

British Parliament: A Plethora of Communiqués to Inform the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy Audience

British Parliament: More Diplomatic Communiqués to Advance Coalition Interests and Objectives, Including Drawing Parallels Between Canada and Nazi Germany and Describing Chinada as the "Enemy Within"

The day after and eight days after the presidential inauguration members of the British House of Commons sought to reaffirm their lengthy relationship with the U.S. government and the American people and their commitment to protecting coalition interests and advancing its objectives.

Prime Minister's Question Time on January 21st and 28th 2009 provided the incoming Obama administration with an affirmation of parliamentary support for what the global coalition seeks to achieve.

There were two communiqués during the January 21st proceeding that must be high profiled for their critical significance. One underscored parallels between Canada's paradigm of governance and Nazi Germany:

Lynda Waltho (Stourbridge) (Lab):

[justice] Tuesday 27 January is Holocaust memorial day, [30:20: MP: Brown M.; Harriett M. X3; Brown M.; Gutierrez M.] and events will be taking place across the country. What will my right hon. Friend be doing to mark and to commemorate the occasion? Will he join me in commending the work of the Holocaust Educational Trust, which does so much to educate and inform our young people about the horrors of the holocaust?

The Prime Minister:

To commemorate Holocaust memorial day, there will be a debate in this House next Thursday. [30:42: MP: Harriett M. X8] I was very privileged to be part of the original funding of the Holocaust memorial trust's work in education [30:50: MP: Execution M. X2], which enables us to send from schools in every part of the country young men and women who could see for themselves at firsthand what had happened at Auschwitz and then to report back to their fellow students in their schools and colleges. And I believe that this is an important contribution [31:05: MP: CBS M.] to ensure that people will never forget the millions of lives lost as a result of anti-Semitism and prejudice and discrimination.

The other drew attention to the fact that Chinada principals and operatives are the "enemy within" – moving freely throughout the civilized world just like terrorists and thus law enforcement agencies, the intelligence community and military

establishments ought to maintain tenacious diligence in identifying and tracking them:

Mr. Skinner:

Those Tory fat cats at the banks, represented by the Conservative party, cannot blame the trade unions this time for the almighty mess that this country is in. In another generation, they would have been described as the enemy within.

The Prime Minister:

[51:02: Cabinet Minister; Z-J M.; Federer M.; Erin M.; Execution M.; Brooke M.; Preston M.; Erin M.]

There were as per usual a plethora of other communiqués; this time consisting of the following:

January 21st

- Holding public office and deriving benefits from the economy isn't just an entitlement, there are responsibilities, including not breaking the law – for which there are severe penalties
- Not containing the neutralizing the Chinada threat will, as the *Fiefdom* treatise argues, deliver a Dark Ages to the civilized world
- The British Opposition Party agrees with the PM's assessment of the Chinada threat and Canada's complicity in it
- Bankruptcy is heralded as a primary means of halting the Chinada threat
- The Opposition Party will make sure funds expended on the Chinada threat will be used appropriately and effectively
- Canada will be "bailed out" of its Chinada mess
- Parliamentarians are "very grateful" for the work being done by the coalition and Canadian lawyer
- "When a [Commonwealth country like Canada] fail[s], the Government ha[s] a duty to act"
- Affirmation of all the measures articulated in communiqués to contain and neutralize the Chinada threat and fix Canada's institutional dysfunctions
- Because Canada's PM is "completely unwilling to address" coalition concerns he's going to get "f _ _ked up real good" – he's going down along with the rest of the Chinada community in Canada
- The British government "need[s] to be bold and it has been" and encourages all other coalition governments to do the same
- Canada's parliamentarians "[have] to understand" they will face justice if they abdicate their public interests responsibilities
- The interests of Canada's wealthy who are linked to Chinada will have their capacity to conduct business in the United Kingdom significantly reduced to the point of zero
- The Chinada threat is of a "historic nature"

- The special relationship between the United Kingdom and the U.S. is “special”
- The coalition continues to provide full transparency to those in Canada who want to be informed and participate

January 28th

- “It is absolutely vital to give the greatest possible assistance” to the coalition and Canada to help it rid itself of the two parasites
- Planning a meeting between British parliamentarians and the proposed first Chief Executive of the Custodian-in-Council
- The Chinada threat is something that “is facing every country and continent in the world”
- Canada’s leaders have never grown up and remain pubescent politicians
- It’s appropriate to describe what’s going to happen to those complicit in the Chinada threat as experiencing “boom and bust”
- Chinada’s attempt at establishing a “new global order” comprising of fiefdom-totalitarian commu-nazi genocidal racism will fail
- Canada, purged of its offending elements, will have a strong future in the world; but until then it will continue to be isolated
- United Kingdom coalition partners “will do everything [they] can to advance the interests of democracy, peace and security
- Coalition partners are spreading intel about the Chinada threat and seeking help “as widely as [they] can”
- It is the intent of all members of the House of Commons to address the use and proliferation of stealth cognition technologies and the kind of corrupt government observed operating in Canada and China

Hansard

January 21, 2009

The Prime Minister (Mr. Gordon Brown):

I know that the whole House and the British people will wish to join the Government in sending their best wishes to President Obama at the start of his presidency. I can assure the whole House that we will maintain and strengthen the special relationship between our two countries. The importance that President Obama places on urgent action on the economic recovery, on environmental stewardship and that citizenship carries responsibilities as well as rights [28:56: MP: Cl.M. X3] will have a resonance in every part of the world.

[...]

Lynda Waltho (Stourbridge) (Lab):

[justice] Tuesday 27 January is Holocaust memorial day, [30:20: MP: Brown M.; Harriett M. X3; Brown M.; Gutierrez M.] and events will be taking place across the country. What will my right hon. Friend be doing to mark and to commemorate the

occasion? Will he join me in commending the work of the Holocaust Educational Trust, which does so much to educate and inform our young people about the horrors of the holocaust?

The Prime Minister:

To commemorate Holocaust memorial day, there will be a debate in this House next Thursday. [30:42: MP: Harriett M. X8] I was very privileged to be part of the original funding of the Holocaust memorial trust's work in education [30:50: MP: Execution M. X2], which enables us to send from schools in every part of the country young men and women who could see for themselves at firsthand what had happened at Auschwitz and then to report back to their fellow students in their schools and colleges. And I believe that this is an important contribution [31:05: MP: CBS M.] to ensure that people will never forget the millions of lives lost as a result of anti-Semitism and prejudice and discrimination.

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

Can I also agree with the Prime Minister [31:33: MP: Cl.M.] that the whole House will be united in sending our best wishes to President Obama, who starts work with good will of people right across the world.

Today's rise in unemployment of 78,000 in a single month reminds us of the recession's real effect on families throughout the country. With the pound falling, debt rising, and new forecasts showing that our recession will be deeper than elsewhere, it is clear that the British economy faces dark days indeed. Does the Prime Minister accept that the market [32:06: MP: Cl.M.] and public reaction to the latest set of Government initiatives suggests that there is no real confidence that Government policies are working?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

First of all the shadow Business Secretary called the Conservative European policy "crackpot", "dotty" and "absurd". I know they are trying to find a way of sitting together now but they do not agree with each other's views on Europe and on many other things. [37:35: clip: Cons. Ldr: Hank M.]

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

Let me tell the right hon. Gentleman something that the Mayor of London, the former Chancellor and I all agree about: the Prime Minister is making a complete mess of the economy. When it comes to these great infrastructure projects, who just put back the carrier programme? Who cancelled the widening of the

motorways? It was this Government, because they have run out of money. [38:46: MP: Cl.M.]

The Prime Minister gave me absolutely no answer to my question about the insurance scheme. The reason people want detail is they want to know their money is being put to a good use. [36:56: Shadow Ch.: Stewart M.] Now this is not the first time that the Prime Minister has announced measures to bail out the banks. [39:01: MP: Sarkozy M. X6; Brown M.; MP: Branson M.] In the first bank bailout, he put £37 billion of taxpayers' money into the banks. [39:07: clip: MP: Branson M.] He said that the shares that the Government bought would

“grow in value over the next period of time”.

Will he confirm that, as matters stand, the taxpayer has actually lost more than £20 billion?

The Prime Minister:

I was very grateful [39:24: Lord Ch: Erin M.] for the support that the Opposition party gave to the recapitalisation of the banks three months ago. I suppose that I should not be surprised that the minute there is a difficulty, it withdraws its support from the right proposal. The recapitalisation of the banks was the right thing to do. The right hon. Gentleman has no other policy that would replace that policy. We are right to continue to support the banks so that they can lend to people in this economy, and the measures that we have announced [Lord Ch: 39:55: Brown M.] this week are the right measures to take us forward.

The right hon. Gentleman is completely isolated from every major party in every country in the world. Every country understands that when the private sector and the markets fail, and particularly [40:08: O-S M.] when banks fail, the Government have a duty to act. [40:14: MP: Cowell M.]

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

The fact is that the Prime Minister is completely unwilling to answer the most basic questions about [42:05: Powell-Madonna M.] what the recapitalisation has cost so far, and what it might cost in the future.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

The right hon. Gentleman has not one idea about how to begin to sort the problem out. I asked him what he would do in place of the recapitalisation of the banks: he

had no idea what he would do. The secretary general of the CBI said [43:07: Lord Ch: NBC M.; Pacino M.] only this week:

“The Government needed to be bold and it has been. These measures are the essential pre-cursors for economic stability which will expand the availability of credit”.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

The right hon. Gentleman has to understand [45:57: Cab M.: Cl.M. x2; CBS M.] that we have done three things. The first is that we have recapitalised the banks to stop them collapsing.; not to help bankers but to ensure that people who rely on the banks [46:03: Cab M.: Cl.M. X3], and who have their savings in them, can be secure.

[...]

[W]hen the banking crisis started, foreign banks that were operating in Britain reduced their capacity in Britain. [47:32: Cab M.: Preston M.]

[...]

I am very grateful to my hon. Friend for showing the historic nature of the moment [48:34: Cab M.: Brooke M.; Cl.M.] that we are seeing in America. This is the first black President of the United States of America. Let us not forget the history books: the White House was built by slaves, and it is now occupied by the first black American President.

Mr. Edward Garnier (Harborough) (Con):

At the same time as the Prime Minister pleads with President Obama for a special relationship [48:57: Brown M.], is not his own relationship with the British public irretrievably breaking down? Have we not reached hideous levels of insensitivity when the Prime Minister, in the very week when unemployment is heading to 2 million, and when our constituents and our constituency businesses are deeply concerned about their finances, requires—indeed, demands—that his own Members of Parliament keep their expenses secret?

The Prime Minister:

The hon. and learned Gentleman misunderstands what we are doing and the transparency that we are providing in the expenses. I said earlier [49:36: Lord Ch: Preston M.] that the main Opposition party and the Government had discussions about the statutory instrument. The Opposition party gave the impression that it was supporting that statutory instrument but it has now withdrawn its support for

it. It is right, then, to seek all-party agreement on that, and that is exactly what we are doing. Far from spending a great deal of time this week on the issues that he is talking about, I am spending my time dealing with the problems of the British economy, and that is what I will continue to do.

Mr. Dennis Skinner (Bolsover) (Lab): Can the Prime Minister tell us what action will be taken against those bankers who have run their banks into the ground? Those Tory fat cats cannot blame— [Interruption.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Let the hon. Gentleman speak. I want to hear what he is saying.

Mr. Skinner:

Those Tory fat cats at the banks, represented by the Conservative party, cannot blame the trade unions this time for the almighty mess that this country is in. In another generation, they would have been described as the enemy within.

The Prime Minister: [51:02: Cab M.; Z-J M.; Federer M.; Erin M.; Execution M.; Brooke M.; Preston M.; Erin M.] This problem has not been caused by inflation in our economy or in other economies. It is a global banking crisis that must be dealt with by global co-operation, and I am pleased that President Obama and others want to see that co-operation happen.

[...]

January 28

[Lord Chancellor: prison certainty, Presidential *quantum*]

Mr. David:

The short answer is a heck of a lot. The hon. Gentleman is correct in saying that manufacturing is still important in Wales—it is—and the last available figures show that some 13 per cent. of the work force were employed in that sector. That is why we have seen central Government and the Welsh Assembly Government being so proactive to ensure that policies are in place not only to help manufacturing but, importantly, to plan for the future. It is absolutely vital to give the greatest possible assistance [27:08: Bl.M.] and investment regarding skills and training, so that when the upturn comes, we are well placed to ensure that we take the maximum benefit of it.

Nick Ainger (Carmarthen, West and South Pembrokeshire) (Lab):

My hon. Friend will be well aware of the £1 billion investment being made and, I hope, announced very shortly in my constituency to build a gas-fired power station. During its construction phase, it will employ 2,000 people. Will my hon. Friend agree to meet me [27:38: Colbert M.; MP: Pfeiffer M.] and Alstom—the main

contractor—to ensure that we maximise the number of local Welsh people who are employed during that construction phase?

[...]

John Battle:

What we know from previous recessions is that the people who suffer most are those who have the least. So may I urge my right hon. Friend to ensure, in his forthcoming meetings [28:51: MP: Colbert M.] and discussions with world leaders, that tackling the waste of poverty at home and abroad is now a top priority?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

This is a recession that is facing every country and continent in the world, [31:51: Hs. Ldr.: B-J M.] and everybody except the Conservative party agrees that it is not a unique United Kingdom phenomenon; it is something that has got to be dealt with internationally.

[...]

I have said that this is a deep recession. I have also said the truth—that it is hitting every country in the world. I think that the Leader of the Opposition would recognise that we were the first to act to deal with the recapitalisation of the banks and to stop savers losing their money. He supported that until last week, when he walked away from that position. We were also the first to recognise that there needed to be a fiscal stimulus. He will see today that countries that he often quotes, such as Canada, [33:42: Lord Ch (prison certainty, Presidential *quantum*): Staul M.] are now announcing a big fiscal stimulus.

