAG). On 13 July, we announced this funding to support schools with the September 2023 teachers' pay award. The funding is being split between mainstream schools, special schools and alternative provision (AP), early years, and 16 to 19 provision. The part of the additional funding that goes to mainstream schools, special schools and alternative provision is worth £482.5 million in 2023-24 and £827.5 million in 2024-25. This funding will be paid on top of NFF funding in both 2023-24 and 2024-25. Further information on the TPAG is published here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-pay-additional-grant-2023-to-2024>.

Funding for mainstream schools through the schools NFF is increasing by 2.7% per pupil compared to 2023-24. Taken together with the funding increases seen in 2023-24, this means that funding through the schools NFF will be 8.5% higher per pupil in 2024-25, compared to 2022-23.

The minimum per pupil funding levels (MPPLs) will increase by 2.4% compared to 2023-24. This will mean that, next year, every primary school will receive at least £4,655 per pupil, and every secondary school at least £6,050. Academy trusts continue to have flexibilities over how they allocate funding across academies in their trust. This means, in some cases, an individual academy could receive a lower or higher per-pupil funding amount than the MPPL value. This may reflect, for example, activities that are paid for by the trust centrally, rather than by individual academies.

The NFF will distribute this funding based on schools' and pupils' needs and characteristics. The main features in 2024-25 are:

We are introducing a formulaic approach to allocating split sites funding. This ensures that funding for schools which operate across more than one site will be provided on a consistent basis across the country.

The core factors in the schools NFF—such as basic per-pupil funding, and the lump sum that all schools attract—will increase by 2.4%.

The funding floor will ensure that every school attracts at least 0.5% more pupil-led funding per pupil compared to its 2023-24 allocation.

The 2023-24 mainstream schools additional grant (MSAG) has been rolled into the schools NFF for 2024-25. This is to ensure that the additional funding schools attract through the NFF is as close as possible to the funding they would have received if the funding was continuing as a separate grant in 2024-25, without adding significant complexity to the formula. Adding the grant funding to the NFF provides reassurance to schools that this funding forms part of schools' core budgets and will continue to be provided.

For the first time, in 2024-25 we will allocate funding to local authorities on the basis of falling rolls, as well as growth. Local authorities can use this funding to support schools which see a short-term fall in the number of pupils on roll.

The 2023-24 was the first year of transition to the direct schools NFF, with our end point being a system in which, to ensure full fairness and consistency in

funding, every mainstream school in England is funded through a single national formula without adjustment through local funding formulae. Following a successful first year of transition, we will continue with the same approach to transition in 2024-25. As in 2023-24, local authorities will only be allowed to use NFF factors in their local formulae, and must use all NFF factors, except any locally determined premises factors. Local authorities will also be required to move their local formulae factors a further 10% closer to the NFF values, compared to where they were in 2023-24, unless they are classed as already “mirroring” the NFF.

Today we are also publishing local authority funding formula data for 2023-24. Following the first year of transition, the number of local authorities that mirror the schools NFF increased significantly from just over half in 2022-23, to just over two-thirds in 2023-24. Of the 72 local authorities that were not mirroring the NFF in 2022-23, 61 chose to move their local formula closer to the NFF than required.

In 2024-25, high needs funding through the NFF is increasing by a further £440 million, or 4.3%—following the £970 million increase in 2023-24 and £1 billion increase in 2022-23. This brings the total high needs budget to over £10.5 billion. All local authorities will receive at least a 3% increase per head of their age two to 18 population, compared to their 2023-24 allocations, with some authorities seeing gains of up to 5%.

The £10.5 billion funding includes the continuation of the £400 million high needs funding allocated to local authorities following the 2022 autumn statement, and the £440 million increase is provided on top of that. All special and alternative provision schools will continue to receive their share of that funding in 2024-25.

Central school services funding is provided to local authorities for the ongoing responsibilities they have for all schools. The total provisional funding for ongoing responsibilities is £304 million in 2024-25. In line with the process introduced for 2020-21, to withdraw funding over time for the historic commitments local authorities entered into before 2013-14, funding for historic commitments will decrease by a further 20% in 2024-25.

Updated allocations of schools, high needs and central schools services funding for 2024-25 will be published in December, taking account of the latest pupil data at that point.

[HCWS958]

ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS

Fisheries Management

The Minister for Food, Farming and Fisheries (Mark Spencer): Today the UK Government are publishing a number of consultations and consultation responses, and announcing funding to use post-Brexit freedoms to support a thriving fishing sector.

Seizing the opportunities of being an independent coastal state, the UK is introducing a world class system of fisheries management which draws on the best available science and the expertise of our fishermen and anglers to ensure that our fish stocks are healthy and sustainable long into the future.

