



DEBATE PACK

Number CDP-2020-0140, 16 November 2020

The covid-19 outbreak and employment rights

By Fintan Codd
(Compiler)
Daniel Ferguson
(Specialist)

Summary

A [Westminster Hall debate](#) on 'The covid-19 outbreak and employment rights' has been scheduled for Tuesday 17 November 2020 at 9.30 a.m. The debate will be led by [Gavin Newlands MP](#).

Contents

1.	Background	2
2.	Press Articles	12
3.	Press releases	13
4.	Parliamentary proceedings	22
5.	Further reading	36

The House of Commons Library prepares a briefing in hard copy and/or online for most non-legislative debates in the Chamber and Westminster Hall other than half-hour debates. Debate Packs are produced quickly after the announcement of parliamentary business. They are intended to provide a summary or overview of the issue being debated and identify relevant briefings and useful documents, including press and parliamentary material. More detailed briefing can be prepared for Members on request to the Library.

1. Background

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on the world of work and the economy more broadly. It is not yet possible to quantify the full impact that the pandemic has had on employment, not least because various parts of the UK are now back in strict lockdowns and key support schemes, like the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme, are being extended.

An overview of the impact of COVID-19 on the economy and work is provided in the Library Briefings, [Coronavirus: Economic impact \(CBP-8866\)](#) and [Coronavirus: Impact on the labour market \(CBP-8898\)](#).

An overview of international comparisons and policy responses can be found in [ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work](#) (6th edn) and [Eurofound: Living, working and COVID-19](#).

The following is an overview the key employment rights issues arising as a result of the pandemic. Employment law is a reserved matter, except in Northern Ireland where it is largely devolved.

Income support measures

One of the key issues during the pandemic has been the right to pay. For the large part, support has been provided through the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and changes to Statutory Sick Pay.

Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme

As part of the first lockdown in March 2020, the UK Government and devolved administrations passed legislation requiring people to stay at home unless they had a reasonable excuse to go out and closed businesses in a wide range of sectors.¹ This resulted in many employees being unable to go to work.

In UK law, it is an implied term of the employment contract that employees have a right to be paid if they are 'ready, able and willing' to work.² This is true even if the employer has no work to offer. In some cases, the contract will include a 'layoff clause', allowing the employer to send the worker home without pay. In other cases, employers will only have an obligation to pay for hours worked and no obligation to offer any hours (zero-hours contracts). In any case, if an employer's business is closed, they might have no income with which to pay the employees and they would have to make redundancies.

Unlike many other European countries, the UK did not have a pre-existing [short-time work scheme](#).³ As such, in March 2020 the UK announced that it was creating a new Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme. Under the CJRS, employers can agree to 'furlough' staff – send them home without work – and HMRC provides a grant to cover 80%

¹ See [Coronavirus: the lockdown laws](#), Commons Library Briefing Paper CBP-8875, 10 November 2020

² [Beveridge v KLM \[2000\] IRLR 765](#)

³ Eurofound, [COVID-19: Policy responses across Europe](#), 24 June 2020, p. 26

of the employee's wages. The rules of the CJRS and rates of support varied over time. Further information on the CJRS can be found in the Library Briefing, [FAQs: Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme \(CBP-8880\)](#).

The CJRS was designed from scratch and there was initially some confusion as rules changed and apparent inconsistencies emerged between guidance and legislation.⁴

The eligibility criteria were broad, initially capturing anyone employed on a PAYE payroll notified to HMRC on or before 19 March 2020. However, a number of workers, including new starters and freelancers, missed the cut-off and were not covered by the CJRS.⁵ As eligibility was based on being an 'employee' for tax purposes, a number of workers in the gig economy were also excluded.⁶ As the decision to furlough is for the employer, it is possible that some employers decided not to furlough certain eligible employees, like agency workers or zero-hours workers, who they would not otherwise have had any obligation to pay.⁷

HMRC statistics indicate that a total of 9.6 million jobs have been furloughed so far, peaking at 8.9 million at one time on 8 May 2020. 3.3 million jobs were furloughed as at the end of August.⁸ A report by the Resolution Foundation indicated that over half of those who were furloughed were back in work by September, mostly with the same employer. A further one third remained on furlough while just under one tenth were out of work.⁹

In September, during an oral evidence session with the Public Accounts Committee, Jim Harra, the Chief Executive of HMRC, said that HMRC was assuming that the fraud rate for furlough claims was between 5% and 10%, including both deliberate fraud and error.¹⁰ An academic study found that two thirds of furloughed employees worked for their employer while on furlough (breaching the CJRS rules), although many were not explicitly asked to do so by their employer.¹¹ Legislation has given HMRC the [power to claw back payments from fraudulent claims](#).

Statutory Sick Pay

Under existing legislation, an eligible employee who is 'incapable for work' for four or more consecutive days is entitled to Statutory Sick Pay (SSP).¹² Normally SSP is paid from the fourth 'qualifying day' (fourth day of absence from work) and it is paid at a rate of £95.85 per week.

⁴ See e.g. Daniel Dyal, [Furlough Furore: the Treasury Direction and the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme](#), Cloisters, 17 April 2020

⁵ Treasury Committee, [Economic impact of coronavirus: Gaps in support](#), 15 June 2020, HC 454 2019-21

⁶ [R \(Adiatu\) v HM Treasury \[2020\] EWHC 1554 \(Admin\)](#)

⁷ See Alan Bogg and Michael Ford QC, [Not Legislating in a Crisis? The Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme, Part 2](#)

UK Labour Law Blog, 31 March 2020

⁸ HMRC, [Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme statistics: October 2020](#), 12 Nov. 2020

⁹ Kathleen Henehan et al., [Jobs, jobs, jobs: Evaluating the effects of the current economic crisis on the UK labour market](#), Resolution Foundation, 27 October 2020

¹⁰ Public Accounts Committee, [Oral evidence: Tackling the tax gap](#), HC 650, 7 September 2020, Qs 11-13

¹¹ Abi Adams-Prassl et al., [Furloughing](#), 17 August 2020, pp. 21-24

¹² Section 151, [Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992](#)

The Government made a number of changes to SSP legislation during the pandemic. Specifically, it made legislation so that people self-isolating or shielding in line with official guidelines were 'deemed' incapable for work.¹³ It made legislation so that SSP was paid from the first qualifying day, rather than the fourth.¹⁴ It also created a [Statutory Sick Pay Rebate Scheme](#) to compensate employers for two weeks' worth of SSP payments made to employees for COVID-related reasons.

However, there have been a number of issues with SSP.

First, there was confusion about the status of pregnant women. Despite many being sent home in mid-March, they were not eligible for SSP (as they were not 'deemed' incapable) and many may have initially missed out under the CJRS until they had a written furlough agreement.¹⁵

Second, only those who are 'employees' for tax purposes can claim SSP, excluding many in the gig economy. Employees must also earn above £120 per week on average. The Independent Workers Union of Great Britain (IWGB) brought a human rights challenge to the exclusion of gig workers from the CJRS and SSP but they were unsuccessful.¹⁶

Third, bodies like the Trades Union Congress (TUC) argue that the rate of SSP is low and would push many workers into debt if they had to self-isolate.¹⁷ In September, the UK Government introduced Test and Trace Support Payments in England: £500 lump sum payments made to low-paid workers on benefits who are required to self-isolate.¹⁸

The right to SSP was also not extended to people who were required to self-isolate after travelling abroad (quarantine). A number of countries were exempt from the quarantine rules. As some of these countries were removed from the exempt list at short notice, a number of people unexpectedly had to quarantine. They were not entitled to SSP.¹⁹

Redundancy

ONS data shows that in July-September 2020, there were 314,000 redundancies in the UK, the highest number since records began in 1995. The number was up 181,000 from the previous quarter.²⁰

The Institute for Employment Studies found that employers were issuing notifications for collective redundancy consultation (HR1 forms) at double the rate of the 2008/9 recession, although not every consultation will actually result in redundancies being made.²¹

¹³ Schedules 1-2, [Statutory Sick Pay \(General\) Regulations 1982](#)

¹⁴ [Statutory Sick Pay \(Coronavirus\) \(Suspension of Waiting Days and General Amendment\) Regulations 2020](#)

¹⁵ Michael Ford QC and Karon Monaghan QC, [Statutory Sick Pay, the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and Pregnant Workers](#), UK Labour Law Blog, 28 April 2020

¹⁶ [R \(Adiatu\) v HM Treasury \[2020\] EWHC 1554 \(Admin\)](#)

¹⁷ Alex Collinson, [Why we need an increase in statutory sick pay](#), TUC, 9 Sep. 2020

¹⁸ [Coronavirus: Test and Trace Support Payments](#), Commons Library Briefing Paper CBP-9015, 12 November 2020

¹⁹ [Coronavirus: Quarantine and employment rights](#), Commons Library Briefing Paper, CBP-8986, 20 August 2020

²⁰ ONS, [Labour market overview, UK: November 2020](#), 10 November 2020

²¹ Institute for Employment Studies, [On Notice: Estimating the impact on redundancies of the COVID-19 crisis](#), 14 September 2020

Employees who have worked for their employer for two or more years are protected from unfair dismissal. A dismissal will be unfair unless the employer can show it was for a potentially fair reason listed in the legislation and the decision was reasonable in the circumstances.²²

Redundancy is one of the potentially fair reasons for dismissal. It occurs where a business or workplace closes or an employer has a reduced need for staff.²³ A tribunal will typically consider a range of factors when deciding whether redundancy was reasonable in the circumstances. These can include whether employees were consulted, whether an objective selection criteria was used and whether alternatives to redundancy were explored.²⁴

Employees dismissed by reason of redundancy will also be entitled to [statutory redundancy pay](#).