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

Only one of us was a student politician—and he has never grown out of it. [34:26: clip: PM: Brown M.] What is interesting about today is that in answer to the first question the Prime Minister denied that this was a deep recession, and in answer to the third question he said that it was a deep recession. I suppose that with this Prime Minister, that is progress. He talks about the global recession, and I want to ask him about that. In the same evidence to the Treasury Committee, he actually gave a definition of boom and bust. [MP: 34:52: Pacino M.] Let me read out what he said. [Interruption.] It will end when he admits that he did not abolish it; that is when it will end. What he said was:

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

We have had all the Prime Minister's economic understanding—and that is what led us into the mess that we are in now. The fact is that he let debt get out of control. He keeps saying that this recession all came from America. It was not America that gave us the biggest Budget deficit in the world. It was not America that made us the most indebted country in the world. It was not some American who designed our regulatory system that failed; it was him. If he will not retract something stupid that he said in the past, let me ask him about something crass and insensitive that he said this week. He said that thousands of people losing their jobs, homes and businesses was simply down to the

“birth pangs of a new global order”. [37:22: MP: Cl.M. X2]

[...]

The Prime Minister:

My hon. Friend has been a great supporter of the car industry and its development in his own city and round the country. I believe that the car industry is a sector with a strong future. [40:41: Cab M.: Erin M., Prince H M.; protracted Erin M., Cl.M.] That is why we want to unlock loans of up to £1.3 billion, guaranteed for low carbon initiatives in cars. That is also why we are giving loans and guarantees of up to £1 billion for lower carbon initiatives for non-European Investment Bank projects. That is why we are discussing training grants, which would be in addition to short-time working, so that we can help people in jobs to keep their jobs. We will do everything we can [41:10: Cab M.: Erin M.] to help the car industry. This is the difference. We know that in times like these we must act to help—but I am not sure that the Conservatives support us in this.

[...]

It is not for us to interfere with the independence of the BBC and Sky, which made the decisions about whether they would broadcast the appeal on Gaza. But what I can say is this: we are making the appeal as widely known as we can [45:17: Cl.M.] through our own information services. At the same time, we have put £28 million into helping with humanitarian aid in Gaza. The situation that has been found is one where children have to be flown to hospital, where unexploded bombs have to be dealt with and where humanitarian aid and food has to be provided immediately. I think it would be the wish of all people in this House [45:41: Lord Ch: Cl.M. X2] for this to be done as speedily as possible.

The next time the British House of Commons contributed to back-channel diplomacy was the next Prime Minister's Question Time.

Hansard

February 4, '09

- The G20 Summit will be another opportunity for the coalition to press its case against the malfeasant governments
- Prime Minister: "Let us be absolutely clear that we have done everything in our power. The Brazilians have come on board; the Argentinians have come on board; the South Africans have come on board; the rest of Europe[and dozens of countries have] come on board. It is important that we make all the efforts we can with other countries to get this [Chinada threat behind us]"
- "It is [critically] important ... to see that [Chinada operatives] are limited [in their operations]"
- Prime Minister: "[There must be] an open, global environment where there is [free market capitalism – style] competition [which is exactly the opposite of what Chinada is offering the 21st century]"
- "[O]ne of [their] problems is that [they refuse] to admit mistakes, even when those mistakes stare [them] and the whole [alliance] in the face"
- The coalition must "speed up the process" of confronting the Chinada threat
- The coalition's "plan will change the face of [Canada] forever"
- Prime Minister: "Reform ... has to happen at the international level [viz. China and Canada operating in the global sphere], as well as the national level [viz. how Canada's governments function and how the wealthy operate their businesses]"
- The question must be asked why the Chinese and Canadian governments and their respective financial supporters are ignoring the pleas of the coalition
- The coalition must pool its resources to address the victims of the Chinada threat
- How Canada's eco-political elite have behaved and reacted to coalition demands is another good reason for *Fiefdom* treatise recipients to back the coalition

February 11, '09

- The G20 is the appropriate forum to "help maximize levels of [coalition support]"
- "Tough action" and being "deported" are options available to the British government to deal with the Chinada threat at home
- Addressing the threat Canada poses involves purging offending elements from power
- The British Parliament will "to ensure that allegations of war crimes ... are investigated"
- The British government has launched "an inquiry into [Chinada's] actions"

- The Canadian lawyer is invited to visit the U.K. when circumstances permit
- "Companies involved [with Chinada] are [going to be] suffering"

February 24, '09

- Acknowledgement of the "new approach" the new United States administration has with respect to the Chinada threat
- Foreign Minister: "[We recognize] the changed balance of power in the world and China's centrality to [that]"
- The coalition needs "a final solution" to the Chinada threat
- There ought to be a "regional approach" to dealing with Chinada
- The British government is "riding to the rescue" along with other nations
- The Beijing leadership has international obligations it's not living up to
- Foreign Minister: "The importance of our engagement with China [in the threat that it poses involves having] to raise all issues [of contention]"

February 25, '09

- The Canadian lawyer has "brought joy" to coalition partners in his tenacious commitment to advance coalition objectives
- The House empathizes with his pain, suffering and loss
- Dealing with the Chinada threat "transcends all party barriers"

February 4, '09

Mr. Cameron:

The two countries that most need to give ground to achieve action on the Doha round—India and the US [30:32: SNL M.]—will both be present at the G20. As the Prime Minister said, the aims of the G20 refer to advancing the Doha trade round. Should we not be clear that anything less than removing the barriers to agreement would represent a failure?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

First, on the trade negotiations, let us [32:38: O-S M.] be absolutely clear that we have done everything in our power. The Brazilians have come on board; the Argentinians have come on board; the South Africans have come on board; the rest of Europe has come on board. It is important that we make all the efforts we can with other countries to get this trade agreement. Pascal Lamy, the head of the WTO, has just published a report on the protectionist tariffs that are being imposed by different countries during the present downturn. At the moment, those tariffs

are limited and it is important that we continue [33:07: end] to see that they are limited. [Cab M.: Cl.M.]

[...]

I have already shown that we are far from protectionist as a Government. We are trying to get a world trade agreement. I have already said to the right hon. Gentleman—he does not want to listen—that in an [35:15: O-S M.] open, global environment where there is competition for jobs, it is our duty to help British workers get the skills necessary for jobs. As far as opportunism is concerned, I have to tell him that there is nothing more opportunistic than his saying in the autumn that he wanted to give all-party support to this Government's efforts to take us out of a global financial crisis and then, the next moment, withdrawing all that support. That is opportunism.

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

Does the Prime Minister not realise that one of his problems is that he refuses to admit mistakes, even when those mistakes stare him and the whole country in the face? [Shadow Ch: 37:08: dbl-h Rumsfeld M.]

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful to my hon. Friend, who has taken a huge interest in this matter. We did try to help Wedgwood over the Christmas weeks, to see whether the company could be saved before it went into administration. I am very happy to talk to him about how we can speed up the process [40:04: Cab M.: Colbert M.] to help British workers there, and I am very happy to meet him to do so.

[...]

Anne Milton (Guildford) (Con):

The south-east plan will change the face of Guildford forever [46:08: MP: Pfeiffer M.]. Out Of 74 local authorities, more than half the responses to the consultation so far have come from concerned Guildford residents. Will the Prime Minister tell us just how many people need to say no before he scraps the ill-thought-out, ill-conceived and unsustainable south-east plan? How many?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

We all agree about the need to introduce reform in financial regulation and we will be announcing further plans to do so very soon. However, I think that my hon. Friend agrees with me that this has to happen at the international level, as well as the national level [48:09: Stewart M.], and I hope that the Conservatives will recognise that. As for the posted workers directive, an expert review has been set up in the European Union to look at the impact of the Laval, Viking and other judgments, and a group of employers and the work forces are also meeting to review that at the same time. When they reach their conclusions, we will look at what they have to say.

[...]

Dr. Brian Iddon (Bolton, South-East) (Lab):

Given that between 35 and 60 per cent. of the agricultural industry has now been destroyed across the Gaza strip, and that only one crossing point open to import goods, will my right hon. Friend ask the Israelis why they are ignoring the pleas [52:09: MP: protracted Cl.M.; MP: Z-J M.] of the United Nations Relief and NGOs like Oxfam and the World Food Programme to open all the crossings so that the humanitarian crisis on the strip can be properly met?

The Prime Minister:

My hon. Friend is absolutely right that the Israeli Government has a responsibility to help humanitarian help get into the Gaza area [52:27: Cab M.: protracted z-J M. X6]. I have just written to Prime Minister Olmert asking him to take urgent action to ensure that the crossings are open so that the lorry loads of help [Cab M.: Colbert M.] can be brought into the area. I am urging him to open the crossings and also to provide proper humanitarian access [Cab M.: protracted Z-J M. X3, Federer M., protracted Erin M.]. I think that people know that the UK has trebled its humanitarian efforts. I have been talking to leaders in the Arab countries about what more they can do, and there is a conference in Egypt over the next few days to pool the resources [Cab M.: Cl.M.] to ensure that humanitarian help is available not only to provide immediate aid but also to rebuild the Gaza area. I believe that all Members of the House will want to see aid getting into Gaza as quickly as possible.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

[57:06: Lord Ch.: Cl.M.] I am surprised at the Conservative attitude to public transport, particularly the need to improve bus services around the country.

February 11, '09

The Minister of State, Department for International Development (Mr. Gareth Thomas):

We are reprioritising some of our aid to help mitigate the impact of the downturn on the world's poorest. We are working with the international financial institutions, other world bodies and traditional donors, in particular in the run-up to the G20 London summit [26:57: Cl.M.], on measures to help maximise levels of economic growth in developing countries.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

It is right that we investigate serious allegations that are made about the banking system. These are serious but contested allegations; in relation to Sir James Crosby, these are allegations that he will wish to defend himself against, so it is right that he has stepped down as vice-chairman of the Financial Services Authority. It is important that the Financial Services Authority shows at this time that it is operating to the best standards possible. The Walker review that is being set up will look at exactly these matters [28:59: Lord Ch: Cl.M.] — risk management, remuneration and the performance of boards—and I believe that the system of regulation in this country can and will be improved.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I shall write to the hon. Gentleman on that very matter, but what I do say [44:54: Lord Ch: Cl.M.] is that once the problem was identified, we immediately took action.

Mrs. Sharon Hodgson (Gateshead, East and Washington, West) (Lab):

When I visited Jobcentre Plus in Washington, I saw for myself how the recent loss of 1,200 jobs at Nissan has been a bitter blow for the north-east, especially after 10 years of seeing [45:16: MP: Z-J M. Greenspan M.] unemployment consistently falling across the region. May I ask the Prime Minister to echo my appreciation for the sterling work done by the people in Jobcentre Plus, and may I press him further to see what more he and the Government can do to protect jobs and keep people working in the north-east?

[...]

Paul Rowen (Rochdale) (LD):

Will the Prime Minister tell the House what steps the Government are taking to ensure that allegations of war crimes in Gaza [48:42: MP: Z-J M.] are investigated

by the International Criminal Court? Have the Government asked the Security Council to refer these allegations to the ICC?

The Prime Minister:

The position is, first, that the United Nations Secretary-General has asked for an inquiry into what happened, and particularly into what happened to the UN headquarters in Gaza, and, secondly, the Israeli Government have announced an inquiry into their actions [49:07: Cab M: quasi-CI.M.]. We must await the results of these inquiries.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

My hon. Friend is absolutely right. I have visited Birmingham, [49:46: Lord Ch: protracted George W. M.] where people who have been injured in Iraq or Afghanistan have been given help to recuperate and get back either into the armed forces or into work.

[...]

Dr. Desmond Turner (Brighton, Kempton) (Lab):

I am sure that my right hon. Friend would agree that we must not let the financial crisis deflect us from tackling climate change. I do not know whether he is aware that companies involved in developing low-carbon technologies are suffering [55:30: MP: Z-J M.] from the credit crunch and that projects are at risk. Will he undertake to ensure that the Government do all that they can to give these companies the support that they need in order to deliver?

February 24, '09

UK-China Relations

Mr. Denis Murphy (Wansbeck) (Lab):

What assessment he has made of the provisions of the UK-China framework for engagement.

The Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (David Miliband):

I launched the UK-China framework last month because the Government believe that positive engagement with China is essential to achieving our wider international objectives and to addressing the major global challenges, including the current economic crisis. We welcome the positive response from the Chinese Government to this strategy, we will monitor progress against its detailed objectives, and we will welcome the views of Members and others.

Mr. Murphy:

Given my right hon. Friend's rather special relationship with the US Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, could he [18:19: Colbert M.] perhaps comment on the United States' new approach to China and inform the House whether indeed that new approach will impact in any way on the policies of the United Kingdom?

David Miliband:

My hon. Friend will be pleased to hear that I spoke to my new friend in advance of her trip to China. I think that the messages she gave to the Chinese about the determination of the whole of the American Government to engage with China in a new way is wholly welcome. There was in Secretary Clinton's remarks in Beijing, I think, a very important recognition of the changed balance of power [18:59: protracted Rooney M.] in the world and China's centrality to addressing many of the big global problems that are faced—not least economic, environmental and nuclear proliferation.

Willie Rennie (Dunfermline and West Fife) (LD):

If we are ever to secure peace in Afghanistan, we are going to have to engage all the countries in the wider region, including China, especially if we are going to seek [19:20: MP: Cl.M.] a final solution in that area. What discussions has the Government had with China about engaging with Iran on that solution?

