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col 1071 Lord Allan of Hallam (Liberal Democrat): … The sort of thing that you might put into a transparency report is, for example, whether you have banned particular organisations. I would be in favour of indicating to the public that an organisation is banned, but you can see that the potential impact of that is that all the people you are concerned about would create another organisation with a different name and then get back on to your platform. We need to be alive to those kinds of concerns. … I would say, “If we are prohibiting specific hate speech terms, tell people that, and then they won’t use them”. For me, that would be a success, as they are not using those hate speech terms anymore, but, of course, they may then find alternative hate speech terms that they can use instead. …

col 1074 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (Viscount Camrose): … Transparency is vital in holding companies to account for keeping their users safe online. …

col 1075 The specific information requested for inclusion within the transparency report will be determined by Ofcom. Therefore, the regulator will be able to ensure that the information requested is appropriate for publication. Ofcom will take into account any risks arising from making the information public before issuing the transparency notice. …

col 1081 Lord Allan of Hallam: … I do not want to minimise the effect on people of hate speech crimes, but they are of a different order, shall we say, from threat-to-life cases … My starting point is to be nervous about platforms acting in that policing capacity for offences that are not at the most extreme end of the spectrum. Individuals who are worried about that activity can go to the police directly themselves and can generally take the content to the police—literally; they can print it off—who can make a judgment about whether to go to the Crown Prosecution Service. I worry about the platforms doing it partly from a constitutional point of view, because I am not sure that I want them acting in that quasi-legal capacity, but also, frankly, from a volume point of view. The risk is that if you
put this duty on a platform, because it is really hard to understand what is criminal hate speech and what is merely hateful hate speech, the temptation will be to send everything over. If you do that, first, you have a greater violation of privacy, and secondly, you probably have not helped the police, because they get swamped with reports that they cannot manage. ....

However, I recognise that it leaves an open question. When people engage in that kind of behaviour online and it has serious real-world consequences, how do we make sure that they do not feel that it is consequence-free—that they understand that there are consequences? If they have broken the law, they should be prosecuted. There may be something in streamlining the process where a complainant goes to the police and the police are able to access the information they need, having first assessed that it is worth prosecuting and illegal, so that we make that loop work first before we head in the direction of having platforms report content en masse because they believe it may have violated laws where we are not at that most serious end of the spectrum. ....

Col. 1082 Baroness Fox of Buckley (Non-affiliated): … I wanted to reflect on the kind of dilemmas I am having around this in relation to the story of Mizzy that is doing the rounds. He is the 18 year-old who has been posting his prank videos on TikTok and has caused quite a stir. People have seen him wandering into strangers’ homes uninvited, asking random people in the street if they want to die, running off with an elderly lady’s dog and making fun of Orthodox Jews—generally speaking, this 18 year-old is obnoxious. His TikTok videos have gone viral; everybody is discussing them.

This cruelty for kicks genre of filming yourself, showing your face full to the camera and so on, is certainly abhorrent but … I have noticed that some people outside this House are attempting to blame the technology for the problem, saying that the videos should have been removed earlier and that it is TikTok’s fault that we have this anti-social behaviour, whereas I think it is a much deeper, broader social problem to do with the erosion of adult authority and the reluctance of grown-ups to intervene clearly when people are behaving badly … It is undoubtedly a police matter. The police seem to have taken ages to locate Mizzy. They eventually got him and charged him with very low offences, so he was on TV being interviewed the other evening, laughing at how weak the law was. Under the laws he was laughing at, he could freely walk into somebody’s house or be obnoxious and get away with it. He said, “We can do what we want”. That mockery throws up problems, but I do not necessarily think that the Bill is the way to solve it. ....

Mizzy was quoted in the Independent newspaper as saying: “I’m a Black male doing these things and that’s why there’s such an uproar”. I then went on a social media thread in which any criticism of Mizzy’s behaviour was described as racist harassment. That shows the complexity of what is being called for in Amendment 268AA, which wants platforms to take additional steps “to combat incidents of online racially aggravated harassment”.

My worry is that we end up with not only Mizzy’s TikTok videos being removed but his critics being removed for racially harassing him, so we have to be very careful here. ....

Col. 1095 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Culture, Media and Sport (Lord Parkinson of Whitley Bay): … Amendment 268AA … relates to reporting requirements for online abuse and harassment, including where this is racially motivated … [It] would place an additional requirement on all service providers, even those not in scope of the Bill. ....

