



HOUSE OF LORDS

Library Note

House of Lords: Maiden and Valedictory Speeches, 2010–2015

The first speech made by a Member of the House of Lords is known as a maiden speech and, by tradition, is an occasion marked with respect by the House. This Library Note includes the full text of a selection of recent maiden speeches, made by a cross-section of Members from different parties and affiliations, to illustrate the range of styles and subjects covered by new Members in their first contribution to the proceedings of the House of Lords. It also includes an index of Members' maiden speeches made in the House of Lords during the course of the last Parliament.

The House of Lords Reform Act 2014 enabled Members to retire from the House of Lords. It was agreed that Members should be given the opportunity to make a valedictory speech to mark their retirement. By the end of the Parliament three such speeches had been made and the text of all are included in the Note.

Tia Bostrom-Westwood
Shorayne Fairweather
Venetia Thompson
21 May 2015
LLN 2015/011

House of Lords Library Notes are compiled for the benefit of Members of the House of Lords and their personal staff, to provide impartial, politically balanced briefing on subjects likely to be of interest to Members of the Lords. 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 hlresearchservices@parliament.uk.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Maiden Speeches..... 2
 - Lord Finkelstein, 21 November 2013 (Human Rights) 2
 - Baroness Kennedy of Cradley, 21 November 2013 (Human Rights) 3
 - Baroness Lawrence of Clarendon, 21 November 2013 (Church of England: Holistic Missions)..... 5
 - Lord Judge, 25 November 2013 (Consumers: Paper Billing) 6
 - Bishop of St Albans, 5 December 2013 (Education: Contribution to Economic Growth) 8
 - Lord Allen of Kensington, 24 February 2014 (Children: Competitive Sport)..... 10
 - Bishop of Rochester, 5 June 2014 (Queen’s Speech) 11
 - Lord Lennie, 29 October 2014 (Scotland: Devolution) 13
 - Baroness Shields, 20 November 2014 (UN Convention on Rights of the Child: Digital Impact)..... 14
 - Baroness Brady, 4 December 2014 (Sport: Governance) 16
 - Lord Goddard of Stockport, 11 December 2014 (Economic Leadership for Cities) 18
 - Lord Cooper of Windrush, 17 December 2014 (Recall of MPs Bill)..... 20
 - Baroness Pinnock, 22 January 2015 (Local Government Finance Settlement) 21
 - Baroness Wolf of Dulwich, 10 March 2015 (Soft Power and the UK’s Influence) 23
- 3. Valedictory Speeches 24
 - Lord Jenkin of Roding, 16 December 2014 (Pension Schemes Bill) 24
 - Viscount Tenby, 19 March 2015 (Inquiries Act 2005 Select Committee Report) 27
 - Lord Lloyd of Berwick, 26 March 2015 (Immigration: Detention) 28
- Appendix 1: Maiden Speeches 2010–15..... 32
 - Maiden Speeches, Session 2014–15 32
 - Maiden Speeches, Session 2013–14 34
 - Maiden Speeches, Session 2012–13 36
 - Maiden Speeches, Session 2010–12 37
- Appendix 2: Valedictory Speeches 43

I. Introduction

Maiden Speeches

The initial speech made by a Member of the House of Lords is known as a maiden speech and, by tradition, is 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. They must also have signed an undertaking to abide by the House of Lords Code of Conduct. 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 whilst speaking 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, a Member wishing to make their maiden speech is expected to do so 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 the full text of a selection of recent maiden speeches made by a cross-section of Members from different parties and affiliations over the last two sessions of the Parliament. 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](#) (2013 edition)—paragraphs 4.48–4.50. An index to all maiden speeches made during the course of the 2010–15 Parliament can be found in Appendix 1.

Valedictory Speeches

Following the passing of the [House of Lords Reform Act 2014](#) allowing Members to retire from the House of Lords, the House agreed to the recommendation from the Procedure Committee that retiring Members be given the opportunity to make a valedictory speech:

We consider that a Member who has formally notified his or her retirement should have the opportunity of making a valedictory speech. Like maiden speeches, certain conventions should apply to valedictory speeches: they should be short (less than 10 minutes), uncontroversial and made in a debate with a speakers list. The Member speaking immediately after a valedictory speech would pay tribute to the departing Member, plus the front benches if they wish.¹

This was agreed by the House on 30 October 2014.² Subsequently, the first valedictory speech was made on 16 December 2014, by Lord Jenkin of Roding. This was followed by valedictory speeches by Lord Tenby and Lord Lloyd of Berwick on 19 and 26 March 2015 respectively. By the end of the Parliament they were the only Members to have taken the opportunity to make such speeches in the Chamber and the full text of all three are included in this Note.