Those who are 'limb (b)' workers, including many agency workers, zero-hours workers and gig workers, as well as employees who have not worked for their employer for two or more years are not protected from unfair dismissal and do not have a right to statutory redundancy pay.²⁵

Employers who are proposing to make 20 or more employees redundant at the same establishment within 90 days must consult employee representatives. For these purposes the term 'employees' has a broader definition. Employers cannot make any dismissals until at least 30 days after the consultations start (45 days if they are proposing to make 100 or more redundancies).²⁶

An overview can be found in the Library Insight, [Coronavirus: Protections from redundancy](#).

One area of concern is protections for pregnant women and new mothers. Employees on maternity leave who are at risk of redundancy must be offered suitable alternative vacancies in priority to other employees.²⁷ In July 2019, the Government committed to extend the protections to cover pregnancy and a period of six months after an employee returns from maternity leave.²⁸ In June 2020, the Petitions Committee published a report calling on the Government to introduce the legislation as a matter of urgency.²⁹ Meanwhile, groups like Maternity Action have called for the Government to support a [Private Members Bill](#) introduced by Maria Miller MP which would provide mothers with stronger protections against redundancy.³⁰

²² Section 98, [Employment Rights Act 1996](#)

²³ Section 139, [Employment Rights Act 1996](#)

²⁴ [Williams v Compare Maxam Ltd \[1982\] IRLR 83](#)

²⁵ Sections 108 and 155, [Employment Rights Act 1996](#)

²⁶ Part IV, Chapter II, [Trade Union and Labour Relations \(Consolidation\) Act 1992](#)

²⁷ Reg. 10, [Maternity and Parental Leave etc. Regulations 1999](#)

²⁸ Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, [Good Work Plan: Pregnancy and Maternity Discrimination Consultation: Government Response](#), July 2019

²⁹ Petitions Committee, [The impact of COVID-19 on maternity and parental leave](#), HC 526 2019-21, para. 115

³⁰ Richard Dunstan, [Redundancy protection: Now is the time for Ministers to act](#), Maternity Action, 12 June 2020

The Government has said its changes will be introduced through the *Employment Bill* which is has not yet been published.³¹

Analysis by the Institute for Fiscal Studies shows that mothers have been 1.5 times more likely to lose or leave their jobs during the COVID-19 pandemic compared to fathers.³²

‘Fire and rehire’

‘Fire and rehire’ is a practice where an employer dismisses an employee and re-employs them on new terms. The practice is typically used when [other methods of varying the contract](#), such as agreement with the employee, have not succeeded.

The practice is not unlawful of itself. However, as employees will have been dismissed, they can bring a claim for unfair dismissal if they are eligible. If more than 20 employees are involved, the obligation to undertake collective redundancy consultations will also apply.

When considering whether dismissals in fire and rehire cases are fair, Employment Tribunals have typically been deferential to employers and have not placed much weight on the reasonableness of an employee’s refusal to accept new terms.³³

Alan Bogg, Professor of Law at Bristol University, has written that an employer using fire and rehire tactics can “[reduce] terms and conditions with relative ease.” He has proposed a number of reforms, including that dismissals in fire and rehire cases should be unfair if an employer had reasonable economic alternatives.³⁴

During the course of the pandemic, there has been a lot of focus on the use of these tactics by British Airways. In oral evidence to the Transport Committee in September 2020, Alex Cruz, then CEO of BA, said that an agreement had been reached with unions and there would be no need to issue new contracts.³⁵ However, there is an ongoing fire and rehire dispute between Unite the Union and the cargo handling business of BA. Unite has now begun balloting its members.³⁶

Gavin Newlands MP has introduced a [Private Members Bill](#) that would make dismissals automatically unfair if the purpose was to rehire the employee on less favourable terms.

An overview can be found in the Library Debate Pack, [Fire and re-hire tactics \(CDP 2020-0105\)](#).

³¹ Petitions Committee, [The impact of COVID-19 on maternity and parental leave: Government Response to the Committee’s First Report](#), HC 770 2019-21, 8 Sep 2020, p. 17

³² Institute for Fiscal Studies, [How are mothers and fathers balancing work and family under lockdown?](#), 27 May 2020

³³ *Catamaran Cruisers Ltd v Williams* [1994] IRLR 386

³⁴ Alan Bogg, [Firing and Rehiring: An agenda for reform](#), Institute for Employment Rights, 9 October 2020

³⁵ Transport Committee, [Oral evidence: Coronavirus: implications for transport](#), HC 268, 16 September 2020, Q624

³⁶ Unite the Union, [British Airways braced for large-scale disruption as cargo workers ballot for strike action in fire and rehire dispute](#), 12 November 2020

Health and safety

Health and safety law

The UK has a comprehensive body of health and safety law. General obligations are set out in the [Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974](#) and are supplemented by detailed secondary legislation. In many areas of health and safety, UK law implements [EU law](#).

The UK Government has published guides for 14 sectors setting out [steps that can be taken to work safely in the context of COVID-19](#).

See the Library Briefing, [Coronavirus: Returning to work \(CBP-8916\)](#).

Health and safety law is enforced by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and local authorities. Following the outbreak of the pandemic the UK Government [provided an additional £14 million](#) in funding for the HSE. A Work and Pensions Committee report concluded that this was insufficient in the context of past cuts to HSE funding.³⁷

Protections from detriment and dismissal

Employees who leave or refuse to attend the workplace because they reasonably believe that there is a serious and imminent danger to themselves or others are protected from suffering any detriments or being dismissed.³⁸ In these cases, employees do not need to have worked for their employer for two years in order to be protected.

One of the key questions in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic will be whether an employee “reasonably believed” that there was a “serious and imminent” danger. Barrister Schona Jolly QC notes there is significant scope for disagreement between employers and employees:

What makes sense to an employee may not make sense to an employer, and vice-versa. Even if the former has followed guidelines on social distancing, the latter may still fear for their safety. An employer may be entirely justified in asking that an employee return to work, in accordance with their contractual duty, while an employee may fear that they, or their loved ones, will be unacceptably exposed. So we may well find ourselves in the situation where an instruction is likely to be reasonable, and the refusal may also be reasonable. In employment law terms, that leaves both decent employers and fearful employees with difficult choices. Common sense does not, sadly, pay wages to employees nor perform work for employers. Where inevitable uncertainties arise, the law must therefore define the parameters.

The letter of the Employment Rights Act is not likely to resolve all such cases. While provision is made for employees to claim they have been unlawfully subjected to a detriment on health and safety grounds, or for automatic unfair dismissal, these provisions are not clear-cut, and are of course untested in pandemic circumstances.³⁹

³⁷ Work and Pensions Committee, [DWP's response to the coronavirus outbreak](#), HC 178 2019-21, 17 June 2020, paras. 242-243. See also Work and Pensions Committee, [DWP's response to the coronavirus outbreak: Government Response to the Committee's First Report](#), HC 732 2019-21, 2 September 2020, paras. 33-38.

³⁸ Sections 44 and 100, [Employment Rights Act 1996](#)

³⁹ Schona Jolly QC, [Desperate bosses and vulnerable workers: We face an imminent “clash of the reasonable”](#), Prospect, 5 June 2020

In addition, there is some disagreement among employment lawyers over whether an employee who refuses to go to work for health and safety reasons is entitled to pay.⁴⁰

Separately, there have been a number of questions about the scope of this protection.

First, it is unclear whether the danger that the employee fears must arise from the workplace or whether it also covers fears from the commute.⁴¹

Second, under UK legislation key health and safety protections, including the protections from detriments and the right to be provided with personal protective equipment (PPE), are only available to 'employees' and not to 'workers'. The IWGB brought a case on behalf of gig economy workers arguing that the UK was failing to properly implement EU health and safety law, which applies to 'workers' as defined in EU law. On 13 November the High Court issued its judgement finding for IWGB.⁴² The judgment, which may still be appealed, would mean that 'limb (b) workers' could bring claims for health and safety detriments. Barristers at Old Square Chambers, who acted for IWGB, have produced a [summary of the judgment](#).

Third, there is some uncertainty over whether an employee can refuse to go to work to protect a vulnerable person in their household. The protections do apply where an employee takes steps to protect others from danger.⁴³ However, the UK Government [guidance on shielding](#) says that those who live with a person who is clinically extremely vulnerable to COVID-19 can leave the home to go to work if they are unable to work from home.

Working from home

Health and safety law applies just as much to people working from home as it does in the workplace.⁴⁴ Employers will need to ensure that employees are provided with the right equipment and look out for their mental health. HSE has produced some [guidance for homeworkers](#).

A survey by the Chartered Institute for Personnel and Development showed that during the first lockdown there was an [increase in fatigue, stress and musculoskeletal pain](#) and that working from home was one key contributing factor.

