



# Political Affairs Digest

A daily summary of political events affecting the Jewish Community

## Contents

Home Affairs

Israel

Relevant Legislation

Consultations

Back issues

## Home Affairs

### House of Commons Debate

#### Online Safety Bill, Report Stage

**col 161 Damian Collins [Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport]:** ...The structure of the Bill is very simple. There is a legal priority of harms, and things that are illegal offline will be regulated online at the level of the criminal threshold. There are protections for freedom of speech and there is proper transparency about harmful content ...

**Joanna Cherry (SNP):** ...Does the Minister agree that, in moderating content, category 1 service providers such as Twitter should be bound by the duties under our domestic law not to discriminate against anyone on the grounds of a protected characteristic? ...

**Damian Collins:** ...The legislation sets regulatory thresholds at the criminal law level based on existing offences in law. Many of the points she made are covered by existing public law offences, particularly in regards to discriminating against people based on their protected characteristics. As she well knows, the internet is a reserved matter, so the legal threshold is set at where UK law stands, but where law may differ in Scotland, the police authorities in Scotland can still take action against individuals in breach of the law. ...

**Joanna Cherry:** The difficulty is that Twitter claims it is not covered by the Equality Act 2010. I have seen legal correspondence to that effect. I am not talking about the criminal law here. I am talking about Twitter's duty not to discriminate against women, for example, or those who hold gender critical beliefs in its moderation of content. ...

**Damian Collins:** ... There are priority offences where the companies, regardless of their terms of service, have to meet their obligations. If something is illegal offline, it is illegal online as well. ... There are also non-priority areas where the company should take action against anything that is an offence in law and meets the criminal threshold online. ... They also have to be transparent ... If they have clear policies against discrimination, which they on the whole all do, they will have to set out what they would do, and the regulator can hold them to account to make sure they do what they say. The regulator cannot make them take down speech that is legal or below a criminal threshold, but they can hold them to account publicly for the decisions they make. ...

*col 162* We recognise that there are cases where platforms must be able to remove content without having to provide an appeal, and the new clause has been drafted to ensure that platforms will not be required to provide an appeal before removing content that would give rise to civil or criminal liability to the service itself, or where it amounts to a relevant offence as defined by the Bill. This means that platforms can take down without an appeal content that would count as illegal content under the Bill. ...

*col 164* The question is: what is to be done about other content that may be harmful but sits below the threshold? The Government have made it clear that we intend to bring forward amendments that set out clear priorities for companies on the reporting of such harmful content, where we expect the companies to set out what their policies are. ...

*col 165* There is no requirement for platforms to take down legal speech, and they cannot be directed to do so. What we have is a transparency requirement to set out their policies, with particular regard to some of the offences I mentioned earlier, and a wide schedule of things that are offences in law that are enforced through the Bill itself. This is a very important distinction to make. I said to him on Second Reading that I thought the general term “legal but harmful” had added a lot of confusion to the way the Bill was perceived, because it created the impression that the removal of legal speech could be required by order of the regulator, and that is not the case. ...

*col 168* **Alex Davies-Jones (Labour):** ... we believe that the Government have made a fundamental mistake in their approach to categorisation, which undermines the very structure of the Bill. We are not alone in this view and have the backing of many advocacy and campaign groups including the Carnegie UK Trust, Hope Not Hate and the Antisemitism Policy Trust. Categorisation of services based on size rather than risk of harm will mean that the Bill will fail to address some of the most extreme harms on the internet. We all know that smaller platforms such as 4chan and BitChute have significant numbers of users who are highly motivated to promote very dangerous content. Their aim is to promote radicalisation and to spread hate and harm. ...

**Damian Collins:** ... I personally agree that the question of categorisation needs to be looked at again, and the Government have agreed to do so. ...

**Alex Davies-Jones:** ... companies will be expected to determine whether content is illegal or fraudulently based on information that is “reasonably available to a provider”, with reasonableness determined in part by the size and capacity of the provider. That entrenches the problems I have outlined with smaller, high-risk companies being subject to fewer duties despite the acute risks they pose. ...