The UK has some of the finest fish stocks in the world. Healthy fish stocks are a vital resource, providing livelihoods, enjoyment, and prosperity to our coastal communities. Since we left the EU, the UK Government have taken important steps for our fishing industry, anglers and marine environment.

As an independent coastal state, we negotiated significant uplifts in fishing opportunities for UK vessels, valued at around £101 million this year. We are investing in the long-term future of the UK fisheries sector through our £100 million UK Seafood Fund, to drive innovation, support job creation, and boost seafood exports to new markets. We introduced the first Fisheries Act for nearly thirty years and published the Joint Fisheries Statement.

In replacing the Common Fisheries Policy with our own domestic policy, we aim to maximise our newfound freedoms to introduce a world class fisheries management system.

Today we take another step in that journey, unveiling proposals for a reform package that will transform how we manage our fisheries. Ensuring a thriving, sustainable industry and healthy marine environment for future generations. These reforms play a crucial role in achieving the goals in our Environmental Improvement Plan and the UK Government Food Strategy as well as levelling up some of our much-loved coastal towns and communities.

This new system will be underpinned by Fisheries Management Plans—blueprints for how best to manage fish stocks—with the first six published today, including bass, king scallops, crab and lobster.

Based on the best available science and experience from fishermen and anglers, FMPs assess the fish stocks, and set out actions to manage them sustainably. The first six draft FMPs and associated environmental reports are being published today for consultation.

We are also consulting on a range of other important changes. These include:

- Expanding the use of remote electronic monitoring (REM) in English waters.
- Introducing a new approach to managing discards in England.
- Establishing a licensed recreational bluefin tuna fishery.
- Permanently lifting the quota cap on licences for small vessels in English waters.

We are also awarding £45.6 million to modernise and improve infrastructure across the seafood sector, helping to support around 1,500 jobs and ensure we are using the best science, research, and technology in fisheries management as part of our £100 million UK Seafood Fund.

Finally, we are publishing a response to our consultation on flyseining measures in English waters, noting we will change legislation to make squid fishing more sustainable and will take forward other measures through the FMPs. We will also publish the summary of responses to our consultation on spatial management measures for sandeels. A clear majority of respondents supported a proposal of a full closure of sandeel fishing in English waters of the North Sea.

This package marks a clear departure from the Common Fisheries Policy and will deliver our ambition to build a modern, resilient and profitable fishing industry underpinned by sustainable fish stocks and a healthy marine environment.

[HCWS951]

FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

The 0.7% of GNI ODA Target: 2022

The Minister of State, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (Mr Andrew Mitchell): The Government took the difficult decision to reduce temporarily the official development assistance (ODA) budget from 0.7% of gross national income (GNI) to 0.5% from 2021, because of the impact of the covid-19 pandemic on the economy and public finances. The Government will return to 0.7% when the fiscal situation allows.

The International Development (Official Development Assistance Target) Act 2015 envisages situations in which a departure from meeting the target of spending 0.7% of GNI on ODA may be necessary—for example, in response to “fiscal circumstances and, in particular, the likely impact of meeting the target on taxation, public spending and public borrowing”.

The FCDO’s annual report and accounts for 2022-23, published today, reports that the 0.7% target was not met in 2022, on a provisional basis. As required by section 2 of the 2015 Act, an Un-numbered Act Paper has been laid before Parliament, in the same terms as this statement.

In a written ministerial statement on 12 July 2021, my right hon. Friend the former Chancellor of the Exchequer confirmed that the decision to reduce the ODA budget is temporary and set out the conditions for returning to spending 0.7% of GNI on ODA. The principles for a return will be met when, on a sustainable basis, the Government are not borrowing for day-to-day spending and underlying debt is falling. The House of Commons voted to approve this approach to returning to 0.7% on 13 July 2021. My right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary reaffirmed this in his 22 November 2022 written ministerial statement.

Each year the Government will review, in accordance with the 2015 Act, whether a return to spending 0.7% of GNI on ODA is possible against the latest fiscal forecast provided by the Office for Budget Responsibility. The most recent assessment, set out in HM Treasury’s autumn statement 2022, showed that the principles for a return to 0.7% had not been met.

