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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Spring Update covers the period from 5 June, when the previous Report was presented, through to 24 July 2018, when the House rose for Summer Recess. This period covers seven weeks when Parliament was sitting.

This Report outlines the main campaigning work undertaken by the Parliamentary Group during this period.

**KEY DEVELOPMENTS**

* *Contributed to debates, including those on rail (Timetabling, GTR, SoS), shipbuilding, and transport safety (see Campaigns section and Annex 3)*
* *Presented the Parliamentary Group Annual Report to the RMT AGM in Edinburgh (25 June)*
* *Hosted a strategy meeting on the Northern Rail guards dispute*
* *Met with Rail Minister Jo Johnson to discuss the East Coast franchise (20 June)*
* *Tabled numerous Written Parliamentary Questions, in particular on rail franchise and offshore issues (see Campaigns section and Annex 2)*
* *Tabled two new Early Day Motions – to highlight Seafarers Awareness Week and commemorate the Piper Alpha Disaster*
* *Circulated briefings on a wide range of transport issues to inform MPs of the union’s concerns*

**PARLIAMENTARY OVERVIEW**

This period has continued to be dominated by ‘Brexit,’ which has limited time for discussion of other issues in Westminster, with the EU Withdrawal Bill taking priority. Following eventual agreement by both Houses, this Bill received Royal Assent on 26 June and became an Act of Parliament (law). Attention switched to the ‘Customs Bill’ – the Taxation (Cross-border Trade) Bill 2017-19 – which the Government just managed to squeeze through its final Commons (Report / Third Reading) stages on 16 July. Its majority was reduced to three on occasions – and it passes to the Lords, where debate is scheduled for 4 September, although it cannot be further amended.

The Prime Minister and her Government remain ‘weak and wobbly’ rather than ‘strong and stable’; beset by divisions in the Conservative Party and reliant upon the DUP (itself now reduced due to suspension of Ian Paisley Jnr) for survival. Following the ‘soft-Brexit’ Chequers Agreement, Theresa May has struggled to retain her premiership, hit by a wave of resignations reaching double figures and including, most notably, Brexit Minister David Davis and Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson. Davis was replaced by Dominic Raab and Boris Johnson was replaced by Jeremy Hunt. After knife-edge victories in votes and amid caustic criticism from both Brexiteers and Remainers in their own ranks, the Government had even considered bringing forward the Summer break – and the PM must have been relieved to have survived through to Recess.

The Labour Leadership has also experienced difficulties, with accusations of anti-semitism accentuated by an appalling attack on Jeremy Corbyn by Dame Margaret Hodge, apparently labelling him a ‘racist and an anti-Semite.’

**The current Government line-up has remained unchanged and comprises –**

Chris Grayling (Secretary of State for Transport)

Jesse Norman (Roads, electric and autonomous vehicles)

Baroness Sugg (Aviation, international and security)

Jo Johnson (Rail)

Nusrat Ghani (Maritime, buses, taxis, accessibility & HS2)

**The Opposition Transport team has remained unchanged and comprises –**

Andy McDonald (Shadow Secretary of State for Transport)

Rachael Maskell (Rail & Road Safety)

Matt Rodda (Local Transport, Buses)

Karl Turner (Shipping, Aviation)

Lord Rosser

**The** **Transport Select Committee** **has not changed during the period of this Report and still comprises:**

Lilian Greenwood (Lab) Chair

Jack Brereton (Con)

Ronnie Cowan (SNP)

Steve Double (Con)

Paul Girvan (DUP)

Hugh Merriman (Con)

Grahame Morris (Lab)

Luke Pollard (Lab)

Iain Stewart (Con)

Graham Stringer (Lab)

Daniel Zeichner (Lab)

**GROUP OVERVIEW**

The RMT Parliamentary Group was formed in 2002, with Labour MPs keen to work with the union on the basis of support for four key policies: Public Ownership of Rail; Employment for UK Seafarers; Opposition to privatisation of London Underground; and Repeal of the Anti-Trade Union laws. It is a ‘campaigning’ Group and members of the Group are not ‘sponsored’ i.e. there is no financial link between the Group and the union and no MPs receive any payment or funding for being a member of the Group. If the union decides to provide a financial donation to any MP’s constituency at any given time, as it did during the last General Election campaign, then that is an entirely separate matter. Having welcomed to the Group since the last Report Mike Amesbury, Jo Platt, Luke Pollard, Matt Rodda, Danielle Rowley and Paul Sweeney, membership now stands at 38 (listed at Annex 5).

**MEETINGS**

The Group normally meets with Executive Officers of the RMT approximately every two months whilst Parliament is sitting and works to an agenda set by the union. The Group is currently chaired by Ian Mearns and professionally administered by Union Services / Solidarity Consulting in liaison with RMT Head Office. Two full Group Meetings have been held during the period of this Report: 11 June and 17 July. The next will take place on 30 October. Additionally, Ian Mearns presented the Group’s Annual Report to the AGM in Edinburgh on 25 June; and a strategy meeting for Northern MPs on the Northern Rail guards’ dispute was convened in Parliament on 18 July.

*RMT PARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETING, 11 JUNE*

*AGENDA*

*1. Apologies for absence*

*2. Railways*

*3. London Underground*

*4. Maritime*

*5. Offshore safety*

*6. Other political and industrial issues*

*7. Diary dates*

*8. Any Other Business*

*RMT PARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETING, 17 JULY*

*AGENDA\**

*1. Apologies for absence*

*2. Railways*

*3. London Underground*

*4. Maritime*

*5. Offshore safety*

*6. Other political and industrial issues*

*7. Diary dates*

*8. Any Other Business*

*\*An item was added to report to MPs on the serious assault on RMT members and officials by supporters of Tommy Robinson after they had attended a counter-demonstration on 14 July*

**CORRESPONDENCE**

The Group’s Secretariat is in regular informal contact with MPs, including the Shadow Frontbench, throughout the year. At Annex 4 is the text of two items, sent by Ian Mearns, referred to in the Campaigns (Rail) section below:

* Letter to Jo Johnson, Minister of State: East Coast (12 May 2018)
* Letter to Chris Grayling, Secretary of State: Northern Rail (12 June 2018)

**BRIEFINGS**

The union is notified of forthcoming Parliamentary business on a weekly basis, and keeps the union informed regarding Transport Committee events and reports. During this period MPs received several RMT briefings and news releases circulated by the Parliamentary Group, including:

5 June – RMT warns that Northern planning to shred safety culture in same way they've shredded timetable as union confirms further strike action in fight over guards

6 June – RMT Note for Adjournment Debate on ‘Transport safety for blind and visually impaired people’

11 June – One in five GTR and Northern Rail trains still late or cancelled this morning despite timetable fiddle

15 June – RMT picket lines on Northern Rail next week

18 June – Northern taxpayers and passengers will be footing bill for cost of this week's strike action union reveals

18 June – RMT suspends strike action on South Western Railway

19 June – RMT strike action rock solid on Northern Rail this morning in fight for rail safety

19 June – RMT briefing for Opposition Day debate re Secretary of State for Transport

21 June – As Northern Rail staff take further action in defence of safety RMT calls on company to stop blocking talks

22 June – Support Seafarer Awareness Week 2018

22 June – RMT Northern Rail protest goes ahead Monday as Grayling chickens out

9 July – RMT demands full disclosure of all GTR contract documentation as speculation grows that they are unsackable and "new timetable" looms

11 July – RMT briefing on Shipbuilding, with points to raise in the Opposition Day Debate on the UK defence industry and shipbuilding

17 July – RMT demands to know what's going on as Peter "punch up" Wlkinson resigns as director of company set up to take over GTR

18 July – RMT demands an urgent Commons statement on the outcome of Grayling’s inquiry into GTR before MPs head off to the sun

19 July – RMT secures important breakthrough as Greater Anglia members vote in favour of a deal that underpins the Guard Guarantee

20 July – RMT confirms further strike action to go ahead next week on south western railway in dispute over guards and safety

24 July – With eight days of strike action set to start Thursday in guards' dispute RMT warns that South Western Railways franchise is teetering on the brink

25 July – RMT slams Government for deliberately withholding key franchise data that would expose the depth of the crisis on Britain’s privatised railways

26 July – RMT South Western Railway Guards' safety action rock solid this morning

27 July –Parliamentary questions reveal taxpayers could pay South Western Railway not to run trains during RMT strike action

**EARLY DAY MOTIONS (EDMs)**

**Note on Early Day Motions**

Following concerns expressed at the 2013 RMT AGM and these being considered by the Executive and conveyed to the Convenor of the Group, it was thought the following note would be useful.

The number of MPs signing an EDM does not always indicate the level of Parliamentary support for an issue and cannot be taken as a hard and fast statistic of the total number or names of MPs who are supportive.

Group members are lobbied to sign RMT-initiated EDMs but there may still be reasons why MPs cannot sign EDMs, for example if they are part of the Shadow team, if they are members of Select Committees or if the EDM is regionally focused. **Since the election of Jeremy Corbyn as Leader, a majority of RMT Group members now fall into this category.**

Scores of EDMs are tabled every week, with well over 1,000 tabled each session. In addition, once an EDM is tabled it is only automatically reprinted in an MP’s papers for the next two weeks. After that the MP may not be aware of the EDM. So for example it won’t be uncommon for Group members to actually initiate and table an EDM on behalf of the Union but might then miss, or not get around to, signing an EDM tabled by another Group member.

Whilst EDMs have a role in highlighting a campaign to other MPs, and sometimes the press, they are only one aspect of campaigning in Parliament and there are a number of other mechanisms that the Group will seek to maximise such as the tabling of Parliamentary Questions, letters to Ministers and intervention in debates. It is hoped the above process can assist in continuing to ensure members of the Parliamentary Group are supportive of the Union and its key polices.

Overleaf is a list of all EDMs tabled by the Group during the 2017–2019 session so far (with those tabled during the period of this Report in ***bold italics***):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EDM** | **TITLE** | **MAIN SPONSOR** |
| 109 | REDUCED ACCESS FOR DISABLED PASSENGERS ON NORTHERN RAIL | IAN MEARNS |
| 112 | RETENTION OF GUARDS ON MERSEYRAIL TRAINS | DAN CARDEN |
| 210 | GREATER ANGLIA TICKET OFFICES | CLIVE LEWIS |
| 211 | GENESEE AND WYOMING AND FREIGHTLINER | IAN MEARNS |
| 350 | DUTCH STATE RAILWAYS AND DRIVER-ONLY OPERATION ON UK RAILWAYS | IAN MEARNS |
| 494 | RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE SAFETY, STANDARDS AND SKILLS | IAN MEARNS |
| 553 | OFFSHORE HELICOPTER SAFETY | IAN MEARNS |
| 920 | EAST COAST MAINLINE | IAN MEARNS |
| 946 | WORKING CONDITIONS OF LONDON UNDERGROUND CLEANERS | KATE HOEY |
| 1005 | SIMEON ANDREWS | IAN MEARNS |
| 1039 | LOW PAY ON CHANNEL ISLAND FERRY SERVICES | IAN MEARNS |
| 1238 | CONSEQUENCES OF CANCELLATION OF CARDIFF TO SWANSEA RAIL ELECTRIFICATION | JO STEVENS |
| 1240 | POOR PERFORMANCE ON NORTHERN RAIL SERVICES | IAN MEARNS |
| ***1424*** | ***SEAFARERS AWARENESS WEEK 2018*** | ***IAN MEARNS*** |
| ***1486*** | ***30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PIPER ALPHA DISASTER*** | ***ALEX CUNNINGHAM*** |

(The full wording of the EDMs and lists of signatories may be viewed at Annex 1)

**OTHER ACTIONS**

Union Services / Solidarity Consulting continue to provide the RMT with weekly updates on forthcoming Parliamentary business (including a range of Transport-related APPGs and Transport Committee meetings); and notify the union of Written Ministerial Statements issued.

**OTHER EVENTS**

Due to late votes in the Commons, MPs were precluded from attending this year’s RMT Cuba Garden Party on 13 June, but messages of solidarity from Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell and Group Chair Ian Mearns were read out. The Group hosted the latest in a series of Political Schools on 22 March.

**LEGISLATION OVERVIEW**

The previous Report described the limited legislative programme for the 2017-19 session that was set out in the Queen’s Speech, dominated by Brexit and ‘looking to the future’ of transport with Bills announced for HS2, automated vehicles and commercial spaceflight.

A special Select Committee is still hearing evidence from petitioners affected by the proposed development outlined in the **High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill 2017-19.**

The Government’s **Automated and Electric Vehicles Bill** received Royal Assent on 19 July and is now an Act of Parliament (law).

Two Private Members Bills mentioned in previous Reports – Daniel Zeichner’s **Licensing of Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (Safeguarding and Road Safety) Bill** and Paul Scully’s **Pedicabs (London) Bill** –have provisional Second Readingsrescheduled for 26 October, but are not expected to progress.

The Group will continue to monitor progress of transport-related legislation and are prepared to make interventions or table amendments on advice from the union.

**Campaigns Update**

**Rail**

Disputes continue – on Southern Rail, Arriva Northern Rail, Merseyrail and South Western – over the introduction of Driver Only Operation, removing the guarantee of a safety-critical guard on every train. This continues to be the main focus for the Group.

Group members continue to make interventions to highlight this, the need for nationalisation to replace franchising and other issues of concern to the union.

Following the Government’s enforced U-turn on the East Coast franchise, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) produced a damning report that concluded that the rail franchising model “was broken” and Chris Grayling came under increasing pressure from MPs over the chaos caused by the introduction of new train timetables. He was forced to make a statement to the Commons on 4 June, which brought criticism from all sides of the House and several Group members, including Andy McDonald, who told him bluntly: *“The travelling public and the rail industry have no faith in this Transport Secretary to fix this situation. Were the Prime Minister not so enfeebled, she would sack him. If he had any concept of responsibility, he would resign. The Transport Secretary should do the right thing and step aside.”*

A further Opposition Day debate on 19 June forced the Government to defend the Transport Secretary once again. This time he survived a vote of no confidence by a slimmer margin of 305 to 285. This came after another three hours of heated debate, to which several Group members contributed. In describing the impact on passengers and staff, Andy McDonald said: “*In the first week of the new timetable, GTR delayed or cancelled a quarter of its trains and announced the schedule for the next day at 10 pm each night. Today’s industrial action on Northern is a reminder of the utter despair felt by the rail industry’s workforce. Both Northern and GTR have waged war on their staff for three years and four years respectively. They have done so at the explicit behest of the Secretary of State for Transport and his senior officials.”*

Group Chair Ian Mearns wrote to Rail Minister Jo Johnson (see Annex 4) seeking a meeting to discuss the East Coast franchise with VTEC staff. This took place on 20 June. Johnson listened to their concerns and agreed to meet again in a year’s time to review the situation under LNER.

Grahame Morris and Luke Pollard have made several contributions to Transport Select Committee meetings, highlighting issues raised by the RMT when questioning witnesses giving evidence to inquiry sessions. This has included grilling Grayling on rail franchising at an Oral Evidence Session on the Intercity East Coast rail franchise East Coast on 24 July.

An RMT briefing was provided for Liz Twist’s Adjournment Debate on 6 June concerning ‘Transport safety for blind and visually impaired people’ (see Annex 3) and the 19 June Opposition Day Debate on the Secretary of State for Transport.

Over eighty Northern Labour MPs signed a letter from Ian Mearns to Chris Grayling (see Annex 4) demanding that Northern be stripped of the franchise and the service retuned to public ownership. The 18 July strategy meeting on the Northern Rail guards’ dispute agreed that a further letter be sent from Northern Labour MPs to Transport for the North members and a letter form Andy McDonald to the Office for Rail Responsibility regarding guards and passengers with disabilities. It was also agreed to press for an Adjournment Debate.

Questions tabled by Group members (see Annex 2) have illustrated vividly the Government’s lack of transparency regarding franchises.

GTR are operating to a second ‘remedial plan’ – an amendment to the main franchise agreement and sets out detailed performance targets and enforcement provisions – however a series of questions from Lloyd Russell-Moyle have been unable to establish when these will be published. That their performance standards remain secret suggest that the Government is desperate to avoid GTR going into public ownership.

Earlier this year, Jo Johnson had replied to Ian Mearns that “The Secretary of State for Transport will endeavour to place an updated copy of the contracted franchise payment profile for all train operating companies in the Libraries of both Houses shortly after the laying of the Department’s annual accounts before Parliament.” When he asked again on the 10 July, Jo Johnson replied that “The Department has reviewed the contracted franchise payment profiles and concluded that this information is commercially sensitive and so cannot be placed in the Library.”  
  
Thus theGovernment appears to be deliberately withholding key franchise data that would expose the depth of the crisis on Britain’s privatised railways. Following the collapse of Virgin East Coast, which had overestimated passenger number growth, the suspicion is that other franchise contracts have similarly been awarded by the Department for Transport on the basis over over-bidding.

Questions from Kate Hoey and Laura Smith elicited information about South Western Trains. Answers revealed that the taxpayer is to pay South Western not to run trains during strikes as have questions from Ian Mearns in respect of Northern. By exploiting a clause in its franchise agreement, South Western applied to be reimbursed for resulting revenue loss. So the Government is committed to bankrolling the company, prolonging the dispute and disruption to passengers.

**Maritime**

Ian Mearns tabled an EDM (1424) on 19 June to highlight the forthcoming Seafarers Awareness Week 2016 – see text at Annex 1. This achieved widespread cross-party (including Conservative) support.

The Ministry of Defence (MoD) is ordering three new Fleet Solid Support (FSS) vessels, which carry supplies for Royal Navy ships, for the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA). The Group want UK shipyards and supply chain companies to benefit from this significant public procurement opportunity. The Fleet Solid Support order is reportedly worth £1bn. Grahame Morris, Rebecca Long Bailey, Luke Pollard, Ruth Smeeth and Paul Sweeney all argued the case for British workers in an Opposition Day Debate on the UK Defence Industry and Shipbuilding on 11 July, for which RMT briefing on the issue was circulated (see Annex 3).

The RMT Group continue to seek opportunities to persuade the Government to implement the recommendations of the DfT-chaired Legal Working Group on Seafarers and the National Minimum Wage. Kelly Tollhurst has recently replaced Andrew Griffiths as the Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy Minister responsible for the final decision on implementing these recommendations. The Group could seek a meeting with her and / or a debate on Seafarers’ Employment Rights.

**Offshore**

Alex Cunningham has tabled more questions (see Annex 2) about the oil and gas industry and continues to campaign on concerns for helicopter safety over the North Sea. Alex Cunningham also tabled EDM 1486 (see Annex 1) to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Piper Alpha disaster, which claimed the lives of 167 offshore workers on 6 July 1988. This received considerable cross-party (including Conservative) support.

Partly due to the downturn in the North Sea oil and gas industry, there is no shortage of suitably skilled and experienced seafarers in the UK available for work to support offshore wind and other renewable energy operations. It is vital that the UK Government provides the basis for UK workers to compete fairly for all offshore wind jobs, including the supply chain and especially at the construction and maintenance stages. Putting the offshore wind sector on a sustainable footing, including the enforcement domestic employment law, will also be absolutely essential in offsetting the huge carbon deficit that will result from the Government's granting of a third runway at Heathrow.

