

To: Council
Date: 31 January 2022
Report of: Head of Law and Governance
Title of Report: **Motions and amendments received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18**

Councillors are asked to debate and reach conclusions on the motions and amendment listed below in accordance with the Council's rules for debate.

The Constitution permits an hour for debate of these motions.

Introduction

This document sets out motions received by the Head of Law and Governance in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18 by the deadline of 1.00pm on 19 January 2022, as amended by the proposers.

All substantive amendments sent by councillors to the Head of Law and Governance by publication of the briefing note are also included below.

Unfamiliar terms are explained in the glossary or in footnotes.

Motions will be taken in turn from the Independent, Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green groups in that order.

Introduction

- a) John Radcliffe Hospital parking (proposed by Cllr Haines, seconded by Cllr Malik)
- b) Elections Bill (proposed by Cllr Djafari-Marbini)
- c) Lift the Ban for Asylum Seekers (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr R Smith)
- d) Opposition to the privatisation of the Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Pegg)
- e) End Fire and Rehire (proposed by Cllr Mundy, seconded by Cllr Dunne)
- f) Setting up a Drug Consumption Room (proposed by Cllr Wade, seconded by Cllr Miles)
- g) EU Nationals deserve to be treated with respect (proposed by Cllr Corais, seconded by Cllr Bely-Summers)

a) John Radcliffe Hospital parking (proposed by Cllr Haines, seconded by Cllr Malik)

Independent Group member motion

Council reaffirms its decision on 7 October 2019 where it agreed:

Council resolves to continue to work with the management of Oxford University Hospitals Trust as a matter of urgency to help them to undertake a review of the approach to sustainable transport at all the Trust's sites including the John Radcliffe hospital, including a review of the Trust's approach to the allocation of car parking capacity so as to allow for an increased proportion of parking at the sites for the disabled, patients and visitors, and for the operational needs of critical medical staff as part of a comprehensive masterplan for all the Trust's sites in Headington including the John Radcliffe hospital, to promote a sustainable approach to transport to those sites as part of the Local Transport Strategy 5.

Reason:

It is grossly unfair on people who are sick and the friends and family of those wanting to urgently visit people in hospital to allow the current situation to continue. A comprehensive shift to more sustainable transport approaches would:

- Reduce the congestion on local roads, freeing up the road network to other traffic including buses and ambulances;
- Reduce the pollution inhaled by cyclists, pedestrians and local residents from vehicles queuing with engines running;
- Reduce lost time and missed appointments which cost the health service a fortune;
- Make it easier for staff to access the hospital, helping to reduce staff shortages;
- In addition the hospital trust have taken away fifteen parking spaces and they continue to build on the site;
- Currently there are 743 parking spaces, 832 beds and the hospital serves roughly 655,000 people.

A petition: 'To build a multi-storey car park at the John Radcliffe hospital' circulating has now received nearly 5000 signatures on [change.org](https://www.change.org), with around 1300 on paper.

I hope this motion can be carried to allow us to resolve this long standing issue for now and in to the future, and to alleviate some of the problems that the public so clearly and desperately need resolving.

Amendment proposed by Cllr Hollingsworth

Add the words in bold italics and delete the words struck through:
[No changes to first part]

- ~~In addition the hospital trust have taken away fifteen parking spaces and they continue to build on the site;~~
- Currently there are 743 parking spaces, 832 beds and the hospital serves roughly 655,000 people.

While this Council notes that a petition: ‘To build a multi-storey car park at the John Radcliffe hospital’ circulating has now received nearly 5000 signatures on [change.org](https://www.change.org), with around 1300 on paper, ***this Council believes that evidence shows that increasing car parking makes traffic congestion worse rather than improving it, and urges the Trust to explore genuinely sustainable solutions to its transport challenges, such as improving the range of direct bus links to the site and introducing shuttle buses from remote parking sites for those able to use them, rather than schemes that can only make the situation worse.***

This Council urges that the Trust works with the City and County Councils ~~I hope this motion can be carried to allow us to~~ resolve this long standing issue for now and in to the future, and to alleviate some of the problems that the public so clearly and desperately need resolving.

