



HOUSE OF LORDS

Library Note

Maiden Speeches

This House of Lords Library Note provides the text of selected recent maiden speeches to illustrate the range of styles and subjects covered by new Members in their first contribution in the Chamber. It also includes an index of Members' maiden speeches in the Lords since 2006.

Joanna Davies and Louisa Bentley
20 August 2010
LLN 2010/019

House of Lords Library Notes are compiled for the benefit of Members of Parliament and their personal staff. Authors are available to discuss the contents of the Notes with the Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public.

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

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Baroness Donaghy, 22 July 2010, Debate on Poverty	2
3. Lord Boateng, 22 July 2010, Debate on Poverty	4
4. Baroness Drake, 21 July 2010, Debate on Women in Society	5
5. Lord German, 15 July 2010, Debate on Criminal Justice System.....	7
6. Lord Willis of Knaresborough, 9 July 2010, Debate on Defamation Bill.....	9
7. Bishop of Derby, 1 July 2010, Debate on Local Communities	11
8. Lord Wei, 16 June 2010, Debate on Social Policy	13
9. Lord Aberdare, 26 November 2009, Debate on Queen's Speech	15
10. Lord Sacks, 26 November 2009, Debate on Queen's Speech	17
11. Lord Freud, 10 July 2009, Debate on Autism Bill.....	19
12. Bishop of Bath and Wells, 4 December 2008, Debate on Queen's Speech	20
13. Lord Mandelson, 16 October 2008, Debate on Enterprise Act 2002 (Specification of Additional Section 58 Consideration) Order 2008.....	22
14. Lord Bates, 7 October 2008, Debate on Millennium Development Goals.....	23
15. Baroness Afshar, 6 March 2008, Debate on Women: Government Policy	24
16. Baroness Warsi, 23 October 2007, Debate on Middle East and Afghanistan.....	26
17. Baroness Campbell of Surbiton, 20 June 2007, Debate on Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill.....	27
18. Index to maiden speeches since 2006.....	29

1. Introduction

The initial speech made by a Member of the House of Lords is known as a maiden speech and is by tradition an occasion marked with respect by the House.

A maiden speech can take place at any time after a Member has been introduced, taken the oath and signed the register. Until a new Member has made their maiden speech they may not table oral questions or questions for short debate, but may table questions for written answer.

It is usual for a Member making a maiden speech not to be interrupted and to be congratulated by the next speaker, on behalf of the whole House. During a maiden speech and the following speaker's congratulations, it is expected that Members will remain seated and not enter or leave the Chamber.

In order for the House to apply these conventions, maiden speeches are usually made in a debate with a speakers list. The speech itself is expected to be short (less than 10 minutes) and uncontroversial, not expressing views that would provoke an interruption.

This Library Note includes an index to maiden speeches made in the 2006–07, 2007–08, 2009–10 and 2010–11 sessions, up to the 26 July 2010. It also includes the full text of a sample of recent speeches selected to give a cross-section of Members from different parties and affiliations.

The procedures relating to maiden speeches are set out in the *Companion to the Standing Orders and Guide to the Proceedings of the House of Lords* (2010 edition)—[sections 4.45–4.47](#).

2. Baroness Donaghy, 22 July 2010, Debate on Poverty

My Lords, since I was introduced on 1 July, I have been overwhelmed by the warmth of my welcome and the generosity of noble Lords on all sides of the House in sharing their experiences with me. I am grateful, too, for the dedication and friendliness of the staff, who seem to be able to read my mind when I am uncertain about geographical direction or procedure. I thank them most sincerely for their care and support.

As a former chair of ACAS, my first instincts are to form a consensus based on bringing the parties together. I am not sure whether those skills will be useful in this House. I know from experience that, when the going gets tough, it is difficult to promote agreement between employer and workers but that it is infinitely more difficult on occasion to achieve agreement among members of the same side. If the coalition Government were ever in need of mediation skills, I would be available.

ACAS's contribution to the modernisation of public services was to recognise that the world of work was not just about collective bargaining but about the millions of individuals, both employers and employees, needing advice. Radical changes were achieved with the involvement and consent of the staff and trade unions in ACAS, and without the demotivating effect of so many pronouncements about public service workers. Calls to the ACAS helpline amounted to 1.2 million last year, and the website is much praised by employers and employees because of its quality and impartiality.

The subject of poverty has been a theme that has threaded throughout my life. On the day of my introduction to this House, one of my cousins gave me a copy of a payslip belonging to our late grandfather, Arthur Howard. It was for £1.53, dated 11 November 1933, and came from New Monckton Collieries near Barnsley, where he worked for most of his life. He brought up four daughters on that wage, played the cello and built the first television in Worsbrough Common. He had no money but a wealth of talent and unfulfilled promise. My own parents taught me the value of work, education and caring for others.

After university, I worked at the Institute of Education in London for 33 years. I had become an assistant registrar at a very early age and was probably destined to be a registrar or secretary, or to fill a role with one of the newer titles in universities today. I was fortunate to work for the great Lionel Elvin, our director, who had been a member of both the Robbins and McNair committees, and then with Sir William Taylor. Both instilled in me the importance of teacher training and education. So what happened to change me from going in the direction of a potentially glittering university career?

The institute took a decision in 1969 not to give a pay rise to its clerical and library staff on the ground of affordability. Academics were given a pay rise. I decided that it was patently unfair to pick on the lower paid and helped to form a union branch of NALGO. No one had ever been in a union before. We lobbied the institute and were awarded our pay rise, backdated. I carried on recruiting members and for 16 years was privileged to represent all clerical and related staff in universities in their pay negotiations, and set up national pay scales for the first time. Ninety per cent of the members were women and 90 per cent were first-generation trade union members. I spent most of my career boxing and coxing between my paid employment and my unpaid trade union activity. I moved within the institute to become permanent secretary of the students' union and was licensee of the union bar for 16 years. I am aware that some noble Lords on different sides of the House have owned breweries, and it is possible that some of them have been their occasional customers, but I suspect that very few have actually been licensees.

After 13 years on the TUC General Council, I became its president. I would chair the General Council and then sometimes appear before the magistrates' court to apply for an extension to opening hours in the students' union bar. Such were the contrasts in my dual life.

In 1997, the continuing theme of poverty arose when I was appointed a founding member of the Low Pay Commission. This was an absolutely wonderful experience, and I like to think that my practical experience of wage structures and the impact of low wages helped to set up a framework that is virtually intact today. We learnt that poverty is complex—a single mother in the south-east would have to earn over £17 an hour to make up any loss in benefits—yet we fixed on £3.60 an hour because the minimum wage cannot solve everything. We learnt that poverty is not a north/south or even a regional phenomenon. The largest proportion of low-paid workers, in terms of population, live in London and the south-east. We also learnt that the low paid need no lessons in hard work or the ability to calculate their earnings. Observing textile workers calculate their complex piece-rate earnings in their heads to the nearest penny would impress any mathematician.

The noble Baroness, Lady Wilcox, in moving the regulations concerning the national minimum wage on Monday, was kind enough to say that the proposed increase for this October,

“strikes the right balance between ensuring that low-paid workers are treated fairly and preventing adverse economic effects. It is based on sound evidence and consultation, and takes into account the present economic circumstances”—
[Official Report, 19/7/10; col. 888.]

Those criteria were established at the start of the Low Pay Commission's work, and it is gratifying to see that this evidence-based work continues and is appreciated by the Government.

I am aware of the recent short debate on poverty on 15 June, initiated by the noble Lord, Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope, and of the excellent contributions that were made. It is not my intention to go over the same ground. I am aware that the measure for poverty might seem like a dry academic debate to some, but if an official poverty measure is changed, it can be used as a respectable excuse for taking away support systems from those who do not fit the new criteria. The Government have promised to maintain the target of ending child poverty in the UK by 2020, and I shall watch this with interest.

There are people now seeking work who are healthy and motivated and have a good employment history, but they cannot find work, so how will those with disabilities, language and literacy barriers or no work record find work? Joblessness is a scourge on any society and the Government will be judged on how many people are unemployed. The margin between poverty and just about managing is perilously narrow. Cutting pennies here and there from benefits, VAT costs, pay and pensions may not seem a lot to those who are privileged to lead society, but together they will have a catastrophic outcome for individual families.

We are a country of extremes in income and no Government have solved that particular inequality. I make a plea to this Government that more work should be done on why we are a relatively low-wage society. Average earnings of £24,000 a year include paid overtime—mainly done by men—and City bonuses. That completely distorts the real situation. Just as we on the Low Pay Commission discovered, women who earned too little to pay national insurance did not appear on any statistics and could not therefore be counted as a group that might benefit from a national minimum wage. Clearly, steps

were taken to rectify the Alice in Wonderland situation, but it shows that statistics without common sense and grounded reality can be used to hold back progress, sometimes unintentionally and sometimes not.

The *Economist* on 3 July stated:

“The past decade made a disappointingly small dent in poverty, but it may be the best time the poor will know for many years”.

I look for an assurance from Ministers that that grim forecast will not be realised.

In conclusion, I thank my two sponsors, my noble friends Lady Dean of Thornton-le-Fylde and Lord McKenzie of Luton for all their help and encouragement. I offer particular thanks to my noble friend Lord McKenzie for raising this topic today and for giving me an opportunity to make my maiden speech on a subject about which I feel so passionately.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1103–5\)](#)

3. Lord Boateng, 22 July 2010, Debate on Poverty

My Lords, in thanking the noble Lord, Lord McKenzie of Luton, for initiating this debate, I confess a degree of trepidation in speaking to your Lordships' House for the first time. That trepidation is in no way engendered by the kindness and warmth shown to me and my fellow newcomers to this House by all Members, officers and staff, but by the requirement to be both brief and uncontroversial. That does not come naturally to me. Given the rather rueful faces of some of my noble friends, I think that they probably share that view. Nevertheless, one will do one's best. I am encouraged in that by the traditions of this House. I first encountered those traditions on the very first occasion that I came to the Palace of Westminster many years ago. I came here wearing flares and with an Afro—when one had hair and wore flares—which tells noble Lords just how long ago that was; it was 14 December 1978.

I came here as a young lawyer accompanying a group of black women from the London Borough of Lewisham. They were concerned about what was happening to their children and other young people in Lewisham—black and white, but largely black—in relation to a piece of legislation known as the sus laws. These women had attempted to initiate a debate about the sus laws in the other place. They had a great deal of support for that from their then local MP, Chris Price, but they did not succeed. The then Labour Government did not want to debate the sus laws or to hear from this group of black women in Lewisham. It was your Lordships' House that found the time and the space to discuss this matter in a debate on a Private Member's Bill on the sus laws initiated by the noble Lord, Lord Avebury. I will never forget it, nor will I will forget the respect that was shown to these women and their concerns by the noble Lord and by the late Lord Pitt, who was one of the first Afro-Caribbeans—my race—to find a place and a welcome in your Lordships' House. He was an inspiration to many of us.

