

Parental Bereavement (Leave and Pay) Bill HL Bill 105 of 2017–19

Summary

The [Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill](#) is a private member's bill that would amend the Employment Rights Act 1996 and the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992 to introduce statutory obligations on employers across Great Britain. This would require employers to offer minimum levels of leave and pay to employees in the event of the loss of a child.¹ It was introduced in the House of Commons by Kevin Hollinrake (Conservative MP for Thirsk and Malton).² Following its passage through the Commons, it was given its first reading in the House of Lords on 14 May 2018 and is scheduled to receive its second reading on 29 June 2018.³ The Bill's sponsor in the House of Lords is Lord Knight of Weymouth (Labour).

The Bill received its first reading in the House of Commons on 19 July 2017 when presented to Parliament via the ballot procedure.⁴ The Bill received cross-party support in the House of Commons. The Government also supported the Bill, having made a commitment in its 2017 general election manifesto to introduce “a new entitlement to child bereavement leave”.⁵ The Bill was amended at committee stage to extend the right to paid parental bereavement leave to parents of a child that is stillborn after 24 weeks of pregnancy. However, a number of issues were repeatedly raised during the Bill's passage through the House of Commons, including the definition of the terms “bereaved parent” and “child”, the requirement to take leave within 56 days of bereavement, and the blocks of time in which leave can be taken. A total of 30 amendments were selected for consideration during committee stage, and a further 25 at report stage. Six of these amendments, all dealing with the subject of stillbirths, were made without division. Two amendments were pressed to a vote (both during committee stage). Amendment 2 would have guaranteed a day of leave for the bereaved parent on the day of the child's funeral, while amendment 12 would have extended the scope of parental bereavement leave to include the bereaved parents of disabled children over the age of 18.

The Bill largely replicates the content of the [Parental Bereavement Leave \(Statutory Entitlement\) Bill](#), introduced by Will Quince (Conservative MP for Colchester) during the previous parliamentary session. Although it received cross-party support, Mr Quince's Bill was halted in its progression through Parliament by the 2017 general election.

Background

Parents of a child that is stillborn after 24 weeks or dies shortly after birth have statutory rights to maternity and paternity leave as set out in the [Maternity and Parental Leave etc. Regulations 1999](#) (part 1, section 2).

However, there is currently no legislation guaranteeing either pay during, or a minimum period of, leave for parents of children that die at a later point.

The Employment Rights Act 1996 gives employees the right to take time off in the event of emergencies involving dependants.⁶ However, this legislation does not specify the duration of leave to which employees are entitled and does not require employers to pay staff during that time. Moreover, the Act provides for leave “to take action which is necessary” (eg logistics surrounding the funeral or any inquest) but makes no mention of time off for emotional recuperation.

Compassionate leave has no footing in statute.⁷ Many employers do offer paid compassionate leave, and the Advisory, Conciliatory and Arbitration Service (ACAS), a non-departmental public body, published guidance in 2014 for employers which noted that “it is good practice to offer employees some paid leave after a bereavement”.⁸ However, whether paid or unpaid, leave on these grounds is granted at employers’ discretion.⁹

The Parental Bereavement (Leave and Pay) Bill seeks to establish the legal right of employees to take a minimum of two weeks’ leave after the loss of a child, with a right to pay if their employment has lasted 26 consecutive weeks or more. The Bill’s sponsor in the Commons, Kevin Hollinrake (Conservative MP for Thirsk and Malton), gave his own summary when introducing the Bill for second reading in the House of Commons:

The successful passage of the Bill will ensure that we are able to put in place a new provision and level of protection so that those who find themselves in this awful situation in future know that, at a minimum, they will be entitled to time off work to grieve, without their suffering any detriment.

[...] The Bill will provide two weeks’ leave for all employees who lose a child below the age of 18. This will be a day-one right. Those key points are established on the face of the Bill, which deliberately leaves some other details to regulations. This leave will be protected and a person should suffer no form of detriment in the event that they find themselves having to take the leave. Crucially, the Bill will give parents an important choice, allowing them to make a decision on what is best for their needs, when they might otherwise be reliant on the good will of their employer.

