

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS
OFFICIAL REPORT
GENERAL COMMITTEES

Public Bill Committee

TERMINALLY ILL ADULTS (END OF LIFE) BILL

First Sitting

Tuesday 21 January 2025

CONTENTS

Motion to sit in private agreed to.
Sittings motion agreed to.
Written evidence (Reporting to the House) motion agreed to.
Adjourned till Tuesday 28 January at twenty-five minutes past
Nine o'clock.

No proofs can be supplied. Corrections that Members suggest for the final version of the report should be clearly marked in a copy of the report—not telephoned—and must be received in the Editor’s Room, House of Commons,

not later than

Saturday 25 January 2025

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2025

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright/.

The Committee consisted of the following Members:

Chairs: PETER DOWD, CLIVE EFFORD, † SIR ROGER GALE, CAROLYN HARRIS, ESTHER McVEY

- | | |
|---|---|
| † Abbott, Jack (<i>Ipswich</i>) (Lab/Co-op) | † Opher, Dr Simon (<i>Stroud</i>) (Lab) |
| † Atkinson, Lewis (<i>Sunderland Central</i>) (Lab) | † Paul, Rebecca (<i>Reigate</i>) (Con) |
| † Campbell, Juliet (<i>Broxtowe</i>) (Lab) | † Richards, Jake (<i>Rother Valley</i>) (Lab) |
| † Charalambous, Bambos (<i>Southgate and Wood Green</i>) (Lab) | † Sackman, Sarah (<i>Minister of State, Ministry of Justice</i>) |
| † Francis, Daniel (<i>Bexleyheath and Crayford</i>) (Lab) | † Saville Roberts, Liz (<i>Dwyfor Meirionnydd</i>) (PC) |
| † Gordon, Tom (<i>Harrogate and Knaresborough</i>) (LD) | † Shah, Naz (<i>Bradford West</i>) (Lab) |
| † Green, Sarah (<i>Chesham and Amersham</i>) (LD) | † Shastri-Hurst, Dr Neil (<i>Solihull West and Shirley</i>) (Con) |
| † Hopkins, Rachel (<i>Luton South and South Bedfordshire</i>) (Lab) | † Tidball, Dr Marie (<i>Penistone and Stocksbridge</i>) (Lab) |
| † Joseph, Sojan (<i>Ashford</i>) (Lab) | † Woodcock, Sean (<i>Banbury</i>) (Lab) |
| † Kinnoch, Stephen (<i>Minister for Care</i>) | |
| † Kruger, Danny (<i>East Wiltshire</i>) (Con) | Lynn Gardner, Lucinda Maer, Jonathan Whiffing, <i>Committee Clerks</i> |
| † Leadbeater, Kim (<i>Spen Valley</i>) (Lab) | |
| † Malthouse, Kit (<i>North West Hampshire</i>) (Con) | |
| † Olney, Sarah (<i>Richmond Park</i>) (LD) | † attended the Committee |

Public Bill Committee

Tuesday 21 January 2025

[SIR ROGER GALE *in the Chair*]

Terminally Ill Adults (End of Life) Bill

2 pm

The Chair: Good afternoon. In the Committee that I was in this morning, someone asked if they could remove their jacket, which seemed unbelievably spartan, but if any Member wishes to do so, they may. We are now sitting in public, so the proceedings at the present are being broadcast. Before we start, I have a couple of preliminary remarks. Please will you all turn off your mobile phones and other noisy electronic devices. I am also asked to remind you that tea and coffee are not allowed during sittings; if you want them, you will have to go outside.

We shall first consider the motion on the amendment paper tabled by the Member in charge of the Bill, Kim Leadbeater, which is to sit in private to consider matters relating to the sittings motion.

Kim Leadbeater (Spennings Valley) (Lab): I beg to move,

That the Committee do sit in private to consider matters relating to the sittings motion.

It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Roger, and to be here for the first formal meeting of the Terminally Ill Adults (End of Life) Bill Committee. Ahead of the oral evidence sessions next week and the line-by-line scrutiny thereafter, we have two jobs to do this afternoon. One is to confirm the sitting times for the Committee and the other is to confirm the witnesses for oral evidence. Following discussions, I have taken the decision to have some of our sitting today in private. That is normal procedure for discussing witnesses and I think it is the right way to proceed, given that some of those discussions will probably involve conversations about the suitability of witnesses who are not here to speak for themselves. It would be inappropriate to discuss named individuals in such a way. Transparency is of course very important, but so is respecting individuals' privacy. I hope that is clear to colleagues and to others.

I appreciate that members of the Committee and those viewing our proceedings may wish to know about the purpose and effect of this motion. Most Public Bill Committees are subject to programming, and the Programming Sub-Committee would discuss in private which witnesses to hear from. Similarly, Select Committees discuss in private which witnesses they will hear evidence from. Out of respect for the named individuals that we may call to hear evidence from, I propose that we discuss them informally in private. Once that informal discussion has concluded, the Committee will move back into a public session to formally consider the sittings motion. Any Member who wished to speak about the motion publicly or move an amendment would then be able to do so.

Danny Kruger (East Wiltshire) (Con): It is a pleasure to serve under your chairmanship, Sir Roger. I look forward very much to the process of this Committee and to working with hon. Members to do what we can to ensure that a good Bill is presented back to the House.

I very much respect the points made by the hon. Member for Spennings Valley. Nevertheless, I do have some real objections to the motion, which I encourage Members to oppose. The fact is that this debate was due to be held in public—in fact, people have travelled here in the expectation that they would be able to attend and observe our debate on the sittings motion—but last night, for reasons we do not fully understand, a decision was clearly made to table a motion that we sit in private. I would be grateful to understand why that decision was made so late.

My general point is that there is a clear public interest case. The public should understand why witnesses have been chosen and why other people have not, and if there are concerns about the witnesses, they should be aired publicly. This is the only time that the public are being consulted—that experts from outside Parliament have a chance to contribute to our deliberations. I fail to understand why those discussions cannot be held in public. The only argument that I can imagine—and the hon. Member for Spennings Valley made it—is that Members might for some reason be uncivil or speak disrespectfully about potential witnesses, which I do not for a moment believe. I am sure that you, Sir Roger, or the other Chairs will keep us in order throughout our proceedings.

We are here to talk about the overall balance and particular qualifications of the witness list. Looking at the witness list that was presented this morning by the hon. Lady, I have very serious concerns, which should be aired publicly, about the list. It includes eight witnesses from foreign jurisdictions, who are being called to give evidence from abroad; all are supporters of assisted dying in their jurisdictions. There are no people speaking against the operations of assisted dying laws internationally. There are nine lawyers on the list—all of them, with the exception of three who appear to be neutral, in favour of a change in the law. There is not a single lawyer against this Bill. Sir James Munby was suggested, but I understand he has been removed. There might be a perfectly good reason for that, but he has spoken against the Bill.

There is nobody on the list from deaf or disabled people's organisations, but the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities recognises the importance of engaging with such organisations in laws of this nature. With the exception of Dr Jamilla Hussain, there is no one on the witness list who can speak to the equality impacts of assisted dying.