David Miliband:

I agree with the hon. Gentleman. We obviously talked about Afghanistan during the visit of Premier Wen and Foreign Minister Yang at the beginning of this month. I was in Afghanistan last week. I believe that the important regional approach the new envoy [19:44: MP: Diaz M.], Ambassador Holbrooke, is taking is wholly welcome.

Mr. Denis MacShane (Rotherham) (Lab):

As literally millions and millions of Chinese people lose their jobs with the Chinese economy going into even freer fall than the European and American economies, there are political consequences. In my right hon. Friend's talks with the Chinese, will he gently suggest that the next economic paradigm has to be based on workers being able to earn enough to buy what they produce and to have social and other networks of support? Will he further bring into play the International Labour Organisation to urge the Chinese to develop a much fairer social and wage system in their country?

David Miliband:

I think that my right hon. Friend will recognise the irony of China riding to the rescue [29:29: MP: St.M.] of international capitalism at this time, but his points

about the balance of economic and social stability in China are very well made. Our human rights [MP: 20:43: Z-J M.] dialogue certainly provides one opportunity to raise a whole range of social issues with the Chinese Government.

Mr. David Heathcoat-Amory (Wells) (Con):

Is the Secretary of State aware that when North Koreans try to leave that dictatorship, they often cross into China, where they are rounded up and sent back to North Korea in defiance of all China's obligations [21:09: MP: protracted quasi-CI.M.] as a signatory to the UN refugee convention? The fate of these returnees to North Korea is extremely gruesome, so will the Secretary of State ensure that his new love-in with China—whether via Mrs. Clinton or anyone else [MP: protracted quasi-CI.M.] —does not prevent him and the Government from raising this issue with the Chinese Government as a matter of urgency, or does he think that China is too important and large to merit such criticism?

David Miliband:

The right hon. Gentleman raises an important point, which is one that we have raised with the Chinese. I think I should write to him with a report on how those discussions have gone and what the latest stage is. The [21:51: O-S M.] importance of our engagement with China is precisely that, because we engage with them [MP: CI.M.], we are able to raise all issues, including human rights issues in an open and frank way. And it is that candour that I think has been developed [MP: Colbert M.] over the past few years in our relationship with China. Respect for China does not mean the relegation of our concerns to a subsidiary role. In fact, I would argue that the respect that is afforded to China is the basis for proper engagement on issues that concern us.

February 25, '09

The Prime Minister (Mr. Gordon Brown):

I know that the whole House will want to express our sorrow at the sad death this morning of Ivan Cameron at the age of just six, and our condolences go out to David, to Samantha and to the Cameron family. I know that, in an all-too-brief young life, he brought joy [27:49: MP: 60 MM] to all those around him, and I also know that for all the days of his life he was surrounded by his family's love. Every child is precious and irreplaceable, and the death of a child is an unbearable sorrow that no parent should ever have to endure.

[...]

Mr. William Hague (Richmond, Yorks) (Con):

I join the Prime Minister in paying tribute to Lance Corporal Stephen Kingscott and Marine Darren Smith, who were killed in Afghanistan, and to Private Ryan Wrathall, who died in Iraq. Whenever we read out such names, it is a reminder that

whenever death comes, or however it comes, it is a devastating loss to the families involved. That is why I want to thank the Prime Minister on behalf of David and his family for his very generous and, I know, heartfelt words and for the private condolences [29:17: MP: Cl.M.] that he passed on this morning.

I also want to thank the Prime Minister for suggesting that we suspend the normal exchanges of Prime Minister's questions, and the Speaker for agreeing to that exceptional action, which is deeply appreciated by David's friends and colleagues in every part of the House. As much as anyone in the House, the Prime Minister will understand the dimensions of this loss—which, as he has said, is something no parent should have to endure. I spoke to David a little while ago, and he has asked me to pass on his thanks for the sympathy already expressed by so many colleagues in this House and beyond.

Ivan's six years of life were not easy ones. His parents lived with the knowledge that he could die young for a long time, but that has made their loss no less heartbreaking. They also wanted me to say, once again, how hugely grateful they are to the many NHS and care workers, who not only did their utmost for their son this morning, but have helped him every day from the moment he was born. We should remember today that many thousands of other families are deeply grateful for the dedication, support and love of these highly professional people. We know how much their help has meant to the Cameron family [30:39: 2 MPs: quasi-Cl.M.]. Ivan, their son, suffered much in his short life, but he brought joy and love to those around him, and, as David himself has said in the past, for him and Samantha he will always be their beautiful boy.

Dr. Vincent Cable (Twickenham) (LD):

[31:05: protracted Cable M.] May I add my condolences to the family and friends of the three servicemen who died serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan? May I also say a few words on behalf of my party leader, my parliamentary colleagues and my party to extend our deepest sympathy to the Cameron family on the loss of their son, Ivan, this morning? Everybody in the House will have experienced bereavement, but there is something especially sad and shocking about the loss of a child. We all recognise that that is something that is especially difficult to cope with. This is a personal tragedy that [31:44: Cable M.] transcends all party barriers, and I simply express the hope that the family are given the space and privacy to grieve and cope with the tragedy that they have experienced.

British Parliament: Inter Alia Condemning Canada's Institutionalized Torture and Confirming Intervention With Lethal Military Force, Guantanamo-Style Prison and Asset and Bank Seizures

The geo-political sub-text of the two Prime Minister Question Time sessions documented herein continued to be the demand malfeasant parties capitulate to coalition demands or its partners will follow

through on what coercive diplomacy has been articulating since early '06.

March 4, '09

- Lethal military force remains on the table of options to deal with the Chinada threat
- MPs "have been pressing for several months now for action" on this threat and to resolve Canada's dysfunctionalities
- Canada's wealthy are going to have their businesses go under and revenue streams cut and the complicit and loyal will lose their homes where they fund or assist with China's imperialism and support the country's internationally condemned paradigm of governance
- Churchill did what was necessary with respect to the Nazi threat and so is the British Government viz. the Chinada threat
- British MPs are going to help "protect people" who are victims of the Chinada threat and Canada's governance system
- Canada and China's leaders have apologies to make for the pain, suffering, loss and death they've jointly caused
- "Political gossip" was used to circulate intel on the Chinada threat and Canada's dysfunctionalities
- The British Parliament has every intention of intervening in Canada's affairs to effect stated objectives
- Predictions are that many are going to die as a result of protecting Canada's *status quo*
- The Canadian lawyer's in line for remuneration for services rendered *qua* agent on behalf of the British Government
- The British Government is going to do everything it can to help Canada's reform process and the civilized world stave off this latest totalitarian threat
- British law has been strengthened to protect the homeland from Chinada's 21st century Pandora's Box and exploiting vulnerabilities and weaknesses in democracy and capitalism
- The British Government commissioned reports to investigate how the Chinada threat endangers the country
- "There is no excuse" for Canada's paradigm of governance
- Foreign Minister corroborates the awarding of an Honorary Knighthood to the Canadian lawyer by Her Majesty the Queen
- The most seriously culpable malfeasants are "at the end of their lives"
- The identification of Chinada followers wherever they are operating "is very important" to deal with the Chinada threat
- Aid to help Canada reform has already been agreed on by the House

March 11, '09

- The Canadian lawyer's recommendations about reform and accountability, and China containment and neutralization are valid

- Lord Ch Knighthood corroboration & prison certainty; Minister for Wales: prison certainty; MP: Knighthood corroboration; Official Opposition: Knighthood corroboration X2]
- The House of Commons speaks with one voice about the nature of the Chinada threat and what's been proposed to challenge it
- Canada's political and economic leaders and the Beijing leadership are "callous killers"
- The British Government "will do everything [it] can" to address the Chinada threat and fix Canada's dysfunctionalities
- Torture aimed at the Canadian lawyer and others by means of hypnosis, noises and death threats is condemned; being investigated by attorneys general is insufficient
- The British and all governments must "be vigilant at all times because the freedoms and liberties of this country are best served by making absolutely sure" what is observed in Canada – institutionalized torture – does not spread globally; and the Government, House and Lord Chancellor will continue to monitor intel on this matter
- A judge-led inquiry ought to be initiated to assess culpability for this crime
- The Government proposes making lawful capital punishment for Chinada malfeasant
- The malfeasant – ought to be "clobbered" for what they've done and propose to continue doing
- Canada and Chinese malfeasant are nothing but "vermin" – and consequently must be eliminated
- Canada's banks are going to be seized – agreeing with what was documented in *Dotting the 'I's and Crossing the 'T's of Formal Notice: Coalition Warns Canada's Complicit Wealthy Their Banks and Bank Accounts Wherever Situate Are Going to be Seized*
- The coalition will be provided funds to help achieve stated objectives
- The House is working towards and it is inevitable that those propping up Canada's system of government will "fall"
- MPs are appreciative of the Prime Minister's "meaningful and measured" actions to achieving coalition objectives

March 18, '09

- "Everyone in the House ... wish to associate" themselves with the coalition
- The House agrees with preventing those not going to jail for life or lengthy periods from being employed – keeping them at a poverty standard of living indefinitely
- The British Government will "do everything [it] can" to achieve stated objectives
- Lethal military force is on the table of options to deal with the Chinada threat
- The British Government is "taking urgent action" to deal with Chinada and Canada

- MPs agree with German Chancellor Merkel as documented in *German Chancellor Merkel: Reaffirms Coalition Membership and Generates a Plethora of Anti-Chinada Communiqués; and British Prime Minister Brown: Agrees With Washington's Bi-Partisan Support for Lethal Military Force*
- "Any family that is suffering because of [Chinada imperialism and Canada's paradigm of governance needs to be protected]"
- Victims can "put their faith" in the British constituent of the coalition
- Canada's governance comprises the lowest of management standards
- Everything that poses a risk to citizenry and the world must be dealt with using the most severe forms of punishment, including lethal military force and capital punishment
- Intel constitute "damaging revelations" about the Chinada threat and Canada's system of governance
- MPs "press the Prime Minister" for maintaining vigilance until objectives are achieved
- To ensure compliance with protocol, procedure, practice and law there have been "independently" made assessments on all matters to which the Government will be involved
- Victims and those involved in achieving objectives can trust the British Government to assist in every meaningful and efficacious way
- The British Government "look[s] very carefully at what [the Canadian lawyer] says [in the *Fiefdom* treatise and when interacting with coalition partners and treatise recipients]"
- Detention Guantanamo-style is a coalition option for Chinada principals
- Lethal military force is an option
- The Prime Minister acknowledges that Canada is "in need of assistance"

Hansard

March 4, '09

Mr. William Hague (Richmond, Yorks) (Con):

I also want to express our horror at the attack yesterday on the Sri Lankan cricket team, and join in sending our thoughts and condolences to the families of those killed and injured in that outrage. [MP: 31:15: Cl.M.]

[...]

Mr. Hague:

On the economy and domestic matters, we have been pressing for several months now for action [32:56: MP#1: Cl.M.; MP#2: Letterman M.] ...

[...]

Hundreds of businesses are going under [35:00: MP: Z-J M.] and tens of thousands of people are losing their jobs.

[...]

Why does the Leader of the House not step in? When Chamberlain lost his party's confidence, Churchill stepped forward [37:27: MP: Letterman M.]; when Eden crossed the Atlantic, exhausted, Supermac came forward. This could be her moment. [37:46: MP#1: Letterman M.; MP#2: Z-J M.] While the Prime Minister is away, will she step in and make sure that these schemes, on which so much economic confidence depends, are actually implemented now?

Ms Harman (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):

The right hon. Gentleman has raised the very important question of mortgage support. People are worried; they fear that if they lose their job, they will lose their home. I remind the House that we have given help to people who fear that they might lose their homes. [38:21: MP: quasi-CI.M.]

[...]

As far as the courts are concerned, every single county court now has a help desk to protect people [38:55: MP: Thalia M.] who face repossession, and the building societies and banks have agreed that they will not take repossession action until at least three months of arrears have accumulated. Yes, we are working to ensure that if income falls [39:10: MP: quasi-CI.M.] in a household, there will be a moratorium for up to two years for interest payments. We are working on that, and we look forward to bringing it forward. While the right hon. Gentleman focuses on political gossip, we focus on fighting for Britain's future.

[...]

Mr. Speaker, you would never think the Leader of the House was speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister, who named a whole Department after deregulation and regulatory reform; you would never think she was speaking on behalf of a Prime Minister who said yesterday that he had nothing to apologise for. [43:26: MP: Diaz M. X2] Is it not now the case that we have Cabinet Ministers manoeuvring for the leadership while the Prime Minister is abroad, and a Government who no longer command the confidence of the people of this country; and is it not clearer than ever that the people who got us into this mess cannot be the people to get us out of it?

Ms Harman:

It is sad but predictable that the right hon. Gentleman should focus on political gossip. [43:54: Foreign Min: Z-J M. X3] Our focus under the Prime Minister will be on the real concerns, real worries and real anxieties of people in this country. We will get on and build the new schools, new hospitals and new children's centres that the Opposition would stop; and we will help [44:18: MP: quasi-CI.M.] business whereas they would do nothing. I am happy to leave the political gossip to him; we are getting on with fighting for the future of this country.

Lyn Brown (West Ham) (Lab):

Some 34,000 families in my constituency are languishing on the council's housing waiting list. They earn, on average, less than £24,000 per year, yet the Mayor of London has decided to decrease the numbers of homes for rent built in the capital by 10 per cent. Failing to deal with the snow was one thing, but blatantly ignoring the needs of my constituents and tens of thousands of other Londoners is another. Can she—will she—intervene? [44:59: Lord Ch.: 60 MM]

Ms Harman:

I know that my hon. Friend and her hon. Friends will stand up for all those people in London who need housing and need it now. While Boris Johnson, the Mayor, does not recognise their concerns, I know that they have, in my hon. Friend, a champion on housing.