¹ House of Lords Procedure Committee, [House of Lords Reform Act 2014: Further Consequential Changes, Questions for Short Debate, Queen's and Prince of Wales' Consents](#), 15 October 2014, HL Paper 50 of session 2014–15, para 2.

² HL *Hansard*, 30 October 2014, [cols 1314–7](#).

2. Maiden Speeches

Lord Finkelstein, 21 November 2013, Debate on Human Rights

My Lords, at the moment I took the oath in the House I was filled with wonder and gratitude. There was gratitude to be given the privilege to sit among your Lordships and to contribute to your deliberations. There was gratitude to my supporting Peers, the noble Lords, Lord Owen and Lord Coe, the latter having forgiven me for defeating him in an egg and spoon race. What can I say? He can run but he dropped the egg. There also was gratitude to all the officials of the House. They have helped me to overcome every practical issue related to having a peerage, save the one that still vexes me; namely, how, in a suburban house containing three children and six guitars, do my wife and I fit a two-foot, red leather box with a large wax seal? I now understand the strategy of barons since the time of King John, which is to get a castle first and only then acquire a peerage.

Finally, there was gratitude that as the son of refugees I live in peace in this extraordinary country with its respect for human rights. It is therefore fitting that human rights should be the subject of my maiden speech. My mother is a survivor of Belsen concentration camp and my father was an exile in a Siberian prison village. Pinner is nicer. People often bemoan the absence of big ideas in British politics. I always reply that big ideas drove my family from their home and their country, murdered my grandmother, starved my mother, imprisoned my father and stole our property. So I like pragmatic, small British ideas, our quiet suburbs and our stable institutions. My politics were never better summarised than by my paternal grandmother saying, “While the Queen is safe in Buckingham Palace, I am safe in Hendon Central”.

My necessarily brief contribution to this debate is that we in this country have a special understanding of the value of allowing people to live their life in peace as they see fit, to enjoy their privacy and never having to fear what they are because they fear their neighbours or the state. For that reason, because of the respect for that fundamental human right, we have become a leader in extending to gay people the freedom, equality and respect that should rightfully be theirs.

However, with that leadership comes a responsibility. Last year, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights identified 76 countries which criminalise private, consensual same-sex relationships. Even where homosexuality is not illegal, all over the world lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people are subject to arbitrary arrest, violence and torture. When they are the victims of crime, they cannot turn to the police or the authorities because it is they who will be arrested. They are left defenceless. In Iran, there are secret executions; in Cameroon, there is torture and imprisonment; and, in Belarus, there is police intimidation and confiscated passports.

The only complaint that these countries can make is: why pick on them? The disrespect that they show to fundamental human rights, and the way in which they defy international law, is not theirs alone. It is common. I recognise—we all do—that there are limits to what we can do and I know that much of what we can do we are doing. It is right to pursue a policy of active diplomacy; right to link aid to the Commonwealth to the question of gay rights; and right to use bilateral diplomacy to, for instance, raise Russia’s discrimination against gay people. Perhaps, as

the Foreign Office reviews its priorities in its human rights policies, which I am sure it does from time to time, it might consider whether the rights of LGBT people should be among them. After all, internationally, if it is not us, who is it?

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1081–2](#))

Baroness Kennedy of Cradley, 21 November 2013, Debate on Human Rights

My Lords, I am very proud and honoured to stand here today as a Member of this House and make my maiden speech. I begin by thanking noble Lords on all sides of the House for the warm welcome that I have received. They will know that I am preceded here by my husband, my noble friend Lord Kennedy, but I also know that noble Lords will be familiar with the quote that begins, “Behind every great man ...”.

I also thank all the staff for the help they have given me. One day when I was looking particularly confused, one staff member asked, “Would it help, my Lady, if I pointed out which way Lord Kennedy went?”. I was impressed by how skilfully he gave me the option of going in the opposite direction. I need to give particular thanks to the doorkeepers. Some noble Lords may have noted that when I and my noble friend Lord Kennedy were introduced, the galleries were rather packed. I would like to thank the doorkeepers and assure them that there are currently no other Kennedys working for the Labour Party on the way to this noble House.

