

Press release: Keep Antibiotics Working campaign returns

The 'Keep Antibiotics Working' campaign returns to alert the public to the risks of antibiotic resistance, urging them to always take their doctor, nurse or healthcare professional's advice on antibiotics.

Antibiotics are a vital tool used to manage infections. Public Health England's (PHE's) English Surveillance Programme for Antimicrobial Utilisation and Resistance (ESPAUR) [report](#) published today, Tuesday 23 October 2018, highlights how more than 3 million common procedures such as caesarean sections and hip replacements could become life-threatening without them.

Without antibiotics, infections related to surgery could double, putting people at risk of dangerous complications. Cancer patients are also much more vulnerable if antibiotics don't work; both cancer and the treatment (chemotherapy) reduce the ability of the immune system to fight infections. Antibiotics are critical to both prevent and treat infections in these patients.

Antibiotics are essential to treat serious bacterial infections, but they are frequently being used to treat illnesses such as coughs, earache and sore throats that can get better by themselves. Taking antibiotics encourages harmful bacteria that live inside you to become resistant. That means that antibiotics may not work when you really need them.

The threat of antibiotic resistance continues to grow. Bloodstream infections have increased and the report shows that antibiotic-resistant bloodstream infections rose by an estimated 35% between 2013 and 2017.

Despite the risks of antibiotic resistance, research shows that 38% of people still expect an antibiotic from a doctor's surgery, NHS walk-in centre or 'GP out-of-hours' service when they visited with a cough, flu or a throat, ear, sinus or chest infection in 2017.

The 'Keep Antibiotics Working' campaign educates the public about the risks of antibiotic resistance, urging people to always take healthcare professionals' advice as to when they need antibiotics. The campaign also provides effective self-care advice to help individuals and their families feel better if they are not prescribed antibiotics.

Professor Paul Cosford, Medical Director, Public Health England said:

Antibiotics are an essential part of modern medicine, keeping people safe from infection when they are at their most vulnerable. It's concerning that, in the not too distant future, we may see more cancer patients, mothers who've had caesareans and patients who've had other surgery facing life-threatening situations if

antibiotics fail to ward off infections.

We need to preserve antibiotics for when we really need them and we are calling on the public to join us in tackling antibiotic resistance by listening to your GP, pharmacist or nurse's advice and only taking antibiotics when necessary. Taking antibiotics just in case may seem like a harmless act, but it can have grave consequences for you and your family's health in future.

Professor Dame Sally Davies, Chief Medical Officer for England said:

The evidence is clear that without swift action to reduce infections, we are at risk of putting medicine back in the dark ages – to an age where common procedures we take for granted could become too dangerous to perform, and treatable conditions become life-threatening.

The UK has made great efforts in recent years to reduce prescribing rates of antibiotics, however, there continues to be a real need to preserve the drugs we have so that they remain effective for those who really need them and prevent infections emerging in the first place. This is not just an issue for doctors and nurses, the public have a huge role to play – today's data and the launch of the national 'Keep Antibiotics Working' campaign must be a further wake-up call to us all.

Professor Helen Stokes-Lampard, Chair of the Royal College of GPs, said:

GPs are already doing an excellent job at reducing antibiotics prescriptions, but we often come under considerable pressure from patients to prescribe them.

We need to get to a stage where antibiotics are not seen as a 'catch all' for every illness or a 'just in case' backup option – and patients need to understand that if their doctor doesn't prescribe antibiotics it's because they genuinely believe they are not the most appropriate course of treatment.

It's crucial that we continue to get this message out, which is why we're pleased to support Public Health England's 'Keep Antibiotics Working' campaign to make sure we can carry on delivering safe, effective care to our patients both now and in the future.

1. The Ipsos MORI Capibus Survey, 'Attitudes towards antibiotics, 2017' was conducted between 24 January to 5 February 2017 with a representative sample size of 1,691 adults (aged 15+) in England only. 269 contacted a

health professional with a respiratory tract infection in the last year – these participants were asked: “What did you expect from the doctor’s surgery, walk-in centre, urgent or out of hours with your cough, throat, ear, sinus, chest infection or flu?”.

