

HOUSE OF LORDS

Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform
Committee

22nd Report of Session 2015–16

**Access to Medical Treatments
(Innovation) Bill**
**Criminal Cases Review Commission
(Information) Bill**
NHS (Charitable Trusts Etc) Bill
Riot Compensation Bill
Scotland Bill: Government Response

Ordered to be printed 24 February 2016 and published 25 February 2016

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee

The Committee is appointed by the House of Lords each session and has the following terms of reference:

- (i) To report whether the provisions of any bill inappropriately delegate legislative power, or whether they subject the exercise of legislative power to an inappropriate degree of parliamentary scrutiny;
- (ii) To report on documents and draft orders laid before Parliament under or by virtue of:
 - (a) sections 14 and 18 of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006,
 - (b) section 7(2) or section 19 of the Localism Act 2011, or
 - (c) section 5E(2) of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004;

and to perform, in respect of such draft orders, and in respect of subordinate provisions orders made or proposed to be made under the Regulatory Reform Act 2001, the functions performed in respect of other instruments and draft instruments by the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments; and

- (iii) To report on documents and draft orders laid before Parliament under or by virtue of:
 - (a) section 85 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998,
 - (b) section 17 of the Local Government Act 1999,
 - (c) section 9 of the Local Government Act 2000,
 - (d) section 98 of the Local Government Act 2003, or
 - (e) section 102 of the Local Transport Act 2008.

Membership

The members of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee are:

Baroness Drake	Lord Lisvane
Baroness Fookes (<i>Chairman</i>)	Countess of Mar
Lord Flight	Lord Moynihan
Baroness Gould of Potternewton	Lord Thomas of Gresford
Lord Jones	Lord Tyler

Registered Interests

Committee Members' registered interests may be examined in the online Register of Lords' Interests at www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld/ldreg.htm. The Register may also be inspected in the Parliamentary Archives. Interests related to this Report are in the Appendix.

Publications

The Committee's reports are published by the Stationery Office by Order of the House in hard copy and on the internet at www.parliament.uk/hldprcrpublications.

General Information

General information about the House of Lords and its Committees, including guidance to witnesses, details of current inquiries and forthcoming meetings is on the internet at <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/>.

Contacts for the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee

Any query about the Committee or its work should be directed to the Clerk of Delegated Legislation, Legislation Office, House of Lords, London, SW1A 0PW. The telephone number is 020 7219 3103 and the fax number is 020 7219 2571. The Committee's email address is hlddelegatedpowers@parliament.uk.

Historical Note

In February 1992, the Select Committee on the Committee work of the House, under the chairmanship of Earl Jellicoe, noted that "in recent years there has been considerable disquiet over the problem of wide and sometimes ill-defined order-making powers which give Ministers unlimited discretion" (Session 1991–92, HL Paper 35-I, paragraph 133). The Committee recommended the establishment of a delegated powers scrutiny committee which would, it suggested, "be well suited to the revising function of the House". As a result, the Select Committee on the Scrutiny of Delegated Powers was appointed experimentally in the following session. It was established as a sessional committee from the beginning of Session 1994–95. The Committee also has responsibility for scrutinising legislative reform orders under the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 and other acts specified in the Committee's terms of reference.

Twenty Second Report

ACCESS TO MEDICAL TREATMENTS (INNOVATION) BILL

1. This Private Member's Bill makes provision for a database of information about "innovative medical treatments" (defined in clauses 2(2) and 3(2) to (6)) and their results, and about access to that information. It has Government support, and a memorandum by the Department of Health explains its delegated powers.¹ The Bill, sent from the House of Commons, is to have its Second Reading on 26 February.
2. Clause 2(1) enables the Secretary of State, by negative procedure regulations, to confer functions on the Health and Social Care Information Centre ("the HSCIC") in connection with the database. The regulations may include provision about the information to be recorded in the database, about the procedures for recording that information, and about access to that information (subsection (3)).
3. In relation to access, the regulations may include provision requiring or authorising the HSCIC to disclose information to specified persons or for specified purposes, and to impose conditions with which recipients of the information must comply, including conditions restricting the use or further disclosure of the information (subsection (4)).
4. We found the explanations on page 3 of the memorandum to be persuasive as to the reasons for delegating these powers to subordinate legislation, and as to the choice of the negative procedure. However, we noted that clause 2 appears to envisage no provision, either in the Bill itself or in the regulations, for the enforcement of conditions imposed by virtue of subsection (4)(b), and **we draw this matter to the attention of the House so that it may seek an explanation, either from the Member promoting the Bill or from the Minister.**