A series of questions on offshore issues, including regulated retraining to provide opportunities for oil and gas workers in renewable energy sectors – have been tabled. Additionally, Home Office Oral Questions on 16 July afforded Lloyd Russell-Moyle an opportunity to raise this issue:

[*Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Brighton, Kemptown) (Lab/Co-op)*](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4615)

*Offshore wind projects such as Rampion, off the coast of my constituency, should provide an opportunity for good jobs in Britain, but the Home Office is continuing to provide immigration rule waivers to allow crews from outside the European economic area to work here. Why is the Home Office undermining good maritime jobs off our coast? [906481]*

[*Caroline Nokes*](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4048)

*Let me reassure the hon. Gentleman. The Home Office is not undermining good maritime jobs; it is working with all partners to ensure that as we leave the EU there are appropriate employment opportunities, which will be set out in the forthcoming immigration White Paper.*

**Buses**

Jeremy Corbyn led on the issue at Prime Ministers Questions (PMQs) on 4 July:

*Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Lab)*

*[…] With fares rising above inflation, passenger numbers falling and services being cut, does the Prime Minister accept her failure on yet another public service: the buses?*

*The Prime Minister (Mrs Theresa May)*

*[…] On his point about buses, I merely ​point out to him that we should look at the responsibility that local authorities up and down the country have for the buses. […]*

*Jeremy Corbyn*

*[…] Since 2010, her Government have cut 46% from bus budgets in England and passenger numbers have fallen, and, among the elderly and disabled, they have fallen by 10%. Her Government belatedly committed to keeping the free bus pass, but a bus pass is not much use if there is not a bus. Does she think it is fair that bus fares have risen by 13% more than inflation since 2010?*

*The Prime Minister*

*The right hon. Gentleman says that, in his first question, he asked about buses; he did indeed and I gave him an answer in reference to buses. What he cannot do is simply stand up and make assertions about what the Government are doing without expecting those to be challenged, which is exactly what I did on his funding for the national health service.*

*It was right that we made that commitment in relation to bus passes. What we are seeing across the country is that, as people’s working habits are changing, there is less usage of buses, but we are working with local authorities on this. Local authorities have many responsibilities in relation to buses, and I suggest that the right hon. Gentleman asks some of those local authorities what they are doing about the buses in their own areas.*

*Jeremy Corbyn*

*Under this Government, fares have risen three times faster than people’s pay. Bus users are often people on lower incomes whose wages are lower than they were 10 years ago in real terms and who have suffered a benefits-freeze. Under the stewardship of this Government, 500 bus routes have been cut every year, leaving many people more isolated and lonely and damaging our local communities. Does the Prime Minister believe that bus services are a public responsibility, or just something that we leave to the market?*

*The Prime Minister*

*I have made the point on two occasions about the responsibilities that others have in relation to buses. The right hon. Gentleman might, for example, look at what the Mayor of London—who when I last looked was a Labour politician—is doing in relation to buses in London. The right hon. Gentleman talks also about the impact of fares on lower-income people. It is important that we consider the situation of people who are on low incomes. That is why it is this Government who introduced the national living wage and have increased the national living wage. That is why it is this Government who have taken 4 million people out of paying income tax altogether. That is helping people on low incomes in this country.*

*Jeremy Corbyn*

*When Sadiq Khan ran for Mayor of London, he promised to freeze bus fares, and what has he done? He has frozen bus fares. [Interruption.] If the Prime Minister is concerned about the travelcard fares, she should speak to the Secretary of State for Transport: he is the one who sets that fare. Bus routes are being wiped out: 26 million fewer journeys have been made across the north of England and the midlands under her Government. So much for a northern powerhouse and a midlands engine. Can we be clear: does the Prime Minister think that deregulation of the bus industry, putting profit before passengers, has been a success or a failure?*

*The Prime Minister*

*The right hon. Gentleman talks about what the Mayor of London has done, but what have we seen in the number of people using buses in London? It has gone down under the current Mayor. If he wants to talk about what Mayors are doing, I am very happy to talk about what Andy Street, the Conservative Mayor of the West Midlands, has done; he has extended free bus fares to apprentices and students.*

*Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Lab)*

*It will be a Labour Government who save the bus industry and who give free fares to under 26-year-olds. The truth is that since deregulation fares have risen faster than inflation, ridership has fallen and these private bus monopolies have made a profit of £3.3 billion since 2010. That is what the Tories give us in public transport.*

*The Prime Minister*

*Of course, the local authorities have some responsibilities and capabilities in relation to subsidising bus routes and fares; and, yes, we have given those powers to the Metro Mayors. The right hon. Gentleman earlier referenced what was happening in the northern powerhouse and the midlands engine. I will tell him what is happening: more investment in our public transport; more investment in our roads; and more investment in the infrastructure that brings jobs to people in the north and across the midlands.*

*Jeremy Corbyn*

*It is a shame that this Government are so shy of giving powers to local authorities, and are instead more interested in cutting their resources. Bus services are in crisis under this Government. Fares are increasing, routes are being cut and passenger numbers are falling. The situation is isolating elderly and disabled people, damaging communities and high streets, and leading to more congestion in our towns and cities, with people spending more time travelling to work or school. It is bad for our climate change commitments and for our air quality. Will the Prime Minister at last recognise the crucial importance of often the only mode of transport available for many people by ending the cuts to bus budgets and giving councils the power to ensure that everyone gets a regulated bus service, wherever they live?*

*The Prime Minister*

*I will take no lessons from the right hon. Gentleman in devolution to local authorities. Which party has established the Metro Mayors and given them those powers? It is the Conservative party in government. Which party is doing growth deals around the country, giving local authorities new responsibilities? It is this Conservative Government. And what did we ​see in the north-east? When we were talking to Labour councils in the north-east about a devolution deal, Labour council leaders there rejected that devolution. That is what the Labour party is doing. The right hon. Gentleman wants to know what this Government are delivering for the people of the north, the south, the midlands—for every part of this country. We are delivering record high employment, rising wages, falling borrowing, stronger environmental protection and a Britain fit for the future.*

**Taxis**

At Annex 2 is the question tabled by Kate Hoey on 11 June, seeking details of those involved with the working party on working conditions in the private hire industry (Task and Finish Group on Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle licensing.

**Tube & TfL**

An EDM is planned to follow Summer Recess, calling for reinstatement of the Government operating grant for Transport for London (TfL) – now the only major transport system in the world lacking such central support – and calling for opposition to cuts arising from the withdrawal of the grant.

**Transport Police**

The Group remain watchful for moves towards Infrastructure Policing, merging the British Transport Police (BTP) with Police Scotland, although the 1 April 2019 date for integration has already been scrapped.

**Trade Union Coordinating Group (TUCG)**

The RMT is a founder member of the TUCG, which was set up in 2008 to coordinate the campaigning work of member unions in Parliament and within the wider movement. A detailed report of the work of the TUCG is distributed bi-annually in February and September. The TUCG currently brings together 10 trade unions (BFAWU, FBU, NAPO, NUJ, NEU, PCS, POA, RMT, UCU and URTU) and represents around one million trade unionists. It meets at a General Secretary level every two months and its Annual Chair rotates.

At the TUCG's AGM on 12 February the officers were confirmed and the annual accounts were agreed – with BFAWU General Secretary Ronnie Draper taking over the Chair from Bob Monks of URTU. The Executive also held an extraordinary meeting on March 20, to consider the immediate arrangements that unions would put in place following the death of Simeon Andrews, to allow the work of both the TUCG and member unions who held contracts with Union Services, to continue.  At the meeting on 11 June Laura Pidcock outlined the role of a ‘Ministry for Labour’ to be created when the next Labour Government takes office. At the meeting on 9 July Nancy Platts spoke about trade unions and political reform. On 16 July the Annual Tolpuddle Seminar on the theme “Working Class Struggles for Justice” attracted an audience of 70 to Parliament to hear from campaigners on issues such as Grenfell, Orgreave and Police Surveillance; and tributes to Simeon Andrews from MPs Jeremy Corbyn, John McDonnell, Richard Burgon and Ian Mearns. Mick Cash spoke of Simeon, the Guards dispute and the fascists’ attack on RMT members. The meeting on 30 August discussed preparations issues likely to be raised at forthcoming Trade Union Congress in Manchester, and the next meeting is scheduled for 8 October.

TUCG Parliamentary actions:

* Briefings distributed to all MPs & Peers of all parties
* Numerous meetings with MPs/Peers, Ministers & Shadow Departmental team
* Union press notices widely circulated to MPs and Peers
* Amendments tabled throughout Bills’ stages in the Commons & Lords
* PQs tabled by Shadow team and other supportive MPs

The TUCG also maintains its own website ([**www.tucg.org.uk**](http://www.tucg.org.uk/)) which includes all the latest parliamentary information of interest to union members and MPs, as well as details of union campaigns, events, blogs and video footage from demos and rallies outside and around Parliament, in addition to numerous links to related campaigns and social media.

**ANNEXES**

**Annex 1 – Early Day Motions**

**EDM 109 – REDUCED ACCESS FOR DISABLED PASSENGERS ON NORTHERN RAIL**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **33**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benn, Hilary | Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan | Crausby, David |
| Cunningham, Jim | Farron, Tim | Flynn, Paul | Gaffney, Hugh |
| George, Ruth | Glindon, Mary | Goodman, Helen | Grogan, John |
| Hepburn, Stephen | Hill, Mike | Hoey, Kate | Hopkins, Kelvin |
| Lewis, Clive | Matheson, Chris | McKinnell, Catherine | Mearns, Ian |
| Morris, Grahame M | Nandy, Lisa | Pidcock, Laura | Shannon, Jim |
| Skinner, Dennis | Smeeth, Ruth | Smith, Laura | Stephens, Christopher |
| Stevens, Jo | Turley, Anna | Twist, Liz | Williamson, Chris |
| Woodcock, John |  |  |  |

That this House notes that 331 of Northern Rail's 527 stations are unstaffed; is concerned that the Government and Northern Rail's proposals to remove the guarantee of a guard on every Northern Rail train will mean many people with disabilities will not be able to turn up and go and travel if there is no guarantee of a second member of staff to assist them on and off the train; understands that where Driver-Only Operation on Southern Rail has recently been introduced there have been a number of instances of wheelchair users being stranded at stations; believes that by removing train guards Northern Rail will be in breach of Rail Vehicle Access Regulations that require every train to have a ramp and staff to operate the ramp for passengers who require assistance; and calls on the Government, Rail North and Northern Rail to protect disabled passengers’ access to Northern Rail services by retaining the guarantee of a guard on every train.

**EDM 112 – RETENTION OF GUARDS ON MERSEYRAIL TRAINS**

**Dan Carden MP**

Total number of signatures: **22**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Carden, Dan | Crausby, David | Cunningham, Jim | Eagle, Angela |
| Flynn, Paul | Hepburn, Stephen | Hill, Mike | Hoey, Kate |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Lewis, Clive | Matheson, Chris | McGovern, Alison |
| Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Nandy, Lisa | Shannon, Jim |
| Skinner, Dennis | Smeeth, Ruth | Smith, Laura | Stephens, Christopher |
| Stevens, Jo | Williamson, Chris |  |  |

That this House welcomes the current guarantee of a guard on every train to provide service, safety and security for Merseyrail passengers; recognises the vital role that guards play in providing advice and assistance and deterring criminal and anti-social behaviour; acknowledges that guards have essential skills and training to enable them to carry out safety critical duties including dealing with fire, evacuations and driver incapacity; is concerned by proposals to remove all of the guards to help pay for new rolling stock, resulting in a dispute situation and strike action on Merseyrail trains; is further concerned that the cuts are being proposed despite Merseyrail paying out up to £14 million a year, or one quarter of all passenger income, in dividends; believes that guards are vital for passenger service safety and security; and therefore calls for guards to be retained on Merseyrail trains.

**EDM 210 – GREATER ANGLIA TICKET OFFICES**

**Clive Lewis MP**

Total number of signatures: **11**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan | Hopkins, Kelvin | Lewis, Clive |
| Martin, Sandy | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Shannon, Jim |
| Skinner, Dennis | Stephens, Christopher | Streeting, Wes |  |

That this House is concerned at warnings from the rail unions that Greater Anglia trains wishes to close all but seven of its 64 ticket offices by the end of its franchise; is further concerned that ticket office closures will result in a worse, less accessible service, higher ticket prices, more dangerous stations and non-availability of tickets when ticket machines break down; is dismayed cuts are being considered when fares are going up and the profits from these cuts will go to Dutch State Railway who owns the franchise; and calls for assurances from Greater Anglia that it will not close ticket offices for the duration of its franchise.

**Early day motion 211 – GENESEE AND WYOMING AND FREIGHTLINER**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **10**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan | Crausby, David | Gaffney, Hugh |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Shannon, Jim |
| Skinner, Dennis | Stephens, Christopher |  |  |

That this House supports members of the RMT union employed by Freightliner Group at the Coatbridge depot who took industrial action, for the first time, on 3 July 2017 in response to the employer's alleged failure to address serial bullying and harassment by a senior member of staff; notes that harassment at work is illegal under the Equality Act 2010; supports the RMT's policy of zero tolerance of workplace bullying and harassment; further notes that Freightliner's parent company, Genesee and Wyoming's code of ethics and conduct includes core commitments to respect and integrity; believes the actions of local management at Coatbridge breach these commitments; further believes that by implementing its own commitments as a matter of urgency, Freightliner would end harassment and bullying of staff in the Coatbridge depot; and calls on Genesee and Wyoming and Freightliner to resolve this dispute as soon as possible.

**Early day motion 350 – DUTCH STATE RAILWAYS AND DRIVER-ONLY OPERATION ON UK RAILWAYS**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **18**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan | Crausby, David | Cunningham, Jim |
| George, Ruth | Glindon, Mary | Hepburn, Stephen | Hill, Mike |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Lewis, Clive | Martin, Sandy | Matheson, Chris |
| Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Skinner, Dennis |
| Stephens, Christopher | Williamson, Chris |  |  |

That this House notes that Greater Anglia and Merseyrail are in dispute with the RMT union over those companies' plans to introduce driver-only operated trains; further notes that Greater Anglia and Merseyrail are both part-owned by Abellio that, when introducing new trains on its franchise in Scotland, was able to reach an agreement with the RMT on this issue; recognises that this resulted in retaining the guarantee of the guard on the services in question and also the guards' role in ensuring the safe despatch of trains; believes that if Abellio in Scotland can reach such an agreement with the RMT then it can reach the same agreement on Greater Anglia and Merseyrail; notes that Abellio is owned by Dutch state railways Nederlandse Spoorwegen, whose recent reports boast of annual revenues of 1.4 billion euros on its UK rail operations and an overall return of 18 per cent on a limited investment; and further believes that the Dutch state railways should cut their profits so passengers can keep the guarantee of guards on Greater Anglia and Merseyrail services.

**Early day motion 494 – RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE SAFETY, STANDARDS AND SKILLS**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **21**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan | Crausby, David | Cunningham, Jim |
| Gaffney, Hugh | Godsiff, Roger | Hill, Mike | Hoey, Kate |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Lucas, Caroline | Martin, Sandy | Mearns, Ian |
| Morris, Grahame M | Rimmer, Marie | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Shannon, Jim |
| Skinner, Dennis | Smeeth, Ruth | Smith, Laura | Stevens, Jo |
| Williamson, Chris |  |  |  |

That this House believes there can be no compromise to safety in the maintenance and renewal of the railways; recognises concerns raised by the Rail Industry Association and RMT union over the current threat to Network Rail's supply chain and skills base caused by the deferral of £3.7 billion of renewals which was due for completion by 2019 but has now been put back by up to five years; is concerned that the feast or famine approach to work allocation, short-term funding periods of five years and the increasing commercialisation of Network Rail is contributing to casualisation of the workforce resulting in the loss of jobs, skills and standards; notes the announced £47.9 billion funding to Network Rail for 2019 to 2024 of which £34.7 billion is from the taxpayer and the vast majority of the remainder from fares; further notes that this will be linked to more cuts, commercialisation and fragmentation; further believes it should instead be linked to stamping out casualisation and gig economy style employment practices which the safety regulator has described as not conducive to a safe railway; is deeply concerned that recent reviews into Network Rail have contained no proper analysis of the benefits of ending outsourcing and casualisation despite evidence that when rail infrastructure work has been brought in-house on a unified basis it has made hundreds of millions in savings; and calls for a Government review and an end to the casualisation of the safety-critical rail infrastructure workforce.

**Early day motion 553 – OFFSHORE HELICOPTER SAFETY**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **32**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Bardell, Hannah | Brown, Alan | Campbell, Ronnie | Carden, Dan |
| Carmichael, Alistair | Crausby, David | Cunningham, Alex | Cunningham, Jim |
| Day, Martyn | Gethins, Stephen | Glindon, Mary | Hendry, Drew |
| Hepburn, Stephen | Hermon, Lady | Hill, Mike | Hoey, Kate |
| Law, Chris | Linden, David | Lucas, Caroline | MacNeil, Angus |
| Mearns, Ian | Monaghan, Carol | Morris, Grahame M | Pidcock, Laura |
| Rimmer, Marie | Robinson, Gavin | Shannon, Jim | Simpson, David |
| Skinner, Dennis | Stephens, Christopher | Stevens, Jo | Williamson, Chris |

That this House is concerned by the safety of offshore helicopter transport; observes that since February 2009, 33 offshore workers and crew have died and 65 have been rescued from the North Sea following six accidents involving Super Puma 225 and AS332 L2 helicopters; remembers the 13 passengers and crew who lost their lives on 29 April 2016 in a crash off the south coast of Norway; notes that Norwegian and UK investigations of fatal and non-fatal Super Puma accidents since 2009 have found similar mechanical failures; supports the continued grounding of the Super Puma fleet across the North Sea; further notes that the manufacturer Airbus surveyed offshore workers in June 2017 and found a majority with profound reservations over flying in Super Pumas again; is further concerned that the Civil Aviation Authority lifted official restrictions on these helicopters in July 2017 without consulting offshore workers or their trade unions; believes that Super Pumas should not return to the North Sea without the prior agreement of a majority of offshore workers; is concerned that the Government rejected the Transport Select Committee's July 2014 recommendation for a public inquiry into commercial pressures on offshore helicopter safety; recognises that 2018 is the 30th anniversary of the Piper Alpha disaster and a reminder of the necessity for the highest possible standards of offshore safety; and supports the RMT union's call for the Government to launch a public inquiry into the offshore helicopter safety concerns that are being raised by offshore workers.

**Early day motion 920 – EAST COAST MAINLINE**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **29**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Bardell, Hannah | Brown, Alan | Chapman, Douglas | Crausby, David |
| Cunningham, Jim | Day, Martyn | Edwards, Jonathan | Farron, Tim |
| Gaffney, Hugh | Gethins, Stephen | Glindon, Mary | Godsiff, Roger |
| Grogan, John | Hendry, Drew | Hepburn, Stephen | Hill, Mike |
| Hoey, Kate | Hopkins, Kelvin | Jardine, Christine | Mearns, Ian |
| Morris, Grahame M | Rimmer, Marie | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Skinner, Dennis |
| Smeeth, Ruth | Stephens, Christopher | Walker, Thelma | Whitfield, Martin |
| Williamson, Chris |  |  |  |

That this House notes that Virgin-Stagecoach who operate East Coast mainline railway are in breach of financial covenants and will shortly be unable to continue to provide this service; further notes that this is the third time a private operator has failed to live up to its commitments on this service route; notes that in contrast previously, under public ownership, East Coast achieved record levels of passenger satisfaction; supports the RMT union's call for the jobs and conditions of rail workers affected to be fully protected and underwritten; and urges the Government immediately and permanently to take back into public ownership East Coast mainline, with the need for good customer service enshrined within its remit.

**Early day motion 946 – WORKING CONDITIONS OF LONDON UNDERGROUND CLEANERS**

**Kate Hoey MP**

Total number of signatures: **30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Crausby, David | Cruddas, Jon | Cryer, John |
| Cunningham, Alex | Cunningham, Jim | Day, Martyn | Field, Frank |
| Gaffney, Hugh | George, Ruth | Glindon, Mary | Hermon, Lady |
| Hoey, Kate | Hopkins, Kelvin | Lammy, David | Martin, Sandy |
| Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Rimmer, Marie | Robinson, Gavin |
| Saville Roberts, Liz | Shannon, Jim | Sharma, Virendra | Skinner, Dennis |
| Smeeth, Ruth | Stephens, Christopher | Stevens, Jo | Walker, Thelma |
| West, Catherine | Western, Matt |  |  |

That this House is grateful to the 3,000 cleaners who keep the capital's underground network clear of obstructions and in a hygienic condition; is concerned that, despite working in dirty and hazardous conditions, frequently through the night time and other unsocial hours, these hard working and often vulnerable public servants only receive the bare minimum statutory sick pay, pensions and holiday entitlement; is further concerned by the decision of the new outsourced Tube cleaning contractor ABM to make employment conditions even worse by introducing an inferior sick pay scheme; believes that such a high profile, world famous public service as the London Underground should be leading the way in providing decent working conditions for all its staff instead of exploiting vulnerable workers; calls for Transport for London to take all necessary steps in ensuring Tube cleaners are treated the same as other Tube staff in respect of their basic working conditions; and further calls for this outsourced cleaning work to be returned in-house as soon as practicable, so that Tube cleaning is part of the public sector alongside the rest of the London Underground.