I also thank my supporters, my noble friends Lady McDonagh and Lord Collins, and my mentor, my noble friend Lady Gould, for all their advice and support. My final thank you is to my friend Margaret Bradley, a local Cradley historian whose research helped me with this speech.

I was delighted when it was agreed that I could use Cradley as my territorial title. It is a town rich in history. For hundreds of years, ironwork—nail-making and chain-making—was the staple industry of Cradley and its surrounding towns. Right up until I went to university, I lived in Cradley, in the same house and in the same street—and it is where my father still lives today. Since at least 1830, my ancestors’ livelihoods relied on the nail and chain industries in Cradley and the surrounding towns.

Noble Lords may be wondering why the history of my home town is relevant to today’s debate on human rights. I thank the noble Lord, Lord Alton of Liverpool, for initiating this crucial debate. It is relevant because it reminds us of the evils of child labour. In Cradley, children were born, reared, worked and died in the chain shops. It was not unusual to see baby baskets swinging from iron poles so that women could hammer iron and rock their baby at the same time. By the age of eight, children were experienced chain makers.

Thankfully, the dominance of child labour in Cradley is a distant memory. However, this is not the case in many other parts of the world, where child labour exists on a colossal scale. Millions of children younger than the basic minimum working age are deprived of their childhood and work in appalling conditions that damage their physical and mental well-being. The ILO estimates that across the world, instead of going to school, 168 million children aged five to 17 are child labourers. Every child has the right to a childhood, and every child has the right to an education. Child labour is a violation of a child’s human rights.

Today, I want to highlight two areas of child labour that particularly affect girls: mining and domestic work. Across the world there are more than 85 million children engaged in hazardous work, the most menacing of which is the plight of child miners. Children as young as six and seven are handling explosives, exposed to toxic air and carrying heavy loads. The physical and psychological effects are traumatic for both boys and girls. However, girls bear a double burden as they also have to carry out domestic chores at home for the family. There is no time for rest, and no time for school.

Another area where girls are particularly vulnerable is when they work behind closed doors as domestic workers. Some 11.5 million children, mainly girls, work dawn to dusk taking care of domestic chores in other people's homes. They live with their employer. They are under the control of their employer. They are isolated and trapped. Many suffer verbal abuse or, even worse, physical abuse. Girls are suffering in silence. It is slavery by anyone's definition.

We must work with each other and everyone involved in our civil society to alleviate global poverty, achieve universal primary education and eliminate child labour. We know we can all do more. There are many charities in the UK that work to alleviate poverty. I declare an interest as I am a trustee of one such charity, APT—Action on Poverty. APT fights poverty by giving people the means to feed their families all year round and forever. It works with local partners on the ground in sub-Saharan Africa and south-east Asia to build lasting livelihoods for the most vulnerable.

We know that child labour is directly linked to poverty, which is why charities like APT are vital. When a person knows that they can feed their family not just today but every day in the future, they can fully embrace education, not employment, for their child. If children fail to get an education, they fail to get the skills needed for their own growth as well as their country's economic growth. The poor of today remain the poor of tomorrow. Sadly, child labour is not just an issue for developing countries. Studies have shown that children here in the UK have been found in forced labour. That is why I very much welcome the Government's commitment to bring forward a modern Slavery Bill, which I hope is still due in December. I hope that it will pay particular attention to child labour here and across the world.

Government must do more to work with international businesses to encourage them to address the issue of child labour in their operations and supply chains. Businesses should not just demand that child labour stops but should help influence national Governments and employers in countries around the world, encourage better working conditions, mobilise communities around education, support social protection programmes, and invest more in education and in modernising agricultural production in poor rural communities where child labour is rife.

I will make one final plea. The next World Day Against Child Labour is on Thursday 12 June 2014. Let us all commit now to join together on that day and encourage other organisations to join with us. Children need to be learners, not labourers. Children should no longer be denied a childhood, an education or the most basic of human rights: a future

(HL Hansard, [cols 1086–8](#))

Baroness Lawrence of Clarendon, 21 November 2013, Debate on Church of England: Holistic Missions

My Lords, I rise to give my maiden speech with some anxiety and, I must admit, emotion, surrounded as I am by so many experienced Members of your Lordships' House and reminded, as I am, of the role of this establishment in my life's story.