[HCWS961]

Afghanistan: Aid and Support

The Minister of State, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (Mr Andrew Mitchell): My Noble Friend, the Minister of State (Middle East, North Africa, South Asia and United Nations) (Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon), has made the following Written Ministerial Statement:

Today I am updating the House on UK efforts to support those most in need in Afghanistan. Afghanistan remains one of HM Government’s (HMG’s) largest bilateral aid allocations and we continue to be a major contributor to humanitarian, health and education support. Since April 2021, HMG has disbursed over £532 million in aid for Afghanistan while the country continues to experience one of the world’s most acute humanitarian crises. This financial year we have made a further

commitment of £100 million and plan an additional £151 million for next financial year. HMG continues to influence international thinking on how to support basic services in Afghanistan, challenge the Taliban on human rights abuses, and build consensus on engaging with the Taliban to make progress on issues of mutual benefit. We remain committed that at least 50% of people reached with UK aid in Afghanistan will be women and girls, a commitment we met in 2021-22 and are on track to meet for 2022-23.

The scale of the need in Afghanistan is profound. Two thirds of the population are estimated to be in humanitarian need. We remain appalled at the continued erosion of the rights of women and girls, which has led to their almost total exclusion from political, educational and social spaces. On 23 March 2022, the Taliban banned girls' access to secondary schools and closed universities to women in December 2022. On 5 April 2023, the Taliban banned Afghan women from working for the UN in Afghanistan, extending their 24 December 2022 directive banning Afghan women from working for non-governmental organisations (NGOs). HMG has strongly condemned the Taliban's decisions through a range of international statements, including the UN Security Council Resolution 2681. Together with like-minded countries—including those in the organisation of Islamic co-operation—we continue to press the Taliban to reverse their prohibitive decrees.

Afghan women play a vital role in the delivery of aid operations, and the FCDO is supporting our international partners to adapt programmes and find solutions to include women and girls in the implementation of aid. Afghan women and girls must have safe and equitable access to aid. HMG continues to support girls' education in Afghanistan through bilateral and multilateral contributions to NGOs, UN partners and multilateral funds. Educated, empowered women will contribute to Afghanistan's economic development, as well as to its peace and stability.

The UN's Humanitarian Appeal for Afghanistan this year is for \$3.2 billion and is currently only 15% funded. We continue to press donors to meet their commitments to support the Afghan people. In 2022-2023, the UK disbursed £95 million to the UN's World Food Programme, supporting 4.2 million people. Through UNICEF, HMG expects to reach an estimated 1.6 million people with nutrition, water and sanitation, and child and social protection services in 2022-23. £50 million was allocated to the UN Afghanistan Humanitarian Fund last year to provide support for health, water, protection, shelter, food, livelihoods, and education interventions.

As co-chair of the Afghanistan co-ordination group until recently, HMG has worked with international partners to deliver sustained essential services for the Afghan people. In 2022, HMG supported the Asian Development Bank to approve a \$405 million package of support. This followed an approval in December 2021 to transfer \$280 million of funds from the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund to UN agencies. This funding supports UN agencies to finance core public health services, education, and the provision of emergency food services.

We continue to engage pragmatically with the Taliban, primarily through the UK Mission to Afghanistan, based in Doha. FCDO ministers are in regular contact with their international counterparts on Afghanistan.

In 2023 The Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP and I as Minister of State have met UN Deputy Secretary General, Amina Mohammed, Afghan women and civil society organisations to discuss the Taliban's restrictions on women and girls. The Foreign Secretary and his ministerial team regularly discuss Afghanistan during their international engagements. The Prime Minister's Special Representative to Afghanistan regularly engaged with international counterparts, including at a substantive meeting for special envoys hosted by the UN Secretary General in Doha in May 2023.

Attachments:

1. ODA spend breakdown for Afghanistan for FY 2022-20 (ODA spend breakdown for Afghanistan for FY 2022-2023.docx.pdf)

Attachments can be viewed online at <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2023-07-17/HCWS960/>.

[HCWS960]

HOME DEPARTMENT

Statement of Changes in Immigration Rules

The Minister for Immigration (Robert Jenrick): My right hon. Friend the Home Secretary is today laying before the House a statement of changes in Immigration Rules.

Changes to the EU Settlement Scheme (EUSS) and EUSS Family Permit

We are making certain changes to the EUSS, which enables EU, other European economic area (EEA) and Swiss citizens living in the UK by the end of the transition period on 31 December 2020, and their family members, to obtain immigration status. In particular, meeting the deadline for the application (or, in line with the citizens' rights agreements, having reasonable grounds for the delay in making an application) will become a requirement for making a valid application. Consistent with the agreements, this will enable us to consider whether there are reasonable grounds for a late application as a preliminary issue, before going on to consider whether a valid application meets the relevant eligibility and suitability requirements. We will also prevent a valid application as a joining family member being made by an illegal entrant to the UK, thereby reinforcing our approach to tackling illegal migration.

