



House of Commons
Work and Pensions Committee

Two-child limit

**Twenty-Third Report of Session
2017–19**

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 9 January 2019*

Work and Pensions Committee

The Work and Pensions Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Work and Pensions and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Frank Field MP](#) (*Independent, Birkenhead*) (Chair)

[Heidi Allen MP](#) (*Conservative, South Cambridgeshire*)

[Jack Brereton MP](#) (*Conservative, Stoke-on-Trent South*)

[Alex Burghart MP](#) (*Conservative, Brentwood and Ongar*)

[Neil Coyle MP](#) (*Labour, Bermondsey and Old Southwark*)

[Rosie Duffield MP](#) (*Labour, Canterbury*)

[Ruth George MP](#) (*Labour, High Peak*)

[Steve McCabe MP](#) (*Labour, Birmingham, Selly Oak*)

[Nigel Mills MP](#) (*Conservative, Amber Valley*)

[Chris Stephens MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Glasgow South West*)

[Derek Thomas MP](#) (*Conservative, St Ives*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

Committee reports are published on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry page](#) of the Committee's website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Anne-Marie Griffiths (Clerk), Stuart Ramsay (Second Clerk), Libby McEnhill (Senior Committee Specialist), Kemi Duroshola (Committee Specialist), George Steer (Assistant Policy Analyst), Jessica Bridges Palmer (Senior Media and Policy Officer), Esther Goosey (Senior Committee Assistant), Michelle Garratty (Committee Assistant).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Work and Pensions Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 8976; the Committee's email address is workpencom@parliament.uk.

Contents

The two-child limit	3
Introduction	3
How it works: Child tax credit vs Universal Credit	3
Roll-out	4
Phase one: 6 April 2017 to 31 January 2019	4
Phase two: 1 February 2019 onwards	4
Overview of concerns	5
Child poverty	5
Family life	6
Disproportionate impacts	8
Non-consensual conception	9
Compatibility with equality and human rights obligations	10
A question of fairness?	10
Lack of awareness	10
Retrospective application	11
Conclusions and recommendations	12
Formal minutes	13
Witnesses	14
Published written evidence	15
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	16

The two-child limit

Introduction

1. In the Summer Budget of 2015 the Government announced a package of reforms, which it said would make the tax credits system (and its successor, Universal Credit) “fairer and more affordable”.¹ Among the reforms was the introduction of the two-child limit: from 6 April 2017, support provided to families—whether through tax credits, Housing Benefit or Universal Credit—would be limited to two children. Subsequent children would therefore not be entitled to the “child element”, which is currently £231.67 a month, or £2,780 a year (2018–19 rates).²

2. The Government argued that this policy would put claimants in the same position as working households when considering the financial costs of having another child. Introducing the policy in 2015, it said:

On top of Child Benefit for every child, an out of work family with 5 children can currently claim over £14,000 a year in tax credits alone. The government believes that those in receipt of tax credits should face the same financial choices about having children as those supporting themselves in work.³

The Secretary of State reiterated this argument when giving evidence to the Committee on 19 December.⁴

3. This report on the two-child limit is intentionally short and reveals only the tip of the iceberg. We hope it will bring to attention the serious concerns that have been raised about this policy and focus Ministers’ minds on the injustice of plans to extend the scope of the two-child limit from 1 February 2019.

How it works: Child tax credit vs Universal Credit

4. Universal Credit (UC) is now available everywhere in Great Britain.⁵ But until 1 February 2019, anyone with three or more children cannot start a new UC claim unless:

- a) they have been receiving UC within the previous six months and are reclaiming; or
- b) they are making a new claim as a single person with children within one month of a previous joint claim ending, because they are no longer a member of a couple.⁶

1 HM Treasury, Summer Budget 2015, [HC 264](#), July 2015

2 Gov.uk, [Child tax credit](#) and [Universal Credit](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

3 HM Treasury, [Summer Budget 2015](#), HC 264, July 2015, paras 1.141-1.150

4 Oral evidence taken by the Work and Pensions Committee, [19 December 2018](#), Q20

5 Gov.uk, [Jobcentre areas where you can claim Universal Credit](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

6 Gov.uk, [2 child limit: claiming benefits for more than 2 children](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

Any new claimant with three or more children who does not fall into one of these categories will not be able to start a new UC claim, and will have to claim child tax credits instead. Whether or not the two-child limit applies—either through child tax credits or UC—currently depends on when the children were born.

