

Green Party leaders ask Theresa May: Did you know about the Muslim ban?



31 January 2017

*** Jonathan Bartley, co-leader: May's inaction a betrayal of Britain and appeasement of a racist, bigoted President**

The leaders of the Green Party have written to Theresa May [1] to ask her if knew about President Trump's Muslim ban before it was announced.

The call follows reports that the Prime Minister was told about the ban during her visit to the United States. [2]

The letter from Jonathan Bartley and Caroline Lucas states that, with more than 1.5 million people signing a petition [3] to cancel Trump's state visit because of the ban, the public have the right to know how much May was told about the policy in advance.

Jonathan Bartley, Green Party co-leader, said:

"News that the Prime Minister already knew about President Trump's Muslim ban is deeply disturbing and will send a chill down the spine of all who believe in a just and compassionate world.

"This week more than 1.5 million British people made it clear they want to live in a country that shows leadership and has a clear resolve to create a world where refugees are welcomed and supported. Donald Trump's action stands in complete opposition to this.

"Theresa May must answer questions on how much she knew and what she did to challenge such a vile policy.

"If the Prime Minister knew about the Muslim ban in advance, and failed to challenge it, it would be not just a betrayal of the open, tolerant and welcoming country that Britain should be, but amount to appeasement of a racist, bigoted President."

Notes:

1. Dear Prime Minister,

We are concerned by reports you were told about President Trump's plans to ban the residents of seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States in advance of the policy announcement.

With more than 1.5 million people signing a petition calling on you to cancel the state visit invitation extended to the US President, it's clear that there is a huge public anger. The country has a right to know how much you

were told about the ban, and what you said to the President about it.

Were you told about the ban at the meeting with President Trump?

If so, what exactly were you told, and when.

And crucially, what did you say in response?

Yesterday we also learnt that the President may be intending to pull the US out of the Paris Agreement – an announcement which came just days after you left the US. Such a move would be a bitter blow to Britain's stated intent to work with other countries to tackle climate change, possibly the greatest threat that our country faces.

Did you talk to the President about climate change?

What did you say, and what was his response?

If you did not raise climate change with him, then why?

The British people deserve to be told the truth. We trust you will answer these pertinent questions as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Bartley, Green Party co-leader

Caroline Lucas, Green Party co-leader

1. <https://www.channel4.com/news/by/gary-gibbon/blogs/theresa-may-told-a-us-refugee-ban-was-coming>
2. <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/171928>

[Tweet](#)

[Back to main news page](#)

[Let's block ads! \(Why?\)](#)

Press release: Tata Steel make amends with £73,000 donation, following pollution

Tata Steel UK Ltd (TSUK) paid the money to the Humber Nature Partnership, an organisation that delivers projects resulting in environmental, economic and community benefits. The payment follows a pollution incident on the

Bottesford Beck.

On the 22 May 2015 after a call from the TSUK Environment Manager, Environment Agency officers found a heavy red coloured lubricating oil on Seraphim lagoon, the Bottesford Beck and in wetland channels of Ashby Ville Local Nature Reserve.

Following investigations it appears that the oil overflowed from an industrial bulk container as oil was being drained from a lubricating tank on the TSUK site.

Under the terms of this Enforcement Undertaking (EU), Tata Steel UK Ltd accepted an obligation to make a donation of £73,000 to the Humber Nature Partnership. Final plans for how the money will be used are still underway, but tree planting creation of wildlife ponds and ground works for an outdoor classroom that could be used by local schools are some schemes under consideration.

As part of the EU, Tata Steel UK Ltd has also agreed to take action to ensure that a similar incident does not recur and paid the costs of the Environment Agency.

Elizabeth Cooper, environment officer with the Environment Agency, said:

We work hard to protect people and the environment. In this case, we considered that the Enforcement Undertaking was an appropriate way to sanction the company while creating a benefit for the local environment.

Serious pollution can have devastating effects on rivers, fields and wildlife.