We are closing the EUSS on 8 August 2023 to new applications under two routes not covered by the agreements: family member of a qualifying British citizen (on their return to the UK having exercised free movement rights in the EEA or Switzerland, known as "Surinder Singh" cases) and primary carer of a British citizen (known as "Zambrano" cases). The UK made generous transitional provisions enabling such persons to access the EUSS for more than four years. It is now appropriate, as a matter of fairness to other British citizens wishing to sponsor foreign national family members to settle in the UK, that any new applications should have to meet the family immigration rules applicable to others. The routes will remain open to those who are already on them (or with a pending application, administrative review or appeal) or who have pending access to them via a relevant EUSS family permit.

The EUSS family permit will also close on 8 August 2023 to new applications by a family member of a qualifying British citizen. Those granted an EUSS family permit as such a family member via an application made by this date will still be able to come to the UK and apply to the EUSS.

Extension of the Ukraine Extension Scheme

We are extending the application deadline for the Ukraine extension scheme for a further six months to 16 May 2024.

This change extends the scheme to allow Ukrainian nationals and their family members who obtain permission to enter or stay in the UK for any period between 18 March 2022 and 16 November 2023 to apply to the Ukraine extension scheme and obtain 36 months' permission to stay in the UK. All applications must now to be made by 16 May 2024.

The extension to the application deadline is intended to encourage people to apply for leave under the Ukraine extension scheme to ensure they maintain a lawful immigration status. This will provide greater certainty and clarity for the individual, the Home Office and other Government Departments and organisations which require evidence of immigration status to confirm entitlement to services.

Student Route (dependants and switching)

As announced by the Home Secretary on the 23 May 2023, and following the Government commitment to reduce net migration, we are removing the right for international students to bring dependants unless they are on postgraduate courses currently designated as research programmes. We are also removing the ability for international students to switch out of the student route into work routes before their studies have been completed.

These changes preserve the ability for dependants already in the UK to extend their stay, and for international students on taught postgraduate courses beginning before 1 January 2024 to bring dependants. They also preserve existing exemptions for dependants of Government-sponsored students and for dependent children who are born in the UK.

The switching restrictions will ensure that students are generally not switching in-country to another route until they have completed their course. Students on courses at degree level or above will be able to apply before course completion to switch to sponsored work routes, as long as their employment start date is not before course completion. Those studying towards PhDs will be able to switch after 24 months' study.

Asylum—pausing the differentiation policy

Provisions within the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 (NABA), which came into force on 28 June 2022, set out the framework to differentiate between two groups of refugees who ultimately remain in the UK: “group 1” and “group 2”.

The primary way in which the groups are differentiated is the grant of permission to stay: group 1 refugees are normally granted refugee permission to stay for five years, after which they can apply for settlement, whereas group 2 refugees are normally granted temporary refugee permission to stay for 30 months on a 10-year route to settlement.

The differentiation policy was intended to disincentivise migrants from using criminal smugglers to facilitate illegal journeys to the UK. This was the right approach. Since then, the scale of the challenge facing the UK, like other countries, has grown—and that is why the Government introduced the Illegal Migration Bill. The Bill goes further than ever before in seeking to deter illegal entry to the UK, so that the only humanitarian route into the UK is a safe and legal one. The Bill will radically overhaul how we deal with people who arrive in the UK illegally via safe countries, rendering their asylum and human rights claims (in respect of their home country) inadmissible and imposing a duty on the Home Secretary to remove them. This approach represents a considerably stronger means of tackling the same issue that the differentiation policy sought to address, people making dangerous and unnecessary journeys through safe countries to claim asylum in the UK.

We will therefore pause the differentiation policy in the next package of immigration rules changes in July 2023. This means we will stop taking grouping decisions under the differentiated asylum system after these rules changes and those individuals who are successful in their asylum application, including those who are granted humanitarian protection, will receive the same conditions. Our ability to remove failed asylum applicant remains unchanged.

Individuals who have already received a group 2 or humanitarian protection decision under post-28 June 2022 policies will be contacted and will have their conditions aligned to those afforded to group 1 refugees. This includes length of permission to stay, route to settlement, and eligibility for family reunion.

On 23 February 2023 the Home Office announced the streamlined asylum processing model for a small number of cases of nationalities with high asylum grant rates: Afghanistan, Eritrea, Libya, Syria and Yemen. Because this model focuses on manifestly well-founded cases, positive decisions can be taken without the need for an additional interview. No one will have their asylum application refused without the opportunity of an additional interview.

Those claims made between 28 June 2022 and the date of introduction of the Illegal Migration Bill (7 March 2023) will be processed according to this model. This will also include claimants from Sudan. Sudanese legacy claimants are already being processed in line with established policies and processes and will be decided in line with the Prime Minister's commitment to clear the backlog of legacy asylum claims by the end of 2023.

