

Press release: CMA launches enforcement action against gambling firms

As it steps up its investigation of the £4.5 billion sector, the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) is acting because it believes people aren't getting the deal they expect from sign-up promotions and operators are unfairly holding on to people's money.

This follows a joint programme of work between the Gambling Commission and the CMA to tackle a shared concern about whether people are being treated fairly by online gambling operators.

Sign-up promotions are designed to attract players onto casino-like gaming websites by offering bonus cash when they put in their own money. However, the CMA is concerned that people often don't get the deal they are expecting as the promotions come with an array of terms and conditions that are often confusing and unclear and, in some cases, may be unfair.

Customers might have to play hundreds of times before they are allowed to withdraw any money, so they don't have the choice to quit while they're ahead and walk away with their winnings when they want to.

Even when players haven't signed up for a promotion, there are concerns that some operators are stopping customers taking money out of their accounts. The CMA has been told by customers that some firms have minimum withdrawal amounts far bigger than the original deposit, or place hurdles in the way of them withdrawing their money.

Nisha Arora, CMA Senior Director for Consumer Enforcement, said:

We know online gambling is always going to be risky, but firms must also play fair. People should get the deal they're expecting if they sign up to a promotion, and be able to walk away with their money when they want to.

Sadly, we have heard this isn't always the case. New customers are being enticed by tempting promotions only to find the dice are loaded against them. And players can find a whole host of hurdles in their way when they want to withdraw their money.

That's why we are today launching enforcement action where we think the law has been broken. We are also asking people who have had difficulties withdrawing their money when they've gambled online to tell us about it, and help probe this issue even further.

Gambling Commission Chief Executive, Sarah Harrison, added:

Gambling operators must treat customers fairly – but some have been relying on terms that are unclear with too many strings attached.

Whilst the CMA takes enforcement action on how consumer legislation is followed, the gambling industry should be under no illusion that if they don't comply with consumer law, we will see this as a breach of their operating licence, and take decisive action.

The CMA [opened an investigation into the gambling sector's compliance with consumer protection law](#) towards the end of last year after hearing about a range of concerns that suggested some operators were not treating their customers fairly. As well as hearing from around 800 unhappy customers, it has also demanded companies answer questions about how they operate, and closely examined the play on a range of websites.

Having identified a number of operators engaging in practices likely to be breaking consumer law, the CMA is now taking enforcement action and has a range of powers at its disposal to bring any illegal activities to an end.

This investigation is part of a joint programme of work with the Gambling Commission to tackle issues around fairness and transparency in the gambling industry. As well as the enforcement cases, the investigation may lead to further action, from the CMA or the Gambling Commission, to improve practices across the online gambling sector.

All information relating to this investigation can be found on the [case page](#). This also sets out how people can get in touch with information on the concerns identified above.

Notes for editors

1. The CMA is the UK's primary competition and consumer authority. It is an independent non-ministerial government department with responsibility for carrying out investigations into mergers, markets and the regulated industries and enforcing competition and consumer law. For CMA updates, follow us on Twitter [@CMAgovuk](#), [Facebook](#), [Flickr](#) and [LinkedIn](#).
2. The Gambling Commission regulates gambling in Great Britain in partnership with licensing authorities. It also regulates the National Lottery. Its regulations are aimed at ensuring gambling is crime-free, fair and open and children and other vulnerable people are protected. It advises central and local government on the impact of gambling and its regulation. It holds operators to account; it ensures operators meet licensing standards and takes action against those that don't. It ensures that National Lottery returns to good causes are maximised.
3. The key pieces of consumer protection legislation relevant to the CMA's investigation are the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRs) and Part 2 of the Consumer Rights Act 2015. The

CPRs contain a general prohibition against unfair commercial practices and specific prohibitions against misleading actions, misleading omissions and aggressive commercial practices. Part 2 of the Consumer Rights Act aims to protect consumers against unfair contract terms and notices, and requires contract terms to be fair and transparent.