Roll-out

5. The two-child limit took effect on 6 April 2017 and its roll-out has been divided into two phases: 6 April 2017 to 31 January 2019, and from 1 February 2019 onwards.

Phase one: 6 April 2017 to 31 January 2019

6. Since 6 April 2017, neither new nor existing claimants of child tax credits or UC⁷ have received the child element for a third or subsequent child born on or after 6 April 2017, unless special circumstances apply (see paragraph 9). If, however, all their children were born before 6 April 2017, they continue to be eligible for support.⁸ During the first phase of roll-out, the two-child limit therefore only applies to children born after the policy's introduction.

Phase two: 1 February 2019 onwards

7. 1 February 2019 is significant for two reasons. From this date:
- a) claimants with three or more children will be able to make a new claim for UC; and
 - b) the child element will only be paid for the first and second child regardless of when third or subsequent children are born, even if they were born before the policy's introduction on 6 April 2017.

There will, however, be some protection for people who have previously claimed UC or other benefits, and exceptions will continue to apply where there are special circumstances (as set out in paragraph 9 below).

Transitional protection

8. The child element for third or subsequent children will be protected in UC claims after 1 February 2019 if the child was born before 6 April 2017 and the claimant:
- a) was getting UC on 31 January 2019 and was responsible for the child/children on that day; or
 - b) the claimant started getting UC on or after 1 February but was getting support for the child/children through another benefit, including child tax credits, in an award that ended within the last 6 months.⁹

7 Where new claimants of UC with three or more children meet the circumstances described in paragraph 3

8 Gov.uk, [2 child limit: claiming benefits for more than 2 children](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

9 House of Commons Library, [Two child limit in Universal Credit and child tax credits](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

Anyone else—such as those claiming UC for the first time or claiming UC after more than 6 months since their previous claim ended—will be subject to the two-child limit regardless of when their children were born.

Special circumstances

9. There are some circumstances under which the two-child limit does not apply. These circumstances, known as “exceptions”, are explained on Gov.uk. They are:

- When a third or subsequent child is born as part of a multiple birth.
- When a third or subsequent child is “likely to have been conceived as a result of a non-consensual sexual act (including rape), or at a time when the claimant was subject to ongoing control or coercion by the other biological parent of the child”.
- When a child is adopted.
- When a child is living with family or friends in a non-parental caring arrangement, whether formal, such as through a Guardianship Order, or informal, where “it is likely that the child would otherwise be looked after by a local authority”.
- When a child for whom the claimant is responsible has their own child.¹⁰

Overview of concerns

Child poverty

10. In oral evidence on 12 December, Josephine Tucker, Senior Policy and Research Officer at Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG), said:

You could not design a policy better to increase child poverty than this one.¹¹

Others explained that the two-child limit would both increase and intensify child poverty. For example, Policy in Practice predicted that it would lead to 266,000 additional children living in poverty by the end of this Parliament, representing an increase in child poverty of more than 10%, while 256,000 children already living in poverty would fall further into deprivation.¹²

11. Tom Waters, a Research Economist at the Institute of Fiscal Studies, explained that there were several reasons why the impact would be so significant:

- a large number of families—approximately 700,000—are expected to be affected by the two-child limit in the long run;
- the average loss to families is substantial, at about £3,000 a year or 10% of income;
- larger families already tend to be worse off; and

10 Gov.uk, [2 child limit: claiming benefits for more than 2 children](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

11 Q4

12 Policy in Practice, [The impact of the two-child limit to tax credits](#), April 2017, accessed on 19 December 2018

- every family pushed into, or further into, poverty because of this policy necessarily includes three or more children.¹³

Family life

12. In 2015, a coalition of religious leaders—including the Church of England, Church of Scotland, Methodist, Baptist and United Reform churches, as well as the Board of Deputies of British Jews and others—described the two-child limit as “fundamentally anti-family” owing to its likely impact on abortion rates and family stability.¹⁴ This was reflected in the evidence we heard on 12 December.

13. Josephine Tucker said that CPAG had been contacted by “women in distress” who, owing to the two-child limit, were considering a termination against their instincts or moral beliefs.¹⁵ Zoe Charlesworth, Policy and Product Manager at Policy in Practice, said that “people make very pragmatic choices about the care of their children” and as a result, the two-child limit could have unintended consequences for family composition and stability.¹⁶ For example, a couple might conclude that they are better off splitting up to avoid the two-child limit; or two people, each with their own children, might decide it is not worth forming a new family if it meant they would be subject to the two-child limit.