[...] The Bill also deals with paid leave. Leave will be paid, as a minimum, at the statutory rate—currently £140.98 a week or 90 percent of average weekly earnings where that is lower—for those who have fulfilled the qualifying period of 26 weeks’ service with the same employer the week before the date of their child’s passing away.¹⁰

In the 2016–17 session, Will Quince (Conservative MP for Colchester) introduced the [Parental Bereavement Leave \(Statutory Entitlement\) Bill](#) to secure the rights of bereaved parents. Speaking on 6 September 2016, Mr Quince gave the following explanation why legislation was needed:

To be clear, most employers are excellent; they act with compassion and kindness, offering their bereaved staff the time they need to come to terms with their loss. However, some do not, and they behave in a manner that falls well short of what we would expect of them. [...] given the countless examples of organisations acting without sensitivity and with utter inflexibility, surely it is time for the Government to act.¹¹

His Bill did not receive a second reading before the 2017 general election (although a second reading was scheduled) and fell at the end of the session. This followed a similar, unsuccessful, attempt by Tom Harris, then Labour MP for Glasgow South, who introduced the Parental Bereavement Leave (Statutory Entitlement) Bill in 2013–14.¹²

Structure of the Bill

The Bill is divided into two clauses and a schedule. Clause 1 dictates that the schedule to the Bill creates a statutory entitlement to parental bereavement leave, and a statutory entitlement to parental bereavement pay.

The schedule itself is divided into three parts. Respectively, these three parts would: amend the Employment Rights Act 1996 to establish a statutory right to parental bereavement leave; amend the Social Security

Contributions and Benefits Act 1992 to establish a statutory right to pay during parental bereavement leave; and make various consequential amendments to other existing pieces of legislation.¹³

Part 1 of the schedule would establish a statutory right to parental bereavement leave from day one of employment (ie a ‘day-one right’ to parental bereavement leave).

It also stipulates that “parent” is to be defined with reference to an interpersonal relationship, where the conditions to be met by that relationship in order to qualify as parenthood will be specified in regulations; the regulations may characterise the relationship fairly broadly so as to include, for example, a person with caring responsibility for the child before its death. This clause would also clarify that, where employees are entitled to parental bereavement leave, they must be granted a minimum of two weeks’ leave which they are obliged to take within 56 days of the death of the child. A person is considered a child, in this context, only if they are under 18 years of age. This clause also stipulates that an employee would have a right to parental bereavement leave each time they lose a child, should they experience more than one bereavement. Part 1 would also ensure that the right to parental bereavement leave extends to parents of a stillborn child—where the text mentions the death of a child, “death” is to be read as “birth” in the case of stillbirth.

Part 2 of the schedule would establish a statutory entitlement to pay during parental bereavement leave, after 26 weeks of consecutive employment, and also sets out the conditions for that entitlement. One such condition is continuous employment with the liable employer for at least 26 weeks. However, the Bill would allow for regulations to specify other circumstances where an employee is to be counted as having been in employment for 26 weeks. This clause provides for the rate of bereavement pay to be specified in regulations, which can also make provision for different rates of pay in different cases. Mr Hollinrake has specified his preference for the rate of pay to be set at the statutory rate, but explained that this would be better achieved through regulations so as to allow uprating when required.¹⁴ The Bill also specifies that pay must be for at least two weeks, with scope for regulations to allow that paid leave be taken in non-consecutive periods of (multiples of) a week. Part 2 defines “employer” and “employee” while also leaving room for regulations to make provision for the application of these terms.

Part 3 of the schedule makes consequential amendments to a number of other Acts of Parliament.

The Bill also specifies that any regulations laid as a result of its amendments to existing legislation will be subject to scrutiny through the affirmative procedure.¹⁵

Clause 2 of the Bill concerns the Bill’s extent, commencement and short title. It states that the substantive content of the legislation, contained in the schedule, will come into force at a time to be specified in the regulations provided for, and that the regulations can establish multiple different commencement dates.

House of Commons stages

Although widely supported, the Bill generated several recurring points of contention during its passage through the House of Commons. One of the issues concerned the definition of the term “bereaved parent.” Six amendments were tabled during committee stage and four during report stage on the issue of who should count as a parent for the purposes of the Bill.¹⁶ There was general agreement that to construe parents as biological parents would be too narrow and would leave out step-parents, foster parents and other individuals to whom the Bill might want to extend the entitlement to parental bereavement leave.