**Early day motion 1005 – SIMEON ANDREWS**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **55**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Abbott, Diane | Bottomley, Peter | Brown, Alan | Burgon, Richard |
| Butler, Dawn | Carden, Dan | Corbyn, Jeremy | Crausby, David |
| Cunningham, Alex | Cunningham, Jim | Day, Martyn | De Cordova, Marsha |
| Edwards, Jonathan | Gaffney, Hugh | Glindon, Mary | Green, Kate |
| Haigh, Louise | Hendry, Drew | Hoey, Kate | Hopkins, Kelvin |
| Hussain, Imran | Lavery, Ian | Lee, Karen | Lewis, Clive |
| Linden, David | Long Bailey, Rebecca | Lucas, Caroline | Madders, Justin |
| Marsden, Gordon | Maskell, Rachael | McDonald, Andy | McDonnell, John |
| McInnes, Liz | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Newlands, Gavin |
| Osamor, Kate | Pearce, Teresa | Pidcock, Laura | Rayner, Angela |
| Rimmer, Marie | Robinson, Geoffrey | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Saville Roberts, Liz |
| Shannon, Jim | Skinner, Dennis | Smeeth, Ruth | Smith, Cat |
| Smith, Laura | Stephens, Christopher | Stevens, Jo | Thornberry, Emily |
| Vaz, Keith | Williamson, Chris | Wishart, Pete |  |

That this House is shocked and saddened by the sudden death of Simeon Andrews, whose advice and assistance has proved invaluable to so many Labour movement comrades and Parliamentary colleagues; pays tribute to his success in creating and co-ordinating several union parliamentary groups and cross-party groups; notes his earlier achievements as an actor with the Royal Shakespeare Company; remembers him as a principled trade unionist and socialist; further notes his passionate commitment to the arts, animal rights and Liverpool FC; and offers sincere condolences to his partner and daughter.

**Early day motion 1039 – LOW PAY ON CHANNEL ISLAND FERRY SERVICES**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **14**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Carmichael, Alistair | Crausby, David | Cunningham, Jim | Gaffney, Hugh |
| Glindon, Mary | Hill, Mike | Hopkins, Kelvin | Linden, David |
| Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Rimmer, Marie | Shannon, Jim |
| Simpson, David | Stephens, Christopher |  |  |

That this House welcomes the States of Jersey's vote to set the Jersey Living Wage of £9.75 per hour for public sector employees and sub-contractors from 1 June 2018; supports the development of low-pay policy in the Channel Islands and all Crown Dependencies and British Overseas Territories; notes that in 2014 Condor Ferries paid Ukrainian stewards £2.46 per hour on lifeline ferry services from Portsmouth to Jersey and Guernsey; is concerned that international seafarers working on Condor Ferries' Bahamian-registered fleet continue to be paid well below the UK National Living Wage of £7.50 per hour; supports the application and enforcement of National Minimum Wage rates of pay in UK territorial waters; and calls on the Government to support the RMT union's campaign to eradicate low pay for seafarers on outsourced public contracts for lifeline passenger and freight ferry services between the UK and the Channel Islands.

**Early day motion 1238 – CONSEQUENCES OF CANCELLATION OF CARDIFF TO SWANSEA RAIL ELECTRIFICATION**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **20**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Campbell, Ronnie | Cooper, Rosie | Edwards, Jonathan | Flynn, Paul |
| Gaffney, Hugh | Glindon, Mary | Hepburn, Stephen | Hopkins, Kelvin |
| Martin, Sandy | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Nandy, Lisa |
| Owen, Albert | Rimmer, Marie | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Saville Roberts, Liz |
| Shannon, Jim | Skinner, Dennis | Stevens, Jo | Williams, Hywel |

That this House notes with dismay and disapprobation the decision to scrap the rail electrification programme between Cardiff and Swansea; further notes that the National Audit Office consider the decision to have been financially driven; rejects claims that bi­modal trains could deliver similar benefits to electrification; believes that the decision will have an adverse impact on improving air quality, energy efficiency, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and enhancing services; is deeply concerned that the decision threatens economic growth and development in areas of England and Wales already suffering from poor connectivity and under­investment; is further concerned that the decision directly places 224 specialist skilled jobs at risk; further believes that the decision compounds existing problems with the feast or famine approach to work allocation which, along with short-term funding periods of five years and the increasing commercialisation of Network Rail, is contributing to casualisation of the workforce resulting in the loss of jobs, skills and standards; and calls on the Government to reinstate the electrification programme immediately and protect the affected skilled rail engineering jobs.

**Early day motion 1240 – POOR PERFORMANCE ON NORTHERN RAIL SERVICES**

**Ian Mearns MP**

|  |
| --- |
| Total number of signatures: **30** |
| |  | | --- | |  | | Benn, Hilary | Campbell, Ronnie | Cooper, Rosie | Crausby, David | | Cunningham, Alex | Farron, Tim | Gaffney, Hugh | Glindon, Mary | | Green, Kate | Hendrick, Mark | Hepburn, Stephen | Hill, Mike | | Hollern, Kate | Hopkins, Kelvin | Jones, Kevan | Lewell-Buck, Emma | | McKinnell, Catherine | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M | Nandy, Lisa | | Owen, Albert | Rimmer, Marie | Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Shannon, Jim | | Stephens, Christopher | Stevens, Jo | Stringer, Graham | Twist, Liz | | Walker, Thelma | Woodcock, John |  |  |   That this House notes the Public Accounts Committee report into Rail Franchising in the UK which recognised that Passengers on the Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern franchise have suffered an appalling level of delays and cancellations since the franchise started in 2014 and that the franchising model is broken; further notes that the problems which franchising has brought to Southern Rail services, including shortage of staff, over-reliance on rest day working and overtime, shortage of trained drivers and poor management planning resulting in frequent cancellations, are now also being replicated on Northern Rail services; is concerned that passengers across the North are now being left waiting at stations, not knowing when, or if, trains will run; is further concerned that plans to introduce driver-only operated trains will exacerbate those problems; and calls on the Government to launch an urgent inquiry into the crisis at Northern Rail and give consideration to stripping Arriva of the Northern franchise and placing the service in public ownership. |  |  |  |

**Early day motion 1486 – 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PIPER ALPHA DISASTER**

**Alex Cunningham MP**

Total number of signatures: **34**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Blackman, Kirsty | Bottomley, Peter | Brock, Deidre | Brown, Alan |
| Carmichael, Alistair | Cowan, Ronnie | Crausby, David | Cryer, John |
| Cunningham, Alex | George, Ruth | Glindon, Mary | Grady, Patrick |
| Hayes, Helen | Hendry, Drew | Hermon, Lady | Hill, Mike |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Jardine, Christine | Law, Chris | Linden, David |
| Martin, Sandy | McDonald, Stewart | Mearns, Ian | Morris, Grahame M |
| Owen, Albert | Penning, Mike | Rimmer, Marie | Saville Roberts, Liz |
| Shannon, Jim | Sheppard, Tommy | Skinner, Dennis | Stephens, Christopher |
| Stevens, Jo | Thewliss, Alison |  |  |

That this House notes with sadness the 30th anniversary of the Piper Alpha disaster which claimed the lives of 167 offshore workers on 6 July 1988; extends a message of condolence and support to the families, friends and workmates affected by this profound and enduring loss; further notes that Lord Cullen's report into the disaster made 106 recommendations to repair and improve the safety culture in the UK's offshore oil and gas industry; welcomes the progress made by employers and workers to implement Lord Cullen's recommendations; notes the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) recent call on North Sea installation owners to state how they intend to further reduce hydrocarbon releases, particularly those with major accident potential; notes the ongoing delay in publication of the updated workforce engagement guide for HSE inspectors; believes that better enforcement of regulations governing safety committees and workforce safety representatives on installations is essential to the continuous improvement of the offshore safety culture recommended by Lord Cullen; and calls on the Government to better regulate the offshore business environment in the interests of safer working and employment practices on installations and in the supply chain.

**Early day motion 1424 – SEAFARERS AWARENESS WEEK 2018**

**Ian Mearns MP**

Total number of signatures: **39**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bottomley, Peter | Brown, Alan | Campbell, Ronnie | Carmichael, Alistair |
| Chapman, Douglas | Cowan, Ronnie | Cunningham, Alex | Cunningham, Jim |
| Day, Martyn | Docherty, Martin | Farron, Tim | Fitzpatrick, Jim |
| Gaffney, Hugh | George, Ruth | Glindon, Mary | Hendry, Drew |
| Hepburn, Stephen | Hermon, Lady | Hill, Mike | Hoey, Kate |
| Hopkins, Kelvin | Jones, Kevan | Lake, Ben | Lewell-Buck, Emma |
| Martin, Sandy | McGinn, Conor | McNally, John | Mearns, Ian |
| Morris, Grahame M | Owen, Albert | Penning, Mike | Rimmer, Marie |
| Russell-Moyle, Lloyd | Saville Roberts, Liz | Shannon, Jim | Stephens, Christopher |
| Stevens, Jo | Thewliss, Alison | Williamson, Chris |  |

That this House welcomes Seafarers Awareness Week 2018, 23 to 30 June 2018, and its theme of UK maritime employment opportunities; recognises the socio­economic and strategic value of the UK's traditional role as a centre of maritime employment, training and skills; further welcomes the 18 per cent growth in the UK Ship Register over the last three years; notes that shipping companies have enjoyed tax concessions worth £1.87 billion since the introduction of the Tonnage Tax; further notes that the total number of seafarer jobs on vessels owned by UK Chamber of Shipping member companies has increased by over 26,100 since 2013; regrets that UK seafarers accounted for under nine per cent of that growth in maritime employment; notes that UK seafarers are ageing, with over 70 per cent of deck, engine and general purpose ratings more than 40 years old; supports the RMT trades union's call for employment, taxation, equality and immigration law reforms to increase maritime training and employment opportunities for UK seafarers which would replenish the national maritime skills base; and calls on the Government to enact such reforms as soon as possible.

**Annex 2 – Parliamentary Questions**

Only questions which have received answers are included in this Report. The Opposition Frontbench have tabled numerous questions, in addition to the selection below.

* **RAIL**

Q

Asked by [Lloyd Russell-Moyle](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/lloyd-russell-moyle/4615)

(Brighton, Kemptown)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4615)

Asked on: 03 July 2018

Department for Transport

Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern Rail Franchise

[160340](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-03/160340/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 27 April 2018 to Question 137644, on Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern Rail Franchise, what the planned publication date is for the second remedial plan.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 06 July 2018

The Department’s current priority is restoring a reliable service on Govia Thameslink Railway services. The second remedial plan will be published in due course.

Q

Asked by [Laura Smith](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/sjF1CMw3pCzMqp0sJ92BH?domain=parliament.uk)

(Crewe and Nantwich)

Asked on: 20 July 2018

Department for Transport

South Western Railway: Compensation

[166508](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/aKCwCNL3qijD0YriR2EE2?domain=parliament.uk)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 28 June 2018 to Question 155260 on rail strikes, whether South Western Railway has made an application in the last 12 months to reimburse the company for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/Wb7JCOM3rcvzpD9CPw-26?domain=parliament.uk)

Answered on: 25 July 2018

South Western Railway has made an application with regards to industrial action.

Q

Asked by [Kate Hoey](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/kate-hoey/210)

(Vauxhall)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=210&dept=27)

Asked on: 18 June 2018

Department for Transport

South Western Railway: Compensation

[154577](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-18/154577/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether (a) he and (b) officials of his Department have had discussions with South Western railway in the last twelve months on reimbursing that company for revenue lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

Any such discussions would be a commercial matter between South Western Railway and the Secretary of State and his Officials.

Q

Asked by [Kate Hoey](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/MgkdCP73vF38KBrcrQsTr?domain=parliament.uk)

(Vauxhall)

[[N]](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/6vZqCQn9wCoMknEc9244H?domain=parliament.uk)

Asked on: 18 June 2018

Department for Transport

South Western Railway: Compensation

[154578](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/kfr-CRO3xs5jvwkI0kzhz?domain=parliament.uk)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether South Western Railway has made an application in the last twelve months for reimbursement for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/e7FMCVA3BFgNxVLIrl8ex?domain=parliament.uk)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

Any such request would be a commercial matter between South Western Railway and the Secretary of State. However, no payments have been made under the relevant Franchise Agreement provisions.

South Western Railway franchise agreement - reimbursement of revenue lost as a result of industrial action

Clause 5 of Schedule 8.1 of the franchise agreement states

“Industrial Action: The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may at any time decide to reimburse or ameliorate net losses of the Franchisee arising from Industrial Action (however caused and of whatever nature) in circumstances where the Franchisee has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that it has taken all reasonable steps to avoid the Industrial Action and that, Industrial Action having nevertheless occurred, the Franchisee has taken all reasonable steps to mitigate its effects.”

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4425)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Transport

Season Tickets: Sales

[166211](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166211/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what assessment his Department has made of the potential effect the recent decline of season tickets sales will have on the current franchise model.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Department frequently meets Train Operating Companies (TOCs) to discuss their financial performance. We also have a specialist central team which monitors the financial performance of TOCs. In both cases we consider the impact of changes in revenue sources, including season ticket sales.

The Department’s franchise model contains a range of options for revenue risk-share mechanisms. We select the most appropriate mechanism based on the circumstances of each franchise we let, including taking account of the changing type of ticket sales in that franchise.

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4425)

Asked on: 17 July 2018

Department for Transport

Great Western Railway: Standards

[165048](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-17/165048/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, how much money Great Western Railway has been fined for not meeting performance targets in each of the last eight years for which data is available.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 23 July 2018

No monetary penalties under the Railways Act 1993 statutory enforcement regime have been imposed on the Great Western franchisee during that period.

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=3&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 07 June 2018

Department for Transport

Railways: Standards

[151210](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-07/151210/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, the total number of trains (a) cancelled and (b) delayed for each franchise in each month since January 2018.

A

Corrected answer by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Corrected on: 18 June 2018

An error has been identified in the written answer given on 12 June 2018.  
The correct answer should have been:

The attached document provides information on the total number of trains (a) cancelled and (b) delayed for each franchise in each month since January 2018.

[Cancelled](http://qna.files.parliament.uk/qna-attachments/919202/corrected/151210%20-%20Cancelled.pdf) (PDF Document, 26.63 KB)

[Late](http://qna.files.parliament.uk/qna-attachments/919202/corrected/151210%20-%20Stevens%20-%20Late.pdf) (PDF Document, 26.66 KB)

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 12 June 2018

The attached document provides information on the total number of trains (a) cancelled and (b) delayed for each franchise in each month since January 2018.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 10 July 2018

Department for Transport

Department for Transport: Annual Reports

[162532](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-10/162532/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, on what date he plans to publish his Department's annual report and accounts for 2017-18.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 17 July 2018

Holding answer received on 16 July 2018

The Department is continuing to work with the NAO to finalise its external financial audit activity and plans to publish its Annual Report and Accounts for 2017-18 in due course.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 10 July 2018

Department for Transport

Railways: Franchises

[162533](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-10/162533/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 16 March 2018 to Question 132026 on Railways: Franchises, if he will place an updated copy of the contracted franchise payment profiles for all train operating companies in the Library before the summer recess.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 16 July 2018

The Department has reviewed the contracted franchise payment profiles and concluded that this information is commercially sensitive and so cannot be placed in the Library.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 19 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Industrial Disputes

[155260](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155260/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether Arriva Northern has made an application in the last year to reimburse the company for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 28 June 2018

Arriva Rail North has made an application under Schedule 8.3 of the franchise agreement with regards to industrial action.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 19 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Industrial Disputes

[155261](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155261/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether he or his officials have had discussions with Arriva Northern in the last year on reimbursing Arriva Northern for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 28 June 2018

Ministers have not had such discussions with Arriva Northern within the last year, but there have been discussions between officials and Arriva Rail North in the last year on this subject.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 19 June 2018

Department for Transport

Railways: Industrial Disputes

[155259](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155259/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether any payment has been made to any rail operator in the last year to reimburse the company for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 26 June 2018

No payments have been made to rail operators over the past 12 months to reimburse them for revenues lost as a result of industrial action.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Standards

[152736](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152736/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether the number of trains cancelled in April by Arriva Rail North has put it in default on its franchise obligations.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

There are a number of service recovery and force majeure claims that will have to be processed before officials are able to assess if Arriva Rail North is in contravention of the Franchise Agreement.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Train Operating Companies: Compensation

[152737](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152737/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to the Answer of 15 May 2003 to Question 113237 on rail strikes, whether rail franchise agreements still contain clauses to allow train operators to claim reimbursement of revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

All franchise agreements contain a standard clause under which train operating companies may approach the Secretary of State with a request for compensation for net losses that arise out of industrial action.

Our records show no compensation payments under this clause have been made to train operating companies since 2006.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152738](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152738/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what provision there is in the current Northern Rail franchise agreement for the train operator to be reimbursed by the government for revenues lost as a result of official industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

As provided for in all franchise agreements, the Secretary of State, in his discretion, may at any time decide to reimburse or ameliorate net losses of the Franchisee arising from Industrial Action (however caused and of whatever nature) in circumstances where the Franchisee has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that it has taken all reasonable steps to avoid the Industrial Action and that, Industrial Action having nevertheless occurred, the Franchisee has taken all reasonable steps to mitigate its effects.

Our records show no compensation payments under this clause have been made to train operating companies since 2006.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152739](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152739/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether Arriva Rail North has asked the Government to reimburse it for revenues lost as a result of industrial action; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

Any such request would be a commercial matter between Arriva Rail North and the Secretary of State. However, no payments have been made under the relevant Franchise Agreement provisions.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152740](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152740/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether Transport for the North or Rail North have agreed any claim by Arriva Rail North to reimburse it for revenues lost as a result of industrial action; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

This is a reserved matter for the Secretary of State. Transport for the North has no authority under the terms of the Partnership Agreement to agree to such a claim. Rail North Ltd has become part of Transport for the North. As stated in my answer of 21 June, UIN 152739, no payments have been made under the relevant Franchise Agreement provisions.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152741](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152741/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether the Government is required to seek the agreement of (a) Transport for the North and (b) Rail North in the event that Arriva Rail North seeks reimbursement for revenues lost as a result of industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

This matter is reserved to the Secretary of State under the terms of the Partnership Agreement. Rail North Ltd has become part of Transport for the North.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152742](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152742/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether Transport for the North or Rail North were consulted in respect of any request by Arriva Rail North to be reimbursed for revenues lost as a result of industrial action; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

This matter is reserved to the Secretary of State under the terms of the Partnership Agreement. Rail North Ltd has become part of Transport for the North.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

Asked on: 12 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Compensation

[152743](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-12/152743/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, on whom the cost of compensating passengers inconvenienced by the emergency timetable introduced on Northern Rail falls.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 21 June 2018

We recognise that passengers have faced an unacceptable level of disruption in the North.

A special compensation scheme for inconvenienced passengers is being established and details will be announced by Transport for the North.

This is an industry funded scheme which Network Rail are paying for in full from within their existing operational budgets. Network Rail have accepted that their late completion of upgrades has led to the significant disruption.

Q

Asked by [Grahame Morris](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/grahame-morris/3973)

(Easington)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Transport

London North Eastern Railway

[166142](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166142/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what is the cost was of changing branding and livery to LNER following the collapse of Virgin Trains East Coast.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 25 July 2018

The estimated cost of rebranding the existing rolling stock and issuing new uniform items to staff is approximately £550,000. The incurring of these costs are normal at the end of any franchise where the operator changes as LNER could not use the Virgin brand following the transfer of the services to LNER.

It was also important to spend this money in order to help establish this new brand in the market and maintain customer awareness of the services on offer.

Q

Asked by [Grahame Morris](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/grahame-morris/3973)

(Easington)

Asked on: 01 June 2018

Department for Transport

Northern: Standards

[148741](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-01/148741/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether the reported cancellation of over 2,500 trains in April puts Arriva Rail North in default of its franchise obligations.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 11 June 2018

Northern have advised that a large number of incidents relating to cancellations and performance in general are still ‘in dispute’, i.e. responsibility for the cause has not been allocated. They are confident that the root causes of many of the issues leading to cancellations or delays are not their responsibility. The Department therefore needs to wait until this process is complete before being able to decide whether action under the Franchise Agreement is appropriate.

If the Secretary of State is satisfied that the Franchisee is contravening or is likely to contravene any term of the Franchise Agreement he may serve a Remedial Plan Notice on the Franchisee requiring it to produce a Remedial Plan.

If the Secretary of State for Transport is satisfied with the Remedial Plan he may require the Franchisee to enter into a Remedial Agreement to implement the matters identified in the Remedial Plan. A material non-compliance with the Remedial Agreement would be an Event of Default.