I also remember the contribution of the late Lord Gardiner and the response of the Minister in this House at that time. This House listened. The Motion was not carried, but subsequently a Conservative Government—due very largely to the heroic efforts not only of those women but of the right honourable Sir John Wheeler—abolished this unfair and discriminatory piece of legislation. However, it was this House, with its tradition of being responsive to the needs of those who might otherwise not get a hearing—the poor and the dispossessed—which showed the way. That taught me something which I have not

forgotten in the course of my subsequent career in the law and in politics, and which strengthens my resolve to put before your Lordships a concern that those women in Lewisham would have wanted this House to hear, were they here today. It is a concern about the impact of the Budget, and a number of its proposals, on a group of young people who all too often are not heard in our society—young people at risk and young people in care. These are some of the most vulnerable young people in our society. They do not have much of a chance because they tend to go into care, having been subjected to abuse and disadvantage in myriad ways. When they are in care, I fear that the state does not prove to be a very good parent.

This Budget was introduced in the context of the notion of the big society. It seems to me that if the big society is to live up to its name, it has to find a place within it for young people at risk and young people in care. I learned, in the course of putting together the Green Paper *Every Child Matters*, way back in 2003, that young people at risk and young people in care are to be found not just in the inner cities of our country, but in rural areas too, because poverty and deprivation can be found all over our land. Young people—young people at risk and young people in care—tend to be the least advantaged of all.

The big society is often juxtaposed with the big state. That is a false dichotomy. It is not a question of whether or not you have a big society or a big state; it must surely be a question as to whether or not the state empowers and enables citizens to make a contribution, to come together to care, and to form sustainable and cohesive communities. I fear that aspects of this Budget work against that. The removal of ring-fencing in terms of local authority grants will, I fear—I am not alone in this; it is a fear shared by many in local government, many social workers and many who run voluntary organisations—lead to a collapse in funding for voluntary organisations, cutbacks in the special support services provided to children in care and children at risk. That would be damaging.

I ask the noble Lord who will reply for the Government in this debate: please, please, in the course of the spending review that must take place, and is taking place, make sure that there is a stream of work that looks at the impact of the budgetary provisions that we are debating on those children in care and children at risk, and the voluntary organisations that serve them, who will inevitably be affected by the increase in VAT and who do not have a rebate system upon which they can rely.

I ask the noble Lord to think also about how the office of the Children's Commissioner, which is being reviewed, can be strengthened in such a way that it is answerable to Parliament. The Children's Commissioner should be appointed by Parliament and have a specific remit to examine the implications of all Budgets, presented in any circumstances, on children and young people at risk, so that they do not as a result of a side wind or neglect lead to their being further disadvantaged.

I hope that I have been brief and uncontroversial—because this cause can unite the whole House—but none the less passionate.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1098–100\)](#)

4. Baroness Drake, 21 July 2010, Debate on Women in Society

My Lords, I begin by thanking your Lordships warmly for the quality and depth of the welcome I have received. I am also most grateful to my sponsors, my noble friends Lord

Young and Lady Warwick, for their kindness and their generous support. I wish to thank all the staff who have been so helpful, and for the courtesy extended to my father on the day of my introduction, it being necessary for him to use a wheelchair and his portable oxygen cylinder. It made the day so memorable for him and I extend my heartfelt personal thanks.

I was born in a small Devon village not far from Plymouth, which makes me a Plymouth Drake. As a little girl I gazed in wonder at some of the great ships moored at Devonport dockyard, so it was fitting to see the Armada exhibition in the Royal Gallery. In 1588, the English—including Sir Francis Drake—were the beneficiaries of a kind of stand-off between the Dutch and the Spanish. Unfortunately, in 2010, an almost equally belligerent contest between those countries in the World Cup was final confirmation that the English had already been sunk.

I worked for many years in the trade union movement. I was an equal opportunities commissioner on a commission which, with a small budget and talented staff, was able to punch well above its weight. For the past eight years I have been engaged in pension policy and reform, whether as a member of the Pensions Commission chaired by the noble Lord, Lord Turner, at the Pension Protection Fund, or in the building of the National Employment Savings Trust.

When young, I purchased a copy of the May 1909 edition of the journal *Votes for Women*, edited by Frederick and Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence. I reread this precious purchase recently and was reminded of the intensity of that campaign. Perhaps I may share with noble Lords an extract from that edition, which refers to the occasion of a visit in that year by Mr Winston Churchill to Manchester:

“Wherever he went he found that he could not get away from the subject of ‘Votes for Women’ and although the most elaborate precautions had been taken to exclude women from the great meeting in the Free Trade Hall ... when Mr Churchill raised his voice to congratulate himself on the absence of suffragettes ... he was immediately interrupted by Miss F Clarkson and Miss Helen Tolson ... who had been hiding [there] all night”.

Mr Churchill’s arrival at the city was equally disturbed:

“All the way to the Reform Club he was pursued by a Miss Drummond in a taxicab, who asked him, THROUGH THE MEGAPHONE, when he intended to deal with the women’s grievance”.

In preparing for this debate, I took the opportunity to read the very first maiden speech of a lady Peer. On 4 November 1958, Lady Elliot of Harwood, on the occasion of her maiden speech, remarked:

“I am very conscious that, except for Her Majesty’s gracious Opening of Parliament, probably this is the first occasion in 900 years that the voice of a woman has been heard in the deliberations of this House”.

She then added wryly:

“I shall try to set a precedent and be short and to the point”.—[Official Report, 4/11/1958; col. 161.]

We have come a long way since 1909, but 10 years into the 21st century we still see substantial under-representation of women in political and public life. It is not the ability

of women but the barriers they face which prevent them from contributing to their full potential and to being effectively represented. This point was recognised by Lady Elliot in that first speech. She acknowledged that she was making history but concluded insightfully that,

“we who are women may be regarded as having come here not because we are women but rather because women are now admitted”.—[Official Report, 4/11/58; col. 166.]

Women are performing strongly in education. The report of the National Equality Panel in 2010, headed by Professor Hills, confirmed that of every 100 pupils, girls have a median achievement ranked between eight and 12 places higher than the median achievement for boys. More women now have higher education qualifications than men in every age group up to the age of 44.

This performance by women, however, contrasts negatively with their wider representation in public life. In 2010, the percentage of women MPs and lady Peers had increased to a little over 20 per cent, but the figures are far fewer, as has been demonstrated, for FTSE 100 directors, editors of national newspapers, senior police officers, high court judges and a long list of so many other professions.

However, underutilising a large proportion of the country’s talent is not good for UK plc. Equality of access should not be seen exclusively as an issue of social policy; it is also a matter of economic importance. To borrow from a UK Treasury Committee report published earlier this year,

“not wasting a large proportion of talent seem more than sufficient to conclude that increased gender diversity is desirable”

and who ever argues with the Treasury or a Treasury Committee?

There are many causes contributing to the underutilisation of women’s potential, but these matters should not be solved by an over-reliance on litigation. There needs to be a collective will to address these issues. With the growing acknowledgement of the basic fairness in representing half the population and enriching decision-making by drawing on a full range of experience and expertise, countries are increasingly considering the merits of positive action on gender representation. The democratic process and business decision-making can only be enhanced by the increase in women’s representation.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1008–9\)](#)

5. Lord German, 15 July 2010, Debate on Criminal Justice System

My Lords, you took a very brave step in allowing a German to be introduced into your Lordships’ House just a few days after England’s defeat in the World Cup. The extremely generous-hearted way in which I have been received has, however, received a few knocks in my first week or so. Just last Friday, my noble friend Lord Lester, in his Defamation Bill, talked of the German ad hoc balancing law. I know the Liberal Democrats favour fair representation, but it made me wonder who I was to be balanced with. Then this week, in questions about your Lordships’ murals, there was a request for the German specialist to be brought in.

I realise that I am to be very careful indeed to observe the frequent exhortations coming my way, but I can tell noble Lords that this German is not German, and neither is he English. The name derives from a 5th century bishop called Germanus, who came from Auxerre; he was dispatched by the Pope to the western parts of this country to return the people to the authentic Christian fold whose followers took on his name. Spelling was not a strong feature of 5th century Britain, so many derivations of the name survive today. There is a street in London named after one of them—Jermyn—and there are Jermin, Germaine and the like. It is reported that the bishop Germanus won the people over to the Augustinian teachings of divine grace by using his superior rhetoric, so no pressure there.

I am privileged to join the growing number of Members of your Lordships' House who have been Members of the devolved Assemblies and Parliaments. I am the first Member of the National Assembly for Wales not to have been to the other place, and I look forward to using that experience to help the Assembly to develop and to questioning my noble friend Lord Wallace of Tankerness on his new responsibilities for my country.

I wish to say something about my experience of prisoner education and the problems with it. There are two prisons close to my home. They are in the area that I represented until just a few weeks ago. One, at Usk, is a secure Victorian building that was built on the monastic level, which the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Liverpool talked about earlier. It houses many medium and long-term sentence offenders. The other, in nearby countryside, is an open prison. Both have the same management team, and both represent different ends of the spectrum of prisons in our country.

A few years ago I received a request from the head of training and skills at these prisons to assist them with the qualification structure of the training programmes that they could offer offenders, and to see whether they could be made more appropriate to the world of work. This was my first introduction to the link between reoffending and reintegration, and the importance of skills to that link. It soon became clear to me that much needed to be done to improve both reoffending rates and the level of ex-offender reintegration into the community.

For those who seek level 2 vocational qualifications and beyond, it is nigh on impossible to achieve them while in prison. The NVQ requires an element of work-based on-the-job experience that cannot be provided in a closed prison environment. These NVQs are needed to provide a ticket to a place of work. City and Guilds-type qualifications are used as a route to the NVQ, but no matter how well a prison can simulate the workplace, this will be insufficient to provide the necessary qualification.

On a visit to a very large prison in Doncaster, I saw a two-storey house that had been completely built from scratch by offenders inside a former aircraft hangar. It had fully functioning plumbing and central heating and a fully fitted kitchen, and it was tastefully decorated. After it had been built, it was completely demolished. Even the construction of the finished object was insufficient to gain an NVQ in any of the craft skills needed such as plumbing, plastering, carpentry, construction, electricals and so on. The examining bodies will not accept a fully constructed building in an aircraft hangar as appropriate on-the-job training.

The only solution to gaining these types of qualification is to get an appropriate work placement following release, and these are not easy to come by. As a report last year from the Prisoners' Education Trust revealed, 87 per cent of offenders surveyed believed that few employers recruit ex-offenders, although there are notable examples of good practice such as National Grid Transco, which employs ex-offenders and takes them on training programmes. The evidence from employers is clear; core skills are a very

much needed element in the mix of skills to be learnt on the job, even though a start can be made in simulated surroundings. Punctuality, working with others, literacy and numeracy are key to success in holding down a job.