Clauses 16 and 26 already require companies to set up systems and processes that allow users easily to report illegal content, including illegal online abuse and harassment. This amendment would therefore duplicate this existing requirement. It also seeks to create an additional requirement for companies to report illegal online abuse and harassment to the Crown Prosecution Service. The Bill does not place requirements on in-scope companies to report their investigations into crimes that occur online, other than child exploitation and abuse. This is because the Bill aims to prevent and reduce the proliferation of illegal
material and the resulting harm it causes to so many. Additionally, Ofcom will be able to require companies to report on the incidence of illegal content on their platforms in its transparency reports, as well as the steps they are taking to tackle that content. …

**Baroness Morgan of Cotes (Conservative):** … There are some platforms which, whilst attracting small user numbers, are hubs for extreme hateful content and should be regulated as larger user-to-user services. …

**Col 1097** … the Bill proposes two major categories of regulated company, category 1 and category 2, and there is another carve-out for search services. Much of the discussion about the Bill has focused on the regulatory requirements for category 1 companies, but … it is expected that the list of category 1 companies may number only a few dozen, while thousands and thousands of platforms and search engines may not meet that threshold. But some of those other platforms, while attracting small user numbers, are hubs for extremely hateful content. In a previous debate we heard about the vile racist abuse often aimed at particular groups. Some of these platforms are almost outside some of our own experiences. They are deliberately designed to host such hateful content and to try to remain under the radar, but they are undoubtedly deeply influential, particularly to those—often vulnerable—users who access them.

Platforms such as 8kun, 4chan and BitChute are perhaps becoming more well known, whereas Odysee, Rumble and Minds remain somewhat obscure. There are numerous others, and all are easily accessible from anyone’s browser. What does the harm caused by these platforms look like? Some examples are in the public domain. For example, the mass shooting in Buffalo, in America, was carried out by a terrorist whose manifesto was inspired by 4chan’s board and who spoke of its influence on him. …

**Col 1098** The Center for Countering Digital Hate revealed that the four leading forums it analysed for incels—involuntary celibates—were filled with extreme hatred of women, glorification of violence and active discussion of paedophilia. On Gab, an “anti-Jewish meme repository”, grotesque anti-Semitic caricatures of Jews are shared from an account with an offensive name that seeks to deny the Holocaust. Holocaust denial material is similarly shared across BitChute, where it is also possible to find a video on the supposed “Jewish Plan To Genocide The White Race” and, of course, 9/11 conspiracy theories. Meanwhile, on Odysee, other than discussion of the supposed “fake Holocaust” one can find discussion of the “Jewish problem”. On Minds, both President Zelensky and President Putin are condemned for having “kike”—an offensive term for Jews—inner circles, while other posts state that communism is Jewish control and the vessel to destroy our freedom. The Government and many others know very well that these small, high-harm platforms are a problem. MPs in earlier debates on this Bill raised concerns repeatedly. … nearly a year ago, the then Secretary of State issued a ministerial Statement indicating that, while the Government appreciated that small high-harm platforms do damage, “more research is required before such platforms can be assigned to the category 1 designation for the online safety regime”.

This was despite Ofcom’s road map for online safety making it clear that it had already identified a number of small platforms that are clearly giving cause for concern. So the case for action, as set out in my remarks and elsewhere, is proven. The Antisemitism Policy Trust has given evidence to the Joint Committee on the draft Bill and the Bill Committee in another place about this. The Community Security Trust, HOPE not hate and many others have data that demonstrates the level of hateful anti-Semitic and other racist and misogynistic abuse on these platforms. … Extraordinarily, these are not platforms where this content is stumbled on or somehow hidden. They are set up deliberately to spread this content, to get people to look at it and to amplify this deeply harmful material. These sites act as feeders for hateful messages and activity on mainstream platforms or as receptors for those directed away from those larger services to niche, hate-filled rabbit holes. … As we hope that the larger platforms will take action and live up to the terms of service they say they have, without action this
content will unfortunately disappear to smaller platforms which will still be accessed and have action in the online and offline worlds. …

Amendment 192 is a small, technical amendment. It does not compel Ofcom to add burdens to all small platforms but provides a specific recourse for the Secretary of State to consider the risks of harm as part of the process of categorisation. A small number of well-known, small high-harm sites would be required to add what will ultimately be minimal friction and other measures proportionate to their size. They will be required to deliver enhanced transparency. This can only be for the good, given that in some cases these sites are designed specifically to spread harm and radicalise users towards extreme and even terrorist behaviours.

