



MEMO is produced by the [Scottish Council of Jewish Communities \(SCoJeC\)](#) in partnership with [BEMIS – empowering Scotland's ethnic and cultural minority communities](#). It provides an overview of information of interest to minority ethnic communities in Scotland, including parliamentary activity at Holyrood and Westminster, new publications, consultations, forthcoming conferences, and news reports.

Contents

Immigration and Asylum	Bills in Progress
Equality	Consultations
Racism, Religious Hatred, and Discrimination	Job Opportunities
Other Scottish Parliament and Government	Funding Opportunities
Other UK Parliament and Government	Events, Conferences, and Training
Cost of Living	Useful Links
Other News	Back issues

Note that some weblinks, particularly of newspaper articles, are only valid for a short period of time, usually around a month, and that the Scottish and UK Parliament and Government websites have been redesigned, so that links published in previous issues of MEMO may no longer work. To find archive material on these websites, copy details from MEMO into the relevant search facility.

Please send information for inclusion in MEMO to MEMO@scojec.org and [click here](#) to be added to the mailing list.

The Scottish Parliament is in recess until 4 September 2023.

Immigration and Asylum

Scottish Parliament Debate

Illegal Migration Bill

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15396&i=131330#ScotParIOR>

Scottish Parliament Oral Answers

Asylum Seekers (Free Bus Travel)

Mark Ruskell (Green) [S6O-02455] To ask the Scottish Government whether it will

provide an update on the pilot providing free bus travel to people seeking asylum in Glasgow.

Reply from the Minister for Transport (Fiona Hyslop): The Scottish Government-funded pilot led by the Refugee Survival Trust and partners in Glasgow commenced on Monday 30 January, and it will run until July. It provides travel support to people who are seeking asylum and are living in Glasgow through the provision of a 12-week digital pass, along with information and digital support. Participants will provide information on how often they travel by bus, the reasons for their journeys and how having access to bus travel impacts their lives. The findings that are collected will help to inform longer-term solutions to provide free bus travel to people who are seeking asylum in Scotland.

Mark Ruskell: ... The pilot in Glasgow will show us exactly how life changing free travel can be for people who are seeking asylum, who, thanks to Tory hostility, are forced to live on barely £45 a week. We already have similar stories from schemes in Aberdeen and Wales that make the case for change. Will the minister agree to meet campaigners to discuss the next steps on extending the scheme to all those who are seeking asylum in Scotland?

Reply from Fiona Hyslop: Yes, I will be happy to meet representatives of those groups following the conclusion of the pilot to discuss how free bus travel can best be provided to people to help to support them in really challenging circumstances. They are in a difficult position—generally, they are not allowed to work to support themselves or eligible for benefits. The Scottish Government takes an inclusive approach to people who are seeking asylum. It works to enable access to support and services on the same basis as other Scottish residents, where that is possible.

Kaukab Stewart (SNP): The minister will be aware that the Equalities, Human Rights and Civil Justice Committee has undertaken an inquiry on the experience of asylum seekers here in Scotland. Given the severely limited financial support, it is clear that free bus travel will better enable access to services. Will the minister outline what discussions have been had with the United Kingdom Government about providing wider support to asylum seekers accessing transport services? ...

Reply from Fiona Hyslop: In the “Ending destitution together” strategy, the Scottish Government recommends that the United Kingdom Government should ensure that the financial element of asylum support reflects the real costs of daily life, including travel.

I am limited for time, so I will just reiterate that the Scottish ministers continue to raise issues that have an impact on people seeking asylum who are living in our communities, and to push the United Kingdom Government for positive change.

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15402&i=131392#ScotParlOR>

Information about the Equalities, Human Rights and Civil Justice Committee inquiry referred to above can be read at

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/committees/current-and-previous-committees/session-6-equalities-human-rights-and-civil-justice-committee/business-items/asylum-seekers-in-scotland>

The strategy referred to above can be read at

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-destitution-together/>

Scottish Parliament Written Answers

Human Trafficking Survivors

Pauline McNeill (Labour) [S6W-18729] To ask the Scottish Government how it plans to

maintain access to the support and assistance entitlements for all trafficking survivors, irrespective of nationality, under the Human Trafficking and Exploitation (Scotland) Act 2015, in light of any retrospective effect of the UK Government's Illegal Migration Bill.

Reply from Siobhian Brown The Scottish Government has been clear that the UK Government's cruel Illegal Migration Bill should be withdrawn immediately. The proposals, if enacted, will unjustly harm some of the most vulnerable people in society by restricting access to support and assistance under the Human Trafficking and Exploitation (Scotland) Act 2015 for a person deemed within scope of the UK Bill.

We recognise and share the significant concern displayed across Scotland about the UK Bill. The Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice and Minister for Equalities, Migration and Refugees hosted a Summit on 22 June, focusing on our response to the Bill's likely impacts - including on potential victims of human trafficking. We will reflect on discussions at the Summit and continue our engagement with partners throughout Scotland.

The Scottish Parliament rejected the UK Bill during a debate on 25 April. We set out our intent to lodge a Legislative Consent Memorandum (LCM) on two clauses within the Bill which alter the executive competence of the Scottish Ministers. Following consideration, the Scottish Parliament has determined that it is not a relevant Bill for the purposes of Standing Orders Rule 9B.1 and has not accepted the lodging of the LCM.

Although an LCM cannot be lodged, the Scottish Government intends to facilitate an alternative debate motion to allow for Parliamentary scrutiny of the Bill. Scottish Ministers will also write to relevant Parliamentary Committees setting out the Scottish Government's position on the Bill for the record and inviting consideration about the implications of the Bill for Scotland.

We continue to monitor the Bill closely as it is considered by the House of Lords.

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/questions-and-answers/question?ref=S6W-18720>

The debate on the Illegal Migration Bill referred to above can be read at

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15260&i=130156#ScotParlOR>

UK Parliament Debates

Population Growth: Impact of Immigration

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-27/debates/18903CC8-FF6B-4D42-B361-D8B4FC404B24/PopulationGrowthImpactOfImmigration>

Asylum Applicants: Mental Health and Wellbeing

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-27/debates/DD09156D-32ED-4E29-BE72-EC8499CD72C6/AsylumApplicantsMentalHealthAndWellbeing>

UK Parliament, Ministerial Statement

Illegal Migration Bill Update

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Suella Braverman) [HCWS883] I have today published the economic impact assessment (EIA) for the Illegal Migration Bill on the Bill page on gov.uk. ...

The Bill is a critical component of the Government plan to stop the boats. Its intent is

straightforward: to make clear that if you come to the UK illegally, you will be detained and swiftly returned to your home country if safe, or resettled in a safe third country such as Rwanda. This will help to break the business model of the people smugglers, save lives, and deter small boat crossings. The Bill will also set an annual quota for the number of people admitted to the UK for resettlement through safe and legal routes—this should be the only way for those seeking refuge to arrive in the UK.

The economic impact assessment supports the need for change, sets out the broad costs of Bill implementation, offers estimates of potential savings should the Bill succeed in deterring small boat crossings, and considers examples of where policy and operations have influenced migrant behaviour in other countries. In these international examples, including the evidence from Australia where there was a significant impact on boat arrivals due to changes introduced by the Government there, the assessment illustrates how an appropriately targeted set of measures can be associated with a decline in numbers of illegal arrivals.

Australia's operational sovereign borders programme reduced the number of small boats arriving in Australia from around 18,000 in 2013 to virtually zero in subsequent years. We have also seen how deterrence strategies can impact on Albanian small boat arrivals in the UK. From January to May, the number of Albanians arriving by small boat so far this year is almost 90% less than in the same period last year.

The economic impact assessment clearly shows that doing nothing is not an option, as the volumes and costs associated with illegal migration and the asylum system have risen significantly over recent years, driven by the rise in small boat arrivals. This increase of pressure on the UK asylum system, public sector spending, public service and accommodation capacity, and local communities is unsustainable. That is why we are changing our laws and taking action to stop the boats.

In 2022-23, the current system cost the UK an estimated £3.6 billion in asylum support costs alone and we are spending £6 million a day on hotel accommodation. Unless we take action to stop the boats, these and other costs will continue to rise.

The economic impact assessment estimates that—at current spending levels—the Bill would need to deter 37% of arrivals to enable cost savings for the taxpayer. However, the costs of accommodating illegal migrants have increased dramatically since 2020. If these trends continue, by the end of 2026 the Home Office would be spending over £11 billion a year, or over £32 million a day, on asylum support. In such a scenario, the Bill would only need to deter 2% of arrivals for the policy to enable cost savings for the taxpayer.

The economic impact assessment forecasts a monetised benefit of over £100,000 for every illegal migrant deterred by the Bill. The impact assessment also considers non-monetised benefits that would result from stopping the boats, including: fewer individuals undertaking hazardous and unnecessary journeys crossing the channel; reduced pressures on public services and housing markets; and other wider asylum system benefits from fewer migrants being supported in the system.

The economic impact assessment will help inform further scrutiny of the Bill as it enters its Report stage in the House of Lords this week. I look forward to the Bill returning to the House of Commons soon and, subject to parliamentary approval, its enactment by the summer recess.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-26/debates/2306267000013/IllegalMigrationBillUpdate>

The Economic Impact Assessment referred to above can be read at

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal_Migration_Bill_IA_-_LM_Signed-final.pdf

UK Parliament, House of Commons Ministerial Statement and Q&A

Migration and Economic Development Partnership

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Suella Braverman): ... I would like to make a statement about the UK's migration and economic development partnership with Rwanda.

The Government fundamentally believe that it is only by removing the incentive for people to take dangerous and unnecessary journeys that we will stop the boats and end the vicious cycle of people smuggling to UK shores. That is why my right hon. Friend the Member for Witham (Priti Patel) signed our groundbreaking migration and economic development partnership with Rwanda in April last year. The agreement allows individuals who arrive in the UK through dangerous, unnecessary and illegal routes to be relocated to Rwanda for the consideration of their asylum claim and to build a new life there.

I visited Kigali in March, meeting Rwanda's President and Foreign Minister, and signing an update to our memorandum of understanding that would bring it into line with our Illegal Migration Bill. Rwanda reiterated its commitment and capacity to receive thousands of individuals, process their claims and provide them with excellent care before they are transitioned to longer-term accommodation, with all the necessary support and services. And it is why, under the terms of that agreement, we attempted our first relocation flight to Rwanda: to demonstrate that if you come here illegally, you will be removed to a safe third country for your claim to be processed.

Importantly, Rwanda is a country where the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees itself operates an emergency transit scheme for migrants from Libya, and with which we have a robust agreement to protect asylum seekers from risk of harm. That first relocation flight was, unfortunately, frustrated by last-minute measures from the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, which has had the effect of pausing flights while our domestic legal proceedings are ongoing.

In December, the Divisional Court of the High Court comprehensively upheld the lawfulness of the partnership, confirming that Rwanda was a safe country. That judgment was appealed to the Court of Appeal, which heard the appeal in April and handed down its judgment earlier today. I respect the Court and welcome the fact that it unanimously found in the Government's favour on the vast majority of the appeals brought against the policy.

Unanimously, the Court of Appeal confirmed that removing asylum seekers to a safe country is entirely consistent with the Refugee convention, including article 31. The Court of Appeal found that it is lawful, in principle, for the Government to relocate people who come to the UK illegally to a safe third country; that the Government can designate countries as safe; and that our processes for determining eligibility for relocation are fair.

Unfortunately, two judges were of the view that there were deficiencies in the Rwanda asylum system that risked a breach of article 3 of the European convention on human rights. Importantly, their concerns were not that conditions in Rwanda would be unsafe, but that there was a possibility that they could be returned to other countries from Rwanda where they may suffer ill treatment. It is therefore simply incorrect to say that the Court has found that conditions in Rwanda make it unsafe for individuals there. The Court of Appeal has merely ruled that there is a risk of refoulement from Rwanda to other countries. The Lord Chief Justice took a different view. Agreeing with the High Court, he held that there was no real risk of individuals being sent to unsafe countries. He cited the strong assurance given by the Rwandan Government, the fact that Rwanda does not have returns agreements with those countries, and the powerful protections provided by monitoring arrangements that would be in place. The result is that the High Court's decision that Rwanda was a safe third country for the purposes of asylum relocation is reversed. We have a strong relationship with Rwanda. Both sides remain committed to the policy. Rwanda is a signatory to the United Nations conventions and has a strong track record of

supporting refugees—including for the UNHCR.

This is a disappointing judgment, and we will seek permission to appeal it. We hope that the process will be swift. I am glad that the Court of Appeal has recognised in paragraph 16 of its summary judgment that it is an important consideration that should be dealt with in a timely fashion.

The judgment is disappointing for the majority of the British people, who have repeatedly voted for controlled migration, and for all those who want to see us deliver on our moral and democratic imperative to stop the boats. I am sure that all Members of this House would agree that the British public are compassionate, reasonable and fair minded. Since 2015, we have welcomed half a million people in need from all over the world, via our global safe and legal routes, as well as via our country-specific routes encompassing Ukraine, Hong Kong, Afghanistan and Syria.

But the British public are not naive. While our compassion to help people may be infinite, the public understand that our capacity to do so is finite and therefore precious. The British people will no longer indulge the polite fiction that we have a duty or infinite capacity to support everyone in the world who is fleeing persecution, nor anyone that would simply like to come here to improve their lot and succeeds in making it to our shores. That abuse is unfair on local communities forced to absorb thousands of illegal arrivals and the pressure on public services and social cohesion that this entails. It is unfair on taxpayers who foot the hotel bill—currently running to £6 million a day, and that could rise to £32 million a day by 2026—for people who have broken into this country.

It is unfair on those who play by the rules, and who want to see an asylum system that is fit for purpose, that our current system is exploited and turned against us by those with no right to be in the UK. It is unfair on those most in need of protection—particularly women, children, and those without the money to pay people smugglers—that our asylum system is overwhelmed by fit young men who have paid criminals thousands of pounds to smuggle them into the UK. It is unfair on people, and our partners in the developing world, that we in the west continue to maintain an asylum system so open to abuse that it incentivises mass flows of economic migration into Europe, lining the pockets of people smugglers and turning our seas into graveyards, all in the name of a phoney humanitarianism.

This is madness, and it must end. That that is why we, on the Government Benches, are committed to doing whatever it takes to stop the boats. The Government remain resolute that we will do exactly that, in partnership with Rwanda, and through changes to our law. That is the only way we will break the business model of the people smugglers, that is the only way we will save lives, and that is the only way we will stop the boats. ...

Yvette Cooper (Labour): Today's judgment shows that the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary have no plan to fix the Tories' small boats chaos. Their only policy, to send everyone to Rwanda, is now completely unravelling. Ministers have admitted that it will cost £169,000 to send each person to Rwanda—on top of the £140 million cheques that they have already written, with more costs to come—but now the court has found that they did not even do the basic work to make sure that the Rwanda scheme was legal or safe.

Over four years, this Tory boats crisis has grown and grown, and the Government have completely broken the asylum system. They have failed to stop criminal gangs taking hold along our borders—gangs that have seen their profits soar from £3 million four years ago to more than £180 million today. They promised four years ago that they would end boat crossings in six months, but the number has increased more than twentyfold since then. Convictions for people smuggling have dropped, asylum decision making has collapsed—down by a third—but the costs of the asylum system have soared. A fivefold increase in the cost for just one person in the asylum system is no one else's fault; it is just Tory mismanagement and chaos, resulting in a backlog that has soared to a record high of 175,000. The projection of the Home Office itself is that those Tory failures will rise to a cost of £11 billion. ...

This Rwanda scheme is unworkable, unethical, extortionately expensive, and a costly and damaging distraction from the urgent practical action that we should be taking—from the plan that Labour has set out to stop wasting all this money on a failing Rwanda scheme and instead to go after the criminal gangs, and to secure a stronger agreement with France and sort out the massive backlog that is costing a fortune: action to stop the dangerous boat crossings that are undermining our border security and putting lives at risk.