Before I embark on the substance of my speech, which will be concerned with the importance and value of voluntary and community sector organisations, I must express the honour that I feel in joining this House. My journey has been a difficult one, and there are Members here who have walked part of that journey with me in solidarity. Their integrity, conviction and calibre assures me that I am among good company.

I have never taken for granted my public platform as someone who should be out there speaking. I do it because I think that there is something important that needs to be conveyed, and this is what drives me. I therefore pledge myself to contribute the knowledge and understanding that I have to offer, building on many years of experience in issues relevant to the decisions of this House and the nation as a whole.

In my short time here, I have been impressed by the commitment to causes in this Chamber. I should like to thank most sincerely Members on all sides of the House for their friendly and supportive welcome. It has been a warm, joyful, if slightly bewildering, experience. The staff and officials, too, have been most helpful. I should like to extend my thanks to my two supporters, the noble Lord, Lord Boateng, and the noble Baroness, Lady Benjamin, to my mentor, the noble Baroness, Lady Crawley, and to the noble Baroness, Lady Royall, the Leader of the Opposition.

I welcome today's debate in the name of the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Leicester on the ResPublica report but wish to focus my contribution on the value of community-based organisations in the broadest sense—mainstream, grassroots, youth-led, women's, BME and faith-based. My parents, like many of their generation, came here from the Caribbean in search of a better life for their family. Never would they have imagined the nightmare that was to engulf my family—my son Stephen's life was taken so brutally and so senselessly by racists—and the 20-year battle for justice which followed. The experience has taught me that power is often resistant to the claims of justice and basic human dignity. Those who demand these rights must be prepared to fight every single day for them, as they will come up against an establishment more interested in maintaining the status quo than it is in helping to foster a society where everyone has an equal claim to justice, no matter who they are or what they look like. I have to believe that in overcoming the hardships, we have contributed to a collective effort in making this country a more fair and inclusive place to live.

The local church played a large role in my life growing up in south London. It was very much a social hub for community members to congregate. During some of my difficult times I sought solace from my friend the Reverend David Cruise who baptised my daughter and led the memorial for Stephen. My one belief that has remained firm despite being challenged time and time again is that of justice and fairness. That is my credo. Ensuring that every person in British society, particularly our young people, have access to the same opportunities to learn, work and succeed is the bedrock of a progressive democracy.

Following the death of my son I was touched and deeply moved by the number of people who reached out to me and my family. I was impressed by the number of people in this country who

were moved to show the love and care they have for strangers who have suffered terrible pain and injustice. Some of the people who reached out to me were religious, but many were not. They were appalled by Stephen's murder and the injustices our family were made to suffer by the police and institutions. It was only because of the support of so many kind people that I was able to maintain any hope and affection for this country.

Over the past 20 years I have become increasingly aware of how many different groups, organisations and charities do great work within our society. I have had the privilege both of being helped by them and working alongside them with my own charity, the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust, which enables children from disadvantaged backgrounds to have the opportunity to have a career in architecture and the built environment, the career Stephen always wanted to pursue.

Faith-based organisations are an important resource for many communities, providing volunteers, buildings and a stable network for those in need. But it is important to note that more than two-thirds of charities and voluntary organisations working in the UK today have no connection with a religion. An example of one of these charities is Stop Hate UK, of which I am a patron; it works with victims of hate crimes and encourages those who have been victims of or witnesses to hate crimes to report them.

Amazing work is being done on the ground by young people at the grassroots level, self-organising in their communities around the issues that they are affected by. It is important that we do not think just of those who want to volunteer—we must also think of those who are actually in need of help from the voluntary sector. A holistic approach must take these people into account.

Profit-driven privatisation has left what should be public services serving shareholders rather than citizens. Yet only by transferring power back into the hands of the people and away from private interests seeking profits under the veil of "efficiency" can the British Government regain the support and trust of the public. Voluntary organisations representing every section of our rich and diverse society deserve to be listened to and supported in order to bolster their contribution to making Britain a safer, healthier and more prosperous country to live in. Only by remaining committed to these fundamental principles can we strive towards a future that is genuinely equal and fairer for all.

(HL Hansard, [cols 1129–31](#))

Lord Judge, 25 November 2013, QSD on Consumers: Paper Billing

My Lords, I had a very nervous, sleepless night last night. When I was at the Bar with a difficult case, appearing in front of a difficult tribunal, I had sleepless nights, too. On those occasions, I used to lull myself to sleep. I would find myself fantasising about scoring 100 in a test match at Lord's against Australia, before lunch, against Lillee and Thomson without a helmet on. That was an amazing way of relaxing before a difficult day in court. I never got more than 50, because I did not need to; I had fallen fast asleep.

