



Infrastructure Bill: Invasive species

Standard Note: SNSC-7086

Last updated: 22 January 2015

Author: Dr Elena Ares

Jess Montgomery

Section Science and Environment Section

Part 3 of the In Bill provides new powers in England and Wales to control populations of invasive non-native species. The proposals were developed following a Law Commission report, which recommended a system of species control orders to address the threats posed by invasive species to biodiversity and infrastructure in the UK.

There has been broad support for the principle of establishing a system of control measures to tackle invasive species. However, there has been debate over which species should be included in the list of those which would be potentially subject to control.

At Committee stage in the Commons, the Opposition proposed an amendment to the definitions contained in the Bill, so that those species afforded protection under the EU Habitats Directive would not be subject to control measures. This was rejected on division. The Government committed to providing further information on the proposed code of practice for implementation of these control measures and on the status of the European beaver within the proposals.

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

Contents

1	Environment control of animal and plant species (Part 3 of the Bill)	3
1.1	Background	3
	Invasive non-native species	3
	Origin of proposals in the Bill	4
	Examples of invasive species in the UK	5
1.2	Proposals in the Bill	5
1.3	House of Lords proceedings	6
1.4	Comment and Reaction	8
	Classifying a species as non-native	8
	Connection with relevant EU legislation	8
	Climate change	9
	Compensation for landowners	9
2	Commons Second Reading	10
3	Commons Committee Stage	10
1.1	Summary	10
1.2	Proceedings	10

1 Environment control of animal and plant species (Part 3 of the Bill)

1.1 Background

Part 3 provides new powers in England and Wales to control populations of invasive non-native species. The proposals were developed following a Law Commission report, which recommended a system of species control orders to address the threats posed by invasive species to biodiversity and infrastructure in the UK.¹ Invasive non-native species can adversely impact native populations by, for example, introducing new diseases, destroying habitats or competing for resources. Examples of invasive species in the UK include: Japanese knotweed; the North American crayfish; and mink. The main area of controversy in the proposals arises from the potential use of control measures on populations of native, or previously native, species such as the beaver.

This section sets out the impact of invasive non-native species in the UK, the origin and content of the Government's proposals, amendments made in the House of Lords and continuing concerns discussed during proceedings at Report and Committee stage in the Commons.

Invasive non-native species

Invasive non-native species are species which are introduced, deliberately or accidentally, into an environment in which they are not normally found, and cause serious harm to that environment.² These species cause environmental harm by, for example, competing with native species for resources or altering habitats, which can result in the extinction of native plants and animals.³ Natural England states that:

Invasive non-native species have an impact on biodiversity by displacing or preying upon native species, by destroying habitats, or by introducing new diseases or parasites. The most direct implications are the threats of predation on, and competition with, native species. For example, water voles have declined as a direct result of predation from non-native mink.⁴

In Europe, approximately ten new non-native species become established each year.⁵ The EU states that:

Invasive alien species represent one of the main threats to biodiversity and related ecosystem services, especially in geographically and evolutionarily isolated ecosystems, such as small islands. The risks such species pose may intensify due to increased global trade, transport, tourism and climate change.⁶

In Great Britain, approximately 1,900 non-native species are established in the wild, "of which 109 plants (including a marine alga) and 173 animals are considered to have a negative ecological or human impact".⁷ The Government states that the economic impact of invasive non-native species in the UK:

[...] has recently been estimated as a minimum of £1.8 billion per annum which includes £1 billion to the agriculture and horticulture sectors and over £200m to the

¹ Law Commission, *Wildlife Law: Control of Invasive Non-native Species*, HC 1039, February 2014

² European Commission, *Invasive Alien Species*, accessed November 2014

³ US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *What is an invasive species?* [accessed November 2014]

⁴ Natural England, *Non-native Species* [accessed November 2014]

⁵ GB non-native species secretariat, *Statistics and facts* [accessed November 2014]

⁶ Regulation EU/1143/2014, 22 October 2014

⁷ op cit., *Wildlife Law: Control of invasive non-native species*, p2

construction, development and infrastructure sectors. Early eradication is critical to tackling invasive non-native species – for example, it is estimated that the early eradication of the invasive aquatic plant water primrose would cost £73,000 compared to £242 million if the plant became fully established as it has in France and Belgium.⁸