Dr Simon Opher (Stroud) (Lab) *rose*—

The Chair: Order. I appreciate that the hon. Member for East Wiltshire, and indeed all members of the Committee, received the final version of these documents fairly late in the day, and I am not unsympathetic to hearing what any Member wishes to say, but now the hon. Gentleman is going rather further down the brief than he is probably entitled to. The motion on the amendment paper is very narrow. The Question is, quite simply, that the Committee should sit in private.

Danny Kruger: I understand, Sir Roger, and I accept your reprimand. I was trying to make the case that it should be acceptable for these arguments to be heard in public, but I take your point.

Let me address the specifics of the motion that we sit in private. The point has been made that it is appropriate and, in fact, common for Committees to consider sittings motions privately. In fact, Public Bill Committees that consider private Members' Bills do not sit in private to consider a sittings motion. That should be the starting point. Members may claim—I think the hon. Member for Spen Valley did—that sitting in private is like a Programming Sub-Committee on a Government Bill, but it is not. Government Bills have a sittings motion that is agreed in the usual channels, between the Whips of each side, and often that does happen privately. The way it works then is that both sides suggest witnesses and agree to them. Those decisions then go to the Programming Sub-Committee, which usually takes a couple of minutes to rubber-stamp them. Then, crucially, the sittings motion goes to the whole Committee, which has the opportunity to discuss what was decided in the Programming Sub-Committee. That is the opportunity for public consideration of the schedule of witnesses in a Government Bill, as set out by the Programming Sub-Committee.

It has also been suggested that the proposal to sit in private today is rather like the private pre-meet that happens before particular evidence sessions, which I am sure we will do when we proceed to take evidence; we will have little private meetings to discuss which Members go in which order and who will ask each question. I fully accept that that is perfectly appropriate for a private discussion, but that is not what this sitting is. Today, we are discussing exactly who we are going to call and the overall timetable for our work. This is much bigger than a discussion about who is going to ask which questions. It is about who the witnesses are going to be.

In the very limited number of private Members' Bills since 2010 that have had a large number—five or more—sittings, the sittings motions were debated in public. That is the way it works. I could list a whole load, but I will not bother the Committee with that detail. The fact is that we have had no discussion through the usual channels; there are no usual channels in a private Member's Bill. Everybody in the Committee was invited to submit suggestions to the hon. Member for Spen Valley, which we all did, and we appreciated that invitation. She then made her choice. There was no discussion about who the witnesses should be. It was just a decision made by the hon. Member.

A list was informally communicated last week, which we also appreciated, although it was different from the list before us now. We did not have full advance notice of this list, which we only received at 10 o'clock this morning. It was not tabled in advance and was not on the amendment paper, so we had no opportunity to prepare amendments to the schedule of witnesses or to the timetable that we are discussing. We can table manuscript amendments—and that needs to happen—but the situation still procedurally disadvantages those of us who have concerns about the Bill. Last night, I and colleagues tabled a sittings motion, which I hope we will have the opportunity to debate, in the absence of one from the hon. Member for Spen Valley.

I am afraid that this issue reflects a general concern I have about the process, which is why it is so important that we debate the witness list before a public audience.

Kit Malthouse (North West Hampshire) (Con): But we will be coming back to public—

The Chair: Order.

Danny Kruger: I look forward to the opportunity to discuss the sittings motion, which I hope we can do publicly. On a general point about process, the Bill was written by a campaign group.

Kim Leadbeater: That is not true.

Danny Kruger: Well, it had a significant input.

Kim Leadbeater: On a point of order, Sir Roger. That is categorically not true. The Bill was written with senior legislative expertise, along with myself as a sitting Member of Parliament and with esteemed colleagues. I take that point of offence quite personally.

Danny Kruger: Well, I hope that the hon. Member—

The Chair: Order. A point of order has been raised; I had better reply to it—if only to say that it is not a matter for the Chair.

Danny Kruger: I apologise, Sir Roger, and I apologise to the hon. Lady for causing offence. I hope she will not be offended when points are made that she disagrees with.

Kim Leadbeater: It is a matter of fact.

Danny Kruger: I am happy to withdraw the suggestion that the Bill was written by a campaign group, on the basis of the hon. Lady's assurance that it was written by herself. I hope it is not the case that there was significant input from campaigners. I do not see why there should not have been; I just mention it because the Bill came to us with no formal consultation. There was no impact assessment—

Kim Leadbeater: On a point of order, Sir Roger. Surely we are having a conversation about whether we sit in private or not. Can we keep to that matter?

The Chair: Forgive me: I am in the Chair and I will decide—but the hon. Lady is absolutely correct. Once again, I am afraid that the hon. Member for East Wiltshire is straying very wide of the motion on the amendment paper. I would be grateful if he would now come to his conclusion so we can start to move forward.

Danny Kruger: I absolutely will. In fact, I will finish there. The points I have been trying to make are simply in the light of the fact that if the hon. Lady's motion is accepted, the public will no longer have the opportunity to hear any of our points on the sittings motion—on the process that we will be decide on.

Kim Leadbeater: On a point of order, Sir Roger. That, again, is factually incorrect. We have already said that there will be a private sitting for conversations about individual witnesses, including some that the hon. Gentleman has already started talking about, and then we will open again to the public so that everybody can hear the Committee's conversations.

The Chair: Order. Once again, that is not strictly a matter for the Chair, so it is therefore not a point of order, although it is now a matter of record. We are going to spend quite a lot of time together and it would be helpful if, reflecting the tone of the debate that took place on the Floor of the House, we were civil and courteous to each other and that the debate was conducted throughout not only these proceedings, but right throughout the entire Committee stage, with customary candour and decency. If we can manage that, accepting that these are highly divisive issues and that strong feelings are held on both sides of the argument, we might just end up with a conclusion that would satisfy most, if not all, people.

Danny Kruger: I genuinely do not want to cause any distress or offence to the hon. Member for Spen Valley. I simply am doing my job, which is to represent my genuine concerns about the process that we are deciding on today. I think it is not appropriate to sit private, and I do not believe it is the case that we will have the opportunity to discuss in public the sittings motion. We are deciding that in private, according to her intention. There is not going to be the chance to debate publicly the list of witnesses or the timetable that we are to follow. So be it. If hon. Members in the Committee want to proceed down that line, that is what we will do. I look forward to that discussion, which I am sure we will have courteously, but I encourage hon. Members to vote against the motion.

Lewis Atkinson (Sunderland Central) (Lab): I, like you, Sir Roger, hope that we can spend the next five or six weeks in the spirit of collaboration and that we do not get bogged down in procedural wrangling. We need to work across the Committee to get the best procedure we can.