Along with prosecutions, the Environment Agency use enforcement notices, stop notices and civil sanctions to either improve performance or stop sites from operating. It is making better use of the wide range of measures that are available to bring sites back into compliance as quickly as possible.

The Environment Agency's use of civil sanctions is in line with recent legislation extending their availability for more offences.

Civil sanctions such as these can be a proportionate and cost-effective way for businesses to make amends for less serious environmental offences.

The Enforcement Undertaking requires Tata Steel UK Ltd to:

- Make a donation of £73,000 to the Humber Nature Partnership
- Implement pollution prevention and restoration works

- Review refresher training for staff
- Site improvement works
- Pay Environment Agency costs

Failure to comply with an EU may result in the offender being prosecuted for the original offence. Details of Enforcement Undertakings accepted by the Environment Agency between can be found on GOV.UK

ENDS

News story: Service personnel want greater choice on where they get to live

Launched in August 2016, the [Future Accommodation Model](#) (FAM) is being set up to provide the best possible accommodation better suited to the modern Armed Forces and their families – offering a choice based on need, not age, rank or relationship status.

The scheme aims to give personnel greater support in purchasing their own home through initiatives such as ‘Forces Help to Buy’ which helps younger military personnel purchase their first home, and has proven popular with those in lower ranks.

It will also include the option of renting privately, with £450 million being spent to subsidise costs. For those renting, allowances will adjust so that personnel based in more expensive areas will not pay more, so a three-bed property in Cornwall will cost them the same as a three-bed property in London. By giving service personnel greater choice in where they get to live it can also offer more opportunities for military families, like increasing employment prospects for partners and spouses.

Taking place between September and October 2016, this survey is part of an on-going consultation to inform the Ministry of Defence (MOD) accommodation policy development.

Chief of Defence People, Lieutenant General Richard Nugee, said:

The Future Accommodation Model will ensure that our people are offered a greater choice in where they want to live. Over the

coming months, we will refine how we do this and look to ensure that service personnel are engaged and listened to every step of the way. This survey will help us immeasurably to better understand what is important to personnel when it comes to where and how they live.

It is vital that the accommodation system works for everybody and reflects the needs of a modern Armed Force. This is why the MOD also refurbished 4,700 military homes last year and is investing over £4 billion to provide better facilities for the Armed Forces and their families.

Future Accommodation Model survey Headline Results

- FAM is considered attractive by over half of Service personnel – with Junior Officers and Other Ranks more likely to find it attractive than Senior Officers.
- Over half of Service Personnel feel that FAM is fairer than the current MOD accommodation offer.
- The most important factor regarding accommodation is the ability to live in good quality accommodation, while the choice of living in either a civilian or military community is considered the least important.
- For married personnel, and those with children, the second most important factor was the opportunity to live with family and children.
- There is a clear preference for home ownership across the Services, with over a third of personnel preferring the ‘owning near work’ option.
- If FAM were widened to include Service Family Accommodation (SFA), offered at the same costs as the ‘Renting near work’ option, then over a third would choose it.
- Some of the top reasons for choosing FAM options were: to own a property; to choose a location near to what’s important to people; and, because they are financially attractive.

The [initial findings can be viewed here](#), and a second tranche of the full data tables will be published in March.

The Ministry of Defence will also be taking into account other evidence gathered, including results from the FAM focus groups and the survey results of the single Service Family Federations, which asked family members and partners of Service personnel for their opinions.

[Press release: Company agrees to £50,000 charitable contribution amidst](#)

pollution allegations

Integrated Waste Management (IWM) has agreed to pay £50,000 to the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust following allegations of pollution in Winteringham.

In July 2015 the Environment Agency (EA) received a report of dead fish in the Haven Drain in Winteringham. Upon further investigation the EA found dead fish and low ammonia, indicating that pollution had taken place. 90 dead fish were counted, with EA officers estimating that 403 fish had been killed over a 4.4km stretch of watercourse.

EA officers traced the pollution back to the vicinity of Winterton North Landfill, a site which is operated by IWM. A leak as well as some blockage issues were found on-site.