It should be noted that employees do not have a right to work from home. Employees who have worked for their employer for more than 26 weeks can make a request for flexible working, including as to the location of their work. However, employers can refuse such requests on the basis of one of the reasons listed in the legislation.⁴⁵ Of course, in

⁴⁰ See Daniel Barnett, [Coronavirus: staying at home under s44 ERA](#), 9 October 2020

⁴¹ Shalina Crossly and Lucy Lewis, [Does an employer's duty of care extend to commuting to work?](#), Lewis Silkin LLP, 21 May 2020

⁴² *R (Independent Workers Union of Great Britain) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [2020] EWHC 3039 (QB) (Admin)

⁴³ Cloisters, [Ninth edition released of Cloisters Toolkit: Returning to work in the time of Coronavirus](#), 9 October 2020, para. 2.26

⁴⁴ Tom Gillie, Ruaraidh Fitzpatrick and Catherine Casserley, [COVID-19: An employer's guide to homeworking](#), Cloisters, 2 April 2020

⁴⁵ [Flexible Working](#), Commons Library Briefing Paper SN 1086, 3 October 2018

the context of COVID-19 employees may be protected if they refuse to go to work because of a serious and imminent danger. In addition, under certain types of lockdown legislation it is an offence for an employee to go to the work if they are able to work from home.⁴⁶

Time off for family and carers

Right to time off

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, there are various circumstances in which a person with caring responsibilities may need to stay at home. This can include those who care for a person who is vulnerable to COVID-19 or parents who need to care for children, either because their school is closed or because the child is required to isolate.

In cases such as these, there is no clear-cut right to paid time off.

Employees who have dependents, such as a child, a family member or someone they care for, have a right to a “reasonable amount” of [time off for dependents](#) if they need to provide care.⁴⁷ However, it is unpaid.

Parents and carers could ask to be furloughed if they are eligible. The Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme [allows employers to claim for those who have to take time off for caring responsibilities](#).

Alternatively, a worker with caring responsibilities could ask to take paid annual leave to care for someone. However, employers can refuse requests for annual leave by giving notice.⁴⁸

The Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas) say employers [should have regular discussions with employees who need time off](#) and be flexible where possible.

Bereavement leave

In the UK there is no general statutory right to time off for bereavement. As such, employees who lose a close family member would need to rely on a contractual right or, if their contract does not allow for time off, agree time off with their employer.

In April 2020, the Government introduced two weeks of [paid statutory bereavement leave for parents](#) who lose a child.⁴⁹

In the context of COVID-19, Sue Ryder, the charity, have [launched a campaign](#) calling on the Government to extend two weeks paid bereavement leave to employees who lose a parent or a close relative.

⁴⁶ See e.g. Regs. 5-6, [Health Protection \(Coronavirus, Restrictions\) \(England\) \(No. 4\) Regulations 2020](#)

⁴⁷ Section 57A, [Employment Rights Act 1996](#)

⁴⁸ Reg. 15, [Working Time Regulations 1998](#)

⁴⁹ [Statutory Parental Bereavement Pay \(General\) Regulations 2020](#). For background, see [Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill 2017-19](#), Commons Library Briefing Paper CBP-8115, 2 May 2018.

Annual leave

The [Working Time Regulations 1998](#) provide workers a right to 4 weeks of annual leave and 1.6 weeks of additional annual leave. The 4 weeks of basic annual leave implement the EU's [Working Time Directive](#).

Normally, statutory annual leave cannot be carried over from one year to the next. However, in the context of COVID-19 the Government made legislation to allow workers to carry over up to 10 days of annual leave into the next two leave years.⁵⁰

Workers can request to take annual leave by giving notice. Employers can refuse this notice and can also require workers to take annual leave on specific days by giving notice or by including terms in the employment contract.⁵¹

In the context of COVID-19, one key question has been whether employers can require workers to take annual leave during lockdown or during periods of furlough.

It is clear that workers can be required to take annual leave during times when they would not otherwise have been working.⁵² However, EU case law also suggests that there are circumstances in which a worker cannot be required to take annual leave, such as during sick leave where they cannot enjoy a period of rest and relaxation.⁵³ A number of employment lawyers and academics have argued that a worker required to take annual leave during furlough, in the context of a lockdown, would not be able to enjoy rest and relaxation.⁵⁴ It should be noted that the EU case law will only apply to the 4 weeks of basic annual leave, not the 1.6 weeks of additional annual leave or contractual leave.

Government [guidance on annual leave and COVID-19](#) says that employers can require workers to take annual leave during furlough, but it also notes that employers should consider whether workers can enjoy a proper period of rest and relaxation.

Privacy

The rise in the number of people working remotely from home has also led to concerns about employee surveillance and privacy.⁵⁵ The concept of employee surveillance and algorithmic decision-making in the workplace is not new and has been the subject of significant debate.⁵⁶ However, COVID-19 has raised new concerns about extending employee surveillance into the home. Dr Philippa Collins, a Lecturer in Law at the University of Exeter, summarised the problem in the following terms:

⁵⁰ [Working Time \(Coronavirus\) \(Amendment\) Regulations 2020](#)

⁵¹ Reg. 15, [Working Time Regulations 1998](#)

⁵² [Russell v Transocean International Resources Ltd \[2011\] UKSC 57](#)

⁵³ [Stringer and ors v HMRC \(C-520/06\) \[2009\] ICR 932](#)

⁵⁴ See e.g. Alan Bogg and Michael Ford QC, [Furloughing and Fundamental Rights: The Case of Paid Annual Leave](#), UK Labour Law Blog, 6 April 2020

⁵⁵ Alex Hern, [Shirking from home? Staff feel the heat as bosses ramp up remote surveillance](#), *The Guardian* [online], 27 September 2020 (accessed 16 Nov 2020)

⁵⁶ See e.g. Jeremias Prassl, ['What if Your Boss Was an Algorithm? The Rise of Artificial Intelligence at Work'](#), (2019) 41(1) *Comparative Labour Law & Policy Journal*, 123

The use of electronic surveillance of workers in the home thrusts the previously public life of the workplace deep into the private sphere of the individual. Boundaries, previously blurred by weekend working or answering emails in the evenings, begin to disappear altogether. Imagine, for example, that an employee – during the pandemic particularly – uses the flexibility of working from home to balance their duties at work with their need to care for their family. They might work unusual or variable hours to complete their tasks, whilst spending time with their family during what would previously have been considered ‘working time’. The employer may consider, therefore, that they have the right to monitor the individual during all of these hours of the day, both the tradition “9-to-5” as well as the early mornings and evenings when the employee might be prioritising their work.⁵⁷

A number of academics, including Dr Collins, have begun considering how Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (the right to private and family life) might regulate such surveillance.⁵⁸

More generally, the COVID-19 pandemic has given rise to other privacy and data protection concerns, including the collection of health data for NHS Test and Trace and health monitoring in the workplace, such as temperature checks. The Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) has produced guidance for [employers](#) and [individuals](#) on data protection and COVID-19.

Equality

Under the [Equality Act 2010](#), employers must ensure that they do not directly or indirectly discriminate against employees on the basis of certain protected characteristics. They also have obligations to make reasonable adjustments for disabled employees. A detailed overview can be found in the Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC) [Employment Statutory Code of Practice](#).

The impacts of COVID-19 in the workplace are not being felt equally. For example, the Fawcett Society have produced a series of briefings highlighting how [mothers](#), [BAME women](#) and [disabled women](#) are disproportionately impacted.

The health impacts of COVID-19 are also felt disproportionately by certain groups. A Public Health England [report on the disparities of risk in the context of COVID-19](#) found increased risk on the basis of age, ethnicity and existing health conditions, among other things.

The Library Briefing, [Coronavirus: Impact on the labour market \(CBP-8898\)](#), considers the impact of COVID-19 on minority ethnic groups, women, younger and older workers, low paid and disabled workers.

The EHRC has published general [guidance for employers on COVID-19](#) as well as specific [guidance on making reasonable adjustments](#).

⁵⁷ Philippa Collins, [The Right to Privacy, Surveillance-by-Software and the “Home-Workplace”](#), UK Labour Law Blog, 3 September 2020

⁵⁸ Collins, *Ibid.* Eleni Frantziou, [The right to privacy while working from home \(‘WFH’\): why employee monitoring infringes Art 8 ECHR](#), UK Labour Law Blog, 5 October 2020

2. Press Articles

[Oct – Nov 2020]

[Let's not pretend, coronavirus is a class issue](#) (£), Sunday Times, 15 November 2020

[Cutting universal credit will push millions of people into great hardship](#), The Guardian, 14 November 2020

[Covid: Support group says excluded self-employed need help](#), BBC News, 14 November 2020

[Don't put key workers at end of the Covid vaccine queue, warn UK unions](#), The Guardian Online, 14 November 2020

[Redundancies loom as employers reject furlough because of National Insurance and pensions costs](#), inews.co.uk, 10 November 2020

[Covid help extended for self-employed people, but some miss out](#), The Guardian, 6 November 2020

Coronavirus: [Human rights watchdog investigating impact of COVID-19 on BAME healthcare workers](#), SkyNews, 5 November 2020

[Key workers must be kept safer in Covid's second wave](#), FT, 3 November 2020

[Most UK bosses would back tougher employment laws to protect workers](#), The Guardian, 27 October 2020

[Everyman cinema staff say Covid-19 lay offs have left them in limbo](#), The Guardian, 20 October 2020

3. Press releases

(Oct – Nov 2020)

[IWGB wins groundbreaking health and safety legal challenge against the Government](#)

Independent Workers' Union of Great Britain (IWGB)

13 November 2020

- The IWGB has won a judicial review against the UK Government calling for health and safety protections for 'gig economy' and precarious workers.
- The High Court ruling means that the UK Government failed to properly implement EU health and safety directives and must now extend health and safety protections to 'gig economy' and precarious workers.
- Workers not classed as employees have been denied the right to refuse unsafe work and the right to PPE, putting them in serious danger throughout the pandemic.