14. The two-child limit therefore seems to work against the Government’s longstanding commitment to supporting family stability. In 2016, the then Secretary of State, Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith said:

Our family stability review found that family instability is one of the main drivers of poverty, with unstable families more likely to have low incomes. That is why support for families is firmly at the heart of what we are doing in Government.¹⁷

Box 1: Blended families

Child Poverty Action Group give the following example of how the two-child limit applies to blended families:

Sami is a single parent on universal credit, with two children both born before 6 April 2017. From 5 August 2018, she forms a couple with Steve who has one child, Ben, born on 2 May 2017. Their joint couple claim is within six months of Sami’s claim as a single person ending. The two-child limit applies regarding Steve’s child Ben. Ben is the youngest of the children in their new family, and who therefore counts as the third child, and who was born on or after 6 April 2017. A child element will not be included regarding Ben, unless an exception applies.

Source: Child Poverty Action Group, [Ask CPAG Online - how does the two-child limit apply to universal credit?](#), accessed on 20 December 2018

The policy also incentivises family breakdown. Families with 3 children will lose around £3,000 a year through the two-child limit, on top of any other cuts through UC, and those with 4 or more children will lose an average of £7,000 a year. These losses will

13 Q10

14 The Guardian, [UK faith leaders unite to challenge welfare penalties on larger families](#), accessed on 19 December 2018

15 Q26

16 Q26

17 HC Deb, 14 March 2016, [col 637](#)

make it unsustainable for some families to maintain a basic minimum standard of living. Financial hardship and debt are one of the major causes of relationship breakdown, and these losses would cause huge strain on any couple's relationship. Knowing that they would be considerably better off by separating and splitting up siblings or step-siblings will incentivise such separations which can be so damaging to children's wellbeing and long-term achievement.

Box 2: Separating families

Tamsin and Tom have four children, aged 13, 11, 8 and 4. They live in their own home and Tom works for 28 hours a week on the minimum wage.

Living together as a couple their weekly entitlement under tax credits would be Working Tax Credit of £36.85 and Child Tax Credit of £224.48. Total £261.40 per week, £13,593.00 per year.

Under Universal Credit, their entitlement will be £158.20 per week, £8,226.44 a year. That's £103.20 a week less or a loss of £5,366.56 a year.

If Tamsin moves out of the family home into her parents' home with 2 of their children, Tom will still be eligible for UC of £116.42 a week, £6,053.60 a year.

Tamsin will also be eligible for Universal Credit of £190.74 per week or £9,918.48 a year.

If she was in rented accommodation, Tamsin would also be eligible for the housing element of UC.

By separating into two households, Tom and Tamsin would receive at least £15,972.44 a year in UC.

By living as a couple they are entitled to £8,226.44 a year, £7,746.00 less a year, or £148.96 a week less.

This would be exacerbated by the children living with Tom being ineligible for Free School Meals. The 2 children living separately with Tamsin would be eligible for FSM, worth £916.50 a year.

So they are at least £8,662.50 a year better off by separating - £166.58 per week.

These amounts would make a huge difference to their lifestyles and that of their children. By remaining as a couple, they would be living well below the poverty threshold under Universal Credit.

In separate households, with 2 children in each, Tom would no longer be in poverty and Tamsin would be near the poverty line.

It is hard to understand why the Government would want to make it almost impossible for families to get by whilst couples remain together, and give such a large incentive to families to separate.

Disproportionate impacts

15. Sian Hawkins, Head of Campaigns and Public Affairs at Women’s Aid, told us that the “vast majority” of people affected by the two-child limit “will be women and will most likely be single parents”.¹⁸ Furthermore, wider concerns have been raised about the policy’s disproportionate impact on certain communities. CPAG explained that the two-child limit:

undermines the rights of parents who have conscientious or religious objections to birth control or abortion, or for whom larger families are a tenet of faith, with particularly severe implications for certain faith communities.¹⁹