The Home Secretary has defended her Rwanda plan, but this is what the judgment reveals. Not only will it cost £169,000 for each person, as well as the £140 million cheques that have been sent; according to the Lord Chief Justice, there will be substantial sums of future aid support. How much? The Government are expecting Rwanda to take asylum decisions under a memorandum of understanding, but the judgment reveals that the Rwandan asylum system takes only about 100 decisions a year at the moment, and has a 100% rejection rate for Afghanistan, Syria and Yemen. Under the Israel Rwanda deal, the Government breached the memorandum of understanding. People were routinely targeted by agents and gangs and moved clandestinely to Uganda, which has made trafficking worse.

The judgment also says that Rwanda has only one committee that takes all the asylum decisions and only one eligibility officer preparing cases. So on the idea that the Government are going to be able to deliver on their pledges, even the Lord Chief Justice, who finds that the scheme could be lawful, has said that it is only on the basis that the scheme is small—just 100 people.

The Home Secretary talks again today about thousands of people being sent. The Lord Chief Justice says that “the talk of Rwanda, within a few years, being a destination for thousands of asylum seekers” is “political hyperbole”. A hundred people is less than 0.5% of those who arrived in the UK, so no wonder the Home Office admits there is no evidence that it will act as a deterrent. It is a total con on the British people.

There are two questions for the Home Secretary. Does she agree with the Lord Chief Justice that “thousands” is “political hyperbole” and that, even if she succeeds, it will just be a few hundred instead? And how long is she going to keep wasting all of this taxpayers’ money on a failing policy and wasting everybody’s time on ramping up the rhetoric rather than coming up with a serious plan?

This afternoon, the Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration set out a damning indictment of the Tory Home Office and its ability to pursue casework or have accurate data. It says that in the Home Office, “there is no single version of the truth” and concludes that “This is no way to run a government department.”

But this Home Secretary is running it. She is running this chaos, failing to sort out the boats chaos, failing to clear the backlog or mend the broken asylum system, failing to get a grip. ...

Reply from Suella Braverman: ... today’s judgment will be frustrating for the majority of the British people who have repeatedly voted for controlled migration, for all those who want to see this Government deliver on our promise to stop the boats. ...

Today is a bad day for the British people. Today is a good day for the people smugglers. It is a good day for Labour. As ever from the shadow Home Secretary, there is no regard for the will of the British people. I know she sees the will of the British people as an inconvenience and an irritation, because her statement demonstrates that she simply has no empathy for the impact of illegal migration on local communities. She fails and refuses to recognise that those crossing by small boat are doing so illegally. ...

The truth is that our current system is rigged against the British people. That is why we are changing the law. The Labour party is perfectly content with this rigged system. Labour Members would like to keep it in place. That is why they are opposing our Illegal Migration Bill. That is why they would scrap our partnership

with Rwanda. Rather than proposing any meaningful reforms to the asylum system, Labour would keep the system as it is to enable more people to come to the country illegally so that they can be settled into local communities more quickly. That is simply open borders masquerading as humanitarianism, and she should be honest with the British people. ...

Although the Court of Appeal did find by majority, with a dissenting view from the Lord Chief Justice, that there are deficiencies in the Rwandan asylum system, specifically relating to the risk of refoulement, all other grounds on which the appeal was brought were unanimously dismissed. That means the policy does not breach our obligations under the UN refugee convention and does not breach our domestic laws, as she and the Opposition have consistently maintained.

As I have said, we will seek permission to appeal the disappointing aspects of the judgment ...

We will do whatever it takes to stop the boats for the British people.

Tim Loughton (Conservative): While respecting the authority of the Court of Appeal, I share the Home Secretary's disappointment at its judgment. I welcome the fact that she will take the judgment to the Supreme Court.

Does the Home Secretary think that the case before the Supreme Court will be strengthened if she brings forward the safe and legal routes now written into the Illegal Migration Bill, so that there are clear options for genuine asylum seekers not to have to use irregular or illegal routes? Secondly, can she write into the Rwanda agreement a default position that, if the Rwandan Government try to move these people on to a third country, a right of appeal could be heard in the United Kingdom? Does she not think those measures might strengthen her case before the Supreme Court? We have heard not a scintilla of a practical solution to this problem from the Opposition Front Bench?

Reply from Suella Braverman: My hon. Friend makes a good point ... The Illegal Migration Bill, which is currently making its way through Parliament, makes reference to and contains provisions relating to safe and legal routes, and we are in discussions about how and when those routes will be rolled out. They are an important element of our overall plan to stop the boats. It is vital that we support genuine claimants in need of support, which is why I am very proud of our track record of supporting and welcoming half a million people to the United Kingdom through humanitarian routes in recent years. ...

Patrick Grady (SNP): ... The economic impact assessment finally dragged out of the Government last week shows the eye-watering potential cost to the taxpayer of the Rwanda scheme and the wider implications of the Illegal Migration Bill. On top of the £120 million that the Home Secretary has already paid to Rwanda, why is she now determined to put even more cost on the public purse by further appealing this ruling to the Supreme Court? ... She says that her dream is of planes full of refugees taking off for Rwanda, but is she not actually dreaming of the opportunity to take the UK out of the European convention on human rights?

Scotland wants no part of the Tories' hostile immigration environment. Despite the ludicrous claims of the Minister for Immigration earlier in the week, Glasgow and communities across Scotland are proud to welcome refugees. We need immigration to help develop our economy and enrich our society and culture, and we want to offer refuge to those who need it most.

... the Government ... need to accept the court's ruling that their illegal migration policies are themselves illegal. It is time to establish instead safe and legal routes for people who are fleeing wars, famine and climate change. ... Ultimately, the message from the Court is clear: enough with the language of, "Stop the boats", it is time to stop the Bill.

Reply from Suella Braverman: ... I have the utmost respect for the Court of Appeal. Senior judges considered this appeal in the right and proper manner. We maintain our respect for the judiciary, but it is entirely legitimate for us to disagree

with points they have made in certain findings. That is why we have made it clear that we disagree with some of the findings delivered today in the judgment, which is why we are seeking permission to appeal against them.

Let us be clear: the SNP is interested in asylum seekers only if they are housed elsewhere in the United Kingdom. Just last week, the SNP Government and the Labour leader of Edinburgh Council conspired to oppose our using a vessel to accommodate asylum seekers in Leith—that same vessel, in the same berth, had until recently housed Ukrainians—despite this having been value for money, despite being offered more cash to help and despite Edinburgh taking fewer than its fair share of asylum seekers. ...

To read this very long question and answer session in full see

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-29/debates/6D789210-ABC0-4694-8F9B-830B494CFE39/MigrationAndEconomicDevelopmentPartnership>

The Appeal Court judgement referred to above can be read at

<https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/AAA-v-SSHD-summary-290623.pdf>

UK Parliament, House of Commons Oral Answers

Illegal Migration Bill: Economic Impact Assessment

Yvette Cooper (Labour): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if she will make a statement on the publication of the impact assessment on the Illegal Migration Bill.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The Illegal Migration Bill is critical to stopping the boats. Its intent is clear: if someone comes to the UK illegally, they should be detained and swiftly returned to their home country if safe, or relocated to a safe third country such as Rwanda. The impact assessment published yesterday makes clear that inaction is simply not an option. The volumes and costs associated with illegal migration have risen exponentially, driven by small boat arrivals. Unless we act decisively to stop the boats, the cost to the taxpayer and the damage to society will continue to grow.

The asylum system currently costs £3.6 billion a year and £6 million a day in hotel accommodation, but that is not the true cost of doing nothing. As this impact assessment shows, the cost of accommodating illegal migrants has increased dramatically since 2020. If these trends continued, the Home Office would be spending over £11 billion a year, or £32 million a day, on asylum support by the end of 2026. In such a scenario, the Bill would only need to deliver a 2% deterrence in arrivals to enable cost savings.

The figure of £11 billion is an extraordinary amount of money—nearly 10 times the amount of money the taxpayer spent on the asylum system as recently as 2021—and anyone opposing this Bill needs to explain how they would pay those costs. Given the Labour party's opposition to this Bill, it represents another £11 billion black hole in its fiscal plans.

The impact assessment suggests that passing this Bill could directly save the UK taxpayer over £100,000 for every illegal migrant deterred from making a small boat crossing. It also finds that the Bill could lead to a much wider set of benefits—including reducing pressures on local authorities, public services and the housing market—that could not be monetised, meaning that the savings will in fact be much greater.

The British public are clear that they want to stop the boats. That is why we must keep using every tool at our disposal to do just that and to secure our borders, and why this Bill must become law.

Yvette Cooper: I was going to ask if the Immigration Minister had seriously signed off this

garbage of an impact assessment, which no self-respecting Minister could possibly think was serious, but actually the nonsense he has just said is even worse and even less coherent. This is not an impact assessment. According to the Government's own guidance, it is supposed to include the "costs, benefits and risks...and a consideration of a range of options."

However, we have something that does not even include some of the most basic options to assess, such as speeding up the asylum system and making savings that way. Instead, it says that this impact assessment "does not attempt to estimate any costs of implementing the Bill...or estimate the volumes of individuals that will be impacted by the Bill."

Really, what is the point of it, given that the document itself admits that people "may not be deterred" by any of this, and it cannot answer the most basic questions? I have never seen anything more clueless and chaotic. ...

The cost for one person in the asylum system for just one night has gone up fivefold in four years. ... It shows the shocking fact that people are now staying in the asylum system for four years, and there is no alternative to try to speed up the system or to look at that.

The Government do say that it will cost £169,000 per person to pay another country to take asylum decisions for us. So far, the Government have sent more Home Secretaries than asylum seekers to Rwanda, but how many people are they actually budgeting for? The Prime Minister says he wants to send everyone, so can the Minister tell us where the billions of pounds it would cost to send everyone to Rwanda this year will come from, and if not, can he tell us how many he is really budgeting for and what in fact is going to happen to everyone else instead?

The impact assessment says it costs £7,000 per person to keep someone in detention for 40 days. That is more than double the current average cost of keeping people elsewhere in the asylum system, so where are the hundreds of millions of pounds for the detention plan going to come from, and where are these detention facilities going to come from? The Minister has not attempted to cost speeding up the system and he has not attempted to cost what we really think will happen, which is that tens of thousands more people will be in indefinite detention or indefinite asylum accommodation. The Treasury bailed out the Home Office by £2.4 billion last year. How much is it going to be this year? ...

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The right hon. Lady misses the point entirely. The impact assessment bears out the cost of the current broken system and makes it clear that there is no option but to completely overhaul our asylum system and make it fit for the decades ahead. ... if people continue to cross in small boats, the cost to the taxpayer in one form or another will continue to increase and that is a completely unacceptable outcome ...

We cannot provide a safe and legal route to every single person eligible for refugee status or every economic migrant who views this country as a better place, and we certainly cannot reheat the tired old policies like the Dublin convention ...

Tim Loughton (Conservative): The Opposition seem to think that the Rwanda scheme is purely about displacing people who have entered illegally from Kent to Rwanda. In fact, it is about deterring them from coming in the first place and instead encouraging them to use the safe and legal routes that are now in the Illegal Migration Bill, because it will become a lottery whether someone ends up on a plane to Rwanda or in a hotel in Kent. Given that the French authorities admitted to the Select Committee on Home Affairs that when the Rwanda scheme was first announced there was a surge in migrants approaching the French authorities about regularising their position in France rather than hazarding the channel crossing, what discussions has my right hon. Friend had with the French and Germans, who have expressed interest in a Rwanda-type scheme, about having a joint multinational scheme to get this thing up and running?

Reply from Robert Jenrick: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. There is a view expressed by some, mainly on the left, that the UK is somehow an outlier in

pursuing a policy like Rwanda. I can tell him, having spoken to our European counterparts and Home Affairs and Interior Ministers in north Africa and beyond, that leaders across the world are looking to the UK not as an outlier but as a leader in this field. They are looking to the Rwanda policy as one of the most innovative and comprehensive approaches to a problem that everyone is facing. In an age of mass migration, with millions of people on the move, it is right that the UK leads. ...

Alison Thewliss (SNP): The Tory Illegal Migration Bill has almost completed its journey through Parliament and only yesterday did the Home Office deign to publish this ludicrous economic impact assessment, which is as revealing in what it omits as what it includes. There is nothing about the backlog they have created; it is all about the boats.

We know the cost of this cruel Tory ideology is £169,000 per soul deported, costing more than if people were allowed to stay. We know the figures for asylum processing claims, which are estimated to take four years, but we do not know the set-up costs for the wildly expanding detention estate or those left in immigration limbo or the staffing in the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice to deal with this.

The Government say that this will save money, because victims of modern slavery will no longer be entitled to support. How despicable. This is an egregious waste of public money in a cost of living crisis, and it fails to recognise the value of human potential. We have just celebrated the Refugee Festival in Scotland—an incredible experience that celebrates the contribution of those who come to our shores for sanctuary. It is increasingly evident that the only way that Scotland can uphold our humanitarian values is by regaining our independence. As Winnie Ewing would have it, stop the world, Scotland wants to get on.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: I am delighted that the hon. Lady celebrated Refugee Week. I do not know if any refugees came to it, because the SNP does not house refugees in Scotland. The point is that we are proud of our record as a country. Since 2015, under a Conservative Government we have welcomed into the United Kingdom more than half a million people seeking genuine sanctuary from war and persecution—individuals coming from Hong Kong, Ukraine, Syria and Afghanistan. ...

Diana Johnson (Labour): ... it is pretty obvious what the economic impact of the Bill will be. We will stop spending £3 billion a year on our asylum cost. It is a Bill that will lead to the cessation of 45,000 people in hotels and £6 million a day. To my mind, those are savings that we cannot ignore.”

The Home Secretary told the Home Affairs Committee that those savings would happen. Can the Minister help me by pointing to where those savings are in the impact assessment? I am struggling to find those figures in the document that the Government have produced.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The document makes it abundantly clear that, were costs to continue to rise on the current trajectory—we are in an age of mass migration and the numbers of individuals looking to cross, for example from north Africa to Europe, are extremely high so there is reason to believe that numbers will remain high for a sustained period—by 2026, which is just a few years away, the system would be costing an additional £11 billion. We cannot countenance such waste of taxpayers’ money. As we have seen in other parts of the world such as Australia, where systems of this kind have been implemented, by delivering this system and ensuring a genuine deterrent effect, we will ensure that we save the taxpayer that money. But, more important than merely saving money, we will save the British public the stress and the strain on public services, housing, integration and community cohesion that tens of thousands of illegal migrants bring to our country. That is a prize worth fighting for, and that is why we are delivering this Bill.

Jackie Doyle-Price (Conservative): May I just say to my right hon. Friend that in the past week we have seen arrests and convictions in Essex? One example was over the tragedy that befell the Vietnamese a few years ago, but another was a new gang that has been

identified that is trafficking people to work in modern slavery locally, in Grays. Although the British public want us to stop the boats, the British public are also generous in spirit, and what they really want is to make sure that this country is not being taken advantage of. The responsibility to tackle that lies with the machinery of Departments, our criminal justice system and our law enforcement agencies. ...

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Our policy with respect to Rwanda is not the totality of our approach; we are also, as my hon. Friend has just noted, investing significantly in law enforcement at home and abroad. We have increased the number of illegal working raids by 50% just this year alone. We have signed two landmark deals with France and a memorandum of understanding with Italy. We have signed a returns agreement with Georgia. I have recently travelled to Belgium and met my counterparts there, where we spoke about that horrific incident with the Vietnamese individuals who died in the back of an HGV. We agreed to further deepen our collaboration and law enforcement co-operation. She has my assurance that we are working around the clock and tackling this issue from each and every dimension, and that is why I believe that the UK has the most comprehensive plan to tackle illegal migration of any country in the western world.