The hon. Member for East Wiltshire made several points, including the precedent for private Members' Bills. The relevant point here is that this private Member's Bill is unique already by the fact that the lead Member, my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, has agreed to take evidence—unlike in any other private Member's Bill. Therefore, in some cases there may be a need to discuss the sensitivity of individual witnesses' availability and personal circumstances. We cannot agree as a Committee just by calling witnesses in the abstract. We have to agree—as is outlined by my hon. Friend's motion and indeed by the alternative motion in the name of the hon. Member for East Wiltshire—for them to attend at a specific time and at a specific place. I gently say to the hon. Gentleman that the Committee would do well to have a conversation in private about the individual availability and suitability of some witnesses.

The motion set out on the amendment paper to sit in private is to consider

“matters related to the sittings motion”,

not the sittings motion itself. My hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley has clearly indicated that we will return to sit in public for the formal proceedings, which I support. That means that the hon. Member for East Wiltshire and any others who wish to place on record their observations can do so then. In the same way that the hon. Gentleman acknowledges happens in Select Committees and other forums where there is discussion about witnesses, how to call them and so on, I suggest that we spend a little bit of time in private to do so too,

before agreeing—I hope with a level of consensus across this Committee—to return in public and to operate in public scrutiny as the hon. Gentleman suggests is appropriate.

I support the motion to sit in private for the consideration of these specific matters in initial discussion and then I support returning to public, as my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley has indicated, so that we can be subject to the right public scrutiny for the decisions that we make today.

2.15 pm

Kit Malthouse: I was going to make exactly the same point. I think my hon. Friend the Member for East Wiltshire has fundamentally misunderstood what is happening. He referred to there being a discussion through the usual channels. What the hon. Member for Spen Valley has proposed is that we have that discussion now—she said informally—because we have not had the chance to do so before, and that we then return. Then my hon. Friend is free to say whatever he likes about whatever witnesses and table his own amendments as he wishes. There is no intention to conceal anything. If I might be so bold, I think he has misunderstood the process.

Naz Shah (Bradford West) (Lab): Just following on from the speech of the right hon. Member for North West Hampshire, I would not read the situation as a misunderstanding by the hon. Member for East Wiltshire. I read the motion to sit in private not as an informal discussion, but as a very formal discussion. I am grateful to the lead Member for the Bill, my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, who before this meeting explained to me what has now been explained here—about the issue of people's availability, privacy and so on. But I do not suspect that we will be going into those details. If people are not available, we do not have to discuss why they are not. We do not have to discuss their personal lives. I am not sure that that is a good enough reason not to have a discussion in public. I trust colleagues across the Committee to be collegiate enough and big enough to refer to witnesses with respect. I think that is a given, considering the way in which we have conducted the Bill so far. I therefore do not support the motion to sit private.

Sean Woodcock (Banbury) (Lab) rose—

The Chair: Mr Woodcock, of course I will call you if you wish to be called. I am rather keen to move forward if we can. Do you wish to make a brief intervention?

Sean Woodcock: I do wish to make a brief contribution. I am broadly sympathetic to the fact that there is considerable public interest in the Bill, so we would all broadly welcome as much public scrutiny as possible of all its aspects. However, I think the hon. Member for East Wiltshire made a meal of his argument, talking about the merits or otherwise of the various witnesses and casting aspersions, which I note he has withdrawn, on my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, who is the promoter of this legislation. I will vote to sit in private, despite the fact that I am sympathetic to the idea that as much of the Committee as possible should be in public.

Question put and agreed to.

The Chair: Once the Committee has concluded its discussions in private, it may—although it does not have to—return to public session.

2.19 pm

The Committee deliberated in private.

3.29 pm

On resuming—

The Chair: I call Kim Leadbeater, as the Member in charge of the Bill, to move the sittings motion standing in her name, which is available in the room.

Kim Leadbeater: I beg to move,

That—

(1) the Committee shall (in addition to its first meeting at 2.00 pm on Tuesday 21 January) meet—

(a) at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm on Tuesday 28 January;

(b) at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm on Wednesday 29 January;

(c) at 11.30 am and 1.00 pm on Thursday 30 January.

(2) during further proceedings on the Terminally Ill Adults (End of Life) Bill, the Committee do meet on Tuesdays and Wednesdays while the House is sitting at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm.

(3) the Committee shall hear oral evidence in accordance with the following Table:

| Date | Time | Witness |
|----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 10.05 am | Sir Chris Whitty (Chief Medical Officer for England), Duncan Burton (Chief Nursing Officer) |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 10.45 am | The British Medical Association, The General Medical Council |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 11.25 am | Association of Palliative Care Social Workers, Royal College of Nursing |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 3.15 pm | Dr Rachel Clark, Dr Sam Ahmedzai (Emeritus Professor at the University of Sheffield), Sue Ryder, Association of Palliative Medicine |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 4.15 pm | Sir Max Hill KC, Alex Ruck Keene KC (Hon), Sir Nicholas Mostyn |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 5.00 pm | Dr Ryan Spielvogel (Senior Medical Director for Aid in Dying Services, Sutter Health, USA), Dr Jessica Kaan (Medical Director, End of Life Washington) |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 10.25 am | Dr Greg Mewett (Specialist Palliative Care Physician, Australia), Dr Clare Fellingham (Deputy Director of Medical Services, Royal Perth Hospital, Australia), Dr Cam McLaren (Oncologist, Australia and New Zealand) |
| Wednesday 30 January | Until no later than 11.25 am | Professor Tom Shakespeare CBE FBA (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), Dr Miro Griffiths (University of Leeds), Yogi Amin (Partner, Irwin Mitchell), Chelsea Roff (Eat Breathe Thrive) |
| Wednesday 30 January | Until no later than 3.00 pm | Professor Jane Monckton-Smith OBE (University of Gloucestershire), Dr Alexandra Mullock (University of Manchester), Professor Allan House (University of Leeds), Professor Aneez Esmail (University of Manchester) |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 4.00 pm | Dr Lewis Graham (University of Cambridge), John Kirkpatrick (EHRC), Lord Sumption |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 5.00 pm | Hospice UK, Dr Jamilla Hussain (Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and Hull York Medical School), Dr Jane Neerkin (Consultant Physician in Palliative Medicine), Marie Curie |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 12.30 pm | Dr Chloe Furst (Geriatrician and Palliative Care Physician, Adelaide), Alex Greenwich MP (MP for Sydney, Parliament of New South Wales), Professor Meredith Blake (University of Western Australia) |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 2.00 pm | Dr Amanda Ward, Professor Gareth Owen (Kings College London and South London and Maudsley NHS Trust), Professor Laura Hoyano (Professor of Law, Oxford University and Red Lion Chambers) |

| Date | Time | Witness |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 3.00 pm | Professor Nancy Preston (Lancaster University), Dr Naomi Richards (University of Glasgow), Claire Williams (Head of Pharmacovigilance and Regulatory Services, North West eHealth DipHE Adult Nursing, MSc Pharmacovigilance, and Chair, Greater Manchester Central Research Ethics Committee) |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 4.00 pm | People and families of those with relevant experience |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 5.00pm | Mencap, Representative of Senedd Cymru |

The motion incorporates an amendment that would involve an extra hour of oral evidence on Thursday 30 January so that we can hear from a representative of the Senedd, to ensure that we cover Welsh devolution, and—as other members of the Committee have advised—from a representative of Mencap.

