

Commons debate notes

Immigration and Asylum Bill 2026-27

13 July - 27 October 2026

Dated debate notes and a sourced 27 October briefing

HOW TO READ THESE NOTES

Notes through 22 October draw on published Hansard and working notes. The 27 October briefing uses selected committee papers checked at 1:45 pm, before a debate transcript or decisions were published. Times identify sitting starts, not individual remarks. Committee votes do not make a bill law.

IN THIS PDF

Second Reading - 13 July	2
Appeals authority - 13 October	3
Family life - 15 October	4
Article 8 and protection - 20 October	5
Asylum support debate - 22 October morning	6
Asylum support decisions - 22 October afternoon	7
Part 5 and age threshold - 27 October	8
Child trafficking support - 27 October	9

27 OCTOBER: SELECTED PROPOSALS; DEBATE OUTCOMES PENDING

Second Reading in the Commons

13 JULY 2026

Debate began 6:43 pm; divisions recorded at 9:59 pm and 10:15 pm.

The House debated whether the bill's overall approach should proceed to detailed scrutiny.

WHAT WAS ARGUED

The Home Secretary framed the bill around border control, asylum costs and public consent. Conservatives argued that it did not go far enough. Liberal Democrats challenged the proposed repayment of asylum support and its effect on integration. Other members raised protection and family-rights concerns. These are positions expressed in debate, not findings about the bill's effects.

WHAT THE HOUSE DECIDED

A reasoned amendment was rejected by 358 votes to 97. The House then gave the bill a Second Reading by 264 votes to 90. That authorised detailed committee examination; it did not approve every clause or bring any proposal into force.

WHAT TO NOTICE

The debate mixed questions about total immigration, asylum protection, irregular arrival, appeals and public spending. Keep those categories distinct when assessing later claims about costs or control.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

Which clauses might change a child's ability to prove family life, obtain advice, or receive support while an asylum claim is decided?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

[Commons Hansard - Second Reading](#) >

Appeals authority and review

13 OCTOBER 2026

Public Bill Committee: third sitting 9:25 am; fourth sitting 2:02 pm.

The committee moved from evidence to line-by-line decisions on a proposed new immigration appeals body.

MORNING - INSTITUTION

Members debated the independence of the proposed Independent Immigration Appeals Authority, adjudicator qualifications and whether its duties would secure fair access. Clause 1 and schedule 1 were agreed with amendments in committee.

AFTERNOON - SAFEGUARDS

Government amendment 29 added a duty to give appellants information about qualified legal advice and representation. Amendment 68, which would have barred the original adjudicator from reviewing their own decision, was defeated. The clause 6 internal review route was narrowed to errors of law.

WHAT THIS MEANS

Being told where advice can be found is different from receiving timely funded representation. The rules for correcting a factual mistake, challenging an error of law and allocating a reviewer each matter in practice.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

How would a child obtain an adviser, present evidence and correct a decision that gets a key fact wrong?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Hansard - third sitting (morning) >

Hansard - fourth sitting (afternoon) >

Family-life claims

15 OCTOBER 2026

Public Bill Committee: fifth sitting 11:30 am; sixth sitting 2:00 pm.

Members tested which family relationships can be raised and how they would be assessed.

MORNING - BRINGING A CLAIM

Clause 17 concerned a route for a UK-based sponsor to raise a human-rights claim after an overseas family member's entry application is refused. The ability to bring a claim would not mean the Article 8 claim succeeds. Members also discussed safeguards where children or abuse are involved.

AFTERNOON - PROVING FAMILY LIFE

The committee agreed clauses 17 and 18 with amendments. Government amendments 44 and 45 clarified that a genuine parent-child relationship must be assessed whether or not parent and child live together; contact history is among the listed factors. Members still disputed the broader family-life definition.

WHAT THIS MEANS

Non-cohabitation alone should not end the parent-child inquiry under the amended committee text. Yet families separated by care, conflict or migration may have gaps in documents and contact history.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

What evidence can a separated child or kinship carer realistically obtain to prove the relationship and explain interrupted contact?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Hansard - fifth sitting (morning) >

Hansard - sixth sitting (afternoon) >

Article 8 and core protection

20 OCTOBER 2026

Public Bill Committee: seventh sitting 9:25 am; eighth sitting 2:00 pm.

The committee agreed some family-life provisions and removed an original protection clause pending replacement text.

MORNING - PUBLIC-INTEREST TEST

Clause 19, concerning Article 8 private and family-life decisions, was agreed in committee after debate about public-interest factors and their effects on children. Members disagreed on whether existing child-welfare duties were enough to protect individual best interests.

AFTERNOON - PROTECTION MODEL

Clause 20 on deportation cases was agreed. The committee disagreed to original clause 21 after the government said it would seek to replace it with new clauses 35 and 36 and a schedule on core protection. Those replacements had not been agreed at this sitting.

WHAT THIS MEANS

Do not treat the removed clause, a ministerial promise and current Immigration Rules as the same legal text. Later committee decisions may change the proposed model again.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

How will a child's best interests and family ties be weighed, and what will the replacement protection provisions actually say about young people?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Hansard - seventh sitting (morning) >

Hansard - eighth sitting (afternoon) >

The asylum-support argument

22 OCTOBER 2026 / MORNING

Public Bill Committee: ninth sitting began 11:30 am.

After agreeing clause 22 with government amendment 133, members began debating clause 23 on possible recovery of asylum-support costs.