*col 169* The second problem arises from the fact that the platforms will need to have “reasonable grounds to infer that all elements necessary for the commission of the offence, including mental elements, are present or satisfied”.

That significantly raises the threshold at which companies are likely to determine that content is illegal. In practice, companies have routinely failed to remove content where there is clear evidence of illegal intent. ... Charities believe it is inevitable that companies will look to use this clause to minimise their regulatory obligations to act. ...

*col 172* In Committee, we heard multiple examples of racist, extremist and other harmful publishers, from holocaust deniers to white supremacists, who would stand to benefit from the recognised news publisher exemption as it stands, either overnight or by making minor administrative changes. As long as the exemption protects antisemites and extremists, it is not fit for purpose. ...

**Andrew Percy (Conservative):** While the shadow Minister is on the subject of exemptions for antisemites, will she say where the Opposition are on the issue of search? Search platforms and search engines provide some of the most appalling racist, Islamophobic and antisemitic content.

**Alex Davies-Jones:** I thank the hon. Gentleman, who is absolutely right. In Committee, we debated at length the impact search engines have, and they should be included in the

Bill's categorisation of difficult issues. In one recent example on a search engine, the imagery that comes up when we search for desk ornaments is utterly appalling and needs to be challenged and changed. If we are to truly tackle antisemitism, racism and extremist content online, then the provisions need to be included in the Bill, and journalistic exemptions should not apply to this type of content. Often, they operate more discretely and are less likely to attract sanctions. Furthermore, any amendment will provide no answer to the many extremist publishers who seek to exploit the terms of the exemption. For those reasons, we need to go further. ...

As a priority, we need to ensure that the exemption cannot be exploited by bad actors. We must not give a free pass to those propagating racist, misogynistic or antisemitic harm and abuse. ...

*col 176 David Davis (Conservative):* ... A further concern is that the large service providers already have terms and conditions that address so-called legal but harmful content. A duty to state those clearly and enforce them consistently risks legitimising and strengthening the application of those terms and conditions, possibly through automated scanning and removal. ... We have to bear in mind how cautious the companies will be. That is especially worrying because, as I said, providers will be under significant pressure from outside organisations to include restrictive terms and conditions ...

*col 181 Chris Philp (Conservative):* ... It has been widely misrepresented that the Bill mandates censorship of speech that is legal but harmful. ... that is categorically untrue. While the large social media platforms will have to address such content as part of their terms and conditions, they are not compelled in the actions that they have to take in relation to it; they simply have to risk-assess it, adopt a policy—what that policy is will be up to them—and then apply that policy consistently. They are not obliged to take any action, and they are certainly not obliged to remove the content entirely. ...

*col 186 Margaret Hodge (Labour):* ... freedom of speech does not mean freedom from consequences. The police and other enforcement agencies can pursue unlawful abuse, assuming they have the resources ... I know the platforms have committed to providing the finance for such resources, but I still question whether the resources are there.

*col 187* The problem with the Bill and the Government amendments ... is that they weaken the platforms' duty on legal but harmful abuse. Such abuse is mainly anonymous and the abusers are clever. They do not break the law; they avoid the law with the language they use. It might be best if I give an example. People do not say, in an antisemitic way, "I am going to kill all Jews." We will not necessarily find that online, but we might find, "I am going to harm all globalists." That is legal but harmful and has the same intent. ...

I received 90,000 posts in the two months from the publication of the Equality and Human Rights Commission report to the shenanigans about the position of the previous leader of the Labour party ... The posts were monitored for me by the Community Security Trust. When I asked how many of the posts were anonymous, I was told that it had been unable to do that analysis. I wish there were the resources to do so, but I think most of the posts were anonymous and abusive.

There is certainly public support for trying to tackle abusive posts. A June 2021 YouGov poll found that 78% of the public are in favour of revealing the identity of those who post online, and we should bear that in mind. If people feel strongly about this, and the poll suggests that they do, we should respond and not put it to one side. ...