Naz Shah: I beg to move manuscript amendment (b), after “General Medical Council”, insert “, Royal College of Psychiatrists”.

The Chair: With this it will be convenient to discuss the following:

Manuscript amendment (c), after

“Dr Ryan Spielvogel (Senior Medical Director for Aid in Dying Services, Sutter Health, USA)”,

leave out

“Dr Jessica Kaan (Medical Director, End of Life Washington)”

and insert—

“Dr Ramona Coelho (Family Physician in Ontario Canada, founding member of Physicians Together with vulnerable Canadians)”.

Manuscript amendment (d), after

“Dr Miro Griffiths (University of Leeds)”,

leave out

“Yogi Amin (Partner, Irwin Mitchell)”

and insert—

“Ellen Clifford (Co-ordinator, UK Deaf and Disabled People’s Monitoring Coalition. Author and Visiting Research Fellow within the Centre for Applied Philosophy, Politics and Ethics at Brighton)”.

Manuscript amendment (e), after “Lord Sumption” insert “Karon Monaghan KC”.

Manuscript amendment (f), leave out

“Dr Chloe Furst (Geriatrician and Palliative Care Physician, Adelaide), Alex Greenwich MP (MP for Sydney, Parliament of New South Wales), Professor Meredith Blake (University of Western Australia)”

and insert—

“Dr John Daffy, previously head of infectious diseases at St Vincent’s Hospital in Melbourne, Dr Stephen Parnis, previous Vice-President of the Australian Medical Association, Professor Sinead Donnelly, a Consultant Palliative Medicine Professor in New Zealand”.

Manuscript amendment (g), leave out “Dr Amanda Ward” and insert

“Barbara Rich (Barrister) and Dr Philip Murray (University of Cambridge)”.

Manuscript amendment (i), at end of table, insert—

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|
| “Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 5.00pm | Richard Robinson, CEO of Hourglass, Cherryl Henry-Leach, CEO of STADA, Sarah Mistry, CEO British Geriatrics Society”. |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---|

Naz Shah: On amendment (b), given the issue we are considering, I think it is important that the Royal College of Psychiatrists is involved. One thing that is very important to me is the issue of coercion, and the royal college would be able to shed light on that. One of the many reasons advanced for giving the Bill its Second Reading was that we would have further debate, and the royal college would add value to that.

On amendment (c), Dr Ramona Coelho is a physician with well-founded concerns about the operation of the law in Canada. She is a member of the Ontario Medical Assistance in Dying Death Review Committee, and she gave evidence to the Scottish Parliament Committee that considered the Assisted Dying for Terminally Ill Adults (Scotland) Bill.

On amendment (d), Ellen Clifford is co-ordinator of the UK Deaf and Disabled People’s Monitoring Coalition, and she has a key role in advocating for people with disabilities.

Danny Kruger: I want to speak in support of the proposed addition of Ellen Clifford. Last week, she won a High Court case against the previous Government for their consultation on benefits reform, so she is no friend of my party, but she is a powerful advocate on behalf of disabled people, and she represents the deaf and disabled people’s organisations that are so important in informing the Government on the implementation of policy that affects disabled people. I recognise that the hon. Lady has included some representatives of the disabled community, but I suggest that there would be particular value in hearing from Ms Clifford because of her role as the co-ordinator of the monitoring coalition of all these deaf and disabled people’s organisations across the country. She is the best person to advise the Committee on the operation of the Bill.

The Chair: Order. Before we proceed any further, let me say that the hon. Gentleman was in order, because I allowed him to speak, but it would be unhelpful if we started to cherry-pick amendments while going through them. Let the hon. Member for Bradford West speak to them—they are being taken together—and then any hon. Member who wishes to comment on any or all of them will have the opportunity to do so. Otherwise, we will have a very piecemeal approach.

Naz Shah: Given what you have just said, Sir Roger, I would be happy not to go through the individual amendments unless anybody wants to comment or wants me to add anything.

The Chair: I do not wish to prevent the hon. Lady from speaking to any of the other amendments, because we have grouped them all. She was doing very well. If she works through them, that will tell other Members where she is coming from.

Naz Shah: Thank you, Sir Roger.

By adding Karon Monaghan KC, an eminent equality and human rights law barrister, amendment (e) would add balance among the lawyers in the Committee. I would also like to add James Munby, or someone from His Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service, because we need someone who can speak to court capacity issues in relation to the Bill. Professor Katherine Sleeman is a great expert on all these matters.

I am going through the list, and I am unclear what the Australian MP would add. If we remove the other two, there are other pro-AD Australian experts who will speak instead. If we replace those three, who are experts from—

Kim Leadbeater: On a point of order, Sir Roger. My hon. Friend has just mentioned two names that are not in her amendment, and I find that slightly confusing.

Naz Shah: These are replacements of the words in your paper.

The Chair: Order. First, they are not mine. Please remember that you are addressing the Chair.

Secondly, the hon. Member for Bradford West has a list of amendments that she has tabled, to add some people and remove others. Patently, she cannot refer to people who are not on that list. If she works through it name by name, I think we will get to where we need to be.

Naz Shah: I appreciate that, Sir Roger. Adding Richard Robinson—

Hon. Members: Not on the list.

The Chair: Are we working from the same list? *[Interruption.]* Order. Continue to work through the list and you will get to where you need to be.

Naz Shah: Thank you, Sir Roger.

Danny Kruger: I want to make a general point in support of the hon. Lady's suggestions.

The Chair: No, I am sorry. Please let the hon. Lady finish her speech.

Naz Shah: I apologise. I thank everybody for bearing with me on this one.

Amendment (e) would insert Karon Monaghan KC after Lord Sumption. I have said that I would like her added because of her expertise.

Amendment (f) would insert Dr John Daffy, previously head of infectious disease at St Vincent's hospital in Melbourne, Dr Stephen Parnis, previous vice-president

of the Australian Medical Association, and Professor Sinéad Donnelly, a consultant palliative medical professor in New York. That is what I was speaking to when I was talking about having three people from one country and not having an alternative voice. I think it is really important to have an alternative voice, and I am not sure what added value the MP for Sydney would bring to the debate when we have so many people contributing from countries that are pro and delivering, rather than from those that have concerns.

Amendment (g) would remove Dr Amanda Ward and insert Barbara Rich, barrister, and Dr Philip Murray from the University of Cambridge.

The Chair: I think you have one more. Would you also like to speak to amendment (i)? It is on the other side of the amendment paper, which we nearly all missed.

Let me assist the hon. Lady: she wishes us to insert, at the end of the table in the sittings motion, a new set of witnesses on Thursday 30 January, to give evidence until no later than 5 pm.

Daniel Francis (Bexleyheath and Crayford) (Lab): On a point of order, Sir Roger. Amendment (i) clashes with the sitting times on Thursday suggested by my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley.

The Chair: The hon. Lady may deal with amendment (i) and with the hon. Gentleman's proposal. At this stage, let me simply call Kit Malthouse to speak to amendment (b).