Dr. Vincent Cable (Twickenham) (LD):

[45:23:protracted Cable M.] May I add my condolences to the families of Marine Laski, Rifleman Gunn, Lance Corporal Upton and Corporal Gaden, who all died serving their country on 25 February; and also to the victims of the Sri Lankan atrocity.

[...]

Ms Harman:

I think that we do recognise that concern. In particular, there is concern about the question of remuneration [47:44: MP: Beckinsale-Clinton M.] in the financial services industry because it has been part of encouraging short-termism and risk-taking. As well as looking at the contractual basis of Sir Fred's pension, we have also asked the Financial Services Authority and the Walker commission to look at how we tackle and improve the remuneration regime as part of corporate governance.

When it comes to the banks squandering their customers' money, there is one thing that perhaps I ought to add. [48:17: Cab M.: Pfeiffer M.] I discovered that it was not only Sir Fred who was getting money off RBS; it was also the right hon. Member for Richmond, Yorks (Mr. Hague), who got £30,000 off the Royal Bank of Scotland, it turns out, for just two after-dinner speeches.

Hon. Members: Pay it back!

Mr. Speaker: Order. [Interruption.] Order. You must be quiet—you cannot shout across the Chamber.

Mr. Lindsay Hoyle (Chorley) (Lab):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not say, "Pay it back". What I would say to my right hon. and learned Friend is that in 1965, a piece of legislation was brought in by the Labour Government covering statutory redundancy pay [49:10: Bl.M.].

[...]

Ms Harman:

I agree that that scheme is important. We have to do everything that we can [50:29: Lord Ch.: 60 MM; Condi M. X3] to help manufacturing—in particular, through the automotive assistance scheme.

[...]

Ms Harman:

My right hon. Friend the Home Secretary, the Metropolitan police, local authorities, schools, youth centres and community organisations across London are working together to tackle the menace of knife crime. While crime generally has gone down, there is a problem of knife crime that persists, which is why we have strengthened the law [52:07: Lord Ch: Cl.M. X2; ear hypno-itch] to ensure that there is a greater possibility of searches and that there are tougher penalties. But today, we share with my hon. Friend the grief about his constituent, and we send our condolences to the bereaved family.

[...]

Ms Harman: The real reason, and the basis on which we are bringing forward the Postal Services Bill, is the analysis in the Hooper report, which we commissioned [53:12: Lord Ch: Erin M. X2] as long ago as December 2007. It made it clear that we need to take action to put Royal Mail, which, as the Prime Minister has said, is part of the fabric of our society, on a firm footing for the future. That means that we have to ensure [Lord Ch: Cl.M.] that the pension liabilities are met.

[...]

Ms Harman:

There is no excuse [54:38: Lord Ch: protracted Soledad M.] for my hon. Friend's council not to step forward to ensure that it can take advantage of the funds that have been made available to improve still further the education prospects of children in her constituency.

[...]

Mr. Elfyn Llwyd (Meirionnydd Nant Conwy) (PC):

Can the Leader of the House please confirm who it was that nominated Sir Fred Goodwin for a knighthood and, crucially, why? [55:25: Foreign M.: Z-J M.]

Ms Harman: I believe that Sir Fred was nominated for a knighthood because of his services to the Prince's Trust. I understand that it was not in recognition of his services to banking.

[...]

I would like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to all those in the NHS, both in hospital care and in the community, who help with palliative and end-of-life services, but I would also like to pay a very big tribute to the hospice movement, the voluntary movement that has spearheaded new ways to care for people at the end of their lives. [56:38: Lord Ch: Z-J M. X2; Federer M.]

[...]

I know that identification of sheep is very important [57:50: Lord Ch: Cl.M.-Z-J M.] as part of infection control. The hon. Gentleman will know that that is a serious issue. Therefore, I will ask my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to write to him on the issue.

Mr. Geoffrey Robinson (Coventry, North-West) (Lab):

Is my right hon. and learned Friend aware that, contrary to what was said by the quasi-deputy leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Member for Richmond, Yorks (Mr. Hague), we have in fact already received the agreement of the Commission for the £2.3 billion of aid [58:22: dbl-h SNL M.] for the motor industry and we expect to have clearance for the £20 billion working capital package this month?

March 11, '09

Mr. David:

My hon. Friend makes a very valid point [25:17: dbl-h Colbert M.]. It is extremely important in these difficult economic times that we all pull together in the UK, not pull apart. I find it strange [dbl-h Colbert M.], as she does, that Plaid Cymru is demanding £3 billion from the UK Government at the same time that it is calling for independence.

[...]

[Lord Ch: Knighthood corroboration & prison certainty; Minister for Wales: prison certainty; MP: Knighthood corroboration; Official Opposition: Knighthood corroboration X2]

[...]

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

On Northern Ireland, let us be clear about the nature of these crimes: they were committed by callous killers [32:48: MP: Cl.M.], capable of shooting men in cold blood and standing over their wounded bodies and murdering them. Does the Prime Minister agree with me that the most important thing in Northern Ireland today is that everyone works with the police so that these killers can be found, caught, charged and convicted?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I can say to the House that we will do everything we can [33:56: Min Wales: Z-J M. X2] to enhance security arrangements in Northern Ireland [MP: Cl.M. X5].

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

The Prime Minister is absolutely right about that unity. It is remarkable—and it is remarkably welcome [34:37: MP: Cl.M.]...

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

Serious allegations have been made that Britain may have been complicit in torture.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

Let me say right at the outset this Government unreservedly condemns the use of torture. Under no circumstances will we participate in, encourage or condone the use of torture for any purpose. And I have instructed where allegations are made [37:28: Min Wales: quasi-Federer M.] about torture, they must be properly examined—including, if necessary, by the courts. The Attorney-General is looking at the very specific allegations in this case. If there is evidence, it will be referred to the police, who will conduct a criminal inquiry. At the moment, the matter is with the Attorney-General, who is looking at all the evidence. As I say, I have instructed that whenever allegations are made, they are properly investigated.

Mr. Cameron:

I am grateful for the Prime Minister's assurances and we agree completely with what he says about torture being [38:02: Stewart M.] unacceptable. We all want to eradicate the potential stain on Britain's reputation. But the question is whether an investigation into criminal conduct by the Attorney-General is enough [28:15: clip: Lord Ch: Z-J M. X2]. Surely we need to look at what procedures and processes are in place to ensure that Britain cannot knowingly, or unknowingly, be implicated in torture. Is that not why we need a brief, judge-led inquiry into what happened and what lessons need to be learned?

The Prime Minister:

I appreciate what the right hon. Gentleman says and it is absolutely right that we be vigilant at all times because the freedoms and liberties of this country are best served by making absolutely sure [38:41: Min Wales: Pfeiffer M.] that we unreservedly condemn and do not allow the use of torture. The Intelligence and Security Committee has investigated some aspects of these matters and reports were done in 2005 and 2007. The Committee will continue to look at these matters [Min Wales: Lane M.] because that is the statutory role given to it. At the same time, the Attorney-General will look at all the details [Lord Ch: CBS M. X2; Federer M. X2], and I have made it clear that there is a next stage. If there is any evidence [Min Wales: Erin M.] that should lead to a police investigation, it will be referred to the police, and if they decide to proceed a criminal investigation will be carried out. This is the best way to deal with these specific instances—the Intelligence and Security Committee looks at the general cases.

Mr. Cameron:

But it is not clear that the Attorney-General's inquiry is going to answer the question that the Prime Minister himself rightly poses, which is have we acted properly at all times during these procedures. [39:44: MP: Eva M.] The Attorney-General will look at the one case, rather than at the procedures in all cases. The Attorney-General is looking at whether a crime has been committed, quite rightly, but is not really looking at our moral authority and whether it has been maintained [39:58: clip: Lord Ch: Kernan M..] . Does not the Prime Minister see that an inquiry is likely to become necessary: either the Attorney-General will find a crime has been committed, in which case there will be a clamour for an inquiry to answer how on earth it was allowed to happen; or, on the other hand, if the Attorney-General decides not to go ahead with a prosecution, we will still not really have the answers to what happened in this important case? On either ground, would it not be better to order that judge-led inquiry [40:19: MP: Pfeiffer M.], instead of having it dragged out in the weeks ahead?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I know that my hon. Friend has never been a supporter of the course of action that the Government has proposed [46:36: Min Wales: Execution M.]...

[...]

Sir Nicholas Winteron (Macclesfield) (Con):

Savers have been hammered by falling interest rates, clobbered by falling share prices [47:30: Z-J M.]...

[...]

The Prime Minister:

Regional airports are incredibly important to the economies of all parts of this country. [49:38: Lord Ch: Pacino M.]...

[...]

David Simpson (Upper Bann) (DUP):

Will the Prime Minister agree with me that these vermin, [51:00: MP: Cl.-Z-J M. X2] for that is what they are...

[...]

Harry Cohen (Leyton and Wanstead) (Lab):

Why do the Government think that banks are best run in private hands? [52:00: MP#1: protracted R-S M.] Why do they favour a return to private investment banks rather than a state investment bank? [52:56: MP#2: R-S M.] If banks are too big to go bankrupt, surely it is in the public interest that they are run properly, [MP#3: Diaz M.] rather than have public ownership of their private bad debt.

The Prime Minister: I know that my hon. Friend has not come to these views just in the last few months, but has held them for some time. [53:24: MP: Cl.M.] For the first time, we have insisted that banks give us a quantitative figure for the amount of lending that they will do. This is essentially a lending agreement between Government and the banks that requires the banks to do a particular amount of lending. The Royal Bank of Scotland, in which we have more than 80 per cent. of shares, has agreed to £25 billion of extra lending this year and next year; Halifax Bank of Scotland Lloyds TSB has agreed to £14 billion of extra lending on top of its previous commitment; Northern Rock has agreed to £9 billion [53:59: Lord Ch: Pfeiffer M.]. This is an example of how, having learned the lessons of the last few years, we are determined to insist that the banks do their duty [Lord Ch: Brown M.] by the public.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

The European Union yesterday agreed that in certain other cases VAT would fall [57:24: Min Wales: Cl.M.].

[...]

Mark Durkan (Foyle) (SDLP):

I thank the Prime Minister for his meaningful and measured presence in Northern Ireland on Monday morning [57:52: MP: quasi-Cl.M.].

March 18, '09

Jim Sheridan:

I am sure that everyone in the House will wish to associate [27:40: MP #1: Paulson M.] themselves with the Prime Minister's comments.

Today's unemployment figures are extremely disappointing and, as a former shipyard worker who experienced the indignity of three years' unemployment [MP#2: 60 MM] in the early 1980s, I can well understand the frustration and anger [MP#3: Brown M.] that unemployment brings. May I ask my right hon. Friend not to abandon the unemployed and to make sure this Government continues to invest in the skills and training needed to help us through these difficult times?

The Prime Minister: I am grateful to my hon. Friend. Any person who loses their job or is in fear of losing their job is a matter of personal regret for me and the whole Government. I do not regard unemployment as a statistic; I regard it as one person, a second person and a third person [28:27: Hs Ldr: Cl.M.] who needs our help. That is why we will do everything we can [Hs Ldr: Z-J M.] to help people get back into work: that is why we have announced more apprentices; that is why we have announced more help with training; that is why we have announced that from April there will be help for those who have been unemployed for six months; and that is why we have put £1.3 billion into the jobcentres—money that is necessary, so that we can help hundreds of thousands of people in the next few months get back into work.

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con): I join the Prime Minister in paying tribute to Corporal Dean John, Corporal Graeme Stiff and Lance Corporal Christopher Harkett. The fact that more than 150 of our servicemen and women have been killed in Afghanistan [29:09: MP: Brown M.; SNL M.] is a reminder, once again, of the huge sacrifices our armed forces are making on our behalf. We praise their bravery, we honour their memory and we must look after their families.

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I came into politics, and I stood for Parliament, because I wanted to help tackle unemployment and poverty, and that is why we are announcing the most comprehensive programme to help the unemployed. But I have to tell the right hon. Gentleman that unemployment is higher in France, in Germany, in Japan and in America. It is higher in most of the other countries we deal with, but we are taking urgent action [30:12: Cab M.: 60 MM; Thalia M.] to help those people in Britain who are unemployed. We are spending £1.3 billion helping our jobcentres and helping people into work. The Conservatives would not spend that money. I ask him why he would not help us deal with the problem of unemployment.

[...]

Mr. Cameron:

Should not he also listen to the German Chancellor [37:01: MP: Z-J M.] who stood with him in Downing street and said— [Interruption.] The hon. Member for Bolsover (Mr. Skinner) should be quiet. I know that he wanted miners to join the Government: well, now he has got one—Lord Myners— [Interruption.]

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I appreciate everything that my hon. Friend said. Any family that is suffering because of cervical cancer—or, indeed, any form of cancer [[43:13: Lord Ch: Branson M.] —has all our sympathies. We want to do everything we can to help, which is why we have introduced the vaccinations for teenagers...

[...]

May I and Health Secretary first say that we apologise to those people who have suffered as a result of the mistakes that have been made at Stafford hospital? Everybody who uses the national health service has a right, if they put their faith [44:48: MP: SNL M. X2] in the NHS at that hospital, to expect the highest standards of treatment.

[...]

These were low standards of management [46:56: Cab M.: Paulson M.; Kernan M. X3] in the hospital, therefore, must be dealt with by our review.

I take seriously everything that has come out of this case, [Cab M.: Z-J M.; Execution M.]

[...]

