

## 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 Joge

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 Jermyn

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?