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

Council reaffirms its decision on 7 October 2019 where it agreed:

Council resolves to continue to work with the management of Oxford University Hospitals Trust as a matter of urgency to help them to undertake a review of the approach to sustainable transport at all the Trust’s sites including the John Radcliffe hospital, including a review of the Trust’s approach to the allocation of car parking capacity so as to allow for an increased proportion of parking at the sites for the disabled, patients and visitors, and for the operational needs of critical medical staff as part of a comprehensive masterplan for all the Trust’s sites in Headington including the John Radcliffe hospital, to promote a sustainable approach to transport to those sites as part of the Local Transport Strategy 5.

Reason:

It is grossly unfair on people who are sick and the friends and family of those wanting to urgently visit people in hospital to allow the current situation to continue. A comprehensive shift to more sustainable transport approaches would:

- Reduce the congestion on local roads, freeing up the road network to other traffic including buses and ambulances;
- Reduce the pollution inhaled by cyclists, pedestrians and local residents from vehicles queuing with engines running;
- Reduce lost time and missed appointments which cost the health service a fortune;
- Make it easier for staff to access the hospital, helping to reduce staff shortages;
- Currently there are 743 parking spaces, 832 beds and the hospital serves roughly 655,000 people.

While this Council notes that a petition: ‘To build a multi-storey car park at the John Radcliffe hospital’ circulating has now received nearly 5000 signatures on [change.org](https://www.change.org), with around 1300 on paper, this Council believes that evidence shows that increasing car parking makes traffic congestion worse rather than improving it, and urges the Trust to explore genuinely sustainable solutions to its transport challenges, such as improving the range of direct bus links to the site and introducing

shuttle buses from remote parking sites for those able to use them, rather than schemes that can only make the situation worse.

This Council urges that the Trust works with the City and County Councils to resolve this long standing issue for now and in to the future, and to alleviate some of the problems that the public so clearly and desperately need resolving.

b) Elections Bill (proposed by Cllr Djafari-Marbini)

Labour Group member motion

Oxford City Council recognises the fundamental principles of a healthy democracy are rooted in ensuring elections are fair and accessible for all voters.

Oxford City Council notes with concern that the Elections Bill is set to bring in major changes to national elections, including the introduction of compulsory photographic ID to vote. Currently 3.5 million people in the UK do not have any form of expensive photographic ID.

Council notes that the number of people convicted of voter fraud in 2017 was 1, while the number of mostly working class people struggling and living in poverty that are expected to be disenfranchised by the introduction of voter ID is 2 million.

Council notes that it is estimated that these changes will cost the taxpayer £180 million and will create unnecessary bureaucracy to Councils and people wishing to vote.

Council believes that at a time when voter turnout is declining, we should be doing all we can to make it easier not harder for people to vote.

Council recognises that voter fraud is a problem that does not exist, and this government's attempts to raise the threshold to vote under the guise of combatting crime is taken straight out of the Trump playbook. They will provide significant barriers for people participating in our democracy and disproportionately disenfranchise the poorest and most marginalised.

In conjunction with the Immigration and Borders Bill, the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill, and the Judicial Review Bill, the changes in the Elections Bill are taking the UK down a worryingly authoritarian path. Together, they aim to silence dissent and further disenfranchise the most marginalised, vulnerable and voiceless in society – in particular those from poorer communities, asylum seekers and those from minoritized communities.

These rights are not only the bedrocks of democracy but are the same rights which the Suffragettes and the Chartists used to win us our rights.

These draconian bills have been introduced at a worrying pace and during the unprecedented conditions of the pandemic. This has provided this government with the opportunity to avoid scrutiny and opposition as they water down our rights to hold the government and public institutions accountable, cut off public access to information, deprive people of citizenship without notice, and criminalise those fleeing persecution for seeking sanctuary.

Oxford City Council doesn't want to see people being turned away at the ballot box because of these changes and resolves to support the #HandsOffOurVote campaign by:

1. Requesting that the Leader writes to Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
2. Requesting that the Leader writes to Anneliese Dodds MP and Layla Moran MP asking them to raise these concerns in Parliament.

