

Speech: PM's Florence speech: a new era of cooperation and partnership between the UK and the EU

It's good to be here in this great city of Florence today at a critical time in the evolution of the relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union.

It was here, more than anywhere else, that the Renaissance began – a period of history that inspired centuries of creativity and critical thought across our continent and which in many ways defined what it meant to be European.

A period of history whose example shaped the modern world. A period of history that teaches us that when we come together in a spirit of ambition and innovation, we have it within ourselves to do great things.

That shows us that if we open our minds to new thinking and new possibilities, we can forge a better, brighter future for all our peoples.

And that is what I want to focus on today. For we are moving through a new and critical period in the history of the United Kingdom's relationship with the European Union.

The British people have decided to leave the EU; and to be a global, free-trading nation, able to chart our own way in the world.

For many, this is an exciting time, full of promise; for others it is a worrying one.

I look ahead with optimism, believing that if we use this moment to change not just our relationship with Europe, but also the way we do things at home, this will be a defining moment in the history of our nation.

And it is an exciting time for many in Europe too. The European Union is beginning a new chapter in the story of its development. Just last week, President Juncker set out his ambitions for the future of the European Union.

There is a vibrant debate going on about the shape of the EU's institutions and the direction of the Union in the years ahead. We don't want to stand in the way of that.

Indeed, we want to be your strongest friend and partner as the EU, and the UK thrive side by side.

Shared challenges

And that partnership is important. For as we look ahead, we see shared challenges and opportunities in common.

Here in Italy today, our two countries are working together to tackle some of the greatest challenges of our time; challenges where all too often geography has put Italy on the frontline.

As I speak, Britain's Royal Navy, National Crime Agency and Border Force are working alongside their Italian partners to save lives in the Mediterranean and crack down on the evil traffickers who are exploiting desperate men, women and children who seek a better life.

Our two countries are also working together in the fight against terrorism – from our positions at the forefront of the international coalition against Daesh to our work to disrupt the networks terrorist groups use to finance their operations and recruit to their ranks.

And earlier this week, I was delighted that Prime Minister Gentiloni was able to join President Macron and myself in convening the first ever UN summit of government and industry to move further and faster in preventing terrorist use of the Internet.

Mass migration and terrorism are but two examples of the challenges to our shared European interests and values that we can only solve in partnership.

The weakening growth of global trade; the loss of popular support for the forces of liberalism and free trade that is driving moves towards protectionism; the threat of climate change depleting and degrading the planet we leave for future generations; and most recently, the outrageous proliferation of nuclear weapons by North Korea with a threat to use them.

Here on our own continent, we see territorial aggression to the east; and from the South threats from instability and civil war; terrorism, crime and other challenges which respect no borders.

The only way for us to respond to this vast array of challenges is for likeminded nations and peoples to come together and defend the international order that we have worked so hard to create – and the values of liberty, democracy, human rights and the rule of law by which we stand.

Britain has always – and will always – stand with its friends and allies in defence of these values.

Our decision to leave the European Union is in no way a repudiation of this longstanding commitment. We may be leaving the European Union, but we are not leaving Europe.

Our resolve to draw on the full weight of our military, intelligence, diplomatic and development resources to lead international action, with our partners, on the issues that affect the security and prosperity of our peoples is unchanged.

Our commitment to the defence – and indeed the advance – of our shared values is undimmed.

Our determination to defend the stability, security and prosperity of our

European neighbours and friends remains steadfast.

The decision of the British people

And we will do all this as a sovereign nation in which the British people are in control.

Their decision to leave the institution of the European Union was an expression of that desire – a statement about how they want their democracy to work.

They want more direct control of decisions that affect their daily lives; and that means those decisions being made in Britain by people directly accountable to them.

The strength of feeling that the British people have about this need for control and the direct accountability of their politicians is one reason why, throughout its membership, the United Kingdom has never totally felt at home being in the European Union.

And perhaps because of our history and geography, the European Union never felt to us like an integral part of our national story in the way it does to so many elsewhere in Europe.

It is a matter of choices. The profound pooling of sovereignty that is a crucial feature of the European Union permits unprecedentedly deep cooperation, which brings benefits.

But it also means that when countries are in the minority they must sometimes accept decisions they do not want, even affecting domestic matters with no market implications beyond their borders. And when such decisions are taken, they can be very hard to change.

So the British electorate made a choice. They chose the power of domestic democratic control over pooling that control, strengthening the role of the UK Parliament and the devolved Scottish Parliament, Welsh and Northern Ireland Assemblies in deciding our laws.

That is our choice. It does not mean we are no longer a proud member of the family of European nations. And it does not mean we are turning our back on Europe; or worse that we do not wish the EU to succeed. The success of the EU is profoundly in our national interest and that of the wider world.

But having made this choice, the question now is whether we – the leaders of Britain, and of the EU's Member States and institutions – can demonstrate that creativity, that innovation, that ambition that we need to shape a new partnership to the benefit of all our people.

I believe we must. And I believe we can.