Last night was different. I got my 100 before lunch against Lillee and Thomson and thought to myself, perhaps I am needed in Australia at the moment. Then I scored a hat-trick in the World Cup final—all headed goals—against Germany. Then I scored a winning try against New Zealand down in New Zealand. Then I started batting again in another test match, this time

against the West Indies with Roberts, Holding, Marshall and Garner, and I was 75 not out before I fell asleep. This is one of the more nervous occasions for a new speaker.

I begin, however, by saying that I cannot see any reason for being nervous at all. Since my arrival here, I have received nothing but kindness from everyone, without exception. Whenever I have been lost in all these many corridors, someone has found me. If I may say so, the officers of the Lord Convenor of the Cross Benches have been tireless in their patience with me in my anxiety to get this ordeal over. I thank you, my Lords, and through you, all the many people and staff here in the House who have been so kind to me.

I declare my support for the noble Baroness on the issue which I wish to address in relation to the generation—sadly, a passing one—for whom the new world of technology is not something merely to be passed by but, to some, represents something of a nightmare. This is not dealing directly with the matters currently in debate, but how often do they find that disembodied voice from, say, Hyderabad, of huge assistance to them? How often do they find a disembodied Home Counties voice telling them that they must listen and then press one of 10 numbers on their telephone and then, having found their way through to which one it should be, press the appropriate number, then come up with another five numbers which they have to listen to and press? What about the machine that you stick a card into that produces cash, but that you cannot tell has failed to give you the correct amount? What about the necessity of remembering codewords and passwords, when everyone tells you that the one thing you must not do is to write them down anywhere in case someone finds out what they are?

I declare an interest. My mother is 94 years old. Like so many of her generation, she is intrepid. Like so many of them, happily, she values knowledge rather than tricks. New knowledge, she is still interested in—new tricks, not. I suspect that there are many like her. They were well into their 80s when Facebook, Google and Twitter were invented. Can we please all remember that none of those existed only 10 years ago? They were taught, when young, to check their bills and their bank accounts carefully. Indeed, some of us remember our parents receiving the cheques which they had sent. Some of us, I dare say, are old enough even to remember having received the cheques ourselves. For them, a computer is not part of everyday living—not for all of them; of course some are adventurous and wish to enjoy the fruits of modern technology, but some do not. For some, online billing is a meaningless concept and they do not wish to have anything to do with it.

What is the real cost to the utility companies which do not provide paper billing for those individuals? I am ignoring the notional figures. Some expert consultant will tell a company that the cost is vast, enormous or huge. I suggest that the real cost cannot be all that high. There is a postage stamp and a member of staff to press the button on the company computer to produce the goods.

I end by asking, can we, should we not, offer the particular generation on whom I have focused my attention—the sadly but inevitably diminishing generation about whom I have spoken—something just a little more generous than penalising them for failing to keep up with the world as it is?

(HL Hansard, [cols 1255–6](#))

Bishop of St Albans, 5 December 2013, Debate on Education: Contribution to Economic Growth

My Lords, as a bishop I find myself standing up regularly in unfamiliar buildings, usually with long and distinguished histories, holding forth to people whom I barely know. I do this every Sunday when I visit one or two of the more than 400 churches in my diocese. Rising to speak in this House evokes a certain level of apprehension. On the day of my introduction I managed to break rule one by standing up at the point when the Lord Speaker had risen to her feet. The noble Lord, Lord McNally, said to me afterwards that he could see that I was starting out as I intended to continue: causing havoc. In the coming years, I trust that I will not create a great deal of havoc, but will perhaps make a modest contribution to the deliberations of this House.

I am conscious that my predecessor but three, Archbishop Robert Runcie, made a very significant contribution here. I recall also that his predecessor as Bishop of St Albans, who was bishop for just over 24 years, reportedly spoke only once in the time that he spent in this House, and that was to argue for the welfare of pit ponies in the coal mines—not a subject that evokes a great deal of passion in the highways and byways of Hertfordshire today. My arrival has been greatly helped by the generous welcome of Members of the House, and the unfailing courtesy and support of the staff, for which I would like to record my sincere thanks.