Kevin Foster (Conservative MP for Torbay), who tabled four amendments on this question at report stage, summarised the issue:

I think that we would all agree that parenting is not just about biology. It is not just about who has

physically created a child, as we see with egg and sperm donor births. My concern is that if the Bill is passed without amendment to the schedule, there could be too much focus on the parent, rather than on the person who has done the parenting by looking after the child, bringing them up and loving and caring for them. The amendments will make it clearer that this is about the primary care giver—the person who is acting as the parent. I would be interested to hear my hon. Friend's views on this and those of the Under-Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, my hon. Friend the Member for Watford (Richard Harrington). We would not want to get into a situation where the person or couple who were acting as the parents could not take time off, yet an estranged biological parent could do so.¹⁷

Mr Hollinrake recognised the difficulty of giving a good definition of “bereaved parent” during the Bill's second reading, noting that “as a society, we have clearly moved on from mum, dad and 2.4 children”, while Laura Pidcock, Shadow Minister for Labour and the Opposition spokesperson during committee stage, made a similar point: “I am very anxious to include as many people as possible and to hear that foster carers would be considered on report”.¹⁸

However, no precise definition of “bereaved parent” has been specified on the face of the Bill. A definition would be provided for in regulations. A consultation on this issue, conducted by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), closed on 8 June 2018.¹⁹

Another recurring point of contention was the definition of the term “child”. The Bill stipulates that someone is a child only if they are under 18 years of age. Various suggestions were made to alter this, including amendments tabled to abolish it entirely and abolish or increase it in the case of people with disabilities.²⁰

Introducing amendments 6 and 7 at committee stage, both of which sought to remove the requirement that an individual be younger than 18 to count as a child, Patricia Gibson (SNP MP for North Ayrshire and Arran) gave the following justification for her proposed changes to the Bill:

The loss of a son or daughter is traumatic and life-changing, no matter how old they are. It is clear from our sittings last week that we all understand that it is against the natural order of events for any parent to bury their own child. We have the opportunity to recognise that in the Bill. I am sure that no Committee member would accept or even suggest that losing a son or daughter aged 17 is a tragedy that should be treated differently from losing a son or daughter aged 19, 21 or 23.²¹

Neither of these amendments—nor any of amendments 6, 21, 24 or 25 at report stage, which would have made similar alterations to the Bill—was pressed to a vote. This was due to a collective recognition of the risk that such changes posed to the Bill's passage, as articulated by Andrew Griffiths, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, during the second sitting of the Public Bill Committee:

Amendments 6 and 7 propose to extend this provision to parents of children of any age. The Bill applies to parents of children under the age of 18. Much as I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Thirsk and Malton, and would like the Bill to cover parents of all children who have passed away irrespective of age, to do so would have financial implications that cannot be ignored. I draw the Committee's attention to the Exchequer estimate that the annual cost of statutory bereavement pay would be between £1.2 million and £2 million, with a best estimate of £1.77 million. The estimated cost to business—the employer—is £1.45 million and we estimate that, as drafted, the Bill will cover 5,600 parents [...] The broader the Bill's coverage, the more it will cost both the state and employers, in terms of absence costs. I therefore believe that the right balance is to ensure that parents of children up to the age of 18 are covered by the Bill. [...] I do not for one minute underestimate the loss of a child at any age, but, for the sake of securing the Bill, I think we have to draw a line.²²

Ms Pidcock sought to make changes to the Bill, through amendments 12 and 13, which would have removed the age cap of 18 in the case of disabled children:

Some people have to care for dependent children for much longer than 18 years—I am sure my father would argue that I am still dependent, and I am 30. Full-time carers have to care for their children because they have a lifelong disability and a recognised dependency.²³

The Bill's supporters were sympathetic to these points but argued against their inclusion in the Bill. Mr Griffiths explained the Government's position:

I agree that resisting amendments 12 and 13 is not a decision to be taken lightly. I understand the genuine and heartfelt feelings on both sides. My intention and that of the Government is not to disregard the parents of a child with a lifelong disability or to ignore their needs, but to ensure that the Bill stays practical, focused and deliverable.²⁴

Ms Pidcock nonetheless pressed amendment 12 to a vote. The amendment was defeated by nine votes to six.²⁵

