



# Political Affairs Digest

A daily summary of political events affecting the Jewish Community

## Contents

Home Affairs

Israel

Relevant Legislation

Consultations

Back issues

## Home Affairs

### Public Bill Committee Debates

#### Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill (*Fifth sitting*)

*Debate of amendments 31, 52, and 53 in*

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0915.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0915.pdf)

*col 154 Matt Western (Labour):* ... I wish to speak in favour of all the amendments in the group. They seek to expand the free speech duty to online platforms, if that is where a speaker is being posted. This is pretty common-sense stuff, given that the past 18 or 19 months of the covid-19 pandemic have fundamentally changed the nature of teaching and hosting events. ... online events have become almost a de facto norm when face-to-face meetings for teaching or other events have not been possible over this past year and a half. ...

*col 155* It seems anomalous for the Government not to wish to incentivise holding online instead of in-person meetings and for them not to accept the amendment. ...

Amendment 53 seeks to build on amendment 52. It would ensure that when the financial costs of hosting speakers were unreasonable and disproportionate, a suitable online platform would have to be provided as an alternative. ...

The truth is that the cancellation of events on campuses has been incredibly rare. Since I assumed this role six months ago, I have been talking to universities and student unions. They have raised certain concerns with me, particularly about when the costs of accommodating a person on campus become prohibitive. Typically, that relates to the security costs of posting that—the security of individuals involved as well as the wider safety of those on campus. There was the case, to which frequent reference has been made, of the former Israeli ambassador, Mark Regev, who was prevented, I believe, from speaking at one university. I think we were talking about a five-figure number for costs. Security costs, whether they are established by the embassy or whether the police deem that a certain level of security is needed for the safety of the speaker and attendees, can be considerable, and I want to come on to that. For student societies, these are significant sums of money—as I said, they can be five-figure sums. ...

*col 156 Emma Hardy (Labour):* ... Yesterday, in a meeting with the Jewish Leadership

Council, I was reminiscing about my time as shadow Universities Minister, when I met the Union of Jewish Students. One of the points that it wanted to reinforce was the difficulty it had holding events because of the extortionate costs that can result from security, given some of the speakers it wished to invite on to campus. I therefore hope that the Minister takes this amendment seriously, because it seems to be a very simple way of allowing people to invite speakers who could be deemed controversial and require extortionate security costs, and to continue their events in the online sphere. ...

**col 158 Minister for Universities (Michelle Donelan):** ... Of course, it is important to be clear that the lawful speech of students, staff, members and visiting speakers in online spaces is covered by the Bill. The Government believe that the Bill as drafted achieves that aim, and I absolutely expect that the new director for freedom of speech and academic freedom will set that out clearly in the guidance in due course. ...

*Debate of amendments 71 in*

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0915.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0915.pdf)

**col 164 Emma Hardy:** ... I will not continue to give my opinion; instead, I sought legal advice on the amendment. The quote that I shall read is from the highly regarded human rights barrister and expert, Adam Wagner, who gave me permission to read out his statement in full:

“This is a bizarre and retrogressive amendment. All speech is already protected by ‘freedom of speech’, i.e. Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, but that right is qualified and will always be balanced against the rights of others, the prohibition on discrimination and generally the interests of the public. The implication of this amendment would be that, for example, hostile and degrading antisemitic speech targeted at a Jewish individual—i.e. hate speech—during an ‘academic discussion’ would no longer be unlawful. A neo-Nazi could repeatedly refer to a Jewish speaker as ‘Jewish scum’ during an academic discussion and this could—on the face of it—be lawful, as would referring to a black speaker as ‘subhuman’ and so on. Hate speech has never been protected by free speech rights and I would not be surprised if this amendment, if it became law, was not ruled to be in breach of the UK’s human rights obligations by a court here and/or in the European Court of Human Rights.”

**Charlotte Nichols (Labour):** ... As someone who is Jewish, one of my key areas of concern is what it would mean for Jewish students—an issue I have raised a number of times throughout the passage of the Bill. I have raised concerns about what it would mean for Holocaust denial, after the Minister appeared to suggest on the radio that that would be protected speech under the Bill. In fact, we heard from witnesses such as Professor Goodwin that he would invite a speaker from the National Front or the British National party, if they were available, to address his students. We have heard evidence that that is what some academics would seek to do, if the Bill were in place.