CRIMINAL CASES REVIEW COMMISSION (INFORMATION) BILL

5. There is nothing in this Bill to which we wish to draw the attention of the House.

NHS (CHARITABLE TRUSTS ETC) BILL

6. There is nothing in this Bill to which we wish to draw the attention of the House.

¹ [http://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/delegated-powers/AccessstoMedicalTreatments\(Innovation\)BillDelPowMemo.pdf](http://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/delegated-powers/AccessstoMedicalTreatments(Innovation)BillDelPowMemo.pdf)

RIOT COMPENSATION BILL

7. This Private Member's Bill is concerned with the payment of compensation for property which is damaged, destroyed or stolen in the course of a riot. It will replace the current system which is set out in the Riot (Damages) Act 1886. It is supported by the Government, and the Home Office has provided a memorandum on the delegated powers.² It will have its Second Reading on 26 February.

Clause 2—Property in respect of which claims may be made

8. Subsections (1) and (2) of clause 2 specify the kinds of property in respect of which a claim may be made. They are buildings, motor vehicles, and property falling within subsection (3). The descriptions of property given in subsection (3) are:
- Property which at the time of the riot was situated within a building, or within the curtilage of a building;
 - Property which at the time of the riot was situated on land being used for the purposes of a business carried on by the claimant.
9. Clause 2(4) contains a regulation-making power which allows the Secretary of State to “amend subsection (3)” and also to “make provision about the meaning of terms used in that subsection”. Although this is a Henry VIII power it is not subject to the affirmative procedure in all cases. Regulations under subsection (4) are only subject to the affirmative procedure where they restrict, or are capable of restricting, the categories of property in respect of which a claim may be made.
10. In our view, there need to be compelling reasons if a Henry VIII power is not to be subject to the affirmative procedure. The Department explains in the memorandum that the negative procedure is considered appropriate where the effect of the regulations is to add to the kinds of property in respect of which compensation may be paid, since it will enhance entitlement to compensation.
11. We are not convinced this reason is sufficient. The delegated power is fundamental to the scope of the Bill since it will affect the kinds of property for which compensation may be claimed. Also, the power is drafted in very broad terms as a power to “amend subsection (3)” generally rather than being limited simply to altering the *categories* of property specified in subsection (3). This means that the power could be used to make an amendment which limits the *circumstances* in which compensation may be claimed for a particular category of property. For example, subsection (3) might be amended so that a claim for compensation could only be made for property which is stolen from the curtilage of a building, if reasonable steps had been taken by the owner to secure the property.
12. We believe this creates a potential loophole. The affirmative procedure only applies where the regulations restrict the *categories* of property for which compensation can be claimed, not where they restrict the *circumstances*. This means that, despite the fact that an amendment restricting the circumstances

2 <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/delegated-powers/RiotCompensationBillDelPowMemo.PDF>

would have the effect of narrowing the entitlement to compensation, it would not require the affirmative procedure.

13. **For these reasons we consider that the Henry VIII power conferred by clause 2(4) should in all cases be subject to the affirmative procedure.**

Clause 3—Regulations governing the making of claims

14. Clause 3(1) requires the Secretary of State to make regulations about the procedure for making compensation claims under clause 1. However, the powers are not limited to making provision about procedural matters:

- Subsection (2)(a) will allow the regulations to determine who is the appropriate person to make a claim where more than one person has an interest in the property. Since clause 8 of the Bill provides for compensation to be paid to the claimant, their effect will be to determine who has the right to be compensated in a case where there is more than one owner.
- Subsection (2)(b) will allow regulations to specify the circumstances in which claims covering multiple items of property must be consolidated into a single claim.

15. As regards subsection (2)(b), the Department acknowledges in paragraph 10 of the memorandum that:

“This is particularly important noting that under clause 8(1) there is a cap on the maximum amount of compensation *per claim*”.