Written evidence from the Church of England highlighted the impact on Muslim and Jewish communities: 60% of Muslim children and 52% of Jewish children live in families with three or more children, compared with 31% of all children living in the UK.²⁰ A group of cross-faith religious leaders argued that the two-child limit presents an “invidious choice between poverty and terminating an unplanned pregnancy”.²¹ This is exacerbated for women in Northern Ireland who “face criminalisation if they do seek a termination”.²² No system of birth control is 100% effective. The most common non-permanent forms of contraception have between 79% and 91% effectiveness for typical use.²³ The policy therefore places great importance on couples’ ability and willingness to consider terminating a pregnancy. The DWP has not provided any assessment of the additional costs to the NHS which might result from an increased number of abortions. Northern Ireland is the region with the highest proportion of families with 2 or more children who would be affected. Of families receiving Child Benefit, or who have received it in the past, 56.8% have 2 or more children. 20% of these families have 3 or more children already.²⁴ Catholic families in Northern Ireland not only have a higher number of children, but are also more likely to be living in deprivation. 69% of the long-term unemployed in Northern Ireland are Catholic, as highlighted by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights.²⁵

16. Ultimately, however, the impact of this policy falls on children, who, as Josephine Tucker explained, are born into larger families by “complete accident of birth” and as a result “are seen less worthy of support than others”.²⁶ She added:

[...] this undermines a very fundamental principle of the social security system that would ensure it is fair. That is about ensuring that entitlement is linked to need and not to some other arbitrary circumstance that the person receiving the support—which is the child—cannot control.²⁷

18 Q29

19 Child Poverty Action Group, [Unhappy birthday! The two-child limit at one year old](#), April 2018, accessed on 19 December 2018

20 Church of England (TCL0001)

21 The Times, [Two-child limit on Universal Credit](#), 6 April 2018, accessed on 19 December 2018

22 Q23

23 NHS, [How effective is contraception at preventing pregnancy?](#)

24 Source: House of Commons Library

25 [Statement on Visit to the United Kingdom, by Professor Philip Alston, United Nations Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights London](#), 16 November 2018, page 22

26 Q17

27 Q17

Non-consensual conception

17. Since the two-child limit was announced, there have been concerns about how the exception for a child born as a result of non-consensual conception would work in practice.²⁸ In particular, there have been concerns about how women would prove to the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP or “the Department”) that their child had been conceived in such circumstances. After consultation, the DWP confirmed that it would use a third-party referral process, so that the evidence provided does not necessarily have to be a police record.²⁹ Sian Hawkins said:

Even though we fundamentally disagree with this policy and how it is working, we feel that the model that is in place is the one that we hope will cause the least distress to women, in that they can tell a Women’s Aid member service and that the Women’s Aid member service can tick a box on a form, fill it in and send it to DWP and, technically, that should be all that is needed.³⁰

18. Nevertheless, she said there were still serious concerns about how the exception works. First, it is only available to women who no longer live with the perpetrator, even though “leaving an abusive relationship is not only the most dangerous time for women [...] but incredibly difficult to do”. Second, it risks revealing that a child has been conceived through non-consensual sex, because it would be clear from a benefit notice that support was being given for more than two children. Since there are so few exceptions to the two child limit, it would not be difficult—including for the child themselves—to work out why an exception had been granted in a particular case. Third, it only applies to children conceived through rape or in an abusive relationship if they are the third or subsequent child; if someone’s first or second child is born under such circumstances, the two-child limit will still apply if they go on to have more children.³¹

19. It should be noted that women’s support groups in Wales and Scotland are boycotting the third party referral system due to their concerns about the whole policy.³² The boycott in Scotland is supported by doctors, nurses, midwives and the Scottish government.³³ A key concern is that no training has been provided to third-party organisations. The suggestion from government Ministers that there is in effect a self-certification process for women seeking an exemption for non-consensual conception is therefore wrong.

28 See for example HC Deb, 9 July 2015, [col 495](#)

29 HM Government, [Consultation response - Exceptions to the limiting of the individual child element of child tax credit and the child element of universal credit to a maximum of two children](#), January 2017

30 Q20

31 Q33

32 See for example Rape Crisis Scotland, [Blog: ‘The Rape Clause’. Yes, it’s as bad as it sounds](#), 6 April 2017; Welsh Women’s Aid, [Welsh Women’s Aid Statement on UK Government’s tax credit ‘rape clause’](#), 6 April 2017

33 See for example: BMA Scotland, [BMA ratifies position on the shameful ‘rape clause’](#), 14 July 2017; [Letter from the Chief Medical Officer, Chief Nursing Officer, and Chief Social Work Adviser, Scottish Government](#), 12 October 2018