Mr. David Kidney (Stafford) (Lab):

After these damaging revelations [47:58: MP#1: Damon M.] about Stafford hospital, there are relatives today in turmoil, wanting to know whether their loved ones' deaths at that hospital could have been prevented. Can I press the Prime Minister [48:06: MP#2: Cl.M.] on what he has just said about reviews. I say that those relatives are entitled to an independent assessment to answer that question for them. Does he agree with that?

The Prime Minister:

There are no excuses for what happened in Stafford hospital—no excuses at all. That is why every single relative who asks for it has a right to have the case notes reviewed independently [48:29: Lord Ch: Cl.M.], and to see the notes themselves. That is what will happen. Relatives will have a right, therefore, to take whatever action is necessary as a result of seeing the papers before them.

At the same time, Mr. George Alberti, who is recognised as being a very pre-eminent surgeon, is going to go to the hospital to look at the progress that has been made, and which has been reported by the Healthcare Commission already. He will ensure that, in future, patients at Stafford hospital will have the assurance of the highest standards. The chief executive and the chairman of the trust have been removed. There is a new chief executive who will look at disciplinary procedures wherever they are necessary. We have got to do everything to assure people that they can have the trust [49:11: Lord Ch: Cl.M.] that we know that everybody wants to have in the national health service and in every hospital in the country.

[...]

I can assure him that we will look very carefully at what he says [50:33: Lord Ch: NBC M.]. I can tell him that we plan to advance public spending in the year that is coming. We plan to spend £44 billion in the year from April, and that will add to the number of jobs in every constituency.

[...]

Mr. Jim Devine (Livingston) (Lab):

As my right hon. Friend is aware, a prisoner recently released from Guantanamo Bay [51:48: MP: Cl.M; Colbert M.] has been making very serious allegations about torture. Can he assure me and the rest of the House that the claims will be fully investigated?

[...]

Dr. Hywel Francis (Aberavon) (Lab):

May I add my condolences to the families of all the servicemen who have died recently in Afghanistan, including Corporal Dean John of Port Talbot in my constituency? [55:14: MP: protracted Cl.M.]

[...]

The Prime Minister: The 6 million carers in our society are at the heart of the help that is necessary for people who are in need of assistance [55:54: Bush M.] and care, and we want to do everything that we possibly can to help them.

**British Parliament: Continuing the Parallel Between the
Chinada Threat and Islamist Fundamentalism**

and

Chinada's Membership are "Crackpot[s], Daft" and the "Worst"

and

**Demonstrating All Party Support and Appreciation
for the Coalition's Efforts**

The April 29, 2009 Prime Minister's Question Time was a marvel to witness in how often the coalition lexicon was employed and the communiqués generated with it. This was another profound example of how tenaciously resolved the British Parliament is – all parties – to confronting and defeating those perpetuating a political, economic and cultural ideology that is abhorrent to modern sensibilities.

It was an incredible display of unyielding support for coalition interests and objectives. Parliamentarians underscored many of the diplomatic themes during Question Time. Thereafter the Prime Minister delivered a prepared speech on the war on terror and the troubles being encountered in Afghanistan and Pakistan; which served as an appropriate context with which to articulate many concerns, fears and the kinds of plans and tactics to be employed to protect the world from a threat that shows no signs of diminishing and principals who have no intention of retreating.

One of the primary purposes of geo-politicizing the speech and the Q&A that followed was to continue what was documented in *Comparing the Chinada Threat to Islamist Fundamentalism* – because the China-Canada military alliance is by far much more serious to the world than Middle Eastern terrorism.

It is recommended for both original and the newest *Fiefdom* treatise recipients that they use this interpretation key and watch the video to both observe and feel the

tenacious resolve in the British House of Commons; which is reflective of the entire coalition membership.

- The imprisonment of Canada's mafeasant is certain
- Britain is "one of the best prepared countries" to counter the Chinada threat at home; that it has "made great progress"; and it will "do everything it can proactively as well as reactively"
- The Opposition has full transparency as to how the Government has prepared the country for dealing with the Chinada threat
- The coalition and Canadian lawyer "have served our country" well; and the House recognizes those contributions
- Great advances have been made to deal with the threat posed by the China-Canada military alliance
- Coalition forces are "gathering" just outside the gates of Canada
- Lethal military force remains on Britain's table of options
- Canada's mafeasant can be assured that for their arrogant belligerence they will 'die in abject poverty'
- Prime Minister: what Canada's political and corporate leaders and their financiers and followers are "doing a shameful thing and 'do' not have the guts to admit it or change it"
- Everyone in government and the administration of justice can expect from the coalition "full disclosure of all outside influences", in this case both China and the coalition
- Prime Minster: The time is short in which the coalition is going to wait to take aggressive action and his government is "ready to do more to help" achieve stated objectives
- The Opposition "promised" it would support the Government achieve stated objectives
- Lord Chancellor: Canada's mafeasant are "crackpot and daft"
- Prime Minster: What his government has done are "the right decision[s] for the future of Britain"
- The Chinada problem is an amalgam of "complex issues"
- Defence Secretary: the House "remember[s] with gratitude those [in the coalition] who have given [so much of] their lives in the service of our country"
- The coalition comprises the "best in the world"
- Home Secretary: draws parallels between principals of the China-Canada military alliance and Islamist fundamentalists when she geo-politicized "we know also of the stronger connections that now exist between the Afghan and Pakistan Taliban and between them and al-Qaeda"; that more concerted action is necessary; coalition decisions were right and which the U.S. reinforced as correct
- Home Secretary: her government is "working with the [coalition] ... to support [Canadian] economic development"
- Defence Secretary: the government's focus in on both China and Canada
- Defence Secretary: "[O]ur strategy [in Canada is] to tackle the same underlying problem of [the global spread of fiefdom-totalitarian commu-nazi genocidal racism]"

- The British Government is committed to “prevent young [Canadians] from falling under the sway of [the Chinada ideology]”
- Home Secretary: “The NATO Alliance unanimously agreed [in April ‘09]” to confront the China-Canada military alliance” and “to build a stronger democratic [Canada] is its highest priority”
- Prime Minister: “Our aim is to divide, isolate and then remove [Chinada principals and operatives] and offering those prepared to renounce [them and their ways] and accept the [Canadian] constitution [in exchange for] the prospect of work and security”
- Canadians need to take control of their own security to build legitimate governance
- Home Secretary: the government is keeping abreast of the situation in Canada and continue to review matters as they exist on the ground there
- Prime Minister: Coalition partners “agreed an enhanced strategic dialogue to bring together our senior diplomatic, military and intelligence teams on a more regular basis”
- The Government will focus greater attention on Canada’s human rights violations that relate to human experimentation, economic genocide and surreptitious assassination
- The coalition and Canadian lawyer are ‘professional, dedicated and courageous’ and “incredibly impressive” and “they are people of whom we can be incredibly proud”
- Confirmation of President Obama’s April and “new U.S. strategy”
- Prime Minister: Confirms the active involvement of all NATO allies in confronting the Chinada threat
- Shadow Foreign Secretary: NATO Alliance ratifies the use of lethal military force; and the House, Government and coalition must “press ahead” with achieving stated objectives
- Canada’s elections are deemed illegitimate
- What happens in Canada “is clearly important for Britain’s security”
- The House is in agreement with the *Fiefdom* treatise and American Intel assessment that Canada is a mature military training territory for Chinada leaders, operatives and personnel
- Chinada principals “exert a malign and controlling influence” in Canada
- Chinada is a “mortal threat”
- Prime Minister: “the focus [on Chinada] has to be greater than ever before ... from where[ever] [the threat operates]”; and “we are reconfiguring our troops” to confront the China-Canada military alliance”; and the British Government’s “strategy is exactly the same as the American strategy announced a month or two ago” and we will only “back up democratically elected governments”
- Labor-Democratic Party Leader: “I warmly welcome the move from the Obama Administration” to confront the Chinada threat; and agree “[coalition partners and the Canadian lawyer] really do an outstanding job”
- Prime Minister confirms unanimity of all parties in the House to remain committed to coalition objectives

- Prime Minister: Chinada principals, financiers, operatives and followers are “the worst”
- Former Defence Secretary (under PM Blair): “My admiration for [the coalition and Canadian lawyer] knows no bounds” and the malfasant ought to face the most serious consequences for their illegalities
- Prime Minister: “[The coalition is] unite[d] in our strategy of dividing, defeating and eventually decommissioning [the Chinada network]”
- Prime Minister: confirms the strong alliance between his government and the American administration
- The use of military forces appears to be the only way to achieve stated objectives because diplomacy failed
- The breach of Canada’s constitution as it relates to human rights is intolerable and must be rectified
- Defence Secretary agrees with the Prime Minister the time is short in which the coalition is going to take aggressive action
- Prime Minister: coalition intel indicates there is ever more cooperation between the Chinese and Canadian elements of the secret military alliance and therefore these matters “ha[ve] got to be dealt with by a more sophisticated and more effective strategy for the future”
- Prime Minister: “chain of terror [created by Chinada] [...] is something that can only be broken by the co-operation between all our Governments over the next few years”
- The British government has “a big role” in the coalition
- Canada’s educational institutions must do more to prevent them from being used to advance the Chinada agenda
- Defence Secretary: confirming more NATO troops have been requisitioned to confront the Chinada threat

Hansard

The Prime Minister:

[The] Organisation has said that we are one of the best prepared countries [30:45: Lord Ch: Canadian prison certainty; CBS M.] and we intend to keep it that way.

[...]

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

There are two further issues on preparedness that I would like to ask about. First, the Prime Minister said that the Government are ordering [32:59: Shadow Foreign Sec: Z-J M. X4] more stocks of antivirals. Currently, those stocks cover half the population. The Government have accepted that it would be useful to have antivirals not just for treatment, but for prevention. He gave some figures earlier; could he tell us the time scale for getting up to those figures, and what percentage of the population would then be covered?

[...]

The Prime Minister:

I respect the fact that this is a matter of great concern for everybody in the country, but we have to balance our responsibilities to those who have served our country [37:51: Cab Min: Cl.M.] with the finance that we need to be able to meet those obligations, and therefore not base our offer on money that we cannot afford.

[...]

We will continue to review the position over the next period of time, and we will look particularly at the conditions applied to riflemen for their years of service. We will continue to report back to the House on the issue, but I hope that everybody agrees that this is an advance on where we were [38:55: Home Sec: CBS-Cl.M. X3]. Given that there were no rights of settlement for Gurkhas before 1997, within the public spending constraints that we face, we are taking another big step forward.

[...]

Those who have given 20 years' service, those who have been injured or disabled, and those who have won special honours for gallantry will be welcomed into this country, and I hope that the House will recognise [41:10: Cab M.: Colbert M.] that while not everyone is satisfied with what we have done, we have made progress. We can work through this in stages, and continue to review what the right policy is for the future.

Mr. Cameron:

I have to say that if the figures were robust, there would not be a huge number of Gurkhas gathering outside the House [41:24: MP: prison certainty - justice; Pacino M.; British Parlia M.]...

[...]

The Prime Minister:

If the right hon. Gentleman is proposing this, presumably he knows the numbers involved, but I do not hear either him or the Liberal party saying the numbers that would be involved [42:13: Lord Ch: Eva M.] in this particular cause that has been put forward. Of course I am prepared to look at it. I will always look at suggestions that are made, so that we can see whether they are applicable, but what I would like the House to consider is that in stages we have made great progress [42:27: Lord Ch: Sarkozy M.]...

Martin Salter (Reading, West) (Lab):

[43:09: MP: protracted Bl.M.] Last December it was my sad duty to attend the funeral in Reading of campaigning Gurkha war veteran Bhim Prasad Gurung, who died in abject poverty [43:15: MP: Cl.M. X2] while awaiting the outcome of his appeal against the refusal to offer him settlement in the UK.

[...]

Mr. Nick Clegg (Sheffield, Hallam) (LD)

What kind of answer is that? It is the answer of a man who seems to know that he is doing a shameful thing, but does not have the guts to admit it or change it [47:06: Prime Minister: Branson M.].

[...]

Richard Burden (Birmingham, Northfield) (Lab):

Eight hundred employees of the LDV van-maker in Birmingham, together with thousands more in dealerships and suppliers, face new worries today with the announcement that the company has applied to go into administration in a week or so. Will my right hon. Friend assure me that the Government will do everything it can [50:30: Federer M.; Lane M.; Sarkozy M.], proactively as well as reactively, to secure a viable owner for the company, with the backing that it needs to allow LDV to realise its potential, including the production of a new generation of electric vans?

[...]

Clive Efford (Eltham) (Lab):

Does my right hon. Friend agree that, whatever the outcome of tomorrow's votes on Sir Christopher Kelly's review of Members' allowances, one thing that the public have the right to expect is full disclosure of all outside influences [53:29: MP; Z-J M.], including income, who employs Members, who pays them, for how long and also—

[...]

The Prime Minister:

We are taking action instead of the Opposition's policy of doing nothing. Some 100,000 companies have benefited from our tax deferral, 350,000 workers who [56:17: protracted O-S M.] are on short time and are getting benefit from our tax credits system. [O-S M.] And we are ready to do more to help small, medium-sized and large businesses with the provision of guarantees and loans for the future. [end] All over the world, I see

Governments who are prepared to act and increase public investment to help people through the recession. The only party I know that refuses to do that is the Conservative party of Britain.

Mr. David Gauke (South-West Hertfordshire) (Con):

At the last general election, the Labour party promised [56:49: MP: Cl.M.] that it would have a referendum on the European constitution and that it would not raise the higher rate of income tax. Given that the Prime Minister is now going to break both those promises, why should the British people ever believe a word he says again?