... the police have been very clear on how I should deal with anonymous online abuse. They say that the last thing I should do is remove it, as they need it to be able to judge whether there is a real threat within the abuse that they should take seriously. So individuals having that right does not diminish the real harm they could face if the online abuse is removed. ...

*col 197 Joanna Cherry:* ... under the Equality Act there are a number of protected characteristics. These include: age; gender reassignment; being married or in a civil

partnership; being pregnant or on maternity leave; disability; race, including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin; religion or belief; sex and sexual orientation. It is against the law to discriminate, victimise or harass anyone because of any of those protected characteristics, but Twitter does discriminate against some of the protected characteristics. It often discriminates against women ... It takes down expressions of feminist belief, but refuses to take down expressions of the utmost violent intent against women. It also discriminates against women who hold gender-critical beliefs. ...

*col 198* At present, Twitter claims not to be covered by the Equality Act. I have seen correspondence from its lawyers that sets out the purported basis for that claim, partly under reference to schedule 25 to the Equality Act, and partly because it says: "Twitter UK is included in an Irish Company and is incorporated in the Republic of Ireland. It does pursue economic activity through a fixed establishment in the UK but that relates to income through sales and marketing with the main activity being routed through Ireland."

I very much doubt whether that would stand up in court, since Twitter is clearly providing a service in the United Kingdom, but it would be good if we took the opportunity of this Bill to clarify that the Equality Act applies to Twitter, so that when it applies moderation of content under the Bill, it will not discriminate against any of the protected characteristics. ... The Bill squarely recognises that Twitter provides a service in the United Kingdom to UK users, so it is only a very small step to amend the Bill to make it absolutely clear that when it does so it should be subject to the Equality Act. ...

*col 207* **Andrew Percy:** ... last week we were—like many people in this place, perhaps—sent the most remarkable online prompt, which was to simply search Google for the words "desk ornament". The top images displayed in response to that very mundane and boring search were of swastikas, SS bolts and other Nazi memorabilia presented as desk ornaments. Despite there having been awareness of that fact since, I believe, the previous weekend, and even though Google is making millions of pounds in seconds from advertising, images promoting Nazism were still available for all to see as a result of those searches.

When he gave evidence to the Bill Committee recently, Danny Stone, the Antisemitism Policy Trust's very capable chief executive, pointed out that Amazon's Alexa had used just one comment posted by one individual on Amazon's website to inform potentially millions of users who cared to ask that George Soros was responsible for all of the world's evils, and that Alexa had used a comment from another website to inform those who searched for it that the humanitarian group the White Helmets was an illicit operation founded by a British spy. ...

*col 208* The Antisemitism Policy Trust has previously demonstrated that Microsoft Bing, the platform that lies behind Alexa, was directing users to hateful searches such as "Jews are bastards" through autocompletes, as well as pointing people to homophobic stories. We even had the sickening situation of Google's image carousel highlighting Jewish baby strollers in response to people searching for portable barbecues.

Our own Alexa searches highlighted the issue some time ago. Users who asked Alexa "Do Jews control the media?" were responded to with a quote from a website called Jew Watch—that should tell Members all they need to know about the nature of the platform—saying that Jews control not only the media, but the financial system too. The same problem manifests itself across search platforms in other languages, as we highlighted not so long ago with Siri in Spanish. When asked, "Do the Jews control the media?" she responds with an article that states that Jews do indeed control international media. This goes on and on, irrespective of whether the search is voice or text-based.

The largest search companies in the world are falling at the first hurdle when it comes to risk assessing for harms on their platform. That is the key point when we ask for lawful but harmful content to be responded to. It is about risk assessment—requiring companies that do not respect borders, operate globally and are in many ways more powerful than Governments to risk assess and warn about lawful but deeply harmful content ...

At present, large traditional search services including Google and Microsoft Bing, and voice search assistants including Alexa and Siri, will be exempted from having to risk assess their systems and address harm to adults, despite the fact that other large user-to-user services will have to do so. ...