**col 165** We need only look at the British National party. Nick Griffin, along with a number of members of the British National party and the National Front, has been repeatedly prosecuted for hate crimes, incitement to racial hatred and Holocaust denial. Inviting someone with those sorts of views to address students on campus—for example, in a politics lecture—might mean someone like Nick Griffin laying out all the reasons why he believes that anyone who is not white British should be repatriated to a different country, why he believes that the Holocaust did not happen, and so forth. Clearly, if he made those remarks outside a university setting, in a discussion that was not about an academic or scientific matter in a higher education setting, he could be prosecuted for that, as he has been repeatedly.

The amendment would allow a loophole for Nazis, fascists and people who hold absolutely objectionable views. As we have heard, those people have, in the public interest, always had their right to absolute freedom of speech, qualified by that public interest, libel laws, the Equality Act 2010 and so on. The unintended consequence would be to drive a wedge

in the Equality Act. Our university campuses would become less safe spaces than the street outside them, where those rules would still be in place. ...

**col 168 Michelle Donelan:** ... Amendment 71 seeks to override the law on harassment so that higher education providers would be required to take reasonably practicable steps to secure freedom of speech in scientific or academic discussions, even where that would constitute harassment under the Equality Act 2010. ... To uphold freedom of speech in higher education, students, staff and members must be able to express their ideas within the law that may be controversial, unpalatable or even deeply offensive. ...

**To read the full transcript see**

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/1bb5d9f7-0f46-4c48-bfb9-a2de4d22c62d/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(FifthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/1bb5d9f7-0f46-4c48-bfb9-a2de4d22c62d/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(FifthSitting))

### **Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill (Sixth sitting)**

*Debate of amendments 26, 27 and 28 in*

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0915.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0915.pdf)

**col 195 Fiona Bruce (Conservative):** ... Without another look at the words “field of expertise”, academics could find themselves with fewer free speech rights than those in other vocations, since straying outside of their perceived field of expertise might lead to more complaints, increased disciplinary action and dismissal...

A requirement to stay within one’s field of expertise could have an unintended chilling effect ...

It cannot be right to penalise an academic simply because he opines on the issues of the day. The issues may be completely outside his field of expertise, and he may speak from a political perspective or with faith-based views, such as on marriage or being pro-life, but is not deliberating on issues of the day a key part of university life? ...

**Charlotte Nichols (Labour):** ... Just because someone is an academic, for example, does not mean that any topic that they choose to wax lyrical about should necessarily be protected, particularly if they are engaging in harmful stereotypes, discriminatory behaviour and so on. ...

**col 200 Minister for Universities (Michelle Donelan):** ... I commit to taking away the topic of field of expertise, which is covered in amendment 28, as well as amendment 80. I will outline the reason why the topic is in the Bill in the first place. Academic staff will have extra protection under the Bill, in addition to the more general protection for freedom of speech. That is the reason that the additional protection only covers speech where an individual has expertise. For example, a maths professor should not have greater protection than a non-academic colleague or a student when they are speaking about matters unrelated to their role as an academic, but in that case the professor would still benefit from the same freedom of speech protections. ...

*Debate of amendments 69, 33, and 34 in*

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0915.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0915.pdf)

**col 206 Charlotte Nichols:** ... The amendment would make it clear and explicit in the Bill that the legal protections afforded to academics for their freedom of speech would not cover denial of the holocaust or other genocides recognised by the UK Government, namely the subsequent genocides in Rwanda, Darfur, Cambodia and Bosnia.

As I have previously explained, I feel that my concern is justified by the Minister’s comments on the radio about how holocaust denial constitutes lawful free speech, however objectionable everyone in this room would find it. There was a swift back-peddalling on that, with the newly sacked right hon. Member for South Staffordshire (Gavin Williamson) saying in the Chamber that freedom of speech would not protect holocaust deniers. However, I am not sure that assurances will be enough, and that is why it needs to be explicit.

One of the witnesses who came before the Committee, Professor Goodwin, stated that he would invite a speaker to address his students “from the British National party or the National Front”. ...

Mr Griffin has a degree from the University of Cambridge, so he could potentially argue that he would be covered by academic freedom when promoting his views. Clearly, this is not an extreme hypothetical; this is someone who has been invited to address a number of universities ... Mr Griffin has engaged in holocaust denial on a number of occasions, including at the trial for his 1998 public order offence, where he said: “I am well aware that the orthodox opinion is that six million Jews were gassed and cremated and turned into lampshades. Orthodox opinion also once held that the world is flat.”