Kit Malthouse: I rise to speak to amendment (b) and to the other amendments tabled by the hon. Member for Bradford West. As we discussed in private, I am concerned that the promoter of the Bill, the hon. Member for Spen Valley, has been through an extensive period of trying to collate everybody's recommendations for the Bill and reach a list that is both manageable within the timeframe and a compromise for all of us on what we would like to see.

The odd adjustment here and there is fine, but we ought to bear in mind that in any one session we need to have sufficient time for people to speak. We have to be careful not to double up because we may or may not think that a particular witness might propose a view with which we are sympathetic, when we already have people who are covering the same subject. On amendment (b), for example, all psychiatrists are regulated by the General Medical Council, as I am sure the hon. Member for Bradford West knows, so effectively the royal college is a doubling up of expertise, which is not necessarily in the interests of time. Similarly, in amendment (c), the hon. Lady is proposing a physician from Canada—

Naz Shah *rose*—

Kit Malthouse: I will just finish, if I may. Our Bill is built on a very different legal framework from Canada's. Drawing legislative parallels between the two seems like a cul-de-sac, not least because, as the hon. Lady will know, the legal framework in Canada is dictated by the charter of rights and freedoms, effectively a constitution,

[*Kit Malthouse*]

which has been used there to widen the scope of the law. Canada started from a very different place as well, so I am not totally convinced.

What the hon. Member for Spen Valley has tried to do with the list is to find overseas territories that are analogous to our own and have adopted a model similar to ours. We are therefore trying to learn lessons from the process of debate and legislative procedure that they went through—either to learn from them or to learn from their mistakes. For example, knocking out the Member of Parliament from Australia would be a mistake, not least because Australia has been through a number of iterations with its law. Most of Australia has a bar on doctor initiation of the conversation. The medical profession think that that is a big negative in Australia, as I understand it, so I would like to understand why, politically and in legislation, it was felt that that was needed or helpful, and why it was imposed.

On the other amendments, the hon. Member for Bradford West is making a value judgment about comparative expertise between Amanda Ward and whoever she wants to propose instead—Philip Murray. I do not know why she is making that value judgment, but as far as I can see, the names were properly submitted in the process. The hon. Lady obviously had the chance to submit names during the process. For better or worse, as she may see fit, the hon. Member for Spen Valley has come up with a list that is a compromise. That is not to say that the hon. Member for Bradford West cannot arrange briefings with any of these experts outside the formal process, for Members to attend should they so wish, or that she cannot seek advice from them during the process of the Bill.

My primary concern about the amendments is that we are opening up a whole area of debate where we could all have gone with our suggestions. I would rather stick with the list that we have, because I fear that the hon. Member for Bradford West is doubling up and making value judgments about expertise that are not necessarily warranted.

Danny Kruger: All the names that the hon. Member for Bradford West has suggested were indeed submitted, I believe, to the hon. Member for Spen Valley ahead of the deadline that she put to us at the end of last month.

Kim Leadbeater: On a point of order, Sir Roger. All those names were not submitted.

Danny Kruger: The hon. Lady can feel free to intervene on me without troubling the Chair. I stand corrected if that is the case. We only received the final list this morning. It was necessary to make alternative suggestions ahead of that, which was done. I am now supporting the hon. Member for Bradford West in making suggestions for slight adjustments, as she suggests is all that is appropriate at this point. The list is unbalanced. I had to do a very quick analysis, and of the almost 60 names that have been put to us, 38 of them are in favour of the Bill and the principle of assisted dying, whereas there are only 20 who are opposed. There is an inherent imbalance there. It is only a quick analysis that has been done, and we will be able to do more of that subsequent to this sitting, but that is my impression.

3.45 pm

A critical thing is that we have eight witnesses from foreign jurisdictions, of whom all are supportive of the operation of assisted dying in their own countries. It is appropriate to hear from Canada, although I am not surprised that my right hon. Friend the Member for North West Hampshire does not want to hear from there, as the stories are so appalling. It is the country most analogous to the United Kingdom in terms of its operation of the common law, although there are some legal differences.

My right hon. Friend points to the charter of fundamental rights. He may have heard of the European convention on human rights, which operates in a similar way. We are concerned about the potential expansion of this law under our own human rights frameworks, so it is not inappropriate to hear from a Commonwealth country that operates a parliamentary system similar to our own.

I am suggesting very minor changes; I am surprised that they should be unacceptable to the Committee. I suggest substituting a small number—two or three—of the witnesses that are being proposed from those foreign countries in favour of others, equally qualified, who take a different view of the legislation. I hope that the Committee will consider accepting some of that.

Dr Opher: The Bill as proposed is extremely similar to the Australian law, but it is not similar to Canadian law. Therefore, I do not see that bringing Canadian expertise into the Committee is of any use at all. I also back the right hon. Member for North West Hampshire when he said that in almost all situations we are just replacing one expert for another, so the only contentious bit is whether we have people from Australia in support of or against assisted dying.

A split of 38 to 20, with the other witnesses being neutral, is appropriate and actually reflects the vote in the House. I do not see that as a disadvantage. Are the witnesses really going to change what we are saying? We need to listen to them and learn from them, but having some of them against assisted dying is enough to give us due discipline and ensure we listen to exactly what the problems might be, so I disagree with the hon. Member for East Wiltshire.

Danny Kruger: Very quickly, let me say that 38 to 20—two to one—was not the split that happened on Second Reading. There was a much more finely balanced position in the House. I accept that the hon. Gentleman does not want to hear from Canada and I do not blame him—people who are in favour of the Bill are desperate to keep Canada out of it. Okay—let us look at Australia. There are many people in Australia—MPs included, if we could hear from politicians—who continue to profoundly oppose the Bill on the grounds that it is not working, it is dangerous and it is being expanded. Let us hear some alternative views if we are interested in foreign experience.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

The Chair: I am going to take the hon. Member for Spen Valley, who is the promoter of the Bill, last.

Sojan Joseph (Ashford) (Lab): I want to talk about amendment (b). The right hon. Member for North West Hampshire said that all members of the Royal College of Psychiatrists are already members of the General Medical Council. But not everyone on the General Medical Council is doing the same job. Psychiatrists are experts whose day-to-day job is to manage people's mental state, and deal with people with suicidal thoughts and depression. They are the experts.

I do not think that all members of the Royal College of Psychiatrists are for or against the Bill, so it would be reasonable to listen to those people who are experts in assessing people's mental state and whether they are having suicidal thoughts—that is part of their job. I strongly support that part of the provision.

Tom Gordon (Harrogate and Knaresborough) (LD): I want to touch on a few bits of language that have been used so far that just worry me slightly. When we talk about the value that experts can add to this process, it is not necessarily helpful for someone to try to say that some experts would be better than others in that regard. The phrase “best person” was used in one particular instance and there were comments about whether or not experts would add balance.

The list that has been collated has taken the lead sponsoring Member of the Bill a number of weeks and months to produce. Everyone had the opportunity to feed into that process over a period of time. And on balance, it is a list that captures a wide spread of views and different organisations.