OPPOSITION WITHIN THE ROOM

Siân Berry (Green) opposed clauses 23 and 24. She argued that charges could deepen poverty for people who needed Home Office support, cited Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and warned about pressure on council family support and housing services. Catherine Fookes (Labour) pointed to the bill's under-18 and destitution exclusions.

THE CONTRIBUTION EXCHANGE

Paul Kohler (Liberal Democrat) asked why people receiving benefits because of poverty are not asked to repay them. David Smith (Labour) then asked Melanie Onn (Labour) about a conditional distinction based on past economic contribution, while describing asylum seekers who wanted to contribute. Onn defended payment later when a person could afford it. Past contribution is an argument in the debate, not a test written into clause 23.

FORMAL OPPOSITION POSITION

Blake Stephenson (Conservative) supported the repayment principle and asked for details of the amount and income threshold. This is different from Berry's opposition to the clauses. His cost questions should not be read as opposition to repayment itself.

WORKING-NOTE CROSS-CHECK

The live notes identified Article 25, family support services, the contribution comparison and clause 23. Hansard confirms those topics, identifies the instrument as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and attributes the historical-contribution question to Labour's David Smith.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

Could a debt or fear of debt shift need from Home Office support to council child and family services, and what evidence would test that?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Hansard - ninth sitting (morning) >

Repayment safeguards and votes

22 OCTOBER 2026 / AFTERNOON

Public Bill Committee: tenth sitting began 2:00 pm.

The afternoon converted the grouped argument into separate amendment and clause decisions.

SAFEGUARDS REJECTED

Siân Berry's amendment 81 would have reduced liability by 20% for each 30-day period after a protection decision was delayed beyond 180 days, unless the applicant caused the delay. Amendment 76 would have used household income below 60% of the median as a poverty floor; amendment 79 would have capped liability at actual support cost; and amendment 77 would have broadened the exemption to under 21 at any time supported. Each lost by 2 votes to 11.

CHANGES MADE

Government amendments 124 to 126 were made. They allow regulations to provide for reduction, waiver or refund of payments and address insolvency. Clauses 23 and 24, as amended, were each agreed in committee by 11 votes to 2. Liberal Democrat amendment 50, on people under 18 at any time supported, was debated but not separately called.

WHAT IS STILL OPEN

The amount, income threshold, collection detail and additional exemptions remain for regulations. The bill's express age exemption is for someone under 18 throughout their support period. A committee decision is not an enacted charging scheme.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

What happens when a supported young person turns 18 during a claim, or has their age disputed, and how will later regulations account for household children?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Hansard - tenth sitting (afternoon) >

Part 5: questions on the agenda

27 OCTOBER 2026 / BRIEFING

Public Bill Committee: 9:25 am and 2:00 pm sittings listed; checked 1:45 pm.

This is a source-based preparation note. The official papers did not yet establish which groups were reached or what members said or decided.

ORDER OF SCRUTINY

The Chair's grouping opens Part 5 with clause 25 and government amendment 113 on slavery and trafficking risk orders. Later selected groups cover clauses 26-34 on prevention and risk orders, 35-43 on victim identification and support, and 44-49 on statements and enforcement. Selection is an agenda, not evidence that each group was debated.

AGE THRESHOLD IN CLAUSE 38

Government amendment 114 would limit public-order disqualification from specified trafficking protections to adults. The introduced child exception depended on existing immigration status; the proposal would use an under-18 threshold instead. Amendment 118 similarly adjusts limited leave: the national-security ground remains general, while public-order and bad-faith grounds are tied to adulthood. Neither amendment was a verified decision at the time of this briefing.

CHILD TRAFFICKING GUARDIANS

Clauses 40-42 propose renaming independent child trafficking advocates as guardians, allowing direct or indirect support, and involving guardians in relevant authority discussions and decisions where disclosure rules permit. The practical question is whether a child gets timely representation and support, not just a different title.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

If age is disputed or a young person turns 18 during a case, which exclusion test applies, and how will their guardian be involved?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

- Chair's selection and grouping >
- 27 October amendment paper >
- Introduced bill, clauses 38-42 >
- Morning Parliament Live audio >

Child support under clause 43

27 OCTOBER 2026 / BRIEFING

Selected amendments only; the 27 October debate record and decisions were pending.

Introduced clause 43 would let the Secretary of State override an authorised support-needs assessment and disapply specified support duties for children.

GREEN AMENDMENTS 70-72

Amendment 70 would remove the ministerial override. Amendment 71 would require decisions to consider the person's best interests, dependent children, individual needs and relevant treaty duties. Amendment 72 would apply the specified support duties to potential child victims, with age-appropriate, trauma-informed help, even if a local authority has separate duties. These are proposals, not agreed safeguards.

FUNDING AND GOVERNMENT TEXT

Green amendment 73 would require resources for local authorities supporting potential child victims and annual reporting on funding, sufficiency and unmet support. Government amendments 120-123 would narrow an exception concerning support lost through a person's conduct to the particular kind of support otherwise available, with a drafting deletion. They do not themselves remove the proposed child exclusion.

WHAT TO VERIFY NEXT

When Hansard and proceedings appear, record which groups were reached, who argued for or against the child support amendments, how each amendment was disposed of, and the final clause text at this stage. A selection paper cannot establish any of those outcomes.

CHILD-FOCUSED QUESTION TO FOLLOW

Would a potential child victim receive the same statutory support offer as an adult, which body must provide it, and who pays if a council is responsible?

OFFICIAL RECORDS

[27 October amendment paper >](#)

[Introduced bill, clause 43 >](#)

[Hansard - 27 October >](#)

[Afternoon Parliament Live event >](#)