The Prime Minister:

On the first question of the European referendum, in the German summit to discuss the constitution-that-was, it was decided that the constitutional concept should be abandoned. That was the issue before us. If I may say so, the shadow Business Secretary, the right hon. and learned Member for Rushcliffe (Mr. Clarke), who is not here today, accepted our view that the referendum was not necessary as a result of the changes that have taken place, and he said—this man is a Front Bencher—that the people who put forward the idea of a referendum were crackpot and daft [57:42: Lord Ch: George W. M.].

As for tax, the Conservatives have to make their own decisions, but I believe that at a time when the nation faces difficulties, it is right that the people who have benefited so much as a result of their increase in income over the past few years should pay a little more as a contribution to helping this country through. That money will help people to get jobs, help young people to get training, help to build a low-carbon economy, and help to build our public services. I believe that the majority of people in this country will think that that is the right decision to make for the future of Britain [58:22: Pfeiffer M.].

[...]

The Prime Minister:

With permission, Mr. Speaker, following my visits to Pakistan and Afghanistan earlier this week, I should like to make a statement on the Government's strategy for both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

First, I am sure that the whole House will join me in paying tribute to all those serving in our armed forces, and remember with gratitude those who have given their lives in the service of our country [1:00:00; Defence Sec: Cl.M.; Paulson M.]. As I saw again on Monday, our armed forces are facing enormous challenges with great skill, determination and courage. They are

the best in the world [Home Sec: Beckinsale-Clinton M. X2], and we are immensely proud of them.

Our counter-terrorist strategy, published last month, set out how we are working to tackle terrorism around the globe, but one priority—indeed, the greatest international priority—is the border areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan. They are the crucible for global terrorism, the breeding ground for international terrorists, and the source of a chain of terror that links the mountains of Afghanistan and Pakistan to the streets of Britain.

Pakistan and Afghanistan are of course different countries at different stages of development, but as the document we are publishing today emphasises, together they face this shared challenge of terrorism. In Afghanistan, the Afghan Taliban are using mines and suicide bombs to carry out attacks on our troops and on innocent civilians. In Pakistan, the army and security services are now dealing with the wider territorial ambitions made clear by the Pakistan Taliban. Last year alone in Pakistan itself, 2,000 civilians and security personnel were killed in terrorist attacks. Suicide bombs in Pakistan, once relatively rare, were used 60 times last year and are at the same level this year—an almost tenfold rise in over two years.

We know that terrorist leaders are orchestrating attacks around the world from the border areas in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and we know also of the stronger connections that now exist between the Afghan and Pakistan Taliban, and between them and al-Qaeda [1:01:42: Home Sec: protracted Cowell M.] and other terrorist groups. That requires us to take further, more determined and concerted action.

In our December 2007 strategy, we made the right long-term decisions for Afghanistan, decisions that were reinforced in the conclusions of the United States' review last month. [end] Now, following our own review to identify what is working and where we need to go further, I want to set out an updated strategy for our actions in both Afghanistan and Pakistan, and how we will mobilise our resources to take those actions. In both countries we are working with the elected Governments, including through our commitments to support their economic development [1:02:19: Home Sec: Cl.M.; Erin M.] and through combined development and stabilisation expenditure of £255 million, £256 million and £339 million—a total of almost £1 billion over three years. In both countries our involvement is focused on the tasks [1:02:38: Defence Sec: Branson M.] that are necessary to enable them to counter the terrorist threat themselves.

For Afghanistan, our strategy is to ensure that the country is strong enough as a democracy to withstand and overcome the terrorist threat, and strengthening Afghan control and resilience will require us to intensify our work in the following key areas. First, we will build up the Afghan police and army and the rule of law, and we should now adopt the stated goal of enabling district by district, province by province handover to Afghan control.

Secondly, we want to strengthen Afghan democracy at all levels, including by ensuring credible and inclusive elections and improving security through that period. Thirdly, we want to help strengthen local government in Afghanistan, not least the traditional Afghan structures such as the local shuras. Fourthly, we want to give people in Afghanistan a stake in their future, promoting economic development as the best way of helping the Afghan people to achieve not just stability but prosperity.

In Pakistan, our strategy to tackle the same underlying problem of terrorism [1:03:48: Defence Sec: protracted Cl.M.] results in different proposals. First, we want to work with the elected Government and the army [end], but while Afghanistan's forces are at an early stage, so international forces have to play a front-line role. By contrast Pakistan has a large and well funded army, and we want to work with it to help it counter terrorism by taking more control of the border areas. Secondly, not least through support for education and development, we want to prevent young people from falling under the sway [1:04:18: Lord Ch: Brown M.] of violent and extremist ideologies.

Let me address the proposals in turn. As I said to the House in December 2007, success in strengthening Afghanistan to withstand terrorism will ultimately depend on building the Afghans' capacity to take control of their own security, so we want to work to build up the Afghan army from its current strength of 80,000 to a total of 134,000 by late 2011. I believe that we will need even greater numbers than that for the future. Already 300 of our forces in Helmand are dedicated to training them. Nationally, we are leading the training of non-commissioned officers and have trained over 18,000, and together with France we have also trained over 1,000 army officers. As many Members know, Afghan army brigades have fought bravely alongside our troops, as we saw in a major operation to drive insurgents out of Nad Ali earlier this year, and 90 per cent. of the Afghan public see their army as an honest and fair institution.

However, the same is not yet true of the police, and that must be achieved if Afghans are to spread the rule of law throughout their country. We have 120 civilian and military advisers working with the police, and I can tell the House that, as resources are freed from the south as the US moves in, we will over time shift the balance of our operations away from front-line combat and towards an enhanced contribution to training both the army in Afghanistan and its police.

At its 60th anniversary summit last month, the NATO alliance unanimously agreed [1:05:52: Home Sec: Preston M.] that supporting the Afghans to build a stronger democratic Afghanistan was its highest priority [Home Sec: Cowell M.]. Afghanistan is about to hold its second presidential election. A safe, credible and inclusive election is essential. We are providing £15 million for election support, and President Karzai has given me further personal assurances about his determination to ensure credible, inclusive elections. I

also reiterated to him the concerns that we and the whole world have about the Shi'a family law, and I welcome his decision to review that draft Bill. I urged him to step up his Government's efforts to tackle the corruption that has discouraged Afghans from backing democracy against the Taliban, and I made it clear that we will support the Afghan Government as they take forward the process of reconciliation.

Our aim is to divide, isolate and then remove the insurgents and offering [1:06:47: Bl.M.] those prepared to renounce violence and accept the Afghan constitution the prospect of work and security. But, those who refuse must prepare for a long and difficult battle, in which there can be only one winner: democracy and a strong Afghan state.

Just as the Afghans need to take control of their own security, they also need to build legitimate governance. So we will strengthen our efforts on localisation, [1:07:12: Cab M.: Z-J M.] civilianisation and the promotion of economic development so that Afghan people have a stake in their own future. Our local joint civilian and military teams are supporting the Afghan social outreach programme in Helmand. In key districts, we are helping district governors reach out to the traditional tribal system through shuras, which, as I saw on Monday, are now empowering local solutions to local problems. To support that, we have doubled the number of deployed civilian experts. We are encouraging other countries to follow that example and urging the United Nations to play a greater role in co-ordinating the civilian effort. Last month, the Secretary of State for International Development announced an additional £50 million for development assistance. Today he is publishing his Afghanistan country plan.

Britain remains Afghanistan's third biggest donor, with more than £500 million committed over the next four years. In Helmand, that allows us to support the building of a road to Lashkar Gah and the refurbishment of the hydropower dam, from which up to 200,000 people will benefit through irrigation. We are also investing £30 million over four years to work with the Government on a new programme of agricultural support, which includes the wheat-seed programme in Helmand as a viable alternative to poppy and, nationally, improved access to credit so that more Afghans can invest in farming.

Following my visit last December, [1:08:34: Cab M: Pfeiffer M.] the Defence Secretary and I approved a temporary increase—until August—in the number of British troops deployed to Afghanistan, from just over 8,000 to around 8,300. Now, to strengthen security through the election period, I have authorised a further increase to 9,000 until the autumn. To ensure that our forces are properly protected, especially from the growing threat of mines and roadside bombs, we will deploy permanent additional units for that purpose. Some are in the process of deploying now, with others joining them soon. After the election and through the autumn, we plan to return our troop

numbers to 8,300. As always, we will keep the situation under review, based on the situation on the ground [1:09:15: Home Sec: Cl.M.].

I am determined that Britain will fulfil its international commitments.

At the NATO summit this year, allies offered around 5,000 more troops in addition to the extra 21,000 combat and training troops that the United States plans to deploy, many of whom are destined for the south. I also welcome the additional Australian deployment announced this morning—an extra 450 personnel, bringing the total of Australian troops to around 1,550.

We will continue to place the highest priority on the safety of our forces, providing the necessary funding, with more than £1 billion in urgent operational requirements for vehicles in the past three years, including Mastiff patrol vehicles, which are among the best protected in the world. We have increased helicopter numbers and flying hours by 60 per cent. in the past two years.

It has become increasingly clear in the past year just how crucial Pakistan and its border areas with Afghanistan have become to stability in Afghanistan and to our national security at home. Those border areas are used by violent extremists as a base for launching attacks against coalition forces in Afghanistan. As President Obama said, al-Qaeda and its extremist allies are a cancer that risks killing Pakistan from within. Although the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan are different and require distinct approaches, we can no longer consider the terrorist threats arising in the two countries in isolation from each other.

While in Pakistan I met President Zardari, Prime Minister Gilani and former Prime Minister Sharif and we discussed stronger action against terrorism and violent extremism. We are agreeing clear shared principles for our bilateral relationship: that terrorism and violent extremists present the most significant threat to both Britain and Pakistan; and that, throughout Pakistan and especially in the border areas, there must be long-term good governance and economic development to underpin progress on security.

To deliver on those principles we agreed an enhanced strategic dialogue to bring together our senior diplomatic, military and [1:11:51: Bl.M.] intelligence teams on a more regular basis. We will support that closer co-operation immediately, through a £10 million programme of counter-terrorism capacity-building, working with Pakistan's police and security services. As Pakistan steps up the fight on terrorism, so we will focus greater attention on the basic human challenges Pakistan still faces in education, health and respect for human rights [1:12:15: Cab Min: Branson M.], in each of which failure serves only to fuel radicalisation.

Britain's development programme in Pakistan will become our second largest worldwide. We will provide £665 million in assistance over the next four

years, but we will refocus much of our aid, including more than £125 million of education spending, on the border areas of Pakistan. We are working for the establishment of a World Bank trust fund for development in those border areas and we will press other countries to increase their contribution. With UK support, the recent Friends of Pakistan meeting and the donor conference in Tokyo have already delivered pledges of \$5 billion over the next two years. Next month President Zardari will visit the UK. We will take forward our shared efforts to tackle terrorism. We will support economic development and harness the international community's assistance for Pakistan, but we will also continue our discussions to agree a concordat to strengthen our practical co-operation to meet all the terrorist challenges.

Forty countries and more have shown the international community's long-term commitment to Afghanistan. In December 2007 we led the way with our proposals to complement the brave action of our troops by building up the Afghan army and police and local government to give Afghans more control over their own affairs. Tackling terrorism in and from the borders of Afghanistan and Pakistan drives forward our new set of proposals today. We will complement the necessary military action with economic, social and political progress aimed at building stronger and more effective democracies and strengthening the ability of the Afghan and Pakistan authorities to take greater responsibility for action against terrorism, building the strength in Afghanistan and Pakistan upon which their security and our security here in Britain ultimately depend. I commend this statement to the House.

Mr. David Cameron (Witney) (Con):

I thank the Prime Minister for giving his statement today, although for a minute it was quite a close-run thing.

There are many things in the statement that we agree with. Above all, we can agree that the professionalism, dedication and courage of our armed forces personnel in Afghanistan are incredibly impressive [1:14:34: MP: Z-J M.; Cl.M.]. I have been three times in the past three years, and whether one is up the Helmand valley at Sangin, in Lashkar Gah or back at base in Camp Bastion, they are people of whom we can be incredibly proud [MP: British Parlia M.; Federer M.]. They have that can-do attitude, but we must always be careful as politicians not to take too much advantage of the fact that the Army and our armed services are always there and ready to serve.

I want to ask the Prime Minister about three areas: first, our overall strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan; secondly, the situation in Afghanistan [1:15:05: Shadow Foreign Sec: Branson M.], particularly with respect to the elections; and finally, the deteriorating situation in Pakistan. Last month President Obama set out a new US strategy [Shadow Foreign Sec: Branson M.], which he summed up in a single sentence:

“to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future.”

Is it not essential that our strategy is as tightly defined, as hard-headed and as realistic as that? We are not in the business of trying to create a new Switzerland in the Hindu Kush; we want to help provide security and deny al-Qaeda those training bases. President Obama also stressed that the Americans would not just press on blindly with their strategy, but would regularly assess whether they were making real progress against clear benchmarks and would hold themselves accountable. Given that we have been in Afghanistan for almost eight years now, what plans does the Prime Minister have to do the same here in Britain?

Next, on preparations for the August elections and the planned increase in troop numbers, we have said that we would be ready to support an increase for the elections, as long as it was clearly justified and backed up by extra equipment, such as helicopters and adequate force protection. In his statement, the Prime Minister gave some figures for the helicopter hours and capacity up to now; can he give us the future figures that will accompany the increase in troops for the election?

The Prime Minister talked about our NATO allies [1:16:34: clip: PM: Pfeiffer M.] sharing a fairer burden in Afghanistan, as was announced at the recent NATO summit. Can he tell us when [Shadow Foreign Sec: Richie-Santelli M.; Federer M.; Execution M.; Prince Harry M.] this commitment will be delivered, and how many of the extra troops will be based in southern Afghanistan? I believe that he said in his statement that many of them would be in south Afghanistan; can he tell us how many? [Shadow Foreign Sec: Execution M.]