Improving Clarity Regarding Withdrawing Asylum Claims

The updated paragraph 333C provides clarity on the circumstances in which an asylum application will be withdrawn, whilst strengthening our ability to promptly withdraw asylum applications from individuals who do not comply with established processes.

It clarifies that there will be no substantive consideration of asylum claims that have been withdrawn and provides greater flexibility to accept explicit withdrawals where a claimant requests to withdraw their claim in writing but fails to do so on a specified form, in doing so preventing duplicative correspondence with the claimant.

In addition, the updates will support the efficient progression of applications by helping to prevent absconder scenarios by making it clear that the burden is on the

claimant to keep the Home Office up to date with their contact details, and that failure to do so may result in a withdrawal of their asylum claim.

Furthermore, it is now made clear that failure to attend a reporting event may result in an asylum application being treated as implicitly withdrawn, ensuring efficiency with application progression through preventing potential absconder scenarios.

These changes will enable decision-making resources to be concentrated on those who genuinely wish to continue with their asylum claims in the United Kingdom.

The changes to the Immigration Rules are being laid on 17 July 2023.

The changes relating to asylum, pausing the differentiation policy and the changes relating to students will come into force at 3 pm today.

The changes relating to the EUSS will come into effect on 9 August 2023.

All other changes will come into effect on 7 August 2023.

[HCWS954]

Biometric Registration Non-compliance: Code of Practice

The Minister for Immigration (Robert Jenrick): In 2018 the Home Office began issuing eVisas, which are an electronic record of immigration status and can be accessed via gov.uk. They were initially issued to individuals granted status under the EU settlement scheme and have since been extended to other schemes such as the Hong Kong (British National Overseas) route to citizenship. By the end of 2024, we will have completed the transition from physical biometric immigration documents (BIDs) in the form of the biometric residence permits, to digitised BIDs, known as eVisas. From this point the vast majority of individuals will receive digital status.

Holders of eVisas are able to evidence their status by creating a share-code which they can share with a third-party checkers, such as employers. We also enable system-to-system checks to directly confirm immigration status, for example the Department for Health and Social Care being able to check a person's immigration status when accessing NHS treatment.

There will be times where key information shown on a customer's record may change and they need to update their details (for example when they get married and change their name). Ensuring that this information is kept up to date is a requirement which is set out in the Immigration (Biometric Registration) Regulations 2008. Failure to comply with one of the requirements in the regulations may result in the Secretary of State imposing one or more sanctions on the individual. These are outlined in the "Code of Practice about the sanctions for non-compliance with the biometric registration regulations", which was last updated in 2015.

However, since the introduction of biometric immigration documents in the form of eVisas, the code of practice needs to be updated to fully reflect the specific elements and approach to eVisas. This includes updating the requirements and sanctions associated with holders of these accounts.

To ensure they are effective and proportionate, I am launching a consultation on these changes. The consultation will explore how these sanctions would potentially be

understood and effect individuals, including those who are vulnerable. It would also explore how the sanctions may impact groups linked to the holders of eVisas (employers, landlords and financial institutions).

The consultation will be available on gov.uk.

[HCWS955]

JUSTICE

Taking Control of Goods (Fees) Regulations 2014: Review

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Justice (Mike Freer): The Under-Secretary of State for Justice, my noble Friend Lord Bellamy KC, has made the following written statement:

The Government has today published the outcome of its review of the fees that can be recovered from judgment debtors by enforcement agents and High Court enforcement officers—commonly known as bailiffs—when using the procedures in the Taking Control of Goods Regulations 2013 and the Taking Control of Goods (Fees) Regulations 2014 in England and Wales.

The ability of creditors to enforce the payment of debts and fines is a fundamental part of the justice system which supports economic growth and underpins the rule of law. The enforcement industry collects debts owed to private individuals, businesses and local authorities, the last of which are in turn used to fund public services. If effective enforcement methods were not available, creditors would be more cautious in their lending and the authority of the courts, and public trust in their effectiveness, would be questioned. To ensure the enforcement system remains effective it is essential that the enforcement industry is sustainable.

The fees that enforcement agents and High Court enforcement officers can recover are set out in the Taking Control of Goods (Fees) Regulations 2014. They were designed to ensure a fair and transparent costs structure that provides appropriate remuneration for enforcement work undertaken, without allowing the sector to make excessive profits to be paid for by debtors. The regulations were also designed to incentivise early recovery without an enforcement visit being necessary, thereby reducing costs to all parties.

The review looked at whether the fees should be uplifted from the level set in 2014; whether more could be done to encourage payment without an enforcement visit becoming necessary; whether reform was needed of the High Court fee scale; and whether the costs of enforcement should continue to be borne by judgment debtors.