For while the UK's departure from the EU is inevitably a difficult process, it is in all of our interests for our negotiations to succeed. If we were to fail, or be divided, the only beneficiaries would be those who reject our

values and oppose our interests.

So I believe we share a profound sense of responsibility to make this change work smoothly and sensibly, not just for people today but for the next generation who will inherit the world we leave them.

The eyes of the world are on us, but if we can be imaginative and creative about the way we establish this new relationship, if we can proceed on the basis of trust in each other, I believe we can be optimistic about the future we can build for the United Kingdom and for the European Union.

Negotiations

In my speech at Lancaster House earlier this year, I set out the UK's negotiating objectives.

Those still stand today. Since that speech and the triggering of Article 50 in March, the UK has published 14 papers to address the current issues in the talks and set out the building blocks of the relationship we would like to see with the EU, both as we leave, and into the future.

We have now conducted three rounds of negotiations. And while, at times, these negotiations have been tough, it is clear that, thanks to the professionalism and diligence of David Davis and Michel Barnier, we have made concrete progress on many important issues.

For example, we have recognised from the outset there are unique issues to consider when it comes to Northern Ireland.

The UK government, the Irish government and the EU as a whole have been clear that through the process of our withdrawal we will protect progress made in Northern Ireland over recent years – and the lives and livelihoods that depend on this progress.

As part of this, we and the EU have committed to protecting the Belfast Agreement and the Common Travel Area and, looking ahead, we have both stated explicitly that we will not accept any physical infrastructure at the border.

We owe it to the people of Northern Ireland – and indeed to everyone on the island of Ireland – to see through these commitments.

We have also made significant progress on how we look after European nationals living in the UK and British nationals living in the 27 Member States of the EU.

I know this whole process has been a cause of great worry and anxiety for them and their loved ones.

But I want to repeat to the 600,000 Italians in the UK – and indeed to all EU citizens who have made their lives in our country – that we want you to stay; we value you; and we thank you for your contribution to our national life – and it has been, and remains, one of my first goals in this negotiation to ensure that you can carry on living your lives as before.

I am clear that the guarantee I am giving on your rights is real. And I doubt anyone with real experience of the UK would doubt the independence of our courts or of the rigour with which they will uphold people's legal rights.

But I know there are concerns that over time the rights of EU citizens in the UK and UK citizens overseas will diverge. I want to incorporate our agreement fully into UK law and make sure the UK courts can refer directly to it.

Where there is uncertainty around underlying EU law, I want the UK courts to be able to take into account the judgments of the European Court of Justice with a view to ensuring consistent interpretation. On this basis, I hope our teams can reach firm agreement quickly.

Shared future

At the moment, the negotiations are focused on the arrangements for the UK's withdrawal from the EU. But we need to move on to talk about our future relationship.

Of course, we recognise that we can't leave the EU and have everything stay the same. Life for us will be different.

But what we do want – and what we hope that you, our European friends, want too – is to stay as partners who carry on working together for our mutual benefit.

In short, we want to work hand in hand with the European Union, rather than as part of the European Union.

That is why in my speech at Lancaster House I said that the United Kingdom would seek to secure a new, deep and special partnership with the European Union.

And this should span both a new economic relationship and a new relationship on security.

So let me set out what each of these relationships could look like – before turning to the question of how we get there.

Economic partnership

Let me start with the economic partnership.

The United Kingdom is leaving the European Union. We will no longer be members of its single market or its customs union. For we understand that the single market's four freedoms are indivisible for our European friends.

We recognise that the single market is built on a balance of rights and obligations. And we do not pretend that you can have all the benefits of membership of the single market without its obligations.

So our task is to find a new framework that allows for a close economic partnership but holds those rights and obligations in a new and different

balance.

But as we work out together how to do so, we do not start with a blank sheet of paper, like other external partners negotiating a free trade deal from scratch have done.

In fact, we start from an unprecedented position. For we have the same rules and regulations as the EU – and our EU Withdrawal Bill will ensure they are carried over into our domestic law at the moment we leave the EU.

So the question for us now in building a new economic partnership is not how we bring our rules and regulations closer together, but what we do when one of us wants to make changes.

One way of approaching this question is to put forward a stark and unimaginative choice between two models: either something based on European Economic Area membership; or a traditional Free Trade Agreement, such as that the EU has recently negotiated with Canada.

I don't believe either of these options would be best for the UK or best for the European Union.

European Economic Area membership would mean the UK having to adopt at home – automatically and in their entirety – new EU rules. Rules over which, in future, we will have little influence and no vote.

Such a loss of democratic control could not work for the British people. I fear it would inevitably lead to friction and then a damaging re-opening of the nature of our relationship in the near future: the very last thing that anyone on either side of the Channel wants.

As for a Canadian style free trade agreement, we should recognise that this is the most advanced free trade agreement the EU has yet concluded and a breakthrough in trade between Canada and the EU.

But compared with what exists between Britain and the EU today, it would nevertheless represent such a restriction on our mutual market access that it would benefit neither of our economies.