The US has announced a substantial troop reinforcement of 21,000 troops, including another 8,000 for Helmand province. Will the Prime Minister tell the House—in some detail, if possible—how the US forces will fit into the command chain in Helmand and Regional Command (South), and what implications their arrival will have for the combined British effort in Helmand?

No Afghan really likes the presence of foreign soldiers on Afghan soil, and the sooner we can safely reduce that number clearly the better. So it is right that we press ahead [1:17:26: Shadow Foreign Sec: Cl.M. x2; protracted CBS M.] with the Afghanisation of the effort to bring security to that country. The Prime Minister is absolutely right that the Afghan national police have been seen as the weakest link in the security chain. Does he really believe that progress is now being made? The stories you still hear when we are there are pretty horrific. Progress is clearly much better in the army, but it is still reported that there is serious under-representation of Pashtuns in the army. Will the Prime Minister tell us what is being done about that?

Turning to the elections, clearly it's going to be difficult for these to be free [1:17:59: MP: Diaz M.; Pfeiffer M.] and fair. Can the Prime Minister tell us what progress has been made on electoral registration and does the Government expect that it will be possible for proper independent monitoring of these elections to take place?

Next, what happens in Pakistan is clearly as important for our security [1:18:16: MP: quasi-Cl.M.] as what happens in Afghanistan, so [Shadow Foreign Sec: Branson M.] for the purposes of our strategy we should treat them as one. If we think of the plotters of 9/11, the killers of Benazir Bhutto, the men who bombed London, and many others involved in many plots against our country either came from or were trained in western Pakistan, in the federally administered tribal areas extending all the way down to Baluchistan. This is where al-Qaeda remains active.

Pakistan, as we all know, has an enormous standing army, but it is configured for a conventional battle against a perceived external threat. It is not designed to deal with the sort of existential threat that Pakistan now faces from within. The Prime Minister talked about providing the assistance that Pakistan needs to train and equip its forces to deal with that threat. Did he meet the heads of the army on this visit? As things stand, what is his assessment of the Pakistan armed forces' ability to come to grips with the Taliban's continuing advance towards Islamabad? Are reports accurate that the Taliban is setting up militant training camps [1:19:22: MP: quasi-Cl.M.] in the areas that they currently occupy, such as the Swat valley, and that many young people are joining these camps? [MP: Erin M.]

Will the Prime Minister also comment on what is being done to disrupt the activities of the Quetta shura, which, by all accounts, exerts a malign and controlling influence on both sides of the border? [MP: protracted Sarkozy M.] Can he comment on specific reports that the Quetta shura holds meetings around Pakistan, including a recent one in Karachi?

We all welcome the increase in UK aid that the Prime Minister has announced. Will he tell us how that aid will be linked to Pakistan's performance in fighting terrorism? In particular, what help will the Government offer Pakistan to deal with extremist propaganda?

Ambassador Holbrooke, who was in Britain recently, has drawn attention to the scores of low-wattage radio stations operating in the Swat valley. Apparently, night after night, they broadcast lists of people who are going to be executed. What are we doing to help the Pakistanis to jam those radio stations? [parallel - roger's CRTC license]

Terrorism and extremism must be confronted, but we must do that by working with the Government of Pakistan, and by drawing on our long history and knowledge of that country to help them deal with the mortal threat that they now face. Does that not require [1:20:35: MP: Cl.M.] patient, steady

work to build up relationships and close ties with Pakistan? Is that not the vital role for Britain, now and in the future?

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful for that level of agreement about what the strategy has to be, now and in the future, and I am grateful that the right hon. Gentleman agrees with me that the focus has to be greater than ever before on the border areas between Afghanistan and Pakistan [1:21:00: Bush M.], from where so much terrorist activity happens.

We all have a shared interest: Afghanistan, Pakistan and Britain. Two thirds of the attacks or plots in Britain come from Pakistan, and 2,000 Pakistanis died last year and as many are dying this year as a result of terrorist plots. We know that the Taliban in Afghanistan have been active in killing not just British soldiers but civilians who refuse to abide by their wishes.

In answer to the right hon. Gentleman's specific questions, yes, it is right to focus the Pakistan army and security services on the border areas. It is true that the federally administered tribal areas and the North West Frontier have never been fully brought under control by a democratic Government in Pakistan. It is also true, however, that there are 120,000 troops from Pakistan on the Afghan border, although of course the major effort has been reserved for protecting the border with India. We are working with the Pakistani army, so that it can be trained in counter-terrorism capability. Sir Jock Stirrup, the Chief of the Defence Staff, was with me in Pakistan and met General Kiani, the head of the Pakistani forces. There is ever closer co-operation between our two countries on these issues, and we have put £10 million immediately into counter-terrorism support in Pakistan. At the same time, we want to see regular conferences at diplomatic, military and political levels to look at the problems that we face.

It is true that there are well publicised incidents in Pakistan of the Pakistan Taliban gaining more control, but it is also true that there have been huge operations by the Pakistan army—two days ago, yesterday and, I believe, today—to take on the Taliban. The army has been very active in trying to deal with this issue. There was of course a motion passed in the Pakistan Assembly that allowed sharia law in a particular place, but I believe that the parliamentarians are now reconsidering that decision.

On Afghanistan, it is right to say that police training has been slow. It is therefore essential that we do more. There is a big NATO effort—the Germans were in the lead—and it is important, as we discuss these things with the Americans and our European partners, that the emphasis is on training the Afghan army and police. The Afghan army is to rise to 134,000. My own view, and that of the Defence Secretary, is that that will still be too small a number, given the terrain in Afghanistan, and that we will probably

have to train far more Afghan soldiers. That is why a lot of our resources will be devoted to training.

Why we are [1:23:58: Bl.M.] reconfiguring our troops in Afghanistan is for one very precise reason also; and that is the tactics of the Taliban have become that of guerrilla warfare. The use of roadside devices and improvised explosive devices has become common, and we have to prepare and arm our troops to deal with that problem and reconfigure our numbers in those areas where there has been significant trouble. When I was in Lashkar Gah, an operation was going on not so far away, and the bravery and dedication of our troops in clearing the areas so that they can sustain communities that are free from the Taliban was very impressive indeed.

The Leader of the Opposition raised the question of development expenditure. He is absolutely right to say that we are trying to combine the measures, militarily and politically, that will help to strengthen the Afghan state and the Pakistani democracy, while, as they take on the terrorists, providing support for development so that people can see that they have a stake in the future. In the northern part of Pakistan, we are offering a very substantial redirection of aid, enabling 300,000 children—girls—to go to school, and the provision of books that will teach people the history of Pakistan and not the teaching of the madrassahs. That additional expenditure on education goes side by side with what we are trying to do to restore and gain democratic footholds in those areas.

In Afghanistan, the key areas are not just education and health. There are 6.5 million children at school, and we have been building health centres, but there is also new development on roads, the building of dams and irrigation in agriculture. The agricultural seed programme is very successful. I talked to Governor Mangal in Helmand, and he believes that all those things are moving forward. Our strategy is therefore exactly the same as the American strategy announced a month or two ago [1:25:58: Bl.M.]. In December 2007, we set down the idea of [Bl.M.] Afghanisation as the way forward, and our strategy now is to back up democratically elected Governments and to ensure that the elections are fair [Defence Sec: Harriett M.] — £15 million has been put into election organisation. Incidentally, electoral registration has been going very well. There could be two rounds in the election and there must be proper monitors. We have to bring in people from outside to perform that role, but on this occasion there must be Afghan monitors as well.

Our strategy is to combine support for the developing institutions of Afghanistan and of Pakistan with development aid, so that people know that they have an economic and social stake in the future. I believe that that is the right strategy not just for Afghanistan and Pakistan, but for Britain.

Mr. Nick Clegg (Sheffield, Hallam) (LD):

I thank the Prime Minister for his statement and I very much welcome he decided to visit these two countries and increasingly deal with them together—that has to be the right thing —just as I warmly welcome the move from the Obama Administration [1:26:58: SNL-St. M.] in Washington to engage with neighbouring powers like Iran, Russia and China [MP: Staul M.; Thalia M.; MP: Staul M.] on the region's stability.

I'd like to join the Prime Minister and others, of course, [1:27:08: Prime Minister: Cl.M.] in commending the extraordinary work of our troops in Afghanistan. They really do an outstanding job [1:27:16: MP: George W M.] in exceptionally difficult circumstances. But it is clear that public support here at home [MP: Prince Harry M.] for the conflict is under strain. We support the decision to send more troops to Helmand to get the job done. I understand why [MP: JLo M.] given the overstretch of our armed forces - we are sending only a small number, but does the Prime Minister agree with me that the worst [1:27:38: clip: Prime Minister: Cl.M.] of all worlds would be to send reinforcements without committing enough resources to really do the job properly? Our brave servicemen and women need to be able to improve security—not just hold the line against the Taliban—if we are to be able to bring this deployment to an end.

When President Obama launched his new strategy on Afghanistan a few weeks ago, he talked about an “exit strategy”, though understandably for the moment with no timetable. Will the Prime Minister tell me about the preparations and criteria for the NATO and British exit strategy in his approach? Does he agree that long-term stability will be achieved in Afghanistan only if we can secure the country's economic and social development, and deliver a major increase in the size and quality of the Afghan security forces, especially the police? He has spoken a great deal about that already.

Will the Prime Minister confirm that because, I imagine, no Afghan Government for the foreseeable future will be able to afford adequate security forces, the international community will have to commit to long-term funding support? If so, what will Britain's long-term funding contribution be?

It is clear—it seems to me, at least—that the international community may find itself committed to Afghanistan for many years. So, to ensure that our forces have the right resources for that and other deployments in the future, will the Prime Minister agree to a full strategic defence review to ensure that we plan for the needs of peacekeeping and asymmetric warfare, not cold war era state-to-state conflict?

Moving on to Pakistan, there are serious concerns about that country's stability, not least because it is a nuclear-armed state. Its future is obviously of immense concern to us all. Will the Prime Minister tell us what progress

was made in ensuring that those weapons, whose very existence is a huge risk in this tinderbox region, are kept in safe hands?

Britain has a unique role to play, given our historical relationship with Pakistan and the large Pakistani community here in Britain, so does the Prime Minister accept that his rather clunking remarks at the height of a counter-terrorism operation that did not even lead to any charges being brought were the perfect example of how to raise anxieties both within Pakistan and in communities in Britain?

The Prime Minister:

I am sorry to start on a discordant note, but the duty of the Government is to protect the citizens of our country, and we have to take what action we think is necessary—based on decisions made by the police and, in cases, the judiciary—to protect the security of the citizens of our country. That is exactly what we did and exactly what we will continue to do.

On the right hon. Gentleman's points about Pakistan and Afghanistan, we are raising the number of troops during the election period to 9,000 to ensure that the elections can proceed without intimidation and without violence, following the registration of the voters. I am confident—because of that increased number and because 10 other countries have committed to provide additional troops during this period to the tune of 5,000, as well as the additional representation of American forces—that we will see an election that I hope will be free and fair. It will need Afghan monitors as well as outside monitors for the terrain to be fully covered, but I hope that we have taken the measures necessary for that.

On the longer-term strategy for Afghanistan, I repeat that our aim is that Afghan people themselves can take more control over their own affairs, so I see a process where, province by province, as has happened in Kabul, Afghan control can be established in the different areas of the country, obviously starting with the north. Parts of the Helmand area could, over time, be passed over to local control. For that, we need greater Afghan army numbers and greater professionalism on behalf of the Afghan police. We also need to support the local shuras and local government in the tasks that they carry out, and that is what we intend to do.

The reason, of course, that America is bringing troops into the south is because that is the area of greatest difficulty. To answer a point that the Leader of the Opposition made that I did not answer earlier, everybody will be working under the ISAF arrangements, including the Americans in the south.

On Pakistan, I agree with the right hon. Member for Sheffield, Hallam (Mr. Clegg) that there is a need to tackle terrorism at all levels. We will continue to do that.

Three years ago, we spent about £700 million on Afghanistan. That is rising to £3 billion next year. That enormous cost is being met by the British taxpayer to ensure security in Afghanistan [1:32:51: Lord Ch. Z-J M.], and of course in the border areas, to prevent terrorism in Britain and to strengthen the Afghan democracy. We want others to join us in sharing that burden in Afghanistan.

On defence strategy as a whole, I think the right hon. Gentleman will agree [1:33:09: Lord Ch.: Prince Harry M.], looking at the documentation over these last 10 years and more, that we have been consistently reviewing our strategy since the end of the cold war. Nobody could have expected some of the events, particularly those after September 2001, that have affected our country and many others. We must have a defence strategy that is not only consistent but able to respond to whatever events happen round the world. Des Browne (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab):

First, may I offer my personal condolences to the family, friends and comrades of the soldier in the 1st Battalion, the Welsh Guards, who gave his life this week in Afghanistan?

My admiration for our troops on the ground in Afghanistan, and for the civilians who support them, knows no bounds [1:33:57: protracted Richie-Santelli M.].

Over the time in which I had the privilege of visiting them regularly, I became very concerned as to whether the vocabulary that I had at my disposal was adequate to express my admiration for them. We tend to repeat the same phrases all the time, but those are the only words we have. We have enormous admiration for our troops, and it grows every time we see them.

I thank my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister for his statement and welcome the publication of a revised strategy. It shows confidence to revisit and revise the strategy, as that suggests that we are reflecting and are on the right lines. My experience in this area suggests to me that almost every other country in this alliance will probably do the same thing now that we have done it. In the past, we have tended to have given them permission to put such thoughts in writing and to develop a strategy because we have done so.