4. The CMA has not reached a final view on whether the terms and practices it is concerned about breach consumer protection law, and will listen to operators' responses to its concerns. If necessary the CMA will take action through the courts to enforce that law under Part 8 of the Enterprise Act 2002. Ultimately, only a court can rule that a particular term or practice infringes the law.
 5. The CMA can give Notice to any person under Part 3 of Schedule 5 to the Consumer Rights Act 2015 requiring that person to provide the information specified in the Notice to enable it to exercise, or consider whether to exercise, its consumer protection law enforcement functions under Part 8 of the Enterprise Act 2002. If a person fails to comply with such a Notice, the CMA may make an application to the court. If it appears to the court that that person has failed to comply with the Notice, the court may make an order requiring the person to do anything the court thinks it is reasonable for the person to do to ensure that the Notice is complied with. Any company officer responsible for the failure may also be required to meet the costs of the CMA's application.
 6. The online gambling sector has grown by around 150% since 2009. It is now worth £4.5 billion, and more than 6.5 million people regularly log on to gambling websites.
 7. Media enquiries to the CMA should be directed to press@cma.gsi.gov.uk or 020 3738 6798.
 8. Media enquiries to the Gambling Commission should be directed to Benjamin Glass (bglass@gamblingcommission.gov.uk or 0121 230 6700).
 9. The CMA [wants to hear from people who have had difficulties withdrawing their money](#) when they've gambled online by 31 August.
-

Speech: Ambassador to Mongolia Catherine Arnold at the Queen's Birthday Party 2017

Catherine Arnold addresses attendees at the Queen's Birthday Party 2017

Vice Ministers, Members of Parliament, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's my great pleasure to welcome you here, as we come together to mark the official birthday of Her Majesty the Queen.

No monarch has reigned longer.

At her coronation in 1953 the Queen promised the peoples she served across the globe:

"Throughout all my life, and with all my heart, I shall strive to be worthy of your trust."

It's one thing for a 26 year to utter those words. It is another to live by them for the next 65 years; today Her Majesty is Queen of 16 UN member states and head of the Commonwealth of 52 nations.

So I would like you to raise your glasses for the first toast of the afternoon, to Her Majesty: [The Queen]

Birthdays are a moment to celebrate. And there is much to celebrate in the last year of relations between Mongolia and the UK. Polo, countering the illegal wildlife trade, enhancing export standards, strengthening mental health care, championing women's rights, the UK and Mongolia are working together here, in the UK, and globally on things that matter to us, that matter to Mongolia, and that matter to the world we all live in.

That wouldn't be possible without the dedicated embassy team and without all of you, our friends, colleagues and partners. Each of you is here because of what the UK and Mongolia are doing together. And the number and diversity of you says more than words. Thank you.

But birthdays are also a moment to reflect. Reflect on what has changed. What has stayed the same. What has happened. The Queen's Birthday is no exception.

As the oldest and longest reigning monarch in the world, Her Majesty's Birthday allows us a particularly long period of reflexion. 91 years to be precise.

But does any of us truly understand what 91 years means? To bring it to life I'm going to quote a short extract from two things that were written in 1926, the year Her Majesty was born.

The first is from a car manual:

The engine is started by the lifting of the crank at the front of the car. Take hold of the handle and push firmly toward the car till you feel the crank engage, then lift upward with a quick swing. With a little experience this operation will become an easy matter.

Fortunately, none of you arrived today having had to use a starting-crank. The beautiful Range Rovers at the entrance demonstrate far better than my speech just how much technology has changed over Her Majesty's life – and I would like to thank Jaguar Land Rover for their sponsorship of today's celebration.

The second extract comes from the British children's classic Winnie the Pooh, also written in 1926:

"Well," said Pooh, "what I like best," and then he had to stop and think. Because although Eating Honey was a very good thing to do, there was a moment just before you began to eat it which was better than when you were, but he didn't know what it was called."

All of us will recognise immediately that moment that so confused Pooh. As the kaleidoscope of technology changes around us, human nature remains stubbornly constant.

That said, I know you won't have Pooh's feeling when you visit our sponsor Portmeirion in the Shangri-La mall – as I hope you all will. I thank Portmeirion today, and every time I have tea in my favourite cup. I am never disappointed.

Change and continuity. Which brings me to the last of my three birthday reflexions: what has happened.

A lot in the last year. Since I last stood here both of our countries have had parliamentary elections. And the UK has voted to leave the European Union – a perfect example of continuity and change.

The UK is exiting the EU. But we are not leaving Europe – that would be impossible, our culture, our values and our geography are inextricably entwined with our friends on the Continent.

The UK's outward looking engagement with the world will also remain unchanged.

Our sponsor Holiday Inn, part of UK InterContinental Hotels Group PLC, is a perfect example of that. IHG's origins lie in the founding of the Bass Brewery in 1777. Last year I was delighted to open Holiday Inn in Mongolia 9000km and 239 years later – a place that will further invigorate Mongolian business and tourism.