**col 214 Kim Leadbeater (Labour):** ... there are hundreds if not thousands of so-called news publishers across the internet that pose a serious threat, from the far right and also from Islamist, antisemitic and dangerous conspiratorial extremism. We must act to ensure that journalistic protections are not abused by those wishing to spread harm. Let us be clear that this is as much about protecting journalism as it is about protecting users from harm. ...

**To read the full transcript see**

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2022-07-12/debates/942C54C4-D672-492E-BAD9-195E3BB63724/OnlineSafetyBill>

## House of Lords Debate

### Schools Bill, Report Stage

**col 1372 Lord Baker of Dorking (Conservative):** ... We are going to be asked to pass this Bill to Third Reading but this House has never been asked in the past to pass a Bill the guts of which have taken out. We have no idea what is going to be placed into the Bill later in the House of Commons. This has simply not happened in our history and it is not the right way to behave. I believe therefore that we should consider not giving this Bill a Third Reading ...

**col 1373 Lord Wei (Conservative):** ... I support ... not giving the Bill a Third Reading. ...

**Lord Addington (Liberal Democrat):** ... I have never seen another Bill that has got itself into this big a mess. I am not the longest-serving person here, but I am the longest-serving on my Benches. ...

**col 1374 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Education (Baroness Barran):** ... I feel very concerned at the tone of some of your Lordships' remarks about the rest of the Bill, which brings in very important measures in relation to children not in school and illegal schools. I remind your Lordships that those parts of the Bill have been extensively consulted on. ...

*[proposal not to proceed to Report and Third Reading withdrawn]*

**col 1375 Baroness Barran:** I have taken on board the concerns raised by your Lordships and the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform and Constitution Committees about Clauses 1 to 18, which is why the Government will be supporting amendments at this stage to remove them from the Bill. We will use the regulation and commissioning review to work closely with the sector to develop revised clauses to address the concerns raised and will bring them back in the other place. ...

**col 1410 Moved by Baroness Penn (Conservative):** 26: Clause 20, page 14, line 32, leave out from beginning to "provision" in line 33 and insert—

"(A1) The Secretary of State must make regulations in relation to Academy schools with a religious character for one or both of the following purposes—(a) securing, so far as practicable, that the character of each such Academy school in a relevant Academy proprietor's care reflects the tenets of its designated religion or religious denomination;(b) securing, so far as practicable, that each such Academy school in a relevant Academy proprietor's care is conducted in accordance with any trust deed relating to the school.(1) The regulations must specify—"Member's explanatory statement

This amendment would change the power in clause 20 to make regulations about the governance of schools with a religious character into a duty to do so. It also makes it clear that the regulations may be for either or both of the purposes mentioned.

My Lords, the amendments in this group primarily relate to schools with a religious character, along with an amendment regarding religion and worldview education for academy schools without a religious character. ...

*col 1411* The Government heard the concerns raised about the contrast between the requirement to make regulations in Clause 19 and the power to make regulations in Clause 20. Amendment 26 would create a legal requirement on the Secretary of State to make regulations under Clause 20 ... In making regulations under this power, the Government will also hold a consultation with religious bodies, and other interested parties, to inform the content of the final regulations. I hope that these amendments provide reassurance ...that the governance of all schools with a religious character will be appropriately safeguarded. ...

Amendment 39 ... gives a power for key bodies involved in the governance of maintained schools with a religious character, such as dioceses and other religious bodies, to apply for an academy order for some or all of their maintained schools. ...

We are extending the power to apply for an academy order further than just the “appropriate religious body”. This is because, in a limited number of schools, the key body who is best placed to apply for an academy order on behalf of several schools with a religious character may not be the appropriate religious body. Instead, it is either the trustees of the school or the persons who appoint foundation governors. By ensuring that these three categories of body can apply for an academy order for their schools with a religious designation, we ensure that the power works for all faiths and all schools with a religious character. ...