There is much research now on the nature of the support that is needed on release to lead to possible successful reintegration into society. In essence, it can be summed up in four words: family, roof, job, and cash—reintegration into some form of family life, a secure home, a job or work placement, and help to manage on a limited income. A Select Committee in the other place recommended:

“If the purpose of providing education and training in prisons is to reduce reoffending by enabling prisoners to gain secure employment, then the continuation of support and programmes on release is essential. The Government needs to: produce an overarching resettlement strategy for prisoners; commit to the continuity of provision of education and training on release”.

My experience was that much more needs to be done if we are to succeed in resettling ex-offenders effectively. For some, perhaps many, prison is not the right solution for reintegration. We are told that reoffending costs the taxpayer £10 billion a year, that there are no robust statistics on those who are successfully reintegrated into society, and that an overarching resettlement strategy will be expensive. This leads me to conclude that we must punish the wrongdoers, but we must also ensure that we help them to get on to the straight and narrow. Not doing so will contribute further to the fracturing of the social fabric of our country.

Finally, I thank all the officials, colleagues and Members of this House for the great kindness that I have been shown in the past few weeks. There is so much to learn, and everyone has gone out of their way to introduce me to the work and operation of this very kind and friendly place.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 792–4\)](#)

6. Lord Willis of Knaresborough, 9 July 2010, Debate on Defamation Bill

My Lords, it is with a sense of pride and a little humility that I rise to speak in your Lordships' House for the first time. I must confess to a little trepidation at having to follow the noble Lord, Lord Pannick. I hope that it will not be necessary, but if it is, I hope that he will defend me on some future occasion.

To be able to contribute to this Second Reading debate on the Defamation Bill, which was introduced so expertly by my noble friend Lord Lester, is a huge privilege, although when he invited me to speak, I little thought that the cast he would assemble would read like a Who's Who of legal nobility.

I have no noble pedigree to bring to the House, although I follow in the steps of the first Baron Knaresborough, Sir Henry Meysey Meysey-Thompson, who was also a Liberal MP for the town. However, having opposed Gladstone's Home Rule Bill and joined the breakaway Liberal Unionist Party to form an alliance with the Conservative Party, he lost his seat. Indeed, Knaresborough has a tradition of being associated with some rather awkward politicians. The early Lords of Knaresborough include Hugh de Morville who, having been granted the Honour of Knaresborough in 1158, went on to plot the murder of Archbishop Thomas Becket before fleeing back to Knaresborough for safety. I notice

that there are no Bishops on their Benches today. It was not surprising therefore that King John, who loved hunting in the forest of Knarborough, took the title Honour of Knarborough for himself in 1210, some five years before he signed the Magna Carta.

Walking through the Lobby yesterday, I noticed a copy of Magna Carta on the wall. It reminded me of the 34 years I spent teaching and my first post teaching history at Middleton County Secondary Boys' School in Leeds. The head teacher, who was more renowned for his discipline than his educational philosophy, insisted that the boys must learn the lessons of Magna Carta to remind them of the freedoms and rights we have won to secure their future. Today's debate is a timely reminder of that duty and why the Defamation Bill is of such profound importance.

Clause 29 of Magna Carta states:

"We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right".

Yet so abused have our libel laws become that justice and right are constantly being denied to a wide spectrum of individuals and organisations who wish to question the truth, interpret the facts or comment on what they believe to be right. What is more, the ideal that,

"We will sell to no man ... either Justice or Right",

has become a cruel parody where the UK has not only become the world capital for "libel tourism", with other Governments like the United States passing laws to limit damage to their citizens, but our citizens are increasingly being silenced by the cost of defending even the most valid of expressed opinion, with only the bravest of defendants risking their livelihoods to fight for justice and right.

It is noteworthy and laudable that much of the recent push for libel law reform has come not just from writers, media editors and lawyers. Ben Goldacre, Simon Singh, Peter Wilmshurst and Henrik Thomsen are clinicians and scientists, and it is the medical and scientific world that has recognised that there is no greater public interest in free expression than the ability, in good faith, robustly to criticise medical claims whether they be from homeopaths or big pharmaceutical companies.

This Bill, as my noble friend has said, is largely a consolidation effort. It attempts to clarify and bring up to date what my noble friend's explanatory notes describe as,

"a history of piecemeal and incomplete reform ... over the course of seventy years".

As such, it deserves the support of this House.

Indeed all three major political parties at the recent general election backed the Libel Reform Campaign led so ably by Dr Evan Harris and by Sense about Science, an organisation founded by my noble friend Lord Taverne and run by the resourceful and energetic Tracey Brown. All concerned welcomed the coalition Government's announcement in the Queen's Speech for,

"Legislation ... to restore freedoms and civil liberties".

This Bill is the first test of that commitment.

However, without wishing to be contentious, I hope that my noble friend would agree that the Bill is capable of improvement as it goes through this House, and I should like to suggest a couple of areas. The appalling abuse of our libel law by NMT Medical Incorporated in the United States to silence the legitimate criticism of Dr Wilmshurst over its STARF1ex device for closing holes in the heart is a clear example of why more needs to be done to prevent the so-called “chilling effect” of our own laws. Nor is Peter Wilmshurst’s case unique. Some 10 per cent of all libel actions in the UK over past six years have involved scientists or academics. The costs of defending and especially of losing an action can be devastating. So I ask my noble friend: should companies and associations even be able to sue for libel? They cannot do so in other jurisdictions. Surely they should rely on malicious falsehood only?

Finally, there is growing evidence that scientists are finding difficulty having articles which have been subjected to assiduous peer review published in serious journals. Fiona Godlee, the current editor of the *British Medical Journal*, has made the point that she is frequently in receipt of letters from lawyers for pharmaceutical companies threatening legal action if criticism of a treatment or a trial is not toned down. A journal cannot risk its viability on a lengthy trial against a complainant with deep pockets, and so the article must be altered or rejected. So we have more chilling of scientific debate. Yet we do not know how many drug scandals are out there, such as the suppression of research data by Merck on the anti-inflammatory drug Vioxx.

What we do know is that we can better protect public interest if properly peer reviewed academic and scientific work was considered to be qualified privilege and thus intimidatory actions could be struck out at an early stage. I appreciate that a journal could rely on the statutory defence set out in Clause 1, that it had acted responsibly, but a defendant would still have to prove that in court, with all the financial risks involved in taking a case to a final hearing where that question is determined. Being able to rely on an a priori defence of qualified privilege would short-circuit the process, as well as having the huge benefit of incentivising journals to use the highest possible quality peer review, and making it clear to writers that only by choosing peer reviewed publications would they gain protection as well as credence for their work.

In ending, may I say how grateful I and indeed my family have been for the courtesy and kindness extended to me during my induction and introduction to the House, and I thank in particular the staff for their patience and support. I thank also your Lordships for your patience during this, my first humble contribution to your proceedings. I trust that the Government will heed the wise advice of my noble friend Lord Lester and make this Bill part of a process to renew our defamation law.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 447–9\)](#)

7. Bishop of Derby, 1 July 2010, Debate on Local Communities

My Lords, I begin by thanking your Lordships very warmly for the quality and depth of the welcome that I have received. People who read *Hansard* may think that this is a purely formal convention, but I have been overwhelmed by the graciousness of your Lordships. I have been accosted in the bar and in corridors by people who want to shake my hand and say “welcome”, and I am truly grateful for that—strangers who want to become friends. That is a very interesting notion of how we make a community in this place and what might lie behind some of this debate—strangers wanting to become friends. It is part of the gospel that I stand for as a priest—trying to encourage strangers to become friends with their maker and with each other—and I am very impressed with the

evangelical fervour with which Members of this House have the desire to help strangers become friends. I thank noble Lords for their welcome.

The right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Southwark, whose place I take, had a long and distinguished service in this House, to which I pay tribute. I do not think that I will be able to emulate it, but one small point of continuity is that I have succeeded him as co-chair of the Inter Faith Network, which brings together people of all kinds of faith perspectives, from the great nine faiths, in local and regional groups to work together and listen to each other—strangers seeking to become friends. That work provides a context for this debate. In our diocese of Derby, I chair the Multi-Faith Centre at the University of Derby, which in a small, local way tries to continue that work. We have heard about the power of the English tradition of street parties. Last week, I had 40 faith leaders for an evening in my garden, where the devolution of strawberries and cream achieved great effect in helping strangers to become friends.

The diocese of Derby does not simply deal with interfaith matters. It is a very mixed diocese. There are great urban areas such as Derby and Chesterfield. There is the former coalmining district on our border with Nottinghamshire, where there is an urgent need for community regeneration; and there is the classic English scene of market towns and villages in the Peak District, one of the most visited areas of our country, where we face issues such as how communities survive in terms of affordable housing, and the future of farming.

It might be interesting for this debate to train a lens on one small part of our diocese and ask what it might mean to—as the noble Baroness said—return power to the people. What is community if it is not about helping strangers to become friends? What might that look like through the lens of one small part of our diocese? I refer noble Lords to a part of the diocese in the centre of Derby, in the inner city. This area covers 0.75 square miles and in it live 15,000 people of more than 100 nationalities. How do those strangers become friends? There are issues about housing, health and the environment. What will local enterprise partnerships and the devolution of planning and housing powers contribute to that scenario? If we ask the people in that 0.75 of a square mile what they desire to help strangers to become friends and grow community, they identify three things: they want community safety, because there is a high level of drug trading, drinking and prostitution; they want community cohesion, because the temptation of all these different national groups is to live in their own shell in a protective way; and they want an environment that is pleasant to live in and not dominated by graffiti, litter and poor housing.

So how can power be given to people in a small area such as that? There is, as the noble Baroness said, amazing energy and initiative there. There are 80 public buildings, and 66 organisations offering 212 types of activity and service. Sixty per cent of that local energy comes from the faith communities—half of it from the Christian churches. Despite all the challenges and problems in a small area such as that, the people have enormous energy and a desire to make community. It seems to me that the great challenge of this debate and the whole big society programme is how the devolution of power downwards, whether it is in planning, housing or local enterprise boards, can meet the energy, commitment and initiative coming upwards from people who desperately want the resourcing and capacity to help strangers to become friends and for community to grow.

I thank noble Lords for the warmth of their welcome and for making this stranger a friend in their presence.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1865–7\)](#)

8. Lord Wei, 16 June 2010, Debate on Social Policy

My Lords, I stand before you today a relative youth with much still to learn. Yet I have been humbled by the extraordinary welcome that I have been given by your Lordships: by my sponsors, the noble Lords, Lord Strathclyde and Lord Bates; by my mentor, the noble Baroness, Lady Seccombe; and by many other noble Lords, with their kind words. I also thank the dedicated staff who serve this House so admirably, for which I am extremely grateful, and without whom I would be literally lost every day. Not once has my youth been held against me: rather, I have been treated as a peer. I have been kindly and undeservedly given the experience and wisdom that graces this noble Chamber and its surroundings.