In other words, being able to require consolidation of claims is important because the compensation cap (of £1 million) operates on a *per claim* rather than on a *per item* basis. Therefore, regulations under subsection (2)(b) are liable to have a direct effect on the amount that a person can claim in compensation where, as will no doubt often be the case, multiple items of property belonging to the same person have been damaged, destroyed or stolen in the course of a riot.

16. Regulations under clause 3 are subject to the negative procedure. The Department suggests this level of procedure is appropriate because “the matters provided for under the regulations will be largely technical”. We find this to be a wholly inaccurate description of the powers conferred by subsection (2) which go to the very important and substantive issues of who is entitled to claim compensation in a particular case, and how the cap on compensation specified in clause 8(1) is to operate where a person is claiming compensation in respect of multiple items of property.
17. **In our view, where regulations under clause 3 make provision for either of the matters set out in subsection (2), the regulations should be subject to the affirmative procedure.**

Clause 7(3)—Guidance on assessing the validity of claims

18. Under clause 7, the first stage of a decision on a claim is whether the claim is valid. Subsection (3) enables the Secretary of State to issue guidance to those making decisions about assessing the validity of claims. It is stated that the guidance may in particular deal with the issue of whether or not property was damaged etc. in the course of a riot. Subsection (4) imposes a duty on

decision-makers to “have regard” to any guidance issued under subsection (3) in reaching a decision on the validity of a claim.

19. We were disappointed that the memorandum gave no reasons for the failure to make the guidance subject to Parliamentary scrutiny or even subject to a requirement to be laid before Parliament. As noted in the Committee’s report on the Housing and Planning Bill,³ a person who is required by statute to “have regard” to guidance will normally be expected to follow the guidance, unless in particular circumstances it has cogent reasons for not doing so. Therefore, the guidance is liable to be highly influential on decisions about the validity of claims for compensation, and is likely to play a significant role in the way in which determinations are made about the validity of claims.
20. **We consider that the guidance should be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny, with the negative procedure providing an appropriate level of scrutiny. That could either take the form of a draft negative procedure applied to the guidance itself, or a statutory instrument which brings the guidance into force being subject to the negative procedure.**

Clause 8(9)–Changing the amount of the compensation cap

21. Clause 8(1) requires the decision maker, in respect of a valid claim, to determine the amount of compensation up to a maximum of £1 million *per* claim. Clause 8(9) contains a regulation-making power which allows the Secretary of State to change the amount of the compensation cap. Regulations which have the effect of reducing the cap are subject to the affirmative procedure. In any other case, the regulations are subject to the negative procedure.
22. We accept that the negative procedure is appropriate if the only effect of the regulations is to provide for a general increase in the amount of the compensation cap, in circumstances where the cap is the same for all areas of England and Wales. However, clause 11(4)(b) allows regulations under the Bill to make *different* provision for *different* areas, and this will allow regulations under clause 8(9) to set the cap at a different level for different areas.
23. **It is surprising that the memorandum says nothing about the reasons for including clause 11(4)(b) and how the power is intended to be used. The House may wish to seek an explanation from the Member promoting the Bill or from the Minister about whether it has been included to allow the compensation cap to be set at a different level for different areas. In our view, any exercise of the powers under clause 8(9) which makes different provision for different areas should be subject to the affirmative procedure, even if the regulations do not have the effect of reducing the cap for any particular area.**

Clause 9–Appeals against decisions on compensation claims

24. Clause 9 requires the Secretary of State to make regulations which give a person affected by a decision on a claim a right to request a review of the decision, and a right to appeal against the decision. Regulations under clause 9 are subject to the negative procedure.

³ 20th Report, Session 2015–16, [HL Paper 90](#), para 11, and 21st Report, Session 2015–16, [HL Paper 98](#), para 28.

25. Clause 9 does not include *any* detail about appeals. Nothing is said on the face of the Bill about the grounds on which an appeal may be made, the body or kind of body which is to determine an appeal, or about the powers which the appeal body is to have in determining appeals. All these matters are left to be set out in the regulations.
26. The Department says very little in their memorandum to explain the approach that has been adopted. What they do say we find wholly unconvincing:
- “This provision will be detailed and technical in nature, and the negative procedure would seem to provide an appropriate level of parliamentary scrutiny in respect of the power.”
27. **We do not accept that matters such as the grounds on which an appeal may be made, the body to which an appeal may be made, and the powers which the appeal body is to have, can properly be described as “technical in nature”. They will each have a significant effect on the nature of the appeal rights which are available to a person in circumstances where the claims which may be appealed are liable to concern very large sums of money (potentially up to £1 million), with the possibility of the claimant being an individual house owner etc., with the claim affecting a very substantial part of the person’s assets. In our view, the power conferred by clause 9 is inappropriate in failing to specify these matters on the face of the Bill.**

SCOTLAND BILL: GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

28. We considered this Bill in our 15th Report of this Session.⁴ The Government have now responded by way of a letter from, Lord Dunlop, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland, at the Scotland Office, published at Appendix 1.