Amendment proposed by Cllr Djafari-Marbini

Add the words in bold italics and delete the words struck through:

This Council notes that current bills going through Parliament are taking the UK down a worryingly authoritarian path which would have the effect of silencing dissent, rolling back access to justice, and further disenfranchising the most vulnerable in society; those from poorer communities, asylum seekers, and those from minoritised communities. These bills include the Election Bill, the Policing Bill, the Nationality and Borders Bill, and the Judicial Review and Courts Bill.

This raft of oppressive legislation has been introduced at pace during an unprecedented pandemic and, if passed, would severely reduce our rights to hold the government and public institutions accountable, cut off public access to information, make it harder to challenge injustice in court, and create dangerous new powers to deprive people of citizenship without notice and criminalise those seeking sanctuary.

The Election Bill uses the pretext of voter fraud (despite a near total absence of evidence) to further silence those who suffer most, whilst the Policing Bill criminalises GRT communities, threatens the freedoms of assembly, association and expression, and shuts down routes for us all to hold the government to account (routes that the Chartists and the Suffragettes used to win us our right to universal suffrage, which was fiercely opposed by the Establishment for many decades).

These hard-won rights and freedoms form the bedrock of our democracy and must be defended.

In particular, Oxford City Council recognises the fundamental principles of a healthy democracy are rooted in ***supreme importance of*** ensuring ***that*** elections are fair and accessible for all voters.

~~The Oxford City Council notes with concern that the Elections Bill is set to bring in major changes to national elections, including the introduction of compulsory **and expensive** photographic ID to vote. Currently 3.5 million people in the UK do not have any form of expensive photographic ID.~~

~~Council notes that the number of people convicted of voter fraud in 2017 was 1, while the number of mostly working class people struggling and living in poverty that are expected to be disenfranchised by the introduction of voter ID is 2 million.~~

~~Council notes that~~ It is estimated that these changes will cost the taxpayer £180 million and will create unnecessary bureaucracy ~~to~~ ***for*** Councils and people wishing to vote.

~~Council believes that at a time when voter turnout is declining, we should be doing all we can to make it easier not harder for people to vote.~~

~~Council recognises that voter fraud is a problem that does not exist, and this government's attempts to raise the threshold to vote under the guise of combatting crime is taken straight out of the Trump playbook. They will provide significant barriers for people participating in our democracy and disproportionately disenfranchise the poorest and most marginalised.~~

~~In conjunction with the Immigration and Borders Bill, the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill, and the Judicial Review Bill, the changes in the Elections Bill are taking the UK down a worryingly authoritarian path. Together, they aim to silence dissent and further disenfranchise the most marginalised, vulnerable and voiceless in society—in particular those from poorer communities, asylum seekers and those from minoritized communities.~~

~~These rights are not only the bedrocks of democracy but are the same rights which the Suffragettes and the Chartists used to win us our rights.~~

~~These draconian bills have been introduced at a worrying pace and during the unprecedented conditions of the pandemic. This has provided this government with the opportunity to avoid scrutiny and opposition as they water down our rights to hold the government and public institutions accountable, cut off public access to information, deprive people of citizenship without notice, and criminalise those fleeing persecution for seeking sanctuary.~~

Oxford City Council believes that this change will function as a barrier to people voting and increase inequality in the electoral process. There are currently an estimated 3.5 million people in the UK who do not have any form of photographic ID. This includes at least two million people struggling in poverty. By contrast, out of 32 million votes cast in the last general election, there was just one person convicted of voter impersonation.

This Council believes that, at a time when voter turnout is declining, we should be doing all we can to make it easier not harder for people to vote.

Oxford City Council doesn't want to see people being turned away at the ballot box because of these changes and resolves to support the #HandsOffOurVote campaign by:

1. Requesting that the Leader writes to Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
2. Requesting that the Leader writes to Anneliese Dodds MP and Layla Moran MP asking them to raise these concerns in Parliament.
3. ***Working with affected communities to amplify voices of protest and to mitigate, where possible, the effects of pernicious legislation.***

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

This Council notes that current bills going through Parliament are taking the UK down a worryingly authoritarian path which would have the effect of silencing dissent, rolling back access to justice, and further disenfranchising the most vulnerable in society; those from poorer communities, asylum seekers, and those from minoritised

communities. These bills include the Election Bill, the Policing Bill, the Nationality and Borders Bill, and the Judicial Review and Courts Bill.