During this sitting a number of points of order have been made to correct the record. In the spirit of the Second Reading debate on the Bill in the House of Commons, we need to try to make sure that we are mindful of any comment we make, so that we do not seem to try to say things that are not necessarily accurate.

The point that was made earlier about eight witnesses coming from foreign jurisdictions is important. My understanding of this whole process is that it is not about our trying to decide whether the Bill should go ahead or not; it is about trying to understand what would be workable. So, hearing from people in places that have already implemented assisted dying is far more useful than hearing from people in countries that have not done so. We have also heard from Members about which of those countries are more comparable to us.

It does not necessarily help us if someone takes us round in circles and talks about the point rather than trying to get on with the work. I fear that that is where we are at with these amendments. If we are now trying to rejig who will give evidence and at what time, that stops us from doing the important job of scrutinising the legislation and hearing from the expert witnesses that we want to call.

These amendments are not minor changes. Regarding the list that has already been collated, I know that it has taken a lot of time to establish when the witnesses on it are free and available to give evidence. I am not sure that those witnesses referred to in the amendment have the same level of availability in their diaries. So, on balance, we should proceed as the lead Member has been putting it, and putting it so well.

Lewis Atkinson: I agree with the comments of the hon. Member for Harrogate and Knaresborough. The hon. Member for East Wiltshire said at the start that the purpose of this Committee was not to relitigate the principle of the vote that we had on Second Reading. Yet in his comment just now, he talked about weighing up the numbers in favour or against, which entirely suggests that the issue of witness evidence selection exists in his head and that he is relitigating matters.

I come to the issues around the Australian amendment—amendment (f). Of course the expertise will come from people who are participating in the system. By definition, they are not ethically opposed to it, because if they were opposed to it on the basis of conscience, they would not be participating in the system in Australia. As the Bill makes amply clear, no medical professional or health professional here will be under any obligation to participate in the system here.

Therefore, in order for this Committee to do the serious work of making sure that the Bill is as robust and workable as possible, we need to hear overwhelmingly from people involved in this practice in other jurisdictions, to benefit from their expertise. We do not need to hear from people from other jurisdictions who are, in principle, opposed to this practice. Why would it be appropriate to remove the evidence of a palliative care physician involved in this practice in favour of a head of infectious diseases, whose relevance I do not see because they are not engaged in this practice? That just highlights my point.

I commend my hon. Friend, Kim Leadbeater, for the flexibility she has already shown today in adding names, and for the spirit that she has shown so far. The fact is that all these individuals may give written evidence that we will all consider. I am in favour of us moving on, getting our evidence sessions done and making progress, and dealing with the detail of the Bill, rather than using the selection of witnesses to try to relitigate the Second Reading debate.

The Chair: Order. We are now in formal session, so I gently remind the hon. Gentleman that in formal session we refer to Members by their constituencies and not by their names. I am the only person who uses names, because I can never remember constituencies.

Dr Neil Shastri-Hurst (Solihull West and Shirley) (Con): I, too, commend the hon. Member for Spen Valley for her efforts in pulling together this list; it is an unenviable task, given the number of contributions that were made.

It is important that we do not let the perfect become the enemy of the good. There is a wide range of individuals and organisations that we would all benefit from hearing from, but given the time available to the Committee—which is much more extensive than most private Members' Bills have, by some margin—we are not in a position to hear oral evidence from all of them. But there is an open invitation for everyone to contribute written evidence and for us, as my right hon. Friend the Member for North West Hampshire noted, to speak to engaged parties outside the Committee to feed into our thought processes and deliberations.

On the amendments tabled, I understand the reasons for amendment (b) on the Royal College of Psychiatrists, but I have to say that I disagree. The hon. Member for

[*Dr Neil Shastri-Hurst*]

Bradford West said it was about coercion. I could understand if she were making an argument that we need to hear from the Royal College of Surgeons about the issue of capacity, so I do not think that this is universally confined to psychiatrists; it is something, as a surgeon, I dealt with every day when I was getting consent for operations. We have to think about how we get a wide range of opinions on the subject: we have the Chief Medical Officer, who can comment on such issues from a policy perspective; we have the BMA, which I am sure will send representatives who will be most able to deal with the questions that are to be asked; and, of course, we have the General Medical Council, which is the ultimate regulator and arbitrator of this issue.

The Committee is also about ensuring that this legislation is as fit and as robust as possible when it goes back to the House for consideration. That is where I think that having a legislator from a jurisdiction in which this has been implemented is crucial. Not having the member for Sydney in the New South Wales Parliament—where they have implemented this, and have dealt with some of the thorny issues that the Committee and subsequently the House will have to deal with—would be a mistake. Likewise, having more geriatricians and palliative care physicians is a better balance than having those with some other expertise—well-meaning as they may be, they are not necessarily dealing with this at the coalface. I do not support the amendments for those reasons.

Jake Richards (Rother Valley) (Lab): I will not speak for long. I merely echo what my hon. Friend the Member for Sunderland Central said: this is not an arms race. It is not about who can get more experts with different views; it is about trying to get a wide-ranging and broad sense of different aspects of the Bill. The list that my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley has produced does that. I made suggestions that are not on it, by the way, but as the hon. Member for Solihull West and Shirley says, we cannot let perfection be the enemy of the good.

I want to push back briefly on some things that have been said about the lawyers and legal experts. I do not accept what the hon. Member for East Wiltshire says about whether they are for or against, and I am not sure that his numbers tally with my reading of their views. That goes to the subjectivity of this issue. It is not black and white; lots of people have complex views on it.

I am not sure whether amendment (g) was moved, but in any event the notion that issues such as ECHR compatibility cannot be handled by Lord Sumption, Lord Neuberger and Baroness Hale—three former Supreme Court judges and potentially the best legal minds of their generation—is frankly absurd. We all have roles and responsibilities, as members of this Committee and as Members of Parliament, to challenge their evidence and to push different cases. I have no doubt that we are all qualified and able enough to do so without hearing from a junior barrister and a junior lecturer. That is not in any way to belittle their expertise, because I have read endless commentary from both the suggested witnesses that is very valuable and could be put to the three former Supreme Court justices, who grappled with such cases time and again.

Danny Kruger: I think Baroness Hale has been knocked off the list. Am I right? I do not think we are going to have the huge pleasure of hearing from Baroness Hale.

Jake Richards: Well, we have had lots of lists, but Lord Sumption and Lord Neuberger are giving evidence, I believe; Lord Sumption is, anyway. These things can be tested and challenged, so the notion that we need to have others is slightly absurd. We have the law lecturer from Cambridge University as well.

Liz Saville Roberts (Dwyfor Meirionnydd) (PC): *Diolch yn fawr iawn.* I put it on record that I am very grateful that we will be able to find time for a legal adviser. It will not be a representative of the Senedd, because it has become apparent that the Senedd itself will not provide a Clerk to advise us. That seems to be a weak point in the process of making legislation: I think that as legislators we should be able to receive advice on the issue that is non-political and is perceived as non-political, so we probably need to address that in future. It will not be a representative of the Senedd, but I will seek within the time to get a legal advisor who is recognised as an expert in this field.