I was brought up in the countryside. As a young man my father was a farmer, and I look forward particularly to engaging with issues of land, countryside and rural affairs. I have also lived in two multicultural communities in the Midlands, one of which was Walsall, from where Morgan, referred to by the noble Lord, Lord Baker, came, and I hope to draw on something of my experience of multicultural and multifaith communities.

I am glad to make my maiden speech in this debate on the contribution of high-quality education to economic growth. I live next to one of the oldest schools in the country. This is St Albans School, founded before the Norman Conquest by Abbot Ulsinus in the year 948. Over the years, it has produced many notable alumni, including the only British-born pope, Nicholas Breakspear, otherwise known as Adrian IV, Professor Stephen Hawking and several Members of this House. The diocese that I have the privilege to lead covers the counties of Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, Luton and parts of Barnet. As well as many independent schools with a Christian foundation, we have 135 church schools serving their local communities. None of the church schools in my diocese is deemed “unsatisfactory”; 18 percent are graded “satisfactory” and the remaining 82 percent are either “good” or “outstanding”. I want to pay tribute to the work of head teachers, governors, teachers, parents and school staff who work so hard to produce schools of such excellence.

Detractors of church schools sometimes claim that our excellent academic results are because we have creamed off the best pupils. The facts do not support that assertion. Our schools are spread across a wide range of neighbourhoods, and we are proud to have schools in some of the most difficult and challenging communities. The national data produced in the Department for Education’s 2013 school census show that 15 percent of pupils at Church of England secondary schools are eligible for free school meals, which is the same as the average for non-Church of England schools. The same census reveals that we serve almost exactly the same proportion of black and minority ethnic pupils as non-Church of England secondary schools do.

I will share one story, which I hope will illustrate our concern and our commitment well, and which takes us to the very heart of today’s debate on education and the economy. Northfields

Upper School in Dunstable, later Northfields Technology College, went into special measures in 2006 and there was a change of leadership to give it a fresh start. Sadly, it was decided that the school should close, but on 1 September 2009 it reopened as All Saints Academy, sponsored by the diocese of St Albans in partnership with the University of Bedfordshire. Today it specialises in science and business and is housed in brand new buildings.

The improvement in academic standards was not immediate, but has been steady and impressive since 2009. Over the past four years, attendance has increased from 87 percent to 93 percent this year. The percentage of pupils achieving five A* to C grades, including English and maths, has risen from 23 percent in 2009 to 40 percent this year. Our partnership with the University of Bedfordshire has generated a tangible rise in the aspirations of its pupils, with increasing numbers of students considering the possibility of going on to higher education. I am glad to acknowledge publicly the huge contribution made by the head, Tom Waterworth, and his team to achieve such a change in four years. That is a success story of which we are rightly proud.

It is too early, however, to know exactly what difference that dramatic improvement in exam results will make to economic growth in Dunstable. Certainly, everyone loses out if we cannot translate academic success into productive outcomes. Andreas Schleicher, already quoted by several noble Lords in this debate, makes the depressing assertion in his comments on that international survey that young English adults aged between 16 and 24 are some of the lowest-ranking in literacy and numeracy in the industrialised world. He concludes that deficiencies in our school system over a lifetime will lead to an unbelievable £4.5 trillion loss in economic output. In bald economic terms, that is the equivalent of living in a permanent recession.

Having said all that, I will pause and ask what we mean by the phrase “high-quality education”. Not one of us can dissent from that, but what does it mean in practice? What is its personal, social—and, dare I ask, spiritual—content as opposed to its crude cash value? I ask that because although we need to ensure that our pupils achieve academic success, education must surely be much more than that. In classical Greek culture the concept of *paideia* constituted a holistic understanding of education for body, mind and soul. That vision was picked up and developed by Cardinal Newman in his seminal work *The Idea of a University*, published in 1852. In today’s world, where so much stress is placed on individuality and the need for every person to realise their inner self, education plays a vital role in developing a sense of social responsibility and the need to contribute to civil society and the common good. If education is to be truly “high-quality”, surely it will also produce people with a rich emotional hinterland, whose souls have been expanded as they have explored the arts, music and literature.

I am also concerned, as we think about education, about the young people whose mental or physical health problems mean that they struggle in mainstream education. I am grateful to the noble Lord, Lord Storey, for highlighting that area a moment ago. It is good to have high standards, and in our diocese we are proud of several leading academic institutions such as the Universities of Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cranfield and the Royal Veterinary College in Potters Bar. Our attention is instinctively drawn to those, but finally, I will mention one small project in the University of Hertfordshire.