Not only that, it would start from the false premise that there is no pre-existing regulatory relationship between us. And precedent suggests that it could take years to negotiate.

We can do so much better than this.

As I said at Lancaster House, let us not seek merely to adopt a model already enjoyed by other countries. Instead let us be creative as well as practical in designing an ambitious economic partnership which respects the freedoms and principles of the EU, and the wishes of the British people.

I believe there are good reasons for this level of optimism and ambition.

First of all, the UK is the EU's largest trading partner, one of the largest

economies in the world, and a market of considerable importance for many businesses and jobs across the continent. And the EU is our largest trading partner, so it is in all our interests to find a creative solution.

The European Union has shown in the past that creative arrangements can be agreed in other areas. For example, it has developed a diverse array of arrangements with neighbouring countries outside the EU, both in economic relations and in justice and home affairs.

Furthermore, we share the same set of fundamental beliefs; a belief in free trade, rigorous and fair competition, strong consumer rights, and that trying to beat other countries' industries by unfairly subsidising one's own is a serious mistake.

So there is no need to impose tariffs where we have none now, and I don't think anyone sensible is contemplating this.

And as we have set out in a future partnership paper, when it comes to trade in goods, we will do everything we can to avoid friction at the border. But of course the regulatory issues are crucial.

We share a commitment to high regulatory standards.

People in Britain do not want shoddy goods, shoddy services, a poor environment or exploitative working practices and I can never imagine them thinking those things to be acceptable.

The government I lead is committed not only to protecting high standards, but strengthening them.

So I am optimistic about what we can achieve by finding a creative solution to a new economic relationship that can support prosperity for all our peoples.

Now in any trading relationship, both sides have to agree on a set of rules which govern how each side behaves.

So we will need to discuss with our European partners new ways of managing our interdependence and our differences, in the context of our shared values.

There will be areas of policy and regulation which are outside the scope of our trade and economic relations where this should be straightforward.

There will be areas which do affect our economic relations where we and our European friends may have different goals; or where we share the same goals but want to achieve them through different means.

And there will be areas where we want to achieve the same goals in the same ways, because it makes sense for our economies.

And because rights and obligations must be held in balance, the decisions we both take will have consequences for the UK's access to European markets and vice versa.

To make this partnership work, because disagreements inevitably arise, we will need a strong and appropriate dispute resolution mechanism.

It is, of course, vital that any agreement reached – its specific terms and the principles on which it is based – are interpreted in the same way by the European Union and the United Kingdom and we want to discuss how we do that.

This could not mean the European Court of Justice – or indeed UK courts – being the arbiter of disputes about the implementation of the agreement between the UK and the EU however.

It wouldn't be right for one party's court to have jurisdiction over the other. But I am confident we can find an appropriate mechanism for resolving disputes.

So this new economic partnership, would be comprehensive and ambitious. It would be underpinned by high standards, and a practical approach to regulation that enables us to continue to work together in bringing shared prosperity to our peoples for generations to come.

Security relationship

Let me turn to the new security relationship that we want to see.

To keep our people safe and to secure our values and interests, I believe it is essential that, although the UK is leaving the EU, the quality of our cooperation on security is maintained.

We believe we should be as open-minded as possible about how we continue to work together on what can be life and death matters.

Our security co-operation is not just vital because our people face the same threats, but also because we share a deep, historic belief in the same values – the values of peace, democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

Of course, there is no pre-existing model for co-operation between the EU and external partners which replicates the full scale and depth of the collaboration that currently exists between the EU and the UK on security, law enforcement and criminal justice.

But as the threats we face evolve faster than ever, I believe it is vital that we work together to design new, dynamic arrangements that go beyond the existing arrangements that the EU has in this area – and draw on the legal models the EU has previously used to structure co-operation with external partners in other fields such as trade.

So we are proposing a bold new strategic agreement that provides a comprehensive framework for future security, law enforcement and criminal justice co-operation: a treaty between the UK and the EU.

This would complement the extensive and mature bi-lateral relationships that we already have with European friends to promote our common security.

Our ambition would be to build a model that is underpinned by our shared principles, including high standards of data protection and human rights.

It would be kept sufficiently versatile and dynamic to respond to the ever-evolving threats that we face. And it would create an ongoing dialogue in which law enforcement and criminal justice priorities can be shared and – where appropriate – tackled jointly.

We are also proposing a far reaching partnership on how we protect Europe together from the threats we face in the world today; how we work together to promote our shared values and interests abroad; whether security, spreading the rule of law, dealing with emerging threats, handling the migration crisis or helping countries out of poverty.

The United Kingdom has outstanding capabilities. We have the biggest defence budget in Europe, and one of the largest development budgets in the world. We have a far-reaching diplomatic network, and world class security, intelligence and law enforcement services.

So what we are offering will be unprecedented in its breadth, taking in cooperation on diplomacy, defence and security, and development.

And it will be unprecedented in its depth, in terms of the degree of engagement that we would aim to deliver.

It is our ambition to work as closely as possible together with the EU, protecting our people, promoting our values and ensuring the future security of our continent.