Stephen Timms (Labour): The Minister is proposing, according to the document, to spend eye-wateringly large sums—£169,000 per person—to process claims in Rwanda. He wants to spend that money to treat people with great cruelty. How can that possibly be justified?

Reply from Robert Jenrick: ... First, the figure that he quoted is a gross figure, not a net figure. Secondly, that figure does not relate to the Rwandan partnership, but is an indicative figure based on the Syrian resettlement scheme. We chose not to publish the commercially sensitive nature of our relationship with Rwanda for good reason, because countries and partners working together in good faith should not publish details that we said we would not. His last point, that individuals will be treated with great cruelty in Rwanda, is categorically untrue. I wonder whether he has been to Rwanda—I certainly have. It is a country that is safe and where we have a good working relationship. The High Court exhaustively analysed Rwanda's safety and the treatment that it would propose to give to those coming from the United Kingdom, and the High Court concluded that the scheme was appropriate and in accordance with our legal obligations. We will shortly hear from the Court of Appeal, but I very much hope it will uphold the High Court's judgment.

Edward Leigh (Conservative): What is nonsense is to deny that it makes economic sense to offshore. Nobody is going to spend thousands of pounds to a people smuggler just to be detained and sent back to Rwanda. In terms of deterrence, will the Minister accept that if someone is fleeing chaos in Syria or Iraq, they will not be deterred to come if they are going to be put up in a cosy, warm, former airman's bedroom in RAF Scampton, rather than a hotel in bracing, cold Skegness? Is not the solution to get the Bill through and pass it into law ...?

Reply from Robert Jenrick: ... The point is that we have to look at each and every one of the pull factors to the United Kingdom. The approach that we are now taking to accommodating asylum seekers is not an outlier within Europe. I have spoken to my counterparts in almost every European country in recent weeks, and they are all considering options such as barges and sites such as former military bases. Many are considering tents. Many are bailing people to no fixed abode with vouchers and essentially leaving them to sleep on the streets. We have to ensure that the UK is not perceived to be a soft touch, and I will never allow that to happen. ...

To read this very long question and answer session in full see

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-27/debates/ABE8419C-FAF8-4D97-A09F-DC765DAD72CF/IllegalMigrationBillEconomicImpactAssessment>

The Economic Impact Assessment referred to above can be read at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal Migration Bill IA - LM Signed-final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal_Migration_Bill_IA_-_LM_Signed-final.pdf)

Asylum Seekers' Access to Justice: Illegal Migration Bill

Marion Fellows (SNP) [905648] What recent discussions he has had with Cabinet colleagues on the potential impact of the Illegal Migration Bill on access to justice for asylum seekers.

Reply from the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Alex Chalk): The Illegal Migration Bill will break the business model of people-smuggling gangs, deter migrants from making dangerous channel crossings and restore fairness to our asylum system. The Bill will provide a robust but fair legal framework to remove illegal migrants swiftly while ensuring that proper opportunity to appeal remains. I am working closely and regularly with Cabinet colleagues on the implementation of the Bill.

Marion Fellows: I thank the Minister for his answer. The Illegal Migration Bill would prevent UK courts from granting an interim remedy to delay the removal of an individual while their judicial review claim is heard. Is that not a fundamental attack on the rights of an individual to access the courts? Does he really believe that an asylum seeker will be able to participate effectively in a judicial review if they are already in Rwanda?

Reply from Alex Chalk: This is a fair country and we will always take what proper steps we should to ensure that individuals' rights are upheld. I respectfully say this: as well as considering those migrants who come across the channel, the hon. Lady needs to think about those migrants on the north coast of France who are thinking about whether to put their lives into the hands of people traffickers. We need to send a clear message that they should not do so. I also say respectfully that she should think about the rights of the British people who are having to fund a great deal of this. We will be fair, but we will also be firm and make no apology for either.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-27/debates/6F6DBD5B-6065-4152-9005-072AAF3EB1C1/AsylumSeekers'AccessToJusticeIllegalMigrationBill>

UK Parliament, House of Commons Written Answer: Channel Migrants

Undocumented Migrants: English Channel

John Hayes (Conservative) [190502] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether the National Crime Agency has made an estimate of the percentage of online content promoting illegal migrant Channel crossings appearing on (a) Facebook, (b) WhatsApp, (c) Instagram, (d) Telegram, (e) TikTok, (f) Twitter and (g) Snapchat.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The NCA does not hold information on the percentages of online content promoting illegal migrant Channel crossings appearing social media platforms.

The Government works closely with social media companies in the UK to target and remove Organised Immigration Crime related content online. Since September 2021, 3,400 posts, pages or accounts advertising organised immigration crime services have been removed from a range of social media platforms.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190502>

UK Parliament, House of Commons Written Answers: Afghanistan

Afghanistan: Refugees

Dan Jarvis (Labour) [190612] To ask the Secretary of State for Defence, how many Afghan Relocations and Assistance Policy applications have been (a) rejected and (b) accepted as of 21 June 2023; and of those accepted how many are in (i) Afghanistan, (ii) Islamabad and (iii) the UK.

Reply from James Heapey: As of 21 June 2023, 36,348 ARAP applications have been refused while 3,470 applications have been deemed eligible. Of these, approximately 220 principal applicants remain in Afghanistan, while 271 are in Islamabad. We have relocated 2,684 principal applicants to safety in the UK - over 12,200 people in total including family members. The remainder are in locations other than those listed in the hon. Member's question.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190612>

Information about the Afghan Relocations Assistance Policy, referred to above, can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/afghan-relocations-and-assistance-policy/afghan-relocations-and-assistance-policy-information-and-guidance>

Refugees: Afghanistan

Stephen Timms (Labour) [190757] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, pursuant to the Answer of 17 May 2023 to Question 184558 on Refugees: Afghanistan, whether people from Afghanistan who arrived in the UK through the (a) Afghan Relocations and Assistance Policy and (b) Afghan citizens resettlement scheme who are due to leave a bridging hotel before 31 August 2023 and make a homelessness application to a local authority will have access to the Find Your Own Accommodation pathway to secure settled accommodation.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Those applying for the ARAP and ACRS will be able to access the Find Your Own accommodation pathway. Local Authorities will be able to use the funding to secure private rented accommodation for an Afghan household.

The government is providing £285 million of new funding to local authorities supporting the Afghan resettlement schemes. This includes £35 million in new cash for local authorities, which will go towards increasing the level of support available and overcoming key barriers in accessing the housing system and employment and a £250 million expansion of the Local Authority Housing Fund to help councils to source homes to house Afghans currently in bridging accommodation.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-22/190757>

The answer referred to above can be read at

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-05-11/184558>

Information about the Find Your Own Accommodation Pathway, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/afghan-quests-your-guide-to-finding-a-settled-home-in-the-uk/your-guide-to-finding-a-settled-home-in-the-uk-accessible>

Information about the Afghan Relocations Assistance Policy, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/afghan-relocations-and-assistance-policy/afghan-relocations-and-assistance-policy-information-and-guidance>

Information about the Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/afghan-citizens-resettlement-scheme>

UK Parliament, House of Commons Written Answers: Other Immigration and Asylum

Biometric Residence Permits

Marsha De Cordova (Labour) [190476] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if her Department will make an assessment of the potential merits of introducing a temporary measure to allow new UK citizens to re-enter the UK from overseas travel using their Indefinite Leave to Remain Biometric Residence Permit while they await the issue of a UK adult passport.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: There are no plans to allow new UK citizens to use a biometric residence permit (BRP) to enter the UK while they wait for the issue of a UK passport. BRPs can only be held and used by foreign nationals who are subject to immigration control. When they become British citizens the BRP card is cancelled, and holders are required to return their BRP card to UK Visas and Immigration.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190476>

Visas: Sudan

Jessica Morden (Labour) [190546] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, what her Department's policy is for Sudanese nationals whose visitor visas are due to expire but are unable to return to Sudan.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The Government's priority has been the successful evacuation of British citizens, and other nationals from Sudan. We are currently considering options for existing Sudanese visa holders who are present in the UK. We expect individuals holding a UK visa to comply with the conditions of the leave they have been granted. Those who require immigration advice (including how to check the eligibility for legal aid which can help pay for legal advice) should contact a regulated immigration adviser. Further information can be found here: [Find an immigration adviser](#)

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190546>

Windrush Compensation Scheme: Reform

Vicky Foxcroft (Labour) [190011] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether she has made an assessment of the implications for her Department's policies of the report entitled Reforming the Windrush Compensation Scheme published by Justice in 2021.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The victims of the Windrush scandal suffered terrible injustices, and this Government remains steadfast in our commitment to do everything in our power to right the wrongs. We are determined to ensure everyone who was affected receives every penny of the compensation to which they are entitled. We are making significant progress towards achieving this aim, and we have now paid or offered more than £72.5 million in compensation.

Since its launch, the Home Office has continued to listen and respond to feedback from affected communities and stakeholders about how the Scheme operates and its accessibility. The changes we made to the Scheme in December 2020 and August 2022, mean people receive significantly more money more quickly. Last year we published redesigned claim forms and refreshed casework guidance, with the aim of reducing the time taken to process claims and improving individuals' experiences of applying to the Scheme. We also made changes to the Homelessness category and created a new category, 'Living Costs', to compensate close family members for certain contributions to a primary claimant's living costs. These significant and positive policy changes were made following consultation with claimants and stakeholders.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-16/190011>

The report referred to above can be read at

<https://files.justice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/12142211/JUSTICE-Report-Reforming-the-Windrush-Compensation-Scheme-Press-Copy.pdf>

Information about the Windrush Compensation Scheme, referred to above, can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/apply-windrush-compensation-scheme>

Migrants: Health Services

Stephen Farry (Alliance) [190374] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, pursuant to the Answer of 19 June 2023 to Question 188802 on Migrants: Health Services, whether the Government has provided guidance to temporary visa holders who have paid the immigration health surcharge on accessing (a) their local GP and (b) other free NHS medical care.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The Home Office has published guidance on the Immigration Health Surcharge (IHS) which highlights when an IHS payer can start using the NHS and what services an IHS payer is required to pay for.

The guidance can be found below:

[Pay for UK healthcare as part of your immigration application: Overview](#)

Provision of healthcare is devolved, guidance on accessing healthcare in each part of the UK is issued by the appropriate Devolved Authority. Guidance on accessing healthcare from GPs in Northern Ireland can be found below:

<https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/articles/your-local-doctor-gp>

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190374>

The answer referred to above can be read at

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-09/188802>

Refugees: Safety

Colum Eastwood (SDLP) [190636] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether her Department plan to take steps to ensure the safety and well-being of refugees undertaking (a) channel crossings and (b) land journeys; and what steps she is taking to help refugees arriving in Northern Ireland.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The UK has a proud history of providing sanctuary through our resettlement schemes, with around half a million having used our global and country-specific routes since 2015.

Our safe and legal routes for recognised refugees mean that they are resettled directly from conflict zones as opposed to safe countries like France, avoiding the need to take dangerous journeys. The level of support they are provided with depends on the resettlement route they arrive on, rather than the location into which they are resettled.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190636>

Asylum: Sudan

Colum Eastwood (SDLP) [190649] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if he will make an estimate of the number of people living in Foyle constituency that have left Sudan due to conflict; and what steps he is taking to provide (a) safe migration routes and (b) asylum to people from Sudan.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Asylum seekers, refugees and other migrants are free to move within the UK, and not all people seeking protection here are escaping conflict and it is not possible to make an accurate estimate.

The UK has a proud history of supporting refugees and providing protection to those in need. Since 2015, we have offered a place to over half a million individuals seeking safety in the UK.

The UK continues to welcome refugees through our existing resettlement schemes which include the global UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS), Community Sponsorship and the Mandate Resettlement Scheme. While our safe and legal routes are some of the most generous anywhere, we cannot accommodate everyone who wants to come to the UK.

The UK has no plans to establish a designated resettlement scheme for Sudanese refugees. We will however continue to provide safe and legal routes to the UK for those that require it.

There is no provision within our Immigration Rules for someone to be allowed to travel to the UK to seek asylum or temporary refuge. Those who need international protection should claim asylum in the first safe country they reach which is the fastest route to safety.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190649>

Information about the UK Resettlement Scheme, referred to above, can be read at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1011824/Resettlement_Policy_Guidance_2021.pdf

Information about the Community Sponsorship Scheme, referred to above, can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/apply-for-full-community-sponsorship/community-sponsorship-guidance-for-prospective-sponsors>

Information about the Mandate Scheme, referred to above, can be read at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/257392/manadateresettlement.pdf

Asylum: Climate Change

Alun Cairns (Conservative) [190562] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether her Department accepts asylum applications on the grounds that a country is affected by climate change.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Refugee status is granted when someone has a well-founded fear of persecution under the Refugee Convention for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190562>

Asylum: Applications

Stephen Farry (Alliance) [190631] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether her Department considers character statements submitted alongside asylum claim questionnaires.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Detailed Home Office policy guidance provides a framework for considering asylum claims and all caseworkers receive the necessary training and mentoring support before making such decisions. Each case is considered on its individual merits. Our guidance for considering asylum claims is available on GOV.UK at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/considering-asylum-claims-and-assessing-credibility-instruction>

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190631>

Asylum: Children

Seema Malhotra (Labour Co-op) [190102] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, pursuant to the Answer of 9 June 2023 to Question 186685 on Asylum: Children, if her Department will monitor the number of (a) families and (b) individuals in housed in House in Multiple Occupancy properties.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The Home Office will not be placing unaccompanied minors in HMO properties and will continue to monitor the numbers of families and

individuals placed in HMO properties in accordance with contractual requirements set out in the Asylum Accommodation and Support Contracts (AASC).

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-19/190102>

The answer referred to above can be read at

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-05-24/186685>

Asylum: Young People

Caroline Lucas (Green) [190289] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to the oral contribution of the Minister for Immigration of 7 June 2023 on Asylum-seeking Children: Hotel Accommodation, Official Report, column 407WH, if he will provide examples of (a) grey and (b) black economies.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: We take the safety of those in our care seriously. We have robust safeguarding procedures in place to ensure all young people in hotels are safe and supported as we seek urgent placements with a local authority.

Young people are supported by team leaders and support workers who are on site 24 hours a day. Further care is provided in hotels by teams of social workers and nurses. All contingency sites have security staff on site 24/7 and providers liaise closely with local police to ensure the welfare and safety of vulnerable residents.

As of 05 June, there were 154 young people missing.

If any child goes missing, including an accompanied asylum seeking child, the MARS (Missing After Reasonable Steps) protocol is followed. A multi-agency, missing persons meeting is chaired by the local authority to establish the young person's whereabouts and to ensure that they are safe. Similar protocols within police forces have safely reduced the number of missing episodes from placements by 36%.

The Home Office continue to work with the police and local authorities to ensure the children in our care are safe. The police are responsible for locating any missing children.

The Grey economy includes any economic activity that is legal, but which is unrecorded and unregulated. The Black economy consists of the buying, selling, and producing of goods or services that goes on without the government being informed, so that people can avoid paying tax on them.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190289>

The oral contribution referred to above can be read at

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-07/debates/89256441-99C1-4A55-9156-69583908D31F/Asylum-SeekingChildrenHotelAccommodation#contribution-6F0ED4AD-C4FE-499D-8F67-A0C52A592C89>

Asylum: Children

Chi Onwurah (Labour) [190617] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, how many asylum applicants who made applications while under the age of 18 have had their substantive interviews cancelled due to turning 18 years of age and being classified as an adult in each of the last three years.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The Home Office takes our duty of care towards children and young people extremely seriously and we prioritise applications from children and young people.

If the child's 18th birthday passes before a substantive asylum interview has been conducted, they are legally an adult. However, staff must follow best practice on children's cases. The child is interviewed by a decision maker who has completed the appropriate training for handling children's asylum claims and be given an opportunity to discuss the statement of evidence form (SEF) as it may refer to issues that are child specific.