Department for Transport

Northern: Industrial Disputes

[148740](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-01/148740/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, how much has been spent from the public purse to Arriva Rail North to reimburse or ameliorate net losses of the franchisee arising from industrial action.

A

Answered by: [Joseph Johnson](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/joseph-johnson/4039)

Answered on: 06 June 2018

No money has been spent from the public purse to Arriva Rail North to reimburse or ameliorate net losses of the franchisee arising from industrial action.

* **MARITIME**

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 06 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[150646](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-06/150646/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to Table SFR0303 of his Department's statistical release, Seafarers in the UK Shipping Industry: 2017, published on 30 May 2018, what assessment he has made of the reasons for the increase in the number of seafarer Ratings of unknown nationality from 2015 to 2017.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 11 June 2018

The statistics in table SFR0303 are derived from information collected from members of the UK Chamber of Shipping via an annual manpower survey. The number of seafarers whose nationality is unknown will fluctuate depending on the completeness of the data returned by those responding to this survey.

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 06 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[150653](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-06/150653/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to his Department's statistical release, Seafarers in the UK Shipping Industry: 2017, published on 30 May 2018, how many member companies of the UK Chamber of Shipping did not provide employment data for inclusion in that statistical release.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 11 June 2018

The 2017 UK Chamber of Shipping manpower survey was issued to 90 companies, with around 95% of these providing a response of some form. In some cases, companies did not provide employment data as they do not have seafarers within scope of the survey.

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 06 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[150657](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-06/150657/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, with reference to Table SFR0302 of his Department's statistical release, Seafarers in the UK Shipping Industry: 2017, published on 30 May 2018, what the average age is of (a) female and (b) male Ratings working at sea.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 11 June 2018

Based on the latest statistics, which relate to the end of June 2017, the average age of UK ratings active at sea and employed by members of the UK Chamber of Shipping was 33 for female ratings and 45 for male ratings.

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=2&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 26 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[157780](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-26/157780/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 25 June 2018 to Question 155833 on Shipping: Bristol Channel, what amount and proportion of the Waterborne Freight Grant for coastal shipping was taken up in each year since it was introduced.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 02 July 2018

The Waterborne Freight Grant (WFG) scheme does not have a discrete budget but shares funding with the Mode Shift Revenue Support scheme for rail and inland waterway freight.

The current version of the scheme dates back to April 2010. Payments made in respect of freight moved in each year since then (though not necessarily paid within that year) are shown in the table below. These include a grant made under the previous version of the scheme.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Year | Payments |
| 2010/11 | £200,410.74 |
| 2011/12 | £81,769.97 |
| 2012/13 | £363,241.94 |
| 2013/14 | £607,818.13 |
| 2014/15 | £234,309.65 |
| 2015/16 | £40,927.20 |

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=2&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 26 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping: Bristol Channel

[157781](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-26/157781/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 25 June 2018 to Question 155833 on Shipping: Bristol Channel, when he plans to publish the research into potential changes to the support regime for modal shift from road to sea; and whether his Department carried out that research.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 02 July 2018

The Options for Changes to Revenue Support Freight Grant Schemes research was commissioned by the Department for Transport from Atkins Ltd. Publication of the summary report is likely this summer.

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=2&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 26 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[157782](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-26/157782/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the answer of 25 June 2018 to Question 155833 on Shipping: Bristol Channel, whether there are any industry representatives working with the Maritime Modal Connectivity Team in his Department.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 02 July 2018

There are currently no industry representatives in the Maritime Modal Connectivity Team. However, the team engaged extensively with the sector both directly and with representative bodies, including the ports and shipping sectors, during the development of “Transport Infrastructure for our global future: a study of England’s port connectivity”.

The team will continue to engage with industry representatives when taking forward the coastal shipping work, as is indicated in the recommendations.

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=3&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 19 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[155317](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155317/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what progress has been made on developing an industrial strategy for the maritime sector in (a) Wales and (b) the UK since the publication of the Green Paper entitled Building our Industrial Strategy in January 2017.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 25 June 2018

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=3&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 19 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping

[155318](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155318/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what steps he is taking to develop a maritime sector deal to increase (a) employment, (b) training and (c) economic activity in the (i) ports and (ii) shipping industries of (A) Wales and (B) the UK.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 25 June 2018

The maritime industry plays a vital role in our economy. As a sector that depends on its skilled workforce, that is geographically spread across the country and is forward looking, it potentially has much to offer to drive growth across the UK, including Wales.

Following the publication of the Industrial Strategy Green Paper in January 2017, Maritime UK identified itself as a sector champion and sought to corral potential bids for a sector deal into one place.

I welcome the leadership that Maritime UK has demonstrated, and recognise the hard work that industry has put into this. I will continue to support and work closely with them to produce a compelling bid for a sector deal.

Additionally, we are working to coordinate the submission of the sector deal with our Maritime 2050 strategy, which is a long term strategic vision for the sector. The overarching aim is to establish clear trajectories against which government and business can plan for the long-term, maintaining our position as a global maritime leader and delivering future prosperity.

Grouped Questions: [155317](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-19/155317/)

Q

Asked by [Jo Stevens](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jo-stevens/4425)

(Cardiff Central)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4425&page=3&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 20 June 2018

Department for Transport

Shipping: Bristol Channel

[155833](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-20/155833/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what recent assessment he has made of the potential for a modal shift from road to sea through the revival of shipping routes in the Bristol Channel between ports in Wales and England.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 25 June 2018

No specific assessment has been made of Bristol Channel shipping routes. In the first instance shipping services are undertaken on a private sector basis. The choice of routes operated will therefore be dependent on potential market volumes, competition and the commercial viability of these.

Some, very limited funding support via Waterborne Freight Grant is available for coastal shipping, in recognition of its wider benefits over road transport. Recent research is planned to be published about potential changes to this support regime.

The recent Department for Transport report “Transport Infrastructure for our global future: a study of England’s port connectivity”, has committed to work with the maritime industry to better understand the barriers, challenges and market opportunities for coastal shipping.

* **OFFSHORE**

Q

Asked by [Rebecca Long Bailey](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/rebecca-long-bailey/4396)

(Salford and Eccles)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4396&page=2&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 24 May 2018

Department for Work and Pensions

Offshore Industry: Divers

[147917](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-05-24/147917/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, what recent assessment she has made of the effectiveness of the basic training qualifications for industrial divers in the offshore oil and gas and wind sectors in enabling those employees to transfer their skills between the two sectors.

A

Answered by: [Sarah Newton](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/sarah-newton/4071)

Answered on: 06 June 2018

Holding answer received on 04 June 2018

The Health and Safety Executive has responsibility for enforcing the Diving at Work Regulations 1997, which apply to all diving carried out in Great Britain where at least one person who is taking part is at work. These regulations specify the requirement for divers to hold an approved qualification for the type of diving that is being conducted.

The regulations are supported by 5 Approved Codes of Practice (ACOPs) which cover different dive industry sectors. The ACOPs were reviewed and revised in 2014 in consultation with the diving industry. The Commercial Diving Projects Offshore ACOP applies to all work associated with the oil and gas industry and some parts of the wind industry. The Commercial Diving Projects Inland/Inshore ACOP applies to all work in the wind sector that doesn’t fall under the Commercial Diving Projects Offshore ACOP.

Diving qualifications are transferable between sectors if the type of diving being undertaken in the particular sector is covered by the diving qualification held. A diver with a qualification appropriate for working in the offshore oil and gas industry would be able to work in the offshore wind industry. However, a diver holding a qualification for certain work in the wind industry may find that they need extra training before they can work in the offshore oil and gas industry. This is due to the different types of diving techniques used.

For further information on diving, please see HSE’s website: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/diving/index.htm>.

Q

Asked by [Rebecca Long Bailey](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/rebecca-long-bailey/4396)

(Salford and Eccles)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?answered-from=2018-06-01&house=commons%2clords&max=20&member=4396&page=2&questiontype=AllQuestions&use-dates=True)

Asked on: 24 May 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Wind Power: Seas and Oceans

[147918](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-05-24/147918/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what discussions he has had with Cabinet colleagues on the Offshore Wind Industry Council’s proposals for a sector deal between Government and that industry up to 2030.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 04 June 2018

I recently met members of the Offshore Wind Industry Council to discuss their proposal for a sector deal. BEIS officials have been in discussions with the sector over recent months and have had engagement with relevant departments across Government as well as the Devolved Administrations on the sector’s proposals.

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 07 June 2018

Home Office

Migrant Workers: Shipping

[151151](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-07/151151/)

To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, pursuant to the Answer of 5 July 2017 to Question 2290, what steps he has taken to support the employment of non-EEA crew on construction and maintenance vessels in the offshore wind sector since June 2017.

A

Answered by: [Caroline Nokes](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/caroline-nokes/4048)

Answered on: 13 June 2018

A concession, which operates outside of the Immigration Rules, has been introduced, and extended until 21 April 2019, for the purpose of facilitating the employment of non-EEA workers employed on vessels engaged in the construction of wind farms located in UK territorial waters. This remains a temporary arrangement which is in place to afford the industry opportunity to take steps to regularise its arrangements for such crew.

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 05 June 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Ports

[150062](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-05/150062/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what plans he has to commission a feasibility study on an ultra-deep-water berth at a UK port.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 12 June 2018

As I said at the Westminster Hall Debate on the UK oil and gas industry on 19 April, we will commission a UK-wide scoping study on an ultra-deep water port to support the decommissioning of offshore oil and gas assets. We will work closely with the Scottish Government which had already commissioned a UK-wide study to support its own commitment through its own Programme for Government. I have since discussed this issue in a meeting with Paul Wheelhouse MSP, and BEIS officials remain in contact with counterparts from the Scottish Government on their study. We expect to tender for a UK Government study in the near future and will ensure that we do not duplicate the work undertaken by the consultants working on behalf of the Scottish Government.

Q

Asked by [Karl Turner](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/karl-turner/4030)

(Kingston upon Hull East)

Asked on: 05 June 2018

Department for Transport

Wind Power: Seas and Oceans

[150059](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-05/150059/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, what discussions he has had with the Home Secretary on the effect on domestic (a) seafarers and (b) maritime skills of the employment of non-EEA crew on offshore wind construction and maintenance vessels in UK territorial waters; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 11 June 2018

There have been no discussions with the Home Secretary on either of these topics.

Q

Asked by [Mary Glindon](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/mary-glindon/4126)

(North Tyneside)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4126)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Decommissioning

[166173](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166173/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what recent discussions he has had with (a) trades unions and (b) the oil and gas authority on employment standards in the offshore decommissioning industry.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 25 July 2018

The majority of companies and people undertaking work on offshore decommissioning are those who also work in the new build and ongoing production phases of the oil and gas industry and as such there are well established employment standards and conditions.

Q

Asked by [Mary Glindon](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/mary-glindon/4126)

(North Tyneside)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4126)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Continental Shelf

[166174](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166174/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, with reference to the UKCS Decommissioning 2018 Cost Estimate Report by the Oil and Gas Authority, what assessment he has made of trends in the cost of labour associated with decommissioning projects.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Department does not have details on the cost of labour associated with decommissioning projects nor trends in the cost. However, the recent report by the Oil and Gas Authority (OGA) indicates that operators are making progress to reduce costs, with some reporting significant cost reductions in platform running costs, platform well plugging and abandonment costs and removal costs. The OGA is working with industry to support further cost reductions to achieve delivery of the £39bn target cost for decommissioning and is developing cost benchmarks that will enable trend analysis of decommissioning costs over time.

<https://www.ogauthority.co.uk/media/4925/decommissioning-cost-report-2018.pdf>

Q  
Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4122)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Chevron Petroleum: North Sea

[166157](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166157/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what discussions he has had with the Oil and Gas Authority on the effect on the terms and conditions of employment for offshore workers of Chevron’s sale of its oil and gas platforms and satellites in the Central North Sea; and what estimate he has made of the number of offshore staff will be affected by that sale.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 25 July 2018

Chevron has confirmed an intent to market its assets in the Central North Sea, however, this may not result in the sale of the assets. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to comment further.

Issues surrounding the terms and conditions of employment for offshore workers fall outside of the remit of the Oil and Gas Authority.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4122)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Chevron Petroleum: North Sea

[166158](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166158/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, how many contractor staff are employed on the (a) Alba, (b) Alder, (c) Captain, (d) Elgin/Franklin, (e) Erskine, (f) Jade and (g) Britannia platforms in the Central North Sea.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Government does not hold information on how many contractor staff are employed in the above fields. Figures from Oil and Gas UK’s Workforce Report 2017 (page 7) (<https://oilandgasuk.co.uk/product/workforce-report-2017/>) indicate that around 40,000 contracted staff travelled offshore in 2016, the most recent year for which figures are provided.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4122)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Chevron Petroleum: North Sea

[166159](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166159/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, how many directly employed staff are working on the (a) Alba, (b) Alder, (c) Captain, (d) Elgin/Franklin, (e) Erskine, (f) Jade and (g) Britannia platforms in the Central North Sea.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Government does not hold information on how many staff are directly employed in the above fields. Figures from Oil and Gas UK’s Workforce Report 2017 (page 7) (<https://oilandgasuk.co.uk/product/workforce-report-2017/>) indicate that around 10,000 personnel working for operators travelled offshore in 2016, the most recent year for which figures are provided.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4122)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: North Sea

[166160](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166160/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, with reference to page 10 of the UKCS Decommissioning - 2018 Cost Estimate Report published by the Oil and Gas Authority in June 2018, if he will make an updated estimate of the total cost of onshore recycling and disposal of decommissioned offshore infrastructure from the Central North Sea.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Oil and Gas Authority have reported that there is an error in the graph on page 10 of the UKCS Decommissioning – 2018 Cost Estimate Report, and have confirmed that the cost of onshore recycling and disposal of decommissioned infrastructure from Central North Sea is around £3bn.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&member=4122)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Continental Shelf

[166161](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166161/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, with reference to the UKCS Decommissioning - 2018 Cost Estimate Report published by the Oil and Gas Authority in June 2018, what his latest estimate is of employment levels in the offshore decommissioning industry in each year from 2018 to 2025.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Department does not have details of the employment levels associated with decommissioning. However, forecasts from industry suggest that the annual expenditure for decommissioning over the next five years will be in the region of £1.7bn to £2bn, offering significant employment opportunities in the supply chain that will deliver the constituent elements of the decommissioning activity.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

Asked on: 06 July 2018

Department for Transport

Helicopters: Norway

[161550](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-06/161550/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, whether he has had discussions with the Civil Aviation Authority in respect of the recommendations in the final report from the Accident Investigation Board of Norway into the fatal incident involving a H225 Super Puma helicopter near Turoy, Norway, on 29 April 2016; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Jesse Norman](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jesse-norman/3991)

Answered on: 13 July 2018

The safety of those who travel on offshore helicopter flights is a priority. The Department for Transport has had discussions with both the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the Air Accidents Investigation Branch regarding the fatal incident in Turoy, Norway.

The report from the Norwegian Accident Investigation Board supports the action taken by the UK CAA since the accident. The CAA is continuing to work with the helicopter operators, the offshore industries, international regulators, unions and pilot representatives to enhance offshore safety standards further and all these parties are actively involved in discussions.

Grouped Questions: [161551](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-06/161551/)

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

Asked on: 06 July 2018

Department for Transport

Offshore Industry: Helicopters

[161551](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-06/161551/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 29 June 2018 to Question 156422, what discussions he has had with the Civil Aviation Authority in respect of the recommendations in the final report of the Accident Investigation Board of Norway, published on 5 July 2018.

A

Answered by: [Jesse Norman](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/jesse-norman/3991)

Answered on: 13 July 2018

The safety of those who travel on offshore helicopter flights is a priority. The Department for Transport has had discussions with both the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the Air Accidents Investigation Branch regarding the fatal incident in Turoy, Norway.

The report from the Norwegian Accident Investigation Board supports the action taken by the UK CAA since the accident. The CAA is continuing to work with the helicopter operators, the offshore industries, international regulators, unions and pilot representatives to enhance offshore safety standards further and all these parties are actively involved in discussions.

Grouped Questions: [161550](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-06/161550/)

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

Asked on: 21 June 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Helicopters

[156422](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-21/156422/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, further to the oral contribution of the Minister for Energy and Clean Growth of 19 April 2018, Official Report, column 228WH, what response he has received from the Civil Aviation Authority on the regulation of helicopter safety standards in the offshore oil and gas sector; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 28 June 2018

Last week, the Department received reassurances from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) that additional safety measures have been introduced to the H225LP and AS332L2 models of Super Pumas. Although the European Aviation Safety Agency has cleared the helicopters to return to service, both the CAA and their Norwegian counterparts have decided to keep the operational restrictions place until the completion of the Norwegian inquiry at the earliest. I have asked BEIS officials to send a copy of the CAA’s letter to all members who were present at the Westminster Hall Debate on the 19th April 2018.

Q

Asked by [Alex Cunningham](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/alex-cunningham/4122)

(Stockton North)

Asked on: 21 June 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: North Sea

[156423](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-21/156423/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what assessment he has made of future trends in the level of employment of UK-based staff in the North Sea oil and gas sector.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 28 June 2018

The Government is committed to the long-term future of the oil and gas sector which supports over 300,000 jobs and has been one of our great industrial success stories over the past 50 years.

Future employment levels are subject to a wide range of factors, not least the oil price, and we are supporting the sector on a number of fronts, as we recognise that a successful offshore industry will continue to generate and protect jobs. For example, in the 2015 and 2016 Budgets, the Government delivered a fiscal package of measures worth £2.3bn to encourage investment in the sector and support jobs, placing the UK Continental Shelf amongst the most competitive fiscal regimes in the world; and in July 2016, the Oil and Gas Workforce Plan was published to address both short and long-term issues in the sector by retaining world class skills and expertise through redeploying skilled workers to other infrastructure projects and matching employees with jobs that require a similar skill set.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Continental Shelf

[166145](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166145/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what assessment he has made of the effect of the 21st Century Exploration Roadmap Palaeozoic Project on the exploitation of viable oil and gas deposits under the UK Continental Shelf; and if he will make a statement.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 27 July 2018

The information which has emerged from the 21st Century Exploration Roadmap Palaeozoic Project has helped incentivise further interest in UK offshore areas and complemented existing knowledge and understanding by making additional geological data available to the industry .

21st Century Roadmap projects, of which the Palaeozoic Project is one, have contributed data and interpretations that have been used by the industry to inform licence applications in the Oil and Gas Authority’s 29th Frontier Licence round. It is expected that the findings from these projects will again prove impactful in the recently launched 31st Frontier Licence round.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: North Sea

[166143](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166143/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what his Department's latest estimate is of the remaining recoverable oil and gas deposits under the (a) North, (b) Central and (c) Southern North Sea.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Government created the Oil and Gas Authority (OGA) to regulate, influence and promote the UK oil and gas industry in order to maximise the economic recovery of the UK’s oil and gas resources.

The OGA’s “UK Oil and Gas: Reserves and Resources” report estimates that overall remaining recoverable hydrocarbon resources ranged between 10 and 20 billion barrels of oil equivalent (boe) as at the end of 2016. The report may be found at:

<https://www.ogauthority.co.uk/data-centre/data-downloads-and-publications/reserves-and-resources/>.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: North Sea

[166144](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166144/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what recent assessment he has made of the level of (a) exploration and (b) drilling activity in the North Sea since January 2017.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The Government created the Oil and Gas Authority (OGA) to regulate, influence and promote the UK oil and gas industry in order to maximise the economic recovery of the UK’s oil and gas resources.

The OGA publishes data on levels of exploration and other drilling in the UK North Sea. These can be found online at: <https://www.ogauthority.co.uk/data-centre/data-downloads-and-publications/well-data/>

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Offshore Industry: Continental Shelf

[166146](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166146/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, if he will publish the (a) public and (b) private sources of funding for the 21st Century Exploration Roadmap Palaeozoic Project undertaken by the Oil and Gas Authority and British Geological Survey between November 2014 and May 2016.

A

Answered by: [Claire Perry](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/claire-perry/3974)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

The 21st Century Exploration Roadmap Palaeozoic Project was co-funded by Government and industry. Oil and Gas UK and 49 operators contributed £685,000 to the £1.32m project, with Government funding the remainder.