The United Kingdom is unconditionally committed to maintaining Europe's security. And the UK will continue to offer aid and assistance to EU member states that are the victims of armed aggression, terrorism and natural or manmade disasters.

Taken as a whole, this bold new security partnership will not only reflect our history and the practical benefits of co-operation in tackling shared threats, but also demonstrate the UK's genuine commitment to promoting our shared values across the world and to maintaining a secure and prosperous Europe.

Implementation

That is the partnership I want Britain and the European Union to have in the future.

None of its goals should be controversial. Everything I have said is about creating a long-term relationship through which the nations of the European Union and the United Kingdom can work together for the mutual benefit of all our people.

If we adopt this vision of a deep and special partnership, the question is then how we get there: how we build a bridge from where we are now to where we want to be.

The United Kingdom will cease to be a member of the European Union on 29th March 2019.

We will no longer sit at the European Council table or in the Council of Ministers, and we will no longer have Members of the European Parliament.

Our relations with countries outside the EU can be developed in new ways, including through our own trade negotiations, because we will no longer be an EU country, and we will no longer directly benefit from the EU's future trade negotiations.

But the fact is that, at that point, neither the UK – nor the EU and its Member States – will be in a position to implement smoothly many of the detailed arrangements that will underpin this new relationship we seek.

Neither is the European Union legally able to conclude an agreement with the UK as an external partner while it is itself still part of the European Union.

And such an agreement on the future partnership will require the appropriate legal ratification, which would take time.

It is also the case that people and businesses – both in the UK and in the EU – would benefit from a period to adjust to the new arrangements in a smooth and orderly way.

As I said in my speech at Lancaster House a period of implementation would be in our mutual interest. That is why I am proposing that there should be such a period after the UK leaves the EU.

Clearly people, businesses and public services should only have to plan for one set of changes in the relationship between the UK and the EU.

So during the implementation period access to one another's markets should continue on current terms and Britain also should continue to take part in existing security measures. And I know businesses, in particular, would welcome the certainty this would provide.

The framework for this strictly time-limited period, which can be agreed under Article 50, would be the existing structure of EU rules and regulations.

How long the period is should be determined simply by how long it will take to prepare and implement the new processes and new systems that will underpin that future partnership.

For example, it will take time to put in place the new immigration system required to re-take control of the UK's borders.

So during the implementation period, people will continue to be able to come and live and work in the UK; but there will be a registration system – an essential preparation for the new regime.

As of today, these considerations point to an implementation period of around two years.

But because I don't believe that either the EU or the British people will want the UK to stay longer in the existing structures than is necessary, we could also agree to bring forward aspects of that future framework such as new dispute resolution mechanisms more quickly if this can be done smoothly.

It is clear that what would be most helpful to people and businesses on both sides, who want this process to be smooth and orderly, is for us to agree the detailed arrangements for this implementation period as early as possible. Although we recognise that the EU institutions will need to adopt a formal position.

And at the heart of these arrangements, there should be a clear double lock: a guarantee that there will be a period of implementation giving businesses and people alike the certainty that they will be able to prepare for the change; and a guarantee that this implementation period will be time-limited, giving everyone the certainty that this will not go on for ever.

These arrangements will create valuable certainty.

But in this context I am conscious that our departure causes another type of uncertainty for the remaining member states and their taxpayers over the EU budget.

Some of the claims made on this issue are exaggerated and unhelpful and we can only resolve this as part of the settlement of all the issues I have been talking about today.

Still I do not want our partners to fear that they will need to pay more or receive less over the remainder of the current budget plan as a result of our decision to leave. The UK will honour commitments we have made during the period of our membership.

And as we move forwards, we will also want to continue working together in ways that promote the long-term economic development of our continent.

This includes continuing to take part in those specific policies and programmes which are greatly to the UK and the EU's joint advantage, such as those that promote science, education and culture – and those that promote our mutual security.

And as I set out in my speech at Lancaster House, in doing so, we would want to make an ongoing contribution to cover our fair share of the costs involved.

Conclusion

When I gave my speech at the beginning of this year I spoke not just about the preparations we were making for a successful negotiation but also about our preparations for our life outside the European Union – with or without what I hope will be a successful deal.

And the necessary work continues on all these fronts so that we are able to meet any eventual outcome.

But as we meet here today, in this city of creativity and rebirth, let us open our minds to the possible.

To a new era of cooperation and partnership between the United Kingdom and the European Union. And to a stronger, fairer, more prosperous future for us all.

For that is the prize if we get this negotiation right.

A sovereign United Kingdom and a confident European Union, both free to chart their own course.

A new partnership of values and interests.

A new alliance that can stand strongly together in the world.

That is the goal towards which we must work in the months ahead as the relationship between Britain and Europe evolves.

However it does so, I am clear that Britain's future is bright.

Our fundamentals are strong: a legal system respected around the world; a keen openness to foreign investment; an enthusiasm for innovation; an ease of doing business; some of the best universities and researchers you can find anywhere; an exceptional national talent for creativity and an indomitable spirit.

