

My Intervention on the Safety of Rwanda Bill amendments – Court challenges

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con):

Many people share the Government's ambition to stop the boats. Would these Lords amendments not muddle the legislation in a way that, once again, would leave us open to an unnecessary court challenge? Can he reassure us that, unamended, the Bill will do the job?

Michael Tomlinson:

I know my right hon. Friend has taken a close interest in the Bill since the outset, and he is right. The amendments fall into two categories: those that are simply unnecessary and those that are worse than unnecessary. The second group are wrecking amendments deliberately designed to prevent the very things that the Bill was designed to do—namely, stopping the boats and getting the planes off the ground.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stone (Sir William Cash) has previously accused me of repeating myself from time to time—heaven forfend—but he is right, because our approach is justified as a matter of parliamentary sovereignty and constitutional propriety. Indeed, my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for South Swindon (Sir Robert Buckland) has even said that it is not unprecedented, and he is right. It also meets our international obligations.