Over the course of our debates on the Bill, we have heard a lot about the need to challenge certain orthodoxies: that such debate is healthy in an academic setting and improves academic rigour, allows students to develop their critical thinking and debating skills, and so on. However, there must be a limit. ...

**Emma Hardy (Labour):** ... I refer back to the evidence given to us by Sunder Katwala, who said:

“Most racist and antisemitic speech does not meet the legal threshold of being unlawful. Intimidation and violence are unlawful, and other forms of stirring up are unlawful, but holocaust denial is not unlawful.” ...

*col 207* So having a definition of allowing speech unless it is unlawful is not enough to stop holocaust denialists coming and speaking at universities. ...

**Charlotte Nichols:** ... holocaust denial ... is, in fact, lawful free speech that could be protected under the regulations currently in the Bill, unless we ensure that the limitations of free speech and academic freedom are spelled out explicitly on the face of the Bill. ...

Clearly, other pieces of legislation that are in place—not least libel law, the limits that are set out in the Prevent duties that universities have to abide by, and the limits set out in the Equality Act 2010—must be read alongside the Bill, but none of those is sufficient to prevent holocaust denial. I am particularly keen to expand the definition of holocaust denial to genocide denial. Just as we not only commemorate the Nazi holocaust of Jews, disabled people, Roma and Sinti, LGBT people, trade unionists and other minority groups within Europe on Holocaust Memorial Day every year, we also commemorate the subsequent genocides in Rwanda, Darfur, Cambodia and Bosnia. ...

If there are no limitations on free speech, what message would it send to students from places such as Rwanda, Darfur, Cambodia and Bosnia? What would it say to students from Germany, where they have much more robust laws in place to ensure that holocaust denial and denial of other genocides—which is of course a disgusting desecration of all those who lost their lives and who suffered in those genocides—is not perpetuated within higher education institutions? ...

*col 208* **Matt Western (Labour):** ... The amendment seeks to draw a line under the question, what constitutes reprehensible but lawful speech that is inimical to academic freedom? I cannot see any academic benefit to denying any genocide, and it would do great harm to an academic were such views espoused on campus, as well as to the wider academy, let alone damaging student welfare. ...

**Michelle Donelan:** ... The Government ... are clear that genocide denial, including denial of the holocaust, is abhorrent and morally reprehensible. The new director will produce extensive guidance to assist universities, further to the points made by hon. Members. That guidance will make it clear that the European Court of Human Rights has held that holocaust denial is not protected speech under article 10 of the European convention on human rights. ...

**Emma Hardy:** I refer the Minister to the evidence given by Sunder Katwala: “Comparing the Israeli Government to Nazi Germany, for example, is a lawful position that we wish to stigmatise.” ...

He complimented ... the Government on trying to get universities to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition; likewise, we support that. However, that is still a “lawful position”. What this amendment would do is to make that, even though it is within the law to hold those opinions, we do not want them in our universities. ...

**col 209 Michelle Donelan:** ... Holocaust deniers often have clear links with neo-Nazi extremism, and with antisemitic violence and intimidation. As I said on the Floor of the House, the Government are clear that there is no place in our universities for an extremist view that is a complete work of fiction and one that grotesquely seeks to misrepresent our global history.

Let me once again be clear that nothing in the Bill encourages providers or student unions to invite speakers who have denied or deny genocide. The Bill will not give anyone the right to a platform, and on that I am categorical.

**Charlotte Nichols:** As we have heard about the broad range of individuals and organisations covered by the Bill, any student society that sought to invite a holocaust denier or genocide denier on to campus could technically have protection under the Bill as drafted. For example, if a free speech society wishes to test the absolute limits of what its university would tolerate regarding free speech and decided, as the Oxford Union did, to invite Abu Hamza and Nick Griffin along, I think it would be irresponsible of the university to allow such events to go ahead. There is nothing to say that the university has to invite them, but clearly there is nothing to say that a society or the students union could not invite them, or what would that mean for the university if it chose to intervene accordingly.

**Michelle Donelan:** Two points are being made. One is about the right to a platform, whereby an individual can, in essence, demand to speak at a university. In no way does the Bill give anyone the right to a platform.

The second point that the hon. Member is referring to is if an individual is invited by a society, a union or a university itself. With regard to that, freedom of speech is not an absolute right; it does not include the right to harass others, or incite people to violence or terrorism. The Bill requires reasonably practicable steps to be taken to secure freedom of speech within the law. That is the crucial point. The Bill is not about unlawful speech.

**Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Labour Co-op):** But the Bill does require student unions to allow students to set up societies regardless of their viewpoints; such societies must be able to be registered and cannot be denied. There could be a group of three students—three deluded, holocaust-denying students—and the student union would not be able to deny them an affiliation, according to the Bill, and they would be given a right to speak in the student union. ... If there is not a protection here in the Bill, can the Minister give assurances that no group of three students can take a student union to court for tort, for being denied a room to preach genocide denial?

**col 210 Michelle Donelan:** ... universities and student unions will only have to take reasonably practicable steps to ensure that freedom of speech exists. University student unions or other bodies will also have to balance that with the Equality Act, with the public sector equality duty and with the Prevent duty, and also criminal law may apply. This is about balancing competing duties, not about giving primacy to freedom of speech ...

**To read the full transcript see**

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/b9b6b41e-8c05-4ac7-b0f8-7b0073a5f4ca/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(SixthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/b9b6b41e-8c05-4ac7-b0f8-7b0073a5f4ca/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(SixthSitting))

### **Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill (Eighth sitting)**

*Debate of amendment 83 in*

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0916.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0916.pdf)

**col 248 Emma Hardy (Labour):** ... We have said many times that we all support free speech; we all accept that people have different views and that those views can be heard

in different places. The amendments seek to address the issue of premises, and I would summarise them as being about respect. While we can hold a different view, sometimes we need to think very carefully about the place in which we choose to express it. ...

I will quote directly from the [Free Churches Group of England and Wales] evidence:

“One problem is that it is not clear which groups might claim use of premises under what circumstances under this clause. Even the Government is unclear whether it will mean universities are required to provide premises for holocaust deniers. What seems equally unclear is whether the clause means that groups opposed to views or activities a space is designated for will be allowed to enter that space to express their views. Arguably not to allow such access would be to deny those wishing entry use of premises, and freedom to speak there, on the basis of their views, beliefs etc. Thus the Bill may be taken to provide for a group opposed to religion to enter an Islamic prayer room to exercise their freedom to speak their views on religion, or, indeed to enter a room booked by, say, a Christian Union or a Jewish Society for similar reasons. Does the Bill provide for holocaust deniers to have entry to a room booked by the Jewish society, or can holocaust deniers be denied entry on the basis of their beliefs?” ...

col 249 [it] does not say that people should not be allowed to express such opinions or to be given space to express them, but it does say that thought needs to be given to the need for respect for the place in which those opinions are expressed. ...

**Lloyd Russell-Moyle (Labour Co-op):** ... We need to be clear—perhaps the Minister can come back and clarify this on the record, which would help—that when we say “any premises”, we do not mean that the students’ union cannot decide which rooms are used. It is not that someone has the right to say, “I want to meet in the Christian prayer room,” or, “I want to meet in the Muslim prayer room to talk about things that would be inappropriate for those spaces.” Students’ unions must have the right to say, “Yes, we give you a free speech platform, but we decide where within our premises we do that.” Or sometimes they might say, “Not those premises, but we have other premises down the road that you can meet in.” The phrase “any premises” gives that indication. Often, chaplaincies use university premises.

col 250 **John McDonnell (Labour):** ... there are schisms within individual organisations. Anyone who has had any dealings in recent years with the gurdwaras in this country knows that we have had real issues, as we have had in the Christian religion. There have been disputes, debates and so on within different groups in a particular religion, some denying premises to individual groups and that becoming a matter of contest. We are treading into some extremely dangerous territory, if we are not careful. We could be dragged into disputes that result, eventually, in claims in court. ...

col 251 **Matt Western (Labour):** ... When we start to delve into this, it is interesting just how far-reaching the unintended consequences become. As has been examined, that is not just between external groups or about mischiefousness between one group and another—whether religious or whatever—but about infiltration of groups ... Factions within different societies or groups might have challenges or issues of power, leading to problems on campus. Many will have views that are sacrosanct, for example, on the denial of the holocaust, and we have to respect that some places on campus should also be sacrosanct. ...

Whether it is, for example, an Islamic or Christian prayer room, or a space for the Jewish Society, we have to be very careful about the implications. ...

col 252 **John McDonnell:** The word “any” is key. To give one other concrete example, I have a large Muslim community in my constituency and an Ahmadiyya Muslim community. The majority Muslim community do not recognise Ahmadiyyas as Muslims. The word “any” means that we could have a situation where one group is insisting on using a particular room, invited by an individual, which then offends others. There is then a situation of conflict and even litigation. The word “any” has to come out. ...