It is our fundamental strengths that really determine a country's success and that is why Britain's economy will always be strong.

There are other reasons why our future should give us confidence. We will always be a champion of economic openness; we will always be a country whose pitch to the world is high standards at home.

When we differ from the EU in our regulatory choices, it won't be to try and attain an unfair competitive advantage, it will be because we want rules that are right for Britain's particular situation.

The best way for us both to succeed is to fulfil the potential of the partnership I have set out today.

For we should be in no doubt, that if our collective endeavours in these negotiations were to prove insufficient to reach an agreement, it would be a failure in the eyes of history and a damaging blow to the future of our continent.

Indeed, I believe the difference between where we would all be if we fail – and where we could be if we can achieve the kind of new partnership I have set out today – to be so great that it is beholden on all of us involved to demonstrate the leadership and flexibility needed to ensure that we succeed.

Yes, the negotiations to get there will be difficult. But if we approach them in the right way – respectful of the challenges for both sides and pragmatic about resolving them – we can find a way forward that makes a success of this for all of our peoples.

I recognise that this is not something that you – our European partners – wanted to do. It is a distraction from what you want to get on with. But we have to get this right.

And we both want to get this done as swiftly as possible.

So it is up to leaders to set the tone.

And the tone I want to set is one of partnership and friendship.

A tone of trust, the cornerstone of any relationship.

For if we get the spirit of this negotiation right; if we get the spirit of this partnership right, then at the end of this process we will find that we are able to resolve the issues where we disagree respectfully and quickly.

And if we can do that, then when this chapter of our European history is written, it will be remembered not for the differences we faced but for the vision we showed; not for the challenges we endured but for the creativity we used to overcome them; not for a relationship that ended but a new partnership that began.

A partnership of interests, a partnership of values; a partnership of ambition for a shared future: the UK and the EU side by side delivering prosperity and opportunity for all our people.

This is the future within our grasp – so, together, let us seize it.

[Press release: UK-China IP symposium highlights importance of innovation](#)

The 2017 UK-China symposium took place in London on Friday 22 September 2017, Co-hosted by the UK's Intellectual Property Office and China's State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO). This annual flagship event for UK-China intellectual property (IP) co-operation formed part of a week of UK-China IP related activity.

The theme of this year's event was 'Future proofing the IP system'. It saw more than 200 thought leaders, policy makers and UK industry trendsetters in attendance.

Topics of discussion included:

- how the intellectual property system is adapting to emerging technology trends such as AI and big data,
- the latest policy and practice innovations in the patent and trade mark fields;
- the challenges of online and offline IP enforcement as well as practical advice for innovative and creative business, including in design-intensive industries

The keynote address was delivered by Lord Prior, UK Business Minister and Vice Commissioner Gan Shaoning of [SIPO]. In his address, Lord Prior highlighted the increased co-operation and work sharing between the UK and China on intellectual property.

He said:

The fourth industrial revolution will be based above all on new ideas and new technology this means that the need for a robust IP regime has never been stronger or more necessary.

This Symposium presents a key opportunity for UK industry to engage with Chinese policy makers to discuss a wide range of IP issues, ensuring we deliver an IP system that protects innovation and creativity that can help boost economic growth and trade for both countries.

Linked to the event, the UK IP Attaché for China, Tom Duke, hosted a series of 8 regional events over 4 days. This year they took place in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Leeds, Barnsley, Liverpool and Manchester. These events focussed on practical IP advice for large and small companies looking to mitigate IP risks in China business ventures.

Following on from this successful symposium, UK IPO Chief Executive Tim Moss will visit China later in the Autumn as part of continued engagement with his Chinese counterparts.

[Speech: Government invests in northern transport infrastructure](#)

Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for inviting me to speak to this conference today.

I particularly wanted to come and talk to you today because I care deeply about developing and strengthening the north...

And I want to make absolutely clear what this government is doing to modernise, expand and improve transport across the region...

Something that has not been reflected in recent coverage of our plans.

Let me start by saying that I know a bit about transport here in the north west.

I wrote my university dissertation on the first transport improvements in and around Manchester and how they drove the growth of the city.

I did my research in Manchester Central Library after getting the bus in from Worsley each morning. I used to live less than 20 miles from here, under the flight path into and out of the airport.

I have been travelling up and down the M6 since I was 8 weeks old to my family's home area in Lancashire. And while my politics are not red, I do enjoy supporting the red side of this city on a Saturday afternoon.

And let me be clear, I am proud to be Transport Secretary in a government that is in the middle of implementing the biggest transport investment programme in the north west for decades.

Yet in recent weeks you may have read that we spend far more in the south than in the north.

But the figures used were misleading, and certainly do not represent the true picture of investment. They give a very partial view of what is happening.

Let me give you just one example.

One of the most important new transport schemes completed by this government is the new link road between the M6 and Heysham in the north-west, unlocking a part of the economy of north Lancashire which has been held back by poor infrastructure.