Q

Asked by [Ian Mearns](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ian-mearns/4000)

(Gateshead)

[[N]](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-questions-answers/?page=1&max=20&questiontype=AllQuestions&house=commons%2clords&use-dates=True&answered-from=2018-06-01&member=4000)

Asked on: 19 July 2018

Treasury

Offshore Industry: North Sea

[166147](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-07-19/166147/)

To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, what the cost to the public purse of was decommissioning projects in the (a) Northern, (b) Central and (c) Southern North Sea in (i) 2016 and (ii) 2017; and what estimate he has made of the cost to the public purse in each North Sea region in 2018.

A

Answered by: [Robert Jenrick](http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/robert-jenrick/4320)

Answered on: 24 July 2018

We do not hold information that provides a breakdown of decommissioning tax relief by region, or a historic breakdown by year.

HM Revenue and Customs currently estimate that the total cumulative Exchequer cost of decommissioning tax relief (comprised of Petroleum Revenue Tax, Ring Fence Corporation Tax and Supplementary Charge) will be £24 billion out to 2062/63.

Further details can be found in the recently published statistics of government revenues from UK oil and gas: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/721314/Statistics_of_government_revenues_from_UK_oil_and_gas_production__June_2018__.pdf>

* **TAXIS**

Q

Asked by [Kate Hoey](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/kate-hoey/210)

(Vauxhall)

Asked on: 11 June 2018

Department for Transport

Taxis: Conditions of Employment

[152033](https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-06-11/152033/)

To ask the Secretary of State for Transport, pursuant to the Answer of 11 September 2017 to Question 6953, on taxis: conditions of employment, if his Department will publish the names of (a) formal members of that group, (b) other people who have been invited to discussions or to give evidence to that group and the (c) the organisations which those people represent.

A

Answered by: [Ms Nusrat Ghani](https://www.parliament.uk/biographies/commons/ms-nusrat-ghani/4460)

Answered on: 19 June 2018

The membership and terms of reference of the Task and Finish Group on Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle licensing were placed in the libraries of both Houses on 27 September 2017 following agreement of these by the Group.

The Group is nearing the conclusion of its considerations and is expected to submit its report shortly. The Government will consider the report and options for publication in due course.

**Annex 3 – Debates**

(The following excerpts are selected from *Hansard*, which is the official parliamentary record. The full debate can be supplied on request and may be read on-line at [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk) under the relevant date.)

**Rail Timetabling**

**4 June 2018**

This Oral Statement by Chris Grayling on the timetabling fiasco was replied to by Andy McDonald as Shadow Transport Secretary. There were contributions from many MPs including fellow RMT Group members Rosie Cooper, Kelvin Hopkins, Liz McInnes, Grahame Morris, Lloyd Russell-Moyle and Luke Pollard. Maria Caulfield’s caustic comments were typical of considerable Conservative anger which piled pressure on their Secretary of State, who nevertheless absolved himself of any blame.

[The Secretary of State for Transport (Chris Grayling)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I am pleased to take the earliest opportunity to update the House on the recent difficulties around the timetable changes, in particular on some GTR and Northern routes.

I want to be absolutely clear: passengers on these franchises are facing totally unsatisfactory levels of service. It is my and my Department’s No. 1 priority to make sure that the industry restores reliability for passengers to an acceptable level as soon as possible. I assure the passengers affected that I share their frustration about what has happened, and that I am sorry that this has taken place. […]

The investigations that are being carried out right now are providing more information about what has gone wrong, but it is worth being clear that the industry remained of the view until the last moment that it would be able to deliver the changes. That is the bit that everyone will find hard to understand and it is why there has to be a proper investigation into what has taken place.

On Northern, which is co-managed through the Rail North Partnership by Transport for the North and my Department, early analysis shows that the key issue was that Network Rail did not deliver infrastructure upgrades in time, in particular the Bolton electrification scheme, with damaging consequences. This forced plans to be changed at a very late stage, requiring a complete overhaul of logistics and crew planning. The early analysis also shows that on GTR’s Thameslink and Great Northern routes, the industry timetable developed by Network Rail was very late to be finalised. That meant that train operators did not have enough time to plan crew schedules or complete crew training, affecting a range of other complex issues that impact on the service on what is already a highly congested network.

It is also clear to me that both Northern and GTR were not sufficiently prepared to manage a timetable change of this scale. GTR did not have enough drivers with the route knowledge required to operate the new timetable. Neither Northern nor GTR had a clear fall-back plan.​

In GTR’s case, the process of introducing the new timetable has been overseen for the past two years by an industry readiness board, comprising some of the most senior people in the industry, which told me it had been given no information to suggest the new timetable should not be implemented as planned, albeit with some likely early issues as it bedded down. This body was set up specifically to ensure that all parts of the rail network—Network Rail, GTR, other train operators—were ready to implement these major timetable changes. It should have been clear to it that some key parties were not ready. It did not raise this risk.

The Department received advice from the Thameslink readiness board that, while there were challenges delivering the May 2018 timetable—namely, the logistics of moving fleet and staff—a three-week transition period would allow for minimal disruption. My officials were assured that the other mitigations in place were sufficient and reasonable. Indeed, as few as three weeks before the timetable was to be implemented, GTR itself assured me personally that it was ready to implement the changes. Clearly this was wrong, and that is totally unacceptable.

The rail industry has collectively failed to deliver for the passengers it serves. […]

It is clear to me that, aside from Network Rail’s late finalisation of the timetable, GTR and Northern were not sufficiently prepared to manage a timetable change ​of this scale, so today I am also announcing that work has begun to set up an inquiry into the May timetable implementation. It will be carried out by the independent Office of Rail and Road, and chaired by Professor Stephen Glaister. It is necessary to have a full inquiry, and Professor Glaister will lead one. The inquiry will consider why the system as a whole failed to produce and implement an effective timetable. Its findings will be shared as early as possible with me and with the rail industry, so that lessons can be learnt in advance of future major timetable changes. The final report will be published by the Office of Rail Regulation by the end of the year, but I want to see initial responses much sooner than that.

In parallel to the inquiry, my Department will assess whether GTR and Northern met their contractual obligations in the planning and delivery of the timetable change. It will consider whether the issues could have been reasonably foreseen and different action taken to prevent the high levels of disruption that passengers are experiencing.

In GTR’s case, the assessment will cover whether the operator had sufficient resources and skills to deliver the new timetable and whether drivers could have been trained in a faster and more effective way, and will examine the contingency and risk management arrangements currently in place. If it is found that GTR is materially in breach of its contractual obligations, I will take appropriate enforcement action against it. That will include using the full force of the franchise agreement and my powers under the Railways Act 2005, and consideration of how such a failure affects GTR’s eligibility to hold a franchise bidding passport. In the case of Northern, my Department will assess the operator’s planning, risk assessment and resilience in preparing for the May timetable change. Bearing in mind Network Rail’s failure to deliver infrastructure on time, we will hold the operator to the terms of its contractual obligations.

I will not be afraid to take enforcement action when it is necessary, but it is right to go through the process of the inquiry and to understand where fault truly lies. I will not hold back from taking appropriate action if the review finds that there has been negligent behaviour.

Given the importance that Members throughout the House ascribe to these issues, I have arranged for both Northern and GTR to come to the House this week to discuss with colleagues any specific issues that they wish to raise with the operators. I am also meeting Members in all parts of the House today to discuss the issues with them. I am incredibly frustrated that what should have been an improvement in services for passengers has turned into significant disruption, and I am sorry about the levels of disruption that passengers are experiencing. I am also sorry for the staff members who have been caught at the sharp end of these changes.

There clearly have been major failures that have led to the situation that we are in today. I am clear about the fact that the industry must and will be held to account for this, but my immediate priority is to ensure that we improve train services to an acceptable level as quickly as possible, and that will remain my priority.

[Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

I am grateful for advance sight of the Secretary of State’s statement—for once. Here we go again, with yet another chapter in the never-ending story of our troubled railways. Not only ​have train timetables been turned upside down, but the Transport Secretary seems to have run into his own timetabling problems in meetings with Members today. […]

Yes, Network Rail has not delivered, but he seems to forget that, as a company limited by guarantee, Network Rail has one member: the Secretary of State for Transport—him. He is the man in charge—allegedly. The right hon. Gentleman might want to blame Network Rail, but it is he who has failed in his responsibility to oversee it; the buck stops with him. What is more, the right hon. Gentleman has burnt his bridges with the leadership of Network Rail, which can only have damaged his oversight of this process. Is not this a terrible failure of him and his role atop the system?

The Northern Rail and Thameslink contracts were awarded by the right hon. Gentleman’s Department to private operators. It is the job of his Department to ensure that the companies fulfil their contracts. Arriva and GTR have had years to prepare for these timetable changes; neither have trained enough drivers to deliver the timetable changes, yet the Department has failed to hold the companies to account. Can the right hon. Gentleman confirm that it is within the franchise agreement for Arriva to report directly to him on progress in recruiting and training drivers? Does not the buck, once again, stop with him?

GTR even had its own readiness board to implement the timetable changes, except that it was not ready; we could not make this up. Chris Gibb’s report on Southern exactly a year ago highlighted the issue of driver numbers as a major operational issue within rail. Why did the Secretary of State not take the report as an alert to review the availability of the train drivers that were needed across the country and do something about it? He says the Office of Rail Regulation will report on the failings by the end of the year, but, with the new timetable due in December, this will be too late. What confidence can we have that it will not be another shambles? Is not the reality that this Secretary of State has been asleep at the wheel and this is just the latest episode in a series of rail management failures on his watch?

The right hon. Gentleman is determined to cling on to the micromanagement of the railway when it suits him, but he will quickly point the finger of blame when things go wrong. He cannot have it both ways. The Secretary of State says he is sorry for the disruption passengers are facing. That is not good enough; he should apologise to passengers for his failures that have put their jobs at risks and played havoc with their family life.

The travelling public and the rail industry have no faith in this Transport Secretary to fix this situation. Were the Prime Minister not so enfeebled, she would ​sack him. If he had any concept of responsibility, he would resign. The Transport Secretary should do the right thing and step aside.

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I was rather expecting the hon. Gentleman to say that, and I respond simply by saying that it is my job to make sure that the problem is fixed, and that is what I intend to do. […]

The real frustration is that this is a consequence of major investment programmes and the delivery at the end of those programmes has gone wrong. The thing I find most frustrating about all this, and I absolutely feel for every single passenger who has waited for a cancelled train in the past week—I get the train every day, and I am as fed up with this as everyone else—is that this is the consequence of a change that resulted from a massive investment programme in the railways. We should now be seeing the fruit of that investment programme. We are not yet seeing it, and we have to make sure that we see it pretty quickly.

[Kelvin Hopkins (Luton North) (Ind)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=2)

I have thousands of constituents who commute daily from Leagrave and Luton stations and who are suffering from recent service failures—I have a sheaf of their complaints in my hand. Is it not the reality that GTR has consistently sought to squeeze more passengers on to too few trains and has employed insufficient drivers in the interest of profits, at the expense of passengers? When are the Government going to accept the grotesque failure of private franchising?

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I absolutely understand the pressures on the hon. Gentleman’s line. Part of the objective of this upgrade is to deliver longer trains and more trains, and it is a huge frustration to me that that has not happened. We have to make sure it happens as quickly as possible. […]

[Rosie Cooper (West Lancashire) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1538)

To describe my constituents as incandescent would be an absolute understatement. Colleagues across the House have described the impact this fiasco has had on families and individuals. I have listened carefully to the Secretary of State and he seems to have been reassured by the information he has received, but he does not seem to have tested that information to assure himself and his Department that the information was correct. If that is so, how can we be sure that he has tested and is assured of his potential solutions?​

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I simply say that we have teams of people whose job it is to assure this. They did not see this situation coming; nor did the train operators. The Glaister review is necessary because this should not have been able to happen.

[*Maria Caulfield (Lewes) (Con)*](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4492)

*Do we really need a review before action is taken? People who commute from Lewes, Polegate, Seaford, Newhaven and many more stations have had to endure not just the timetable changes, but 18 months of strike action and 18 months of misery while the London Bridge works were happening, and we now have fewer trains than ever before. When trains do run, they sometimes do not stop, as happened ​in Lewes and Polegate today, and when they do stop, passengers cannot get on because of short formations, with trains going down from 12 carriages to four today. The only question my constituents have is, “When is Southern Rail going to lose its franchise?” If I can be helpful to the Secretary of State, the answer should be “Now.”*

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

The important thing to do is to make sure that these problems are sorted out. It may be that at the end of this there is a franchise change, but I want to do anything like that in the right way, in the right timeframe, and in a way that is justifiable. I have to fulfil contractual commitments. I have to look at where culpability lies. We need to go through that process first. In the meantime, having short-formation trains on Southern, which otherwise is performing pretty well, is completely unacceptable, and it needs to fix that straight away.

[Several hon. Members rose—](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=0)

[Mr Speaker](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=17)

Having heard the hon. Member for Brighton, Kemptown (Lloyd Russell-Moyle) chuntering from a sedentary position, perhaps we can now hear him on his feet.

[Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Brighton, Kemptown) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4615)

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

If someone conspired to break into my garage and steal or immobilise my car, they would face the full force of the law. The Secretary of State’s Department has conspired with the railway companies in an incompetent manner to change the timetables, and despite repeated warnings from the Opposition, the companies went ahead with it. When will they face the full force of having their franchises stripped from them, or when will he be brave enough to face up to this and resign?

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I have mentioned to the House the industry bodies that we have put in place. It is only a week since Labour was demanding that the railways were run by rail professionals—actually, they are. Those rail professionals have been overseeing this process, they got it wrong, and that is why we are having the inquiry. […]

[Liz McInnes (Heywood and Middleton) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4342)

Northern Rail has cancelled so many trains that an app has sprung up called “Northern Fail”, to help commuters in the so-called northern powerhouse make even the most basic of journeys. What will the Secretary of State do to ensure that these commuters, who have forked out for childcare, taxis, hire cars and hotels, are adequately and fully compensated?

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I am very clear that we have to provide a compensation scheme of the kind that was delivered to Southern passengers after the huge disruption they experienced a year ago. I am very clear that that is what will happen for them.​

[Luke Pollard (Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4682)

The Secretary of State told the House that sorting out the timetable chaos was his Department’s No. 1 priority. That is a phrase he has used before about Dawlish and the resilience work in the far south-west, which was apparently his No. 1 priority. What is his No. 1 priority, and will Northern and GTR passengers have to wait the years that passengers in the far south-west have had to wait for action on Dawlish?

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

The work on Dawlish has already started, as the hon. Gentleman knows. In terms of the infrastructure period that is about to start, delivering that work is, in my view, the most important capital project in the country. The most important priority on my desk now is self-evidently to get this sorted.

[Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

My constituents are also experiencing their share of misery. The hon. Member for Lewes (Maria Caulfield) said that trains serving her constituency had four carriages, but most of the trains serving mine only have two carriages to begin with, so they are already overcrowded even before any cancellations. It is clearly a failure of planning and co-ordination and a lack of integration. Will the Secretary of State or his successor give an assurance to the travelling public that a similar fiasco will not occur with the next timetable changes in December?

[Chris Grayling](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

We are working extremely hard to make sure that this does not happen again. We have to deal with the short-term problem. We also have to make sure that this is not repeated with the December timetable change or future timetable changes. Where major investment leads to a major change in services, we cannot have a situation where that causes chaos on the network again. […] It is unconscionable, and infuriating to all of us in Government, that the things that were supposed to deliver a better outcome for everyone have not done so. We will not be anything other than relentless in pushing the rail industry to ensure that those benefits are delivered. They should be there now. They are not. It is worse than it should be. That has to change and it has to change quickly.

**Transport Safety: Blind and Visually Impaired People**

**6 June 2018**

Adjournment Debate

[Liz Twist (Blaydon) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4618)

[…] I wish to raise one more issue, which I suspect will be much more contentious. I recently heard about some new train carriages being produced for our railways by Hitachi in Newton Aycliffe that include accessibility features for blind and visually impaired people. That is absolutely great and as it should be, but the Government’s intention to take guards off some train services will compromise the safety of not only blind and partially sighted travellers but other passengers with disabilities. I urge the Government to recognise that point and change their position.​ […]

[The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport (Ms Nusrat Ghani)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4460)

[…] Delivering a transport system that is truly accessible to all is of great importance to me personally and to the Department for Transport. I hope that the hon. Lady will have seen the Department’s draft accessibility action plan, which was published for consultation last year, as evidence of the Government’s commitment to taking action to safeguard and promote the rights of all disabled passengers. Following the responses to that consultation, the Department is developing an inclusive transport strategy that will build on the draft accessibility action plan by setting out the immediate improvements that can be made to the transport system, as well as our longer-term aspirations.

[Liz Twist](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4618)

When are we likely to see the outcome of that consultation and when are we likely to see some real action?

[Ms Ghani](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4460)

The inclusive transport strategy is due to be published shortly. I am sure the hon. Lady will be very pleased when the report comes out. I cannot highlight the action points—obviously, I cannot divulge them—but she will be pleased when she sees the results considering the issues she has raised today.

The accessibility action plan will set out immediate improvements that can be made to the transport system, as well as our long-term aspirations of supporting the Government’s aim for disabled passengers to have the same access to transport as everyone else, enabling them to travel easily, confidently and without extra cost. The inclusive transport strategy will be published later this year. […] I move on now to talking buses. Audible information on buses is key to enabling disabled passengers to take journeys. Disabled people make 10 times as many journeys by bus as by rail, and it is essential that the service provided should be accessible to them. The provision of audible information on all buses will clearly make a huge different in this regard, but some passengers have raised concerns that there is too much information on buses and that it confuses them even further, so although some bus companies have already introduced talking buses, they will not be required to do so by law until the relevant power in the Bus Services Act 2017 takes effect. We will consult later this year on the regulations that will bring these powers into force.

[Ruth George](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4662)

I want to make a point about Passenger Assist. My visually impaired constituent was simply given a leaflet that was supposed to enable him to travel. Does the Minister agree that that is not acceptable? Although Passenger Assist is available to wheelchair users in my constituency, there are no taxis that can accommodate passengers with wheelchairs. I am trying to arrange for some disabled constituents to visit the Minister in a couple of weeks, but they are having real problems in accessing any sort of public transport.

[Ms Ghani](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4460)

The hon. Lady is absolutely right. The purpose of Passenger Assist is to assist passengers with all kinds of disabilities, and handing out a leaflet is just not on. The role of Passenger Assist is to help passengers to reach their destination with the service for which they have paid. I look forward to meeting the hon. Lady and her constituents to discuss that further.

As I have said, I have met the regulators and reminded them of their responsibilities, and of the work they need to do to ensure that redress is available when things go wrong. That is another issue that we must tackle: when laws and regulations are in place, we must ensure that they are enforced.

I thank the hon. Member for Blaydon again for securing a debate on such an important issue, and I look forward to working with her and Members in all parts of the House to achieve our ambition to improve the travelling experiences of blind and visually impaired people.

*Question put and agreed to.*

**Confidence in the Secretary of State for Transport**

**19 June 2018**

This Opposition Day Debate was introduced by Group member and Shadow Secretary of State for Transport Andy McDonald, proposing a vote of no confidence in Chris Grayling for his handling of the timetabling fiasco. There were contributions from many Labour MPs including fellow RMT Group members Rachael Maskell (Shadow Rail Minister), Dan Carden, David Drew, Ian Mearns, Grahame Morris, Lloyd Russell-Moyle and Jo Stevens. Chris Grayling himself and then Rail Minister Jo Johnson responded for the Government. After a debate of over two hours, the House divided and the Government defeated the motion by 305 to 285.

[Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

I beg to move,

That this House has no confidence in the Secretary of State for Transport, the Rt Hon Member for Epsom and Ewell; notes the failed implementation of the May rail timetables which has left thousands of commuters without services and has drastically affected their everyday lives; believes Northern and Govia Thameslink Railway should have their franchises terminated; and regrets that the Secretary of State for Transport has failed to strategically manage and oversee the UK railway and take responsibility for his role in the crisis on England’s railways, whilst officials at other organisations have resigned and forgone bonuses.

Before I come to the topic of today’s debate, I would like to express my condolences to the families and friends of those who so sadly died as a result of being struck by a train at Loughborough Junction in south London yesterday. I also pay tribute to all the railway staff who attended in response, in particular the British Transport police. Despite the challenges we face, we can never forget the outstanding public service that tens of thousands of men and women provide every day. We owe it to them to do our very best for the industry.