This raft of oppressive legislation has been introduced at pace during an unprecedented pandemic and, if passed, would severely reduce our rights to hold the government and public institutions accountable, cut off public access to information, make it harder to challenge injustice in court, and create dangerous new powers to deprive people of citizenship without notice and criminalise those seeking sanctuary.

The Election Bill uses the pretext of voter fraud (despite a near total absence of evidence) to further silence those who suffer most, whilst the Policing Bill criminalises GRT communities, threatens the freedoms of assembly, association and expression, and shuts down routes for us all to hold the government to account (routes that the Chartists and the Suffragettes used to win us our right to universal suffrage, which was fiercely opposed by the Establishment for many decades).

These hard-won rights and freedoms form the bedrock of our democracy and must be defended.

In particular, Oxford City Council recognises the supreme importance of ensuring that elections are fair and accessible for all voters.

The Council notes with concern that the Elections Bill is set to bring in major changes to national elections, including the introduction of compulsory and expensive photographic ID. It is estimated that these changes will cost the taxpayer £180 million and will create unnecessary bureaucracy for Councils and people wishing to vote.

Oxford City Council believes that this change will function as a barrier to people voting and increase inequality in the electoral process. There are currently an estimated 3.5 million people in the UK who do not have any form of photographic ID. This includes at least two million people struggling in poverty. By contrast, out of 32 million votes cast in the last general election, there was just one person convicted of voter impersonation.

This Council believes that, at a time when voter turnout is declining, we should be doing all we can to make it easier not harder for people to vote.

Oxford City Council doesn't want to see people being turned away at the ballot box because of these changes and resolves to support the #HandsOffOurVote campaign by:

1. Requesting that the Leader writes to Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
2. Requesting that the Leader writes to Anneliese Dodds MP and Layla Moran MP asking them to raise these concerns in Parliament.
3. Working with affected communities to amplify voices of protest and to mitigate, where possible, the effects of pernicious legislation.

c) Lift the Ban for Asylum Seekers (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr R Smith)

Liberal Democrat Group member motion

Oxford City is rightly proud to welcome asylum seekers but currently those seeking asylum in the UK can only apply for the right to work only if they have been waiting for over a year – and even then only in a limited number of professions.

Allowing Asylum Seekers the right to work much sooner in their application process would generate over £100 million a year for the UK economy and allow Asylum Seekers to support themselves far more effectively than they currently can on £5.66 a day allowance.

Polling has shown that 71% of people are in favour of allowing Asylum Seekers the right to work.

This Council:

(a) notes that:

- (i) since 2002, people seeking asylum are only able to apply for the right to work after they have been waiting for a decision on their asylum claim for over a year, and only if they can be employed into one of the narrow, highly-skilled professions included on the Government's Shortage Occupation List;
- (ii) people seeking asylum are left to live on £5.66 per day, struggling to support themselves and their families, and left vulnerable to destitution, isolation, and exploitation;
- (iii) the potential foregone economic gain for the UK economy of allowing people to work is estimated to be £108.8 million a year via increased taxable income and reduced payments of accommodation/subsistence support;
- (iv) 71% of people polled agreed with the statement: "when people come to the UK seeking asylum it is important they integrate, learn English and get to know people. It would help integration if asylum-seekers were allowed to work if their claim takes more than six months to process";

(b) believes that:

- (i) people seeking asylum want to be able to work so that they can use their skills and make the most of their potential, integrate into their communities, and provide for themselves and their families;
- (ii) restrictions on right to work can lead to extremely poor mental health outcomes, and a waste of potentially invaluable talents and skills both for the economy of and the UK;
- (iii) allowing people seeking asylum the right to work would therefore lead to positive outcomes for those seeking asylum in and for the local and national economy;

(c) resolves to:

- (i) join the *Lift the Ban Coalition*, which is campaigning to restore the right to work for everyone waiting for more than 6 months for a decision on their asylum claim.
- (ii) Call on the UK Government to give people seeking asylum the right to work unconstrained by the shortage occupation list after they have waited six months for a decision on their initial asylum claim or further submission.
- (iii) Request the Leader writes to the Minister of Immigration with the Council's resolution.