4 15th Report, Session 2015–16, [HL Paper 64](#).

APPENDIX 1: SCOTLAND BILL: GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Letter from Lord Dunlop, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, at the Scotland Office, to Baroness Fookes, Chairman of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee

Introduction

1. The Government is grateful for the Committee's examination and subsequent report on the Scotland Bill, which forms a valuable part of the scrutiny of the Bill. I apologise the memorandum submitted by the department did not provide the detail the Committee expected. The Government wishes to respond to the points raised by the Committee in order to inform the debate in the remaining parliamentary stages, and provide further information about powers used in the Bill.

Responses to recommendations

2. The Committee Report made several observations which relate to the following clauses and subsections:
 - Clause 15(8)–Powers to make consequential provision in connection with the income tax provisions of the Bill;
 - Clauses 15(8), 19(2) and 68–Power to “otherwise modify” primary legislation;
 - Clauses 13(14) and 13(15)–Commencement of clauses 13 and 14;
 - Clause 19(2)–Power to make further provision about devolved taxes;
 - Clause 34(1)–scheme to transfer Scottish functions of the Crown Estate Commissioners;
 - Clause 34(9)–Power to make provision about the exercise of transferred functions; and
 - Clause 68–Power to make consequential, transitional and saving provision.

Income tax

3. **For clause 15(8)**, the Committee queried why the powers conferred by this subsection were needed alongside the powers conferred by section 80G(1A) of the Scotland Act 1998. The Committee also queried why this subsection confers the power to amend the tax provisions of the Bill after enactment. I am pleased to set out the Government's position on these.
4. As the delegated powers memorandum submitted by the department outlines, the power conferred by clause 15(8) of the Bill allows HM Treasury to make consequential amendments that arise in connection with changes made to the Scotland Act 1998 and Income Tax Act 2007 by clauses 13 and 14 of the Bill. The power conferred by section 80G(1A) of the Scotland Act 1998, which was inserted by the Scotland Act 2012, is amended to reflect the changes made to section 80C of the Scotland Act 1998. The power is a tailored, specific power that allows HM Treasury to make amendments that are needed in consequence of, or in connection with, the powers of the Scottish Parliament under the amended section 80C of the Scotland Act 1998 through a Scottish rate resolution.
5. There is expected to be a period of time between the Bill receiving Royal Assent and the Scottish Parliament exercising the new income tax powers

conferred by this Bill for the first time - the length of this period is uncertain as commencement of the tax powers within the Bill are an element of the Fiscal Framework negotiations being undertaken between the UK and Scottish Governments. As a result there may be circumstances where changes are made to the UK income tax in the intervening period between Royal Assent and the commencement of devolved powers, which would require amendment to the Bill. As a result, the Government therefore considers it is necessary and appropriate to include this power in the Bill.

6. The Committee also raised the procedure for orders raised under clause 15 (8). The Committee correctly noted the negative procedure would not apply to all regulations made under this clause. I apologise to the Committee for the omission and thank them for highlighting this in their report. As the Committee states, the affirmative procedure applies if the regulations contain provisions amending or repealing a provision of an Act, with the negative procedure applying in all other cases. As outlined in the department's memorandum, the Government considers this appropriate to allow the House of Commons to scrutinise the impact of the Scottish rate on the wider income tax system. The negative procedure has also been included as it is anticipated that this power will be used primarily for consequential and tidying up amendments made to existing secondary legislation. We consider the negative procedure provides an appropriate level of scrutiny for such changes, which are anticipated to be minor and could otherwise burden Parliamentary time.
7. **For clauses 13(14) and 13(15)**, the Committee recommends amendments be brought forward to require regulations under clause 13, which commence provisions in clauses 13 and 14, to be made by statutory instrument. The Orders that will be made under this clause are typically short and factual, giving the decided date. Nonetheless, the manner of commencement for clauses 13 & 14 of this Bill (by Appointed Day Order) are modelled on those provided for the commencement of devolved tax powers in the Scotland Act 2012. Appointed Day Orders made under sections 25(4)&(5), 29(4) & 31(4) of the Scotland Act 2012 have provided for the arrangements relating to the commencement of devolved powers to the Scottish Parliament over the Scottish rate of income tax, Stamp Duty Land Tax and Landfill Tax respectively. This has worked effectively. Therefore the Government accepts the Committee's recommendation and will bring forward a suitable amendment to address this point.