This contrast between my relative youth and the privilege of being able to be surrounded by others of much greater wisdom and experience than I reminds me of a time in my early childhood that shaped the man you see before you today. Unlike perhaps many second-generation Chinese born in this country, I had the joy and fortune not only to grow up in the company of others who emigrated from Hong Kong where my parents originated and from other parts of Asia but to enjoy the friendship of many wonderful English men and women of much experience who served at the Christian mission at which my father worked, and even to stay frequently with an English babysitter and her family. This early and subsequent exposure to people from different walks of life, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds has helped me time and again. It has given me what I know today is called social capital, particularly the bridging kind, and has allowed me to explore different worlds. It gave me an early understanding of civil society and its ability to transform your outlook and even your life.

After spending my formative years in London, my family moved to a part of Milton Keynes which I only recently discovered was mainly inhabited by another sort of émigré, people who had left the slums of east London in search of a better life in the 1960s and 1970s. Attending the local comprehensive school, I was exposed early to the kinds of social problems that come with having a low income and witnessed behaviour and the use of narcotics that I now still come across in east London where my family and I live today. I learnt above all that while income was an important factor in poverty, escaping it required much more than just financial capital; it required social capital. I was fortunate to have access to teachers and mentors who lent me theirs, who were supportive and who knew how to help me get into a great university.

At that university I learnt many things, but one experience stood out; I took part in a business competition run by a computer simulation in which different teams competed to make rounds of decisions in the hope of successfully producing virtually the best products and the greatest profit. My team won against the odds, which was most shocking because none of us had any business or higher mathematical training and many other teams were better qualified than ours. All we did was organise ourselves so that we could make any kind of useful decision faster and reasonably well. It taught me that ordinary people can, against the odds, out-perform expectations when they work together in groups. Over the years since that victory, I have been able to observe the same phenomenon in business, in education, in social enterprise, and now in civil society. To quote Margaret Mead's timeless phrase:

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed it is the only thing that ever has”.

This brings me on to the topic of today's debate, which I am thankful to the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Leicester for having initiated and which is very much close to my

heart. I have enjoyed the speeches so far and I look forward to those to follow. The debate is indeed incredibly well timed. The role of partnerships between government and civil society in shaping social policy is at the forefront of many minds in this country. There is much discussion in the nation at large about the associated phrase “the big society” and what it really means. As a regular citizen who has the privilege to speak today on this topic, I would like briefly not only to hazard an informed guess but to acknowledge a number of challenges that will need to be overcome to make such a vision—such effective partnerships—work, and then to close by highlighting the powerful role this House can and does play in facilitating such partnerships.

The big society, it would appear, operates at three levels. On one, it is a question that civil society is now, more than ever, being asked about what role it wants to play in shaping our collective social future, in driving long-term change and solving entrenched problems. The answer to the question can vary depending on one’s political inclinations, geography and past experiences, but the first step is to ask the question. There will be many different answers, many big societies, but the exciting development is that the topic of the debate in this House is also a topic of debate in many houses across this land, often for the first time in generations.

On another level, the big society describes a set of policies to give more powers to people closer to where they live, to help increase the capacity and resources of civil society to take up such powers, and to encourage a sense of collective progress and momentum since it can be hard to “bowl alone”. I shall defer to noble Lords speaking after me to further elaborate on these policies, but it would seem to me that this Government clearly wish to affirm that partnerships between government and civil society in shaping social policy are to be welcomed.

The third level at which the big society seems to operate beyond asking the question and setting out policies is that of nurturing an ecosystem. I describe this as the big society coral reef, because at the heart of this debate, in my humble opinion, is not just what civil society thinks social policy should be or even what government pronounces, but a collective and very British constitutional negotiation of a partnership for the 21st century that values and combines not just the seabed, the bedrock of our public services—to protect the vulnerable—but the coral represented by the many current and future providers of those services that add variety and innovation and humanity to their delivery. Last but not least it is the very fish that feed in these waters, the local citizen groups that can extend, vivify and shape this landscape in ambitious as well as humble ways. No single part of this ecosystem can or should dominate, but by working well together each comes to form a whole that is often more than the sum of its parts.

There will be challenges in realising such a partnership, as many attempts to forge it before have shown both here and abroad. I list a few of the possible risks: unclear goals leading to a dissipation of effort; a lack of even a moderate amount of resource to empower scalable citizen responses; institutional resistance to the change this approach entails; the capture of new powers by vested interests that are so off-putting to the apolitical citizen; and apathy or a lack of critical mass. Neither civil society or government, nor we in this House, should be under any illusion that the journey to achieving this 21st century partnership will not be long, arduous and filled with setbacks. But the state of our politics, the resourcefulness now required of our economy, and the multi-faceted and complex nature of the social policy challenges we face appear to me to invite us to travel down this path as far as it can take us over the coming years until a new, healthier, more vibrant balance can be found for the benefit of this nation: one that is built upon ancient values and traditions as well as the latest technology and ways of working.

This House can and does play a pivotal role in the success or failure of this journey, this partnership, this big society. It does so in three ways: in the tireless and passionate championing of charitable, social enterprise and other socially beneficial causes, whether with or without government support, which so many of your Lordships undertake; in the holding to account of government through debate and questioning; and in the recognition of whether particular laws government seeks to pass will strengthen or weaken civil society and the ability of local groups to thrive and flourish.

This House role models, defends and forges the very partnerships we are debating today. My hope is that as long as I am privileged to be a Member of it, and indeed at least until I can one day speak with the same experience and wisdom that your Lordships possess—which no doubt will not be for a very long time—this House will continue to be a source of inspiration for partnerships between government and civil society in houses up and down the land—houses which, like ours, are motivated by Gandhi’s timeless entreaty to,

“be the change you wish to see in the world”.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1010–13\)](#)

9. Lord Aberdare, 26 November 2009, Debate on Queen’s Speech

My Lords, some years ago I helped to organise an event in the Cholmondeley Room, in the course of which I had the opportunity to make a short speech of thanks. I said then that it would probably be the only speech that I would ever make in this House. As I make my maiden speech today, I hope that noble Lords will not feel too much regret that my powers of foresight proved so poor.

My arrival here would have been even more daunting were it not for the generous welcome I have received from your Lordships and the helpfulness of the staff of the House, who have shown great patience in putting me back on the right path when I have frequently strayed from it. In addition, I am fortified by the advantage of having two outstanding examples to follow in my efforts to contribute to this House. The first is that of Lord Bledisloe, in whose place I was elected. It is clear from what I have heard and read about him that I have substantial shoes to fill. The other is that of my father, Morys Aberdare, who was a member of this House for nearly 50 years, 16 of them as Chairman of Committees. They have set a high standard for me to try to live up to—as did the noble Lord, Lord Sacks, in his splendid maiden speech, which it is a great, if daunting, privilege to follow.

I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak in this debate on the Queen’s Speech and to offer some thoughts on education, particularly the transition from education to employment. I declare my interest as a director of two small social enterprises, WALTZ Programmes Ltd and The Twist Partnership Ltd. Both work to help people in London—mostly young and in disadvantaged or difficult circumstances, and many from ethnic minorities—to acquire the skills that they need to find and keep jobs.

Your Lordships will be aware that many young people are currently finding it extremely hard to get jobs, with the resultant danger that some may fall into a culture of worklessness and disillusion, if not despair. I welcome the range of efforts being made to tackle this issue and to help as many young people as possible to take the essential first step onto the employment ladder. Many of the young people we work with are disadvantaged not so much by their lack of knowledge and skills but by a lack of

aspiration and of self-belief. Surely a “joined-up” education system should address these needs as well. I am sometimes shocked that young people may come from families with not a single member in employment and may emerge from their education with little idea about work and jobs: what opportunities exist, what sort of work might suit them and what it actually involves—from basic things like punctuality and appearance to key skills such as communications and teamwork.

Part of the role of an education system should be to address issues like these that make it easier for young people to cross the bridge from education to employment, even if that has to be done through activities outside, or supplementary to, the mainline curriculum. These may include mentoring—even at an early age, in primary schools—after-school clubs, community engagement projects and especially activities involving local employers, such as talks, visits or work “taster” sessions, all of which are too often seen as marginal. A number of young people for whom we have arranged such activities, who had had no thought of going on to further or higher education after leaving school, changed their minds after discovering an area of employment that attracted them—for example, in travel and tourism—and realising that they needed higher-level qualifications to build a career in that area.

Group activities such as singing in a choir can also help to build key skills and attitudes. Some noble Lords may have seen the television series “The Choir”, in which a young choral conductor, Gareth Malone, created successful choirs in seemingly unpromising communities, including a mixed secondary school in Middlesex that had never had a choir and a boys’ comprehensive in Leicester specialising in sport, where singing was initially viewed—by staff as well as pupils—as distinctly un-cool. A striking feature of these programmes was the way that choir members gained in confidence, energy and a sense of achievement as the programme progressed—which can only serve them well in their careers.

Sport can fulfil a similar educational purpose: it, too, can generate enthusiasm, motivation and a sense of achievement. Recently I was taken on a coach tour of some of the Olympics 2012 sites in east London, which reinforced my belief in the opportunity presented by the Games. I hope that the Olympics will succeed in conveying a spirit of hope and enthusiasm to young people, as well as involving them directly—whether as spectators, competitors, staff or volunteers—in ways that will reinforce their motivation and employability.

I hope, too, that these opportunities will extend beyond the London area to all parts of the United Kingdom, not least to the land of my own fathers, Wales. I do not mean just by holding some events locally—for example, football in the Wales Millennium Stadium. I am thinking more of the sort of nationwide impact made by the Great Exhibition of 1851, which attracted more than 6 million paying visitors from all over the country in the six months that it was open and significantly changed attitudes to industry and commerce. It even made a large profit, but that might be hoping for too much. By engaging young people appropriately, the 2012 Olympics could leave an educational legacy comparable in value to their legacy of physical regeneration.

I will end with two brief summary points relating to the Children, Schools and Families Bill, which offers,

“guarantees for parents and pupils, setting out what they can expect from a 21st century schools system”.

First, what matters most is not what is guaranteed but what is delivered. Secondly, that delivery must cover all the skills, attitudes and expectations needed by our young people

to make a successful transition into employment and worthwhile careers, to the benefit of our nation.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 504–6\)](#)

10. Lord Sacks, 26 November 2009, Debate on Queen’s Speech

My Lords, when I entered this Chamber for the first time, I did so from the Moses Room. I thank noble Lords for the extraordinary lengths to which they went to make a rabbi feel at home. Today, I feel the other side of that occasion, for it was Moses at the burning bush who felt so overwhelmed by emotion that he told God that he could not speak; he was,

“not a man of words”.

Mind you, that did not stop him speaking a great deal thereafter. In fact, on one occasion, when pleading with God to forgive the people for making the golden calf, he spoke for 40 days and 40 nights. However, on another occasion, when asking God to heal his sister, Miriam, he limited himself to a mere five words. I am told by your Lordships that, when making a maiden speech, it is better to err on the side of the latter than the former; and that I will try to do.