**Minister for Universities (Michelle Donelan):** ... A key part of the Bill is the emphasis on “reasonably practicable” steps. ... if a range of rooms was available and some rooms were not suitable, for example because of religious beliefs, it would be “reasonably practicable” not to choose certain rooms. However, I have heard the concerns raised in the debate and the evidence that has been provided, so I will commit to take this important point away. ...

**Fiona Bruce (Conservative):** ... Could [the Minister] reflect on whether the code of practice is a vehicle that could be used to respect freedom of religion or belief in this context?

**Michelle Donelan:** An important aspect of the Bill is that it does not place freedom of speech above other duties, such as freedom of religion. It is down to the university or students’ union to balance those competing duties and make a reasonable assessment. We think that freedom of speech duties should apply to the terms of use of premises. It would not be right if a students’ union decided, for example, to charge one group more for room hire than another group. In any event, proposed new section A4(3) is clear that the freedom of speech duties include the stated provision on premises, so the exact wording of the amendment would not be likely to have any effect in practice. However, I am happy to reconsider how we could make it clearer in the Bill. ...

**To read the full transcript see**

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/3187a628-8c2b-452b-b8fe-bad93b7cf6b5/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(EighthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/3187a628-8c2b-452b-b8fe-bad93b7cf6b5/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(EighthSitting))

## House of Commons Written Answer

### Slaughterhouses

**Chris Loder (Conservative) [44450]** To ask the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, if he will release the method of slaughter statistics for (a) 2019, (b) 2020 and (c) 2021.

**Victoria Prentis:** The last method of slaughter survey was undertaken by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) in 2018 and the results were published in February 2019 [Farm animals: survey of slaughter methods 2018](#).

The survey is not conducted annually and we are planning for it to be carried out again by the FSA in early 2022.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2021-09-07/44450>

## Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

**Dominic Raab** On #YomKippur, I stand with Jewish communities everywhere marking this holy day. The UK is a champion of freedom of religion all over the globe.

<https://twitter.com/DominicRaab/status/1438056541190598659>

TOP

## Israel

### House of Commons Written Answers

#### Data Protection: EU Law

**Emily Thornberry (Labour) [44268]** To ask the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, what assessment he has made of the potential effect of plans announced

on 26 August 2021 to change the UK's data regime on the continuation of the UK's EU data adequacy status.

**John Whittingdale:** The UK regained autonomy over its domestic data protection laws on 1st January 2021. Exact alignment to EU law is not a requirement for EU data adequacy. Indeed, the thirteen EU 'adequate' countries, from Israel to New Zealand, each have data protection laws that are different to the EU's.

The UK can reshape its approach to regulation and seize opportunities with its new regulatory freedoms, helping to drive growth, innovation and competition across the country. The first step in delivering on that objective is the consultation that was announced on 26 August, which went live on 10 September.

In doing so, the UK intends to maintain its high standards of data protection and ensure that the UK data regime continues to be based on public trust in the responsible use of data. We will continue to engage with EU counterparts, as appropriate, on these issues.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2021-09-07/44268>

*The announcement referred to above can be read at*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-unveils-post-brex-it-global-data-plans-to-boost-growth-increase-trade-and-improve-healthcare>

### Israel: Palestinians

**Rosie Cooper (Labour) [45085]** To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, if his Department will conduct further research using programme budgets and evaluations as recommended by DME for Peace's report entitled, Research Study for the Department for International Development, Value for Money Investment in People to People Programming in Israel and Palestine, published in March 2021.

**James Cleverly:** We are taking forward relevant recommendations in the research study undertaken by the Department for International Development "Value for Money Investment in People to People Programming in Israel and Palestine". We firmly believe a just and lasting resolution that ends the occupation and delivers peace for both Israelis and Palestinians is long overdue. That is why we support steps to increase understanding and dialogue between the parties that can help create the conditions for meaningful negotiations. We will continue to fund peacebuilding projects focused on Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and have increased our focus on monitoring and evaluation within these projects.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2021-09-08/45085>

*The report referred to above can be read at*

<https://www.dmeformpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Jerusalem-PPC-Report-FINAL-1.pdf>

## Department for International Trade

### Updated Trade and Investment Factsheet: Israel

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1017601/israel-trade-and-investment-factsheet-2021-09-17.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1017601/israel-trade-and-investment-factsheet-2021-09-17.pdf)

### Updated Trade and Investment Factsheet: Occupied Palestinian Territories

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1017658/occupied-palestinian-territories-trade-and-investment-factsheet-2021-09-17.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1017658/occupied-palestinian-territories-trade-and-investment-factsheet-2021-09-17.pdf)

## Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

**Dominic Raab** I welcome @yairlapid's speech proposing positive policy suggestions to support economic development in #Gaza and greater security for Israel. A long-term solution for Gaza is needed to prevent further conflict and make progress towards a two-state solution.