4 pm

I would like to note two things. We are endeavouring to maintain a balance between the normal procedure of private Members' Bills and, frankly, the concerns among some members of the public that that procedure will not allow us to replicate the conditions for Government Bills, which would assure us a balance of backgrounds represented and a consultation beforehand.

I very much feel that our duty is to produce a workable and legally watertight piece of legislation. I have some concerns that I want to put on record. We must not prevaricate, procrastinate and keep on discussing indefinitely something that has been discussed for decades prior to its arrival here, but we need the confidence of the public that we have taken balanced views and have allocated sufficient time for witnesses. I put it on record that I am concerned there may be a public perception that the time we have over three days next week, although there is an extension to that time, is insufficient. If we need to return to this and if there is agreement that we need further witnesses, we need—somehow, within the circumscription of private Members' Bills—the means to revisit that decision.

Jack Abbott (Ipswich) (Lab/Co-op): I want to briefly address the implication or inference that my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, who is leading the Bill, has not produced an incredibly balanced set of witnesses, or indeed a scrutiny Committee. I put it on record that in principle I am in support of assisted dying, but I did not feel that I could support the Bill on Second Reading, as I had a number of concerns including the strength of the Bill. We will be listening to evidence and discussing the issue not on the basis of principle, but on the basis of the strength of the Bill, the deliverability of the Bill and the number of safeguards, among other things. We are not here to debate the principle—that is a really important point.

Points that have been made about the suitability or otherwise of the people coming to speak to us. It is wrong to imply that any of those individuals will use

their personal feelings or principles and discount their neutrality. Are we really saying that the British Medical Association, the judges who have been mentioned or the chief medical officer will put their own views in place of their expertise and knowledge?

I should say for the public's benefit, my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley ensured that all Committee members were able to submit hundreds of names for consideration. In my view, she has come up with a panel of witnesses who are incredible experts in their field and have long-standing expertise in these areas, and we should absolutely listen to them.

I am sympathetic to the right hon. Member for Dwyfor Meirionnydd, who said that we may need extended time to hear from more people. I know that my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley would certainly be sympathetic to that and that we can look to do so, if it is necessary. However, the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. We have to ensure that we move this Committee along at a decent pace and hear from all these people.

Our job is to scrutinise the suitability of the Bill, not the principles. On that basis I oppose the amendment, although I am not against some of the names that have been proposed. Maybe there will be an opportunity to hear from them in future, but I do not think that we can get into a situation where we are removing some names and adding others. We would be here all week if we did, so I will be opposing the amendment.

The Chair: I now call the promoter of the Bill. I will then call the mover of the amendment.

Kim Leadbeater: I thank colleagues for their time this afternoon. It has been an extremely productive session. I am very proud of the tone of the debate: I think we have done a very good job, as we did on Second Reading, of showing this place in a good light.

I reiterate that there are a range of views in this Bill Committee, in the same way that there are a range of views across the House on this significant and deeply emotive issue. There are a range of views among the witnesses we will hear from, and I spent a huge amount of time ensuring that. Colleagues have given me more than 100 names of people they might like to hear from. I had my own list of people I would like to hear from, and many of them are not on the list of those who will give oral evidence.

I have tried to be extremely balanced, so we will hear from people with a range of views and opinions, but most importantly we will hear from people with expertise. That is the purpose of the Committee: to hear from people who can advise us on the detail of the Bill. We will go through this Bill line by line, and we need to hear from people who can help us to do that. We have some fantastic expertise on the Committee, but for many of us there are areas that we need to learn more about. It is important that the witnesses give us the information to enable us to do that, rather than—as numerous colleagues have said—once again going over the fundamental principles around assisted dying, because we did an excellent job of that on Second Reading.

At the end of our endeavours, we will produce a piece of legislation that will be re-presented to the House, and colleagues will again have the opportunity to vote on it however they see fit. There may be people in this room

who vote differently from how they voted on Second Reading; there may be colleagues out there who do likewise, one way or the other.

I am very clear about this Committee's role, which is to work on the Bill together, collegiately and collaboratively, irrespective of our different views, and re-present it to the House so that the House can continue to do its job. It is not just the Commons; the Lords will also have the opportunity to scrutinise the Bill and table amendments. I have always been open about the fact that this is about us working together. Where the Bill needs to be amended to make it more robust and alleviate people's concerns, whether that is around coercion or capacity, that is now the Committee's job. I stand ready to serve and to do that.

We have spent a lot of time this afternoon on this, and quite rightly so. As far as I am concerned, we are now in a position to move forward. I am very happy that we will hear from so many witnesses over several days, and I am happy that I have added more time to that so that we can hear from more witnesses, which I think is important. As colleagues have said, our job now is to get on with this really important piece of work.

Naz Shah: I thank my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, the promoter of this Bill, because she has been very helpful. She has certainly added one of my key witnesses to her list, and I am grateful for that.

I want to respond to some of the points that have been made. One of the biggest issues for me is amendment (b), which would insert "Royal College of Psychiatrists". My hon. Friend the Member for Ashford made the point that all psychiatrists come under the GMC, but not every member of the GMC is a psychiatrist. That speaks to the issue of coercion, mental health and capacity. That is the expertise that I am looking for in the line-by-line scrutiny of the Bill, and I would really like to hear from the Royal College of Psychiatrists.

I am happy to be guided by you, Sir Roger, because I am new to this process and I have not done a Bill of this nature before, but my only worry with the outside evidence and briefings is that they will not be on the record when we are looking at *Hansard* and seeing whether they have been taken into account. I would be happy to receive some assurance about that. Yes, we can organise lots of briefings and lots of experts, but does that not defeat the object of having this debate so robustly in the first instance?

The hon. Member for Harrogate and Knaresborough raised the issue of language, and the point about added value. I think that language is correct, because I do want to add value to this debate. I want value added, because it is important for my constituents that when I vote on the Bill on Report, I do so knowing that I have listened to all sides of the debate.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stroud asked whether this is a for-and-against argument. In particular, he said that we do not need to hear from those who are opposed, because we want to strengthen the Bill so that it can go through the House. Although I appreciate the sentiment, I put it to everyone that it is not about getting the Bill through; it is about getting the right information so we can scrutinise whether it is fit to go through the House. For that reason, it is important to hear from those who are opposed. It is naive to think that we only need to hear from people who are in support.

Tom Gordon: Will the hon. Member give way?

Naz Shah: Sorry—may I just make my point?

I need to know the other side of the argument in order to make a balanced decision. Those who are opposed to the Bill might have very valid concerns, while those who have expertise in support of the Bill might not give me the same arguments. I want to hear a balance. At the moment, I think there is a real discrepancy between the number of people who are for and against the Bill; it is not very close.

I appreciate that my hon. Friend the Member for Spen Valley, the Bill's promoter, really wants to get this legislation through Parliament. I also value how she has taken part in the debate and been amenable to having discussions both in Committee and in our offices. I have given my reasons for tabling the amendment, and I particularly want the Committee to accept amendment (b), on the Royal College of Psychiatrists; that is my top amendment.