The powerful emotion that I feel today is simply explained. My late father came here as a child fleeing persecution in Poland. My mother’s family had arrived here somewhat earlier. And the love they felt for Britain was intense. It took me a while to understand it, but eventually I came to realise what so many Jews in Britain know in their hearts and their very bones: that had it not been for this country, their parents or grandparents would not have lived and they would not have been born.

That visceral sense of indebtedness to this country is what made Jews want to give back, to contribute to society as a whole, which they did with all their heart. They contributed to its arts and sciences, its law and medicine, its business and finance, its Armed Forces and its public life, its charities and its voluntary associations. And they wanted us to do the same, to be proud of being British and be proud of being Jewish, seeing no contradiction between the two but, on the contrary, a mutual reinforcement. I believe that the same is true for other minority groups in this country.

My late father had to leave school at the age of 14 to help support the family, and he wanted us, his four sons, to have the education that he lacked. For that, too, I am deeply grateful. We were able, all four of us, to go to university, the same university that educated a Foreign Secretary of Israel, Abba Eban, who began his speech, when he returned there many years later to receive an award, with the words:

“It was here that I learned the honesty, integrity and love of truth that have been such a disadvantage to me in my political career”.

I, too, learnt lessons there that I will never forget. I was religious; my doctoral supervisor, the late Sir Bernard Williams, was Britain’s most intellectually gifted atheist. Yet never once did he deprecate or even challenge my religious faith. For we were both equal participants in that collaborative pursuit of truth that Judaism’s sages, long ago, called,

“argument for the sake of heaven”.

It is this that I have rediscovered in your Lordships' House. What extraordinary things happen here. When somebody speaks, other people listen. When people disagree, by and large they do so politely. What special gifts these are in this age of clashing soundbites, diminishing attention spans, angry voices and gladiatorial politics. I hope that, whatever constitutional changes are in store for this House, those things will always be preserved. For what I have found in your Lordships' House, and what I learnt at university, are the foundations of the virtues that made Britain the country my parents loved: its tolerance, its decency, its undemonstrative but indomitable sense of fairness and justice.

With this, I come to my point. Democratic freedom is not just a matter of political arrangements, of constitutions and laws, elections and majorities. It depends, too, on what Alexis de Tocqueville called "habits of the heart": civility, the willingness to hear the other side, respect for those with whom you disagree, and friendships that transcend the boundaries between different parties and different faiths. And those things must be taught again and again in every generation.

If there is one insight above all others to be gained from Jewish history it is that freedom depends on education. To defend a country, you need an army, but to defend a civilization, you need schools. Abraham was chosen, says the Bible, so that he would teach his children to practise righteousness and justice. Moses commanded, in what has become the most famous of our prayers:

"You shall teach these things diligently to your children".

In ancient times, the Egyptians built pyramids, the Greeks built temples, the Romans built amphitheatres, but Jews built schools. And because of that, alone among ancient civilizations, Judaism survived.

I wonder whether, even now, we value teachers sufficiently highly, for they are the guardians of our liberty. Schools teach us theories and facts. They help us answer the question, what do I know? Schools teach us skills. They help us answer the question, what can I do? But they also teach us the story of our nation, what freedom is and how it was fought for, and what battles those who came before us had to fight. They help us to answer the questions: who am I, of what story or stories I am a part, and, how then shall I live? They teach us about keeping faith with the past while honouring our obligations to the future. At best, they teach us collective responsibility for the common good.

Sadly today, schools have to fight against a culture that sometimes overvalues material success. Some years ago I visited a school whose children came from affluent backgrounds. They told me that the previous week an inspector had visited the school and tested the children—they were seven or eight years old—on their vocabulary. He asked the class, "Who can tell me the meaning of the word 'economy'?" One of the children put up his hand and said, "Please sir, that's where the other people sit on a plane". True story.

Thankfully, such things are rare. Therefore, with your Lordships' permission, I simply wish to say: let us value our teachers, celebrate our schools, keep education at the top of our priorities, and we will raise a generation of British children who will make us proud.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 492–4\)](#)

11. Lord Freud, 10 July 2009, Debate on Autism Bill

My Lords, I am delighted to rise for the first time in your Lordships' House in support of this Bill. First, perhaps I may place on record my appreciation to the staff of this House for their helpfulness towards me and my family. I am particularly impressed by the way in which the Doorkeepers thrust notes into my hand as I wander through the corridors. They clearly have a much better idea of where I am than I do.

Let me turn to the Autism Bill. I congratulate my honourable friend in another place, Cheryl Gillan, on championing this Bill and the noble Baroness, Lady Pitkeathley, on so ably introducing it in this House. I should like to take the opportunity to draw your Lordships' attention to the close connection with another Bill before this House, the Welfare Reform Bill. The underlying concept in that Bill is that, if we invest in a disciplined fashion in people who need help in making their way in the labour market, we all win—that is, the individuals concerned, society and the taxpayer. The autistic fit exactly into this paradigm. Indeed, when I was compiling my independent report on this matter two and a half years ago, autistic people were one group that I had explicitly in mind. With the right support, autistic adults can make an incredible contribution in the workplace. Many have an attention, a focus on detail and a sheer perseverance that can be invaluable attributes in particular jobs.

Two forward-looking employers—BT and Goldman Sachs—have programmes that allow people with autism to make this kind of contribution. BT has told me that autistic people are highly prized for their extraordinary facility with numbers. The tragedy is that, according to estimates provided to me by the National Autistic Society, only some 50,000 adults with autism, or 15 per cent, have regular work. The approach presaged in the Welfare Reform Bill would allow us to find the very considerable resources necessary to transform the lives of those adults with autism. It would do so despite the very difficult times that we are facing, when the economic pressures on spending will inevitably be severe. Properly organised programmes, managed with financial rigour, should allow the 15 per cent figure to improve dramatically.

With your Lordships' indulgence, I should like to take advantage of this unique opportunity to place some more personal remarks on the record. My family arrived here 71 years ago at a very difficult time for this country and the world. They escaped only because Sigmund Freud, my great-grandfather, was a well known figure. My father and grandfather were both desperately proud to join the Armed Forces of their newly adopted home. Indeed, my father parachuted back into Austria in 1945 as an officer of the SOE and single-handedly captured the enemy aerodrome of Zeltweg.

The descendants of Sigmund Freud have been accepted and have thrived in this country. I cannot remember a single occasion—not one—when I have been made to feel an outsider or that I did not belong here. That is a remarkable testimony to the tolerance and generosity of this country. I firmly believe that—perhaps with one or two exceptions—I would not have been able to make that statement of any other country in the world. While I would not presume to speak for all Freuds, who are a fiercely individualist group, many of them will, I know, join me when I place on record in this place and at this very difficult time my gratitude to this great country for all that it has done to nurture the Freud family and other families who have come here for freedom and to achieve their potential. I thank the House for its indulgence.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 891–2\)](#)

12. Bishop of Bath and Wells, 4 December 2008, Debate on Queen's Speech

My Lords, I begin by expressing my thanks to Members of the House for their kind and generous welcome. I also thank all the officials, and staff for their courtesy and unfailing helpfulness to me and my family, particularly on the day of my introduction.

In the aftermath of the "Blackadder" television series, there are always perils for the bishops of Bath and Wells. I am constantly reminded of the alleged activities of one of my predecessors as a baby eater, as well as doing unmentionable things with a red hot poker. Entering your Lordships' House has proved no exception, and the greeting from the Doorkeeper on my first day referring to these matters was capped only by the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Southwark seeing my five-week-old granddaughter arrive and remarking, "The Bishop has brought his own lunch".

I am grateful for this opportunity to make my maiden speech in today's debate on the gracious Speech. Having been a director of one of the church's mission and development agencies for six years, I am particularly concerned to encourage the Government on matters to do with international development outlined in the Queen's Speech.

The Jubilee 2000 debt campaign raised to popular awareness the issue of debt in the poorest of the world's developing countries. This in turn led to Make Poverty History, a campaign that creates awareness of the ongoing issue of poverty, as well as raising the profile of the millennium development goals, a subject on which the Prime Minister addressed the bishops of the Anglican Communion at the Lambeth Conference.

We live in a world, to quote the words of the Chief Rabbi, Sir Jonathan Sacks, where:

"We cannot feast while others starve, we cannot be happy while others are sad, we cannot be fully at ease while millions suffer".

As long as millions of people are in poverty in our world, our whole society is impoverished. The recent view of the world presented by the National Intelligence Council is that 63 per cent of the world's population is expected to be poor in 2025—fewer people than today—but that the poor will be poorer. That emphasises the urgency of the challenge to meet the millennium development goals.

Prior to the launch of Make Poverty History, I was invited to participate in a small demonstration in the City of London entitled "Bread not Stones". The idea was that a number of church leaders would take it in turn to ride in a donkey cart through the City, passing out bread, stones and leaflets to passers-by. The cart would be festooned with banners, stating, "Bread not Stones", reminding people of Jesus of Nazareth's question, "Would a parent give a child a stone instead of bread?". On the day, the donkey and cart arrived but, embarrassingly, no banners or posters, no bread or stones and, I am afraid, no other church leaders, except the woman moderator of the United Reformed Church. Accompanied by two mounted City of London police officers we set off looking and feeling like prisoners being taken to the Tower in a tumbrel. After an excruciatingly humiliating half hour we drew into the churchyard that was our final destination. It was filled with church leaders, charity executives, banners, bread and stones. As we exited the cart, some climbed aboard and others surrounded it smiling at the assembled press corps. The resulting pictures were of an evidently successful demonstration.

I tell the story because it is easy to grandstand on poverty on the millennium goals, but the hard work goes on largely unnoticed or understood. The embarrassment of the

failure of the demonstration was of no consequence, except perhaps to my pride. I am convinced, however, of the truth of the Haitian proverb: “God gives but doesn’t share”. We have everything we need to flourish. It is our responsibility to divvy it up. I believe that the first call on humanity as represented by Governments, nations and peoples of faith is identified by the priorities of the millennium development goals. This requires upside-down thinking. Along with the other bishops of the Anglican Communion during the Lambeth Conference, I marched down Whitehall on behalf of those goals. But I fear that the church’s obsession with internal agendas rather than with the priority declared in Jesus’s manifesto of,

“good news to the poor”,

will leave the church open to the charge of grandstanding. The church must think upside down and radically reprioritise.

It is in the context of the further elements of today’s debate, including foreign and European affairs as well as defence, that I plead for a continuing reprioritising by Government. Rightly, defeating terrorism is high on the agenda of western nations, but if we are to defeat the mosquitoes of terrorism we must drain the swamps of poverty and despair, which result in the stones of anger, hatred and violence. In welcoming the British Government’s support for the arms trade treaty, I urge the Foreign Secretary to call on the new United States Administration to sign up to that treaty. More than 695,000 people have been killed directly with firearms since the UN arms treaty process began in December 2006. That is about 1,000 people a day, illustrating the urgent need for worldwide compliance with the treaty.