The decision maker is trained in handling children's cases. The Home Office would not therefore cancel interviews based on a child turning 18.

Where the applicant has since admitted to being an adult, or evidence confirms the applicant as an adult, at the point of claiming asylum, the application is assessed as an adult claim.

[Section 67 of the Immigration Act 2016 asylum casework guidance](#)

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190617>

Asylum: Interviews

Seema Malhotra (Labour Co-op) [190103] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, pursuant to the Answer of 9 June 2023 to Question 186690 on Asylum: Interviews, what steps she is taking to monitor (a) progress in the Streamlined Asylum Process and (b) the accuracy of the forecast budget.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: The commitment made by the Prime Minister on 13 December 2022 is to clear the backlog of legacy initial asylum decisions relating to claims made before 28 June 2022, by the end of 2023.

We are taking immediate action to speed up asylum processing whilst maintaining the integrity of the system. This includes simplifying guidance, reducing interview length and streamlining processes. The Streamlined Asylum Process plays an important role in achieving this.

We have already doubled our decision makers over the last 2 years. We are continuing to increase this further with large campaign already underway. This will take the headcount of our expected number of decision makers to 2,500 by September 2023.

The aim is to clear the initial decision backlog of asylum legacy cases by the end of 2023.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-19/190103>

The answer referred to above can be read at

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-05-24/186690>

The Prime Minister's commitment, referred to above, can be read at

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2022-12-13/debates/DB61C374-16B5-411C-9A29-CC3DCA119EB3/IllegalImmigration>

Asylum: Hotels

Rob Roberts (Independent) [190632] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, what was the cost to the public purse of accommodating unprocessed asylum seekers in hotels in the most recent week for which data is available.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Under the Immigration & Asylum Act 1999, the Home Office has a statutory obligation to house asylum seekers, who would otherwise be destitute, whilst their claim is under consideration. The cost for hotel rooms has now reached £6 million a day. The enduring solution is to stop the boats and that's why we have brought forward the Immigration bill.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-21/190632>

Undocumented Migrants

Matt Vickers (Conservative) [190387] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what recent steps he has taken with Cabinet colleagues to help secure international (a) partnerships and (b) other agreements that help tackle illegal immigration to the UK.

Reply from Andrew Mitchell: We are prioritising international engagement to secure more ambitious partnerships to tackle irregular migration and destroy the business model of organised immigration crime. These include a multi-year

operational funding plan with France, a new UK-Italy strategic migration partnership and deepening cooperation with Albania. We have recently announced a new partnership with Bulgaria, as well as negotiations on a new working arrangement between the UK and EU border agency Frontex.

We are also prioritising engagement on migration through multilateral fora, including most recently at the Council of Europe and European Political Community summits.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190387>

The following two questions both received the same answer

Heathrow Immigration Removal Centre: Children

Nadia Whittome (Labour) [191239] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether any children under the age of 18 are currently detained in Heathrow Immigration Removal Centre; and whether any children under the age of 18 have been detained in that centre in the last (a) week, (b) month and (c) year.

Heathrow Immigration Removal Centre: Standards

Nadia Whittome (Labour) [191240] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether her Department has made a recent assessment of the adequacy of living conditions inside the Heathrow Immigration Removal Centre.

Reply from Robert Jenrick: Prior to arrival at an immigration removal centre (IRC) all detained persons will have been assessed as over the age of 18 and deemed suitable for detention. In some cases, individuals who are detained subsequently claim to be children. Our contracted service providers follow published guidance - Detention Services Order 02/2019 - on managing those who claim to be under the age of 18 after entering detention, to safeguard and promote their welfare.

The Home Office publishes statistics on people entering, in and leaving immigration detention in the '[Immigration System Statistics Quarterly Release](#)'. The number of people entering and in detention each quarter are in tables Det_D01 and Det_D02 of the '[Detention detailed datasets](#)', where the data can be broken down by age and first place of detention or current place of detention. The number of people leaving detention each quarter are in table Det_D03 of the same datasets, where the data can be broken down by age. The latest data relates to the end of March 2023.

The Home Office takes the welfare and safety of people in its care very seriously and is focused on providing decent, safe and secure accommodation in all immigration removal centres. Independent scrutiny is a vital part of assurance that detention facilities are safe, secure, and humane. Robust statutory oversight is provided by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons and the Independent Monitoring Boards, ensuring that detained individuals are treated with proper standards of care and decency.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-26/191239>

and

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-26/191240>

UK Parliament, House of Lords Ministerial Statement and Q&A

Migration and Economic Development Partnership

[The statement given by the Minister to the House of Commons was read in the House of Lords.](#)

Lord Coaker (Labour) ... We have said throughout the discussions on the Illegal Migration Bill that the Government need to accept reality. The Bill ignores many of our international obligations, abandons many of our long-held traditions and principles, and is unworkable. The costs are enormous and growing, stretching into the billions of pounds, and are based

on a theory of deterrence that even its own impact statement, published at last on Monday this week, says may not work.

Of course there is a problem that needs dealing with. We have said that should be done by speeding up decision-making, clearing the asylum backlog, getting proper international agreements, including returns agreements, and tackling the problem at source and cracking down on the criminal gangs. But the Government seem to say that we just have to carry on—an “It will be all right on the night” approach, flying in the face of reality, the evidence and the facts.

The number of people crossing the channel in small boats in June 2023 is already more than crossed in June 2022, despite the fact that measures in the Bill apply to them because of its retrospective start date. Then we have today’s Court of Appeal judgment, which shows that the Government’s Rwanda policy regarding small boats is unravelling before our own eyes. There is chaos regarding small boats, and one of its main policy planks is falling apart.

What are the Government going to do? What are the implications of the Court of Appeal judgment for the Illegal Migration Bill? What are the Government going to do in light of that decision that the Rwanda policy is unlawful? It cannot just be wished away, can it? Will they bring forward amendments? What does it actually mean for those to be detained under the Bill? Is it not now even more unworkable, as detained asylum seekers are supposed to be sent to Rwanda or to other safe countries but, as I say, will be left in limbo. Ministers were forced to admit this week that it will cost up to £169,000 to send each person to Rwanda, on top of the £140 million already spent. Now this judgment has said that Ministers did not even do the basic work to make sure that the scheme was either legal or safe. Why not?

As we have learned, the Government are to appeal, and the Home Secretary has said that we need to deal with the challenge of small boats. I repeat that we all agree with that, but it has to be done lawfully. Does the Minister agree with that statement? If he does, are the Government still prepared to deliver their policy based on the assumption that they will be able to do so? In other words, if they receive permission to appeal to the Supreme Court and the decision of the Court of Appeal is upheld, what then? Is there a plan B, and what changes are the Government proposing to take account of today’s ruling? As one of the judges said: “Our conclusion on the safety of Rwanda issue means that the Rwanda policy must be declared unlawful”.

How on earth has it come to this? Appeal and carry on regardless—is that the Minister’s policy?

Is it not the stark reality that carrying on regardless will mean a huge backlog of people on top of those we have already, as I said, left in limbo? Thousands upon thousands will be waiting to be deported in detention centres or other government accommodation, such as military camps, barges, ex-liners or even, as we have read this week, big marquees. Time and again Ministers have chased headlines and slogans instead of getting a grip in the way that I outlined earlier.

The Court of Appeal judgment today is just the latest blow. The Rwanda scheme is unworkable, unethical and extortionate. It is a costly diversion from the urgent action the Government should be taking to deal with this issue. As my noble friend Lady Hayter’s International Agreements Committee said, much of this could have been avoided if it had been done by a treaty not a memorandum of understanding.

Finally, does the Minister, as a barrister, agree with me that we must have no talk—as I expect we are bound to hear—that judges are the enemies of the people or that the Government are being thwarted by trendy lawyers or tofu-eaters? We all want the challenge of the boats dealt with, but done so practically and lawfully. That is not too much to ask, is it?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: ... The programme set out in the Illegal Migration Bill will continue—I reassure the noble Lord that we are 100% behind the

Bill. The decision of the Court of Appeal was not that the procedure in the Bill was unlawful; the very opposite is the case. The Court of Appeal has endorsed the key principle of the scheme: that a signatory of the refugee convention can remove people to a safe third country for the determination of their asylum claims.

The only point on which the Court of Appeal found against the Government was on whether Rwanda would be a safe country. Even that, of itself, was not a finding that Rwanda was unsafe for refugees; it was a finding that there was a potential risk that Rwanda would allow those refugees to be returned to their original country, and even that decision was disagreed with by the Lord Chief Justice himself. I suggest that this is no indication that this scheme is unlawful in itself. I reassure the noble Lord that the Government will very much be continuing with the Bill. ...

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle (Green): My Lords, the Statement refers to public opinion, and I am sure the Minister is aware that polls show that the public is very strongly of the view that the Government will never send any refugees to Rwanda. More than that, a YouGov poll found that 58% of the public believe that Ministers should arrange safe and orderly routes for refugees to be able to come to the UK. Should the Government not stop pursuing this obviously failed and unworkable policy and follow public opinion by arranging those safe and orderly routes? Is that not the way to stop the boats?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: This Government already have a very considerable number of safe and legal routes. I need only remind the noble Baroness that we have had more than half a million people arriving on safe and legal routes in the past five years. We are one of the most generous countries in the world. The noble Baroness and those who sit on the Benches opposite never adequately explain why it is said that more safe and legal routes would stop people crossing the channel. The point is, as even the most reverend Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury accepted, that if you impose a cap, the people who want to come here who are not accepted via a safe and legal route will simply take to the boats. It is no answer to say that safe and legal routes will stop the dangerous channel crossings. Our imperative is to save lives.

Lord Hannan of Kingsclere (Conservative): My Lords, I am very grateful to the Minister for taking the time. I cannot imagine that anyone in this House likes the Rwanda scheme from first principles. It is cumbersome, it is expensive. I have listened to a lot of the criticism from various Benches, and a lot of it hit home, but what I have not heard is a credible alternative. We are in this situation because there has been this steady policy of overturning every deportation order from the Bench. We have therefore run out of alternatives. Will the Minister tell me what kind of legal changes might be necessary in order to ensure that we get the policy that was promised and whether those changes will include looking again at some of the international associations and agreements into which we have entered?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: I thank my noble friend. He is absolutely right: we realised that, unfortunately, institutional changes were required. That is why we brought forward the innovative scheme set out in the Illegal Migration Bill. The changes brought forward by that Bill will ensure that a removal system that acts as an effective deterrent to illegal entrants will be fully operational and stop the dangerous channel crossings. My noble friend is entirely right to highlight that, to date, it has been all too easy for removals of those who should not be in our country to be thwarted ...

To read this very long question and answer session in full see

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-29/debates/910A9899-8D69-4B3A-8033-FC536E2D31DE/MigrationAndEconomicDevelopmentPartnership>

The Appeal Court judgement referred to above can be read at

<https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/AAA-v-SSHD-summary-290623.pdf>

UK Parliament, House of Lords Oral Answers

Illegal Migration Bill: Economic Impact Assessment

The answer given by the Minister to the House of Commons was read in the House of Lords.

Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede (Labour): My Lords, yesterday the Government released an impact assessment on the Illegal Migration Bill, two days before the first day of Report on the Bill, contrary to the principles of HM Treasury's Green Book and the Better Regulation Framework guidance to departments. The impact assessment does not contain an explanation of the costs and benefits, does not outline alternative policy options and was not published on the same day that the Bill was introduced.

The impact assessment quite literally states that it has "not attempted to estimate the total costs or benefits of the proposal".

It also does not consider anything other than either implementing the Bill as a whole or not implementing the Bill at all. Do the Government believe there are any other options?

The timing of the impact assessment's arrival has prevented the other place from improving it with its scrutiny. A significant proportion of the time set aside in this House has been taken up discussing the arrival of the impact assessment. Does the Minister think this is good policy-making procedure?

If this House is to perform its critical function of scrutinising legislation, it is necessary for us to have complete, comprehensive and timely information about the basis on which policy choices are made and the reasons alternative options have been rejected. Can the Government now explain why an impact assessment for such a significant Bill does not conform to government guidance on policy communication with Parliament?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: ... The answer is that there are no other options. The option before the House tomorrow and on succeeding days is the Bill; the alternative is the present scenario, which is not tolerable, in the Government's view. On the questions about the timing and context of the impact assessment, it was drafted, obviously, in the context of the need urgently to address the dangerous and illegal crossings of the channel. Accordingly, the legislation and the IA were prepared in order to address that problem at speed. It is also the case that the Rwanda scheme was the subject of a legal challenge in the courts, and clearly it was appropriate to take that into account in preparing the impact assessment.

On the question about whether the impact assessment complies with government guidance, I suggest that, in the context of the Bill, it does. It sets out, so far as can be ascertained, the likely impact. But this Bill, like others, is predicated on a strong theory of deterrence, and it is therefore important to note that it is hard empirically to provide detailed statistics, because the purpose of the Bill is to deter the illegal crossings, as the noble Lord acknowledges.

Lord German (Liberal Democrat): My Lords, it is no wonder that we have had to wait so long for this impact assessment, because it makes very uncomfortable reading for the Government. It tries to justify the unjustifiable by leaving out the costs of so many pieces of the project. It is certainly not rigorous: uncertainty is mentioned 24 times and the Government have looked at only one option. As the House heard in Committee, the Government could have made other choices. This IA cements in uncertainty because it fails to provide a sensible view of the cost consequences, given the outcome of a policy that does not distinguish between those fleeing for their lives and safety, and others.

The impact assessment does not measure the impact on local authorities. It does not measure the impact on the budget of not having the third countries to remove people to, with people having to remain in limbo. It also does not measure the impact on children and the victims of modern slavery, who are not able to obtain protection and support. In essence, this impact assessment has more holes than a Gruyère cheese.

Are the Government diverting resources from reducing the backlog in order to resource

the implementation of the illegal migration legislation? That comment has been made in the media throughout the last week: people are being diverted from reducing the backlog in order to make sure that the Bill is resourced.

The impact assessment is clear that, if the deterrent does not work and the numbers arriving do not change, costs will be higher, so why has the range of costs left out the development costs to implement the project? ...

The Government say that this is an “illustrative analysis”—it certainly provides more illustrations than proper analysis of the costs.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: I do not accept the premise of the noble Lord’s question, if that is what it was. The impact assessment published yesterday supports the need for change, sets out the broad costs of implementing the Bill, outlines potential savings, and highlights examples of where policy and operations have delivered an impact on illegal migration in other countries. For example, it shows that, for every illegal migrant deterred from making these crossings, the Bill will save the taxpayer £106,000, rising to £165,000 if current trends in accommodation costs continue.

Lord Carlile of Berriew (Crossbench): My Lords, can the Minister advise the House as to what weight should be given to this financial and legal impact assessment alongside the damage caused to the consistency of our domestic law and the terrible damage being done to our reputation as a keeper of international treaties?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: As I made clear during its earlier stages, the Bill introduces a new legal regime, and it is the Government’s view that it is consistent with our international obligations, which we always strive to meet. It is right that the facts in this impact assessment, and in the overall assessment of the situation made by the Government, are in favour of this legislation.

Baroness Lister of Burtersett (Labour): My Lords, the Statement said that the Bill will have a deterrent effect and that there was strong evidence of that effect. Could the Minister therefore explain why the impact assessment says that “it is not possible to estimate with precision the level of deterrence that the Bill might achieve”? It refers also to: “The academic consensus ... that there is little to no evidence suggesting” such a deterrent effect.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: I refer the noble Baroness ... to paragraph 38 of the impact assessment. ...

Lord Hunt of Kings Heath (Labour): My Lords, in the other place, Theresa May said: “The Home Office knows that the Bill means that genuine victims of modern slavery will be denied support”.—[[Official Report, Commons, 13/3/23; col. 593](#)]

In this House, we were very proud of the Modern Slavery Act, so why are the Government dismantling its provisions?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: As the noble Lord is aware, it is the intention of the Bill to create as tight a framework as possible, and there is a risk that a loophole would be created if the modern slavery provisions were left unamended. That is the purpose of the provisions on modern slavery in the Bill.