In a [detailed judgment](#) handed down today, Mr Justice Chamberlain found that the UK has failed to grant workers in the 'gig economy' the rights they are entitled to under EU Health and Safety law.

The judgment means that workers in the 'gig economy' are entitled to the same EU-derived health and safety rights as employees. Key rights are (i) to be provided with Personal Protective Equipment by the business they are working for and (ii) the right to stop work in response to serious and imminent danger. The UK Government must now urgently take steps to ensure that workers have the same protection as employees.

The pandemic has made workers' rights into a public health issue. The Government's failure to extend health and safety protections has left many workers in the 'gig economy' exposed to serious risks. [1 in 10 adults engage in 'gig economy' work](#), which accounts for at least 4.7 million people working in the UK with little to no health and safety protections.

Henry Chango Lopez, IWGB General Secretary says: *"We are delighted with this win for workers' rights. In the midst of the pandemic, health and safety at work has never been more important. It is crucial that businesses know they must protect the health and safety of their workers and that the Government brings the criminal prosecutions necessary to enforce this law."*

Alex Marshall, IWGB President says: *"Key workers have been calling for greater protection throughout the pandemic and this has largely fallen on the deaf ears of their employers. The IWGB contacted numerous companies during the first wave and they either did very little or nothing at all as they tried to escape any accountability for their workforce. This ruling is long overdue and the IWGB expects that in the light of this clear ruling, the UK Government will now take urgent legislative measures to ensure workers' safety."*

Kate Harrison, solicitor says: *“We are delighted by this clear decision and the Government should now take urgent steps to make sure the judgment is followed and all gig-economy workers can exercise their rights to health and safety protection and PPE during the pandemic and beyond.”*

The IWGB was represented by [Ijeoma Omambala QC](#) and [Cyril Adjei](#) of Old Square Chambers and [Kate Harrison](#) and [Harry Campbell](#) of Harrison Grant solicitors. Assistance was also provided by Professor Alan Bogg of Bristol University. Old Square Chambers’ report on the ruling can be found [here](#).

The judicial review was supported by a public [crowdfunding initiative](#) which received more than 100 donations

[British Airways braced for large-scale disruption as cargo workers ballot for strike action in fire and rehire dispute](#)

Unite the Union

12 November 2020

British Airways is facing significant disruption in its cargo handling business in the run up to Christmas as members of Unite, the UK’s principal aviation union, prepare to ballot for industrial action.

Controversial plans

The dispute is a result of British Airways’ highly controversial plans to fire and rehire its entire workforce on vastly reduced pay.

While Unite has finally been able to secure agreements to mitigate the company’s plans for most of its workers, this has currently proved impossible in the case of the cargo workers based at Heathrow Airport, where Unite has in excess of 850 members.

Huge pay cuts

The workforce has been forced to sign new contracts resulting in pay cuts of between 20-25 per cent.

To make a difficult situation worse, British Airways is also threatening to outsource the workforce and appoint a sub-contractor to operate this part of the business.

British Airways is also trying to renegotiate and weaken the collective bargaining agreement with Unite.

Balloting to begin

Members will begin to be balloted on Thursday 19 November and the ballot will close on Monday 7 December. If members vote for industrial action, strikes could begin shortly before Christmas.

Ironically, while the Covid-19 pandemic has resulted in the number of airline passengers being dramatically reduced, cargo services have remained very healthy and are a vital revenue stream for the company at the present time.

The workforce have continued to operate throughout the current lockdown and played a crucial role during the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic, helping to bring vitally needed PPE into the country.

Workers mistreated

Unite assistant general secretary Howard Beckett said: "British Airways are once again treating its workers with contempt.

"Cargo workers have worked throughout the pandemic and have continuing to provide a highly profitable revenue stream for British Airways and all the thanks they have received is a huge pay cut.

"Workers are faced with the double whammy of operating in incredibly challenging conditions due to Covid-19 while worrying about how they will provide for their families, especially with Christmas fast approaching.

"Unite remains committed to resolving this dispute via negotiations and will engage in talks at ACAS. However BA needs to drop the threats of outsourcing and imposition of new contracts under the threat of 'fire and rehire' and be prepared to reach agreement on a fair deal for our members if they are to avoid industrial action."

Excluded from Chancellor's support schemes

Unite for our Society 9 November 2020

Anger mounts among self-employed, PAYE Freelancers and many other worker groups as they are once again excluded from Chancellor's support schemes.

On Fri 26th May, the Chancellor announced the extension of the JRS and SEISS income support schemes. Incredibly, he continued to ignore the repeated calls from dozens of MP's (many from his own party), trade unions, industry groups, grass roots campaigns and workers themselves to fill in the giant cracks in these schemes i.e. to help those who have been totally left out so far.

One such grass roots campaign is [ExcludedUK](#)

This rapidly growing non-profit organisation, exists to provide a collective platform for those excluded, and has calculated that **up to 3 million people** have been left out of these schemes.

Some of the many examples of cases of excluded workers include:

1. **New starter furlough** - people who were due to start new jobs but can't get furloughed by either their new or former employer due to a quirk in timing
2. **PAYE freelancers** - freelancers who are forced to pay tax via PAYE as they move from project to project but are more like self-employed. None of their employers will furlough them
3. **Newly self-employed** - people who only recently made the switch to self-employment

4. **Under 50% threshold-** people who have a mixture of self-employment and PAYE earnings i.e. portfolio workers. Where their self-employment portion is less than 50% of their total income, they are completely excluded from any support

And many, many other types of cases. Some of these use cases are linked to IR 35 / off-payroll taxation which is something Unite have been very vocal about over the years. The same people who have been negatively affected by IR 35 are among those being further punished now by being excluded from the Govt financial support schemes.

Many of these people are now getting desperate:

- they have had no financial support for 12 weeks and no sign that the Govt will do anything
- many of them work in the tourism, hospitality and events sectors where business is not expected to pick up quickly
-

The **Association of Professional Tourist Guides (APTG)**, a London-based branch of Unite, reports that many of its members do not now expect much work at all during this calendar year. Danny Parlour, current Chair of APTG, comments "when we conducted a survey of our members, as many as 32% of respondents reported that they didn't qualify for SEISS. These are people on modest incomes and to have so many excluded is frustrating and very disappointing. Much time has passed since SEISS was originally launched and it is clear nowhere near 95% of self-employed workers, the number first mentioned by the Chancellor, are eligible. I hope our Government reviews and expands the eligibility requirements in order to provide parity for those struggling with no help."

One of the founders of Excluded UK, Sonali Joshi, was recently involved in a roundtable discussion with Keir Starmer, Anneliese Dodds and Ed Miliband to discuss how small businesses could survive this crisis and help drive the needed economic recovery afterwards.

As Sonali puts it *"We're not asking for any special treatment, we just seek parity. Many workers and businesses have received Government support but far too many have not. We will keep fighting for those who have been Excluded"*.

Excluded are calling on the Government to end disparities in government Covid-19 support packages that are currently excluding millions across the UK, putting livelihoods and businesses at risk. We would like to ask any Unite members who have been excluded from the support schemes and are looking for additional help to:

1. **Join the community and share their stories** <https://www.facebook.com/excludeduk/>
2. **Sign the open letter to the Chancellor** <https://www.excludeduk.org/open-letter>

Written by Nigel Rundstrom, Blue Badge Tourist Guide, Member of APTG, Member of Unite, Member of ExcludedUK

Sue Ryder calls for statutory paid bereavement leave

Sue Ryder

9th November 2020

Sue Ryder is calling on the government to introduce two weeks statutory paid bereavement leave for all UK employees for the loss of close relative or partner after research shows workplace grief costs the UK economy £23 billion per year*

- 7.9 million people in employment (24% of all employees**) experienced a bereavement in the last 12 months
- Grief experienced by employees who have lost a loved one costs the UK economy £23bn a year and costs HM Treasury nearly £8bn a year ; through reduced tax revenues and increased use of NHS and social care resources; according to economic research commissioned by Sue Ryder*.
- Most of the negative economic impact arises from grieving employees being unable to work at their normal levels of productivity while they deal with the mental, physical, and financial impacts of a bereavement.
- Sue Ryder is urging people to [support its campaign on bereavement leave](#), and contact their local MP to ensure the government includes statutory paid bereavement leave in the upcoming Employment Bill.

Currently, in the UK there is no legal requirement for employers to grant bereavement leave, except for parents who have lost a child under 18 years old.

Sue Ryder research* suggests that investing in adequate bereavement leave and support may result in initial short-term costs. However, this could lead to a significant saving for the UK economy and the treasury in the long-term, through reduced staff absence, higher employee productivity and a lesser reliance on the health and benefits system post-bereavement. As a result, the charity is now calling on the government to introduce a statutory two weeks bereavement leave for the loss of a close relative or partner.