2. The campaign will run from Tuesday 23 October 2018 across England for 8 weeks and will be supported with advertising, partnerships with local pharmacies and GP surgeries, and social media activity.
 3. The campaign is part of a wider cross-Government strategy to help preserve antibiotics. The Government’s [‘UK Five Year Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy 2013 to 2018’](#) set out aims to improve the knowledge and understanding of AMR, conserve and steward the effectiveness of existing treatments, and stimulate the development of new antibiotics, diagnostics, and novel therapies.
-

Statement to Parliament: Foreign Secretary updates the House of Commons on the death of Jamal Khashoggi

Deputy Speaker, with your permission I will make a statement on the death of Jamal Khashoggi.

From the moment that he was reported missing after entering the Saudi Consulate in Istanbul on 2nd October, extremely disturbing reports emerged about his fate.

On Friday, we received confirmation that Mr Khashoggi had indeed suffered a violent death, and the Saudi foreign minister has since described it as murder.

The Government condemns his killing in the strongest possible terms. Today the thoughts and prayers of the whole House are with his fiancée, his family and his friends, who were left to worry for more than two weeks, only to have their worst fears confirmed.

After his disappearance, the Government made clear that Saudi Arabia must cooperate with Turkey and conduct a full and credible investigation. Anyone found responsible for any offence must be held fully accountable.

But on top of our concerns about the appalling brutality involved lie two other points. Firstly, Mr Khashoggi’s horrific treatment was inflicted by people who work for a government with whom we have close relations.

And secondly, as well as being a critic of the Saudi government, he was also a journalist.

At the time of his death, Mr Khashoggi wrote for the Washington Post and had contributed to the Guardian. Because in this country we believe in freedom of expression and a free media, the protection of journalists who are simply doing their jobs is of paramount concern.

On 9th October, I conveyed this message to the Saudi Ambassador in person and to the Saudi Foreign Minister by telephone. I instructed the British Ambassador in Riyadh to emphasise our strength of feeling to the Saudi government at every level.

Last week my Right Honourable Friend the International Trade Secretary cancelled his attendance at a forthcoming conference in Riyadh. On 17th October I met Fred Ryan, the Chief Executive of the Washington Post, and I spoke again to the Saudi Foreign Minister this weekend.

On Friday, the Saudi government released the preliminary findings of their investigation. They later announced the arrest of 18 people and the sacking of two senior officials, which is an important start to the process of accountability.

But I will say frankly to the House that the claim that Mr Khashoggi died in a fight does not amount to a credible explanation. There remains an urgent need to establish exactly what happened on 2nd October and thereafter.

The incident happened on Turkish soil, so it is right that the investigation is being led by the Government of Turkey.

They now need to establish who authorised the dispatch of 15 officials from Saudi Arabia to Turkey; when the government in Riyadh first learned of Mr Khashoggi's death; what became of the body; why there was a delay in allowing Turkish investigators to enter the Consulate; and why it took until 19th October to disclose that Mr Khashoggi had died 17 days earlier.

This matters because only after a full investigation will it be possible to apportion responsibility and ensure that any crimes are punished following proper due process.

Last week I spoke to both my French and German counterparts and the House will have noticed the strong statement jointly released yesterday by Britain, France and Germany.

The actions Britain and our allies take will depend on two things: firstly the credibility of the final explanation given by Saudi Arabia, and secondly on our confidence that such an appalling episode cannot – and will not – be repeated. We will of course wait for the final outcome of the investigation before making any decisions.

Honourable Members know that we have an important strategic partnership with Saudi Arabia involving defence and security cooperation which has saved lives on the streets of Britain. We also have a trading partnership that supports thousands of jobs.

But whilst we will be thoughtful and considered in our response, I have also

been clear that if the appalling stories we are reading turn out to be true, they are fundamentally incompatible with our values and we will act accordingly.

Indeed such reports are also incompatible with Saudi Arabia's own stated goal of progress and renewal. That is why the extent to which Saudi Arabia is able to convince us that it remains committed to that progress will ultimately determine the response of the UK and its allies – and we will continue to convey our strength of feeling on the issue to every level of the Saudi leadership.

In his final column, published in the Washington Post after his death, Jamal Khashoggi lamented the lack of freedom of expression in the Arab world.

Let us make sure that the lessons learned and actions taken following his death at least progress and honour his life's work.

I commend this statement to the House.

Speech: PM's statement on European Council: 22 October 2018

Mr Speaker, before I turn to the European Council, I am sure the whole House will join me in condemning the killing of Jamal Khashoggi in the strongest possible terms.