Compatibility with equality and human rights obligations

20. We were extremely concerned to hear from Sian Hawkins that “the two-child limit runs counter to several of the Government’s wider responsibilities and international commitments to equality and human rights”.³⁴ She outlined several commitments she believed the two-child limit breached, including:³⁵

- The European Convention of Human Rights
- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
- The United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
- The Council of Europe’s Istanbul Convention³⁶
- The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child³⁷

21. **On their own, any one of the concerns outlined in this report should raise a red flag for the Government. We will return in more detail to these issues through a wider inquiry into the two-child limit. But in the meantime, the Government must consider whether the very serious consequences we have identified are offset by any benefits it believes the two-child limit will deliver.**

A question of fairness?

22. The Government continues to argue that the two-child limit is about fairness, which, after all, was at the heart of its justification for introducing the policy in 2015. It stated then that:

[It] believes that those in receipt of tax credits should face the same financial choices about having children as those supporting themselves in work.³⁸

But witnesses called into question whether the policy was fair. First, Tom Waters questioned why two children had been chosen as the appropriate, or “fair” number of children for families to have. He said “two is one number but you could choose another one”.³⁹

Lack of awareness

23. Second, we heard that people simply did not know about the two-child limit and more information was needed.⁴⁰ Zoe Charlesworth argued, however, that an information

34 Q32

35 Q32

36 The Istanbul Convention is a Council of Europe convention combatting violence against women and domestic violence. The Government signed the convention in 2012 and in 2017 announced that the final steps of its ratification would be included in a Domestic Abuse Bill. At the time of writing, this Bill had not been introduced to Parliament.

37 The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child is an international human rights treaty that grants all children and young people (aged 17 and under) a comprehensive set of rights. The UK signed the convention on 19 April 1990, ratified it on 16 December 1991 and it came into force on 15 January 1992.

38 HM Treasury, Summer Budget 2015, [HC 264](#), July 2015

39 Q2

40 Qq14-16

campaign could not simply target current benefit claimants but must reach all women.⁴¹ She said that each year, 10% of households with three or more children claiming benefits are new to the system.⁴² Josephine Tucker explained:

There will also be families [...] for whom it is retrospective in the sense that they would have made the decision to have children while needing no support from tax credits or the benefit system and, subsequently, become widowed, divorced, lose their job, ill or unwell.⁴³

[...] They go to find support when they need it most and are hit by the two-child limit and then, rather than perhaps having support to get back on their feet, find that suddenly they cannot pay bills. Things can spiral.⁴⁴

Retrospective application

24. Finally, from 1 February 2019, the two-child limit will apply regardless of when children were born, meaning it will affect those who decided to have children long before the policy was implemented. Witnesses argued that widening the scope of the policy in this way conflicts with the Government's stated objective of influencing family-planning decisions.⁴⁵

25. **The Government introduced the two-child limit to make the benefits system fairer. But this fails to recognise the fact that people move in and out of the system. The distinction between benefit claimants and those "supporting themselves in work" is crude and unrealistic—someone supporting themselves in work today might well need help from the benefits system tomorrow. This fundamentally undermines the Government's arguments that the two-child limit is about fairness.**

26. **Furthermore, applying this policy retrospectively to children born before it was even announced, let alone introduced, entirely undermines any notion that the two-child limit is designed to influence decisions. Pressing ahead with the planned changes on 1 February 2019 will demonstrate a complete disregard for people's ability to plan for the two-child limit.**

27. *As previously stated, we will return to the wider issues of the two-child limit in a future inquiry. But the most immediate and obvious injustice is the retrospective application of this policy to children born before it was introduced. We therefore recommend that the Government immediately abandon its plans to apply the two-child limit retrospectively from 1 February 2019.*