I regret having to table the motion, but given the totally unacceptable state of the railway I felt that I had a duty to passengers. The latest chaos follows meltdown on the east coast, resulting in a £2 billion bail-out and huge cuts to promised electrification in Wales, the north of England and the midlands. This is not shaping up to be a distinguished legacy. In his resignation letter to staff, Charles Horton, the outgoing chief executive of Govia Thameslink Railway, said:

“In my view, this was an industry-wide failure of the timetabling process. But with leadership comes responsibility and so I feel it is only right that I step down”.

Why is it that the chief executive of a train company who is responsible only for the travel disruption on one part of the railway is able to recognise the responsibility that comes with his leadership role and resign, yet the person who is truly responsible, the Transport Secretary, remains in post?

[…] Why are train companies allowed to retain their franchise despite repeated failures? Northern and GTR should be stripped of their contracts. Labour said very clearly that franchise ​failure should mean forfeit. It is clear that the Department for Transport has failed to ensure that train companies fulfil the terms of their contracts.

[Caroline Lucas (Brighton, Pavilion) (Green)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3930)

Does the hon. Gentleman agree that it is not only GTR that should lose its franchise? The Secretary of State should have his office removed as well because this is a façade of a franchise. We know that Ministers are behind it, and it is Ministers who should be held accountable for the fact that passengers in places such as Preston Park in Brighton are losing their jobs, cannot spend time with their kids in hospital and are having their lives wrecked.

[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

I agree entirely. The Government seem to want to have control and intervene, but they do not want to take responsibility. GTR should have been stripped of its contract years ago for running the worst rail service in modern times. The company has repeatedly been found in breach of its contract as well as overseeing toxic industrial relations and poor customer service. Had the Government heeded Labour’s call to strip the company of its franchise, the recent disruption could have been avoided.

[Mr Jim Cunningham (Coventry South) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=308)

It is not many months since we had a problem with Southern, as has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas). From time to time there are problems on the west coast main line, yet the Secretary of State sits there like Pontius Pilate and abdicates responsibility.

[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

My hon. Friend make the point wisely and accurately. […] It is not acceptable to allow companies to continue to run and profit from rail services following failures on this scale. Services should return to public ownership to be run as part of an integrated railway under public ownership.

I turn to the distressing situation that confronts us more broadly on the railway as a result of the calamitous introduction of new timetables across more than half the UK rail network. The changes were intended to be improvements to introduce much-needed rail capacity following public expenditure on new rail infrastructure, but instead of improvements passengers on Northern and GTR have experienced a nightmare of disruption, and there seems to be little prospect of their trials and tribulations ending quickly. […] Disruption of this scale and severity, particularly when passengers experience it endlessly over an extended period, destroys faith and trust in the railway and drives people away from rail into their cars. Last week, figures showed that rail passenger usage has fallen yet again—this time, the fall was the biggest in 25 years. Not only does that mean more congestion, worse air pollution and an increased contribution to climate change, but it threatens the very sustainability of the railway. […]

Franchise agreements assume ever-growing fare revenues, so the downturn in rail use increases the likelihood of more failed franchises and further taxpayer bail-outs. Fares have soared at three times the rate of wages since 2010, pricing passengers off the railway, while disruption encourages more people to revert to driving. That is exactly the wrong modal shift that we need our transport policy to achieve if it is to fulfil our environmental obligations and remove traffic and fumes from our towns and cities. Polling conducted by Which? found that three in five respondents affected by the timetable changes said that those changes had a negative impact on both their work and family life, with four in 10 saying that they had a negative impact on their health.

Considering the scale of the disruption, I am sure the whole House will agree that passengers must be adequately compensated. Yet at present 72% of those affected by the disruption said they had not been informed, either on the train or at the platform, about any compensation they may be entitled to receive. The Transport Secretary should have ensured passengers were made properly aware of the compensation they are owed. In addition, considering the scale of the disruption, a compensation package that goes above and beyond what is currently available must be delivered. The Transport Secretary has indicated some such package is being considered, but he has not provided detail. I ask him to do so today to ensure that the amount of compensation is commensurate with the scale of disruption and, importantly, that it is funded by the train companies, not taxpayers and passengers. They should pay voluntarily. If they refuse, he should make them.

It is important to step back and review the key steps in how we have come to this sorry state of affairs. This year’s timetable changes, introduced on 20 May, are the most extensive and ambitious undertaken in decades. More than 50% of the network schedules have been revamped. Four million trains have been retimed: about six times as many changes as is usual for a timetable change. It was clear before Christmas that there were going to be difficulties in implementing the new timetable. In February, the rail industry body, the Rail Delivery Group, confirmed it would not be able to complete timetables 12 weeks ahead of travel from 20 May for about six months. That should have set off alarm bells.​

Since 20 May, 43% of Northern’s trains have been delayed or cancelled each day. From 4 June, the train operator cancelled 165 trains a day, including all services to the Lake district. In the first week of the new timetable, GTR delayed or cancelled a quarter of its trains and announced the schedule for the next day at 10 pm each night.

Today’s industrial action on Northern is a reminder of the utter despair felt by the rail industry’s workforce. Both Northern and GTR have waged war on their staff for three years and four years respectively. They have done so at the explicit behest of the Secretary of State for Transport and his senior officials.

[John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=14)

How does the hon. Gentleman explain that the Labour Mayor of London has been unable to run strike-free transport in London, although he promised to do so? Did he also anger staff in this way?

[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

We can have that discussion, but today I am dealing with these services and I am going to concentrate on them.

Senior officials directly interfered. Let us not forget that the managing director of passenger services at the Department for Transport, Peter Wilkinson, said two years ago:

“we’re going to be having punch-ups and we will see industrial action”

and that he wanted to run people “out of my industry.”

The introduction of the May 2018 timetable required change on an unprecedented scale. The process of managing change requires co-operation, dialogue, engagement and good will. The Government and the management of Northern and GTR have destroyed their relationships with their employees. Millions of passengers in the UK are paying the price for the belligerence and the antagonistic approach of the Secretary of State. […]

Ever since the timetable chaos arose, we have witnessed carefully crafted statements that try to ensure as little responsibility as possible can be attributed to the Department for Transport and the Secretary of State in charge of it. Let us consider the situation. This is a Government who refuse to recognise the accumulated evidence that their privatised structure of the railway is failing. Therefore, they refuse to accept a sensible and practical railway structure that can function properly. […]

​No one other than the Government hold responsibility for their dogmatic stance. This dogma causes them to stand by and defend the rail structure that is manifestly not fit for purpose. It then falls to the Department for Transport to get involved to try to run the railway properly. It cannot do this. Today’s railway cannot run itself effectively because it was decapitated by privatisation and chopped into bits to facilitate private profit taking. Because there is no guiding mind overseeing the railway, the Department has to wade into the railway much more deeply than it should. Having taken this approach, the Government assume a greater deal of responsibility, but they have not shown themselves capable of discharging that responsibility.

The Department for Transport’s oversight has failed in three major ways. First, it appears that, when there was a decision on whether to press ahead with the timetable changes affecting Northern, the Department stood against allowing a deferral. Why did the Department not believe the professional advice it was given? Secondly, the Transport Committee heard from Network Rail yesterday that Thameslink phasing was first raised by the GTR readiness board in June 2017. Mr Halsall, the route managing director for the south-east, said the Department stood by and did not make a decision until November 2017—an astonishing five-month delay. What did the Secretary of State know and when did he know it?

[The Secretary of State for Transport (Chris Grayling)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

I can confirm that the decision to proceed with a slimmed down timetable was taken by me in July 2017.

[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

Well, I am saying to the Secretary of State quite clearly that a competent Secretary of State would have known this right at the outset and taken the appropriate steps. He did not. He allowed the situation to unwind.

Thirdly, the Thameslink industry readiness board—readiness board, there’s a laugh—formally requested that the GTR timetable changes should be scaled back, yet the Department dithered for two months. GTR boss Mr Horton said the board did not have an executive role, so he could not explain who was responsible for the meltdown—no one accountable and no one responsible.

I do not want to personalise the issue and I do not expect the Secretary of State to know every detail of what happens in his Department—*[Interruption.]* No, it is just everything he does and everything he stands for; it’s nothing personal. However, the three points I have described are all important failures of the Department for Transport at a high level. […] Recent events demonstrate more than ever that our railway is not integrated. I am afraid that the breach of faith and trust is so great that the Secretary of State’s credibility will never recover. There comes a point when the publicly accountable politician in charge of the railway should step up and shoulder the blame. It seems to me, and I suspect to many rail users, that we have more than reached that point.

[The Secretary of State for Transport (Chris Grayling)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1413)

[…] For years, the Opposition have demanded that the railways be renationalised and run by the Government, and they have claimed that they would be run much better if they were. Now it appears that they think the railways are already run by the Government, and that if something goes wrong, it is down to us. Frankly, I am going to let their confusion speak for itself and concentrate today on what really matters: getting things back into shape for passengers. […]

As I told the House, I have commissioned an independent inquiry. This will be led by the independent rail regulator, Stephen Glaister, to examine why we are in this situation and to avoid it ever happening again. I have met the owners of the franchises and demanded that they improve their operational response, including, in the case of GTR, increasing its managerial capacity. Clearly, nobody wants us to be in the position we find ourselves in today, but let me be absolutely clear: everyone in my Department is as focused as we possibly can be on improving reliability for passengers. […]

At the end of all this, I rule nothing out as regards the future structure of franchises. […]

I would like to update the House on how the industry is working to improve the reliability of services. On 4 June, Northern introduced a temporary timetable, including a targeted reduction in trains by around 6% to achieve a more deliverable service. Even with this reduction in service, there are still more trains running across the whole Northern network than before the timetable change in May. That does not mean that there are not individual areas that still have very significant problems, and I am very conscious that many passengers are still experiencing significant disruption, but there are signs that the service is stabilising. Over the first two weeks of the reduced timetable, 80% of trains arrived on time and 4% were cancelled or arrived significantly late, which is a significant improvement. This is not nearly good enough, but it is an improvement on what was happening before the introduction of that timetable. Northern is planning to run the timetable until the end of July, when it will review and, we hope, significantly increase the number of trains running, while ensuring continued stability. Stability is the most important thing for passengers so that they know what is expected, when trains are going to come and that they are going to come.

Officials from the Rail North Partnership—it is worth reminding Labour Members that this franchise is managed as a partnership between my Department and the leaders of local authorities in the north. Decisions about it are taken by the partnership board of Transport for the North, and it has been considering how to respond—*[Interruption.]* The shadow Secretary of State says it does not exist. This is the most devolved franchise in England. Responsibilities for managing and overseeing the franchise are shared through the board of Transport for the North—*[Interruption.]*Labour Members do not like it, but that is the truth.

GTR is also working to increase the predictability and reliability of journeys on its network. It is working actively to reduce the number of on-the-day cancellations and is now updating its timetables a week ahead. There is clearly still a lot more to do. In too many places, there is very significant disruption, but we have to move things in the right direction. Alternative travel arrangements are in place—for example, for passengers on the Brighton main line, who can have their Thameslink tickets accepted on Gatwick Express. Next month, GTR will introduce a full temporary timetable across its network as the next step to improve reliability and performance for passengers. This will allow GTR to slowly build up services to the new full timetable. […]

The one thing on which I agree with the shadow Secretary of State is the need to put passengers first, and there are two areas where we have to work on that. I encourage all sections of the industry, including the trade unions, to put passengers first. Railway workers across the country are dedicated to providing a high level of service for their passengers and have been on the frontline facing the anger of passengers affected by the timetable disruption, and I am sorry they have had to experience that. I encourage trade union leaders to support their efforts and those of this industry to sort things out for passengers. It is a matter of great disappointment to me that the RMT has again today gone on strike on Northern at a time when the whole industry needs to work together to get the timetable back into shape.

The union makes spurious claims about safety, but trains have operated like this in the UK for more than 30 years. The London underground uses this system, as do trains around the network, and no one at Northern is losing their job or any pay. These changes will modernise the railway in the north and deliver better services for passengers and were signed up to by all the members of the partnership managing that franchise in the north. It is worth adding that on the Southern network, ASLEF, the train drivers union, reached a perfectly sensible agreement that should point the way forward. It is particularly disappointing, therefore, to see the Opposition acting effectively as a mouthpiece for a trade union that regards a Labour party led by the right hon. Member for Islington North (Jeremy Corbyn) as too right wing to affiliate to. I urge him and his colleagues to urge his union supporters to back down from this dispute, stop calling strikes at a time of disruption on Northern and work together to sort out these problems. […]

Political points scoring does not help passengers. We have seen that today. We need to work to deliver the best outcome for passengers and to improve services urgently. That is what I am focused on, what my Department is focused on and what the Government are focused on.

[Lloyd Russell-Moyle](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4615)

Does the hon. Gentleman not agree that the situation on Southern and GTR was so long-running that the Secretary of State should step in now, and that there should be not a review but an immediate revocation of the franchise, as happened with Connect Southeastern under Labour? […] Does he agree that that is why many commuters, particularly in London and the south, have been so angry? They have had years and years of disruption due to not only repair works, but the disaster of the franchise, and now the railway collapses under their feet. The Government have a responsibility to take action.

[Jo Stevens (Cardiff Central) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4425)

Does my hon. Friend agree that there is a pattern of behaviour here? Before the 2015 election, when the right hon. Member for Epsom and Ewell (Chris Grayling) was Lord Chancellor, Labour wrote to say that there should be no more privatisation contracts in the probation service. The right hon. Gentleman ignored that, because he did not want to accept that Labour was right about the disaster that the probation service now is.

[Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

It is a pleasure to take part in this debate and to support the motion standing in the names of my Front-Bench colleagues. I also wish to thank members of the Transport Committee for their informed contributions to the debate, and I am delighted that the hon. Member for Bexhill and Battle (Huw Merriman) is a supporter of keeping the guards on the trains—well done on that. *[Interruption.]* Perhaps it is qualified support.

As a member of the Transport Committee and a regular rail user, I have been following the recent regression of the rail service, particularly in my region, with great concern. The catastrophic May timetable changes seem to have been completely avoidable. The Secretary of State ignored warnings and failed to delay or phase in the changes.

Yesterday, my Transport Committee colleagues and I spent three hours asking questions of and taking evidence from representatives from Northern, GTR and Network Rail. I was quite interested to hear the Secretary of State say in response to a comment made by the shadow Secretary of State, my hon. Friend the Member for Middlesbrough (Andy McDonald), that he made the decision to proceed with the changes in July 2017, because my understanding from what the witnesses said yesterday is that concerns were expressed at a meeting involving stakeholders and Network Rail in January, some six months before the ultimate decision was made. There was ample opportunity for the Secretary of State and his advisers in the Department to intervene and identify some mitigating actions, which could have included either delaying the implementation or phasing it in.

[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

Given that GTR is a concession and is paid a management fee, could my hon. Friend cast some light on whether the revenue due to the DFT was a factor in the delay in the implementation of the decision?

[Grahame Morris](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

My hon. Friend raises a good question. I asked the GTR witnesses yesterday whether revenue was a material factor, and their response was that all the revenue is collected directly. They intimated that there were no revenue implications, although I am rather sceptical that ultimately revenue may well have been a factor in the decision about whether to phase or to delay the implementation of the new timetable. Perhaps the Committee can pursue further whether that was the case.

We have heard from Opposition and Government Members about the impact of the terrible delays. In my area, at the worst times up to 43% of Northern trains have been cancelled or delayed each day. From 4 June, Northern cancelled 165 trains a day, including all services to the Lake district, as we have heard. Since 20 May, 11% of Northern trains have been delayed or cancelled each day.

​[Dr David Drew (Stroud) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=252)

Does my hon. Friend accept that although this issue is concentrated in the north, the east and London, it is a national problem? Great Western has been going through its own dramatic problems, with a huge number of cancellations, driver shortages and all the other problems that have been mentioned. It is a national problem.

[Grahame Morris](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

I am grateful for that thoughtful intervention, and my hon. Friend makes a good point. However, although there are national issues with the training of drivers and ensuring that they have the appropriate skillset, industry stakeholders pointed out to the Department and, presumably, the Secretary of State that it would normally take 40 weeks to prepare, identify training needs and ensure that drivers were in place, but in this case only 16 weeks were allocated and, if my memory of yesterday’s evidence serves me right, it was not until around two days before implementation, when they were drawing up the driver rosters, that they discovered that they had the wrong skill mix and that the drivers were in the wrong places to operate the new timetable. So although my hon. Friend makes a good point, Ministers and the Secretary of State must ultimately bear responsibility for the decisions that were made.

[Ian Mearns (Gateshead) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4000)

It is quite simple in the industry: although experienced, train drivers need training on new routes and on the use of different rolling stock. Without that training, they cannot go into service.

[Grahame Morris](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

Absolutely; that is a key point. I am kind of long in the tooth now, but I remember the dreadful train accident at Ladbroke Grove, where 31 people were killed and 500 injured; a dear friend of mine was killed in the Southall train disaster, in which seven were killed and more than 140 were injured; and I remember another accident at Clapham Junction. What with the complexity of the new signalling systems at places like London Bridge, with large numbers of tracks, it is safety-critical that the drivers are fully aware of which signals actually apply to them. It is a mistake for the Secretary of State to imply that ASLEF, representing the train drivers, should somehow make a concession on the training to which its members are subjected. When I get on a train, I want to be absolutely certain that it is completely safe and that the drivers are familiar with the track and the signalling system. I also want to know that there is a guard on the train, so that if anything happens—if anyone is attacked or taken ill—or there is a disabled or blind person or a woman with children travelling, the guard will be able to assist. That is reasonable in such circumstances.

I agree with the hon. Member for Bexhill and Battle about the GTR chief executive, Charles Horton, who seemed like a thoroughly decent man. He said that he was deeply sorry for the timetable disruptions. It is a bit unfair that he seems to be carrying the can, when I suspect the blame should be apportioned further up the food chain. The witnesses yesterday were well schooled in collective responsibility, but ultimately the buck must stop with the Secretary of State. It is not good enough just to keep saying sorry. […]

It is another failure on the Secretary of State’s watch. We have fundamental problems with integration, lack of planning and decision making. The franchising model is broken. It is time for a new approach and a new driver at the head of the Department for Transport.

[Dan Carden (Liverpool, Walton) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4651)

The motion on the Order Paper is

“That this House has no confidence in the Secretary of State”

and we have already heard from the fourth and final Government Back Bencher who has come along to speak in support of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has not stayed in the Chamber to listen to the speeches today, but if I were giving advice to him or to Conservative Back Benchers, I would suggest that they go out and buy a plaque that says, “The buck stops here” and attach it to his desk, because that is what the debate is all about. It is about the public wanting to elect politicians to run a decent railway system. I congratulate my hon. Friend the shadow Secretary of State on standing up and confidently saying that he wants to be a Secretary of State who runs the railways and is held accountable.

The meltdown caused by the introduction of the new rail timetable in May is just the latest in a chain of crises on our railways. We have an over-complex and fractured rail system. It has too many operators and a complex web of contractors and sub-contractors. This patchwork of competing interests militates against effective planning and delivery of the railway, making Britain’s rail system one of the most expensive and now worst run in Europe. Since 2010, fares have risen three times faster than wages, and in January we had the highest fare increases for five years. That is not to mention the more than £5 billion of public money used to subsidise the private rail network every year.

It seems to me that incompetent rail companies have become too big to fail in the eyes of this Government. The rewards are privatised, but the risks are dumped on passengers and taxpayers, who always end up footing the bill. The public are tired of paying the price for a broken privatised and franchised model. Is that any surprise? What are they getting in return? Higher fares for a worse service; botched timetables and thousands of cancellations; and a policy of de-staffing the railways in the interests of profit, regardless of the consequences for staff and the travelling public.

One of the first campaigns I backed following my election in June last year, was the RMT’s campaign to keep the guard on the train, after Merseyrail announced that it was planning to axe all 207 guards from the service when the new fleet arrives in 2020. My constituents welcome the introduction of new and modern trains—long overdue and for which the unions campaigned—but they also value the safety and security of a guard on the train.

Private rail companies are making huge profits from the travelling public, and it is completely wrong that we are presented with false choices between embracing new technology and protecting secure jobs and public safety. It is nonsense. The campaign has enjoyed the overwhelming support of the public, despite strikes, and I am glad that ​Merseyrail has recognised that strength of feeling and that talks at ACAS are now taking place. Both the Scottish and Welsh Governments have agreed that there will be no extension of driver-only operation on services that they are responsible for, and I hope that Merseyrail will follow suit so that passengers in my constituency are afforded the same safety standards as are enjoyed elsewhere.