Over the coming weeks, a proliferation of tests will be applied to the strategy to see whether it is correct, but the only test that matters is whether it goes with the grain of the communities that we are trying to serve in Helmand province and beyond, in the Afghan-Pakistan area. That is why the fact that the Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker:

Order. Please have a seat. May I say to the right hon. Gentleman that I do not wish to be cruel, but he is now on the Back Benches and the difficulty is that there must be only one supplementary? This is not an opportunity for a speech. Out of respect, will he please finish? He will know next time.

Des Browne:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I apologise. At the shura that my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister attended, what did the tribal leaders tell him that the people they represent want? Did their requests fit with the grain of the strategy?

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful to my friend, who served with great distinction at the Ministry of Defence. There is great respect for him right across the Chamber of the House.

I visited one of the shuras in Helmand, at Lashkar Gah, and the message I got was very simple: people want security, and they want it to be guaranteed by our presence, a stronger Afghan army and a stronger Afghan police force. They want that security to be the basis on which they can build prosperity for their families, making use of the agricultural land in that area while at the same time getting education and health care for their families.

It is very clear that we are responding to the wishes of the Afghan people. That is why it is so important that we unite in our strategy of dividing, [1:36:47: Cl.M.] defeating and, eventually, decommissioning the terrorist forces that operate there.

Sir Peter Tapsell (Louth and Horncastle) (Con):

Bearing in mind that there are probably more potential international terrorists in Britain than in the Tora Bora mountains, may I nevertheless congratulate the Prime Minister, no doubt under the influence of the new American Administration, [1:37:11: clip: Prime Minister: Cl.M.] on at last moving away from the political and strategic follies of the last seven years, and on making a much more realistic assessment—that the war in Afghanistan cannot be won by foreign military forces, [1:37:29: clip: Prime Minister: George W M.; Defence Sec: quasi-Cl.M.]; that the existence of foreign forces in Afghanistan radicalises Pakistan, and that Pakistan is a far greater problem because it is a nuclear power and a vastly bigger country with a vastly bigger population? May I give my advice, which is that we should give every encouragement to the Pakistan army to resume political control of that almost ungovernable country before there is an international nuclear catastrophe?

The Prime Minister:

Pakistan has been under military rule for half its existence, and people, including the army, want to see a democratic Pakistan taking control of its own affairs and being able to deal with the terrorist problems in its midst. On reflection, I hope that the hon. Gentleman will agree that that is the right course, not only now but for the future. Of course we must take action against the terrorists in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but that is exactly what we are doing. We are working closely with not only the American Government but 40 other partners in NATO to do so.

Jeremy Corbyn (Islington, North) (Lab):

In six months' time, British troops will have been in Afghanistan for almost eight years. Now the numbers are going up to 9,000 and the conflict is spreading over into Pakistan. Is it not just a matter of time before the conflict spreads over for real into Pakistan, and British troops are also deployed there? Is it not time for a complete rethink of the whole strategy, which is beginning to look awfully like that which sucked the Americans deeper and deeper into Vietnam and ended up with a humiliating retreat 15 years later?

The Prime Minister:

In the seven years that we have been in Afghanistan, a democracy has been established for the first time, the Taliban have been removed from power and 6 million children are going to school, a third of those children are girls who never got the chance of education before. We are building health care centres with the Afghan people, and we are now trying to build up an Afghan democracy, which has a strong army and police force to protect itself against terrorism. I agree with my hon. Friend that the border areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan are the source of many of the terrorist problems faced not only by that region but around the world. The way to deal with that is to work with the Afghan people and the Pakistan people to defeat that terrorist threat.

Malcolm Bruce (Gordon) (LD):

I welcome the decision that recognises the simple fact that the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan effectively does not exist and is completely porous. But will the Prime Minister also acknowledge that additional aid to the two countries will first go towards poverty reduction, which will be its prime purpose, and that the rights of women and human rights will be respected by the Governments of both Pakistan and Afghanistan? Given President Karzai's statement that the last leader who stood up for the rights of women was the king in 1929, who was assassinated, and that he did not want to follow his example, that is not leadership that we should respect. We should require him to understand what that international support is for.

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman, who has been involved in international development for many years, for sharing his knowledge with the House. The Shi'a family law is completely unacceptable and we have made it clear to President Karzai that in our view it is a breach of the Afghan constitution, which respects human rights. Yesterday, at the press conference we held, he said that he accepted that anything that breached the constitution and [1:41:10: clip: MP: Cl-Federer M.] undermined the fundamental rights of people in his country could not be an acceptable law for the future. We will continue to press him on that issue.

The right hon. Gentleman is also right that the focus of our development spending is on providing opportunities that help people out of poverty, and that includes the increased spending on education in Pakistan. According to our knowledge, it is correct that people can get free education, board and lodging at madrassahs, but must then submit to an extremist ideology as part of that education. If we can increase the number of schools in Pakistan, and particularly the opportunities for girls to get education, that will make a huge difference in the long term to how Pakistani people see their future, free of terrorism. That is exactly what we will do.

Tony Lloyd (Manchester, Central) (Lab):

My right hon. Friend has rightly reminded the House that Pakistan and its people have been great victims of terrorism yet, despite that, the overwhelming majority remain wedded to democracy. In accepting that his proposals for greater economic assistance to Pakistan are important in showing that democracy has its own rewards, will he remind all our allies in Washington and elsewhere that in any military action it is necessary to work to sustain the democratic institutions of Pakistan, not undermine them?

The Prime Minister:

That was well expressed by the Pakistani leaders I met yesterday, who are worried about the airspace incursions. At the same time, the Pakistani leadership wish to rid themselves of the al-Qaeda elements that operate in their country, and know that the focus of al-Qaeda's organisation and bases has moved from Afghanistan to Pakistan. We must find ways of working with them to deal with the terrorist threat, and we will do so.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind (Kensington and Chelsea) (Con):

If, as the Prime Minister has indicated, the Afghan Taliban and the Pakistan Taliban are now working closely together and co-operating, is it not about time that the Afghan Government and the Pakistan Government showed a similar degree of co-operation? Is the Prime Minister aware that one of the major problems is that since 1948 the Afghan Government have consistently

refused to recognise the frontier between their two countries as permanent? Will the Prime Minister speak to President Karzai and encourage him to recognise that frontier? Without that, many in Pakistan will continue to be ambivalent, to put it mildly, about working closely with the Afghan Government?

The Prime Minister:

The right hon. and learned Gentleman is absolutely right about some of the existing problems, and I respect his knowledge. I spoke to President Karzai on Monday about those issues, and I also spoke to President Zardari about them. Afghanistan and Pakistan need to come together to consider what issues they can address in common, including agreements about the border areas. Over a short period of time [1:44:15: Defence Sec: Pfeiffer M.] it will be difficult to get an agreement on the border line, but such cross-border co-operation, which has not occurred before, is possible. Six co-ordination centres exist at the moment, and we need to do more to expand co-operation between the Afghan army and the Pakistan army—police numbers are limited, but we must ensure that they co-operate in future as well. Next week, President Karzai of Afghanistan and President Zardari of Pakistan will go together to Washington for a meeting with President Bush—[Hon. Members: "Obama."] Yes, I apologise—with President Obama. They will have that meeting to discuss their common issues in terms of dealing with terrorist and security problems. I assure the right hon. and learned Gentleman that we wish to have the same level of co-operation, with them both working together with us.

Alan Simpson (Nottingham, South) (Lab):

I welcome the list of initiatives that the Prime Minister mentioned in relation to development, democracy and diplomacy in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. Does he accept, however, that the line that cannot be crossed would be one that saw any involvement of UK troops, either conventional or special forces, in Pakistan? Does he agree that that would inevitably lead to a civil war in Pakistan, and to wider hostility to the presence of western forces in the region as a whole? Will he assure the House that under no circumstances will UK forces be given a remit to cross that frontier?

The Prime Minister:

I think that my hon. Friend is finding difficulties where they do not exist. The issue is not that but how we can support and back up both the Afghan and Pakistan army and police forces, and we will continue to do that. If we are to fight terrorism, co-operation will be necessary. As the former Foreign Secretary, the right hon. and learned Member for Kensington and Chelsea (Sir Malcolm Rifkind) mentioned, Afghanistan and Pakistan must learn to work together to deal with their common problems. We can assist in that, but

I believe that there is a will from Presidents Karzai and Zardari for that co-operation to happen.

Mr. James Arbuthnot (North-East Hampshire) (Con):

At the end of this very good statement, and in view of the close connection between Pakistan and the United Kingdom, the instant communication between our two countries, the general instability in that region and Pakistan's possession of nuclear weapons, does the Prime Minister agree that these issues are of supreme importance to this country and that they affect us very deeply and closely? Will he make it one of the highest priorities of his Government to renew the effort to persuade the people of this country that this is our battle and that we must continue to fight alongside the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan until we win it?

The Prime Minister:

I shall do so. I think it is very important for the country to be informed about the dangers that come from both the Pakistan border and the Afghan border. If we have been able to show something today, it is that the [1:47:42: protracted Bl.M.] greater co-operation between these terrorist groups that operate across these borders has got to be dealt with by a more sophisticated and more effective strategy for the future. That is why we want to increase Afghan and Pakistan army and police work in those areas, where it has been limited in the past, and why we are also prepared to work with the Americans and others to increase the counter-terrorism capability, and its financing, of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the problems that we face from the threat of terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom come mainly from those areas of the world that we have been talking about today, and people should know that that line or chain of terror that goes from Afghanistan and Pakistan to Britain is something that [1:48:25: Bl.M.] can only be broken by the co-operation between all our Governments over the next few years.

Hugh Bayley (City of York) (Lab):

The security that ISAF provides is essential to Afghanistan's future, but ultimately democracy and human rights will not be won on the battlefield; they will be won through winning the hearts and minds of the people on both sides of the border. A new World Bank trust fund for development in the border areas will help the Government of Pakistan to win hearts and minds. The United States is the biggest donor to the region by a long margin, but, unlike the United Kingdom, it has not, in the past, put much money through the Afghan trust funds. What discussions has the Prime Minister had with President Obama about US funding for the new trust fund and for the Afghanistan trust funds? Will the United States be putting more money through the trust funds and spending less on bilateral projects?

The Prime Minister:

I am grateful to my hon. Friend for his question. I know the interest that he has taken in that [1:49:23: MP: dbl-h SNL M.] as a member of the Select Committee on International Development. The Secretary of State for International Development has just been explaining to me how the United States Agency for International Development—USAID—and the Department for International Development are working well together on those very issues. It is absolutely right that in so far as there is a co-ordination of military activity, there should also be a co-ordination of development activity—that is what we intend to see happen over the next few months.

Mr. Elfyn Llwyd (Meirionnydd Nant Conwy) (PC):

May I add my condolences to the [1:49:50: Condi M.] family and friends of the Welsh Guardsman who was killed? [MP: Federer M.]

I thank the Prime Minister for an early copy of his statement. Given the pivotal role that the UK police played in the Balkans and have played in Iraq, will the Prime Minister ensure that as soon as the security situation permits it, UK police forces will play a pivotal role in training a good Afghan police service?

The Prime Minister:

The hon. Gentleman is absolutely right to say that British police have helped around the world in establishing the civil order that is necessary in countries that are reconstructing themselves. I believe that over the long term we will have to have some form of organisation comprising civil people from the police, the fire brigades and the legal professions that can help rebuild countries in difficulty. In Afghanistan, the British police could work with the European and NATO force squad that is trying to strengthen police training in Afghanistan.

And I believe he is absolutely right that we have a big role [1:50:56: Cab Min: Letterman M.] to play in helping to develop the police in that country.

Keith Vaz (Leicester, East) (Lab):

In his welcome discussions on counter-terrorism with the President and Prime Minister of Pakistan, did he discuss Operation Pathway? And did he [1:51:09: protracted Bl.M.] take the opportunity of visiting our entry clearance operation in Islamabad, where Pakistanis seeking to come to come here as students are not routinely personally interviewed — that are interviegive a pledge to give whatever resources are needed to boost our entry clearance operation?

The Prime Minister: Yes, indeed. Now biometric visas have to be obtained by students coming into this country. There is the provision that interviews can take place where that is necessary. The rate at which applications have been refused has increased very substantially, and, of course, the number of colleges in Britain are registered to accept students coming from abroad has been radically reduced as a result of the review that has taken place from I think 4,000 to 1,500. We are doing what we can to prevent those people who may be falsely claiming to be students coming into our country.

[...]

[W]e've got to be able to act where there is suspicion of terrorist activity.

Sir Menzies Campbell (North-East Fife) (LD):

Does the Prime Minister accept that the success of this strategy will depend on the co-operation and support of allies? Given that this is a NATO operation in Afghanistan, how far is the strategy that he has announced consistent with NATO's strategy? Has he discussed this with, and had it endorsed by, our NATO partners? In relation to those same partners, what steps has he taken to persuade those who have imposed caveats on the use of their armed forces in Afghanistan to withdraw those caveats so as to ensure that they make a much stronger and more effective military contribution?

The Prime Minister:

This is exactly what we talked about when we had a full discussion of these matters at the NATO summit. We discussed how other countries could play their part in sharing the burden in Afghanistan. As I said earlier, 10 countries announced that they would put at least some more troops in for the period of the election. I believe that our strategy is very much in line [1:53:29: Defence Sec: Eva-Preston M.] with the new thinking that is developing across the whole of NATO about this exercise, and it is in line of course with President Obama's statement of the last few weeks.

I believe that looking at Afghanistan and Pakistan and these terrorist areas together will form a bigger feature [1:53:44: Defence Sec: Federer M.] of NATO and other thinking in the times to come.

I agree with the right hon. and learned Gentleman that we expect other countries to share the burden too.