Lord Cormack (Conservative): My Lords, that is no answer to the noble Lord. The Modern Slavery Act was introduced by the Government, supported by us on this side, and received with pride in all parts of the House. It is being unravelled and there is no proper excuse for that.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: The noble Lord will not be surprised to learn that I do not agree with him.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-27/debates/C8ED1DB5-DDC2-47C9-B55B-46B134D0CF33/IllegalMigrationBillEconomicImpactAssessment>

The Economic Impact Assessment referred to above can be read at

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal_Migration_Bill_IA_-_LM_Signed-final.pdf

Illegal Migration Bill

Lord Kennedy of Southwark (Labour Co-op) My Lords, I wish to raise how unhappy noble Lords are on these Benches and, I believe, other Benches, including some on the Government Benches. At the end of the first day on Report of the Illegal Migration Bill, after the Minister was repeatedly pressed on when the House will be given the child rights impact assessment, he said that the official position of the Government is that it “will be provided in due course”.—[[Official Report, 28/6/23; col. 791.](#)]

That is totally unacceptable and not how the Government or any Minister of the Government should treat this House.

The assessment is an important document which your Lordships need to see to assist them in their scrutiny of the legislation. It is not right that my noble friends Baroness Lister, Lord Dubs and Lord Coaker, and noble Lords on other Benches, who have been asking for impact assessments throughout our debates on the Bill were given such a response. We must have the impact assessment next week before we conclude Report. No Member of this House should accept this totally unacceptable position from the Government.

As Opposition Chief Whip, I always try to be fair and reasonable. The Opposition, and indeed all Members, have an important role to play in scrutinising and revising legislation. The Government also have the right to get their business through; I fully accept that. But for these two essential aspects to be delivered properly there has to be co-operation, engagement and respect.

Let us be clear: this is a controversial Bill. It has gone through its First Reading, Second Reading, Committee and the first day of Report, yet we are still asking for the child rights impact assessment, and the best we can get is, “You’ll get it in due course”. That is plain wrong. I always thought that “in due course” meant getting something at the appropriate time, but the appropriate time was weeks ago. ...

Reply from Baroness Williams of Trafford: ... I hear him, and my noble friend the Minister, Lord Murray of Blidworth, certainly heard the House last night. In the hours since the debate, he has been back to the Home Office to seek what the House requested. I can confirm that the child rights impact assessment will be forthcoming early next week and well before Report concludes, as the noble Lord requested.

Lord Marlesford (Conservative): My Lords, where does this morning’s decision of the Appeal Court that people cannot lawfully be transferred to Rwanda leave this legislation?

Reply from Baroness Williams of Trafford: I know that my noble friend the Minister will discuss that later. It is not quite a matter for debate now.

Baroness Butler-Sloss (Crossbench): My Lords, I remain concerned about the child impact assessment. The Chief Whip said that it will come before the end of Report. The next day of Report is Monday, and the last day is Wednesday. If we do not get it until Tuesday evening, for instance, many of us who have spoken on child matters may have a very limited opportunity on the last day of Report to express any view whatever on the impact assessment. I am extremely concerned that we have not had it.

Reply from Baroness Williams of Trafford: As I said to the noble Lord, Lord Kennedy, I undertake to get it early next week—Monday, if possible.

Baroness Berridge (Conservative): My Lords, can my noble friend clarify that the child rights assessment is cross-government and will include liaison with the Department for Education on the child’s right to a parent? It seems that in this legislation we could be dealing with a group of children in the country who have neither a corporate nor a natural parent. Is that included in the definition of the child rights assessment?

Reply from Baroness Williams of Trafford: I am afraid to tell my noble friend that I have not looked at the details of the child rights impact assessment. My noble friend the Minister will deal with that, but I am sure that what my noble friend Lady Berridge said will be considered.

Lord Paddick (Liberal Democrat): My Lords, will the Minister give an undertaking that, if

we have discussed all the child issues by the time we get the relevant document from the Home Office, these matters can be brought back at Third Reading, once we have the relevant information?

Reply from Baroness Williams of Trafford: I have this morning pledged to the House to ensure that the impact assessment is with the House early next week ... <https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-29/debates/BE60CAA4-F748-42F8-9299-DB74FFF3FF4F/IllegalMigrationBill>

Asylum: Channel Crossings

Lord Dubs (Labour): To ask His Majesty's Government how many people since January have (1) crossed the Channel irregularly by boat, and (2) claimed asylum having done so; and how many of these asylum claims are awaiting a decision.

Reply from the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Migration and Borders (Lord Murray of Blidworth): An overall total of 11,279 people have arrived in the United Kingdom by small boat since January of this year to today's date. From 1 March to 31 March, 3,362 asylum claims were raised from small boat arrivals, of which 3,306 are awaiting initial decision. The number of asylum claims made from arrivals from 1 April 2023 will be detailed in the next quarterly publication of statistics.

Lord Dubs: Can the Minister tell us how many of these people in the various categories were unaccompanied children? Is there any reason why unaccompanied children are barely mentioned in the impact assessment?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: I will need to write to the noble Lord regarding the precise number of unaccompanied children in those statistics. We will be discussing the impact assessment in due course—to coin a phrase.

Lord Newby (Liberal Democrat): My Lords, some time ago, the Government pledged to eliminate the backlog of asylum claims by the end of this year. How is that going, and how confident is the Minister of that target being met?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: On 31 December, the Prime Minister pledged to clear the backlog of 92,601 initial asylum claims; that relates to asylum claims made before 28 June 2022. One way this will be achieved is via the streamlined asylum process, which is centred around accelerating the processing of manifestly well-founded asylum claims. From 23 February, legacy claims from nationals of Afghanistan, Eritrea, Libya, Syria and Yemen will normally be considered through the streamlined asylum process. That means that a positive decision can be taken on the information available, and the claimant will not be substantively interviewed. I reassure the noble Lord that this work has progressed in terms of the recruitment of further caseworkers, and we hope to have 2,500 further case-workers in place by September.

Baroness Gohir (Crossbench): My Lords, of the numbers crossing the channel, how many are women and how many are pregnant women? I asked this question in writing during the debates on the Illegal Migration Bill; I got a response, but no clarity on numbers. Could they be shared today?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: ... As far as I am aware, there were no pregnant women.

Lord Hamilton of Epsom (Conservative): My Lords, further to the question about children from the noble Lord, Lord Dubs, does my noble friend have any evidence that human rights lawyers are telling people who come here illegally on boats across the channel to say that they are children, when they are clearly not?

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: My noble friend is right that intelligence exists suggesting that people smugglers give information to those they smuggle. I am aware that allegations have been made against lawyers, but I would not like to say any more at this stage.

To read this very long question and answer session in full see

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-27/debates/DCB14B8A-E061-486D-977B-D60A6B59DE92/AsylumChannelCrossings>

The Prime Minister's pledge, referred to above, can be read at

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2022-12-13/debates/DB61C374-16B5-411C-9A29-CC3DCA119EB3/IllegalImmigration>

UK Parliament, House of Lords Written Answers

British Nationality: British Overseas Territories

Baroness Lister of Burtersett (Labour) [HL8499] To ask His Majesty's Government what are the reasons for delays in scheduling citizenship ceremonies and issuing certificates to British Overseas Territories citizens approved for British citizenship under the BOTC(F) process.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: For applicants in the UK, we are amending the British Nationality (Overseas Territories) Regulations 2007 so that registrars in the UK can administer the oath and pledge for British overseas territories citizenship. In the interim, Governors of overseas territories can waive the need for a citizenship ceremony on a case by case basis. We will shortly be holding citizenship ceremonies where applicants can receive both certificates.

For applications made outside the UK, Governors and FCDO staff are permitted to conduct ceremonies for both British overseas territories citizenship and British citizenship. Customers in these territories, which represent the majority of cases, are unaffected.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8499>

Health Services: Asylum

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle (Green) [HL8469] To ask His Majesty's Government whether they are giving GPs different advice about the provision of treatments and services to asylum-seekers as compared to provision for the general population.

Reply from Lord Markham: Anyone in England can register and consult with a general practitioner without charge, including people seeking asylum. Asylum seekers are particularly vulnerable to potential health needs because of their experiences either before, during or after migration. Additional services may be locally commissioned by the National Health Service, including from general practice, to identify and manage such health needs. Information for healthcare professionals on meeting the health needs of migrants is available in the Migrant Health Guide, which is produced by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8469>

General Practitioners: Asylum

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle (Green) [HL8472] To ask His Majesty's Government whether they plan to require GPs to provide, without charge, letters confirming the residential addresses of asylum-seekers and refugees seeking to open a bank account.

Reply from Lord Markham: There is currently no plan to require general practitioners to provide letters confirming the residential addresses of asylum-seekers and refugees seeking to open a bank account. Asylum seekers and refugees are entitled to register for and receive general practice services in the same way as any other member of the general population. This is confirmed in a range of advice and guidance published by NHS England and the NHS more widely.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8472>

Children and Young People: Asylum

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle (Green) [HL8471] To ask His Majesty's Government what restrictions there are on the provision of free school, and other public, transport to children and young people who are from asylum-seeking families.

Reply from Baroness Barran: The department's school travel policy aims to ensure that no child of compulsory school age is unable to access education because of a lack of transport. Children of families seeking asylum in the UK are eligible for free home to school travel on the same basis as UK citizens. Their immigration status is not taken into account.

Local authorities must arrange free travel to school for children aged 5 to 16 who attend their nearest school and cannot walk there due to the distance, route safety, or as a result of special educational needs, disability or mobility problems. There are additional rights to free travel for low-income families aimed at helping them exercise school choice.

Fares, concessions and operating criteria for public transport are set by transport operators themselves. The criteria, including the age at which any discount or concessions are made available for children and young people, are decided locally.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8471>

Asylum: Housing

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle (Green) [HL8470] To ask His Majesty's Government what guidelines they provide to those providing accommodation to asylum-seekers to ensure that their privacy is respected and safety ensured; and whether any such guidance includes preventing unannounced visits to such accommodation, particularly in relation to accommodation for women and children.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: Asylum seekers receive full induction briefings when arriving at Home Office accommodation. This briefing will include health & safety awareness, security and how access to local supporting organisations is facilitated. Whilst sites have 24/7 security, asylum seekers are permitted to come and go and are able to receive visitors.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8470>

Asylum: Detainees

Lord Scriven (Liberal Democrat) [HL8450] To ask His Majesty's Government whether, since 7 March, any individuals entering the UK to seek asylum by irregular routes have been held in detention; and if so, how many.

Reply from Lord Murray of Blidworth: The Home Office does not publish data on people entering detention broken down by arrival route.

The Home Office publishes statistics on people entering detention in the Immigration System Statistics Quarterly Release on gov.uk. The number of people entering detention can be broken down by asylum and non-asylum-related cases in table Det_01 of the detention summary tables.

The latest data relates to the end of March 2023. Data up to the end of June 2023 will be published on 24 August 2023.

[table Det_01](#)

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-13/hl8450>

UK Parliament Home Affairs Committee

Human Trafficking: Evidence session

<https://committees.parliament.uk/oralevidence/13369/html/>

Press Releases

Prime Minister's statement on the Court of Appeal ruling on the Rwanda refugee policy
<https://twitter.com/RishiSunak/status/1674378165261680640>

Community projects supporting Hong Kongers receives £2.6m funding
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/community-projects-supporting-hong-kongers-receives-26m-funding>

New Publications

Appeal Court Judgement that Government proposals to send asylum seekers to Rwanda are unlawful
<https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/AAA-v-SSHD-summary-290623.pdf>

Economic Impact Assessment, Illegal Migration Bill
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal Migration Bill IA - LM Signed-final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal_Migration_Bill_IA_-_LM_Signed-final.pdf)

Impact of immigration on population growth
<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CDP-2023-0143/CDP-2023-0143.pdf>

Information on UK accommodation for those assessed as eligible through either ACRS Pathway 3 or the ARAP scheme
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/afghan-schemes-letters-on-uk-accommodation-policy-changes/afghan-citizens-resettlement-scheme-overseas-letter>

An inspection of the Home Office's operations to effect the removal of Foreign National Offenders October 2022 – February 2023
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1166304/An inspection of the Home Office s operations to effect the removal of Foreign National Offenders Oct 2022 to Feb 2023.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1166304/An_inspection_of_the_Home_Office_s_operations_to_effect_the_removal_of_Foreign_National_Offenders_Oct_2022_to_Feb_2023.pdf)

Government Response to an inspection of operations to effect the removal of foreign national offenders (FNOs)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/response-to-an-inspection-of-operations-to-effect-the-removal-of-fnos/response-to-an-inspection-of-operations-to-effect-the-removal-of-foreign-national-offenders-fnos>

Seasonal Worker visas and UK agriculture
<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9665/CBP-9665.pdf>

Supreme Court Appeal Judgement concerning eligibility for the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme
<https://www.supremecourt.uk/press-summary/uksc-2021-0195.html>

Updated: Migrants detected crossing the English Channel in small boats – last 7 days
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/migrants-detected-crossing-the-english-channel-in-small-boats/migrants-detected-crossing-the-english-channel-in-small-boats-last-7-days>

Updated: Ukraine Family Scheme, Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme (Homes for Ukraine) and Ukraine Extension Scheme visa data

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ukraine-family-scheme-application-data/ukraine-family-scheme-and-ukraine-sponsorship-scheme-homes-for-ukraine-visa-data--2>

News: Rwanda Refugee Policy

Rwanda policy: Government to take Rwanda ruling to Supreme Court

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-66051292>

Rwanda: Court of Appeal decision raises difficult questions

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-66057908>

Court of Appeal judges split over ruling to block Rwanda plan

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2023/06/29/court-of-appeal-judges-split-ruling-block-rwanda-plan/>

Braverman 'disappointed' with Rwanda ruling

<https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-politics-66057661>

Boris Johnson tells Rishi Sunak to override court on Rwanda deportation scheme

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/boris-johnson-rwanda-deportations-rishi-sunak-b2367434.html>

List Rwanda 'safe' to fast-track deportation, urges Boris Johnson

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/uella-braverman-rwanda-deportation-court-appeal-8t0hfqx0p>

Equality and Human Rights Commission response following Court of Appeal judgment on Rwanda asylum policy

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/ehrc-response-following-court-appeal-judgment-rwanda-asylum-policy>

Church welcomes asylum court ruling

<https://www.churchofscotland.org.uk/news-and-events/news/2023/articles/church-welcomes-asylum-court-ruling>

Rwanda asylum a risk to UK foreign policy, says ex-minister

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-66073718>

Cost to remove a migrant £63,000 more than keeping in UK

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-66022219>

Each migrant deported to Rwanda 'will cost taxpayer almost £170,000'

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2023/06/26/each-migrant-deported-rwanda-cost-taxpayer-169000/>

Sending asylum seekers to Rwanda will cost £169k a person, says Home Office

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jun/26/cost-of-sending-each-asylum-seeker-to-rwanda-is-170000-says-home-office>

Flights to Rwanda will cost £170,000 for every migrant

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/flights-to-rwanda-will-cost-170-000-for-every-migrant-cx0fv0lbz>

Rwanda migrant flights could begin in September

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/06/26/suella-braverman-rwanda-migrant-flights-court-appeal/>

Over 24,000 UK asylum seekers could be sent to Rwanda despite court ruling

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jun/30/over-24000-uk-asylum-seekers-could-be-sent-to-rwanda-despite-court-ruling>

After the Rwanda ruling, what are the options for Britain's immigration policy?