We intend to make the following changes:

Uplifting the fixed fees that enforcement agents and High Court enforcement officers can recover from judgment debtors by 5%. This will be the first uplift to the fees since 2014. We consider it is necessary to do so to ensure that enforcement firms are appropriately remunerated for the work they do in order to ensure the sustainability of the sector.

Uplifting by 24% the thresholds above which enforcement agents and High Court enforcement officers can recover a percentage fee and rounding the result to the nearest £100. This will ensure that inflationary increases are accounted for so that only consumers and businesses with higher value debts requiring greater amounts of work to enforce have to pay this additional fee.

We also intend to consult on a package of measures aimed at incentivising earlier and cheaper settlement of debt. Proposals include extending the minimum period of notice that must be given before making an enforcement visit from 7 to 28 days; defining in regulations the tasks that are to be undertaken before a visit is made; and amending the statutory notice of enforcement to signpost debtors to advice and encourage early engagement with enforcement agents. We will also consult on amending the regulations that apply to High Court enforcement to prevent a higher fee being applied to low value debts, and to clarify when cases can progress to the next enforcement stage. We also intend

to consult on proposals to amend the Taking Control of Goods: National Standards to prohibit creditors from seeking to recover a percentage of the enforcement agent or High Court enforcement officer fees when tendering for enforcement contracts. This will ensure enforcement agents do not recover less than they should for each stage of enforcement and prevent debtors being unnecessarily moved to more expensive stages of enforcement and higher costs.

This package of reforms aims to ensure the sustainability of the enforcement sector, whilst tightening up the rules that enforcement agents and High Court enforcement officers must follow to ensure that people in debt are given more opportunities to settle the debt at the earliest and cheapest stage possible. These reforms will complement the work that the government is already doing to make sure that people facing enforcement action are treated fairly, such as supporting the establishment of the Enforcement Conduct Board to provide independent oversight of the sector.

Following consultation, we propose introducing legislation to implement all of these measures at the same time.

Our review benefited from a wealth of data and feedback from the enforcement sector and other interested parties including debt advice providers local authorities, court users and other interested parties and the Government would like to thank them for their important contributions.

A copy of the Government Response to the Review will be online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/enforcement-agent-fee-review-2023>.

[HCWS952]

TRANSPORT

Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands

The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Huw Merriman): The Integrated Rail Plan, published in November 2021, set out a £96 billion investment to benefit the midlands and the north, the largest ever Government investment in the railways. The Government stand by the conclusions of the plan and continue to consider it the most effective way of providing rail benefits to the north and the midlands.

As part of the plan, we also committed to take forward a study to consider the most effective way to run HS2 trains to Leeds.

I am today publishing the terms of reference for this work, which will include consideration of station capacity at Leeds, and the implications of different options on the wider network.

The proposals set out in the Integrated Rail Plan bring communities and labour markets together and will support growing our economy in towns and cities across the nation.

The work in the study will consider a range of options and take account of: value for money; affordability; deliverability and timescales; economic development; disruption to passengers; and local views and evidence. The study will be extensive and will take two years to complete.

As this work progresses, we intend to review the case for dropping certain options, taking account of evidence gathered, particularly on costs, affordability, benefits and value for money.

In addition, the Transport Select Committee on 13 July published the Government's response to its report on the Integrated Rail Plan. In response to the following recommendation on Bradford:

The Government should reconsider the case for the development of a new station in Bradford. The development of the St James's Market station would not only enhance rail connectivity in the North, allowing further investment in the city, but also provide further opportunities for rail development in Bradford after the 'core pipeline' of IRP upgrades take place. (Paragraph 63)

I have confirmed that the Government accept this recommendation.

The Government stand by the conclusions of the Integrated Rail Plan on Bradford, and the benefits that plan brings to the city. However, in the light of this recommendation, a re-assessment of the evidence for better connecting Bradford and the case for a new station will now form part of the Northern Powerhouse Rail development programme and the HS2 to Leeds study.

The Government's approaches for Leeds and Bradford remain those that were set out in the Integrated Rail Plan, and the undertaking of this work does not guarantee further interventions will be agreed or progressed.

The Government remain committed to the Integrated Rail Plan's £96 billion envelope and expect that additions or changes to the core IRP pipeline will be affordable within that. Any options that are progressed, including those that would exceed the £96 billion envelope, will be subject to the established adaptive approach, as set out in the IRP.

[HCWS962]

Ministerial Corrections

Monday 17 July 2023

WOMEN AND EQUALITIES

Government Equalities Office: Policy Relating to Men

The following is an extract from Women and Equalities questions on 12 July 2023.