Following the incident, IWM agreed to pay £50,000 to the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. It also agreed to put measures in place to prevent a similar incident from occurring in the future, and paid £7,041.70 in costs to the EA.

The Environment Agency uses civil sanctions, enforcement notices and stop notices along with prosecutions, to either improve performance or stop sites from operating. The Environment Agency's use of civil sanctions is in line with recent legislation extending their availability for more offences.

Civil sanctions such as these can be a proportionate and cost-effective way for businesses to make amends for less serious environmental offences.

Simon Mitchell, Environment Manager with the Environment Agency, said:

At the Environment Agency we work hard on a day-to-day basis to protect the environment. In this particular case of pollution, the impact on the environment was limited. The company co-operated with our investigation and responded quickly to the incident.

This is why we decided that an Enforcement Undertaking would be an appropriate way to sanction the company while contributing positively to the environment.

We will still choose to prosecute offenders in the most severe cases.

The Enforcement Undertaking requires Integrated Waste Management to:

- Make a donation of £50,000 to the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
- Make improvements to site operations
- Pay Environment Agency £7,041.70 in costs

Failure to comply with an EU may result in the offender being prosecuted for

the original offence. Details of Enforcement Undertakings accepted by the Environment Agency can be found on our [website here](#).

ENDS

Notes to editors:

- On or about 15 July 2015, Integrated Waste Management Ltd failed to comply with a condition of its Environmental Permit for a regulated facility at Winterton North Landfill Site. This was contrary to Regulation 38(2) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.
- The EU was accepted on 31 August 2016.

Press release: Anglian Water makes amends following pollution

Anglian Water Services Ltd has agreed to pay £100,000 to a local community interest company following a pollution incident in Peterborough.

Anglian Water paid the sum to River Nene Regional Park, a local social enterprise. The payment follows a pollution incident at Anglian Water's Flag Fen Water Recycling Centre (WRC).

In May 2013, storm tanks at Flag Fen WRC overflowed, discharging untreated sewage into the Counter Drain. Although the overflow occurred throughout May 2013, the environmental impact was localised and short-lived. It only affected the Counter Drain, and did not adversely affect the River Nene.

Because this was not a case of severe pollution, the Environment Agency decided to agree to a civil sanction called an Enforcement Undertaking (EU). Under the terms of this EU, Anglian Water offered to make a donation of £100,000 to the River Nene Regional Park. This donation will enable the River Nene Regional Park to employ a River Restoration Officer.

As part of the EU, Anglian Water has also agreed to take action to ensure that a similar incident does not recur. The company paid £13,486.43 in costs to the EA.

Along with prosecutions, the Environment Agency use enforcement notices, stop notices and civil sanctions to either improve performance or stop sites from operating. It is making better use of the wide range of measures that are available to bring sites back into compliance as quickly as possible.

The Environment Agency's use of civil sanctions is in line with recent legislation extending their availability for more offences.

Civil sanctions such as these can be a proportionate and cost-effective way for businesses to make amends for less serious environmental offences.

Yvonne Daly, Environment Manager with the Environment Agency, said: "We work hard to protect people and the environment. In this case, we considered that the Enforcement Undertaking was an appropriate way to sanction the company while creating a benefit for the environment.

"Serious pollution can have devastating effects on rivers, fields and wildlife. In the most severe cases, we will still prosecute offenders."

The Enforcement Undertaking requires Anglian Water to:

- Make a donation of £100,000 to the River Nene Regional Park Community Interest Company
- Make improvements to site operations
- Pay Environment Agency £13,486.43 in costs

Failure to comply with an EU may result in the offender being prosecuted for the original offence. Details of Enforcement Undertakings accepted by the Environment Agency can be found on our [website here](#).

ENDS

Notes to editors:

- Anglian Water Services Ltd discharged sewage effluent into the Counter Drain from Flag Fen Water Recycling Centre, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire between 8 May and 1 June 2013. This is contrary to section 4(1) of the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975.
- The EU was accepted on 12 July 2016.