These costs arise as a result of measures undertaken to control or eradicate the species, structural damage to infrastructure or loss of production as a result of the invasive species' presence.⁹

Origin of proposals in the Bill

At present, Defra and the Welsh Government do not have powers to compel landowners to take action to remove invasive, non-native species from their land. Nor do they possess powers of entry to remove such species from land themselves or undertake surveillance. The Government explains its current powers as follows:

Defra's and the Welsh Government's network bodies have to rely on reaching voluntary agreements with landowners to undertake work or to gain access to their land to eradicate invasive non-native species found there. Whilst most landowners are willing to enter into voluntary agreements, experience has shown that a small minority (around 5%) are not. In contrast to powers available under animal and plant health legislation to combat disease and pests, the network bodies have no powers to compel landowners to act, or powers of entry for surveillance or to carry out work themselves in respect of invasive non-native species. This places England and Wales in a vulnerable position in terms of biosecurity.¹⁰

Defra requested that the Law Commission look at wildlife law as part of its 2011 programme.¹¹ Following a review, the Commission published its report in February 2014. It stated that:

Invasive non-native species [...] pose a significant threat to ecosystems as well as damaging property and infrastructure. Existing law does not contain sufficient powers to allow for their timely and effective control or eradication. Our recommendations in relation to species control orders will allow for a proportionate and necessary response to an increasing problem.¹²

The Environmental Audit Committee commented on the current regulatory regime around invasive non-native species in its April 2014 report on the subject.¹³ It stated that the current system of monitoring and controlling species "is too slow".¹⁴ Chair of the Committee, Joan Walley MP, said:

Scotland has introduced legal powers to be able to take effective action, quickly and comprehensively, when invasive species are identified as a threat. They use 'species control orders' to allow access to land to establish the presence of invasive species, and to implement any necessary control measures. The Law Commission have concluded that such powers should be replicated in England and Wales. We agree. The Government needs to get these implemented straightaway.¹⁵

⁸ HL Bill 2 EN, June 2014, para 65

⁹ op cit., *Wildlife Law: Control of invasive non-native species*, p3

¹⁰ HL Bill 2 EN, June 2014, para 66

¹¹ Law Commission, *Wildlife* [accessed November 2014]

¹² ibid.

¹³ EAC, *Invasive non-native species* (fourteenth report of session 2013-14), HC 913, 16 April 2014

¹⁴ EAC press notice, "Invasive non-native species report published", 16 April 2014

¹⁵ ibid.

Examples of invasive species in the UK

In 2008 Dr Paul Raven of the Environment Agency provided the following list of the Agency's top ten 'most wanted' invasive species in the UK:

- 1) Japanese Knotweed (structural damage to buildings; clogs waterways)
- 2) N. American crayfish (outcompetes native crayfish; impacts on invertebrate plant communities)
- 3) Mink (linked to huge decline in water vole and moorhen populations)
- 4) Giant hogweed (toxic and causes skin irritation; suppresses native plants)
- 5) Floating Pennywort (forms mats that choke waterways and starve them of light, nutrients and oxygen)
- 6) Himalayan Balsalm (lures bumblebees from native plants)
- 7) Australian Swamp Stonecrop (destroys pond life and impacts on recreational activities)
- 8) Chinese Mitten Crab (secondary host of parasitic lung fluke; outcompetes native species)
- 9) Parrots Feather (forms dense mats; can increase drowning risk for children)
- 10) Top mouth gudgeon (prolific breeder that outcompetes native species)¹⁶

1.2 Proposals in the Bill

The *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended*, is the primary legislative basis for tackling invasive non-native species in England and Wales. The Bill amends that Act by inserting a new Schedule. The Bill provides for the creation of species control agreements and species control orders by environmental authorities in England and Wales.¹⁷ These agreements or orders can be used to authorise the undertaking of "species control operations" against invasive non-native species of animals or plants, or against a new category of species of animal that is "no longer normally present in Great Britain".¹⁸

The main area of controversy regarding these proposals arises from the categories of species which may be subject to these agreements or orders, rather than the proposals themselves.