Margaret Ferrier: Current legislation requires all public facilities to have sanitary bins in female and gender-neutral toilets. However, as highlighted by the Boys Need Bins campaign, hygiene bins need to be provided in men's toilets. What steps is the Minister taking to introduce legislation that addresses that issue?

Maria Caulfield: I reassure the hon. Lady that work is going on in that space. My ministerial colleagues from the Department for Work and Pensions are looking at this, and will be updating the House shortly.

[Official Report, 12 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 338.]

Letter of correction from the Minister for Women, the hon. Member for Lewes (Maria Caulfield):

An error has been identified in my response to the hon. Member for Rutherglen and Hamilton West (Margaret Ferrier).

The correct response should have been:

Maria Caulfield: I reassure the hon. Lady that work is going on in that space. My ministerial colleagues **from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs are looking into this.**

TRANSPORT

Topical Questions

The following is an extract from Transport oral questions on 13 July 2023.

Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab): Can I ask the roads Minister about the lower Thames crossing project? In particular, what steps is the DFT taking to ensure that companies such as Murphy Group respect basic workers' rights to join a trade union when bidding for major transport contracts?

Mr Holden: The Minister of State, Department for Transport, my right hon. Friend the Member for Hereford and South Herefordshire (Jesse Norman), who is the Minister for the future of transport, met Murphy Group this week.

[Official Report, 13 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 491.]

Letter of correction from the Under-Secretary of State for Transport, the hon. Member for North West Durham (Mr Holden):

An error has been identified in my response to the hon. Member for Easington (Grahame Morris).

The correct response should have been:

Mr Holden: The Minister of State, Department for Transport, my right hon. Friend the Member for Hereford and South Herefordshire (Jesse Norman), who is the Minister for the future of transport, met with **Matt Palmer, executive director of lower Thames crossing, to discuss LTC** this week.

TREASURY

Public Sector Pay

The following is an extract from the oral statement on public sector pay on 13 July 2023.

Ian Mearns (Gateshead) (Lab): I am a little concerned about the £1.425 billion to be found from within the Department for Education's existing budget between now and 2025, with £525 million this financial year and a further £900 million in the next financial year. Will the Minister be a bit more specific about exactly where that will be taken from within the Department's budget to meet the teachers' pay increase? While of course we welcome the fact that the Government are honouring the teachers' pay review body recommendations, let us not forget that the envelope for the review bodies is set by the Government in the first place. There is something else going on in this situation: we currently have a recruitment and retention crisis among our teaching workforce, with something like 20% of newly qualified teachers leaving after three years and 40% leaving after five years. Nobody goes into teaching because of the money, but it always helps, and a rise in line with inflation would certainly help.

John Glen: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his question. I think he welcomes what we have decided to do with the 6.5% pay increase, which leaves a typical teacher with £44,300. We are reprioritising within the Department for Education's existing budget to deliver the additional funding to schools, but we are protecting core schools funding and frontline services. We have put in additional sums of money through the spending review and subsequent fiscal events: £330 million in 2023-24 and £550 million in 2024-25. The numbers add up, and he will recognise that.

[Official Report, 13 July 2023, Vol. 736, c. 533.]

Letter of correction from the Chief Secretary to the Treasury, the right hon. Member for Salisbury (John Glen):

An error has been identified in my response to the hon. Member for Gateshead (Ian Mearns).

The correct response should have been:

John Glen: I thank the hon. Gentleman for his question. I think he welcomes what we have decided to do with the 6.5% pay increase, which leaves a typical teacher with £44,300. We are reprioritising within the Department for Education's existing budget to deliver the additional funding to schools, but we are protecting core schools funding and frontline services. We have put in additional sums of money **to fully fund this pay award: £525 million in 2023-24 and £900 million in 2024-25.** The numbers add up, and he will recognise that.

EDUCATION

Adult and Further Education

The following are extracts from the estimates day debate on adult and further education on 5 July 2023.

Robert Halfon: I also think that it is important that we do not paint just a partial picture. We should look at the 10% uplift in T-level funding, the £300 million that we are spending on institutes of technology, the £115 million

spending on higher technical qualifications, which are now being taught in more than 70 institutions, the £2.7 billion that we will be spending on apprenticeships by 2025, the up to £500 million that is being spent on Multiply, and the many millions of pounds being spent on boot camps. Billions and billions of pounds are being spent on skills, which is absolutely right.

[Official Report, 5 July 2023, Vol. 735, c. 893.]

Letter of correction from the Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education, the right hon. Member for Harlow (Robert Halfon).