Air Passenger Duty and Aggregates Levy

8. **For clause 19(2)**, the Committee queried why it is necessary for the powers conferred by clause 19(2) to include a power to amend both future enactments and the Bill itself, and noted the Scotland Act 2012 had taken a different approach for similar provisions. For both air passenger duty and aggregates levy, it is expected there will be a period of time between the Bill receiving Royal Assent and the Scottish Government introducing its own arrangements (if it chooses to do so in the latter case). In the case of aggregates levy, the length of time is uncertain as it will depend on resolution of the levy's legal challenges in the European Courts. There may be circumstances where there are future changes to the UK taxes, and the amendments to the legislation of both taxes included in clauses 17 to 19 of, and Schedule 1, the Bill would need to be amended in the period between Royal Assent and the commencement of devolved powers. Similarly, there may be future

enactments relating to the taxes which would need amendment. I hope the Committee is reassured that the Government's approach here is sensible in light of the current uncertainty, and that as with previously devolved taxes, we are confident that the use of these powers will be used to provide for a logical and smooth transition and are therefore justified.

9. **For clause 15(8), 19(2) and 68**, the Committee suggested that non-textual modifications of an Act should require the same level of Parliamentary scrutiny as textual amendments, that being the affirmative procedure. The Government accepts the general principle that changes made to primary legislation by secondary legislation should be subject to the affirmative procedure. Wherever possible in the approach to legislative drafting, changes to primary legislation are made by textual amendment.
10. The Government notes the Committee's suggestion. We continue to believe however that non-textual and minor/technical changes should be possible under the negative resolution procedure. The Government believes that it would be inappropriate to set out on the face of the Bill specific kinds of modification of primary legislation that should require the negative procedure. Doing so would create legal uncertainty, especially in those outlying and indirect cases where it is not always clear when a provision non-textually modifies primary legislation. As well as this undesirable level of legal uncertainty, the Government thinks that many of the cases which fall into this category are unlikely to warrant the use of the affirmative procedure due to their indirect and remote nature.
11. Given the range of legislation under the provisions in this Bill, the Government considers that the approach taken is proportionate, particularly as the provisions in the Bill enable the use of the affirmative procedure should there be a need to do so. The Government acknowledges that this allows discretion on the part of the Minister, but the Government has also undertaken to the Committee that on those rare occasions and unless otherwise provided for, changes to primary legislation by secondary legislation are normally subject to the affirmative procedure. The Government therefore considers that the current approach is justified, but we look forward to further details in the Committee's End of Session Report.

Crown Estate

12. **For clause 34(1)**, the Committee questioned why the subsection confers the power to make retrospective amendments to the Crown Estate transfer scheme. The transfer of the management of the Crown Estate assets is a transfer of an on-going commercial business with the complexities which that entails. I can reassure the Committee that the power to make retrospective provision is therefore precautionary. However, the power is necessary in the event the Government subsequently needs to amend the Transfer Scheme in a retrospective manner. An example would be a designated right or liability, which should have been included in the Scheme at the outset and will give rise to real difficulties if its later inclusion is not backdated to the transfer date.
13. The Government will make every effort to ensure that the Scheme is accurate as at the transfer date and will only subsequently use the power to make retrospective provision in exceptional circumstances where there is good reason to do so. Any such amendment must be agreed by the Scottish

Ministers and approved by both Houses of Parliament. We have taken this approach to ensure there are real safeguards in relation to any proposed exercise of the power. In light of those safeguards, and given the commercial nature of the transfer, the Government considers this power to be reasonable.