<https://twitter.com/DominicRaab/status/1437861118618345472>

**James Cleverly** Great to join @liamfox for the anniversary celebration of the Abraham Accords and the creation of the UK Abraham Accords Group yesterday with guests @AnwarGargash @MansoorAbulhoul @TzipiHotovely @BahrainEmbUK and many others.

<https://twitter.com/JamesCleverly/status/1438063136427417605>

TOP

## Relevant Legislation \*\* new or updated today

### UK Parliament

#### **Assisted Dying Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2875>

#### **Charities Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2877>

#### **Education (16 to 19 Academies) (Religious Character) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2946>

#### **Education (Assemblies) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2878>

#### **\*\* Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2862>

Notice of amendments

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0915.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0915.pdf)

and

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd\\_day\\_pbc\\_0916.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/HigherEd_day_pbc_0916.pdf)

and

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/highered\\_rm\\_pbc\\_0917.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-02/0012/amend/highered_rm_pbc_0917.pdf)

Public Bill Committee

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/1bb5d9f7-0f46-4c48-bfb9-a2de4d22c62d/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(FifthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/1bb5d9f7-0f46-4c48-bfb9-a2de4d22c62d/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(FifthSitting))

and

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/b9b6b41e-8c05-4ac7-b0f8-7b0073a5f4ca/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(SixthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-15/debates/b9b6b41e-8c05-4ac7-b0f8-7b0073a5f4ca/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(SixthSitting))

and

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/ceefa3d9-8a27-4cc6-8090-f2330c230415/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(SeventhSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/ceefa3d9-8a27-4cc6-8090-f2330c230415/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(SeventhSitting))

and

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/3187a628-8c2b-452b-b8fe-bad93b7cf6b5/HigherEducation\(FreedomOfSpeech\)Bill\(EighthSitting\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-09-16/debates/3187a628-8c2b-452b-b8fe-bad93b7cf6b5/HigherEducation(FreedomOfSpeech)Bill(EighthSitting))

### **Israel Arms Trade (Prohibition) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3025>

### **Marriage Act 1949 (Amendment) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3017>

### **Marriage and Civil Partnership (Minimum Age) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2900>

### **\*\* Nationality and Borders Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3023>

Equality Impact Assessment

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-nationality-and-borders-bill-equality-impact-assessment/the-nationality-and-borders-bill-equality-impact-assessment-accessible-version>

### **Online Safety Bill (Draft)**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-online-safety-bill>

### **Palestine Statehood (Recognition) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2942>

## **Northern Ireland Assembly**

### **\*\* Organ and Tissue Donation (Deemed Consent) Bill**

<http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/assembly-business/legislation/2017-2022-mandate/primary-legislation---bills-2017---2022-mandate/organ-and-tissue-donation-deemed-consent-bill/>

Summary of responses and Department of Health response to the public consultation

<https://www.health-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/health/doh-response-and-analysis-to-the-organ-donation-soft-opt-out-consultation.pdf>

TOP

## **Consultations**

\*\* new or updated today

**\*\* closes in 6 days**

**Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill** (closing date not stated, but no later than 23 September 2021)

<https://www.parliament.uk/business/news/2021/july/have-your-say-on-the-higher-education-freedom-of-speech-bill/>

**Dispute Resolution in England and Wales** (closing date 30 September 2021)

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1008174/dispute-resolution-call-for-evidence.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1008174/dispute-resolution-call-for-evidence.pdf)

**Equality and Human Rights Commission Strategic Plan for 2022 to 2025** (closing date 30 September 2021)  
<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/our-strategic-plan-2022-2025-have-your-say>

**The Scottish Government's international work** (closing date 29 October 2021)  
<https://yourviews.parliament.scot/cteea/international-engagement-external-affairs/>

**Labelling for Animal Welfare** (closing date 6 December 2021)  
<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/animal-welfare-market-interventions-and-labelling/labelling-for-animal-welfare/>

**TOP**

The Scottish Council of Jewish Communities (SCoJeC) is Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation SC029438