Mr Quince tabled amendments at committee stage to extend the notion of a child to include stillborn children. He made the following remarks in defence of these changes:

As the Bill is drafted, the parents of babies that draw breath would be entitled to statutory parental bereavement leave in addition to their statutory paternity and maternity leave, whereas the parents of stillborn babies would not. The Bill by its nature must have arbitrary cut-offs. We have just debated eligibility in terms of definition, and to some extent this is no different. There is currently a disparity between parents of a child who drew breath and those of a child who did not. Luckily, parents of all babies, whether stillborn or those who die neonatally, would be entitled to those rights afforded at present as part of the statutory maternity and paternity; the discrepancy is between a stillbirth and a live birth. There is a piece of work to be done on including parents of stillborn children, because at the moment there is an unfairness between them and those who lose a child neonatally.²⁶

These were agreed to without division.²⁷ Mr Griffiths explained the Government's position on the amendments:

My hon. Friend included in the Bill a power to extend the entitlement to include the parents of stillborn children, and explained, very clearly, the rationale for doing exactly that. I have thought about this long and hard, and I am supportive of the rationale and the position. The reasoning, to my mind, was clear, coherent and sound. I just add that, by including stillbirth—which affects 3,300 children a year—more than 6,000 additional parents will be covered by the provisions in the amendment. My hon. Friend the Member for Colchester was right to ask whether a line should exist in terms of the provision for a child who has been born still and a child who has taken a single breath and then died. What a conundrum, what a decision—to differentiate between the griefs of a parent whose child has taken a breath and one whose child has not. I speak as somebody who is eagerly awaiting that first breath. I cannot imagine the anguish and devastation that would come.²⁸

Also contentious was the requirement that employees take their leave within 56 days of bereavement. Mr Quince addressed this during the Bill's second reading in the House of Commons when he called for this period to be increased to six months, not least to account for the needs of fathers who might be more likely to bottle up grief.²⁹

David Linden (SNP MP for Glasgow East) explained his rationale for introducing an amendment at committee stage that would have extended this period to 52 weeks:

Amendment 3, in my name and those of my hon. Friends the Members for North Ayrshire and Arran and for Paisley and Renfrewshire North, would extend the period within which bereavement leave must be taken from 56 days to 52 weeks. The rationale behind the amendment is to give more flexibility to parents who lose a child. Through my fundraising work with children's hospices across Scotland, I have had the opportunity to visit Robin House in Balloch and meet parents whose children have a life-shortening or life-limiting condition. I have also spoken to families who have experienced the loss of a child. One of the clear messages and asks they have of us as policy makers and legislators is to allow more flexibility in when they can take bereavement leave.³⁰

Another amendment with the same aim was tabled at committee stage and a further four were introduced at report stage.³¹ None was made or pressed to a vote. This was again due, in large part, to the shared desire to ensure that the Bill successfully become law. Mr Hollinrake's consideration of these amendments at report stage is illustrative of this point:

I am certainly sympathetic to increasing it from eight weeks to a longer period of perhaps six or 12 months. I am sure that the Minister will listen to such representation. [...] Finally, I politely ask Members not to press their amendments to a Division and to allow the Bill to pass through the House and on to the statute book as quickly as possible so that we help more parents who suffer these terrible tragedies in their hour of greatest need.³²

Several MPs also raised the issue of how the two weeks of parental bereavement leave (or more, if an employer chooses to exceed the statutory requirements) could be taken. The Bill specifies that they must be taken in week-long blocks. Two amendments were tabled at committee stage, and one at report stage, to allow employees to take individual days of leave when required.³³ Although none of these amendments was pressed to a vote, Karen Lee (Labour MP for Lincoln) summarised the motivation for the changes during the Bill's second reading:

You never know when you are going to have something come up like a funeral or a day when the grief just hits you, and you need a day off then.³⁴

Mr Linden introduced a related amendment, at committee stage, designed to supplement the two weeks of leave guaranteed by the Bill with a further day for the funeral:

Amendment 2, in my name and those of my hon. Friends the Members for North Ayrshire and Arran and for Paisley and Renfrewshire North, would provide two weeks' paid bereavement leave and one additional day dedicated for the child's funeral.³⁵