It was promoted and secured by two local MPs who sit on the government's benches, David Morris and Eric Ollerenshaw, delivered by Lancashire County Council, but almost entirely funded by this government. Because it was a locally driven project rather than a national scheme, it and scores of schemes like it weren't counted in the IPPR figures.

But the road is completed and serving the people and businesses of north Lancashire.

The reality is that when you include those centrally funded and locally delivered projects, this government is spending more per head on transport in the north west than we are in the south east. There are regional discrepancies, but they are nothing like those suggested by critics.

And promoting them only serves to misinform the travelling public and risks undermining confidence in the north. That's incredibly frustrating when we're working so hard to overcome decades of underinvestment in the north. What we

are actually delivering is somewhat different:

- crucial road schemes completed and underway all across the north
- the biggest upgrade of railways in the north since the steam age
- better road and rail connections to our regional airports, opening up global possibilities for the local economy

Let me start with the roads. Projects completed. Projects being developed on both sides of the Pennines.

- that Heysham link.
- the new link road between the M56 and the M6 near my old home in Cheshire
- the smart motorway schemes, on the key motorways of the north, which includes widening on the M6, the M1, the M60 and the M62
- the A1, a rolling programme of much-needed improvement, next stage about to open
- dualling the rest of the A66 so that we create another proper route across the Pennines to link our great northern cities
- the Mottram Moor Link Road. To help meet that Transpennine challenge
- the road links to the Port of Immingham
- the A5036 Princess Way access to the Port of Liverpool
- the Manchester Airport relief road
- the vital bypass on the A585 at Fleetwood

Part of the biggest road building programme that this region has seen for a very long time.

In the next few months I will be starting work on another dimension of that programme. The Major Road Network, focusing attention on roads of most importance to regional economies...

Significant new investment on local and regional schemes...

Including much needed bypasses to tackle problems in places that have been missed out in the past.

Many of these crucial routes were detrunked between 2001 and 2009 and have received too little investment since.

So I'm determined to address this.

And for those who really believe that our opponents have the smartest approach to transport, let me share one fact with you about roads.

In the 13 years up to 2010, the government of the day cancelled as many road schemes as they actually completed.

We aren't just announcing these projects, we are working nationally and with local authorities to deliver them.

Then there's the trains.

Let me give you one statistic on the topic of the moment, electrification.

And I'll talk a bit about our strategy on that in a moment.

Since 2010 – at a time of financial challenges – we have electrified 4 times as many miles in the north-west alone than the previous government did in the whole of England and Wales in 13 years of office, when the money flowed freely.

And here's the truth on the railways of the north.

This government has launched the biggest modernisation programme of railways in the north since the steam age. An age that started here in the north.

It includes better infrastructure now, new trains, more services, more seats and bold plans to carry on that expansion for the future.

Let's start with those old Pacer trains.

The hideous old noisy trains that were built on the cheap in British Rail days. They have no place on a modern railway. And so they are off to the scrap yard. By the end of 2019, all of them will be cut up for recycling, to be replaced by the kind of modern replacements that this region needs so badly. This isn't a vague promise. It is already happening.

Under the new Northern and Transpennine franchises every single train in the North West- some of the oldest carriages in the country- will be replaced or refurbished.

And there will be more of them, with extra seats and carriages for commuters into Manchester in the rush hour. There will be more services and new services.

Not just here in Greater Manchester, but across the North West.

Trudy Harrison, the new MP for Copeland, excitedly stopped me in the corridor recently when she discovered that the Cumbrian Coast line is going to get a Sunday service for the first time.

Because these are real improvements for people.

Then there are the radical upgrades happening now to some of the oldest train tracks in the world.

We are upgrading Liverpool Lime Street, delivering a new platform, extending two platforms, straightening track and improving signalling to support more train services across the region from 2019.

It is part of a £340 million railway investment programme. A major upgrade which is starting next week with more work to follow next year.

Here in Manchester, the Ordsall chord – a world-class piece of engineering to finally connect Piccadilly and Victoria.

The Victorians didn't do it. We did.

So let's not hear any rhetoric from our opponents about us not caring for Liverpool or Manchester.

In Leeds we are building new stations.

We modernised the Calder Valley line.

We are working on plans for new Metro trains in Newcastle.

Let me say a couple of things about the two issues that created most noise over the summer.

Firstly the expansion of Piccadilly station.

I am limited in what I can say because this is subject to a live planning application. However, I am ambitious for Manchester and its vital connections, not least to the North West and the Airport and I am keen to see Manchester have connections as good as London.

My ambitions for the link for the Piccadilly to Victoria link, and the route through Oxford Road – so vital for the connections between much of the North West and the Airport – are to do more than is currently planned to allow more services through Manchester.

The current plan involves expanding the route to take up to fifteen trains an hour.

But in London the new Thameslink core uses digital technology to take up to 24 trains an hour, on just two tracks with two platforms.

Why does Manchester have to settle for an analogue solution in a digital age? Why does Manchester have to get an old-fashioned solution where London gets state of the art technology?

So I have asked Network Rail to look at better solutions.

Then there's the question of the Transpennine modernisation.