In partnership with HCS Careers and GB Sports Coaches, the university has organised, for the sixth year running, a two-day event for 14 to 19 year-old students from special needs schools. The purpose of that unsung annual event, which sadly never achieves headlines, is to enable those young people to meet people who work in business and industry to help them develop

appropriate skills and grapple with issues of employability. With the right support, many of them are also able to contribute to economic growth.

I hope that we will ensure that every part of our education system is given help and support so that all our young people, whatever their academic ability, are equipped to make their contribution to the flourishing and thriving of our nation.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 363–6](#))

Lord Allen of Kensington, 24 February 2014, QSD on Children: Competitive Sport

My Lords, my background is a career that started in the steel industry in Scotland when I was 17 and has spanned more than 40 years working in business, broadcasting and the media, but I am delighted to be able to make my maiden speech on a subject that I am equally passionate about. I had the privilege of chairing the Commonwealth Games in Manchester in 2002, was vice-chair of the London 2012 bid and was Mayor of the Olympic Village. Visiting thousands of grassroots clubs as chair of nations and regions has fuelled that passion. I remember vividly one particular visit to the Percy Hedley Academy for Disability Sports in north Tyneside where I was asked to play wheelchair football, demonstrating that this sport is not for the faint-hearted as I sped around at 20 mph much to the amusement of the young, elite athletes.

I thank the noble Baroness, Lady Grey-Thompson, an athlete of distinction, a friend and a great inspiration, for her kind words of introduction. I also congratulate the noble Baroness, Lady Heyhoe Flint, a cricketing legend, on securing such an important debate.

Today is my first time at the crease on an unfamiliar pitch. I have yet to become familiar with the House but my own fitness has improved as, many times, I have gone down the wrong corridor or up the wrong stairs. In this, I have had great assistance from the wonderful staff and Peers alike, and I am very grateful to them for that. I also pay tribute to my sponsors, the noble Baroness, Lady Jay of Paddington, and the noble Lord, Lord Bragg, and thank them for their patience in answering my many “daft laddie” questions such as, “Why do we say ‘Good morning’ in the House when it is 2.15 in the afternoon?”.

Although feeling humble and, as you can see, slightly nervous in the presence of such distinguished Members of your Lordships’ House and so many sporting greats, today is an opportunity for me to highlight and honour the 2 million heroes who give up their time each week to help sports clubs in their communities.

In 2012, the world witnessed how London made the two greatest sporting events, the Olympics and Paralympics, even better. Seventy thousand Games makers and London 2012 volunteers around the country played a huge part. Every competitor I spoke to told me how important volunteers are at grassroots level: it had been volunteers who had inspired them, volunteers who had coached them and volunteers who had raised money for their equipment and training. We therefore need to encourage disabled and able-bodied people from all walks of life to join this army of volunteers: the Ritas who, after a gruelling shift at work, turn up even on the wettest Wednesday evening in Wigan, Winchester and Wishaw to coach the under-12s; the Roys who give up their time to repair and maintain the club houses; the Alans who do the fixtures and the transportation; and the Amys who spend many hours doing the accounting and

the administration. These heroes are contributing to the many benefits that sport brings and, most importantly, to improving the health and life expectancy of our young people.

Data from Public Health England show that 30 percent of 10 to 11 year-olds are overweight or obese. Diabetes UK warns that type 2 diabetes—normally associated with obesity and inactivity in middle age—is now becoming prevalent in children, with around 1,400 children diagnosed with this condition. We need urgently to address and reverse those trends if we are to avert an obesity and chronic health time bomb. Getting kids into sport will play an important part but we need to build capacity, and that means more volunteers. Sport England reports that seven out of 10 clubs need more volunteers. I am honoured to be chair of the Join In Trust, which aims to match grass-roots clubs with the thousands of people who are looking to find rewarding and interesting things to do in their communities. Last year we signed up more than 100,000 sports volunteers. This is a good start, but we must do more.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols GC313–4](#))

Bishop of Rochester, 5 June 2014, Debate on the Queen’s Speech (Second Day)

Having been what one might call a jobbing vicar for 23 years, I come to your Lordships’ House with that background. My journey has taken me from living and working in inner-city Birmingham for a number of years and then in more suburban parts of that city to rural north and west Norfolk and, now, within the very mixed socioeconomic geography of north and west Kent and south-east London. In each of those rather varied settings I have found myself drawn to, among other things, a particular interest in and engagement with issues around housing and homelessness. Having served for some 20 years on the boards of housing associations, first in the city of Birmingham and then in East Anglia, and now chairing the trustees of Housing Justice, which is the national ecumenical voice of the churches on these matters, I expect also to take a particular interest in these issues within the work of the House.