Background:

[Lift the Ban – Refugee Action \(refugee-action.org.uk\)](http://refugee-action.org.uk)

d) Opposition to the privatisation of the Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Pegg)

Green Group member motion

Council notes:

- The Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (VMIC), based at the Harwell Campus in Oxfordshire was established in 2018 as an institution that would develop vaccines and prepare for future pandemics.
- The VMIC was established by a consortium of universities - the University of Oxford, Imperial College and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. It now operates as a non-profit company in which the founding universities are shareholders.
- The VMIC is set to become operational in 2022, and would be the UK's first strategy vaccine development and advanced manufacturing facility.
- Reports from the *Financial Times*, *Observer* and *Independent* among others have indicated that government officials are currently reviewing bids from the private sector to manage the centre - including multinational biotechnology firms and healthcare manufacturers.
- Civil society groups including Keep Our NHS Public Oxfordshire and We Own It have publicly opposed any move to place the VMIC in the hands of the private sector.

Council believes:

- Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, private involvement in the health sector has been hugely damaging, with companies prioritising profit above public health.
- Allowing the VMIC to pass into the hands of profit-driven private companies will reduce the efficacy of the centre, inhibit its ability to deliver proper preparedness for future pandemics and reduce the innovation in vaccine manufacturing the centre was designed to achieve.

Council resolves

- To oppose the privatisation of the VMIC.
- To request the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.
- To request the Leader write to the three founding universities expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.

e) End Fire and Rehire (proposed by Cllr Mundy, seconded by Cllr Dunne)

Labour Group member motion

This Council notes that:

The practice of Fire and Rehire, or dismissal and reengagement, has come to public attention in recent years. This involves an employer dismissing staff and reoffering their roles under inferior conditions, usually to effectively change the contract of employment. The currently legal practice has been increasingly threatened by

employers. The prevalence and impact of Fire and Rehire has been researched by the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas).¹ Though not new, there is suggestion that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has spurred an increase in its use. Others have told Acas that the pandemic is being used “opportunistically as a smokescreen to diminish workers’ terms and conditions”. This has impacted a range of employees, many of whom have been key workers such as factory, utilities, and retail workers. These people have kept working and kept our country going during the pandemic and lockdowns.

According to TUC research² nearly 1 in 10 workers have been told to re-apply for their jobs on worse terms and conditions or face the sack. Working-class people (12%) are nearly twice as likely than those from higher socio-economic groups (7%) to face Fire and Rehire. For black and ethnic minority workers (15%) the rate is nearly twice the rate of white workers (8%).

Here, and across the country, Fire and Rehire is increasing the precariousness of work and financially and mentally compromising people who work hard to put food on the table and pay their bills. It is shackling our trade unions and making it impossible for them to fight for a fair deal for their members.

According to the National Union of Journalists (NUJ), our city’s own newspapers The Oxford Mail and The Oxford Times threatened to Fire and Rehire NUJ members over bank holiday pay. In August the NUJ agreed a deal to end the dispute, but they could not get Fire and Rehire taken off the table in negotiations with the newspapers’ owners Newsquest Media Group.³

In Oxfordshire, workers at the Jacob Douwe Egberts coffee factory in Banbury were threatened with Fire and Rehire earlier this year. The profitable factory succeeded in settling an agreement with Unite the Union in August.⁴

Council resolves:

- **To publicly oppose any future use or threat of Fire and Rehire by employers in our City.**
- **For the review of future contracts, contract renewals and procurement to seek to include a commitment for employers to not use or threaten Fire and Rehire, as part of their social clause.**
- **For our City Council Leader to add the voice of the Council to that of our MPs Anneliese Dodds and Layla Moran in supporting national legislation to ban Fire and Rehire.**
- **For our City Council Leader to write to the Business Secretary on behalf of Council, urging him to reverse the current government position, support a ban of fire and rehire, and back the workers of our country.**