col 1103 Baroness Fox of Buckley: … It seems important to me that there is a distinction between small platforms and large platforms, but my view has never been that if you are small, you have no potential harms, any more than if you are large, you are harmful. The exception should be the rule. We have to be careful of arbitrary categorisation of “small”. We have to decide who is going to be treated as though they are a large category 1 platform. I keep saying but stress again: do not assume that everybody agrees what significant risk of harm or hateful content is. It is such highly disputed political territory outside the online world and this House that we must recognise that it is not so straightforward. …

We end up where it is assumed that the manifestoes of mass shooters appear on these sites, but if you read any of those manifestoes of mass shooters, they will often be quoting from mainstream journalists in mainstream newspapers, the Bible and a whole range of things. Just because they are on 4Chan, or wherever, is not necessarily the problem; it is much more complicated. …

col 1104 Lord Clement-Jones (Liberal Democrat): … We heard in the UK from some of the larger services about their concerns about the activities of smaller services. You might say “They would say that, wouldn’t they?” but they were pretty convincing. We heard from HOPE not Hate, the Antisemitism Policy Trust and Stonewall, stressing the role of alternative services.

Of course, we know that these amendments today … have a very important provenance. They recognise that these are big problems. … I very much hope that when we come to consider how this works in practical terms that the Minister will think very seriously about the way in which risk is to the fore— the more nuanced approach that we suggested—and the whole way that profiling by Ofcom will apply. …

col 1105 Lord Parkinson of Whitley Bay: … all services in scope of the Bill, regardless of their size, will be required to take action against illegal content and all services likely to be accessed by children must put in place protections for children. Companies designated as category 1 providers have significant additional duties. These include the overarching transparency, accountability and freedom of expression duties, as well as duties on content of democratic importance, news publishers’ content, journalistic content and fraudulent advertising. It is right to put such duties only on the largest platforms with features enabling the greatest reach, as they have the most significant influence over public discourse online. …

Following removal of the legal but harmful provisions in another place, the Bill no longer includes the concept of risk of harm in Category 1 designation. As we set out, it would not be right for the Government to define what legal content it considers harmful to adults, and it follows that it would not be appropriate for the Government to categorise providers and to require them to carry out duties based on this definition.

col 1106 In addition, requiring all companies to comply with the full range of Category 1 duties would pose a disproportionate burden on services which do not exert the same influence over public discourse online. …

The most robust protections in the Bill are for children, while those for adults strike a
balance between adults being protected from illegal content and given more choice over what legal content they see. …

col 1108 … we are making the risk assessment that the riskiest behaviour is illegal content and content which presents a harm to children. … In relation to other content which is legal and for adults to choose how they encounter it, there are protections in the Bill to enforce terms of service and empower users to curate their own experience online, but that assessment is made by adult users within the law. …

To read the full transcript see

The amendments under consideration above can be read at
https://bills.parliament.uk/publications/51290/documents/3470

House of Commons Oral Answer

Christian Wakeford (Labour): The city of Manchester has a rich and vibrant history, in which those of different faiths and backgrounds have lived together, as well as stood together through difficult times and times of division, so I am concerned that Roger Waters is due to play at the AO Arena in Manchester next month. Mr Waters performed in Berlin this week and used the name of Anne Frank to stoke division, performed while dressed as an SS soldier and used the star of David on a giant pig to insinuate that Jewish people run the world, forcing the Jewish Representative Council of Greater Manchester to issue a statement condemning his divisive actions. Will the Leader of the House agree that such concerts have no place in our society and should not go ahead? Will she agree to a debate in Government time on the record levels of anti-Jewish hatred in this country?

Penny Mordaunt: I think the whole House was shocked by what the hon. Gentleman said. I shall make certain that the Home Office has heard the hon. Gentleman’s concerns. This House has made great efforts, particularly in recent years, to ensure that the scourge of antisemitism is addressed and stamped out from our country. I shall make sure that all relevant Departments have heard the hon. Gentleman’s concerns.

https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-05-25/debates/251DF5D3-AAC5-4714-A8B4-F5AAF7D9D0B5/BusinessOfTheHouse#contribution-DB7A7F86-7017-4B38-BF64-5E81D418116A

House of Commons Written Answer

Inter Faith Network for the United Kingdom: Finance

Holly Lynch (Labour) [1857995] To ask the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, pursuant to the Answer of 27 April 2023 to Question 182308 on Inter Faith Network for the United Kingdom: Finance, for what reason his Department will stop funding the Inter Faith Network in the 2023-24 financial year.