The grief that follows a bereavement may include difficult and unexpected emotions, from shock or anger to disbelief, guilt, and profound sadness. Intense grief can lead to loss of sleep and appetite, an inability to think clearly and in the most extreme cases, can lead to mental health conditions such as depression, eating disorders, anxiety and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Research shows*** that low income workers are at higher risk of experiencing persistent grief, not only because of the relatively higher impact of financial losses post-bereavement, but because they face more barriers in accessing appropriate services and information to help them cope with grief. Sue Ryder's research and anecdotal evidence highlighted that the security of knowing that they are being given paid

leave, without concerns of how they are being perceived or possibly penalised by employers, can give people the time and space to come to terms with their loss.

Sue Ryder believes that introducing statutory paid bereavement leave to all UK employees, would alleviate at least some of the pressure that people feel in the immediate aftermath of a bereavement and this would particularly benefit people in low income jobs.

Heidi Travis, Chief Executive at Sue Ryder, said:

"For many people, grief can be debilitating and additional stressors such as work, can feel overwhelming.

"Currently many employers offer three to five days compassionate leave, but lower income workers in less secure jobs often don't have access to any leave.

"Sue Ryder is calling on the government to introduce two weeks statutory paid bereavement leave when a person is grieving the loss of any close relative or partner. This will allow people a crucial period of time to start processing their grief.

"Not only would this improve how, as a society, we approach an issue that will affect almost all of us, but it would also address the financial impacts of unresolved grief, and its cost to the economy."

An anonymous user of Sue Ryder's bereavement services, said:

"I felt pushed to go back to work before I was ready and I want it to be better for other people. One size doesn't fit all in the case of grief and a lot of people are suffering unnecessarily."

Debbie Abrahams, MP for Oldham East and Saddleworth and member of the Work and Pensions Select Committee, added:

"The coronavirus pandemic has cast a spotlight on the urgent need to better support people who are dealing with grief. Introducing a statutory right to two weeks paid bereavement leave would be a significant step forward. This would mean that people who are in the immediate aftermath of a loved one's death do not need to worry about work and are not put under any pressure to return to work.

"I've heard too many stories from people who've felt obliged to return to work straight after the death of someone close to them, when they simply weren't ready. Introducing this simple measure would be a concrete way that both the government and employers can better support people who are grieving."

Sue Ryder provides a range of [online bereavement support](#), including free video counselling delivered through trained bereavement counsellors; an online community forum offering 24-hour peer to peer support and a wide range of advice and resources for people who are grieving or supporting someone through bereavement.

References

* - Sue Ryder commissioned an economist in September 2020 to conduct a literature review of current research.

** - Additional research was commissioned with a survey conducted by Censuswide in September 2020 surveying 1,000 working age adults, 1,000 Scottish working age adults and 500 bereaved people of working age in the last 12 months.

*** - Newsom, C., Stroebe, M. S., Schut, H., Wilson, S., Birrell, J., Moerbeek, M., & Eisma, M. C. (2019). Community-based counselling reaches and helps bereaved people living in low-income households. *Psychotherapy research*, 29(4), 479-491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2017.1377359>

First wave furloughing pushed two million employees below the minimum wage

Resolution Foundation

3 November 2020

Around two million employees were paid less the National Living Wage last April as low-paid workers found themselves at the heart of the crisis and were less likely to have their furloughed wages topped up by their employer, the Resolution Foundation said today (Tuesday) in response to the latest ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings.

The ONS survey – the most authoritative data on employees' pay and hours – vividly illustrates the scale of the initial lockdown on the labour market, as well as the impact of the Job Retention Scheme in supporting firms and workers through the first lockdown.

While real median hourly pay across the economy fell by 0.9 per cent in the year to April, and the average number of hours paid fell by 1.5 per cent, there were sharp differences across the workforce, reflecting the sectoral nature of the crisis.

In accommodation and food services, for example, 39 per cent of workers were furloughed on reduced pay in April, compared to 11 per cent of all employees.

As a result, low-paid workers were far more likely to be furloughed than the rest of the workforce, and far less likely to have their pay topped up by their employers.

The ONS survey shows that around half of the lowest paid workers (paid £8.72 an hour or less) were furloughed on reduced pay – compared to fewer than one in twenty higher paid workers (paid £15.87 an hour or more).

The combination of low-paid workers being paid at the heart of the crisis, and being less likely to receive top-up pay from their employer when furloughed, pushed two million workers below the legal National Living Wage in April.

Nye Cominetti, Senior Economist at the Resolution Foundation, said:

“Young people and low-paid workers in customer-facing roles, such as hospitality and leisure, were hit hard during the first lockdown, and are likely to be hit hardest again during the coming lockdown too.

“Given the scale of the economic shock facing Britain, today's data also confirms how much of a living standards lifeline the Job Retention Scheme is for millions of often low-paid staff.

“But furloughing can’t completely shield workers from the effects of the crisis. With many employers unable to top up staff wages, around two million workers were paid less than the legal minimum wage last April.

“That’s still a lot more that they would have received had they lost their jobs altogether, but it’s sobering reminder of just how important our wider social security safety net is – and why it should be strengthened, not cut back next April, as the Covid-crisis continues into 2021.”

Fundamental rights at work can help build back better from COVID-19

ILO

28 October 2020

Core work-related rights and principles can play a vital role in recovery from the COVID-19 crisis and help build back a better, more equitable, world of work, according to a new ILO paper.

However, the paper also warns that the crisis has placed these same freedoms and rights at work at greater risk, as countries face increases in poverty, inequality and vulnerability.

The [*Issue paper on COVID-19 and fundamental principles and rights at work*](#) provides a comprehensive overview of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on child labour, forced labour, discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining. It details how a downward spiral into informality, poverty and exploitation can be reversed to build back better and to leave no one. It cautions that the urgent need for an integrated response to the pandemic has not yet been met.

The document, published by the FUNDAMENTALS branch of the ILO, addresses all four fundamental principles and rights at work – forced labour, child labour, discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining – and highlights the importance of mainstreaming them into COVID-19 responses, to ensure such responses are inclusive.

The paper finds that limits on freedom of movement and public gatherings, brought in as part of some national pandemic responses, is making “the realization of rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining more difficult, both in law and practice, which in turn hampers the development of responses to the crisis rooted in social consensus”. In particular, the paper says, this affects the two billion people working in the informal economy who often lack a collective and representative voice.

Recent initiatives to identify and address [child labour and forced labour in global supply chains](#) are also now in jeopardy, “as businesses at all levels struggle to cope with the crisis and the severe demand shocks associated with it”.

Economic and other shocks, like those associated with the pandemic, are known to exacerbate child labour, as families try new strategies to survive. They also often lead to debt bondage and an increased reliance on [informal recruitment agencies and platforms, which leave workers are more exposed to exploitation](#).

Access to quality education is also crucial for preventing child labour. 1.5 billion children have been affected by school closures this year. A third of these children have no access to remote learning, many relied on free school meals and cash transfers conditional on school attendance.

The paper also highlights concern that, in some countries, support for forced labour victims and survivors is being rechannelled towards the pandemic response.

The COVID-19 crisis has also exposed discrimination against different groups of workers and the entrenched gender inequalities in labour markets and in unpaid care work.

The Issues paper proposes a four-pillar policy framework for the response to COVID-19, based on international labour standards. These cover stimulating the economy and employment; supporting enterprises, jobs and incomes; protecting workers in the workplace; and relying on social dialogue for solutions.

“Protecting people’s lives must be our priority,” said Francesco d’Ovidio, Officer in Charge, FUNDAMENTALS branch. “Protecting livelihoods helps us do this. The particular strength of these fundamental principles is their inter-related and mutually-reinforcing nature. Basing our policies around them paves the way for a recovery that is socially and economically inclusive, and ensures that the needs of the most vulnerable are taken into account.”

4. Parliamentary proceedings

(Oct – Nov 2020)

[Paid Bereavement Leave](#)

Early Day Motion)1128: tabled on 12 November 2020

Jonathan Edwards MP

That this House recognises that losing a loved one can be one of the most difficult and painful challenges that many of us face; further recognises that common symptoms of grief include feeling shocked and numb, overwhelming sadness, tiredness or exhaustion, anger and guilt; notes that an employee has the right to time off if a dependent dies but that under current legislation, statutory bereavement pay is only available to eligible parents if their children die before they turn 18, or if a baby is stillborn after 24 weeks of pregnancy; further notes that research commissioned by the charity Sue Ryder calculates that grief experienced by employees who have lost a loved one costs the UK economy £23 billion a year through reduced productivity, and the Treasury nearly £8 billion as a result of reduced tax revenues and increased use of NHS and social care resources; and calls on the UK Government to urgently consult with stakeholders on the best way to introduce paid bereavement leave, with a view to introducing a statutory right to two weeks.

[Industrial Health and Safety: Coronavirus](#)

Asked by: Seema Malhotra | Party: Labour Party · Cooperative Party

12 Nov 2020 | Written questions

To ask the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, how many (a) improvement notices and (b) prohibition notices have been issued and (c) prosecutions have been instigated by the Health and Safety Executive in relation to employers not adequately managing the risks of covid-19 transmission in each month since March 2020.