We must get to the truth of what happened – and my Rt Hon Friend the Foreign Secretary will be making a statement shortly.

Mr Speaker, on the European Council, in addition to Brexit, there were important discussions on security and migration.

First, at last Monday's Foreign Ministers meeting my Rt Hon Friend the Foreign Secretary and his French counterpart secured agreement on a new EU sanctions regime on the use of chemical weapons.

At this Council, I argued along with Dutch Prime Minister Rutte that we should also accelerate work on further measures – including sanctions – to respond to and deter cyber-attacks.

The attempted hacking of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in The Hague earlier this year was a stark example of the very real threats we face.

We must impose costs on all those who seek to do us harm, regardless of the means they use. And this Council agreed to take that work forward.

Second, in marking anti-slavery day, I welcomed the continued commitment of all EU leaders in working together to eliminate the barbaric crime of people trafficking.

We reaffirmed our shared commitments to doing more to tackle the challenges of migration upstream.

Following the Council, I met Premier Li of China, President Moon of South Korea and Prime Minister Lee of Singapore at the ASEM Summit.

Since 2010, our trade with Asia has grown by almost 50 per cent – more than with any other continent in the world. I want to develop that even further.

Indeed, Mr Speaker, the ability to develop our own new trade deals is one of the great opportunities of Brexit.

So at this Summit we discussed how the UK can build the most ambitious economic partnerships with all our Asian partners as we leave the European Union. And we also agreed to deepen our co-operation across shared threats to our security.

Turning to Brexit, Mr Speaker, let me begin with the progress we have made on both the Withdrawal Agreement and the political declaration on our future relationship.

As I reported to the House last Monday, the shape of the deal across the vast majority of the Withdrawal Agreement is now clear.

Since Salzburg we have agreed the broad scope of provisions that set out the governance and dispute resolution arrangements for our Withdrawal Agreement.

We have developed a Protocol relating to the UK Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus.

Following discussions with Spain – and in close co-operation with the Government of Gibraltar – we have also developed a Protocol and a set of underlying memoranda relating to Gibraltar, heralding a new era in our relations.

And we have broad agreement on the structure and scope of the future relationship, with important progress made on issues like security, transport and services.

And this progress in the last three weeks builds on the areas where we have already reached agreement – on citizens' rights, on the financial settlement, on the Implementation Period, and in Northern Ireland, agreement on the preservation of the particular rights for UK and Irish citizens – and on the special arrangements between us such as the Common Travel Area, which has existed since before either the UK or Ireland ever became members of the European Economic Community.

Mr Speaker, taking all of this together, 95 per cent of the Withdrawal Agreement and its protocols are now settled.

There is one real sticking point left, but a considerable one, which is how we guarantee that – in the unlikely event our future relationship is not in place by the end of the Implementation Period – there is no return to a hard border between Northern Ireland and Ireland.

The commitment to avoiding a hard border is one this House emphatically endorsed and enshrined in law in the Withdrawal Act earlier this year.

As I set out last week, the original backstop proposal from the EU was one we could not accept, as it would mean creating a customs border down the Irish Sea and breaking up the integrity of our United Kingdom.

I do not believe that any UK Prime Minister could ever accept this.

And I certainly will not.

But as I said in my Mansion House speech: We chose to leave; we have a responsibility to help find a solution. So earlier this year, we put forward a counter-proposal for a temporary UK-EU joint customs territory for the backstop.

And in a substantial shift in their position since Salzburg, the EU are now actively working with us on this proposal.

But a number of issues remain.

The EU argue that they cannot give a legally binding commitment to a UK-wide customs arrangement in the Withdrawal Agreement, so their original proposal must remain a possibility.

Furthermore, Mr Speaker, people are understandably worried that we could get stuck in a backstop that is designed only to be temporary.

And there are also concerns that Northern Ireland could be cut off from accessing its most important market – Great Britain.

During last week's Council, I had good discussions with Presidents Juncker, Tusk and Macron, Chancellor Merkel and Taoiseach Varadkar and others about how to break this impasse.

I believe there are four steps we need to take.

First, we must make the commitment to a temporary UK-EU joint customs territory legally binding, so the Northern Ireland only proposal is no longer needed.

This would not only protect relations North-South, but also, vitally, East-West.

