

## Keir Starmer is in a spot of bother

Published: January 13, 2026, 4:45 am

---

To suggest that Keir Starmer is in a spot of bother with his [Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill](#).

This lot have, so far, [opposed his Bill](#) by tabling an amendment that effectively kills it. They are Labour MPs, and each and every one of them risks losing the Whip, and so their chance of reselection as the Labour candidate at the next general election (which they are going to lose anyway based on current progress), by doing so:

Dame Meg Hillier  
Debbie Abrahams  
Helen Hayes  
Sarah Owen  
Florence Eshalomi  
Paulette Hamilton

Mr Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi  
Patricia Ferguson  
Vicky Foxcroft  
Antonia Bance  
Dawn Butler  
Kirsteen Sullivan  
Ms Stella Creasy  
Matt Bishop  
Lee Pitcher  
Connor Naismith  
Charlotte Nichols  
Josh Fenton-Glynn  
Tracy Gilbert  
Adam Jogee  
Daniel Francis  
Kirith Entwistle  
Yasmin Qureshi  
Elaine Stewart  
Marsha De Cordova  
Lizzi Collinge  
Fabian Hamilton  
Mr Richard Quigley  
Sam Rushworth  
Richard Burgon  
Amanda Hack  
Paula Barker  
Dr Simon Opher  
Apsana Begum  
John McDonnell  
Kim Johnson  
Imran Hussain  
Steve Witherden  
Jen Craft  
Grahame Morris

Cat Smith  
Ruth Jones  
Olivia Blake  
Laurence Turner  
Yuan Yang  
Lee Barron  
Ben Coleman  
Sadik Al-Hassan  
Lauren Edwards  
Matt Western  
Kate Osamor  
Sarah Hall  
Gill Furniss  
Maya Ellis  
Jo Platt  
Henry Tufnell  
Mohammad Yasin  
Dr Allison Gardner  
Kevin McKenna  
Melanie Onn  
Ms Polly Billington  
Ms Marie Rimmer  
Dr Rosena Allin-Khan  
Kate Osborne  
Rebecca Long Bailey  
Cat Eccles  
Ian Lavery  
Chris Hinchliff  
Nadia Whittome  
Andy McDonald  
Euan Stainbank  
Mary Kelly Foy  
James Naish  
Navendu Mishra

Ruth Cadbury  
Louise Haigh  
Anneliese Midgley  
Anna Dixon  
Richard Baker  
Mr Jonathan Brash  
Mr Clive Betts  
Abtisam Mohamed  
Tony Vaughan  
Paul Davies  
Chris Webb  
Dr Scott Arthur  
Dr Beccy Cooper  
Alison Hume  
Patrick Hurley  
Darren Paffey  
Peter Lamb  
Lillian Jones  
Clive Efford  
Andrew Cooper  
David Williams  
Samantha Niblett  
Emma Lewell  
Rachael Maskell  
Bell Ribeiro-Addy  
Jon Trickett  
Neil Duncan-Jordan  
Ian Byrne  
Ms Diane Abbott  
Brian Leishman  
Lorraine Beavers  
Clive Lewis  
Terry Jermy  
Jenny Riddell-Carpenter

Their amendment, which is, I think, bound to be called by the Speaker, because it is the one with by far the largest number of supporters, says (and I have added bullet points to make it more readable than the form in which parliament demands it be written):

*That this House, whilst noting the need for the reform of the social security system, and agreeing with the Government's principles for providing support to people into work and protecting people who cannot work, declines to give a Second Reading to the Universal Credit and Personal Independent Payment Bill:*

- \* because its provisions have not been subject to a formal consultation with disabled people, or co-produced with them, or their carers;*
- \* because the Office for Budget Responsibility is not due to publish its analysis of the employment impact of these reforms until the autumn of 2025;*
- \* because the majority of the additional employment support funding will not be in place until the end of the decade;*
- \* because the Government's own impact assessment estimates that 250,000 people will be pushed into poverty as a result of these provisions, including 50,000 children;*
- \* because the Government has not published an assessment of the impact of these reforms on health or care needs;*
- \* because the Government is still awaiting the findings of the Minister for Social Security and Disability's review into the assessment for Personal Independence Payment and Sir Charlie Mayfield's independent review into the role of employers and government in boosting the employment of disabled people and people with long-term health conditions.*

This is a damning indictment of Labour, by Labour.

The Starmer-Reeves-Kendall axis behind this Bill is exposed as uncaring, unthoughtful, ill-prepared and dogmatically driven by the amendment.

What is more, it is clear that those signing are suggesting that Starmer's government is guilty of just not caring. There is little more to it than that; that is the suggestion that is on the table.

I applaud those who have rebelled. They have shown courage, so far. Many will have done so for the first time since being elected. It is much easier to do so again, thereafter. They do, of course, need to see this through.

Starmer faces a loss in the House because, despite the stupid words Kemi Badenoch has had to offer, of course, he is not going to turn to her for support.

So what will happen? I think a screeching U-Turn is likely.

But the real question is, what then?

Will the message be heard?

Will Labour change direction?

Will it understand that short-term deficits to pump prime payments that create wealth and multiplier effects are worth doing?

Will it realise that this idea needs to be widely used?

Or will Reeves announce another round of deeply damaging cuts in reaction, saying that the City demands it, when it very clearly does not?

The immediate focus is appropriate. But the next rounds are where the real action is now going to be.

Starmer will lose in the Commons to his backbenchers on payments to people with disabilities. But the real question is, what happens then? Can he survive in a Labour Party he has lost control of?