The UK's global engagement is clear. We remain the only G7 country to have met our UN commitment to spend 0.7% of GNI on overseas development. We have the largest defence spend in Europe. And our universities will continue to foster some of the world's greatest minds; the only countries to have more Nobel Prize winners than my university, Cambridge, alone has nurtured, are

the US, UK and Germany, in that order. Of all the world's heads of state and government, one in every seven was educated in Britain.

But as the Queen celebrates another birthday, we should pause for one final reflexion. Her Majesty is the only living head of state to have served in World War II. Shortly after her 18th birthday the then Princess Elizabeth trained as a war-time mechanic and truck driver.

3 weeks ago, over 70 years later, Her Majesty toured the wards of Manchester's Children's Hospital. She was there to talk with children who had been blown up leaving a concert.

Terrorism stalks the world. And today we remember those affected in recent weeks.

But I also want us to reflect on our personal response.

After the horrific attack, many thousands of people gathered in the central square in Manchester to commemorate the 22 who died and the dozens of injured. After the silence, the crowd struck up a song by Manchester band Oasis: don't look back in anger.

We stand here today, the UK and Mongolia, as proud democratic nations. Let me conclude with something else the Queen said on her coronation day.

"Parliamentary institutions, with their free speech and respect for the rights of minorities, and the inspiration of a broad tolerance in thought and expression – all this we conceive to be a precious part of our way of life and outlook.

I ask you now to cherish them – and practice them too; then we can go forward together in peace, seeking justice and freedom for all men."

Politics, events, what happens are shaped by people. We each have a personal part to play. We can choose to engage, to counter the narratives of hate, whatever mask they wear, whether of religion, ideology or nationalism.

Or we can choose to stand by and watch.

Each of us is here today because we have influence and, in different ways, power over narratives or people. As we make our choice each day, let us think of that 26 year old Queen:

"Throughout all my life, and with all my heart, I shall strive to be worthy of your trust."

May we strive to be worthy of the trust of those over whom we have influence.

Thank you.

News story: Female engineers play a vital role in Britain's transport industry

Transport Minister John Hayes met with female engineers at Waterloo Station to mark International Women in Engineering Day and to discuss their vital role in Britain's transport industry.

The minister met 7 engineers working across a number of Network Rail projects to find out about their work and their experiences in the industry.

Today (23 June 2017) is International Women in Engineering Day, which aims to raise the profile of women in engineering around the world and focus attention on the exciting career opportunities available to women in the industry.

Transport Minister John Hayes said:

At a time when we need more skills to make our transport infrastructure the best in the world, just 12% of people in the UK engineering industry are women. This is unacceptable and means we are missing so much talent and so much potential in this crucial field.

So to meet women who are so enthusiastic about their careers in the transport industry is as inspiring as it is meaningful. Female engineers can and will play a vital role as we deliver unprecedented investment in transport infrastructure over the coming years.

I am determined to draw on female talent in the transport sector because it is right to attract the best and brightest people. We need more high calibre women to join, and I encourage young women to rise to this challenge; to choose an exciting career in engineering. They will build Britain's future.

Charlotte Cove, Engineer at Network Rail said:

I got into engineering because my dad encouraged me. I went to an all girl's school and didn't have much support when it came to considering the right GCSE and A level choices to become an engineer – I was very lucky to have my dad and his engineering contacts.

I know that there is a perception among girls that engineers get dirty and wield spanners and screwdrivers all day – that's not what

I do, I'm more likely to have a pen and calculator in my hand.

I would strongly recommend engineering as a profession to all girls, simply because it's such a fulfilling career; it's stable, well-paid and you get so much respect from your colleagues. It fulfils your creative side as well.

The minister discussed the upcoming Year of Engineering campaign, which begins next year and will showcase the breadth of careers available to young people in engineering, as well as highlight the government's focus on encouraging more girls to become engineers.

The Network Rail engineers spoke with the minister about their paths into the transport sector; including what inspired them to pursue careers in engineering and their experiences at school and university. They advocated the diverse range of work, and the daily opportunities to be creative and problem-solve. They also discussed what could be done across the sector to encourage more women to pursue engineering roles, such as increasing liaison with schools to raise the profile of engineering with girls at a young age.

The Prime Minister's offer is too little too late – Starmer

Keir

Starmer, Labour's Shadow Secretary of State for Exiting the EU, responding to the Prime Minister's announcement on EU nationals, said:

"Labour has been clear that people should not be bargaining chips in the Brexit negotiations. The Prime Minister's offer is too little too late and falls far short of the full and unilateral guarantee Labour would make.

"We believe there must be a clear commitment that there will be no change to the status of EU nationals in the U.K. This is not only the right thing to do, but it will also help deliver a reciprocal agreement for the 1.2 million U.K. Nationals living in the EU."