This is critical: the relationship between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK is an integral strand of the Belfast Good Friday Agreement. So to protect that Agreement we need to preserve the totality of relationships it sets out.

Nothing we agree with the EU under Article 50 should risk a return to a hard border, or threaten the delicate constitutional and political arrangements underpinned by the Belfast Good Friday Agreement.

The second step, is to create an option to extend the Implementation Period as an alternative to the backstop.

Mr Speaker, I have not committed to extending the Implementation Period.

I do not want to extend the Implementation Period – and I do not believe that extending it will be necessary.

I see any extension – or being in any form of backstop – as undesirable. By far the best outcome for the UK, for Ireland and for the EU – is that our future relationship is agreed and in place by 1st January 2021.

I have every confidence that it will be. And the European Union have said they will show equal commitment to this timetable.

But the impasse we are trying to resolve is about the insurance policy if this does not happen.

So what I am saying is that – if at the end of 2020 our future relationship was not quite ready – the proposal is that the UK would be able to make a sovereign choice between the UK-wide customs backstop or a short extension of the Implementation Period.

And Mr Speaker, there are some limited circumstances in which it could be argued that an extension to the Implementation Period might be preferable, if we were certain it was only for a short time

For example, a short extension to the Implementation Period would mean only one set of changes for businesses – at the point we move to the future relationship.

But in any such scenario we would have to be out of this Implementation Period well before the end of this Parliament.

The third step, Mr Speaker, is to ensure that were we to need either of these insurance policies – whether the backstop or a short extension to the Implementation Period – we could not be kept in either arrangement indefinitely.

We would not accept a position in which the UK, having negotiated in good faith an agreement which prevents a hard border in Northern Ireland, nonetheless finds itself locked into an alternative, inferior arrangement against our will.

The fourth step, Mr Speaker, is for the Government to deliver the commitment we have made to ensure full continued access for Northern Ireland's businesses to the whole of the UK internal market.

Northern Ireland's businesses rely heavily on trade with their largest market

– Great Britain – and we must protect this in any scenario.

Mr Speaker, let us remember that all of these steps are about insurance policies that no-one in the UK or the EU wants or expects to use.

So we cannot let this become the barrier to reaching the future partnership we all want to see.

We have to explore every possible option to break the impasse and that is what I am doing.

When I stood in Downing Street and addressed the nation for the first time, I pledged that the government I lead will not be driven by the interests of the privileged few but of ordinary working families.

And that is what guides me every day in these negotiations.

Before any decision, I ask: how do I best deliver the Brexit that the British people voted for.

How do I best take back control of our money, borders and laws.

How do I best protect jobs and make sure nothing gets in the way of our brilliant entrepreneurs and small businesses.

And how do I best protect the integrity of our precious United Kingdom, and protect the historic progress we have made in Northern Ireland.

And, if doing those things means I get difficult days in Brussels, then so be it. The Brexit talks are not about my interests. They are about the national interest – and the interests of the whole of our United Kingdom.

Serving our national interest will demand that we hold our nerve through these last stages of the negotiations, the hardest part of all.

It will mean not giving in to those who want to stop Brexit with a politicians vote – politicians telling the people they got it wrong the first time and should try again.

And it will mean focusing on the prize that lies before us: the great opportunities that we can open up for our country when we clear these final hurdles in the negotiations.

That is what I am working to achieve. And I commend this Statement to the House.

Speech: PM's statement on European Council: 22 October 2018

Mr Speaker, before I turn to the European Council, I am sure the whole House will join me in condemning the killing of Jamal Khashoggi in the strongest possible terms.

We must get to the truth of what happened – and my Rt Hon Friend the Foreign Secretary will be making a statement shortly.

Mr Speaker, on the European Council, in addition to Brexit, there were important discussions on security and migration.

First, at last Monday's Foreign Ministers meeting my Rt Hon Friend the Foreign Secretary and his French counterpart secured agreement on a new EU sanctions regime on the use of chemical weapons.

At this Council, I argued along with Dutch Prime Minister Rutte that we should also accelerate work on further measures – including sanctions – to respond to and deter cyber-attacks.

The attempted hacking of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in The Hague earlier this year was a stark example of the very real threats we face.

We must impose costs on all those who seek to do us harm, regardless of the means they use. And this Council agreed to take that work forward.