Mr Hollinrake "politely ask[ed] the hon Gentleman to withdraw his amendment" since "putting that into legislation would be difficult at this point" and raise issues with "redrafting legislation and ensuring consideration of the needs of employers."³⁶ For the Government, Mr Griffiths raised a further possible issue with this amendment:

What we would not want though is a situation where employers say that they do not need to have a policy in place because there is already a statutory requirement. In other areas, such as maternity, there is a statutory pay period and some businesses enhance that, but the vast majority do not. We need a consultation to properly understand, because I would hate for this to be the minimum and for that to be what is expected, rather than businesses stepping up to the plate and offering the generous terms that they already do.³⁷

Mr Linden nonetheless pressed the amendment to a vote, noting that “we are in a two-year [session this] Parliament, so it is not as if we have to get the Bill passed before Prorogation in March”.³⁸ The amendment was defeated on division by eight votes to five.

In addition to the recurring themes above, several other points were raised either in debate or through amendments tabled. There was discussion around the definition of “employee” (to capture the self-employed, those working on zero-hour contracts, and possibly those in receipt of universal credit). There was debate around the possibility of extending the entitlement to pay to all employees irrespective of length of employment.³⁹ Other suggestions included: increasing the mandated rate of pay; increasing the minimum length of leave; specifying the employee’s right to return to the same job they left; and reducing the administrative burden on employees wishing to take parental bereavement leave.⁴⁰ None of these changes was made to the Bill.

Other Reaction to the Bill

The Parental Bereavement (Leave and Pay) Bill received cross-party and government support.⁴¹ Reaction to the Bill beyond Westminster was also largely positive, although similar issues to those addressed in Parliament were raised.

When the Bill was first introduced in the House of Commons, Child Bereavement UK, Care for the Family and the Lullaby Trust all welcomed the introduction of paid leave for bereaved parents.⁴²

The National Bereavement Alliance, an umbrella organisation for groups dealing with bereavement, “broadly welcome[d] the Bill” which would, if passed, “introduce a crucial right”, in a briefing it published before report stage.⁴³ It made a number of recommendations for improvements to the Bill which focused on similar issues to those raised during the Bill’s passage through the House of Commons. These included proposals for an extension to the window of time within which bereaved parents can take leave and an increase in the prerequisite age of a child from 18 to 25.

The business community is also broadly in favour of the Bill. The Government’s impact assessment reported that following an (unpublished) survey to its members and followers on social media, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) found that 88 percent of respondents “were in support of a Parental Bereavement Leave policy”.⁴⁴

The CIPD itself supports the Bill. The CIPD’s ‘People Management’ website reported:

Charles Cotton, performance and reward adviser at the CIPD, said the Bill’s introduction was an opportunity for HR departments to rethink their current bereavement policies and consider more broadly “how we should as an organisation deal with a colleague who’s unfortunately suffering from a child bereavement, and how we treat [them]”.⁴⁵

¹ The Bill will not, if passed, apply in Northern Ireland, where employment legislation is devolved.

² [Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill, HC Bill 14 of 2017–19](#).

³ [HL Hansard, 14 May 2018, col 414](#).

⁴ [HC Hansard, 19 July 2017, col 876](#).

⁵ Conservative Party, [The Conservative Party Manifesto 2017](#), May 2017, p 70.

⁶ Employment Rights Act 1996, s 57A.

⁷ That the Employment Rights Act 1996 does not establish a duty to offer staff compassionate leave was clarified by the judgment in the case of *Forster v Cartwright Black Solicitors* [2004] IRLR 781.

⁸ Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, [‘Managing Bereavement in the Workplace—A Good Practice Guide’](#), September 2014, p 13.

⁹ ComRes, a market research consultancy, found in 2013 that 32 percent of people who had experienced a bereavement while employed over the preceding five years felt they had not been treated with compassion. See [Life After Death](#) (p 6), a

report published by the National Bereavement Alliance in January 2014.

¹⁰ [HC Hansard, 20 October 2017, cols 1158, 1159 and 1160.](#)

¹¹ [HC Hansard, 6 September 2016, cols 215–16.](#)

¹² [Parental Bereavement \(Statutory Entitlement\) Bill, 2013–14.](#)

¹³ A more detailed exposition can be found in the House of Commons Library briefing, [Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill 2017–19](#) (18 October 2017, pp 9–11).