Ends

Speech: “Questions on the British Indian Ocean Territory have long been a bilateral matter between the UK and Mauritius. “

Thank you Mr President.

Last September, Mr President, you asked the United Kingdom and Mauritius to engage in bilateral talks about the Chagos Archipelago, which the United Kingdom administers as the British Indian Ocean Territory. We have done that in good faith. Only this week, our new Minister for the United Nations, Lord Ahmad, flew to New York to continue the bilateral dialogue and to meet the Minister Mentor of Mauritius, whose eloquent speech we have just heard.

You were right, Mr President, to ask us to talk bilaterally – we should, as a rule, talk bilaterally to try to settle bilateral differences, and questions on the British Indian Ocean Territory have long been a bilateral matter between the UK and Mauritius. And we firmly hold that these questions should remain a bilateral matter.

So I regret that this issue has come to the General Assembly. It saddens us that a dispute between two UN members, two Commonwealth partners, should have reached this Chamber in this way. A more constructive path is still available and I call for the withdrawal of this draft resolution to keep that path open.

Despite the terms of the draft resolution, this is not a matter of decolonisation. Mauritius became independent in 1968, through mutual agreement between the Council of Ministers of Mauritius and the UK Government. In separate talks with the Council of Ministers, Mauritius had earlier accepted the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago: an agreement that Mauritius continued to respect until the 1980s. The General Assembly has not discussed this matter for decades.

And yet, here we are today, returning to this issue. Just think: how many other bilateral disputes left over from history could be brought before the General Assembly in this way? The present draft resolution could set a precedent that many of you in this hall could come to regret.

We do not doubt the right of the General Assembly to ask the ICJ for an advisory opinion on any legal question. But the fact that the General Assembly has not concerned itself with this matter for decades shows that today's debate has been called for other reasons.

Put simply, Mr President, the request for an advisory opinion is an attempt by the Government of Mauritius to circumvent a vital principle: the principle that a State is not obliged to have its bilateral disputes submitted for

judicial settlement without its consent. And let me be clear: we do not and we would not give that consent, because we are clear about what was agreed with Mauritius.

If the draft resolution were passed, the Court would, of course, have to decide whether it could properly respond to the request. Our view is that it could not do so, as it concerns a bilateral dispute between two member states.

Many of you here today have told us privately that you too see this as bilateral business and have urged us to use bilateral means to resolve it. So in turn, let me urge all of you who have told us this – and not only you – to vote against the draft resolution today. In particular, any of you planning to abstain because this is bilateral, please vote no precisely because this is bilateral.

We have made every constructive effort to engage and encourage the Government of Mauritius not to proceed with this plenary meeting today. Precisely because it is a bilateral matter, we entered into bilateral talks in good faith, determined to make them work.

Since September, we have had three substantive rounds of talks, and as I said we held discussions with Mauritius at Ministerial level here in New York this week. Despite every effort by the UK, we have not yet succeeded in bridging the differences between us. I regret this, but we remain committed to bilateral discussion.

This Assembly should also know that we have made significant offers to Mauritius. In 1965, we made a binding commitment to cede sovereignty of the Chagos Archipelago to Mauritius, when the archipelago is no longer needed for defence purposes. In the recent bilateral talks, our offers to Mauritius signalled very clearly that we acknowledge Mauritius's long-term interest in the archipelago. And we used the talks to try to increase mutual confidence between us, on those very matters that divide us.

So we offered, without prejudice to our sovereignty, a framework for the joint management, in environment and scientific study, of all the islands of the territory except for Diego Garcia. And we offered strategic and tactical forms of bilateral security co-operation. These offers were relevant to the dispute and were seriously made. I regret that Mauritius did not engage on them, because they could have made a big difference to our mutual confidence, and they would give Mauritius a more tangible and direct stake in the archipelago than it has ever had.

It was a surprise to us, Mr President, to see that the draft Resolution links the former inhabitants of the Chagos Archipelago, the Chagossians, with our sovereignty. It's a surprise, because Mauritius has not made more than a passing reference to the cause of Chagossians during all our bilateral talks. The Mauritian focus throughout the talks was its demand for a transfer of sovereignty.

Nevertheless, the welfare of Chagossians is an extremely important matter and

a real concern to us, and I want to be clear about my Government's position.

Like successive Governments before it, the present UK Government has expressed sincere regret about the manner in which Chagossians were removed from the British Indian Ocean Territory in the late 1960s and early 1970s. And we have shown that regret through practical action and support for the Chagossians ever since. In 1973, the then British Government gave funds directly to the Government of Mauritius to assist with their resettlement. In 1982, a further payment was made through a trust fund.