All the talk seems to be about electrification.

And let's be clear. Our programme of electrification is continuing, and soon we will have electrified not three times, but dozens of times more railway than were electrified in the years between 1997 and 2010. That means more electrification in and around Manchester, and looking at electrification as part of passenger improvements across the Pennines.

But people have got to stop only thinking about how a train is powered, and focus instead on getting the best possible improvement for passengers.

And what delivers better journey times is primarily the way you upgrade the tracks and the signalling, and how you invest in trains.

If you take the case of the Midland Main Line, we have an ambitious modernisation plan in place for between now and 2020.

We are adding extra tracks for part of the route. We are putting in place better signalling. We are working on straightening the curves on the route right now, so that trains can run faster. We are buying brand new 125 mile an hour hybrid/bi-mode electric trains for the route. We will electrify those parts of the route where it will make the biggest difference.

And by doing all of that we will reduce the journey time from London to Sheffield by up to 20 minutes in the peak. It will be the biggest set of improvements to journeys on that route since it opened in 1870.

Improvements that passengers can see and feel.

Easier and more comfortable and quicker journeys.

But then if you want to electrify the whole route, every inch of the way, it will cost the taxpayer nearly a billion pounds more than our current plan and it will save one extra minute on the journey time to Sheffield.

Yes that's right. A billion pounds to save one minute.

How many people would think that should be a transport priority for us?

The thing that makes the difference is the arrival of a new generation of bi-mode, hybrid trains. Like hybrid cars they can run on electricity or diesel or for that matter battery or hydrogen. And they switch seamlessly between different technologies. We're bringing these trains to the Great Western mainline to Penzance.

To the East Coast Mainline to Aberdeen. To cross-country routes in East Anglia. Even to the tram system in Birmingham. And to Manchester, to this City, in 2019. Brand new trains running from Liverpool to Hull. On electric tracks where they are present. Using diesel when they are not.

For passengers, it's the train and the timetable that really matters.

So this government will deliver the improved journey times promised. And of course there are plenty of electric tracks for them to run on. We've just completed the electrification between Liverpool and Manchester.

We're electrifying Manchester's suburban railways, because that makes a real difference for commuters. And we are cracking on with the modernisation of the Transpennine railway line.

With straighter tracks. Faster journey times. But it also means that places like Scarborough can have access to the electric trains as well meaning they can keep their direct access to Manchester Airport.

And ask this question. If the trains can run seamlessly in diesel and electric, do we really need to cause disruption and close the Standedge tunnel for weeks to put wires through it, as we did with the Severn Tunnel,

if the trains can run through it anyway?

But there's something more.

I am ambitious for the transpennine routes. I want a big increase in transpennine capacity. On roads. And on rail. It's why we are pressing ahead with the A66, and looking for new road corridors.

And it's why I want the modernisation of the transpennine rail route to use the latest technology to maximise its potential for the future.

We're already seeing how digital technology is transforming the London underground. And some metro lines.

Digital technology and digital control rooms mean a more reliable service, an even safer railway, and more capacity for passengers.

With this in mind, I have asked Network Rail to put together a plan setting out how they could embed digital technology in the transpennine upgrade, and I have set aside an initial £5m of development funding to scope this work.

This means that the trans Pennine route could be Britain's first digitally controlled intercity main line railway. My goal is simple.

I want to put the passenger first, and use the newest, best smartest technology to disrupt their lives as little as possible.

To be honest, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have been baffled by the accusations coming from some of our opponents.

They have been telling us that we are doing nothing.

And yet some of those same opponents are sitting at the table with us, in Transport for the North, planning the detail of this modernisation programme.

They co-designed the transformation of Northern and TransPennine.

They help us manage the franchises and the replacement of all those trains.

They are also sitting beside us planning the detail of Northern Powerhouse Rail.

A commitment to the North that was in our manifesto.

I am waiting for TfN to tell us where they believe the priorities for that project lie, so we can begin to plan in detail. That's why I'm surprised to hear some accuse us of doing nothing, while they are a part of the work to deliver transformational and exciting improvements to the North.

Then there's the biggest project of all.

Our commitment to bring HS2 to Manchester.

A project that will join up North and South— but equally importantly will

create the opportunity for thousands of extra seats on commuter trains south of Manchester and will help take lorries off our roads and onto the existing railway.

One of the biggest transport infrastructure projects happening anywhere in the world right now, all conceived to help build connectivity in and to the north.

The development of HS2 will create a link between the Midlands and the North unparalleled in the history of our transport system.

But before then we will continue to see the transformation of the road network in the north.

A future that will see the biggest modernisation of rail in the North since the steam age. Not to mention the private sector's ambitious plans for Manchester Airport's new terminal, and ours for more links to an expanded Heathrow. I am very happy to stand up and be counted on our record on transport in the North. Yes there have been decades of underinvestment. Yes things needed to change. Between 1997 and 2010 the transport system of the north stood still. But today there's amazing work going on across Northern transport. Bold, visionary work. Fantastic engineering. But also lots of local upgrades to make everyday journeys better. All backed by unprecedented investment. With northern authorities, northern businesses and northern people working with Government to deliver that vision. I'm proud to be part of that effort. To put transport right at the heart of the Northern Powerhouse.