However, the RMT fears that since the Secretary of State was appointed he has been blocking any similar deals in an effort to “take on” the union. These fears were again confirmed when the Public Accounts Committee recently produced a report on franchising that concluded that the blame for the protracted Southern driver-only operation dispute lay squarely at the door of the Government for not engaging properly with the trade unions.

The franchising system fails to allow for industrial relations at all. Train operating companies have little interest beyond the terms of their franchise agreements, and changes are routinely forced through without any serious consultation. The introduction of the May 2018 timetable required changes on a huge scale. Change requires the co-operation, engagement and good will of the workforce, which has been undermined constantly by the rail companies and by the Government’s handling of the DOO dispute.

The rail industry lacks a clear chain of command and clear lines of accountability, so it is easy to blame others. Ultimately, though, the buck stops with the Transport Secretary. Not only has he failed on a managerial level; he has defended, at every turn, the systemic failure of rail privatisation. My advice to him is simple. First, take responsibility. Secondly, listen to the public, who by a vast majority support a return to public ownership and public control of our railways.

[Rachael Maskell (York Central) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4471)

The Secretary of State can be in no doubt from the contributions across the House today that the rail chaos is having a devastating impact on people’s lives and jobs and on the economy.

The meltdown in the timetable and the revised timetable is causing serious pain to commuters. We have heard from hon. Members north, south, east and west. The whole nation, as my hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Dr Drew) said, is facing the pain. My hon. Friend the Member for Oldham East and Saddleworth (Debbie Abrahams) talked about how promised improvements were yet to be delivered, as did my hon. Friend the Member for Eltham (Clive Efford), who highlighted that the £9 billion spent has led to more chaos. My hon. Friend the Member for Kingston upon Hull North (Diana Johnson) reminded us that the northern press has united in its call for the Secretary of State to resign.

[…] We all know that the problem is much deeper rooted. Were Robert Adley alive today, he would have seen himself truly vindicated for his call to halt the Railways Act 1993, for he foresaw how fragmentation would eventually create complete chaos across the railways, as my hon. Friend the Member for Middlesbrough (Andy McDonald), the shadow Transport Secretary, set out. Mr Adley dubbed that Bill the then Tory Government’s “poll tax on wheels”. The fate of the poll tax is a stark reminder of what happens when Governments continue to blame everyone but themselves and fail to listen to the public. The public now overwhelmingly call for the renationalisation of the railways, which Labour will deliver.

The failure of one part of the Secretary of State’s Department to talk to the other, with franchises promising one thing despite Network Rail not having the capacity to deliver on his promises, demonstrates that the buck stops with no one but the Secretary of State. No Government can sleepwalk their way through a crisis, and this weak and floundering Government most certainly cannot. To ignore the public, to ignore the industry and now to ignore Members of this House shows utter contempt, for which the public will not be forgiving—not least when people have lost their jobs, been unable to sit vital exams, or missed precious moments of family life. Passengers are exhausted from working very long days due to their uncertain commutes. Passengers are unable to plan. Passengers are unable to have any form of life as their short journeys have been replaced by waits at stations that are 10 times the length of their journeys.

It is clear that commuters are not just frustrated with this totally avoidable Government failure, but with their own MPs for not securing change at the top. Today, we all have the opportunity to make the necessary change. If it is not addressed today, it most certainly will be at the ballot box, and MPs who were silent today when they had the chance to act on behalf of their constituents will find that those constituents will vote accordingly come the next general election.

The problem is that all this rail chaos, which was well known in advance by the Secretary of State, was allowed to happen on his watch because he put his ideology of private interests ahead of public service, because he failed to co-ordinate franchises across the divides in his Department, because he did not intervene and stop the timetable changes when he had the chance to do so, and because he evidently has put himself and his career above passengers and theirs. He was warned time and again but failed to act.

This afternoon’s vote is simply about confidence. Voting against the motion or even sitting on your hands would not only highlight how hon. Members are complicit in the chaos that has ensued over the last few weeks, but show support for how the Secretary of State conducted his Department, his actions in the months preceding the introduction of the new timetable, and the way in which he has let the public down consistently over the last 30 days. Constituents who were late to work again this morning will want to know how their MP voted today—did they place their confidence in the Secretary of State, despite all that has happened, or were they willing to stand up for their constituents and vote for this motion? When constituents miss their family meal and time with their children tonight, will they look up to their MP for ​taking action through the first step of removing the heart of the problem—the Secretary of State—or will they remember that their MP, when given the opportunity to do something, sidestepped the issue?

Perhaps the Prime Minister will show her full support for the Secretary of State this afternoon by neither voting for the motion nor taking any action to replace the person at the heart of the crisis, thus tying her own leadership to this national public disaster, or perhaps she will start to distance herself from all that has happened and find someone who can respond to this crisis. Surely she cannot continue to back a Secretary of State who has not only failed rail passengers but will continue to preside over the chaos that, as we have heard, he will unable to resolve for weeks if not months. Anyone who understands the need to make a fresh start after a public disaster knows that they need to deal with those responsible, which in this case means pulling Northern and GTR back into public ownership with immediate effect. The public will not forget how the avoidable rail chaos was woefully responded to.

There is one more issue that I want to raise: public safety. Even as we speak, public safety is being put at risk. We heard the Secretary of State take a swipe at the unions—he always does—but they represent the very people who work relentlessly across the network and, in particular, have kept passengers safe over the past few weeks. They have taken action today because they fear for public safety as guards are removed from trains. They are right to do so. If anything makes the case for guards on trains, it is the experiences of the last month. The guards are the very people who help the public in times of need. Labour will never put ideology above safety, let alone public service.

There is another public service issue on which the Secretary of State is failing. In this chaos, I have heard reports of stations crammed with passengers and trains crammed with people. Those people are fortunate to get on board—disabled people have been left stranded at stations because they cannot push their way on to trains. This is a seriously unsafe situation. The country must remember above all that national disasters have occurred when people have been squeezed into spaces that are too tight to hold them. When they are not just standing for hours on their commute but physically restrained on trains, it is easy to imagine how someone could fall on the tracks or fall ill on a train, especially in this heat. If nothing more, all hon. and right hon. Members should vote with Labour to put down a clear marker that they urge the Government to address this very serious issue. The choice today is to stand up for passengers, or to stand up for the Secretary of State and his failure on the railways. I trust that I will see hon. Members from both sides of the House in the Aye Lobby shortly.

[The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Joseph Johnson)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The disruption faced by passengers over the past three weeks on parts of the GTR and Northern franchises is unacceptable. […] I want to reassure colleagues on both sides of the House that the Department’s overriding priority is to restore the reliability of service across the network. The Secretary of State has left the rail industry under no illusion that it must urgently improve its operational response including, if necessary, by changing top management, as is now happening at GTR. He has commissioned an independent inquiry by Stephen Glaister of the Office of Rail and Road, the independent regulator, to examine why we are in this situation and to reduce the chances of it ever happening again.

Turning to the performance on Northern, passengers continue to experience disruption on some parts of the network. There is a long way to go until performance is where it needs to be, but we are beginning to turn the corner. The introduction of a temporary timetable by Northern on 4 June will help to rebuild passengers’ trust. The first signs are promising, as industry figures show that over the first two weeks of the reduced timetable, 80% of trains arrived on time, and 4% of trains were cancelled or arrived significantly late. In the previous fortnight, 66% of trains arrived on time and an average of 12% of trains were cancelled or were significantly late. That improvement must continue over the coming weeks.

[Ian Mearns](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4000)

That all sounds very nice—a real improvement. However, according to the BBC this morning—this is certainly the evidence that we have all heard from our constituents—11,000 trains on the Northern rail network have been either cancelled or delayed for more than 30 minutes. That is tens of thousands of constituents who have been really badly put out, often left without a route to work, school, college or training.

[Joseph Johnson](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The cancellation of services is now progressively more and more planned by Northern as it seeks to stabilise the timetable and to ensure that the travelling public—the constituents of hon. Members on both sides of the House—can plan their journeys with greater assurance. This improvement, and the stabilisation and increased reliability, must continue over coming weeks. Northern plans to run the timetable until the end of July, when it will review progress and take stock. At that point, it will hope significantly to increase the number of timetabled services while ensuring continued improvements in stability.

The crux of the performance issues, as hon. Members have recognised, is the availability of drivers with the correct training. I am happy to say that, as a result of Northern’s hard work with ASLEF on rest day working, they were able to announce last week that they had reached an agreement for the immediate introduction of a new rest day working agreement. This will allow for more training and a better service for passengers sooner.

Let me turn to GTR’s performance. GTR is also working to increase the predictability and reliability of journeys on its network. It is working actively to reduce on-the-day cancellations, and is now updating its timetables on a Friday evening for the following week, enabling ​passengers to plan ahead more effectively. Alternative travel arrangements are in place. For example, passengers on the Brighton main line can have their Thameslink tickets accepted on Gatwick Express, and next month GTR will introduce a full temporary timetable across its network as the next step to improve reliability and performance for passengers.

It is worth noting that some parts of the GTR network, including all of Southern, are now experiencing more train services and better performance than ever before. However, I do not consider the service to be anywhere near approaching one that I or passengers would find acceptable and, as the Secretary of State said, we are examining why GTR is taking longer than Northern to improve services. The review that has been commissioned will look at whether GTR has met and is continuing to meet its contractual obligations in the planning and delivery of the May timetable. […]

Let me turn to compensation. We are clear that passengers on the lines that have been severely affected by these issues will receive additional compensation. The Department is working closely with Network Rail, train operators and stakeholders to introduce a special compensation scheme as soon as possible. We have already recommended to the board of Transport for the North that passengers who buy weekly, monthly or annual tickets on affected Northern and TPE routes should be eligible to claim up to four weeks’ compensation. As part of the scheme, the industry will be providing financial support to Transport for the North to deal with other costs that have arisen from the disruption.

I expect the board of TFN to confirm the final details of the scheme by its next meeting on 28 June and for payments to begin for Northern in early July. The Secretary of State has also announced a compensation package for passengers who travel on affected Thameslink and Great Northern routes. As he said, it will follow the special compensation scheme for Northern and TPE. Finally, we are looking at options to further support the northern economy and expect Northern to fund a marketing campaign encouraging travel to affected areas by train, including the Lakes.​

I hope that this has reassured right hon. and hon. Members of the seriousness with which the Government are taking the disruption facing passengers. We are taking action to resolve the problems as quickly as possible, to compensate passengers appropriately, and to learn the lessons that will prevent this happening again in the future.

*Question put.*

*The House proceeded to a Division.*

​

**Defence Industry and Shipbuilding**

**11 July 2018**

[Nia Griffith (Llanelli) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1541)

I beg to move,

That this House recognises the important contribution of the defence industry to the UK; calls on the Government to support the UK defence industry by taking into account the economic and employment benefits to the UK when awarding contracts and to publish a full, overarching defence industrial strategy; and further calls on the Government to make the competition for the Fleet Solid Support ships contract a UK-only competition to maximise the return on that contract.

Today could be a significant step forward for things coming home. Of course, I am talking about the contract for the fleet solid support ships. As a proud island nation, the UK shipbuilding industry is vital for our prosperity and defence—a message that workers’ representatives from the shipyards spelled out loudly and clearly to Members yesterday. The industry makes a substantial economic contribution, directly employing some 23,000 people and contributing £1.7 billion a year to the UK economy. […]

I was disappointed to hear in Defence questions on Monday that the Government will not publish the conclusions of the modernising defence programme this week, as had long been promised. Instead, we have the Secretary of State’s less than inspiring commitment of “aiming to” introduce the headline findings before the summer recess. We wait with bated breath. […]

I hope that the delay will allow Ministers to reflect on the overwhelming case for an active defence industrial strategy that recognises the immense value of building in Britain and takes a longer term view of the orders that the Government will place, giving industry the confidence to invest in the UK and to plan for a steady stream of work. […]

The contract for the fleet solid support ships would bring immense value to this country if it were awarded to a UK bidder. Our carriers, frigates and destroyers will, of course, always be built in the UK, but with ships such as the fleet solid support vessels, the Government have a choice to make, and Labour Members believe that they are making the wrong one by choosing to put this order out to international competition. I know that some in the Conservative party like to blame everything on the European Union, but the fact is that the Government would be able to procure these ships in the UK under existing EU law, and there are compelling reasons for doing so. The GMB trade union has estimated that the ships would support 6,700 jobs if they were built in UK yards and up to £285 million of the £800 million potential UK spend would be returned to the Treasury through taxation.

The case for buying British is clear, and it would be a betrayal of our UK workers if this contract were allowed to go overseas, so we need to question what is really driving Ministers to put this out to overseas bidders. Perhaps it is the view that there will be a lower price tag for the MOD. We all want to get the best value for money, and we are aware of the difficulties that the MOD is having in balancing its budget, but this short-sighted, narrow, silo mentality about what might look good on the MOD’s balance sheet ignores both the benefits to the UK economy of building the ships in Britain and the costs of not doing so. We as taxpayers all want to see value for our money, and taxpayers up and down the country would far rather see that money spent on supporting skilled jobs for workers here in the UK than see it spent abroad, knowing that some 30% of the money spent on wages will come back directly to the ​Treasury as taxation, and that the spending power of those workers and their families will sustain local businesses in their communities.[…]

As taxpayers, we all want to see value for our money, but we recognise the consequences if we do not spend the money in the UK—the immediate impact on workers and their families, with workers unemployed or able only to find much lower-paid work, leaving them and their families much more reliant on social security payments and tax credits. All that is a cost to the taxpayer and, sadly, there are all too often the hidden costs of the increased risk of mental health problems and family break-up. While workers and their families will take the hardest hit, the wider consequences will be far-reaching and long term. Shipyards will close. We will lose a skilled workforce and a generation of apprentices. […] To those who argue that UK companies should simply compete on a level playing field with international bidders, I say that the point is that currently the field is simply not level. For example, the South Korean shipbuilding industry has been the subject of a great deal of criticism for the level of state aid it receives. Shipbuilding is a significant element of the country’s economy, and state-run lenders have injected billions of dollars into the industry. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions has found that German yards benefit from targeted research and development, from funds for redeveloping and upgrading yards and from regional development funding, while significant potential bidders in Italy, France and Spain are owned in whole or part by their respective Governments. Rather than allowing this valuable contract to disappear overseas, the Government should do the right thing and put UK yards and workers first.​ […]

When I was very young, I remember not only the excitement of England winning the World cup in 1966, but the I’m Backing Britain campaign. Before they go off to support the English football team this evening, I urge Members from across the House to recognise that the order for the fleet solid support ships represent a prime example of one that can and should be awarded here. I urge Members to back British industry and to vote to build them in Britain.

[The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence (Mr Tobias Ellwood)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1487)

[…] Let me step back from the details for a second, and reflect on the importance of the security and prosperity of our island nation in the context of the seas. For centuries our world-renowned Royal Navy has protected our shores and our people, and has safeguarded our interests. […]

[Grahame Morris (Easington) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3973)

I apologise for interrupting the Minister’s flow. I do not think any Member on either side of the House would disagree about the importance of the Royal Navy and the incredible job it does, but our point on this side of the House—I suspect shared by some on the Government Benches—is that shipbuilding is a vital strategic industry. There are many benefits apart from producing the very best ships in the world, such as maintaining employment and a skills base that could itself generate more economic activity. I hope the Minister will take that into account, and not least the importance of the supply chain.

[Mr Ellwood](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1487)

There is nothing in that that I would disagree with; the hon. Gentleman is absolutely right. I will come on to what we are doing to promote Royal ​Navy ships; we will come on to the core fact of what is a Royal Navy ship and what is a fleet auxiliary ship, which again goes to the heart of the difference in how these different types of ship are procured. […] When we look at the current challenges facing Europe, the middle east and parts of Africa, we see that we are the best in Europe in terms of security, military capability, and intelligence and policing. We have an opportunity to leverage that position of strength as we craft a new post-Brexit relationship with our European allies and take a leading role in NATO, but we can only realistically do that with a sensible increase in our defence spending, which includes investment in ships.

[Nia Griffith](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1541)

The Minister needs to take into consideration the fact that something like 36% of that spend would immediately come back to the Treasury in taxation. There would also be a knock-on effect for all the small businesses that would benefit from that money being spent out into the local economy. We would also have to take into account the cost of social security if those people were unemployed, as well as the disastrous cost of losing our shipbuilding industry altogether. Does he recognise that if we do not invest now to create a drum beat of orders, we could see the shipbuilding industry going the same way that the Tories let the coalmining industry go?

[Mr Ellwood](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1487)

Now we really are seeing the difference between us, if the hon. Lady is comparing this situation with the coalmining industry. Is that where this debate is going? I certainly hope not. […] To achieve our ambitions, we need a strong shipbuilding industry as part of the wider maritime sector. As the Opposition spokeswoman said, more than 100,000 people work in this country’s maritime and marine sectors, including in the shipyards that supply parts and support equipment to keep the great industry alive.

[Mr Paul Sweeney](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4642) (Glasgow North East) (Lab/Co-op)

The Minister refers to shipyards. He might be aware that a deal was done in 2013 so that, in return for closing down operations in Portsmouth, capital investment would be made on the Clyde to make it a world-class centre of shipbuilding expertise, but that deal was never followed through with. He talks about creating a world-class industry, so why has he ​failed to follow through on the investment proposals that would make the Clyde world class and restore that capability?

[Mr Ellwood](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=1487)

We are investing both in the Clyde and in Portsmouth. Looking back over the past few decades, let us be honest that although we have world-class shipbuilding capability, efficiency has not been what it could be. Successive Governments could have done better—we put up our hands up to that—which was why it was all the more important to create a shipbuilding strategy. We commissioned John Parker’s report so that we would be able to understand—

[Luke Pollard (Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4682)

I not only declare an interest but, as the MP for Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport, proudly proclaim that I am the vice-chair of the all-party parliamentary group on shipbuilding and ship repair. I am very proud to be a GMB and Unite member. I add my name to the list of Members who have called today for the new Royal Fleet Auxiliary ships to be built in Britain. Build them here. Do not ship those jobs abroad.​

This is not the first time we have had this debate. Members will recall that I led a debate in Westminster Hall on the national shipbuilding strategy in January, when I offered scrutiny and suggestions to make the strategy more robust and valuable to industry, to the Government and to our armed forces. […] I also called for the RFA fleet solid support ships to be built in Britain.

Ministers will know that they have my support in calling for more money for defence from the Treasury and especially in using that money to baseport the new Type 26 frigates in Devonport, to save the amphibious ships and to strengthen our Royal Navy. Ministers will also know that I am a critical friend of theirs, and on procuring the new RFA ships abroad, they are getting it wrong and I am do not mind telling them. We need three RFA ships, not two. Cutting that order is simply not good enough. At 40,000 tonnes each, the combined order would be the same size as the aircraft carrier order, sustaining jobs right across the country.

My arguments are the same today as they were in January. We risk sleepwalking into major contracts being given to those abroad. […] I believe contracts to build ships for the Royal Navy and RFA should be onshored. These ships should be homegrown, British-designed and British-made, using British steel and British technologies, and preserving Britain’s sovereign defence capabilities to design, build, equip and repair complex and important ships for our own use and for export. I favour a restricted tender for these ships, as I did back in January. They will be carrying arms, munitions and supplies, so only UK shipyards should build them. I also believe that history will be unkind on those MPs who offshore our defence work.

Let us not forget that when the Royal Navy is on the frontline, in contested waters, off the coast of hostile powers, the RFA is there with it. Often overlooked, these ships form a vital part of the Royal Navy’s ability to operate at sea, and they lead humanitarian, counter-piracy and counter-narcotics operations in and of themselves. RFAs are forward deployed, so they are already in the firing line. Let us not forget that the Government would have the support of Members on both sides of the House if they followed the recommendation and applied a restricted tender. […]

[Mr Paul Sweeney (Glasgow North East) (Lab/Co-op)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4642)

I shall do my best to keep my remarks brief, Mr Speaker, although this is a subject close to my heart. I have grown up around the shipbuilding industry my entire life, and I had the privilege of working in it as a new graduate in 2010-11 and through to 2016. Through that time, I have learned the bitter lessons of failed and deeply flawed MOD procurement practices. Through the 1990s, my dad had to travel around the country following shipbuilding orders, as Type 23 frigate orders were drip-fed and we were usually in a race to the bottom with the Irish shipbuilders and Swan Hunter to build them. That was a recipe for disinvestment and unemployment, and that was the harsh lesson learned. That is why the Labour Government turned away from the policy after 1997 and promoted a defence industrial strategy, which was well regarded in all parts of the House. That was followed up by a terms of business agreement that would have guaranteed a stable pipeline of work, with one ship built every 12 months in a six-year design cycle for complex warships. That was extinguished in 2014 by the MOD, in pursuit of an utterly wrongheaded policy on shipbuilding procurement.