Answering member: Mims Davies | Department for Work and Pensions

The numbers of COVID-19 related Health and Safety Executive (HSE) intervention cases where the outcome is recorded as being an enforcement notice are shown in the table below. A breakdown of notices by type (prohibition / improvement notices) is not available.

Month (2020) Number of intervention cases resulting in notices

March	0
April	1
May	9
June	15
July	32
August	26
September	30
October	23
Total	136

To date, there have been no COVID-19 transmission related prosecutions instigated by HSE.

Note - the above quoted numbers were taken from HSE's live operational database on 5th November 2020 and are subject to change e.g. as there can be a delay before actions are updated on the database.

Remote Working: Coronavirus

Asked by: Lord McKenzie of Luton | Party: Labour Party

Date answered: 12 Nov 2020

To ask Her Majesty's Government what safety advice and guidance they have made available for individuals who (1) choose, and (2) are required, to work from home.

Answering member: Baroness Stedman-Scott | Department for Work and Pensions

Under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974, all employers are under a duty to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare at work of all their employees. This duty extends to those working from home, either temporarily or permanently.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) has published guidance on its website for employers and home workers (<https://www.hse.gov.uk/toolbox/workers/home.htm>). The guidance covers all workers who work from home and includes information on working alone, working without supervision, ways to keep in touch and guidance on mental health, stress and wellbeing. It also covers practical guidance on setting up workstations, display screen equipment (DSE) and how to prevent musculoskeletal disorders.

The DSE guidance is intended to provide a flexible, proportionate and pragmatic approach for employers and employees on managing low-risk activities during a time when the Government advice is for people to work from home where it is possible to do so.

The HSE guidance emphasises the need for employers to keep health and safety arrangements for home working under review.

Industrial Health and Safety: Coronavirus

Asked by: Lord Mendelsohn | Party: Labour Party

10 Nov 2020 | Written questions |

To ask Her Majesty's Government how many reported breaches of the COVID-secure workplace guidance have been received by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE); what proportion of those were investigated by the HSE; and what proportion of such investigations triggered formal advice to the relevant employer.

Answering member: Baroness Stedman-Scott | Department for Work and Pensions

To date, 14817 COVID-related workplace concerns have been reported to HSE. 4895 (approximately 33%) have been assigned to inspectors for investigation. The remainder have been dealt with by HSE's Concerns and Advice Team.

Of the 4895 concerns assigned to inspectors, 4284 have had a recorded outcome to date.

Of these, 22 (approx. 0.5 %) required formal enforcement notices, 220 (approx. 5.1%) written correspondence indicating there was a breach of the law and confirming the action required to make the workplace safe and 1118 (approx. 26.1%) verbal advice to secure compliance with health and safety at work law. The remainder required no action.

Note: The figures were extracted from HSE's live operational database and provide the picture on the date of extraction (27th October 2020). Any new cases yet to be added to the system will not be included.

Employment: Coronavirus

**Asked by: Mick Whitley | Party: Labour Party
10 Nov 2020 | Written questions**

To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to his oral statement of 5 November 2020, on Economy Update, what steps he is taking to ensure that people not eligible to access the (a) Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and (b) Self-Employment Income Support Scheme will have access to financial support in the period leading up to March 2021.

Answering member: Jesse Norman | Department: Treasury

Throughout the pandemic, the Government's priority has been to protect lives and livelihoods. Since the start of the pandemic the Government has provided support for people, businesses and public services totalling an estimated £200 billion.

Beyond the extension of the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and Self-Employment Income Support Scheme, to support individuals further the Government has implemented a £20 per week increase to the Universal Credit standard allowance and Working Tax Credit basic element until the end of March 2021. This means that for a single Universal Credit claimant (25 or over), the standard allowance will increase from £317.82 to £409.89 per month.

The £20 per week uplift is one part of a package of temporary welfare measures, which also includes the suspension of the Universal Credit Minimum Income Floor in order to support self-employed people on low incomes, and increases to the Local Housing Allowance rates for Housing Benefit and Universal Credit, which mean over 1 million households who rent privately will gain an average of £600 per year.

The Government has also given local authorities an additional £500 million to support the most vulnerable people in society, who may struggle to meet their council tax payments this year. The Government has requested that local authorities use the Hardship Fund grant to provide all recipients of working age local council tax support (LCTS) during the financial year 2020-21 with a further reduction in their annual council tax bill of £150. This funding is in addition to the £3.4bn which Local Authorities already spend on LCTS schemes each year, benefiting about 3.8 million people.

The Government is committed to supporting individuals financially through this difficult time and has put in place a comprehensive package of support for those told to self-isolate, extending Statutory Sick Pay (SSP) so that employees can claim it if they are asked to self-isolate, and changing the rules so that SSP is payable from day one rather than day four. In addition, people who are instructed to self-isolate by NHS Test and Trace and are on low incomes, unable to work from home and will lose income as a result, may be entitled to a payment of £500 from their local authority.

The Government continues to keep policies under review, and it will continue to provide a comprehensive economic support package as public health measures change.

Dismiss and Re-engage Tactics

Oral Parliamentary Questions

House of Commons, 10 November 2020

Anna McMorrin (Cardiff North) (Lab)

What steps his Department is taking to reduce the use of dismiss and re-engage tactics by employers. [908535]

Kim Johnson (Liverpool, Riverside) (Lab)

What steps his Department is taking to reduce the use of dismiss and re-engage tactics by employers. [908545]

Mr Virendra Sharma (Ealing, Southall) (Lab)

What steps his Department is taking to reduce the use of dismiss and re-engage tactics by employers. [908550]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Paul Scully)

Employers must have the flexibility to offer different terms and conditions. However, using threats about firing and rehiring as a negotiating tactic is unacceptable. The Government are working with ACAS to convene a roundtable of business organisations and employee representatives to discuss these issues.

Anna McMorrin

Earlier this year, I joined workers and trade unions across Cardiff North to stand up to businesses behaving badly. People are struggling to grapple with the uncertainties of life under covid, yet some businesses are still using fire and rehire tactics to undermine pay and working conditions to line their own pockets. Will the Government stop the dithering and delay, outlaw these bad practices and protect workers' rights?

Paul Scully

I understand the enormous impact of losing a job, or even of a job being threatened. We expect all employers to treat employees fairly and respectfully, but businesses in real financial difficulty do need the flexibility to offer new terms and conditions to save as many jobs as they can.

Kim Johnson

Increasingly, rogue bosses such as British Airways, Centrica and ESS are using the covid crisis to cut pay and terms and conditions and are exploiting the legal loophole to fire and rehire loyal staff. With many workers now facing an impossible choice between losing pay or losing their job, will the Minister explain how these scandalous tactics can possibly be legal in the first place, and will he legislate to outlaw them—yes or no?

Paul Scully

It is a commercial matter, but businesses do need flexibility with regard to terms and conditions—both for them and their employees—to protect jobs. We expect all employers to treat employees fairly and in the spirit of partnership. The very threat of fire and rehire is totally unacceptable, and we hope that all the businesses cited will reach a negotiated outcome with their employees.

Mr Virendra Sharma [V]

I hope that the Minister will give a more open and clear response to my question. Heathrow airport is pushing staff to strike—a measure that garnered support in a ballot ending last week. Its behaviour now amounts to bullying. Staff are being summoned to meetings before the consultation is finished and without support. Will the Secretary of State say that this is wrong, condemn this behaviour and agree that this business has relied on the support of the community, who are owed something back in these troubled times?

Paul Scully

I know how important Heathrow and the airlines sector is to the hon. Gentleman's constituents, which is why we put so much support into that sector. I come back to the fact that we expect all employers to treat employees fairly and respectfully, no matter what job, what position and what community they live in.

Drew Hendry (Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey) (SNP)

The hon. Gentleman is a Minister in government. He has repeatedly called this unacceptable. A number of his colleagues have called out companies such as British Airways that have shamefully used fire and rehire tactics. The Chief Secretary to the Treasury called it

“a practice that all of us in the House would condemn.”—[Official Report, 13 October 2020; Vol. 682, c. 168.]

The Prime Minister said that he was looking at what we can do. People are fed up with this Government's warm words and no intention of action, so let us hear it today: does the Minister support the aims of the Bill introduced by my hon. Friend the Member for Paisley and Renfrewshire North (Gavin Newlands), and will he support it?

Paul Scully

We will address and respond to the Bill when it comes before us. We have to reach the balance between protecting jobs and allowing employers who are in difficulty to have the necessary flexibility. We are one of the most flexible employment countries in the developed world,

and we want to remain so, but we do want to make sure that businesses have their responsibilities and use those responsibilities wisely.

Dr Alan Whitehead (Southampton, Test) (Lab)

Surely the Minister must understand that fire and rehire tactics are not part of a negotiating tactic: they are a gun to the head of every worker in the organisation. It has nothing to do with negotiation: it says, "You will accept lower terms—otherwise we will chuck you out." British Gas has recently become one of a number of large companies threatening their workforces in this way with this medieval tactic. I think the Minister must agree that it is not only a terrible way to reward the thousands of energy workers who have worked day and night to keep our energy supply constant and reliable during the covid crisis, but must be seen as a completely unacceptable way to conduct industrial negotiations. Will he join me in condemning the use of this practice and, specifically, write to British Gas demanding that it withdraw its threats to its employees?