¹⁴ [HC Hansard, 20 October 2017, col 1160.](#)

¹⁵ [Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) HL Bill 105 of 2017–19](#), schedule 1, paras 3 and 6.

¹⁶ These were amendments 16, 17, 21, 22, 23 and 24 at committee stage, and amendments 1, 2, 12 and 14 at report stage.

¹⁷ [HC Hansard, 11 May 2018, col 1016.](#)

¹⁸ Mr Hollinrake's comments were made during [second reading](#) (20 October 2017, col 1161) and Ms Pidcock's at [1st sitting of Public Bill Committee](#) (31 January 2018, col 22).

¹⁹ Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, '[Consultation on Parental Bereavement Leave and Pay](#)', 28 March 2018.

²⁰ Amendments 6 and 7 at committee stage and 6, 21, 24 and 25 at report stage would have abolished the age ceiling. Amendments 14 and 15 at committee stage would have abolished or raised the ceiling, respectively, for disabled children.

²¹ [Public Bill Committee, Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill, 7 February 2018, session 2017–19, 2nd sitting, col 43.](#)

²² *ibid*, col 50.

²³ *ibid*, col 48.

²⁴ *ibid*, col 51.

²⁵ *ibid*, col 53.

²⁶ *ibid*, col 54. Part I of Mr Quince's Bill from the previous parliamentary session included a provision which specified that parental bereavement leave was to be available only to parents of a child whose death occurred at least 56 days after birth.

²⁷ Before these amendments were made, the text of the Bill made it possible, but not obligatory, for regulations to extend parental bereavement leave entitlement to parents of stillborn children. This would have made it possible for regulations to establish a discrepancy in legal rights between parents of children who are born alive but die shortly after, on the one hand, and parents whose child is stillborn, on the other.

²⁸ [Public Bill Committee, Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill, 7 February 2018, session 2017–19, 2nd sitting, col 55.](#)

²⁹ [HC Hansard, 20 October 2017, col 1161.](#) Mr Quince's Bill from the previous parliamentary session made no mention of the time within which leave was to be taken.

³⁰ [Public Bill Committee, Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill, 7 February 2018, session 2017–19, 2nd sitting, col 34.](#)

³¹ Amendments 3 and 20 at committee stage, and 3, 5, 20 and 23 at report stage.

³² [HC Hansard, 11 May 2018, cols 1067–8.](#)

³³ Amendments 10 and 11 at committee stage, and 22 at report stage.

³⁴ [HC Hansard, 20 October 2017, col 1162.](#)

³⁵ [Public Bill Committee, Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill, 7 February 2018, session 2017–19, 2nd sitting, col 39.](#)

³⁶ *ibid*, cols 39–40.

³⁷ *ibid*, col 41.

³⁸ *ibid*.

³⁹ Amendments 4 and 5 at committee stage, and 13 at report stage.

⁴⁰ Amendment 1 at committee stage, and 7 at report stage; amendments 4 and 19 at report stage; amendment 8 at report stage; and amendments 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 17 at report stage.

⁴¹ The Labour Party's 2017 general election manifesto pledged to consult trade unions and employers on parental bereavement leave and pay (Labour Party, [The Labour Party Manifesto 2017](#), 2017, p 50).

⁴² Lullaby Trust, '[We Welcome the Parental Bereavement \(Pay and Leave\) Bill Introduced to Parliament](#)', 20 July 2017;

HuffPost, '[Employed Parents Could Soon be Entitled to "Paid Leave to Grieve" after the Death of a Child](#)', 19 July 2017.

⁴³ National Bereavement Alliance, '[Parental Bereavement \(Leave and Pay\) Bill 2017–19](#)', accessed 19 June 2018.

⁴⁴ Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, '[Parental Bereavement Leave and Pay Impact Assessment](#)', October 2017, p 6.

⁴⁵ People Management, '[Bereaved Parents Bill is "Valuable Opportunity" to Reconsider HR Policies](#)', 20 July 2017.

House of Lords Library briefings are compiled for the benefit of Members of the House of Lords and their personal staff, to provide impartial, politically balanced briefing on subjects likely to be of interest to Members of the Lords. Authors are available to discuss the contents of the briefings with the Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public.

Any comments on briefings should be sent to the Head of Research Services, House of Lords Library, London SW1A 0PW or emailed to purvism@parliament.uk.