Dehenna Davison: This department has provided funding to the Inter Faith Network UK since 2006/07. When making funding decisions, the Government considers a wide range of factors, including government priorities and current budgetary pressures. The department monitors all funded organisations throughout the lifecycle of their project for the purposes of assessing delivery against workplan targets, compliance and evaluation, in line with best practice for the management of public funding.
House of Lords Oral Answer

NHS National Health Inequalities Improvement Programme

Lord Mann (Non-affiliated) My Lords, currently some Jewish children are having to survive due to the funding formula on a bagel every dinnertime. Is that acceptable and, if not, which Minister will sort it out?

Lord Markham: I hope that every child would have something more nutritious and healthier than just a bagel. I will happily discuss that with the noble Lord; I am not familiar with that particular case but it is something I will happily take up.

[Link to Hansard]

House of Lords Written Answer

Inter Faith Network for the United Kingdom: Finance

The Lord Bishop of Leeds [HL7839] To ask His Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the contribution of inter-faith engagement and cooperation to the Levelling Up agenda; and what plans they have, if any, to provide funding support towards the work of the Inter Faith Network, including for Inter Faith Week during 2023–24.

Baroness Scott of Bybrook: The department continues to take steps to support inter-faith community cohesion. For example, this government is supporting Dame Sara Khan's independent review of Social Cohesion and Resilience which is due to report in the Autumn, and I am considering additional options to take forward. This department has provided funding to the Inter Faith Network since 2006/07. The Government considers a wide range of factors when deciding which projects to fund.

The department monitors all funded organisations throughout the lifecycle of their project for the purposes of assessing delivery against workplan targets, compliance and evaluation, in line with best practice for the management of public funding.

[Link to Hansard]

Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

Lord (Tariq) Ahmad of Wimbledon I wish everyone celebrating the Jewish holy day of Shavuot a joyful holiday. Chag Sameach. The UK Government is committed to defending freedom of religion or belief for all.

[Link to Twitter]

The Charity Commission

Guidance: Charities Act 2022: information about the changes being introduced

[Link to GOV.UK]
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House of Commons Oral Answer

Business of the House

Peter Bottomley (Conservative): ... Recently, the examiners classified the Holocaust Memorial Bill as hybrid. Will my right hon. Friend, in peacetime, refer to the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee the comments of the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and of those who lead the Holocaust Memorial Foundation that they welcomed the Bill passing this step and that the Government actually spent their time trying to oppose the Bill being classified as hybrid. I also refer the Government to something in the press notice that said that one holocaust survivor has had to wait nine years from the time that this proposal was put forward to getting to this stage, and that he hopes to be able to be there when the memorial is opened.

Under the present plans, assuming that the Bill gets through both Houses of Parliament, with or without amendments—probably with amendments—that memorial cannot be completed for another five to six years. I suggest that the Government consider having the memorial—not necessarily the big one in Victoria Tower Gardens, but a smaller, more appropriate one—either there, in College Green, or Parliament Square and recognise that the learning centre is well suited at the Imperial War Museum, where one of Dame Diane Lees’s tributes was to create both the learning centre and the holocaust galleries. Everyone can then be satisfied and the holocaust survivors may be able to see a memorial in their lifetime.

Penny Mordaunt: I thank my hon. Friend for raising that matter and for suggesting a pragmatic way forward. My understanding is that that suggestion has been made and rejected, but he will know that the Government are very keen to ensure that a memorial can be built in the swiftest time possible, precisely because we want the remaining holocaust survivors to be able to witness that.

I shall make sure that the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities has heard his suggestions today.

https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2023-05-25/debates/251DF5D3-AAC5-4714-A8B4-F5AAF7D9D0B5/BusinessOfTheHouse#contribution-A93B661D-52D8-4949-AF3F-ED78CEF6DD68
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International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace

Carolyn Harris (Labour) [185614] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, with reference to the speech by the Prime Minister to the Conservative Friends of Israel on 16 December 2022, what recent progress his Department has made on assessing the potential merits of supporting the International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace.

David Rutley: The UK Government remains in close contact with the US Government about the US Middle East Partnership for Peace Act and how existing peace-building projects and funding can better support the goals of this Act. We share the objective of advancing economic, social, and political connections, and peaceful co-existence between Israelis and Palestinians. We stand ready to collaborate and coordinate further.
Israel: Terrorism

Matthew Offord (Conservative) [185589] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, whether his Department is taking steps to help support Israel to tackle terror threats.