¹ <https://www.acas.org.uk/fire-and-rehire-report/html>

² “Fire and rehire” tactics have become widespread during pandemic – warns TUC January 2021
<https://www.tuc.org.uk/news/fire-and-rehire-tactics-have-become-widespread-during-pandemic-warns-tuc>

³ <https://www.nuj.org.uk/resource/oxford-mail-and-times-use-fire-and-rehire-tactic-to-end-bank-holiday-working-payments.html>

<https://www.holdthefrontpage.co.uk/2021/news/daily-journalists-facing-fire-and-rehire-after-rejecting-pay-change-union-says/>

⁴ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-oxfordshire-58078221>

f) Setting up a Drug Consumption Room (proposed by Cllr Wade, seconded by Cllr Miles)

Liberal Democrat Group member motion

One in five Local Authorities in England have cut budgets for addiction services and for support for drug users by more than half since 2015/16 and, with drug-related deaths at a record high, this Council believes that there needs to be greater commitment to setting up drug consumption rooms (DCRs).

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable so this Council seeks to give them the protection of a DCR.

Drugs policy is currently the province of the Home Office, which since June 2018 has been resisting calls from the Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council for leave to open the first heroin assisted-treatment facility in the city, which would allow addicts to use drugs in a regulated environment.

In 2006 the Joseph Rowntree Independent Working Group on DCRs concluded that 'well-designed and well-implemented DCRs would have an impact on some of the serious drug-related problems experienced in the UK' and proposed the setting up of pilot DCRs. Its recommendations have not been taken forward.

- This Council regrets the 2020 Home Office statement that it would not be decriminalising drug use.
- This Council proposes a public health evidence-based approach to drug use. Reliance on the criminal justice system has been at best ineffective, and at worst has driven drug dealers and users underground.
- Oxford City Council calls on the UK Government:
 1. To seek an explicit statement from the Home Office that the operation of DCRs is a matter for Local Authorities; specific rules can then be agreed by Police Forces, the CPS, Health Bodies and Local Authorities
 2. To make a ministerial commitment through the Home Secretary to protect the budgets of alcohol and drug partnerships
 3. To fund drug-testing services to be deployed at localities where there is a need, allowing 'at risk' users to find out what is in a substance and to offer advice on harm reduction.
 4. To allow the setting up of a pilot drug consumption room in Oxford City under an exemption from the 1971 UK Misuse of Drugs Act.

Oxford City Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Home Office and to Oxford's MPs to inform them of this Resolution and urge them to take appropriate action.

References:

1. Independent Working Group on DCRs (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2006)
<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781859354711.pdf>

2. Volteface: Are DCRs viable in the UK? (28.11.17)
<https://volteface.me/drug-consumption-rooms-viable-uk/>

3. Room for Improvement: How Drug Consumption Rooms save lives (01.04.19)
<https://www.adamsmith.org/research/room-for-improvement-how-drug-consumption-rooms-save-lives>

4. HIV Scotland 'Charity backs plans for unofficial DCRs' (07.03.20)
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-51782882>

5. British Medical Journal (5.08.21)

Scotland intends to set up safe spaces for drug users in defiance of UK Govt.

<https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1957>

6. Safer drug consumption facilities: Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership

<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=38604&p=0>

7. Mobilizing DCRs

<http://www.sfu.ca/~emccann/HealthPlace%20DCRs.pdf>

8. A critical analysis of UK news media representations of proposals (Liverpool John Moores University)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10656/>

9. Review of Drugs Pt 2: prevention, treatment and recovery (Dame Carol Black, 2.08.21)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-drugs-phase-two-report/review-of-drugs-part-two-prevention-treatment-and-recovery#contents>

Amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Mundy

Add the words in bold italics and delete the words struck through:

[No changes to first paragraph]

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable so this Council ~~seeks to give~~ **would consider giving** them the protection of a DCR **if other local health providers such as Turning Point were supportive**.

[No changes to last part]

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

One in five Local Authorities in England have cut budgets for addiction services and for support for drug users by more than half since 2015/16 and, with drug-related deaths at a record high, this Council believes that there needs to be greater commitment to setting up drug consumption rooms (DCRs).