Clause 20 would insert new Schedule 9A into the 1981 Act. It would create a system of species control agreements or species control orders:

- A **species control agreement** would be a mutual agreement between an environmental authority and the owner of a premises on which a species is present, to state that species control operations would be carried out on the premises.
- A **species control order** could be made by environmental authorities on premises where the owner was deemed to have failed to control a species. These orders would

¹⁶ British Ecological Society, *Invasive non-native species: BES POSTnote Seminar at Parliament* [accessed November 2014]

¹⁷ Scotland operates its own separate system of control orders

¹⁸ Species control operations are activities which: eradicate a species from a premises; control a species on a premises or prevent a species from returning to a premises.

set out the conditions under which the owner or environmental authority would carry out control operations on the premises.

The species against which the control measures specified in the Bill could be carried out are set out in the 1981 Act. Species control agreements or orders could be created in respect of species which are invasive non-native or “no longer normally present”. Before seeking to control populations of species classified as “no longer normally present in Great Britain”, the relevant environmental authority would have to be satisfied that: the animals were present without a licence having been issued; they were having a significant adverse impact on biodiversity, environmental, social or economic interests; and that there was no appropriate alternative for obviating that impact.¹⁹

Clause 21 would amend the categories of species subject to the provisions of section 14 of the 1981 Act. Section 14 makes it an offence to release into the wild any animals listed in Schedule 9 to that Act. The clause would amend Schedule 9 so that the title of the existing list of species is changed to “non-native” and create two new categories of species, as follows:

- Native animals (capercaillie, chough, corncrake, commons crane, white-tailed eagle, goshawk, red kite and barn owl); and
- Animals which are no longer normally present (wild boar).

The species listed in these categories could be amended by way of secondary legislation.²⁰ This means that in future control measures could be applied to other species that are not normally present in Great Britain (e.g. the wolf, lynx, beaver or brown bear), if they were to be added to the list of animals in the Schedule. These animals were once present in the UK, but have since become extinct. A separate category (2) lists affected species of plants.

Clause 22 would amend other sections of the 1981 Act, relating to: species introductions; the sale of invasive non-native species; and codes of practice in connection with these species. This would ensure that the new definitions of species outlined in clause 20 are subject to those provisions of the Act.

1.3 House of Lords proceedings

There was cross-party support in the House of Lords for the introduction of measures to control invasive non-native species, but concerns were expressed about which species could be affected. In particular, there were concerns about whether native animals could be subject to population control measures. In response, the Government introduced a number of amendments. Baroness Kramer noted that these changes would:

- Remove eight native species which had previously fallen within the scope of the Bill; and
- Create a separate category within the Bill for species which had previously been normally resident but which are or have been absent. Control measures could still be applied to these populations, but “the environmental authority must be satisfied that there is no appropriate alternative way of addressing the adverse impact from the animals” and control powers could only be applied to these species “when they have been reintroduced into the wild unlawfully, without the appropriate licence”. The only species currently classified in this way is the wild boar, but Baroness Kramer noted

¹⁹ [HL Bill 2 EN](#), June 2014, para 91

²⁰ provided for in clause 22, subject to affirmative parliamentary procedure

that “it is possible that other species could be added to this list in the future, such as the European beaver”.²¹

These amendments were agreed to, but their Lordships expressed a number of remaining concerns. Many of these concerns related to the scope of the provisions being broader than originally intended, as a result of the new category of “no longer normally present” having been introduced. These provisions could be used to authorise control measures against native species that were currently being re-established. The two species of particular concern were beavers and wild boar.

Lord Davies of Oldham stated that the proposals “introduce a possibility that native species can be placed on a list of difficult animals and so can receive species control orders”. He argued that beavers were “a native component of British Wildlife” which are “already living wild in the UK in significant numbers”. He also highlighted the protections afforded to that species by the EU Habitats Directive.²²

Baroness Parminter noted it was important that the code of practice established around the use of species control measures was used to ensure their “limited use” in relation to these species.²³

Concerns were raised about the application of these powers to wild boar, which is the only species that the Bill currently lists as being no longer normally present. Baroness Parminter questioned what criteria had been used to create the list, and Baroness Young of Old Scone asked what criteria would be used to add other species to the list in future.²⁴

In response to concerns about beavers and boars, Baroness Kramer explained that:

One reason why our wild boar are the only creature on Schedule 9 is that, although obviously they once lived extensively across these islands, they disappeared due to hunting and were re-established in the wild as a result of unlawful releases. They did not come by themselves, so we are putting them into the category of formerly native.