Let me make it clear: the capacity to award this contract to a British shipyard is entirely at the MOD’s discretion, under the terms of article 346 of the treaty on the functioning of the European Union. Indeed, it is common practice to have done this; France, Germany, Italy, Spain and US do it. Most recently, Canada has pursued a similar policy with its national shipbuilding strategy. […]

Let us be clear about the economic benefits, which the Minister dusted over somewhat in his rather flimsy analysis. According to the Royal United Services Institute, naval shipbuilding work offers a return of 36p in the pound. Some £285 million would be returned to the Exchequer, but that is just a quarter of the overall industrial and economic benefit to the UK. A recent Institute for Public Policy Research report, which took into account welfare savings and greater GDP growth, found that naval shipbuilding activity in the UK offered a return of 40% to the Treasury. That must be taken into account when we consider the awarding of public procurement contracts. Some 70% of shipbuilding contracts are derived from the supply chain, which was worth £2.8 billion in 2015. That is a huge industrial benefit to the UK.

[Rebecca Long Bailey (Salford and Eccles) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4396)

The World cup semi-final starts in less than half an hour, so I shall make sure that my comments are uncharacteristically brief.

I thank all Members who spoke today; I apologise for not referring to them individually. I give a special mention to my hon. Friend the Member for Llanelli (Nia Griffith), who made the case for why greater Government intervention is necessary not only for defence manufacturing in the UK, but, in a broader sense, for manufacturing as a whole.

Manufacturing accounts for 10% of output, 44% of exports and 70% of business investment in research and development. Output per hour is £4 higher in manufacturing than the average for all sectors, and the average annual earnings of somebody who works in manufacturing are nearly £4,000 higher than average earnings from across the whole economy. Over the past 35 years, though, the UK has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs, which is 53% of all manufacturing jobs. Compared with 66% in 1991, some 81% of all jobs in the UK are now in service sectors, and only 8% of employment is in manufacturing.

The industries that, as we have heard, provided our parents and grandparents with employment are no longer an option for our children and grandchildren. There are many reasons for this shift, including Thatcher’s big bang deregulation of 1986 and the movement of production overseas in search of cheap labour. […]

What should the Government be doing to support British manufacturing? As I have said, infrastructure is a key tool in driving investment upwards. Upgrading the nation’s infrastructure in projects such as the Swansea Bay tidal lagoon, which the Government shelved recently, would have created more than more than 2,300 jobs in Swansea and paved the way for the creation of a new domestic industry with substantial export potential. Of course, the Government must ensure that they negotiate the best deal possible, but they must also, on projects such as this, start seeing beyond the short-term basic cost calculations and realise the wider benefits of infrastructure projects such as Swansea.

The most obvious start, so obvious in fact that it is shining like a Belisha beacon, would be using the enormous power of Government procurement to support British industry. The public sector currently spends more than £200 billion every year in the private sector, but sadly this Government have failed effectively to use procurement as an economic lever for supporting manufacturing. There are many examples of this, not least the failure to support British steel. It was revealed last year that the renovation of Big Ben clock tower is using steel from Germany, Brazil and the United Arab Emirates.

[…] Given the severity of the crisis facing British steel, this is simply shocking. The Government need to take a long-term approach to procurement, appreciating the wider economic and societal benefits of their decisions, rather than simply driving down the upfront costs. The Minister said that this is what the shipbuilding strategy states, but what I have read so far in the strategy is extremely ambiguous, and there is no detail as to how these wider socio-economic benefits are measured or quantified. […] Our motion recognises the wider socioeconomic benefits of procuring wisely. We have sought to place the fleet solid support ship order with domestic shipyards, creating or securing 6,500 jobs, including 1,805 shipyard jobs, which are highly skilled and 45% better paid than the average for all jobs. It would also mean that £285 million of the estimated cost of the order could be returned to the Exchequer through taxes. Many people across Britain clearly see it as right, moral and economically sound to take this course of action. The Government have a duty to use their enormous spending power to support British industry and its workers. Tonight, football’s coming home; we need a commitment from the Government that the same will happen to British manufacturing.

[The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence (Guto Bebb)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3910)

It is a pleasure to respond to this important debate. I think that we have had 12 passionate speeches on this matter. *[Interruption.]* I thank the right hon. Member for North Durham (Mr Jones).

Although we all agree about the importance of the future of our shipbuilding sector, there is clearly a differential between my views and those of the Ministry of Defence, and the views of many Opposition Members. However, I am willing to recognise completely openly the commitment of those who have spoken in this debate to our defence sector, the defence industry and jobs within that industry.

Before I go on to my detailed notes, I want quickly to say two things. I have been asked to be short in my response because of a football match that is going on this evening—although, as a Welshman, I am quite happy to miss kick-off.

[Mr Deputy Speaker (Sir Lindsay Hoyle)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=467)

I assure the Minister that the rest of us are not—come on!

[Guto Bebb](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=3910)

[…] It is very clear that the Government are fully committed to supporting our defence sector. The shipbuilding strategy was not developed in order to avoid our support for the shipbuilding sector. The whole point was to ensure that we did support, in a coherent manner, a shipbuilding sector that would be competitive on an international basis, that would be able to retain the skills about which hon. Members have spoken so passionately, and that would allow the qualities of our shipbuilding sector to be understood and appreciated on a worldwide basis. […]

The strategy has been adopted in full and was consulted on widely. The Ministry of Defence has decided that we have to adopt the strategy and implement it, and we are confident that we will see the success of this strategy and, more importantly, a very successful future for our shipbuilding sector. I look forward to bids coming in for the fleet solid support ships from British yards with the confidence that seems to be lacking from Opposition Members.

*Question put and agreed to.*

*Resolved,*

That this House recognises the important contribution of the defence industry to the UK; calls on the Government to support ​the UK defence industry by taking into account the economic and employment benefits to the UK when awarding contracts and to publish a full, overarching defence industrial strategy; and further calls on the Government to make the competition for the Fleet Solid Support ships contract a UK-only competition to maximise the return on that contract.

**Govia Thameslink Franchise**

**18 July 2018**

[Andy McDonald (Middlesbrough) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

*(Urgent Question):*To ask the Secretary of State to update the House on the performance of the Govia Thameslink franchise.

[The Minister of State, Department for Transport (Joseph Johnson)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The shadow Transport Secretary has requested an update on the Govia Thameslink franchise. The Secretary of State and I have been clear that the way that the timetable was implemented by GTR and Network Rail from 20 May provided an unacceptable level of service for passengers. The industry as a whole has apologised to passengers for the disruption suffered on Thameslink and Great Northern services.

I can inform the House that, on Sunday 15 July, GTR implemented an interim timetable, a planned step that aims to improve the reliability and performance of services for passengers. The Department is, of course, watching performance carefully. Some of the benefits that passengers are now seeing include: more trains—around 150 to 200 extra services each day; on-the-day cancellations, which are extremely frustrating for passengers, have been significantly reduced; passengers no longer need to check journey planners before they travel; and the public performance measure has improved on Thameslink, closing yesterday at 84% and at 86% on Great Northern. However, as I said, the Department is closely monitoring for sustained performance improvements by GTR, and we will be holding it and its new chief executive officer to account. At the same time, the Department has been working hard to make sure that passengers receive compensation and an explanation for the disruption that they have suffered. […]

The Department has commissioned two reviews of what went wrong with the implementation of the May timetable. First, the independent Glaister review is under way and seeks to understand the factors that led to the disruption. Our aim is to make sure that we learn lessons so that this does not happen again. Within the Department, we have also started a hard review of this franchise to establish whether GTR has met and continues to meet its contractual obligations in the planning and delivery of the May timetable. As part of that process, we are looking at whether GTR has breached its contracts and we will not hesitate to take tough action against it if it is found to have been at fault.

We are still in the first days of the interim timetable on GTR and all timetables require time to bed in. My Department is watching GTR’s progress carefully and we want to see a continued increase in performance for passengers.

​[Andy McDonald](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4269)

It is disappointing that the Secretary of State has had to be summoned here to update the House on the ongoing calamity that is the GTR rail contract, and it just a shame that he has not turned up—yet again.

For four years, Govia’s appalling service and performance have wreaked havoc and misery in the lives of millions of people. What have the Government done to hold the company to account? Precisely nothing. What does this disgraceful company have to do to be stripped of its contact? […]

This failure is totally unacceptable. Labour says that enough is enough. The Government must stop pussyfooting around and strip Govia of its contract without delay. There is no need to wait for Stephen Glaister’s review of the timetabling chaos, as the Minister says, as it will not tell us what we do not know today. The Government and the rail industry have failed passengers both on GTR and across the north of England.

The Government’s threats to GTR mean nothing. Members of this House and the public are not reassured. Can the Minister tell the House whether GTR is in breach of its contractual obligations with the Department for Transport? If it is, will he remove the contract from the company?

The Government have already done a sweetheart deal with GTR over compensation. Can the Minister confirm who will pay for the compensation promised to passengers? Will it be the company or taxpayers?

Almost a year ago, the Government announced major rail investment cancellations on the last sitting day, thereby avoiding parliamentary scrutiny of the decisions. Perhaps the Minister could give the House some notice today of any cuts to transport investment that he plans to sneak out on the sly before or during the summer recess?

[Joseph Johnson](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The Secretary of State would have been here had he not been at the Farnborough air show, which is a long-standing commitment that has been in his diary for a considerable time. I understand that he was on an aeroplane at the time the urgent request came in, and it was simply not practical for him to make arrangements to be back in the Chamber to answer this urgent question.

Let me turn to the points raised by the hon. Gentleman. We will establish during the hard review whether GTR has been in breach of its contractual obligations. That process is under way. It is important that the Department follows due process in all these matters. He asked who will pay compensation. The compensation that I described—a month’s cash compensation for passengers on the most severely affected lines—will be predominantly funded by Govia Thameslink Railway. That is important, as it is the private sector operator of this train company and it will be providing the predominant amount of compensation.

[Teresa Pearce (Erith and Thamesmead) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4003)

I listened to what the Minister said about reviewing the contract to see whether the terms had been adhered to; surely the ​contract is to run a rail service and surely GTR has not done that. What other business would possibly stay in business if it had to compensate its customers on a daily basis? What will it take for this contract to be withdrawn?

[Joseph Johnson](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The important questions that the hon. Lady raises will be answered by the Glaister review and the departmental hard review. We need to establish what responsibility GTR had for the disruption that passengers have experienced, while recognising that other actors are involved that also have a share in what has happened, including Network Rail.

[Marsha De Cordova (Battersea) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4676)

In May, GTR issued guidance to its staff instructing them to ignore the needs of disabled passengers if not doing so would cause a delay to trains. We know that that was discrimination against disabled passengers. Does the Minister agree that no rail operator should be discriminating against disabled passengers? In future, will all rail franchises ensure that all disabled passengers are treated equally?

[Joseph Johnson](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

It is entirely right that the train operating company in question apologised for that incident. No disabled passenger should be treated in such a way. We must have a fully accessible transport system. The Department will shortly launch an inclusive transport strategy, which will ensure that that is the case. […]

[Bambos Charalambous (Enfield, Southgate) (Lab)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4610)

Despite the interim timetable from Govia Thameslink, my constituents continue to get a woeful service, as they have done for years, on the Great Northern route in and out of Moorgate. Does the Minister agree that it is about time that Govia was stripped of this franchise and the line given to the Mayor of London to run?

[Joseph Johnson](https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/MemberContributions?house=Commons&memberId=4039)

The Secretary of State has indicated that he is open to looking at the shape of the franchise in future. Discussions have been held with the Mayor of London about potentially including some elements of the current franchise within the orbit of Transport for London’s Overground service. We are totally open-minded to solutions that work in the passenger interest. […]

**Annex 4 - Correspondence**

Jo Johnson MP

Minister of State

Department for Transport

Great Minster House

33 Horseferry Road

London SW1P 4DR

12 April 2018

Dear Jo

**Re: Ministerial meeting request – East Coast franchise**

I write in my capacity as Chair of the RMT Parliamentary Group to request a meeting to discuss the East Coast franchise.

As you may recall I raised the issue of the East Coast franchise at Transport Oral Question time on 1 March and asked if I could bring some East Coast staff to explain their concerns about the conduct of the franchise. In reply, the Secretary of State said Ministerial colleagues would be happy to talk to staff. I would be grateful if you could suggest a date for such a meeting.

I look forward to your reply and an opportunity to discuss these concerns. I would appreciate it if your response could be addressed to Richard Hanford (details below), who co-ordinates the work of the RMT Parliamentary Group.

Yours sincerely

**Ian Mearns MP  
Chair, RMT Parliamentary Group**

The Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP

Secretary of State for Transport

Department for Transport

Great Minster House

33 Horseferry Road

London

SW1P 4DR

12 June 2018

Dear Secretary of State,

During the past month over 2000 Northern Rail trains have been cancelled completely. A

further 2000 or so have been “part cancelled” and hundreds of services have been confined to inadequately short trains. These statistics show how clear it is that Northern Rail is yet

another failing franchise.

Northern Rail’s passengers, our constituents, have been left in the lurch, with cancellations

and delays causing complete chaos. We in the North have passengers who cannot travel to

work, children who cannot travel to school, with some commuters reporting that more than

70% of their journeys have been delayed over the past six months.

Northern Rail was awarded the franchise in 2016 under the stipulation that the outdated pacer trains would be phased out by 2019, along with other improvements and extra services being introduced. We are sure that you will be aware that these things have not yet happened.

Your announcement that improving Northern Rail’s service is the Department of Transport’s

‘number one performance priority’ is welcome, but it is crucial that this aspiration is quickly

followed by positive action to relieve the travelling misery that our constituents are enduring.

We hope that you are also willing to make regular statements to the House to allow those of

us who represent Northern Rail’s passengers to question the Government on your plans,

which are of a huge significance to so many of our constituents.

The problems with Northern Rail should have been dealt with long before now. It should not

have taken the situation to reach such critical levels before the Department for Transport

woke up to what is quite demonstrably a system which is simply failing.

There are significant failings at an operational level as train operators have struggled to recruit new drivers and train existing drivers in the appropriate route knowledge. Like Network Rail, train operators have had two years to prepare for these changes.

Arriva Northern Rail have not had an overtime agreement with the train drivers’ union

ASLEF since February, which clearly restricts the company’s operational flexibility. It should be noted that overtime agreements are contingent on the time being used for training. Less overtime therefore means less training. No overtime facility has led to significant service

cancellations.

To compound matters, the franchise operator has serious issues with driver retention, losing

staff to other operators and also has a shortage of driver instructors which increases the time it takes for newly qualified drivers to become operational. In addition, the company’s depot

strategy has added to the difficulties with a new depot at Blackburn taking drivers and route

knowledge from other depots. These failures of management mean that Arriva Northern Rail

has been unable to run a full service on the previous timetable, never mind the new one.

As Secretary of State your statement, which suggested that tinkering with rosters and

recruiting new drivers on Arriva Northern Rail will solve the franchise’s problems, seems

naïve. Changes to rosters require negotiation, and agreement has to be reached over

improvements to productivity. It takes 13 to 16 months for a new driver to be fully trained.

The Department’s current proposals will therefore have a limited impact on the immediate

difficulties. These operational oversights are not restricted to Arriva Northern Rail but are

manifest in other franchises such as GTR.

It is counterproductive to attempt to shift the blame onto parties who are not responsible for

decisions taken by the Department for Transport. Denying Transport for North any

meaningful powers but publicly blaming them as an organisation for your Department’s

mistakes represents the worst of both worlds for transport devolution.

We are all too aware that Arriva Northern Rail is not the only franchise whose failure is

penalising the travelling public. Your decision to strip VTEC of their franchise is an obvious

testament to that.

The franchise system is not fit for purpose and the travelling public would, by vast majority,

welcome a radical solution to this systemic failure and a return to public ownership and public control. It is what the majority of the travelling public want, and it is what they deserve: trains which run, and run on time. It is the very least that our constituents should expect.

Yours sincerely

**Ian Mearns MP**

Andy McDonald MP Julie Cooper MP Liz Twist MP Derek Twigg MP Tony Lloyd MP Holly Lynch MP Rachael Maskell MP Laura Pidcock MP Caroline Flint MP Thelma Walker MP Angela Rayner MP Helen Goodman MP Richard Burgon MP Nick Brown MP Yvette Cooper MP Emma Hardy MP Gill Furniss MP Bill Esterson MP Mary Glindon MP Ian Lavery MP Sharon Hodgson MP Kate Hollern MP George Howarth MP Imran Hussain MP Paul Blomfield MP Rebecca Long-Bailey MP Tracy Brabin MP Jim McMahon MP Paula Sheriff MP Jenny Chapman MP Stephanie Peacock MP Emma Lewell-Buck MP Liz McInnes MP Louise Haigh MP Mark Hendrick MP Judith Cummings MP Grahame Morris MP Catherine McKinnell MP Ruth George MP Yvonne Fovargue MP Nik Dakin MP Chi Onwurah MP Graham Jones MP Mike Amesbury MP Peter Dowd MP Jeff Smith MP Kate Green MP Angela Eagle MP Karl Turner MP Roberta Blackman-Woods MP Mary Creagh MP Joanne Platt MP Naz Shah MP Mike Kane MP Helen Jones MP Andrew Gwynne MP Diana Johnson MP Mike Hill MP Sarah Champion MP Faisal Rashid MP Lisa Nandy MP Alex Cunningham MP Sir David Crausby MP Cat Smith MP Laura Smith MP Afzal Khan MP Chris Matheson MP Dan Carden MP Margaret Greenwood MP Debbie Abrahams MP Ronnie Campbell MP Stephen Hepburn MP Phil Wilson MP Lucy Powell MP Conor McGinn MP Justin Madders MP James Frith MP Jonathan Reynolds MP Alex Sobel MP Yasmin Qureshi MP Kevan Jones MP Sue Hayman MP

**Annex 5 - Group Membership**

| First Name | Surname | Constituency |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Diane** | **Abbott** | **Hackney North & Stoke Newington** |
| Mike | Amesbury | Weaver Vale |
| **Dan** | **Carden** | **Liverpool Walton** |
| Rosie | Cooper | West Lancashire |
| **Jeremy** | **Corbyn** | **Islington North** |
| Alex | Cunningham | Stockton North |
| **David** | **Drew** | **Stroud** |
| Paul | Flynn | Newport West |
| Roger | Godsiff | Birmingham Hall Green |
| Mike | Hill | Hartlepool |
| Kate | Hoey | Vauxhall |
| Kelvin | Hopkins | Luton North |
| **Imran** | **Hussain** | **Bradford East** |
| **Ian** | **Lavery** | **Wansbeck** |
| **Clive** | **Lewis** | **Norwich South** |
| **Rebecca** | **Long Bailey** | **Salford & Eccles** |
| **Rachael** | **Maskell** | **York Central** |
| **Chris** | **Matheson** | **City of Chester** |
| **Andy** | **McDonald** | **Middlesbrough** |
| **John** | **McDonnell** | **Hayes & Harlington** |
| **Liz** | **McInnes** | **Heywood & Middleton** |
| Ian | Mearns | Gateshead |
| Grahame | Morris | Easington |
| Lisa | Nandy | Wigan |
| Teresa | Pearce | Erith & Thamesmead |
| Jo | Platt | Leigh |
| Luke | Pollard | Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport |
| Angela | Rayner | Ashton-under-Lyne |
| Matt | Rodda | Reading East |
| Danielle | Rowley | Midlothian |
| Lloyd | Russell-Moyle | Brighton Kemptown |
| Ruth | Smeeth | Stoke on Trent North |
| **Cat** | **Smith** | **Lancaster & Fleetwood** |
| **Laura** | **Smith** | **Crewe & Nantwich** |
| Jo | Stevens | Cardiff Central |
| Paul | Sweeney | Glasgow North East |
| **Karl** | **Turner** | **Hull East** |
| Chris | Williamson | Derby North |

Those listed **in bold** were Shadow Ministers during the period of this Report. Those listed in *italics* are new members of the Group.