*col 1412* Amendment 35 adds the “appropriate religious body” to the list of bodies or persons that must consent to a local authority’s application for an academy order for a maintained school in its area that is designated with a religious character. The amendment requires a local authority that is intending to apply for an academy order for a maintained school with a religious character to obtain the consent of the appropriate religious body before submitting an application relating to that school to the Secretary of State. ...

**Baroness Meacher (Crossbench):** ... The aim of ... amendment [30] is to make it explicit that religious education in schools which are not faith schools or academies must be inclusive. That is to say RE must include worldviews, including a number of different religions and non-religious values. Just because one does not believe in a metaphysical god, it is absolutely vital that we do not then lose Christian values. ...

The amendment is in line with the recommendations of the 2018 report of the Commission on Religious Education, convened by the Religious Education Council for England and Wales. ...

I emphasise that this amendment makes no attempt to affect religious teaching in faith schools. ...

*col 1414* **The Lord Bishop of Durham:** ... Some concerns have been raised about the protections and guarantees given to academies with a religious character, and the Church welcomes the clarity and assurance the Government have given about the scope of regulations in this regard. It moves us from a contractual to a statutory footing better to safeguard the distinctive Christian character and ethos of our family of Church schools. ... The Government’s commitment to ensure the transfer of provisions for RE and collective worship currently set out in maintained legislation to the academy sector are to be commended, so I welcome this amendment, which helps to clarify the purposes for which the regulations are made and secures a duty to make those regulations. ...

*col 1415* Amendment 30 ... is an important topic if we are to enable our young people to play an active role in a world where faith and world views are so important. RE must be safeguarded in all our schools. However ... Progress has been made since then within the RE community through the work of the Religious Education Council, which has not yet concluded. We are confident that we are moving towards a consensus about the future of

the RE curriculum in all schools, and I fear that if we do not wait for that consensus, the danger is that we will pursue an amendment that fixes something unhelpful. ... It is very important that the content of the RE curriculum in schools with a non-religious character be given attention, but I think it is better to wait for consensus about that content to be reached before mandating it in this way. ...

*col 1416 Lord Murphy of Torfaen (Labour):* ... [Baroness Meacher] quite rightly referred to the fact that you do not have to be Christian in order to have Christian values and ensure that they form the basis of a moral education for young people. Of course, that is why there are very many faith schools in our country which are attended by people of other faiths and sometimes no faith at all: because they want that sort of moral education. ...

... over the past 30, 40 or 50 years, the teaching of other faiths in religious education has increased—and rightly so. If you live in an area of England that is dominated by people of other faiths, of course you teach those faiths—it is about religion. If you have to teach non-religious things, call it something else—it is not religion. ...

*col 1417 Lord Mann (Non-affiliated):* My Lords, I feel obliged to make a few comments on the question of what is and what is not religious education.

On Amendment 30 and the discussion of other religions, is the teaching of Judaism regarded as religious education or civics? ... A major piece of work is already under way looking at how contemporary Jewish life could, in a very minimal but important way, be put into the curriculum of every school, and how contemporary anti-Semitism could be more than touched on and built into teaching in a timewise, modest way. That could be defined as a discussion of Judaism and classified as religious education.

From my perspective, in a sense, that does not matter. What matters is that somewhere within all secondary schools in the country, pupils get a glimpse of another community and its life, our history with the Jewish community—which has not been the proudest over the past 1,000 years—and some feeling and understanding of what it is like to be Jewish in this country. ...

**Lord Storey (Liberal Democrat):** ... We live in a multicultural, multifaith community, and we make that successful by respecting each and every one of us. ...

I agree with the noble Baroness, Lady Meacher, that you do not have to be a Christian to believe in Christian values, but the values of other faiths are also important. For example, my daughter went to a Jewish school, where she learned many values which were not, initially, her understanding. Because that Jewish school admitted children from different faiths, at 28 she still has lifelong friends from a whole range of different faiths: Muslim, Jewish, Christian and Hindu. ...

I understood that we had SACREs, Standing Advisory Committees on Religious Education; each local authority had to establish a SACRE, which determined the religious syllabus for the schools in its district or city. ... If we agree to this amendment, which I hope we do, how does a SACRE get involved? ...