Second, in marking anti-slavery day, I welcomed the continued commitment of all EU leaders in working together to eliminate the barbaric crime of people trafficking.

We reaffirmed our shared commitments to doing more to tackle the challenges of migration upstream.

Following the Council, I met Premier Li of China, President Moon of South Korea and Prime Minister Lee of Singapore at the ASEM Summit.

Since 2010, our trade with Asia has grown by almost 50 per cent – more than with any other continent in the world. I want to develop that even further.

Indeed, Mr Speaker, the ability to develop our own new trade deals is one of the great opportunities of Brexit.

So at this Summit we discussed how the UK can build the most ambitious economic partnerships with all our Asian partners as we leave the European Union. And we also agreed to deepen our co-operation across shared threats to our security.

Turning to Brexit, Mr Speaker, let me begin with the progress we have made on

both the Withdrawal Agreement and the political declaration on our future relationship.

As I reported to the House last Monday, the shape of the deal across the vast majority of the Withdrawal Agreement is now clear.

Since Salzburg we have agreed the broad scope of provisions that set out the governance and dispute resolution arrangements for our Withdrawal Agreement.

We have developed a Protocol relating to the UK Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus.

Following discussions with Spain – and in close co-operation with the Government of Gibraltar – we have also developed a Protocol and a set of underlying memoranda relating to Gibraltar, heralding a new era in our relations.

And we have broad agreement on the structure and scope of the future relationship, with important progress made on issues like security, transport and services.

And this progress in the last three weeks builds on the areas where we have already reached agreement – on citizens' rights, on the financial settlement, on the Implementation Period, and in Northern Ireland, agreement on the preservation of the particular rights for UK and Irish citizens – and on the special arrangements between us such as the Common Travel Area, which has existed since before either the UK or Ireland ever became members of the European Economic Community.

Mr Speaker, taking all of this together, 95 per cent of the Withdrawal Agreement and its protocols are now settled.

There is one real sticking point left, but a considerable one, which is how we guarantee that – in the unlikely event our future relationship is not in place by the end of the Implementation Period – there is no return to a hard border between Northern Ireland and Ireland.

The commitment to avoiding a hard border is one this House emphatically endorsed and enshrined in law in the Withdrawal Act earlier this year.

As I set out last week, the original backstop proposal from the EU was one we could not accept, as it would mean creating a customs border down the Irish Sea and breaking up the integrity of our United Kingdom.

I do not believe that any UK Prime Minister could ever accept this.

And I certainly will not.

But as I said in my Mansion House speech: We chose to leave; we have a responsibility to help find a solution.

So earlier this year, we put forward a counter-proposal for a temporary UK-EU joint customs territory for the backstop.

And in a substantial shift in their position since Salzburg, the EU are now actively working with us on this proposal.

But a number of issues remain.

The EU argue that they cannot give a legally binding commitment to a UK-wide customs arrangement in the Withdrawal Agreement, so their original proposal must remain a possibility.

Furthermore, Mr Speaker, people are understandably worried that we could get stuck in a backstop that is designed only to be temporary.

And there are also concerns that Northern Ireland could be cut off from accessing its most important market – Great Britain.

During last week's Council, I had good discussions with Presidents Juncker, Tusk and Macron, Chancellor Merkel and Taoiseach Varadkar and others about how to break this impasse.

I believe there are four steps we need to take.

First, we must make the commitment to a temporary UK-EU joint customs territory legally binding, so the Northern Ireland only proposal is no longer needed.

This would not only protect relations North-South, but also, vitally, East-West.

This is critical: the relationship between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK is an integral strand of the Belfast Good Friday Agreement. So to protect that Agreement we need to preserve the totality of relationships it sets out.

Nothing we agree with the EU under Article 50 should risk a return to a hard border, or threaten the delicate constitutional and political arrangements underpinned by the Belfast Good Friday Agreement.

The second step, is to create an option to extend the Implementation Period as an alternative to the backstop.

Mr Speaker, I have not committed to extending the Implementation Period.

I do not want to extend the Implementation Period – and I do not believe that extending it will be necessary.

I see any extension – or being in any form of backstop – as undesirable. By far the best outcome for the UK, for Ireland and for the EU – is that our future relationship is agreed and in place by 1st January 2021.

I have every confidence that it will be. And the European Union have said they will show equal commitment to this timetable.