<https://www.independent.co.uk/politics/rwanda-echr-illegal-migration-bill-b2367518.html>

Suella Braverman's Rwanda plan has turned from 'dream' to undiluted farce

<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/rwanda-court-unlawful-suella-braverman-b2366671.html>

Let's cheer a Rwanda court victory. But the cruel and punitive policy lives on

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jul/02/court-win-on-rwanda-but-uk-asylum-system-already-broken>

Not a single Question Time audience member shows support for Rwanda policy

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2023/06/30/question-time-rwanda-policy-no-audience-member-supports/>

News: Other Immigration and Asylum

UK migration bill 'does not meet criteria for consent from Holyrood'

<https://www.heraldscotland.com/politics/23615764.uk-migration-bill-does-not-meet-criteria-consent-holyrood/>

Migration bill: Government suffers series of defeats in Lords

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-66047337>

Peers 'wrecked' small boats Bill by voting to allow asylum seekers to stay in UK

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2023/06/28/peers-accused-wrecking-small-boats-bill/>

Small boats bill suffers defeats as Lords vote to stop trafficking victims being deported to Rwanda

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/small-boats-illegal-migration-bill-lords-b2365903.html>

Peers amend migration bill hours before Rwanda ruling

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/peers-amend-migration-bill-hours-before-rwanda-ruling-d0b9q6vzn>

Suella Braverman's 'stop the boats' policy is scuppered. And there's no plan B

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jun/29/suella-braverman-stop-the-boat-policy-sunk-no-plan-b>

Illegal Migration Bill: rights watchdog 'seriously concerned'

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/illegal-migration-bill-rights-watchdog-seriously-concerned>

Ministers think expensive migrant plan worth a try

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-66026831>

A way out of the asylum crisis: offshoring, not outsourcing, is the way to go

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/06/30/offshoring-not-outsourcing-is-way-to-solve-asylum-crisis/>

Tory MPs want a plan B on small boats after Rwanda defeat

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/tory-mps-want-a-plan-b-on-small-boats-after-rwanda-defeat-nr62bk53t>

Home Office must process asylum claim every four minutes to clear backlog by January

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jun/28/home-office-must-process-asylum-claim-every-four-minutes-to-clear-backlog-by-january>

Suella Braverman U-turns on new rules targeting trafficking victims

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jul/02/suella-braverman-u-turns-new-rules-targeting-trafficking-victims>

Home Office censured over failure on foreign criminals and deportations

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/home-office-censured-over-failure-on-foreign-criminals-and-deportations-g5vl57727>

Migrant fruit-pickers are skilled workers, says ex-minister George Eustice

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-66056038>

Home Office admits placing lone nine-year-old in asylum seeker hotel

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/jun/30/home-office-admits-placing-lone-nine-year-old-in-brighton-asylum-seeker-hotel>

Bishop of Dover: Migration concerns only for 'brown people'

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-kent-66044153>

Organ harvesting: Trafficked for his kidney and now forced into hiding

<https://www.bbc.com/news/65960515>

Refugee Festival Scotland 2023 Comes to a Close

<https://scottishrefugeecouncil.org.uk/refugee-festival-scotland-2023-comes-to-a-close/>

TOP

Equality

Scottish Parliament Written Answers

BME People: Public Sector Workforce

Jackie Baillie (Labour) [S6W-19199] To ask the Scottish Government what its response is to recent research by the Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights (CRER), which found that only 2.8% of Scotland's public sector workforce identify as BME, in light of BME people being over 5% of the working age population.

Reply from Neil Gray: The Scottish Government welcomes the focus of the

research and is committed to increasing the representation of racialised minorities in the public sector. The research estimates that 2.8 per cent of public sector employees identified as belonging to a “black and minority ethnic group”, 76.5 per cent were white and 20.7 per cent were marked as “unknown”, which included “not completed”, “don’t know” and “prefer not to say” responses.

The report acknowledges it does not function as a perfect census of Scotland’s public sector workforce. The Annual Population Survey by the Office of National Statistics notes that from January to December 2022, the proportion of public sector workers in Scotland aged 16 and over who are minority ethnic was 6.2 per cent. This is higher than the proportion of the population aged 16 and over who are from minority ethnic groups (5.5 per cent in 2022).

As an employer, our Race Recruitment and Retention Action Plan published in 2021, supports the Scottish Government and its agencies to increase the representation of racialised minorities, across all grades, to be reflective of the working age population. We are making progress in this regard, with an estimated 4.1% of staff in the Scottish Government and its agencies identifying as a racialised minority (December 2022). This is almost double the figure from 2017 (2.2%).

The Scottish Government published A Fairer Scotland for All: An Anti-Racist Employment Strategy in December 2022 which sets out a series of actions, including those recommended in the report. We will be piloting the use of an anti-racist workplace training framework with employers; supporting employers in their use of positive action measures; and continuing to engage with public sector leadership on recruitment and representation, data and understanding institutional racism.

We are also reviewing the operation of the Public Sector Equality Duty in Scotland with a view to improving the Scottish Specific Duties, including data reporting on ethnicity. We have consulted on proposals which include extending the existing gender pay gap reporting duty to ethnicity and disability, with listed public authorities required to make more evidence-based decisions on the information they publish.

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/questions-and-answers/question?ref=S6W-19199>

The report referred to above can be read at

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/615c1bee105b4f55a98326d0/t/646e148912826a771547f272/1684935841144/Ethnicity+and+Employment+in+Scotland%27s+Public+Sector+V4.pdf>

The Action Plan referred to above can be read at

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-race-recruitment-retention-action-plan-instigation-change/>

A Fairer Scotland for All, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/fairer-scotland-anti-racist-employment-strategy/>

Information about the Public Sector Equality Duty in Scotland, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/public-sector-equality-duty-scotland>

Police and Fire Services: BME Staff

Jackie Baillie (Labour) [S6W-19198] To ask the Scottish Government what initiatives it has to promote the number of BME staff in the police and fire services, in light of reports that they have the lowest BME employment rate among all of the public sector.

Reply from Angela Constance: While the promotion of workforce diversity is a matter for the Chief Constable of Police Scotland and Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, the Scottish Government set clear ambitions on equality, diversity and inclusion in the [Strategic Police Priorities 2023](#) and the [Fire and Rescue Framework 2022](#).

Police Scotland’s [Joint Equality Outcomes for Policing](#) include outcomes on workforce diversity monitoring, leadership, recruitment, progression and retention. Progress across

a broad range of activity is highlighted in the [Police Scotland EDI Mainstreaming and Equality Outcomes Progress Report 2021-2023](#), published in April this year.

SFRS has developed a Positive Action toolkit to proactively engage with Scotland's diverse communities, host community targeted recruitment events and present SFRS as an inclusive employer. SFRS also has a range of initiatives to encourage retention of its diverse workforce for example in developing a Race Employee Network and in mainstreaming its dignity and respect policies.

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/questions-and-answers/question?ref=S6W-19198>

UK Parliament, House of Commons Written Answer

Blood: Donors

Navendu Mishra (Labour) [190495] To ask the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, what steps his Department is taking to encourage more people from ethnic minority backgrounds to become blood donors.

Reply from Neil O'Brien: The Department works with NHS Blood and Transplant (NHSBT) as it continues its work towards recruiting and retaining more blood donors from ethnic minority backgrounds. Diversifying the donor base is a key priority for NHSBT to address health disparities and ensure patients from all backgrounds can receive the best matched blood.

Work to increase the supply of Ro Kell negative blood type includes increased investment into targeted marketing and engagement. NHSBT launched its 'Not Family but Blood' campaign in October 2022, aimed at recruiting more black heritage blood donors and this year launched the #GivingType campaign for National Blood Week.

In addition, the Community Grants Programme funds community and faith/belief organisations to drive awareness, understanding and behaviour change around donation. More than £1.7 million has invested in grassroots organisations promoting blood, organ, and tissue donation since 2018.

Most recently National Blood Week (NBW) has driven over 700 registrations to donate whole blood from people of Black heritage. Sickle Cell Awareness Day followed directly after NBW with a further 77 registrations from people of Black heritage, nearly double NHSBT's daily average of registrations from this group'.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190459>

UK Parliament, House of Lords Oral Answers

Employment Gap: Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic, and White, Workforce

Baroness Thornton (Labour): To ask His Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the contribution to the economy which could result from closing the employment gap between (1) the Black, Asian and minority ethnic, and (2) white, workforce.

Reply from the Minister of State, Department for Business and Trade (Lord Johnson of Lainston): The employment rate gap is closing. Data for the first quarter of 2023 shows an ethnic minority employment rate of 69.4%, which is a record high and an increase of 1.1 percentage points on the same quarter a year ago. In April, we set out to Parliament the excellent progress we have made in delivering our ambitious *Inclusive Britain* strategy to tackle unjust racial disparities in education, health, criminal justice and the workplace.

Baroness Thornton: ... The reward for getting this right and closing the gap between

BAME and white employees is huge. Research has shown over many years that this could add billions to the economy. Why is this not a priority for the Treasury, the business community and the Government? It would not only deal with the unfairness for the individuals affected but add hugely to the size of our economy. That is really the point. Please can the Government think big about this and take on board the research from McKinsey and all sorts of places that says that this will grow our economy if we get it right?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I thank the noble Baroness, Lady Thornton, very much for those comments. It is absolutely right that the expected deficit of underutilisation of all groups in this economy is between £20 billion and £30 billion. I draw attention to the fact that 32 of the 74 measures in *Inclusive Britain* that we put into place have been achieved or are in motion. A huge amount of work is being done to encourage right entry into workplaces following graduation, entrepreneurship, changes in bank lending policies, fundamental mentoring policies and money being put into scholarship programmes. I completely agree with the noble Baroness's points. This is very much a focus for the Government, and my Secretary of State, Kemi Badenoch, sees it as one of her core priorities.

Lord Shinkwin (Conservative): My Lords, the introduction of mandatory ethnicity pay gap reporting is the number one recommendation from the Institute of Directors' commission, which I chair, in *The Future of Business: Harnessing Diverse Talent For Success*. The director-general and I wrote to the Prime Minister last November, and we are still waiting for a response. I ask my noble friend to encourage No. 10 to reply to our recommendations and avoid giving the impression that this is not an important issue.

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I am grateful to the noble Lord for his point. I will certainly encourage a response, and I appreciate the comment.

Baroness Burt of Solihull (Liberal Democrat): My Lords, while government guidance is very welcome, does the Minister accept that the only way to close the ethnicity pay gap is to make reporting mandatory for businesses and companies with over 250 employees, and that we can address this disparity only when we really know the true scale of the problem?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I am grateful to the noble Baroness for her comment. As this House will be aware, a deep consultation was undertaken to see what would be the most effective way to ensure that those gaps were narrowed. Since 2012, the gap has narrowed from 5.1% to 2.3% in median hourly pay, but it has very much been felt that, because of the complexities of measuring ethnicity pay gap differentials, particularly in smaller companies of 500 employees or fewer, it would produce data that would not be valid and helpful. Instead, we have introduced a series of voluntary measures and a great deal of training and guidance, which we believe will have the intended outcomes.

Lord Singh of Wimbledon (Crossbench): My Lords, prejudice in society should be tackled not simply for economic reasons but because it is wrong. We all like to believe that it is those people out there who have prejudices and it is not in us. The reality is that prejudice—wariness of difference—is ingrained in us all, in our very genes. But we have to tackle irrational prejudice based on the assumption that people of different colour or who look different are inherently different and inferior to us. What steps are the Government taking to make sure that that irrational prejudice is tackled in schools and universities, particularly in religious education, to emphasise what Sikhs constantly repeat about the oneness of the human family?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I greatly appreciate the noble Lord's comments. Clearly, this is a government priority. Continuing on the theme of the original Question, we have developed a number of different action plans, including a work panel process to assess how we can, for example, give more support to employers on ensuring inclusivity. I am pleased to say that we committed to launching that inclusion at work panel and the first meeting is today.

Lord Sewell of Sanderstead (Conservative): My Lords, I am sure that my noble friend

will be aware of the findings of my recent report. One of the things that has come out of it is the disparity in apprenticeships. We found that take-up of higher apprenticeships by white young people was twice as likely as by black youngsters. Does my noble friend agree that we need to target parents to explain that apprenticeships are an effective route to great jobs?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: ... On encouraging inclusion in entrepreneurship, in accessing banking services and in high-quality postgraduate education, the Government have paid specific attention in our *Inclusive Britain* report to ensuring that there is mentoring and specific funding—I believe that £70 million has been allocated specifically for a scholarship programme that will enable people to move into the right jobs that they want to seek—and that the barriers around class and culture are reduced to enable all students in this country to achieve their potential.

Baroness Lawrence of Clarendon (Labour): My Lords, I will mention the disparity report that came out a couple of years ago. It put immigration, race relations, unemployment and education so much further back, so it is completely wrong to use it as something that is well known. Will the Minister focus on what the noble Baroness, Lady Thornton, was talking about, which is the contribution around education and employment that needs to be looked at, making sure that the disparity is forthcoming, and that employers understand that it is all about the earnings, not the report?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I am grateful to the noble Baroness for her comments. I hope that she understands the importance that the Government place on this. It is also worth looking at how companies—the FTSE 100 businesses and so on—are managing their own boards and make-up to provide the signal and leadership. By the time of the March 2023 report, 96% of the FTSE 100 had met the target to the end of 2022, which is an increase of 7% from 2021. In the FTSE 250, 59% of the companies had achieved their target ahead of their 2024 goal. This is following on from the Parker review. I think that this is extremely encouraging. This is a priority for the Government. I have said very clearly that the estimated economic loss to the economy was between £20 billion and £30 billion. If I look at the different ethnic groups that make up some of the most successful businesses in this companies, for instance, the Indian ethnicity group is powering ahead. If any noble Lords have had a chance to read the Grant Thornton report that came out three weeks ago, they will see the enormous value of releasing the potential of different specific groups on the economy.

Lord Green of Deddington (Crossbench): My Lords, in the last couple of years or so, the Government have reduced the salary requirements for immigrant workers and the qualifications required, from degree level to A-levels, and they have abolished the requirement to first advertise jobs in local markets. How can those actions help achieve the objectives referred to in this Question?

Reply from Lord Johnson of Lainston: I am not entirely sure that I agree with the noble Lord on all those comments, or, necessarily, on the relevance. However, he commented on education. There is an issue around ethnic groups accessing the highest levels of quality in education, rather than going to low-quality tertiary education outlets. There has been a particular amount of work done on that, as I said, to ensure that we live in an inclusive, one-nation country where everyone can achieve their potential.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-29/debates/BD69BE0B-448F-44D9-8B26-4704422F8E98/EmploymentGapBlackAsianAndMinorityEthnicAndWhiteWorkforce>

Inclusive Britain, referred to above, can be read at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/inclusive-britain-action-plan-government-response-to-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities/inclusive-britain-government-response-to-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities>

The Institute of Directors' report referred to above can be read at <https://www.iod.com/app/uploads/2022/10/loD-Future-of-Business-practical-guidance-for-employers-ACCESSIBLE-v11-b0e2942127a9d327222471624d4f697.pdf>

Lord Sewell's report, the report of the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, can be read at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331 - CRED Report - FINAL - Web Accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331_-_CRED_Report_-_FINAL_-_Web_Accessible.pdf)

UK Parliament, House of Lords Written Answers

Equal Pay

Lord Taylor of Warwick (Non-affiliated) [HL8453] To ask His Majesty's Government whether they intend to make reporting on ethnicity pay gaps mandatory for the purposes of tackling racism.

Reply from the Earl of Minto: This government remains committed to tackling all areas of disparities in this country, including in employment. It is crucial that everyone is treated fairly in the workplace, so that they can thrive and reach their full potential and we want to ensure that everyone has access to the same employment opportunities.