More recently, we have considered very closely the matter of resettlement. We commissioned an independent feasibility study and undertook a public consultation. These found that there is an aspiration among some Chagossian communities for resettlement, but demand appears to fall substantially when those consulted understand more about the likely conditions of civilian life on what are very remote and low-lying islands.

The Government has considered all the available information and has decided against resettlement on the grounds of feasibility; cost; and defence and security interests. While we have ruled out resettlement, we are determined to address the Chagossians' desire for better lives; their desire for connections with the territory. So, we are implementing a 50 million US dollar support package, which is being designed to improve Chagossian livelihoods in the communities where they now live: in Mauritius, the Seychelles and the UK.

We have already consulted Chagossian groups in all three countries and will continue to do so.

As I say, Mr President, the Mauritian focus throughout the talks has not been the Chagossians, but Mauritius's claim for sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago. The Government of Mauritius has repeatedly pressed us to specify a date for the transfer of sovereignty. We have explained to them why we cannot do this. We made an agreement in 1965 and the UK is standing by that agreement.

We created the British Indian Ocean Territory for defence purposes, and in 1966, concluded an agreement with the United States of America for joint defence use of the territory. The extensive facilities that have since been established, are primarily used as a forward operating location for aircraft and ships, and they make an essential contribution to regional and global security and stability. Moreover, they contribute to guaranteeing the security of the Indian Ocean itself, from which all neighbouring states benefit, including Mauritius. The facilities play a critical role in combating some of the most difficult and urgent problems of the 21st century, such as terrorism, international criminality, piracy and instability in its many forms.

Our current agreement with the United States lasts until 2036. We cannot, 19 years away, predict exactly what our defence purposes will require beyond that date. We should not and will not make arbitrary, or ill-informed, or premature decisions. We cannot gamble with the future of regional and global

security. Mauritius's attempted assurances on the base's future lack credibility. In contrast, the UK stands by its commitment. When we no longer need the territory for defence purposes, sovereignty will pass. That, by the way, is exactly what we did in relation to the very similar agreement reached with the Seychelles in 1965. We ceded sovereignty of islands to the Seychelles when we no longer needed them for defence purposes.

In our dealings with Mauritius, we have tried to set out bilateral relations on a positive, future path, rather than focus on the past. But we should be clear about the past. The simple fact is that we negotiated the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago with the elected representatives of Mauritius – the same people with whom we were, separately, negotiating the independence of Mauritius. The representatives of the Mauritian people had authority to negotiate with us in both negotiations, and in both cases they reached agreements with us.

On the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago, they negotiated first, compensation, which we paid; second, various rights for Mauritius; and third, this long-term commitment to cede the islands to Mauritius, when no longer needed for our defence purposes.

Our promise to cede sovereignty of the islands to Mauritius, when they are no longer needed for defence purposes, is not a sign that we lack confidence in our sovereignty. On the contrary, we were and we remain confident about our sovereignty. In its recent Arbitral Award, the UNCLOS Tribunal found that it had no jurisdiction to rule on Mauritius's sovereignty claim – contrary to what Mauritius has sought to imply in its notes to members of this Assembly.

In 1965, we undertook to cede the territory in due course because we were setting it up for a specific purpose but could envisage a future situation in which the territory might no longer make a useful contribution to defence purposes. That moment has not yet come. The base is playing a vital role.

Until the moment does come and subsequently, we want to enjoy positive, and friendly, and constructive relations with the people and with the Government of Mauritius. We have much in common and many reasons to work together. For our part, we are always willing to sit down and talk to our partners about contentious, bilateral matters that divide us. Although our efforts so far have not been successful, I repeat that offer now to the Government of Mauritius. This is a bilateral matter for bilateral talks. It is not a matter for an advisory opinion to be given to the General Assembly.

The United Kingdom has always been and continues to be a strong upholder of international law. We are not opposing this Resolution because we have changed our principles, nor because we believe the rule of law does not apply in this case, rather we oppose this Resolution because referring a bilateral dispute to the ICJ is not the appropriate course of action.

So in conclusion, Mr President, for all of these reasons, we strongly oppose the draft Resolution. A request for an advisory opinion would be a distraction and, I fear, an obstacle to the path of bilateral talks, which is our preferred course of action. And it would set a terrible precedent, both

for this Assembly and for the Court. If Mauritius will not withdraw it, I urge members to vote against the resolution.

Thank you Mr President.