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable so this Council would consider giving them the protection of a DCR if other local health providers such as Turning Point were supportive.

Drugs policy is currently the province of the Home Office, which since June 2018 has been resisting calls from the Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council for leave to open the first heroin assisted-treatment facility in the city, which would allow addicts to use drugs in a regulated environment.

In 2006 the Joseph Rowntree Independent Working Group on DCRs concluded that 'well-designed and well-implemented DCRs would have an impact on some of the serious drug-related problems experienced in the UK' and proposed the setting up of pilot DCRs. Its recommendations have not been taken forward.

- This Council regrets the 2020 Home Office statement that it would not be decriminalising drug use.

- This Council proposes a public health evidence-based approach to drug use. Reliance on the criminal justice system has been at best ineffective, and at worst has driven drug dealers and users underground.
- Oxford City Council calls on the UK Government:
 1. To seek an explicit statement from the Home Office that the operation of DCRs is a matter for Local Authorities; specific rules can then be agreed by Police Forces, the CPS, Health Bodies and Local Authorities
 2. To make a ministerial commitment through the Home Secretary to protect the budgets of alcohol and drug partnerships
 3. To fund drug-testing services to be deployed at localities where there is a need, allowing 'at risk' users to find out what is in a substance and to offer advice on harm reduction.
 4. To allow the setting up of a pilot drug consumption room in Oxford City under an exemption from the 1971 UK Misuse of Drugs Act.

Oxford City Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Home Office and to Oxford's MPs to inform them of this Resolution and urge them to take appropriate action.

References:

1. Independent Working Group on DCRs (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2006)
<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781859354711.pdf>
2. Volteface: Are DCRs viable in the UK? (28.11.17)
<https://volteface.me/drug-consumption-rooms-viable-uk/>
3. Room for Improvement: How Drug Consumption Rooms save lives (01.04.19)
<https://www.adamsmith.org/research/room-for-improvement-how-drug-consumption-rooms-save-lives>
4. HIV Scotland 'Charity backs plans for unofficial DCRs' (07.03.20)
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-51782882>
5. British Medical Journal (5.08.21)
Scotland intends to set up safe spaces for drug users in defiance of UK Govt.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1957>
6. Safer drug consumption facilities: Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership
<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=38604&p=0>
7. Mobilizing DCRs
<http://www.sfu.ca/~emccann/HealthPlace%20DCRs.pdf>
8. A critical analysis of UK news media representations of proposals (Liverpool John Moores University)
<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10656/>
9. Review of Drugs Pt 2: prevention, treatment and recovery (Dame Carol Black, 2.08.21)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-drugs-phase-two-report/review-of-drugs-part-two-prevention-treatment-and-recovery#contents>

g) EU Nationals deserve to be treated with respect (proposed by Cllr Corais, seconded by Cllr Bely-Summers)

Labour Group member motion

Council notes:

- That following the UK's departure from the EU there are significant new entry restrictions for EU nationals seeking to come to the UK;
- That at the 2011 census, over 12,000 Oxford residents were born in an EU member state apart from Ireland and the UK;

Council believes:

- That nationals from EU member states are, along with many other migrant communities, an important part of Oxford's diverse and vibrant society;
- That EU nationals, their families, friends and visitors deserve to be treated with respect;
- That in law, EU nationals have the right to receive visitors, yet there is disturbing evidence of hostile treatment of such visitors at the UK border, and that this is causing great distress to those affected, and uncertainty amongst people in Oxford more widely;
- That this is further evidence of the government's discredited "hostile environment" policy being continued.

Council resolves:

- To ask the Council Leader to write to the Home Secretary urging a much more sensitive approach to those visiting the UK from EU countries at the UK border, and protesting at the poor treatment visitors have received since the start of 2021;
- To request this letter is shared with representative organisations in Oxford, relevant embassies, and through the Council's social media channels.

[1] <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/speech-by-home-secretary-on-second-reading-of-immigration-bill>

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/0/theresa-may-interview-going-give-illegal-migrants-really-hostile/>