Question put, That the amendment be made.

The Committee divided: Ayes 8, Noes 14.

Division No. 1]

AYES

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Campbell, Juliet | Paul, Rebecca |
| Francis, Daniel | Saville Roberts, rh Liz |
| Joseph, Sojan | Shah, Naz |
| Kruger, Danny | Woodcock, Sean |

NOES

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Abbott, Jack | Leadbeater, Kim |
| Atkinson, Lewis | Malthouse, rh Kit |
| Charalambous, Bambos | Opher, Dr Simon |
| Gordon, Tom | Richards, Jake |
| Green, Sarah | Sackman, Sarah |
| Hopkins, Rachel | Shastri-Hurst, Dr Neil |
| Kinnock, Stephen | Tidball, Dr Marie |

Question accordingly negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (c), after

“Dr Ryan Spielvogel (Senior Medical Director for Aid in Dying Services, Sutter Health, USA)”,

leave out

“Dr Jessica Kaan (Medical Director, End of Life Washington)”

and insert—

“Dr Ramona Coelho (Family Physician in Ontario Canada, founding member of Physicians Together with vulnerable Canadians)”.—(*Naz Shah.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (d), after

“Dr Miro Griffiths (University of Leeds)”,

leave out

“Yogi Amin (Partner, Irwin Mitchell)”

and insert—

“Ellen Clifford (Co-ordinator, UK Deaf and Disabled People's Monitoring Coalition. Author and Visiting Research Fellow within the Centre for Applied Philosophy, Politics and Ethics at Brighton)”.—(*Naz Shah.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (e), after “Lord Sumption” insert “Karon Monaghan KC”.—(Naz Shah.)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (f), leave out

“Dr Chloe Furst (Geriatrician and Palliative Care Physician, Adelaide), Alex Greenwich MP (MP for Sydney, Parliament of New South Wales), Professor Meredith Blake (University of Western Australia)”

and insert—

“Dr John Daffy, previously head of infectious diseases at St Vincent's Hospital in Melbourne, Dr Stephen Parnis, previous Vice-President of the Australian Medical Association, Professor Sinead Donnelly, a Consultant Palliative Medicine Professor in New Zealand”.—(*Naz Shah.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (g), leave out “Dr Amanda Ward” and insert

“Barbara Rich (Barrister) and Dr Philip Murray (University of Cambridge)”.—(*Naz Shah.*)

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Manuscript amendment proposed: (i), at end of table, insert—

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| “Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 5.00pm | Richard Robinson, CEO of Hourglass, Cheryl Henry- Leach, CEO of STADA, Sarah Mistry, CEO British Geriatrics Society”.—(<i>Naz Shah.</i>) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|

Question put, That the amendment be made.

Question negated.

Main Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That—

(1) the Committee shall (in addition to its first meeting at 2.00 pm on Tuesday 21 January) meet—

- (a) at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm on Tuesday 28 January;
- (b) at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm on Wednesday 29 January;
- (c) at 11.30 am and 1.00 pm on Thursday 30 January.

(2) during further proceedings on the Terminally Ill Adults (End of Life) Bill, the Committee do meet on Tuesdays and Wednesdays while the House is sitting at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm.

(3) the Committee shall hear oral evidence in accordance with the following Table:

| Date | Time | Witness |
|----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 10.05 am | Sir Chris Whitty (Chief Medical Officer for England), Duncan Burton (Chief Nursing Officer) |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 10.45 am | The British Medical Association, The General Medical Council |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 11.25 am | Association of Palliative Care Social Workers, Royal College of Nursing |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 3.15 pm | Dr Rachel Clark, Dr Sam Ahmedzai (Emeritus Professor at the University of Sheffield), Sue Ryder, Association of Palliative Medicine |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 4.15 pm | Sir Max Hill KC, Alex Ruck Keene KC (Hon), Sir Nicholas Mostyn. |
| Tuesday 28 January | Until no later than 5.00 pm | Dr Ryan Spielvogel (Senior Medical Director for Aid in Dying Services, Sutter Health, USA), Dr Jessica Kaan (Medical Director, End of Life Washington) |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 10.25 am | Dr Greg Mewett (Specialist Palliative Care Physician, Australia), Dr Clare Fellingham (Deputy Director of Medical Services, Royal Perth Hospital, Australia), Dr Cam McLaren (Oncologist, Australia and New Zealand). |
| Wednesday 30 January | Until no later than 11.25 am | Professor Tom Shakespeare CBE FBA (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), Dr Miro Griffiths (University of Leeds), Yogi Amin (Partner, Irwin Mitchell), Chelsea Roff (Eat Breathe Thrive) |
| Wednesday 30 January | Until no later than 3.00 pm | Professor Jane Monckton-Smith OBE (University of Gloucestershire), Dr Alexandra Mullock (University of Manchester), Professor Allan House (University of Leeds), Professor Aneez Esmail (University of Manchester) |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 4.00 pm | Dr Lewis Graham (University of Cambridge), John Kirkpatrick (EHRC), Lord Sumption |
| Wednesday 29 January | Until no later than 5.00 pm | Hospice UK, Dr Jamilla Hussain (Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and Hull York Medical School), Dr Jane Neerkin (Consultant Physician in Palliative Medicine), Marie Curie. |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 12.30 pm | Dr Chloe Furst (Geriatrician and Palliative Care Physician, Adelaide), Alex Greenwich MP (MP for Sydney, Parliament of New South Wales), Professor Meredith Blake (University of Western Australia) |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 2.00 pm | Dr Amanda Ward, Professor Gareth Owen (Kings College London and South London and Maudsley NHS Trust), Professor Laura Hoyano (Professor of Law, Oxford University and Red Lion Chambers) |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 3.00 pm | Professor Nancy Preston (Lancaster University), Dr Naomi Richards (University of Glasgow), Claire Williams (Head of Pharmacovigilance and Regulatory Services, North West eHealth DipHE Adult Nursing, MSc Pharmacovigilance, and Chair, Greater Manchester Central Research Ethics Committee) |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 4.00 pm | People and families of those with relevant experience. |
| Thursday 30 January | Until no later than 5.00pm | Mencap, Representative of Senedd Cymru |

The Chair: The Committee has agreed that the first day of line-by-line scrutiny will be Tuesday 4 February. The deadline for amendments to be considered on the Committee's first day of line-by-line scrutiny is on Thursday 30 January. The first day of oral evidence will be Tuesday 28 January.

Resolved,

That, subject to the discretion of the Chair, any written evidence received by the Committee shall be reported to the House for publication.—(*Kim Leadbeater.*)

The Chair: Copies of the written evidence received by the Committee will be made available in the Committee Room.

For the record, we are seeking a Committee Room in which our proceedings can be televised. I will try to find as much accommodation for public space as possible, because there may be considerable interest in the Bill.

Ordered, That further consideration be now adjourned.—(*Kit Malthouse.*)

4.16 pm

Adjourned till Tuesday 28 January at twenty-five minutes past Nine o'clock.