14. **For clause 34(9)**, the Committee questioned why the powers under this subsection continue after the transfer date of the Crown Estate. The power to make an Order in Council allows the Scottish Ministers to legislate in order to have provisions in place for the transfer of the management of Crown Estate assets. After the transfer the Scottish Ministers may choose to use an Order in Council to amend the legislation, rather than an Act of the Scottish Parliament. The power to use the Order in Council after the transfer is important if the Scottish Ministers needs to amend the original Order in Council to take into account early experiences of managing the Crown Estate assets, for example for any small or technical amendments. If the Order in Council could not be used following the transfer the only way to amend the original Order in Council would be through an Act of the Scottish Parliament. If the Scottish Ministers wanted to continue to use an Order in Council to amend the legislation then they would need to explain why they were using an Order in Council rather than an Act of the Scottish Parliament, when seeking the approval of the Scottish Parliament. If the Scottish Parliament is unconvinced of the merits of using an Order in Council, it would be able to prevent the use of one and require an Act of the Scottish Parliament.
15. Whilst the UK Government's view is that the Scottish Ministers needs to be clear about what its legislative intentions are regarding the transfer of the management of the Scottish Crown Estate assets, the Government considers the power in the Bill is appropriate to ensure the Scottish Ministers have legislative avenues to take forward the management of the Crown Estate's Scottish assets.

Power to make consequential, transitional and saving provision

16. **For clause 68**, the Committee queried why the power to amend Welsh and Northern Irish devolved legislation and the power to amend future enactments, documents, etc., is required for Parts 1, 4, 5 and 6 of the Bill. Since the Committee's report, and the observations of the Lords Constitution Committee, the Government has given careful consideration to the provisions in clause 68. The Government accepts that the power in clause 68 to amend Welsh and Northern Irish legislation, future enactments and any other future instruments or documents is unlikely to be required for Parts 1, 4, 5 and 6 of the Scotland Bill. On this basis we intend to bring forward an appropriate amendment at Report stage amending the provision. We will keep the Committee informed of such amendments and thank them for bringing it to our attention.
17. The Committee further asked for justification for the ability to amend future instruments or documents. The reasoning is similar to that for amending future enactments. The commencement of Part 3 of the Bill is expected to take place over a period of time and it may be necessary to make changes to contracts entered into between the date when the Bill receives Royal Assent and the date functions to which Part 3 applies are transferred to the Scottish Ministers. The types of contracts that are typically entered into by the Government for the provision of welfare include assessments relating to

Disability Living Allowance, the Personal Independence payment and the provision of welfare foods across England, Scotland and Wales.

18. Section 117 of the Scotland Act 1998 provides that so far as may be necessary for the purpose of, or in consequence of, an exercise of a function by a member of the Scottish Government within devolved competence, any pre-commencement enactment or prerogative instrument, and any other instrument or document, shall be read as if references to a Minister of the Crown were or included references to the Scottish Ministers. The effect of the gloss by clause 30 of the Bill (of references to “pre-commencement enactment” in the Scotland Act 1998) is (broadly) that enactments made in the period before the relevant clauses of the Bill are brought into force, will attract the effect of section 117 of the Scotland Act 1998. This will provide for, amongst other things, documents referring to the Secretary of State to be read as if those references were instead, or included, references to the Scottish Ministers. (This would apply to instruments and documents created even after Royal Assent of the present Bill). This might not always produce the correct result and it may be necessary to make bespoke provision through subordinate legislation to achieve the correct result. Accordingly, the power to make such subordinate legislation is required to modify documents created even after Royal Assent of the present Bill. We regret this element of the clause was not covered in the original memorandum and thank the Committee for drawing this to our attention.

12 February 2016

APPENDIX 2: MEMBERS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Committee Members' registered interests may be examined in the online Register of Lords' Interests at www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld/ldreg.htm. The Register may also be inspected in the House of Lords Record Office and is available for purchase from The Stationery Office.

For the business taken at the meeting on 24 February 2016 Members declared the following interests:

NHS (Charitable Trusts Etc) Bill

Lord Jones

President, League of Friends, Deeside Community Hospital

National Vice President, Attend (hospital league of friends)

Attendance:

The meeting on the 24 February 2016 was attended by Baroness Fookes, Baroness Gould of Potternewton, Lord Jones, Lord Moynihan, Lord Thomas of Gresford and Lord Tyler.