Ethnicity pay gap reporting is just one type of tool to assist employers in doing this and it may not always be the most appropriate mechanism for some types of organisations. Therefore, as set out in the "Inclusive Britain" report, which was published in March 2022, the Government will not be legislating to make ethnicity pay reporting mandatory at this stage. Instead, we committed to producing guidance to support those who wish to report voluntarily. This was published in April 2023.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-13/hl8453>

Inclusive Britain, referred to above, can be read at

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1061421/Inclusive-Britain-government-response-to-the-Commission-on-Race-and-Ethnic-Disparities.pdf

The guidance referred to above can be read at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethnicity-pay-reporting-guidance-for-employers>

Education: Travellers

Baroness Whitaker (Labour) [HL8520] To ask His Majesty's Government when they plan to publish their evaluation of their pilot education funding programme for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and proposed next steps; and what assessment they have made of the connection between (1) the adequacy of educational provision and funding for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children, and (2) their statistics for children missing education for the academic year 2022–23, which show that 10 per cent of children missing from education are from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller families.

Reply from Baroness Barran: The £1 million Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) Gypsy Roma and Traveller (GRT) Education Areas programme enabled five local authorities and a Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise organisation to deliver tailored support to improve GRT attendance and attainment. Whilst the programme was a one year pilot, the delivery of some of the targeted support carried on beyond that timeline. The close monitoring of the projects helped DLUHC to pick up issues quickly, facilitated the setting up of a buddying system, and improved cross agency relationships and knowledge sharing.

The department has no plans to commission a government evaluation of the

programme. The department's expectation is that participant local authorities will carry out their own evaluation of their projects, build lessons learnt into wider services, and share learning with other local authorities.

The government is committed to ensuring that all children are safe and have access to an excellent education. The department is currently running a call for evidence on 'Improving support for children missing education' to seek views on challenges in identifying and supporting children missing from education and how to address those challenges. The call for evidence is open until 20 July and will be used to inform policy future policy thinking. The open consultation is available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/improving-support-for-children-missing-education>

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-14/hl8520>

UK Parliament Early Day Motion

Alison Thewliss (SNP) [1371] 25 Years of Amina Muslim Women's Resource Centre – That this House acknowledges the 25th anniversary of the founding of Amina, the Muslim Women's Resource Centre (MWRC), which works to empower Muslim and BAME women across Scotland; acknowledges that to this day, BAME and Muslim women remain one of the most disadvantaged groups in the UK with poor access to health, housing and financial support, high rates of unemployment, and discrimination based on their gender, ethnicity and religion; welcomes Amina MWRC's longstanding commitment to tackling these issues via domestic abuse advocacy, financial advice, the Amina Hardship Fund, employability and language training, and device loaning services; notes Amina MWRC is widely recognised as the chief national hub for consultation with Muslim and BAME women across Scotland; congratulates Amina MWRC on this momentous occasion; and wishes them all the best in all future endeavours.

<https://edm.parliament.uk/early-day-motion/61102>

Press Release

UK Supreme Court signs up to the Black Talent Charter

<https://www.supremecourt.uk/news/uk-supreme-court-signs-up-to-the-black-talent-charter.html>

New Publication

The effects of doctor strikes on patient outcomes: Evidence from the English NHS

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268123002184>

News

Equality and Human Rights Commission response to Fawcett Society report on the 'Ethnicity Motherhood Pay Penalty'

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/ehrc-response-fawcett-society-report-ethnicity-motherhood-pay-penalty>

Why do black patients suffer more than white ones during doctors' strikes?

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jul/02/nhs-long-term-plan-big-gaps-and-short-term-grim>

Racism, Religious Hatred, and Discrimination

Scottish Parliament Written Answer

Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Act 2021

Annabelle Ewing (SNP) [S6W-19193] To ask the Scottish Government when it plans to introduce commencement regulations for the Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Act 2021.

Reply from Siobhian Brown: The Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Act 2021 will consolidate, modernise and extend existing hate crime legislation in Scotland. We are working closely with justice partners to ensure effective implementation of the Hate Crime Act.

We continue to work towards a commencement period of early 2024 in order to provide sufficient time to allow justice partners to complete a number of IT change programmes which will support implementation.

Officials and Ministers are continuing to engage regularly with justice partners with a view to ensuring the necessary IT changes are delivered in time for implementation by our early 2024 deadline.

Hate crimes will continue to be dealt with under existing hate crime legislation until such time as the Act comes into force.

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/questions-and-answers/question?ref=S6W-19193>

The Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Act 2021, referred to above, can be read at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2021/14/contents>

UK Parliament, House of Lords Written Answer

Coronavirus

Lord Taylor of Warwick (Non-affiliated) [HL8669] To ask His Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of (1) inequalities in health, and (2) any increase in structural racism, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic; and what steps they are taking in response.

Reply from Lord Markham: The gap in the number of years different groups of people live in good health is stark and unacceptable. Health disparities exist across a variety of conditions and contribute to variations in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy.

In July 2020, the then Prime Minister appointed the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities to consider the causes of persistent disparities and barriers that different ethnic minority groups face, including the role of racism. The Commission published its report in March 2021, and the Government's response, 'Inclusive Britain', was published in March 2022.

In June 2020, Public Health England published the 'COVID-19: review of disparities in risks and outcomes' report, outlining the impact of COVID-19 on health inequalities. In response, the then Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care asked the Minister for Equalities, with support from the Cabinet Office Race Disparity Unit (RDU), to lead cross-government work to look

at why COVID-19 was having a disproportionate impact on ethnic minority groups and to consider how the government response to this could be improved. The 'Final report on progress to address COVID-19 health inequalities' was published in December 2021.

The Office for Health Improvement and Disparities was established in October 2021 to work across the Department, the rest of Government, the healthcare system, local Government and industry to be creative about how we shift our focus towards preventing ill health, in particular in the places and communities where there are the most significant disparities.

In the white paper 'Levelling Up the United Kingdom', published in February 2022, the government set out a levelling up health mission to narrow the gap in healthy life expectancy (HLE) between local areas where it is highest and lowest by 2030, and increase HLE by five years by 2035. A range of action is being taken forward which will support progress on the health mission, including the development of a Major Conditions Strategy on which an interim report will be published in the summer.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/hl8669>

The Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities report, referred to above, can be read at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331 - CRED Report - FINAL - Web Accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331_-_CRED_Report_-_FINAL_-_Web_Accessible.pdf)

Inclusive Britain, referred to above, can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/inclusive-britain-action-plan-government-response-to-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities/inclusive-britain-government-response-to-the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities>

The Public Health England report referred to above can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes>

The Race Disparity Unit report referred to above can be read at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/final-report-on-progress-to-address-covid-19-health-inequalities>

The White Paper referred to above can be read at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1054769/Levelling Up the United Kingdom accessible version .pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1054769/Levelling_Up_the_United_Kingdom_accessible_version.pdf)

New Publications

Anti-racism in Scotland: progress review 2023 – The Race Equality Framework and the Immediate Priorities Plan

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/anti-racism-scotland-progress-review-2023/>

Hate Crime in Scotland, 2022-23

<https://www.copfs.gov.uk/publications/hate-crime-in-scotland-2022-23/html/>

Hate Crime in Scotland, 2022-23, data tables

<https://www.copfs.gov.uk/publications/hate-crime-in-scotland-2022-23-data-tables/>

Breaking the mould: Principles for an anti-racist curriculum

<https://education.gov.scot/resources/breaking-the-mould-principles-for-an-anti-racist-curriculum>

Holding up a Mirror to Cricket: A Report by the Independent Commission for Equity in Cricket

<https://theicec.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/HOLDING-UP-A-MIRROR-TO-CRICKET-REPORT-ICEC.pdf>

News

Stephen Lawrence: Anger at police failings after BBC names sixth suspect

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-66023387>

Stephen Lawrence: How the Met Police failed to spot suspect Matthew White

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-65997090>

Equity in Cricket report: Discrimination 'widespread' in English cricket

<https://www.bbc.com/sport/cricket/66022949>

Equity in Cricket report: 'Absolutely horrific' stories show 'culture is rotten'

<https://www.bbc.com/sport/cricket/66021884>

Rishi Sunak discusses 'sting' of racism amid fallout from damning cricket report

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/prime-minister-rishi-sunak-jonathan-agnew-british-asian-b2367786.html>

Rishi Sunak speaks of sting of racism after damning cricket report

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2023/jul/01/rishi-sunak-speaks-of-sting-of-racism-after-damning-cricket-report>

Equality and Human Rights Commission response to ICEC report 'Holding Up a Mirror to Cricket'

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/ehrc-response-icec-report-holding-mirror-cricket>

'Baked in' racism and bigotry is not just cricket – it's endemic

<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/racism-bigotry-cricket-icec-report-b2365187.html>

Racist jailed for violent attempted murder in Livingston

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-scotland-edinburgh-east-fife-66065111>

Hostility towards hate crime bill is misplaced

<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hostility-towards-hate-crime-bill-is-misplaced-fjdb9wkk9>

Oxford professor says Britain's racial guilt is based on ignorance

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/07/02/oxford-professor-nigel-biggar-deplores-racial-guilt/>

There are two kinds of antiracism. Only one works, and it has nothing to do with 'diversity training'

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jun/29/antiracism-diversity-training-liberal-antiracists-vocabulary-direct-action>

TOP

Other Scottish Parliament and Government

Scottish Parliament Oral Answers

Legal Age of Marriage

Claire Baker (Labour) [S6O-02437] To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on any meetings that it has had with stakeholders regarding the legal age of marriage.

Reply from there is a range of views. Increasing the minimum age could be argued to increase safeguards, but it could also be seen as removing young people's right to marry or to enter into a civil partnership. We also need to consider the fact that young people acquire a number of important rights at the age of 16. I am meeting Pauline Latham MP after the summer. As Claire Baker may know, she promoted legislation at Westminster to raise the age of marriage in England and Wales.

Claire Baker: I thank the minister for that response, and I welcome the meetings that are taking place, but I am unclear as to why the Scottish Government is not prepared to undertake a full public consultation on the issue. The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child is clear that the age of marriage should be raised to 18. Under the UN sustainable development goals, member states around the world, including the United Kingdom, have pledged to end all marriage under 18 by 2030. As the minister has recognised, the change in the law in England and Wales came into force in February. In Northern Ireland, following a public consultation, the overwhelming majority of respondents were in favour of raising the age to 18, and the intention is to introduce legislation there once Stormont is fully operational. Is the Scottish Government really willing to remain out of step with other western countries and to ignore the international conventions on women's rights and on children by failing to take action on raising the age in Scotland to 18?

Reply from Siobhian Brown: The UN committee's recommendation will be fully taken into account as we gather views from stakeholders and consider our next steps. Our approach will help ensure that we properly assess the potential impacts of any changes, as the Parliament would expect. If we proceed with a full public consultation, we want that to include robust evidence. If we decide to issue a public consultation, the earliest that that could be done is 2024. Clearly, any legislation after that would depend on the results of the consultation and the availability of time in the Parliament.

Ruth Maguire (SNP): One concern with the legal age of marriage is around the potential vulnerability of young people to forced marriage. What protections and safeguards are currently in place for those who may be vulnerable to or at risk of forced marriage?

Reply from Siobhian Brown: Forced marriage has a devastating impact on people who are affected by it and can be a form of honour-based violence. There are protections in both criminal and civil law, and forcing someone into marriage is a criminal offence. Forced marriage protection orders can also be sought from the civil court, and breach of an order is a criminal offence. From 30 November, those protections will extend to forced civil partnerships. No one should have to endure forced marriage. We fund the national Scottish domestic abuse and forced marriage helpline to provide advice and support, and help is available 24 hours a day on 0800 027 1234.

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15400&i=131366#ScotParlOR>

Scottish Parliament Written Answer

Legal Age for Marriage

Claire Baker (Labour) [S6W-19071] To ask the Scottish Government what evaluation it has undertaken of the appropriateness of the legal age of 16 for marriage, in light of reported concerns regarding forced marriage and coercion.

Siobhian Brown: We recognise that points have been made around the minimum age of marriage and civil partnership and whether young people need more protection.

This is why we have been meeting with interested stakeholders.

There are a range of views here. Increasing the minimum age can be argued to increase safeguards for young people, but such a change can also be seen as removing their right to marry or to enter a civil partnership. Additionally, given the range of rights that people acquire when they reach 16, we need to consider carefully whether broader implications would arise from a change to the minimum age of marriage.

The number of registered marriages in Scotland involving 16- and 17-year-olds is very low. However, we are also aware that there are some concerns regarding unregistered marriage ceremonies and about children and young people being taken abroad to be married.

The forced marriage offence in England and Wales has recently been extended, so that it is an offence there in all circumstances to do anything intended to cause a child to marry before they turn 18. No form of coercion requires to be used and the offence applies where the marriage is to take place outside England and Wales, and regardless of whether the marriage would have legal effect.

We would need to assess if this approach would be right for Scotland. Introducing a similar measure here might have the adverse impact of driving forced marriages even further underground. Forcing someone into marriage is already a criminal offence in Scotland and applies to any religious or civil ceremony of marriage whether or not legally binding. This offence will extend later this year to include forced civil partnerships.

The Scottish Government will continue to listen to stakeholders and the wider debate, as we actively consider our next steps. This will help ensure that we properly assess the potential impacts of changes and, if we take forward a full public consultation, that this includes robust evidence.

<https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/questions-and-answers/question?ref=S6W-19071>

Press Releases

The King and Queen in Scotland

<https://www.gov.scot/news/the-king-and-queen-in-scotland/>

King and Queen visit to Edinburgh July 2023: events

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/king-and-queen-visit-to-edinburgh-july-2023-events/>

First Minister's Eid Al Adha message (video)

<https://twitter.com/ScotGovFM/status/1673949455370838019>

Festival of Politics 2023 programme announced

<https://www.parliament.scot/about/news/news-listing/festival-of-politics-2023-programme-announced>

New Publication

Gypsy/Travellers action plan: 2023

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/improving-the-lives-of-gypsy-travellers-action-plan/>

TOP

Other UK Parliament and Government

UK Parliament, House of Commons Written Answer

Television Channels: Minority Groups

Jamie Stone (Liberal Democrat) [190460] To ask the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, if she will make an assessment of the potential merits of the effectiveness of smaller TV channels in catering to (a) faith groups, (b) specific ethnic groups, (c) minority groups and (d) local audiences.

Reply from John Whittingdale: The Government recognises the importance of a diverse broadcasting landscape for communities around the country, with hundreds of channels, large and small, catering to a wide range of audiences.

The Government is committed to supporting a broadcasting sector that delivers for all audiences. On a local level, the BBC, local TV providers and commercial and community radio stations all play a crucial role in disseminating accurate news and local information, strengthening pride of place, reflecting the unique interests of the audiences that they serve, connecting communities, and helping to address social issues like loneliness and mental health.

The Government also believes that it is important that the broadcasting industry – both on- and off-screen – is representative of the country in which we live. In this context, the Government recognises the editorial and operational independence of the broadcasting sector and understands the value of smaller channels and content that caters to specific audiences.

The BBC also plays an important role in delivering this, and in the UK's wider public service broadcasting ecosystem, with a mission to serve all audiences through the provision of impartial, high-quality and distinctive output and services which inform, educate and entertain.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2023-06-20/190460>

UK Parliament Early Day Motion

Kirsten Oswald (SNP) [1368] **Calderwood Lodge Primary School 60th Anniversary** – That this House congratulates all at Calderwood Lodge Primary School on the occasion of reaching 60 years; notes that Calderwood Lodge is now situated in Newton Mearns, having moved from a site in Glasgow in 2017, and shares a joint campus with St Clare's Primary School making it Scotland's only joint Jewish Catholic Campus; appreciates that both Calderwood Lodge and St Clare's work closely together; understands that Calderwood Lodge is Scotland's only Jewish faith school, working to

foster a sense of pride and identity in pupils' heritage within a strong Jewish ethos while promoting respect for all global cultures and religions; further notes that Calderwood Lodge has around 150 pupils and a nursery attached with options for wrap-around childcare; recognises Calderwood Lodge's importance to the large local Jewish population in East Renfrewshire and the surrounding areas, with the school promoting the study of Hebrew and Jewish culture; highlights that the school's 60th anniversary will be marked with an exhibition and tours on 26 and 27 June; and wishes all the staff and pupils at Calderwood Lodge Primary School all the very best for the future.