[...] Beaver falls into the same category in many ways. The noble Baroness, Lady Young, described the beaver as an entirely amiable creature. Unfortunately, some beavers carry a potentially deadly zoonotic disease known as EM.²⁵

In response to concerns about the application of control measures to species currently being reintroduced, Baroness Kramer argued there was “a proper process for lawful reintroduction”. In addition:

Where we have a species that is formerly native, it should go through the appropriate process where bodies can make the appropriate judgment for reintroduction. Brought in lawfully, control orders would not apply. That is the thinking behind the provision. I think that it has now being broadly accepted that that is a rational way to proceed.²⁶

²¹ [HL Deb 3 November 2014, c1523](#)

²² *ibid.*, c1524

²³ *ibid.*, c1525

²⁴ *ibid.*, c1526

²⁵ *ibid.*, c1527

²⁶ *ibid.*, c1528

1.4 Comment and Reaction

Classifying a species as non-native

As originally drafted, the Bill defined a species as being potentially subject to control agreements or orders if it was listed in Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 9 to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, or was “not ordinarily resident in, or a regular visitor to, Great Britain in a wild state”.²⁷ This list included a number of species which had been native in Great Britain, but had become extinct, or were considered native. George Monbiot, writing in *The Guardian*, stated:

Among those in schedule 9 are six native species that have already been re-established in Britain (the capercaillie, the common crane, the red kite, the goshawk, the white-tailed eagle and the wild boar); two that are tentatively beginning to return (the night heron and the eagle owl); and four that have been here all along (the barn owl, the corncrake, the chough and the barnacle goose). All these, it seems, are now to be classified as non-native, and potentially subject to eradication or control.²⁸

Amendments in the Lords changed the species lists, introducing a new category of “not normally present” to the Bill. This clarified that certain species were considered native. It created a new section of the 1981 Act – species no longer normally present – in which there was only one species listed: the wild boar.

The wild boar is a native British species, which became extinct at the end of the 13th century. There are, however, “small populations of 200-300 in the Kent/East Sussex borders” and some in Dorset. These are “believed to be derived from escapees of imported stock from Europe for specialist farms”.²⁹

The proposals were criticised for a lack of clarity over the criteria used to assign species as ‘native’, ‘non-native’ and ‘not normally present’. Wildlife and Countryside Link³⁰ stated that the amendments introduced in the Lords had addressed some concerns but noted that the control measures in the Bill could still be used to control native species in certain circumstances. It stated:

While this might be appropriate for some unlicensed reintroductions, concern remains because the amendments introduce a new Section (1B) in Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, which would bring wild boar within the scope of control provisions. In addition, the criteria for listing an animal in 1B are unclear. [...] an extinct species that recolonized GB could be controlled if it was having a significant impact on, eg, economic interests. Also, whilst Clause 16 would strengthen control measures for invasive non-native animals, provisions for plants would remain limited.³¹

Connection with relevant EU legislation

The EU Habitats Directive aims “to promote the maintenance of biodiversity by requiring Member States to take measures to maintain or restore natural habitats and wild species”.³² The Directive requires Member States to introduce measures to maintain or restore European protected habitats and species to a favourable conservation status. This includes

²⁷ the 1981 Act sets out a list of animals and plants which it is an offence to release into the wild, or allow to escape

²⁸ “[How the coalition is stopping the reintroduction of wildlife to the UK](#)”, *The Guardian*, 21 July 2014

²⁹ The Mammal Society, [Re-establishment of Wild Boar in Britain](#) [accessed November 2014]

³⁰ [List of members](#) on the website [accessed 3 December 2014]

³¹ Wildlife and Countryside Link, [Legal Strategy Group](#) [accessed November 2014]

³² JNCC, [Council Directive 92/43/EEC](#), acceded November 2014

strict protection for certain species.³³ Wildlife and Countryside link expressed concerns that the provisions of the Bill “could be in contravention of the Habitats Directive if species given protection in that Directive were included in the lists of species subject to control”.³⁴

A new EU Regulation on invasive species will come into force on 1 January 2015. The Law Commission states that the Regulation:

[...] provides that within 3 months of an early detection notified to the European Commission and member states, member states should apply measures which are effective in achieving the complete and permanent removal of the population of the invasive alien species concerned, with due regard to human health and the environment, and ensuring that targeted animals are spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering.³⁵

Climate change

In 2008 the [Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology \(POST\)](#) described how climate change could alter the natural ranges of species, bringing them into previously unoccupied habitats. Whilst in some cases these species would migrate with others, such as predators or parasites, which would prevent them becoming invasive, it is possible that migration could result in new invasive species:

For example; red eared terrapins are found in several water bodies in Britain but it is currently too cold for them to reproduce. Warmer summers may allow this so that the terrapins become invasive. Warmer winters will also allow cold-intolerant species to persist. Climate change may also stress native species, reducing their resilience to the impacts of invasive non-native species.³⁶

Sarah Durant, Zoological Society of London, has noted that the UK could become a refuge for some species – such as the stork – who become unable to occupy their current habitats:

But if we have such an inflexible definition of what is a non-native species, we could end up treating these creatures - no matter how precious - as pests rather than animals that we should protect. It is very worrying.³⁷

Compensation for landowners

Part 4 of the new Schedule would create “new powers of entry for specified purposes in connection with the operation and enforcement of species control orders and species control agreements”.³⁸ The Law Commission summarised the concerns of a number of organisations as to the impact of new species control agreements or orders on landowners:

A number of organisations, ranging from the Wildlife Trust and the National Anti-Snaring Campaign to the Country Land & Business Association (CLA), the NFU and NFU Cymru argued that adequate safeguards should be available to protect the interests of landowners. The CLA argued for an appropriate system of checks and balances to protect landowners’ interests.³⁹

³³ European Commission, [EC Guidance on Species Protection](#) [accessed November 2014]

³⁴ op cit., [Legal Strategy Group](#)

³⁵ op cit., [Wildlife Law: Control of invasive non-native species](#), p6

³⁶ POST, [Invasive non-native species](#), PN 303, April 2008

³⁷ “[Efforts to curb invasive species spark battle in the countryside](#)”, *The Guardian*, 23 August 2014

³⁸ See Infrastructure Bill [HL] – EN para 308

³⁹ op cit., [Wildlife Law: Control of invasive non-native species](#), p16

In written evidence to the Commons Bill Committee, the NFU expressed concern about the costs associated with undertaking the control measures outlined in the Bill. It stated:

[...] the proposals need to outline where the costs fall and whether the environmental authority is picking up those costs. Agriculture should not be picking up the costs of invasive control when, for established species, the species have 'arrived' on the land and it has been outside of the control of the land manager.⁴⁰

2 Commons Second Reading

At Second Reading, the Minister, Rt Hon John Hayes MP,⁴¹ stated that the provisions in the Bill would allow environmental authorities “to address the few cases each year where owners do not allow access to their land to eradicate new species that threaten to spread across the country”.⁴² The Shadow Minister, Richard Burden MP, stated that the Opposition supported “a proper control regime for invasive non-native species” but “did not believe the Bill is fit for purpose”, as a result of the way in which invasive non-native species were defined therein.⁴³

3 Commons Committee Stage

1.1 Summary

During debate in Committee, the main concern of the Opposition was the compatibility of the proposals with the EU Habitats Directive. In particular, this related to concerns regarding the potential application of control measures within the Bill to wild populations of the European beaver. The Government disputed that the proposals were incompatible with the Habitats Directive, but agreed to return to the issue of the classification of the European beaver on Report. The Government amended the Bill to clarify the use of scientific species names in any disputes. It also committed to providing further information and to undertake wide consultation on the proposed code of practice.

1.2 Proceedings

The Opposition tabled an amendment to clause 20, which sought to change the definition of “species that are no longer normally present in Great Britain”.⁴⁴ As originally drafted, this definition included

- a) species listed in Part 1B of Schedule 9 to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, or
- b) for animals, a species:
 - i. whose natural range includes all or any part of Great Britain; and
 - ii. which has ceased to be ordinarily resident in, or a regular visitor to, Great Britain in a wild state.