Thank you.

[News story: Landmark containers move radioactive waste from Harwell, Oxfordshire](#)

The Type B Novapak stainless steel containers were commissioned by the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR), near Drigg, as part of its transport services, and will replace an existing fleet of containers for Intermediate Level Waste (ILW).

Each container is intricate to manufacture, requiring:

- 12 welders
- more than 750 welds
- 1,500 items of material

The final containers provide 2 layers of thermal shielding and impact protection.

They will transport the Harwell ILW as well as plutonium-contaminated material (PCM) from the LLWR site to Sellafield for long-term storage.

LLWR's Type B (Novapak) project team members were on hand to witness the historic initial delivery to Sellafield in the first pair of containers, which were manufactured by Cumbrian firm Bendalls Engineering at Carlisle.

Marc Goodwin, LLWR Project Support, said:

This is a key milestone for the NDA estate. The first pair have now returned empty to Harwell, to successfully complete the first full cycle.

The delivery of the second pair to LLWR will signal a re-start of transports by rail of legacy PCM for storage at Sellafield, which had been on hold for over 3 years until the Novapaks became available. Inactive handling trials will start in mid-September, before they enter service.

Alan Jackson, LLWR Programme Manager, said:

It has taken us over 2 years to get to this point, and it has been a huge team effort, involving Sellafield, Magnox Ltd Harwell, ourselves, Bendalls Engineering and the Design Authority Nuvia.

We've had a few issues along the way, but it's the attitude that counts and the team was always been motivated to solve any problems and make progress. They've had a steely determination which was nice to see.

Bendalls won the £multi-million contract to produce six pairs of Novapaks, all of which will be completed and in service by mid-2018. Each package, around 2m³, will be in operation for a minimum of eight years and carry up to four, 200 litre drums of material.

Simon Williams, of Bendalls Engineering, said:

Turning ideas and design into an actual manufactured high specification piece of kit is always a challenge.

By working closely with the LLWR team and the Design Authority, we have together reached this significant milestone and captured a lot of learning and experience that can be applied to the remaining pairs yet to be manufactured.

In addition to supporting manufacture, Nuvia, through commercial arrangements

with LLWR, will support the Novapaks' full life cycle operation.

[Find out more about Low Level Waste Repository in Cumbria](#)

[Find out more about radioactive waste in the UK](#)

Press release: CMA clears Cardtronics and DirectCash Payments merger

Both companies supply pay-to-use and free-to-use cashpoints (ATMs) at sites across the UK.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) began investigating the merger in January, referring it for a phase 2 inquiry by an independent group of panel members in May.

This group considered whether the merger would reduce competition and result in higher surcharges at pay-to-use cashpoints.

In their [final report](#), published today, the inquiry group found that the presence of free-to-use ATMs, and the availability of alternative non-cash payment methods, are likely to constrain such surcharges at pay-to-use machines.

The group also found that contracts and relationships with the owners of sites at which ATMs are installed would limit the merged company's incentives to increase surcharges.

There was also evidence that ATM surcharges are not set according to local competition and that the merger would be unlikely to change this.

Alasdair Smith, CMA Inquiry Chair, said:

We've looked carefully at the scope for the merger to result in cashpoint users paying higher charges at pay-to-use ATMs. As part of our in-depth inquiry, we surveyed consumers and spoke to the owners of a wide range of premises at which these machines are installed.

We've found that the merger does not provide the merged company with an incentive to increase surcharges for people using pay-to-use ATMs, not least because of the increasing use of non-cash payment methods and the decline in the use of pay-to-use ATMs relative to free-to-use ATMs.

The final report has been published on the [case page](#), where all other information relating to the inquiry is available.

Notes for editors

1. The CMA is the UK's primary competition and consumer authority. It is an independent non-ministerial government department with responsibility for carrying out investigations into mergers, markets and the regulated industries and enforcing competition and consumer law.
2. The CMA referred the case for in-depth investigation on 15 May 2017. The group published its provisional findings report on 25 August 2017.
3. The members of the inquiry group are: [Alasdair Smith](#) (Chair), [Rosalind Hedley-Miller](#) and [Gavin Robert](#).
4. All the CMA's functions in phase 2 merger inquiries are performed by independent inquiry groups chosen from the CMA's panel members. The appointed inquiry group are the decision-makers on phase 2 inquiries.
5. The CMA's panel members come from a variety of backgrounds, including economics, law, accountancy and business; the membership of an inquiry group usually reflects a mix of expertise and experience.
6. For more information on the CMA see our homepage or follow us on Twitter [@CMAgovuk](#), [Flickr](#) and [LinkedIn](#) and like our [Facebook page](#). Sign up to our [email alerts](#) to receive updates on mergers cases.
7. Media enquiries should be directed to press@cma.gsi.gov.uk or 020 3738 6798.