The right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Durham said that RE must be safeguarded in all our schools, and here is the problem. The problem is not religious education; it is the quality of its teaching. I have been in non-faith schools and been appalled at how religious education is taught. Nobody is qualified—it can be the person who is least qualified who does it and, frankly, it would be better not to do it.

*col 1418 Baroness Penn:* ... The Government believe that ... amendment [30] is unnecessary because it places into primary legislation what is already in academy trusts' funding agreements about teaching religious education. ...

*col 1419* ... this amendment would introduce a new requirement on academies to teach worldviews and dictate the nature of the religious education curriculum. We have been clear that ... the aim ... is for the first set of standards regulations largely to consolidate existing requirements on academies, not place more burdens on them or interfere with their freedoms. ... worldviews can already be taught as part of religious education. ...

I say to the noble Lord, Lord Mann, that, as I said, existing provisions already allow worldviews to be taught as part of religious education. They also allow for other religions to be taught in maintained schools, not just Christian views. There are also other opportunities in the curriculum—for example, through PHSE lessons—for what he is looking for. The Government believe that schools already have flexibility to determine the curriculum that they think appropriate. They also have an explicit flexibility that can include non-religious worldviews as well as religious ones. Therefore, we do not think that there is any need to specify that further in the Bill ...

*Amendment 30 disagreed ...*

**To read the full transcript see**

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/AE96C493-35D3-4E00-871C-73DDD0A90152/SchoolsBill\(HL\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/AE96C493-35D3-4E00-871C-73DDD0A90152/SchoolsBill(HL))

*The amendments referred to above can be read at*

<https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/47302/documents/2139>

## House of Commons Written Answer

### Antisemitism

**Tobias Ellwood (Conservative)** [29932] To ask the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, what steps his Department is taking to help tackle anti-Semitism.

**Paul Scully:** Antisemitism has absolutely no place in our society, which is why we are taking a strong lead in tackling it in all its forms. The UK became the first country to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) Working Definition of Antisemitism and we have encouraged councils and universities to do the same. We have provided funding for innovative projects, such as Holocaust Educational Trust, to reinforce messages of tolerance for our young people and teach them about the dangers of hate. We have provided over £65 million to date for the Protective Security Grant to help secure Jewish schools, colleges, nurseries, and community sites, including synagogues and we are also working to tackle antisemitism online through the Online Safety Bill.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2022-07-04/29932>

TOP

## Israel

### House of Commons Written Answers

#### Israel: Palestinians

**John McDonnell (Labour)** [29858] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what diplomatic steps she is taking to help end the 15-year blockade of Gaza.

**Amanda Milling:** The UK continues to urge both the Israeli Government and the Palestinian Authorities to prioritise progress towards reaching a durable solution for Gaza and to take the necessary practical steps to ensure Gaza's reconstruction and economic recovery. I recently visited Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs) where I saw first-hand the challenges of the prolonged conflict and the impact of the occupation. I reiterated UK support for a two-state solution and the need to improve conditions for ordinary Palestinians in my meetings with

Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Roll, and with the Palestinian leadership, including Prime Minister Shtayyeh.

We remain longstanding supporters of the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) and their work to support Palestinian refugees across the region including Gaza. At the UNRWA pledging conference in New York in June, we announced a new multi-year funding programme with the agency providing £15 million in 2022, which helps UNRWA provide education to over 533,000 children a year (half of them girls), and access to health services for 3.5 million Palestinian refugees.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2022-07-04/29858>

*The following two questions both received the same answer*

#### **Gaza: Development Aid**

**John McDonnell (Labour)** [29857] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what assessment she has made of the implications for her Department's policies of Save the Children's report entitled Trapped: The impact of 15 years of blockade on the mental health of Gaza's children, published on 15 June 2022.

#### **Gaza: Children**

**John McDonnell (Labour)** [29859] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what representations she has made to her Israeli counterpart on protecting children in Gaza.