41 Q15

42 Q37

43 Q3

44 Q17

45 Q16, see also Child Poverty Action Group, [Unhappy Birthday! The two-child limit at one year old](#), April 2018

Conclusions and recommendations

The two-child limit

1. On their own, any one of the concerns outlined in this report should raise a red flag for the Government. We will return in more detail to these issues through a wider inquiry into the two-child limit. But in the meantime, the Government must consider whether the very serious consequences we have identified are offset by any benefits it believes the two-child limit will deliver. (Paragraph 21)
2. The Government introduced the two-child limit to make the benefits system fairer. But this fails to recognise the fact that people move in and out of the system. The distinction between benefit claimants and those “supporting themselves in work” is crude and unrealistic—someone supporting themselves in work today might well need help from the benefits system tomorrow. This fundamentally undermines the Government’s arguments that the two-child limit is about fairness. (Paragraph 25)
3. Furthermore, applying this policy retrospectively to children born before it was even announced, let alone introduced, entirely undermines any notion that the two-child limit is designed to influence decisions. Pressing ahead with the planned changes on 1 February 2019 will demonstrate a complete disregard for people’s ability to plan for the two-child limit. (Paragraph 26)
4. *As previously stated, we will return to the wider issues of the two-child limit in a future inquiry. But the most immediate and obvious injustice is the retrospective application of this policy to children born before it was introduced. We therefore recommend that the Government immediately abandon its plans to apply the two-child limit retrospectively from 1 February 2019. (Paragraph 27)*

Formal minutes

Wednesday 9 January 2019

Members present:

Rt Hon Frank Field, in the Chair

Heidi Allen Steve McCabe

Ruth George Nigel Mills

Derek Thomas Chris Stephens

Draft report (*Two-child limit*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 27 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Twenty-third Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 9 January at 9.20am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 12 December 2018

Tom Waters, Research Economist, Institute for Fiscal Studies, **Sian Hawkins**, Head of Campaigns and Public Affairs, Women's Aid, **Zoe Charlesworth**, Policy and Product Manager, Policy in Practice, **Josephine Tucker**, Head of Policy and Research, Child Poverty Action Group

[Q1-37](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

TCL numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Church of England ([TCL0001](#))
- 2 Equality and Human Rights Commission ([TCL0002](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Session 2017–19

First Report	Universal Credit: the six week wait	HC 336
Second Report	A framework for modern employment	HC 352
Third Report	Protecting pensions against scams: priorities for the Financial Guidance and Claims Bill	HC 404
Fourth Report	PIP and ESA assessments: claimant experiences	HC 355
Fifth Report	Universal Credit Project Assessment Reviews	HC 740
Sixth Report	British Steel Pension Scheme	HC 828
Seventh Report	PIP and ESA assessments	HC 829
Eighth Report	European Social Fund	HC 848
Ninth Report	Pensions freedoms	HC 917
Tenth Report	Assistive technology	HC 673
Eleventh Report	Universal Credit: supporting self-employment	HC 997
Twelfth Report	Carillion	HC 769
Fourteenth Report	Appointment of Professor Sir Ian Diamond as Chair of the Social Security Advisory Committee	HC 971
Fifteenth Report	The Motability Scheme	HC 847
Sixteenth Report	Collective defined contribution pensions	HC 580
Seventeenth Report	Universal Credit and Domestic abuse	HC 1166
Eighteenth Report	Universal Support	HC 1667
Nineteenth Report	Benefit Sanctions	HC 955
Twentieth Report	Universal Credit: managed migration	HC 1762
Twenty First Report	Universal Credit: support for disabled people	HC 1770
Twenty-Second Report	Universal Credit: Childcare	HC 1771
First Special Report	Child Maintenance Service: Government's Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 354
Second Special Report	Self-employment and the gig economy: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 644

Third Special Report	Disability employment gap: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2016–17	HC 652
Fourth Special Report	Victims of modern slavery: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 672
Fifth Special Report	Employment Opportunities for Young People: Government response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 872
Sixth Special Report	Protecting pensions against scams: priorities for the Financial Guidance and Claims Bill: Government Response to the Committee's Third Report	HC 858
Seventh Special Report	A framework for modern employment: Government response to the Second Report of the Work and Pensions Committee and First Report of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee	HC 966
Eight Special Report	PIP and ESA assessments: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report	HC 986
Ninth Special Report	British Steel Pension Scheme: The Pensions Regulator Response to the Committee's Sixth Report	HC 987
Tenth Special Report	Pension freedoms: Government response to the Committee's Ninth Report	HC 1231
Eleventh Special Report	Carillion: Responses from Interested Parties to the Committee's Twelfth Report	HC 1392
Twelfth Special Report	Universal Credit: supporting self employment: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report	HC 1420
Thirteenth Special Report	Employment Support for Carers: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report	HC 1463
Fourteenth Special Report	Carillion: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report	HC 1456
Fifteenth Special Report	Assistive technology: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report	HC 1538
Sixteenth Special Report	Universal credit and domestic abuse: Government response to the Committee's Seventeenth Report	HC 1611