The Opposition amendment sought to add a third criteria to category (b):

- (iii) which is not a species of Community Interest as defined under the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992)

⁴⁰ [Written evidence to the Committee from the NFU](#)

⁴¹ Minister of State, Department for Transport

⁴² HC Deb 8 December 2014 [Col 656](#)

⁴³ HC Deb 8 December 2014 [Col 670](#)

⁴⁴ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 105

Richard Burden MP, Shadow Minister (Transport), stated that Article 12 of the EU Habitats Directive provided “that all species listed in its fourth annex require ‘strict protection ... in their natural range’”. The Shadow Minister therefore explained the purpose of the amendment as follows:

As drafted, the legislation could classify absent native species, recently reintroduced native species and those naturally spreading in range as a result of climate change as non-native. [...] The amendment is about getting definitions right. Along with non-governmental organisations such as Friends of the Earth, we propose that the EU habitats directive is given due regard within these definitions.⁴⁵

The Shadow Minister argued that this amendment would provide “clear legal protection” within the Bill to species protected under the Habitats Directive, such as the European beaver.⁴⁶ He pointed to public support for populations of this species in areas where they had become established and the potential environmental benefits of such populations.⁴⁷

With regards to the potential impact of the provisions relating to invasive species on the European beaver, the Minister explained that:

To ensure clarity of our intention not to use species control provisions on licensed reintroductions, we will give further consideration to the merits of listing the European beaver alongside other former native species in proposed new part 1B of schedule 9 to the 1981 Act. As a direct result of the overtures from the shadow Minister and others, I will return to that on Report.⁴⁸

However, on the broader issues raised by the amendment, the Minister responded that, despite suggestions that the Bill was incompatible with the Habitats Directive, “application of the provisions to a species of community interest in limited circumstances is entirely consistent with the habitats directive”. The Minister explained this as follows:

While the directive provides strict protection for some species of community interest, such protection is not absolute. The directive allows for derogations from protection in certain circumstances, including the reasons for public health and environmental protection. The new provisions for not affect the existing licensing requirements in place in respect of this species. Any action that could affect such a species would still require a licence, in accordance with the habitats directive requirements.⁴⁹

The proposed amendment was rejected, on division (Ayes: 8, Noes: 12).⁵⁰

Another issue raised was the spread of aquatic invasive species. Two aquatic invasive species were discussed specifically: the signal crayfish and the killer shrimp. In response to concerns raised about the spread of these species, the Minister stated that species control agreements and orders were “not an ideal vehicle for dealing with a whole range of aquatic nuisance or menace, because of the nature of the beast, as it were”. He noted that, for such species, “good bio security practice” had been effective in preventing the spread of the species and referred specifically to the “check, clean, dry” campaign.⁵¹

⁴⁵ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 107

⁴⁶ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 107

⁴⁷ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 106

⁴⁸ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 114

⁴⁹ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 114

⁵⁰ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 118 Ayes 8, Noes 12

⁵¹ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 116

The Government tabled two amendments to clause 21, in order to secure “that the scientific name of the animals listed is determinative” in any dispute.⁵² The Minister explained the rationale behind these amendments as follows:

the Government are making two minor amendments to clarify that, should a dispute or legal proceedings arise, the scientific name of a species listed in new parts 1A and part 1 B of schedule 9 to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is determinative, rather than its common name. The wording introduced by the amendment is consistent with that that already appears in the list in schedule 9 and other schedules to the 1981 Act.

These amendments were agreed to without division.⁵³

In response to concerns about the costs to landowners of the control measures outlined in the Bill, the Minister explained that the Bill contained a discretionary power to compensate for financial loss arising from any species control agreement or order. The circumstances under which such a power could be used would be set out in a code of practice. He agreed to write to Members with further detail on this matter.⁵⁴

Regarding the code of practice, the Minister stated that:

I will ensure that there is full consultation on the code of practice outside the House and inside, too. As soon as we can reasonably produce a draft reflecting our current thinking, we should do so, and it would be good to do that before the Bill reaches its conclusion. Certainly, early thoughts can be made available, even if we are still in discussion with those third parties.⁵⁵

⁵² PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 118

⁵³ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 120

⁵⁴ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 116

⁵⁵ PBC (Bill 124) 2014 – 2015: [Tuesday 6 January 2015 \(morning\)](#), col 120