Paul Scully

In my first answer on this subject, I talked about the fact that we believe that making threats about firing and rehiring as a negotiating tactic is totally unacceptable. I hope that the situation with Centrica will be satisfactorily resolved both for employers and employees. However, it is important to retain the flexible labour markets where we remain 11th out of 140 countries with regard to the ease of hiring and, indeed, firing workers to make sure that we can protect important sectors across this country.

Beth Winter (Cynon Valley) (Lab) [V]

British Gas has put a halt on its fire and rehire plans, but only until the beginning of next year, and workers, many of whom are my constituents, are not optimistic. Centrica plc, British Gas's parent company, reported profits of £900 million this year. Does the Minister agree that it is morally indefensible for workers to be expected to accept a reduction in their pay and conditions when shareholders still enjoy dividends, and if so, what steps will he take to ensure that workers are protected from these underhand tactics?

Paul Scully

I talked about using threats in terms of negotiation. Employers need to treat employees fairly and in a spirit of partnership. I therefore hope that Centrica will reach a negotiated outcome with employees.

[Low Pay: Coronavirus](#)

Asked by: Richard Bugon | Party: Labour Party

Date answered: 09 Nov 2020

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what estimate his Department has made of the number of workers who are expected to be paid less than the National Minimum Wage during the period of the national restrictions that are being introduced from 5 November in (a) Leeds East constituency, (b) Leeds (c) Yorkshire and the Humber and (d) nationwide.

Answering member: Paul Scully | Department: Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

The Government is clear that employers must comply with National Minimum Wage legislation and pay their workers at least the minimum wage for hours worked.

The Government is committed to ensuring workers receive the pay that they are owed, more than doubling the budget for National Minimum Wage enforcement. Indeed, last year was another strong year for minimum wage enforcement, with £20.8 million in pay arrears identified for over 263,000 workers.

The Government will continue to support workers across the United Kingdom during this pandemic. Through our Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme, we have supported 9.6 million jobs with claims worth £41.4 million. On August 31st, 4,000 jobs in Leeds East, 35,700 jobs in Leeds and 220,000 jobs in Yorkshire and the Humber were supported through the Job Retention Scheme. My Rt. Hon. Friend Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer has announced that we will extend the scheme through to 31st March 2021, to continue to protect jobs and provide certainty.

Remote Working: Coronavirus

**Asked by: Tulip Siddiq | Party: Labour Party
09 Nov 2020 | Written questions**

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what steps his Department is taking to ensure that clinically vulnerable people cannot be required to attend work by their employers if their work can be done remotely, during the covid-19 outbreak.

Answering member: Paul Scully | Department: Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Government guidance on shielding and protecting those who are clinically extremely vulnerable from COVID-19 has been updated to clearly state that this group of people are strongly advised to work from home. If they are unable to do so they should not attend work for this period of restriction. The full guidance is available on GOV.UK.

The Government's safer working guidance makes clear what employers need to do to support clinically vulnerable and clinically extremely vulnerable workers. In all instances, employers must carry out a workplace risk assessment and take action in line with this guidance, which can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/working-safely-during-coronavirus-covid-19/the-visitor-economy>.

Employers who dismiss an employee because they are, or have been, self-isolating, may be liable for unfair or automatically unfair dismissal. This will depend on all the circumstances of the case. Individuals, including those of higher clinical vulnerability, or those who live with someone in that category, may have valid reasons to believe that attending work would create a serious and imminent danger to their health, or to the health of the person they live with. In such cases, it

could be automatically unfair to dismiss that individual for staying at home.

Business: Coronavirus

Asked by: Barbara Keeley | Party: Labour Party

09 Nov 2020 | Written questions | Answered | House of Commons | 110766

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what steps he is taking to monitor compliance with covid-19 guidance among office-based businesses.

Answering member: Paul Scully | Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Across all industries, 97% of UK businesses say they are aware of the government safer workplace guidance. Source: '[Business Impact of Covid-19 Survey](#)', ONS, October 2020.

Across all industries, only 2% of UK businesses said that they have not implemented any safety measures in the workplace. Source: '[Business Impact of Covid-19 Survey](#)', ONS, October 2020.

A survey of the public found that almost two thirds of employees (63%) in Great Britain had been consulted on safer working practices by their employer, whilst a similar proportion (62%) said that their employer is displaying a covid-secure poster in their workplace. Source: '[Coronavirus and the social impacts on Great Britain](#)', ONS, October 2020.

Employment (Dismissal and Re-employment)

HC Debate, 4 November 2020

Motion for leave to bring in a Bill (Standing Order No. 23)

Gavin Newlands (Paisley and Renfrewshire North) (SNP)

I beg to move,

That leave be given to bring in a Bill to prohibit employers dismissing employees and subsequently re-employing them for the purpose of diminishing the terms and conditions of employment; and for connected purposes.

Since I introduced the Employment (Dismissal and Re-employment) Bill in its first incarnation in June, I have been taken aback by the level of support for the measure. The messages I have received from people across the country asking how they can help and support the progress of my Bill have been touching and gratifying. I thank the great many colleagues from all parts of the House who have been supportive since the outset. That is perhaps evidenced by the fact that every political party that has elected Members in this place is represented in the list of sponsors of the Bill. I should add that without the help of Public Bill Office staff, I would have no Bill to speak to today, and I offer them my thanks for their help with getting it this far.

Tens of thousands of workers have been forced to the edge of a cliff by employers who have suddenly discovered the value of ignoring loyalty. Some 30,000 British Airways employees were told to suck up huge wage cuts and slashed conditions or join the dole queue. For some, this meant a cut in take-home pay of 60%-plus. They were told that they were the lucky ones. More than 10,000 of their colleagues have joined that queue.

Like many of my colleagues on the Transport Committee, I have received hundreds of emails from BA employees who have been subjected to such tactics. Those emails tell individual stories of fear, worry, anxiety, disappointment, anger and resignation, but they also paint a picture of a corporation intent on badness from the start. Workers who had decades of service with BA received emails just before midnight advising them to sign on the dotted line or face the sack. Employees who had recently returned from leave for ill health were told that their annual leave would be slashed, or they would face the sack. People were told that their wages would be slashed and they had no option but to accept, or face the sack. This is not how a modern, civilised country manages its labour market. These are the tactics and behaviour of characters from a Dickens novel, and the behaviour of these companies is like yet another remnant of the 19th century.

No one argues that the economic crisis that the world faces means that businesses do not have tough decisions to make; of course they do. The impact of covid-19 on commerce and industry will not disappear as soon as we have tackled the virus and normality begins to return. The after-effects will be long-lasting and damaging, but that does not give employers the right to behave like absentee lairds, returning to their assets only to inflict yet more damage on people they appear to hold in contempt.

We should expect—and, given their various answers and statements on the matter, the Government fervently hoped—that these companies might self-police their behaviour. Most other employers are able to treat their staff fairly, with decency and respect, but it is clear that we cannot rely on rogue bosses to show that same decency and fairness voluntarily. That is where the state, this Parliament and the UK Government must step in to guarantee fairness for every worker in the UK, as Governments around Europe have done in the past.

It is one of the sad ironies of the British Airways situation that in the other two countries where its parent company, International Airlines Group, operates—Ireland and Spain—fire and rehire tactics are banned. IAG could not tell its Aer Lingus subsidiary to copy and paste from the playbook of Willie Walsh and Alex Cruz, because the Irish Dáil took a decision to extend protections to workers in Ireland. Ireland's economy is better placed, better structured and better regulated than that of the UK. It is time for the UK Government to learn lessons from our nearest neighbour and follow its lead.

The Government can, in the words of the Prime Minister himself, put their "arms around" millions of workers across these isles with one very

simple action: put aside Government time for my Bill. Get it into Committee, where we can debate how best to offer workers more protection from rogue bosses, and encourage those who are yet to be convinced to back this measure. My Bill would simply amend the Employment Rights Act 1996 and equip workers with the tools to protect their living standards virtually overnight. It would put our labour market on a level playing field with those of our European friends and allies, and, crucially, it would put our workers on a level playing field with workers in the rest of Europe. It would put our businesses on notice that the Victorian era is fit for the history books, not a guide to human resources.

As I said to the Minister when we met to discuss the merits and content of my Bill, I am not precious about it being my Bill—this Bill—that makes the changes required. If the UK Government and the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy come up with their own plan that achieves the same ends, I will wholeheartedly welcome it. I know that hon. Members on this side of the House would do the same, and that a great many of the Minister's concerned colleagues, who have spoken to him about the issue, would also appreciate action.

Workers do not care whose name is on the Bill. They care that their interests are being protected and that their jobs are not being used as pawns in a war in which the only winners are the likes of Willie Walsh and well-upholstered shareholders. The Minister said that although he and the Government could not support the Bill at this time, he remained open to looking at the issue and further protections. I hope to continue the dialogue.

My Bill would make a simple amendment to the Employment Rights Act 1996 to add the re-employment of a worker on less favourable terms and conditions to the definition of unfair dismissal. That would allow employees to use the existing employment tribunal system to enforce their rights if required, and would mean that employers could no longer act with impunity. Amending the Act in that way would allow employees targeted for fire and rehire to take cases against unscrupulous employers and, where appropriate, secure reinstatement and compensation. In short, the Bill creates no extra bureaucracy, no extra administration and no extra complexity, but creates a necessary protection for workers that employers will be forced to respect or face judicial proceedings.