In 2000, 189 countries adopted the millennium development goals with their aim vastly to reduce global poverty by 2015. While there have been some major achievements, most nations have defaulted on the promised 0.7 per cent of their gross national product and Her Majesty’s Government expect to reach their target by 2013. Today’s global financial situation provides little hope of a tipping point in favour of the world’s poor, but rather an increased downward spiral into deeper poverty and debt. The United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon has observed that the global financial crisis,

“threatens to undermine all our achievements and all our progress. Our progress in eradicating poverty and disease. Our efforts to fight climate change and promote development ... It could be the final blow that many of the poorest of the world’s poor simply cannot survive”.

In the diocese of Bath and Wells, we are committed to seeking ways of addressing the millennium development goals, but we are conscious that their title makes it difficult for them to be communicated simply and easily. I therefore urge DfID to look for ways of bringing the priorities of the millennium development goals into a popular and accessible form, so that readers of the red tops as well as of the broadsheets can engage in the task of remaking humanity.

Finally, Get Fair, which is a coalition of religious and secular groups, cites evidence in a recent survey that politicians must do more drastically to reduce domestic poverty and that it is in their own self-interest to do so. The poll indicates that 51 per cent of Britons, evenly spread across gender, age group, social class and region, say they would reward the political party that had the confidence to tackle poverty. Rising to such a challenge would ensure—in the words of Delboy in “Only Fools and Horses”—that everyone is a winner, and that is always appealing.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 60–2\)](#)

13. Lord Mandelson, 16 October 2008, Debate on Enterprise Act 2002 (Specification of Additional Section 58 Consideration) Order 2008

My Lords, it is a great honour to speak for the first time in this House. I want to begin by thanking your Lordships for the wonderfully warm welcome I have received from all sides of the House over the past few days and also from the staff who work here and add so much to the character of the House. It means a lot to me; it is nice to be back.

Being greeted by such a succession of noble Lords these past few days—many old friends and former colleagues—has been like replaying the last 30-odd years of my life, starting in the Wilson years and moving through the eras of Callaghan, Foot, Kinnock, Smith and then Blair. I know that a lot of people think of me as being quintessentially new Labour—indeed, who could doubt that?—but my roots go deeper. One of the privileges of being a Member of your Lordships' House is the richness of the political experience drawn from past decades that I have benefited from over the years, and which is available to our debates today.

Of course, my greatest wish is that my parents were alive today. My gregarious father loved mixing with politicians. When I was a boy, he was not above driving his car into the precincts of Parliament, although not a Member, relying on a cheery wave and a copy of Hansard left casually on the back shelf of his car to reassure the policeman on the gate—in those days it was a single policeman on the gate. My mother had more mixed feelings about politicians. The daughter of one, and then the mother of another, she had no appetite for more.

The House is very different from the one my that my grandfather attended. Its breadth is wider. It is more representative. It is also a House that takes its scrutiny role very seriously, as I know from my European experience. There is not only a breadth but a depth in this House—something that might be more generally acknowledged.

More than 50 years ago, my grandfather, making his maiden speech in this House, spoke of the Marshall plan and its importance in rebuilding the shattered economies of the allied countries of Europe after the Second World War. Now, as then, the world must come together to secure the future of its financial systems and the international architecture supporting them, at a time of deep uncertainty and turbulence in global markets.

A strong, stable banking system is essential to support and protect the investments, savings and loans that help us grow our economy and succeed as individuals. Further to the recent measures announced by the Prime Minister and Chancellor to put the British banking system on a sounder, more secure long-term footing, private sector mergers can play an important role in helping a financial institution in difficulty. It is critical that in cases where a proposed merger could bolster financial stability in the UK's economy, the overall public interest is served by a proper consideration of the need for stability, alongside the implications for competition.

I beg to move, therefore, that your Lordships consider the Enterprise Act 2002 (Specification of Additional Section 58 Consideration) Order 2008, Statutory Instrument No. 2645. The order was considered by the Lords Merits of Statutory Instruments Committee at its meeting on Tuesday.

Merger control in this country is regulated under the Enterprise Act and the European Community merger regulations, with the Office of Fair Trading and Competition

Commission responsible for investigating UK mergers on the basis of their impact on competition in UK markets.

The Enterprise Act provides limited powers for the Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform to intervene in mergers to protect legitimate public interests. Public interest considerations are currently defined under Section 58 of the Act as ensuring national security and plurality of media ownership. Section 58 also provides the Secretary of State with the power to specify additional considerations, when necessary, to protect the public interest.

As noble Lords will be aware, my right honourable friend John Hutton—my predecessor at the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform—announced on 18 September that he had issued an intervention notice in respect of the proposed Lloyds TSB group merger with HBOS plc. He also announced that he would place an order seeking the necessary power to enable him to take into account the vital public interest issues surrounding this merger.

Let me be clear. It is not that the merged bank would be sheltered, if the merger goes ahead, from competition law. Were there to be any evidence of market abuse at some future time—not that I expect any such behaviour—the normal powers will be available to the competition authorities to protect consumers.

The order specifies the maintenance of stability in the UK financial system as a public interest consideration under Section 58 of the Enterprise Act 2002—a new public interest consideration. This will enable the Secretary of State to intervene in those mergers in order to be able to make the final decisions based on the vital public interest of financial stability, alongside the competition issues.

As Secretary of State, I am unable to take decisions on this merger until parliamentary approval is received for the order. Subject to approval of the order by your Lordships, I will ensure that I receive all available advice and views before I make any decisions. This will include advice from the Treasury, the Bank of England and the FSA, which make up the tripartite authorities. I am sure that your Lordships would agree that swift, decisive action is needed to give investors the regulatory certainty that they need and to send a clear signal to the market about the proposed merger between Lloyds TSB group and HBOS.

The order will allow us to make careful and urgent consideration of financial stability an additional part of our assessment process, and as a result, support our work to help millions of UK businesses and families get through these very difficult times. It is a critical addition to the public interest considerations specified in the Act and I commend it to your Lordships.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 849–51\)](#)

14. Lord Bates, 7 October 2008, Debate on Millennium Development Goals

My Lords, I am grateful for the opportunity to rise for the first time in your Lordships' House to make my maiden speech, and to make it on such an important issue. What we are talking about are the preventable deaths of some 10 million children under the age of five each year which, as the noble Lord said, puts the other matters we are debating at this time into some perspective.

It is a particular privilege and honour to speak in a debate initiated by the noble Lord, Lord Alton, who was a role model as a parliamentarian and constituency Member of Parliament when we served together in the other place, and who will continue to be a role model in this place as well. I want also to put on the record my thanks to and deep appreciation of the officials and staff of your Lordships' House. They have helped me when sometimes I have wandered bewildered around the corridors, and I want to pay particular tribute to those hardy souls on the parliamentary IT Help Desk who deserve special recognition. Someone asked me what I thought was the principal difference I have noticed between the other place and here. I said that the great difference is that when the Whips' Office calls and offers to help you, over here they really mean it, and that is very welcome.

Turning to the substance of the debate, I have only one focus which follows on from the previous speaker, and that is on conflict as a cause of poverty. As we have been reminded, of the 30 current conflicts around the world, the vast majority are occurring in sub-Saharan Africa. They are responsible for drawing some 10 million children into the net of poverty and for the deaths of an estimated 2 million children over the past two years. Surely it behoves Her Majesty's Government and all other agencies to move the issues of conflict resolution, of peace-keeping, and indeed where necessary, of peace-making, higher up the agenda. It follows that unless we are able to make advances in preventing war and initiating a war on war itself, the victory over child poverty that everyone seeks will not be achieved.

[\(HL Hansard, col 196\)](#)

15. Baroness Afshar, 6 March 2008, Debate on Women: Government Policy

My Lords, I apologise for not being here for the opening speeches. Unfortunately the train caught fire, which held me back by two and a half hours. It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity of participating in a debate in your Lordships' House. I would like to thank your Lordships for the enormous kindness shown to me. As a defender of minorities, of outsiders and of those who have been otherised, it has been very rare in my life to have been so warmly welcomed and so thoroughly supported. I would like to thank my mentor, my noble friend Lord Bhatia, who taught me to think the unthinkable. I would also like to thank my noble and right reverend friend Lord Harries of Pentregarth and the noble Baroness, Lady Kennedy, for introducing me to the Floor of the House and the noble Lord, Lord Phillips of Sudbury, for being such a wonderful sounding board. I give special thanks to the noble Lords, Lord Patel of Bradford and Lord Avebury, and the noble Baroness, Lady Gould, and to my noble friend Lady D'Souza for providing invaluable help and guidance. I would also like to thank the staff and officials of the House, without whose continuing advice and kind assistance I would not have been able to function. Most likely I would still be in some distant corridor, trying to find my way to the Chamber.

I have been advised that maiden speeches should be short and non-controversial. Even though an academic, I have no difficulty with the former, but if I manage the latter it will be a first in my life. I have taken the opportunity to contribute to this debate because it is a subject that is very close to my heart. I had the good fortune of being born in Iran, the daughter and granddaughter of feisty women with a long tradition of campaigning for their rights. I was educated in French and Persian in a Catholic school. At the age of 14, much against my parents' wishes, I decided to come to England even though I did not know a word of English. I saw the UK as a land that produced women like Jane Eyre who could stand on their own feet and survive hardships and misadventures thanks to

the traditions of stoicism, self-reliance and resilience. As a third-generation feminist, I felt that I had the commitment, but not the strength of character, to stay the course but the rigours of boarding school certainly provided that. I felt that I had found my corner of the world.

It was therefore with some surprise that I gradually realised that, even in this wonderful land, gender, creed and colour can construct barriers that dent opportunities and mar the destinies of many. I came to that realisation rather late in life. As a university student at York and Cambridge, I had not thought of colour or creed as being of any importance. I had faced the unrealistic expectation of some of my contemporaries that I would be rather exotic. They looked for a living example of what the advertisers at the time were projecting as the attributes of Turkish delight. Sadly, I lacked all the necessary characteristics, but though not exotic, I was never made to feel inferior until I began working and tried to combine motherhood with full-time employment. I became more and more convinced that women, especially minority women, had to be present at all decision-making to reflect their specific needs, which were often different. I went on the barricades, where I have remained ever since.

Women have had the right to stand for Parliament in the UK since 1918, yet it was not until 1987 that Diane Abbott became the first representative of minority women in the other place where there is still no Asian or Muslim woman. So I consider myself extremely privileged to be in your Lordships' House where I have the good fortune of joining Muslim women across the Benches. I can assure noble Lords that there are still a great many good women who remain unrecognised. They are a most valuable untapped pool of talent who should not be wasted.