David Rutley: We are appalled by terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens. There can be no justification for such acts of violence. Every Israeli and Palestinian has the right to live in peace and security. We continue to closely monitor the security situation in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs). The UK Government remains resolute in its commitment to Israel's security. The UK condemns the indiscriminate rocket fire from Gaza targeting innocent civilians in Israel and welcomes the announcement of a ceasefire between Israel and militant factions in Gaza, brokered by Egypt, following the recent round of conflict. The ceasefire must now be honoured to prevent the loss of further civilian life. The UK will support all efforts to promote dialogue and create a pathway towards sustainable peace.

Israel: Palestinian Islamic Jihad

Matthew Offord (Conservative) [185590] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, whether he has had recent discussions with his international counterparts on the implications for the Middle East peace process of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad group firing rockets towards Israel.

David Rutley: We continue to closely monitor the security situation in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs). The UK has proscribed Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) as a terrorist entity since March 2001. PIJ and other terrorist groups must cease all actions that are violent or provocative, or that put civilian lives at risk. The UK condemns the indiscriminate rocket fire from Gaza targeting innocent civilians in Israel and welcomes the announcement of a ceasefire between Israel and militant factions in Gaza, brokered by Egypt, following the recent round of conflict. The ceasefire must now be honoured to prevent the loss of further civilian life. The UK will support all efforts to promote dialogue and create a pathway towards sustainable peace.

West Bank: Lions' Den and Palestinian Islamic Jihad

Nicola Richards (Conservative) [185856] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what recent assessment he has made of the implications for the Middle East peace process of the emergence of (a) Palestinian Islamic Jihad and (b) Lions' Den terror cells in the West Bank.

David Rutley: We continue to closely monitor the security situation in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs). The UK has proscribed Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) as a terrorist entity since March 2001. PIJ and other terrorist groups including the Lions' Den must cease all actions that are violent or provocative, or that put civilian lives at risk. There can be no justification for such acts of violence. Every Israeli and Palestinian has the right to live in peace and security. As the Foreign Secretary said in his 14 April statement, the UK will support all efforts to promote dialogue and create a pathway towards a sustainable peace.
Palestinians: Prisoners
Nicola Richards (Conservative) [185857] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what recent discussions he has had with his international counterparts on the implications for the Middle East peace process of the Palestinian Authority's practice of paying salaries to prisoners convicted of terrorist offences.

David Rutley: The UK remains resolute in its commitment to Israel's security. Our clear and long-standing message to the Palestinian Authority (PA) is that the prisoner payments system should be reformed so that it is needs-based, transparent and affordable. The British Consulate General Jerusalem regularly raises this issue with the Palestinian Authority. This is also a matter that the Minister of State for the Middle East, Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon discussed with Israeli Ambassador Hotovely in their 21 April meeting. We also have robust safeguards in place to ensure that no UK aid is used for payments to Palestinian prisoners, or their families.

Israel: Palestinian Islamic Jihad
Andrew Percy (Conservative) [185891] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what recent discussions he has had with the Palestinian Authority on recent attacks on Israel by Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

David Rutley: We closely monitor the security situation in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs). The UK has proscribed the organisation known as Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) as a terrorist entity since March 2001. PIJ and other terrorist groups must cease all actions that are violent or provocative, or that put civilian lives at risk. The Minister for the Middle East, Lord (Tariq) Ahmad of Wimbledon last met with Palestinian Authority Foreign Minister Riad Malki on 5 May, before the recent outbreak of violence. As the Foreign Secretary said in his 14 May statement, we welcome the current Egyptian-brokered ceasefire and urge all sides to de-escalate tensions.

Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
Lord (Tariq) Ahmad of Wimbledon The UK strongly opposes Israel’s decision to allow a permanent Israeli presence in Homesh - built on private Palestinian land according to Israeli law and inconsistent with commitments made by Israel in 2004. We urge Israel to reverse the measures in Homesh.

https://twitter.com/tariqahmadbt/status/1661777287925080064

Lord (Tariq) Ahmad of Wimbledon Also shocked by the violence perpetrated by settlers against Palestinians in Burqa and Ein Samiya in the West Bank. We urge Israel to hold the perpetrators of this violence to account.

https://twitter.com/tariqahmadbt/status/1661777491558641664
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