An error has been identified in my response to my hon. Friend the Member for Worcester (Mr Walker). The correct response should have been:

Robert Halfon: I also think that it is important that we do not paint just a partial picture. We should look at the 10% uplift in T-level funding, the £300 million that we are spending on institutes of technology, the £115 million spending on higher technical qualifications, which are now being taught in more than 70 institutions, the £2.7 billion that we will be **investing in** apprenticeships by 2025, the up to £500 million that is being spent on

Multiply, and the many millions of pounds being spent on boot camps. Billions and billions of pounds are being spent on skills, which is absolutely right.

Robert Halfon: The hon. Member for Twickenham mentioned the apprenticeship budget. We spent 99% of the apprenticeship budget, and let us not forget that we send hundreds of millions to the devolved authority, so the levy is being used.

[Official Report, 5 July 2023, Vol. 735, c. 896.]

Letter of correction from the Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education, the right hon. Member for Harlow (Robert Halfon).

An error has been identified in my response to the hon. Member for Twickenham (Munira Wilson). The correct response should have been:

Robert Halfon: The hon. Member for Twickenham mentioned the apprenticeship budget. We spent 99% of the apprenticeship budget, and let us not forget that we send hundreds of millions to the **devolved Administrations**, so the levy is being used.

ORAL ANSWERS

Monday 17 July 2023

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
EDUCATION	599	EDUCATION—continued	
Bullying in Schools	605	Persistent Absence from School	602
Childcare	604	Reading Standards: Primary-age Children	607
Foster Care Placements	607	Recruitment and Retention	605
Institutional Partnerships:		Skills and Apprenticeships: Funding.....	599
Further and Higher Education	610	Student Visa Eligibility:	
Local Secondary School Provision:		Impact on Higher Education Sector	609
Sittingbourne and Sheppey	609	Topical Questions	613
Maths Attainment: Primary Schools.....	603	Tuition Fees: Social Mobility	612

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Monday 17 July 2023

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
BUSINESS AND TRADE	35WS	FOREIGN, COMMONWEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE	44WS
Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership: Accession Protocol...	35WS	Afghanistan: Aid and Support	44WS
Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry: Interim Report ...	35WS	The 0.7 of GNI ODA Target: 2022	44WS
CABINET OFFICE	37WS	HOME DEPARTMENT	46WS
Public Procurement Regime: Draft Regulations		Biometric Registration Non-compliance:	
Consultation Part 2.....	37WS	Code of Practice	49WS
DEFENCE	38WS	Statement of Changes in Immigration Rules.....	46WS
Armed Forces Compensation Scheme		JUSTICE	50WS
Quinquennial Review and Independent Review of Veterans Welfare Services for Veterans	39WS	Taking Control of Goods (Fees) Regulations	
Camp Bagnold: Gifting to the UN.....	38WS	2014: Review	50WS
EDUCATION	40WS	TRANSPORT	51WS
Minimum School Week	40WS	Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands ..	51WS
School Funding: Provisional 2024-25 Allocations..	40WS	TREASURY	38WS
ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS.	42WS	South Yorkshire Advanced Manufacturing	
Fisheries Management	42WS	Investment Zone	38WS

MINISTERIAL CORRECTIONS

Monday 17 July 2023

	<i>Col. No.</i>		<i>Col. No.</i>
EDUCATION	10MC	TREASURY	10MC
Adult and Further Education	10MC	Public Sector Pay	10MC
TRANSPORT	9MC	WOMEN AND EQUALITIES	9MC
Topical Questions	9MC	Government Equalities Office: Policy Relating to Men	9MC

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 24 July 2023**

STRICT ADHERENCE TO THIS ARRANGEMENT GREATLY FACILITATES THE
PROMPT PUBLICATION OF BOUND VOLUMES

Members may obtain excerpts of their speeches from the Official Report (within one month from the date of publication), by applying to the Editor of the Official Report, House of Commons.

CONTENTS

Monday 17 July 2023

Oral Answers to Questions [Col. 599] [see index inside back page]
Secretary of State for Education

Higher Education Reform [Col. 621]
Statement—(Gillian Keegan)

Illegal Migration Bill [Col. 638]
Lords message considered

Social Housing (Regulation) Bill [Lords] [Col. 710]
Programme motion (No. 2)—(Fay Jones)—agreed to
Lords message considered

Strikes (Minimum Service Levels) Bill [Col. 712]
Lords message considered

Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority [Col. 727]
Motion—(Penny Mordaunt)—agreed to

Liaison Committee [Col. 730]
Motion—(Penny Mordaunt)—agreed to

Covid-19 Pandemic: Fiscal Policies [Col. 740]
Debate on motion for Adjournment

Westminster Hall
Teaching Assistant Pay [Col. 201WH]
E-petition debate

Written Statements [Col. 35WS]

Ministerial Corrections [Col. 9MC]