Recently, the Muslim Women's Network had a year-long conversation with women around the country to identify the barriers that they perceived as hard to surmount. Here I must declare an interest as I am the chair of that network. It is a UK-wide organisation set up in 2002 to help the then Minister for Women, the right honourable Patricia Hewitt, hear the unheard voices of Muslim women. Subsequently, the network and the Women's National Commission held a series of meetings around the country. The resulting report, *She Who Disputes*, was launched last year and is available on the Women's National Commission's website.

Young Muslim women that we talked to highlighted two major problems that hampered their progress from their school days. The first and foremost was the expectation of teachers and schools that, as a group, they would marry young and be saddled with families and therefore should not aspire to pursue demanding careers. The second was the assumption that young girls who covered did so in response to pressure from families and therefore could be categorised as submissive, pliant and not ambitious. The young women felt silenced and disempowered and did not think that the public domain had a place for them. I may add that the education sector, to a large extent, also fails Muslim boys. Again and again, we were told that these women considered themselves to be both British and Muslim. They were educated, informed and courageous girls, many of whom were born and raised in this country, who wished to be recognised and respected as Muslims and as valuable potential participants in all walks of life. They felt that a first step would be for the curriculum to offer a better understanding of their faith. It could be revised to reflect the realities of both Islam and Islamic histories. Teaching could become enriched by noting the centuries-long intellectual and cultural interactions between Islam and the West that planted the seeds of enlightenment and sparked the renaissance.

To quote the statements of the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Chester and the noble Baroness, Lady Corston, in an earlier debate in this House, we need government

policies that recognise women in general—and, I would add, minority women in particular—as equal but different. Celebrating differences could enable women of all colours and creeds to participate fully in the political processes and exercise their rights, including the right to choose their own husbands, without having to abandon their identities.

I thank noble Lords for their indulgence and greatly look forward to participating in the work of this House, although I cannot promise to be uncontroversial.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1247–9\)](#)

16. Baroness Warsi, 23 October 2007, Debate on Middle East and Afghanistan

My Lords, I thank the noble Lord, Lord Janner, for surprising me, and I hope that noble Lords will indulge me as I rise to make my maiden speech in your Lordships' House. I was given two pieces of advice about today. I was told, first, to ensure that I used language that was appropriate for your Lordships' House. I remind noble Lords that, as the daughter of Pakistani immigrants, English was an unknown language to me until I went to nursery school; but today I will certainly try to follow that advice. Secondly, I was told to remain non-controversial. As those who know me will know, on this rule I will have to try much harder.

I am the latest of a long line of women that my home town of Dewsbury has contributed to this House. There is the noble Baroness, Lady Taylor, whom I confess I had hoped two years ago to replace in another place. There is the noble Baroness, Lady Boothroyd, who as the Speaker of the other place had a distinguished career, and whose father, like my father, was a weaver in the textile mills of Yorkshire. Of course, there is also the noble Baroness, Lady Lockwood, whose contribution to this house as Deputy Speaker must be truly acknowledged, as must her tireless campaigning on women's issues.

Today, I wish to highlight the plight of women in Afghanistan. In June 2001, Saira Shah, a British journalist, revealed the horrific lives of many ordinary Afghan women. She was assisted in her efforts by RAWA, the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan. She exposed an Afghanistan where women were excluded from jobs and medical care, where education was denied them and where war widows were forced to beg on the streets of Kabul. This was Afghanistan under Taliban rule. On International Women's Day in 2007, some six years after our invasion, RAWA said that,

“the world came into motion in the name of liberating Afghan women and our country was invaded, but the sorrows and deprivation of Afghan women has not just failed to reduce but has actually increased the level of oppression and brutality”.

UNIFEM, Amnesty and Human Rights Watch have many statistics on Afghanistan, and I will share some of them. Some 86 per cent of Afghan women are illiterate; 87 per cent of the Afghan population still believe that a woman needs male authorisation to vote; every 29 minutes a woman dies in childbirth; and 50,000 war widows live in Kabul alone, and many still beg on the streets. The number of girls in secondary school is decreasing; 80 per cent of women face forced marriages; nearly 60 per cent are married before the legal age of 16, despite the 2005 protocol to,

“eliminate child and forced marriage by 2008”.

Sadly, that honourable aim is unlikely to be met by then or at any time in the near future.

I acknowledge that some progress has been made. As we know, 27 per cent of Members of the National Assembly are women, but only one serves in the Cabinet and, sadly, too many are ineffective and subdued. Indeed, in recent provincial council elections, not enough women came forward to take up the women's quota, resulting in some of the reserved women's seats reverting to men. I pay tribute to Malalai Joya, a brave and determined young Afghani parliamentarian who more than deserves the international accolades that follow her, but whose life is under constant threat.

Amnesty International writes that,

“women continue to face severe violence both within and outside the house”.

Abduction and rape is widespread, and officials are killed merely for registering women to vote. An extremely disturbing phenomenon is the ever increasing number of Afghan women who seek death by fire: women who are set alight or set themselves alight in sheer desperation. Cases of self-immolation have doubled in Kabul in the past year alone, and the situation is even more acute in the city of Herat. Human Rights Watch believes that contributing factors are severe governmental and social discrimination, illiteracy and an incompetent justice system.

The pictures alone do not fully describe the plight of these women. It is a subject close to my heart and one of which I have direct experience. I chair a women's empowerment charity, the Savayra Foundation, which seeks to empower women in Pakistan through education and training. Sadly, I meet many abused and desperate women, but one in particular remains vivid in my mind. Aliya, a beautiful 21 year-old woman, a loving mother of two, was set alight by her husband in her home in the Pothohar region of Punjab. She presented herself to me with severe burns and disfigurement from her scalp to her waist. She is a woman whose children fear her because of her appearance. She is a woman who simply longs to hug her young son.

Whenever we go to war, we must ensure that our actions leave women safer and stronger, and we must ensure that never again do we allow women to be abused on our watch in a country that we have invaded to make better.

Let me finish by thanking my noble friends Lady Morris and Lord Strathclyde, who have been far more than supporters—they have been consistently good-humoured despite my constant questioning. I also thank noble Lords from all sides of the House for their very warm welcome and constant offers of tea, far too many of which I have reluctantly had to decline in the interests of my growing waistline. Finally, I thank those who serve your Lordships' House, many of whom have accompanied me while I was lost in the numerous corridors, and who always smile when they realise that I am the newest and youngest Member of your Lordships' House and not an intern.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 1032–4\)](#)

17. Baroness Campbell of Surbiton, 20 June 2007, Debate on Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill

My Lords, it is with great pleasure that I address your Lordships' House for the first time. My breathing does not permit me to give long speeches, so noble Lords will be pleased to know that I will seldom exceed seven minutes. I wish to begin by paying tribute to the

late Lord Carter. His encouragement and support over the years is one of the main reasons I am in this House today. I should like to thank also my sponsor, the noble Lord, Lord Ashley. I have had the pleasure of working with him for over 15 years, and he has given me terrific and great inspiration. My thanks also go to the noble Baronesses, Lady Finlay and Lady Wilkins, and to others who have patiently answered my endless questions. I also wish to thank the staff of the House. Their enlightened approach to my access needs has been most welcome. As a disability rights commissioner, I am happy to inform your Lordships that this place is one of the best models of good practice under the DDA that I have ever come across.

I have chosen this Bill for my maiden speech because most of my adult life has been spent helping under-represented groups fully to participate in their communities. I began my working life in local government as a disability awareness trainer, and I soon understood that disabled people needed to define the solutions to our own problems. Otherwise, public policy would fail. The term,

“nothing about us without us”,

became our mantra in the late 1980s, and it has been our guiding principle ever since. I went on to become highly involved in campaigning for anti-discrimination legislation. That led, eventually, to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. In parallel to this, I also campaigned for community care direct payments, and the noble Lord, Lord McColl, was strongly supportive, along with a large number of Members of this House. In both cases, disabled people fully shaped the legislation, and I think that is why it has been so very successful.

These experiences demonstrated to me the importance of public involvement in shaping services, so I was thrilled to join the Department of Health’s expert panel on public and patient involvement last year. This panel was tasked with looking at one of the proposals in the Bill; the setting up of local involvement networks, or LINKs.

As your Lordships know, LINKs will replace the current patients’ forums. My overriding reason for supporting the introduction of LINKs is that they will bring together health and social care while placing greater emphasis on joined-up user and public participation. People like me who use both health and social care services seldom differentiate between social care support and health interventions. We need a holistic approach so that we are not bogged down by multitudes of different professionals, each armed with assessment forms which go on for days. Social care has a long and successful history of user involvement. Bringing it to work in an integrated way with healthcare within these LINKs will bring a rich dimension to the public involvement described in the Bill.

The exciting thing about LINKs is that they will be supported by host organisations, one for each local authority. There is no blueprint for a LINK and that is what is so good; each will evolve to suit local circumstances. This is a great opportunity to use the energy and creativity of a whole range of diverse stakeholders; for example, centres for independent living run by disabled people. They are, after all, the experts by experience in health and social care. They will be key members of LINKs. What is more exciting is that, at last, they may also be excellent candidates for the role of a host.

To make LINKs truly valuable in their local communities, they need to be opened to the widest range of user voices. This includes people with all types of impairments, people from minority ethnic communities and even people living in residential care. Consider how enabling LINKs could be for older people. Their large and growing numbers mean that they are under-represented in local decision making. There is increasing evidence that they are often exploited, neglected or abused, but their voices are seldom heard. I

believe that the measures in the Bill will go a long way to empowering such groups actively to improve their health and wellbeing.

I am excited about some parts of the Bill which signal a culture of greater inclusion. As a new commissioner on the Commission for Equality and Human Rights, it is my responsibility to ensure that public services empower and involve all members of the public. We need inclusive communities where no one gets left out. Parts of the Bill take us in that direction.