**Amanda Milling:** We are aware of Save the Children's report into the wellbeing of Gazan children. In 2021, the UK contributed £2 million to UNICEF, which provided child-sensitive grants to vulnerable households in Gaza reaching 4,311 boys and girls. This support met the essential needs of vulnerable children, with the majority of it being spent on food, education, and healthcare. The UK also contributes annually to UNRWA, supporting their Mental Health and Psychosocial Support interventions, especially for children, which included summer school activities targeting 98,595 children in Gaza in 2021.

I recently visited Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs) where I saw first-hand the challenges of the prolonged conflict and the impact of the occupation. I reiterated UK support for a two-state solution and the need to improve conditions for ordinary Palestinians in my meetings with Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Roll, and with the Palestinian leadership, including Prime Minister Shtayyeh.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2022-07-04/29857>

and

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2022-07-04/29859>

*The report referred to above can be read at*

[https://www.savethechildren.nl/sci-nl/media/Save-the-children/PDF/Trapped-June-2022\\_1.pdf](https://www.savethechildren.nl/sci-nl/media/Save-the-children/PDF/Trapped-June-2022_1.pdf)

## **House of Lords Oral Answer**

#### **Cannabis: Medicinal Use**

**Baroness Walmsley (Liberal Democrat):** My Lords, I understand that the MHRA is considering extending its compassionate access scheme, particularly regarding the import of Celixir20 from Israel. A number of children with rare forms of drug-resistant epilepsy rely on this medicine. Given the severity of the crisis of access to NHS prescriptions for medicinal cannabis, can the Minister ensure that there are no barriers to the MHRA acting now to extend this scheme?

**Lord Kamall:** The noble Baroness raises an important point about working with the importer of those medicines. The MHRA is exceptionally continuing to allow those medicines and is hoping to work with the importer and the Israeli company itself to

see whether they will go through the MHRA approval process. In Israel, there are two ways of supplying the product: one is medicinal and the another is for non-medicinal cannabis uses. It has advised us that this is not a licensed medicine in Israel, and therefore we are asking the company to come forward. In the meantime, we are looking at an interim solution.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk//lords/2022-07-12/debates/5AD6EF11-1317-4FE4-A47D-7F8947F5F5CD/CannabisMedicinalUse#contribution-B7F4A1F7-7BC3-4906-9190-451AFE83984A>

TOP

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

### **UK Parliament**

#### **Bill of Rights Bill**

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

#### **Education (Non-religious Philosophical Convictions) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3186>

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

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

#### **\*\* Online Safety Bill**

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

Report Stage, House of Commons

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2022-07-12/debates/942C54C4-D672-492E-BAD9-195E3BB63724/OnlineSafetyBill>

Notice of amendments

[https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-03/0121/amend/onlinesafety\\_rm\\_rep\\_0713.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-03/0121/amend/onlinesafety_rm_rep_0713.pdf)

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

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3217>

#### **Private Burial Grounds and Cemeteries Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3188>

#### **Universal Credit (Removal of Two Child Limit) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3163>

#### **\*\* Schools Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3156>

Report Stage, House of Lords

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/AE96C493-35D3-4E00-871C-73DDD0A90152/SchoolsBill\(HL\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/AE96C493-35D3-4E00-871C-73DDD0A90152/SchoolsBill(HL))

and

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/F2375462-71C0-40E0-8188-896156960DAD/SchoolsBill\(HL\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2022-07-12/debates/F2375462-71C0-40E0-8188-896156960DAD/SchoolsBill(HL))

## Scottish Parliament

### Gender Recognition Reform (Scotland) Bill

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

TOP

## Consultations

\*\* new or updated today

**\*\* closes in 9 days**

**Public Participation at the Scottish Parliament** (closing date 22 July 2022)

<https://yourviews.parliament.scot/cppp/participation-2022/>

**Standards for ethnicity data** (closing date 30 August 2022)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/standards-for-ethnicity-data>

**Equality Evidence Strategy 2023-25** (closing date 23 September 2022)

<https://tinyurl.com/mpunv6cw>

TOP

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