But the impasse we are trying to resolve is about the insurance policy if

this does not happen.

So what I am saying is that – if at the end of 2020 our future relationship was not quite ready – the proposal is that the UK would be able to make a sovereign choice between the UK-wide customs backstop or a short extension of the Implementation Period.

And Mr Speaker, there are some limited circumstances in which it could be argued that an extension to the Implementation Period might be preferable, if we were certain it was only for a short time

For example, a short extension to the Implementation Period would mean only one set of changes for businesses – at the point we move to the future relationship.

But in any such scenario we would have to be out of this Implementation Period well before the end of this Parliament.

The third step, Mr Speaker, is to ensure that were we to need either of these insurance policies – whether the backstop or a short extension to the Implementation Period – we could not be kept in either arrangement indefinitely.

We would not accept a position in which the UK, having negotiated in good faith an agreement which prevents a hard border in Northern Ireland, nonetheless finds itself locked into an alternative, inferior arrangement against our will.

The fourth step, Mr Speaker, is for the Government to deliver the commitment we have made to ensure full continued access for Northern Ireland's businesses to the whole of the UK internal market.

Northern Ireland's businesses rely heavily on trade with their largest market – Great Britain – and we must protect this in any scenario.

Mr Speaker, let us remember that all of these steps are about insurance policies that no-one in the UK or the EU wants or expects to use.

So we cannot let this become the barrier to reaching the future partnership we all want to see.

We have to explore every possible option to break the impasse and that is what I am doing.

When I stood in Downing Street and addressed the nation for the first time, I pledged that the government I lead will not be driven by the interests of the privileged few but of ordinary working families.

And that is what guides me every day in these negotiations.

Before any decision, I ask: how do I best deliver the Brexit that the British people voted for.

How do I best take back control of our money, borders and laws.

How do I best protect jobs and make sure nothing gets in the way of our brilliant entrepreneurs and small businesses.

And how do I best protect the integrity of our precious United Kingdom, and protect the historic progress we have made in Northern Ireland.

And, if doing those things means I get difficult days in Brussels, then so be it. The Brexit talks are not about my interests. They are about the national interest – and the interests of the whole of our United Kingdom.

Serving our national interest will demand that we hold our nerve through these last stages of the negotiations, the hardest part of all.

It will mean not giving in to those who want to stop Brexit with a politicians vote – politicians telling the people they got it wrong the first time and should try again.

And it will mean focusing on the prize that lies before us: the great opportunities that we can open up for our country when we clear these final hurdles in the negotiations.

That is what I am working to achieve. And I commend this Statement to the House.

Press release: New River Wear fish pass is complete

Essential work to safeguard the future of a flood warning service on the River Wear has also significantly improved access for fish.

The new state of the art Larinier fish pass at Stanhope is now complete, and will allow more species of fish to pass upstream over the weir in a much wider range of river levels, improving access to around 15 miles of spawning grounds.

The pass includes a series of 'baffles' – metal plates which are fixed to a sloped concrete channel – which slow the flow of the water so fish can swim over the top of them easily.

Phil Rippon, Fisheries Technical Specialist with the Environment Agency in the North East, said:

This fish pass has improved access to a large section of what was a difficult to reach area of the River Wear, improving spawning and

nursery grounds for salmon and trout in particular.

Projects such as this at Stanhope is an example of the sort of work which takes place right across the country to open up and enhance our rivers and streams.

We will be keeping a close eye on the success of the pass, and will be hoping to do some detailed monitoring of the pass and the upstream areas in the future.

Safeguarding the flood warning service

The Environment Agency has also carried out repairs to the weir which will improve the river flow and level monitoring capability of the Stanhope River Gauging Station – safeguarding the flood warning service for the area. Environment Agency Project Manager, Daniel Magee, added:

By improving the monitoring capabilities of the gauging station we can continue to provide an accurate and timely flood warning service to around 400 homes at risk of flooding from the River Wear.

This project safeguards the flood warning system for the future as well as creating environmental improvement. We appreciate the community's patience throughout this project and hope they are reassured now it is all complete.

Stanhope Gauging Station is ranked in the top 10 most important flow sites in the North East area. Opening in September 1958 it has almost continuous record of flow data, making it one of the longest flow records in the North East at 60 years.

[Stanhope Fish Pass](#)