I am grateful for the opportunity to lay out the case for action in that area. I look forward to the Labour Party re-tabling an Opposition day motion on it to allow us to have a real discussion and debate on the finer points. I also look forward to one or two Conservative Members potentially attempting to justify the actions of rogue employers such as Willie Walsh and Alex Cruz. Their actions were and are utterly shameful and immoral and should be illegal. After wrecking thousands of lives, they have both skipped off into the sunset. Mr Walsh took an £800,000 bonus pay-off having thrown more than 10,000 loyal staff on the dole in the middle of the biggest economic crisis since the war and effectively rehired 30,000 more on reduced terms and conditions.

BA would say that fire and rehire has been taken off the table. Indeed, the outgoing chief exec told the Transport Committee a few weeks ago that that was the case, but there are two problems with that. First, a lot of the damage to thousands of lives has already been done. BA threatened the workforce with taking an effective pay-cut of 40%, 50% or 60% or taking redundancy, then followed through with the process of accepting voluntary requests, selecting who was successful in getting their old but less well-paid jobs back and making thousands more compulsorily redundant. Only then did it take fire and rehire off the table. That is callous and fools absolutely no one.

Secondly, it seems that employees under the BA/IAG umbrella still face being fired and rehired at the turn of the year. When Alex Cruz confirmed to the Committee that it had been taken off the table, he was being at best disingenuous and at worst misleading. I should say that there is a new management team in place at BA. I wish them well in fixing the mess and trying to repair the broken relationship with the workforce. They need a lot of luck.

It is not just British Airways. We said that its practice would be swiftly followed by others if the Government refused to follow the Prime Minister's warm words with action, and so it has proven. Fellow blue-chip company, Centrica British Gas, has made the same fire and rehire threats to more than 20,000 of its employees, although it has not served notice on anyone at this point. Ground handler Menzies Aviation has also followed a similar path, despite assuring me personally that it would absolutely not be taking that approach. Many other companies across the UK, including Heathrow, have followed in British Airways' dark and ever-growing shadow.

Trade unions across the board, including Unite, GMB, Unison and Prospect; thousands of betrayed BA and Centrica workers; thousands more who feel that they will be next; and crucially, I believe, a natural majority in this House are all demanding action from the Government. They should act sooner rather than later, back our constituents and give them the support and protection they deserve, not just in the short term during the pandemic and its economic impact, but in the long term as we collectively build the economic recovery that we all need and hope for. But that recovery will be a hollow one if the Government leave workers in the same position they were in previously, at the mercy of corporations that treat the lack of regulation over their actions as a green light to mistreat and bully their employees.

We must act to give workers security and dignity at work and my Bill would go some way—only some way, but an important way—to providing that security and dignity. I ask the Government and Government Members to go that way too and get behind my Bill.

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered,

That Gavin Newlands, Huw Merriman, Neil Gray, Chris Stephens, Lilian Greenwood, Sarah Olney, Sammy Wilson, Caroline Lucas, Stephen Farry, Claire Hanna, Liz Saville Roberts and David Linden present the Bill.

Gavin Newlands accordingly presented the Bill.

Bill read the First time; to be read a Second time on Friday 29 January 2021, and to be printed (Bill 206).

Employment: Coronavirus

Asked by: Seema Malhotra, Seema | Party: Labour Party · Cooperative Party

Date answered: 02 Nov 2020

To ask the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, what plans the Health and Safety Executive has to maintain oversight of how employers are (a) meeting their responsibilities in the context of the covid-19 outbreak and (b) equipped to respond effectively to (i) their employees, or members of their supply chain, testing positive for covid-19 or (ii) being close contacts of such a person.

Answering member: Mims Davies | Department for Work and Pensions

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) continues to use a blended approach combining communications with policy, sector and operational interventions to ensure appropriate measures are in place to protect workers and the public from the risks of Covid-19 in the workplace. This includes continuing spot check work, including on site interventions with employers as well as investigating reported concerns and the most serious reported cases of Covid-19 under the Reporting of Injuries Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013. Advice on Covid-19 related risks is provided by HSE's Concerns and Advice Team and up to date guidance and information is available on or via HSE's website. HSE continues to work closely across government, with the devolved administrations, industry sectors and a range of other stakeholders to enable employers to put practical measures in place to control Covid-19 workplace risks. Where necessary, HSE takes appropriate enforcement action to ensure compliance with health and safety law.

HSE does not have a role in establishing or enforcing the NHS Test and Trace service. However, when responding to queries or concerns, HSE signposts to relevant GOV.UK guidance on NHS Test and Trace service in the workplace which provides advice for employers on supporting employees when they are asked to self-isolate.

Employment: Females

Asked by: Hendrick, Sir Mark | Party: Labour Party · Cooperative Party

Date answered: 23 Oct 2020

To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, what steps he is taking to ensure the covid-19 outbreak does not increase (a) job security, (b) job opportunity and (c) pay inequalities among men and women.

Answering member: Kemi Badenoch | Department: Treasury

To help protect people's job security, the Government announced the unprecedented Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme to help firms keep millions of people in employment. Up to 30th June 4.5 million female employees have been supported through the Government's furlough scheme. With the announcement of the Winter Economy Plan, the Government is adapting its response to the changing context, as we said we would. The Job Support Scheme will provide more targeted support, aimed at viable businesses who are facing lower demand due to Covid-19 to help keep their employees in work.

Alongside this, the government has announced additional support for working parents. Any working parent usually eligible for Tax Free Childcare or 30 hours free childcare will temporarily remain eligible if they fall below the minimum income requirement due to COVID-19. This supports individuals with childcare commitments who are temporarily working less as result of Covid-19. An IFS report (<https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/bns/BN223.pdf>) found that gender differences in rates of part-time and fulltime paid work account for approximately half of the widening of the gender wage gap over the 20 years after the first child in a family is born, highlighting the importance of childcare for reducing pay inequalities between men and women.

Since 1 June, early years settings have already been able to welcome back children of all ages. The Government is continuing to work to understand how it can ensure that sufficient safe, appropriate and affordable childcare is available. Providers who run community activities, holiday clubs, breakfast and after-school clubs, tuition and other out-of-school provision for children can now operate with protective measures in place

In its Plan for Jobs, the Government has announced unprecedented support to help unemployed people in Great Britain find a job. We are providing £1.2bn to significantly expand and enhance work search support, including doubling the number of work coaches, additional investment into the Flexible Support Fund to provide direct support at a local level, and using externally contracted provision to expand support even further.

Recognising that young people are particularly at risk, the government has also launched a new £2bn Kickstart Scheme, creating hundreds of thousands of new, fully subsidised jobs for young people across Great Britain, as well as a guaranteed foundation of support to all 18-24 year olds on Universal Credit in the Intensive Worksearch group, through its new youth offer.

These measures will help provide job opportunities to women.

Employment: Coronavirus

Asked by: Mike Amesbury | Party: Labour Party

| Date answered: 22 Oct 2020

To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, what assessment his Department has made of the need to

legislate to protect workers in workplaces in regions placed in (a) Tier 2 and (b) Tier 3 where (i) an employee could reasonably work from home but is prevented from doing so because of their employer and (ii) working from home is not an option.

Answering member: Paul Scully | Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

As our Working Safely guidance states, which applies for all tiers: to help contain the virus, workers who can work effectively from home should do so over the winter. Where an employer, in consultation with their employee, judges an employee can carry out their normal duties from home they should do so.

Employers already have a legal obligation to protect the health and safety of not just their workers but also of the other people who may be affected by their business.

The decision to return to the workplace must be made in meaningful consultation with workers (including through trade unions or employee representative groups where they exist). It is vital employers engage with workers to ensure they feel safe returning to work, and they should not force anyone into an unsafe workplace.

5. Further reading

i) Parliamentary Research

[Coronavirus: returning to work](#), House of Commons Library, 13 November 2020

[Coronavirus: Self-Employment Income Support Scheme](#), House of Commons Library, 13 November 2020

[Coronavirus: Impact on the labour market](#), House of Commons Library, 12 November 2020

[COVID-19 and occupational risk](#), Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 19 October 2020

ii) Reports (Sep- Nov 2020)

[From precarious to prosperous: How we can build back a better labour market](#), Centre for Progressive Policy, 27 October 2020

[BME women and work](#), TUC equality briefing, TUC 26 October 2020

[How coronavirus has affected equality and human rights](#), EHRC, 20 October 2020

[COVID-19 and occupational risk](#), Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 19 October 2020

[Issue paper on COVID-19 and fundamental principles and rights at work](#), ILO, 7 October 2020

[Living, working and COVID-19](#), Eurofound, 28 Sep 2020

iii) Websites

Parliament

[House of Commons Library Research Publications on Coronavirus](#)

[Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology Research on Covid-19](#)

Other

ACAS - [Coronavirus \(COVID-19\): advice for employers and employees](#)

CIPD - [Responding to the coronavirus](#)

[Excluded UK](#)

HSE - [Coronavirus \(COVID-19\): working safely](#)

TUC - [Coronavirus - protecting workers](#)

UK Government - [Coronavirus – Worker support](#)

About the Library

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publicly available research briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email papers@parliament.uk. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email hcinfo@parliament.uk.

Disclaimer

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).