<https://edm.parliament.uk/early-day-motion/61101>

Press Release

The Prime Minister's message for Eid al-Adha 2023

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/the-prime-ministers-message-for-eid-al-adha-2023>

New Publication

Aggregating to improve ethnicity data quality

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aggregating-ethnicity-data-to-improve-data-quality/aggregating-to-improve-ethnicity-data-quality>

TOP

Cost of Living

Scottish Government Website

Help during the cost of living crisis

Most households are concerned about the cost of living, with worries about issues such as rent and mortgages, food and utility bills, energy costs, and debt.

In response, the Scottish Government has launched a new website that provides information to help people access support with

- Energy and Bills
- Benefits and Income
- Children and Families
- Debt and Money
- Health and Wellbeing

Your local council might be able to help if you need urgent help with money, food or fuel – contact the council for information.

<https://costofliving.campaign.gov.scot/>

Publication

Rising cost of living in the UK

<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9428/>

News

Food banks Scotland: Report shows one in six Scots faced hunger in last year
<https://www.scotsman.com/health/food-banks-scotland-report-shows-one-in-six-scots-faced-hunger-in-last-year-4199197>

Concern as two in three Scots referred to food banks are disabled
<https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/homenews/23618228.concern-two-three-scots-referred-food-banks-disabled/>

Energy bills fall as new price cap comes into force
<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-66030365>

Centrica boss warns energy bills will stay high for foreseeable future
<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-66051560>

Cost of living worsening health of children in UK, say school nurses
<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2023/jun/28/cost-of-living-worsening-health-children-uk-school-nurses>

TOP

Other News

Concern as firefighters no longer go to all automatic alarms
<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-scotland-66034178>

Scottish Fire and Rescue Service: Unwanted Fire Alarm Signals
<https://www.firescotland.gov.uk/your-safety/business-advice/unwanted-fire-alarm-signals-ufas/>

Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator: How to prepare a good Trustees' Annual Report
<https://www.oscr.org.uk/news/how-to-prepare-a-good-trustees-annual-report/>

What do the changes to Scottish charity law mean for you?
<https://www.oscr.org.uk/news/what-do-the-changes-to-scottish-charity-law-mean-for-you/>

Scottish coronation event: Details revealed for Edinburgh ceremony
<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-scotland-66056826>

TOP

Bills in Progress ** new or updated this week

Scottish Parliament

**** Charities (Regulation and Administration) (Scotland) Bill**
<https://www.parliament.scot/bills-and-laws/bills/charities-regulation-and-administration-scotland-bill>

Stage 3

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15400&i=131378>
[#ScotParlOR](#)

Stage 3 Debate

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15400&i=131379#ScotParlOR>

Scottish Government press release: Charities Regulation Bill passed

<https://www.gov.scot/news/charities-regulation-bill-passed/>

Gender Recognition Reform (Scotland) Bill

<https://www.parliament.scot/bills-and-laws/bills/gender-recognition-reform-scotland-bill>

Police (Ethics, Conduct and Scrutiny) (Scotland) Bill

<https://www.parliament.scot/bills-and-laws/bills/police-ethics-conduct-and-scrutiny-scotland-bill>

UK Parliament

Asylum Seekers (Accommodation Eviction Procedures) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3257>

Asylum Seekers (Permission to Work) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3263>

Asylum Seekers (Permission to Work) (No.2) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3304>

**** Bill of Rights Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3227>

The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Alex Chalk): Having carefully considered the Government's legislative programme in the round, I can inform the House that we have decided not to proceed with the Bill of Rights, but the Government remain committed to a human rights framework that is up to date, fit for purpose and works for the British people. ...

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-06-27/debates/FE807865-51C0-4E01-AE13-42E219714C99/TopicalQuestions#contribution-FB5FC112-9572-4AB5-843B-D1061BC45DDC>

**** British Nationality (Regularisation of Past Practice) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3465/publications>

Royal Assent

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-29/debates/D2B46F8C-D94B-434D-9717-97640C808BA4/RoyalAssent>

Updated Factsheet

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/british-nationality-regularisation-of-past-practice-bill-factsheet/british-nationality-regularisation-of-past-practice-bill-factsheet>

Housing Standards (Refugees and Asylum Seekers) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3264>

Human Trafficking (Child Protection) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3248>

Human Trafficking (Sentencing) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3249>

Illegal Immigration (Offences) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3282>

**** Illegal Migration Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3429>

Economic Impact Assessment

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal Migration Bill IA - LM Signed-final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1165397/Illegal_Migration_Bill_IA_-_LM_Signed-final.pdf)

Report Stage, house of Lords

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-28/debates/8C5B765C-FB2F-4808-8680-B100FE735973/IllegalMigrationBill>

and

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2023-06-28/debates/2FE7FF9E-973D-464C-A7F5-2E82FD603D0C/IllegalMigrationBill>

Notice of amendments

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51919/documents/3711>

and

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51958/documents/3724>

and

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/52035/documents/3751>

and

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51989/documents/3735>

Immigration and Nationality Fees (Exemption for NHS Clinical Staff)

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3436>

**** Online Safety Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3137>

Scottish Parliament Legislative Consent Motion approved

<https://archive2021.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=15402&i=131414#ScotParlOR>

Notice of amendments

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51899/documents/3702>

and

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51961/documents/3727>

and

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51961/documents/3749>

Refugees (Family Reunion) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3164>

Scotland (Self-Determination) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3413>

Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Draft Bill

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/terrorism-protection-of-premises-draft-bill-overarching-documents>

TOP

Consultations

** new or updated this week

**** Legal aid fees in the Illegal Migration Bill** (closing date 24 July 2023)

<https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/legal-aid-fees-in-the-illegal-migration-bill/>

Victims, Witnesses, and Justice Reform (Scotland) Bill (closing date 8 September 2023)

<https://yourviews.parliament.scot/justice/victims-witnesses-justice-reform-bill/>

A Human Rights Bill for Scotland (closing date 5 October 2023)

<https://consult.gov.scot/equality-and-human-rights/a-human-rights-bill-for-scotland-consultation/>

Let's Be Heard – Sharing Scotland's COVID Experience (closing date not stated)

<https://lbh.covid19inquiry.scot/>

Experiences of Racism in Scotland's Night-Time Economy (closing date not stated)

<https://t.co/IUabNPI1nK>

ITV/Tell MAMA survey on mosque safety in the UK (closing date not stated)

<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/V7V5B6L>

TOP

Job Opportunities

[Click here](#) to find out about job opportunities.

TOP

Funding Opportunities

** new or updated this week

**** closes this week!**

People's Postcode Trust

*There are two further opportunities to apply for funding in 2023 but **each will only be open for 24 hours**. Applications can be submitted from:*

10am on 3 July 2023

10 am on 2 October 2023

*Application forms will go live at the above dates and times and must be **started and submitted** within the submission window. In the meantime, a copy of the application questions can be downloaded in order to help you prepare your submission.*

National Lottery funding of between £500 and £25,000 for projects on a wide range of themes including supporting marginalised groups and tackling inequality. Funding priorities include communities experiencing racial inequity, people with disabilities, and the LGBT+ Community. For information and to apply see

<https://www.postcodetrust.org.uk/apply-for-a-grant/>

and

https://www.postcodetrust.org.uk/media/2724/3_ppt_fundingguide_2023.pdf

**** closes this week!**

Big Give: The Christmas Challenge

Closing date for applications: 7 July 2023

When someone donates to a charity through a Big Give campaign, funders are asked to match that donation, so, for example, £50 from a member of the public becomes £100 for a good cause. Charities must secure a minimum of £1k in pledges to be eligible for Champion funding. For information see <https://biggive.org/christmas-challenge/>

Cost-of-Living Support Scotland

Application deadline not stated

National Lottery funding from £10,001 to £75,000 for projects to help support individuals, families and communities currently experiencing hardship as a result of the cost-of-living increases. The programme aims to fund activity that reduces the impact of, or prevents financial insecurity so that people have more resilience and are more able to identify ways to deal with the impact of increased cost of living in their lives, are able to shape activity in their community to address the increased cost-of-living, and have more access to support and services that will help them to deal with the increased cost of living. For information and to apply see

<https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/funding/programmes/cost-of-living-support-fund>

TOP

Events, Conferences, and Training

**** new or updated this week**

**** this week!**

Crossroads: which way now for the human rights system in Scotland?

3 July 2023 (venue not stated, 11.00–12.00)

13 July 2023 (venue not stated, 6.00–7.00)

Scottish Human Rights Commission roundtables to discuss a SHRC discussion paper [Exploring the experience of human rights protection for the people of Scotland](#) and potential ways forward. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/4serrnjt>

Scotland's New Human Rights Bill - Have Your Say

11 July 2023 (Glasgow, 12.30–4.30)

CEMVO consultation event to discuss what human rights look like and feel like to you including the right to healthy environment, access to justice, adequate standard of living, and wellbeing. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/mtwf86sc>

The story of Empire Windrush in ten documents

21 July 2023 (online, 2.00–3.00)

National Archives event to explore what government records can tell us about migration from the Caribbean in the post-war era, and the experiences of people who settled. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/mr22nu2m>

**** A Human Rights Bill for Scotland**

27 July 2023 (online, 10.00–12.00)

15 August 2023 (Dumfries, 10.00–12.00)

22 August 2023 (Glasgow (10.00–12.00)

28 August 2023 (Inverness (2.00–4.00))
5 September 2023 (online, 6.00–8.00)
11 September 2023 (Portree, 10.00–12.00)
19 September 2023 (Dundee, 10.00–12.00)

Scottish Government consultation on proposals for a new Human Rights Bill, including information about the proposals, and an opportunity to tell the Scottish Government your views in order to inform development of the Bill. For information about each event see:

Online (July) <https://tinyurl.com/46n5ed5a>
Dumfries <https://tinyurl.com/3tbj54a3>
Glasgow <https://tinyurl.com/2jmf49z>
Inverness <https://tinyurl.com/yckx35jz>
Online (September) <https://tinyurl.com/9ss2hnpm>
Portree <https://tinyurl.com/3kny2u5j>
Dundee <https://tinyurl.com/yckunjtjv>

**** How to disagree agreeably**

9 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 1.45–3.15)

Festival of Politics event. In an age where conflict culture and manufactured dissent seems to be actively encouraged in politics, the art of debating, listening and learning from the other side has been overshadowed by rancour and adamant polarisation. So, how do we revive the art of critical thinking, recognise the value of the 'grey area', and the goal of both parties making a discovery, rather than being right? For information see <https://tinyurl.com/24f28ahx>

**** Volunteers and the state**

9 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 2.00–3.30)

Festival of Politics event. Volunteers contribute an estimated £5.5 billion to the Scottish economy each year with over 2 million people giving their time freely. Are volunteers vital for the delivery of public services in Scotland or is there a concern in the current financial climate that volunteers are contributing to the erosion of the state by enabling cuts to services and undercutting paid jobs? For information see <https://tinyurl.com/37epmut7>

**** Women of colour in politics and challenging racism**

9 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 6.15–7.45)

Festival of Politics event. What has inspired women of colour to enter politics and/or be activists? And how has this intersected with their experiences as black and minority ethnic women? Join the panel to discuss the routes into the conventional political system and activism, whether the Black Lives Matter movement played a part in inspiring activism, and how can effective change be made both inside and outside the political system. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/mw6zt3cd>

**** Talking to boys and men about gender-based violence**

(10 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 3.00–4.30)

Festival of Politics event. How do we talk to boys and men in ways that will engage them and stop gender-based violence? What is being done in the legal world, in schools, with public education campaigns and with perpetrators to understand, challenge and change male attitudes and behaviour on harassment, assault and abuse? For information see <https://tinyurl.com/5t5frkwt>

**** Navigating migration**

(11 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 11.00–12.30)

Festival of Politics event. For people arriving in the UK as migrants and asylum seekers, the requirement to navigate employment, education, housing, and detention are both

monumental and vital to survival and settlement in the UK. Join the panel to discuss the realities of migrants and asylum seekers as they negotiate their rights to work, study, and live in the country. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/2b3x44xj>

**** Scotland's poverty problem**

(11 August 2023 (Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, 11.00–12.30)

Festival of Politics event. With nearly a quarter of children in Scotland growing up in poverty, we are storing up mental, physical and emotional health problems for our future. All political parties are committed to tackling the issue, so why has more progress not been made? Does stigma hold back the debate? How can we build a healthier and fairer society for everyone in Scotland? For information see <https://tinyurl.com/2p8f3emk>

Developing a Volunteer Strategy

19 September 2023 (Stirling, 10.00–4.00)

Volunteer Scotland course to discuss the purpose of developing a strategy for volunteering, the benefits of a volunteering strategy for the wider organisation, and steps to develop a strategy. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/mu3dkx53>

Supporting Volunteers

4 October 2023 (Stirling, 10.00–4.00)

Volunteer Scotland course to discuss building a positive relationship with volunteers, plan and deliver a suitable induction process, identify and apply different support methods, and manage some of the challenges of supporting volunteers. For information see <https://tinyurl.com/2nbpr7se>

TOP

Useful Links

Scottish Parliament <http://www.parliament.scot/>

Scottish Government <https://www.gov.scot/>

UK Parliament <http://www.parliament.uk/>

GovUK (links to UK Government Departments) <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations>

One Scotland <http://onescotland.org/>

Scottish Refugee Council <http://www.scottishrefugeecouncil.org.uk>

New Scots <https://newscots.scot/>

Refugee Survival Trust <https://www.rst.org.uk/>

Freedom from Torture <https://www.freedomfromtorture.org/>

Interfaith Scotland <https://interfaithscotland.org/>

Equality and Human Rights Commission <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en>

Equality Advisory Support Service <http://www.equalityadvisoryservice.com/>

Scottish Human Rights Commission <http://www.scottishhumanrights.com/>

ACAS <http://www.acas.org.uk/>

SCVO <https://scvo.org.uk/>

Volunteer Scotland <https://www.volunteerscotland.net/>

Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) <https://www.oscr.org.uk/>

Scottish Fundraising Standards Panel <https://www.goodfundraising.scot/>

Disclosure Scotland <https://www.mygov.scot/disclosure-types>

Volunteer Scotland Disclosure Services

<https://www.volunteerscotland.net/for-organisations/disclosure-services/>

BBC News <https://www.bbc.com/news>

TOP

SCoJeC
Scottish Council of
Jewish Communities

Representing, connecting, and supporting Jewish people in Scotland



*The **Scottish Council of Jewish Communities (SCoJeC)** is the representative body of all the Jewish communities in Scotland. It advances public understanding about the Jewish religion, culture and community, and also works in partnership with other organisations to promote good relations and understanding among community groups and to promote equality. (Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation SC029438) <https://www.scojec.org/>*

BEMIS
Empowering Scotland's Ethnic and
Cultural Minority Communities

***BEMIS** is the Scottish national Ethnic Minorities led umbrella body, supporting, empowering, and building the capacity of minority third sector community organisations. As a strategic partner with Government, it is proactive in influencing the development of race equality policy in Scotland, and helps develop and progress multicultural Scotland, active citizenship, democracy, and Human Rights Education at the Scottish, UK, and European levels. (Scottish Charity, no. SC027692) <http://www.bemis.org.uk/>*



*The **Scottish Government** is committed to promoting equality of opportunity and social justice for all those who live in Scotland. **One Scotland** is the Scottish Government campaign designed to tackle racism. It aims to raise awareness of racist attitudes, highlight its negative impact and recognise the valuable contributions that other cultures have made to our society – and make Scotland no place for racism. <http://www.gov.scot/>*

The copyright of each article belongs to the publisher on whose website it appears, and it may only be copied or reproduced in accordance with the relevant terms and conditions. Full details of these, and the publisher's contact information, are available on each website.