[\(HL Hansard, cols 233–4\)](#)

18. Index to maiden speeches since 2006

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
Spicer, L	Conservative	26/07/10	2010/11	720 c1176-7	Finance Bill
Browning, B	Conservative	26/07/10	2010/11	720 c1184-5	Finance Bill
McFall of Alcluith, L	Labour	22/07/10	2010/11	720 c1118-20	Poverty
Shipley, L	Liberal Democrat	22/07/10	2010/11	720 c1110-2	Poverty
Donaghy, B	Labour	22/07/10	2010/11	720 c1103-5	Poverty
Boateng, L	Labour	22/07/10	2010/11	720 c1098-100	Poverty
Parminter, B	Liberal Democrat	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1013-5	Women in society
Kennedy of Southwark, L	Labour	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1017-9	Women in society
Drake, B	Labour	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1008-9	Women in society
Deben, L	Conservative	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1004-6	Women in society
Black of Brentwood, L	Conservative	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1035-7	Women in society
Liddell of Coatdyke, B	Labour	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1022-4	Women in society

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	Hansard ref	Debate title
Smith of Basildon, B	Labour	21/07/10	2010/11	720 c1040-2	Women in society
German, L	Liberal Democrat	15/07/10	2010/11	720 c792-4	Criminal Justice System
Hussein-Ece, B	Liberal Democrat	15/07/10	2010/11	720 c781-3	Criminal Justice System
Prescott, L	Labour	14/07/10	2010/11	720 c738-40	Environment: Low-carbon Technologies
Willis of Knaresborough, L	Liberal Democrat	09/07/10	2010/11	720 c447-9	Defamation Bill
Hayter of Kentish Town, B	Labour	09/07/10	2010/11	720 c436-7	Defamation Bill
Touhig, L	Labour	08/07/10	2010/11	720 c402-5	Housing
Gardiner of Kimble, L	Conservative	08/07/10	2010/11	720 c394-6	Housing
McConnell of Glenscorrodale, L	Labour	08/07/10	2010/11	720 c358-60	Africa: Post-conflict Stabilisation
Derby, Bp	Bishops	01/07/10	2010/11	719 c1865-7	Local Communities
Knight of Weymouth, L	Labour	01/07/10	2010/11	719 c1869-71	Local Communities
Maples, L	Conservative	01/07/10	2010/11	719 c1900-2	Foreign Policy
McAvoy, L	Labour	01/07/10	2010/11	719 c1877-9	Local Communities

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
Liddle, L	Labour	24/06/10	2010/11	719 c1445-7	Latin America
Wei, L	Conservative	16/06/10	2010/11	719 c1010-3	Social Policy
Grey-Thompson, B	Crossbench	14/06/10	2010/11	719 c840-2	Olympic Games and Paralympic Games 2012
Sassoon, L	Conservative	08/06/10	2010/11	719 c632-5	UK: Competitiveness
Guildford, Bp	Bishops	03/06/10	2010/11	719 c401-4	Queen's speech (Education, Health, Welfare and Culture)
Hall of Birkenhead, L	Crossbench	03/06/10	2010/11	719 c385-7	Queen's speech (Education, Health, Welfare and Culture)
Hill of Oareford, L	Conservative	03/06/10	2010/11	719 c375-9	Queen's speech (Education, Health, Welfare and Culture)
Kakkar, L	Crossbench	03/06/10	2010/11	719 c409-11	Queen's speech (Education, Health, Welfare and Culture)
Bichard, L	Crossbench	27/05/10	2010/11	719 c156-8	Queen's speech (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs and Local Government)
Gloucester, Bp	Bishops	06/04/10	2009/10	718 c1382-4	British Film and Television Industries (Communications Committee Report)
Carswell, L	Crossbench	28/01/10	2009/10	716 c1565-7	Constitutional Reform
Hereford, Bp	Bishops	05/01/10	2009/10	716 c73-6	Child Poverty Bill
Aberdare, L	Crossbench	26/11/09	2009/10	715 c504-6	Queen's speech (Equality, Social Affairs, Health, Education)

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
Sacks, L	Crossbench	26/11/09	2009/10	715 c492-4	Queen's speech (Equality, Social Affairs, Health, Education)
Martin of Springburn, L	Crossbench	25/11/09	2009/10	715 c403-5	Queen's speech (Business and Economic Affairs, Consumer Affairs, Culture)
Sugar, L	Labour	25/11/09	2009/10	715 c393-5	Queen's speech (Business and Economic Affairs, Consumer Affairs, Culture)
Blackburn, Bp	Bishops	24/11/09	2009/10	715 282-4	Queen's speech (Environment, Energy, Agriculture, Local Government and Transport)
Lichfield, Bp	Bishops	24/11/09	2009/10	715 c274-6	Queen's speech (Environment, Energy, Agriculture, Local Government and Transport)
Bristol, Bp	Bishops	23/11/09	2009/10	715 c171-3	Queen's speech (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs)
O'Loan, B	Crossbench	23/11/09	2009/10	715 c176-8	Queen's speech (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs)
Freud, L	Conservative	10/07/09	2008/09	712 c891-2	Autism Bill
Kinnock of Holyhead, B	Labour	30/06/09	2008/09	712 c203-6	UN: Responsibility to Protect
Wakefield, Bp	Bishops	30/06/09	2008/09	712 c197-8	UN: Responsibility to Protect
Campbell of Loughborough, B	Crossbench	18/06/09	2008/09	711 c1191-2	Olympic Games 2012
Bradford, Bp	Bishops	07/05/09	2008/09	710 c681-2	Economy
Davies of Abersoch, L	Labour	09/02/09	2008/09	707 c1003-8	EU Regional Policy (EUC Report)

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
Smith of Kelvin, L	Crossbench	16/12/08	2008/09	706 c767–9	Banking (No 2) Bill [HL]
Mance, L	Crossbench	12/12/08	2008/09	706 c585–8	EU Legislation (EUC Report)
Bath and Wells, Bp	Bishops	04/12/08	2008/09	706 c60–2	Queen's speech (Foreign and European Affairs, International Development and Defence)
Pannick, L	Crossbench	18/11/08	2007/08	705 c1109–12	Constitution: Executive, Judiciary and Parliament (Constitution Committee Report)
Lincoln, Bp	Bishops	14/11/08	2007/08	705 c876–8	Immigration (EAC Report)
Carter of Barnes, L	Labour	05/11/08	2007/08	705 c307–15	Ownership of the News (Communications Committee Report)
Myners, L	Labour	28/10/08	2007/08	704 c1546–9	Landsbanki Freezing Order 2008
Mandelson, L	Labour	16/10/08	2007/08	704 c849–51	Enterprise Act 2002 (Specification of Additional Section 58 Consideration) Order 2008
Bates, L	Conservative	07/10/08	2007/08	704 c196	Millenium Development Goals
Manningham-Buller, B	Crossbench	08/07/08	2007/08	703 c647	Counter-Terrorism Bill
Mogg, L	Crossbench	13/06/08	2007/08	702 c765–7	Planning and Energy Bill
Chichester, Bp	Bishops	01/04/08	2007/08	700 c881–3	European Union (Amendment) Bill
Afshar, B	Crossbench	06/03/08	2007/08	699 c1247–9	Women: Government Policy

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	Hansard ref	Debate title
Stern of Brentford, L	Crossbench	06/03/08	2007/08	699 c1221-2	Women: Government Policy
Hameed, L	Crossbench	31/01/08	2007/08	698 c779-80	War Powers and Treaties
Janvrin, L	Crossbench	31/01/08	2007/08	698 c760-2	War Powers and Treaties
Wallace of Tankerness, L	Liberal Democrat	24/01/08	2007/08	698 c405-7	Non-governmental Organisations
Garden of Frogna, B	Liberal Democrat	07/01/08	2007/08	697 c710-2	Apprenticeships (EAC Report)
Hart of Chilton, L	Labour	06/11/07	2007/08	696 c7-9	Debate on the Address (Outline of the Government's policies and proposed legislative programme)
Neville-Jones, B	Conservative	23/10/07	2006/07	695 c1040-2	Middle East and Afghanistan
Warsi, B	Conservative	23/10/07	2006/07	695 c1032-4	Middle East and Afghanistan
Darzi of Denham, L	Labour	10/10/07	2006/07	695 c313-7	NHS: London
Bew, L	Crossbench	23/07/07	2006/07	694 c626-8	Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (Northern Ireland Political Parties) Order 2007
Vadera, B	Labour	18/07/07	2006/07	694 c358-61	Commonwealth
Jones of Birmingham, L	Crossbench	12/07/07	2006/07	693 c1514-8	Energy: White Paper
West of Spithead, L	Labour	12/07/07	2006/07	693 c1507-10	Extradition Act 2003 (Amendment to Designations) Order 2007

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	Hansard ref	Debate title
Malloch-Brown, L	Labour	11/07/07	2006/07	693 c1471-4	Afghanistan: Provincial Reconstruction Teams
Campbell of Surbiton, B	Crossbench	20/06/07	2006/07	693 c233-4	Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill
Mawson, L	Crossbench	20/06/07	2006/07	693 c254-7	Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill
Krebs, L	Crossbench	08/06/07	2006/07	692 c1369-72	Television Advertising (Food) Bill [HL]
Coussins, B	Crossbench	08/05/07	2006/07	691 c1342-4	Education: Young People in Custody
Walker of Aldringham, L	Crossbench	22/02/07	2006/07	689 c1192-4	Iraq
Marland, L	Conservative	17/01/07	2006/07	688 c718-9	Bus Industry
Paisley of St George's, B	Other	14/12/06	2006/07	687 c1634-6	HIV/AIDS and Sexual Health
Ripon and Leeds, Bp	Bishops	14/12/06	2006/07	687 c1673-5	Immigration and Asylum
Bilimoria, L	Crossbench	27/11/06	2006/07	687 c565-7	Debate on the Address (Industry, Economic and Consumer Affairs)
Rowe-Beddoe, L	Crossbench	27/11/06	2006/07	687 c584-7	Debate on the Address (Industry, Economic and Consumer Affairs)
Dear, L	Crossbench	23/11/06	2006/07	687 c482-4	Debate on the Address (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs)
Luce, L	Crossbench	23/11/06	2006/07	687 c460-3	Debate on the Address (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs)

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
York, Abp	Bishops	23/11/06	2006/07	687 c448–50	Debate on the Address (Home, Legal and Constitutional Affairs)
Bradley, L	Labour	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c256–8	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
Butler-Sloss, B	Crossbench	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c276–7	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
James of Blackheath, L	Conservative	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c269–72	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
Low of Dalston, L	Crossbench	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c264–7	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
Meacher, B	Crossbench	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c282–4	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
Morrow, L	Other	21/11/06	2006/07	687 c292–4	Debate on the Address (Social Affairs, Education and Health)
Browne of Belmont, L	Other	20/11/06	2006/07	687 c144–6	Debate on the Address (Foreign and European Affairs, International Development and Defence)
Jay of Ewelme, L	Crossbench	20/11/06	2006/07	687 c153–5	Debate on the Address (Foreign and European Affairs, International Development and Defence)
Leach of Fairford, L	Conservative	20/11/06	2006/07	687 c140–2	Debate on the Address (Foreign and European Affairs, International Development and Defence)
Patel of Bradford, L	Labour	20/11/06	2006/07	687 c135–7	Debate on the Address (Foreign and European Affairs, International Development and Defence)
Ford, B	Labour	16/11/06	2006/07	687 c63–6	Debate on the Address (Local Government, Transport, Agriculture and the Environment)
Jones of Whitchurch, B	Labour	16/11/06	2006/07	687 c33–5	Debate on the Address (Local Government, Transport, Agriculture and the Environment)

Member	Affiliation	Date	Session	<i>Hansard</i> ref	Debate title
Sheikh, L	Conservative	16/11/06	2006/07	687 c49-51	Debate on the Address (Local Government, Transport, Agriculture and the Environment)