A number of speakers in this debate—the noble Baroness, Lady Andrews, and the noble Lords, Lord MacGregor and Lord McKenzie—have touched at some length on issues to do with housing. I hope that it is not thought too controversial for what is meant to be an uncontroversial maiden speech if I touch on some of those matters again. It is hard at present to go even 24 hours without being aware of some comment, research report, announcement or other public contribution on housing-related matters; reference has already been made today to the recent intervention of the Bank of England, and there have been many others. At some point, housing-related questions impinge at almost every level on discussions around the economy, family life, community well-being, societal cohesion, welfare policy and much more besides.

Living and working in rural Norfolk for six years, I became aware of the pressing need for small-scale affordable housing developments in villages. They are essential to sustain the diversity and vitality of such places—their community infrastructure, as it were—not least by enabling local younger people to remain in their communities and to be economically active in those places. In the south-east, where I am now, an area dominated by the London housing market, as we have heard, there is a similar need for housing to be available to those working in the lower-waged sectors of the economy—sectors that are vital for that economy. We have heard of the huge pressure on housing, both for purchase and for rent, in the south-east. In our socially disadvantaged communities across the nation, there is a simple need for decent places

to live at prices that can be afforded in communities where support networks and opportunities for training and employment are also close at hand.

Why do these things concern me as a bishop, or indeed simply as a human being? Because at a very deep level our human well-being is bound up with our sense of belonging and identity—and, our sense of the global notwithstanding, belonging and identity are in turn bound up with our sense of locatedness and, more specifically, of what we might call home. For those like me who draw inspiration from the Judaeo-Christian tradition, we find in the Hebrew prophets a vision of a person sitting in security beneath their vine and their fig tree, with no one to make them afraid, and at another point there is the encouragement, even when finding oneself in a strange place, to build homes, settle down and plant productive vineyards. These are visions of settledness, locatedness and security. “Home” in that sense is of course about much more than bricks, mortar and roof tiles, but certainly in our culture, and perhaps more specifically in our weather, to think of home without adequate and affordable bricks, mortar and roof tiles is very hard indeed.

As we have heard, the Government’s programme for this Parliament, as outlined yesterday, touches on housing matters at a number of points. There is the expression of a continuing aspiration to increase housing supply by means of reforms of various kinds, including to the planning system, about which we have also heard; initiatives such as the garden cities, the first one of which, at Ebbsfleet, will be in my diocese; and support for small housebuilding firms. Alongside this, there is the intention to see new homes built to a zero-carbon standard although, while I welcome that, the big issue is of course the retrofitting of existing homes to those sorts of standards, which is far more difficult.

I await the outcomes of all this with interest because, as I think we all know and acknowledge, there is an awfully long way to go regarding housing supply, markets for housing both for purchase and for rent, and many other issues connected with housing in one way or another. I am well aware that the issues are complex, having worked in the field in one way or another for 25 years, and that there are no easy answers, but I cannot rest content for as long as there are those without somewhere to call home and, more sharply, without security in relation to the shelter over their head. I trust that Her Majesty’s Government will continue to give these matters focused attention for they are foundational, yes, for the economy, but also for our individual, familial and societal well-being.

Lest it be thought that people like me talk about these things and then simply sit back and expect others to make things happen, I would point out that the churches are not inactive in this field. Our work at the sharper end of homelessness, often of course in partnership with others of good will, is well known: winter shelters, advice centres, day care and the like. But it goes further than that: there is, for example, under the umbrella of Housing Justice, the organisation that I chair, a project that we call Faith in Affordable Housing. Developed over recent years, this helps to make church-owned land and property available for development for affordable housing purposes. The resulting developments are small scale but are beginning to emerge in both England and Wales, in urban and rural settings. We need more such initiatives. As well as legislation and policy, we need imagination, creativity, a properly entrepreneurial spirit and a restless passion for what is right and good for the future of our society in this regard. This is for the well-being of us all—and, more particularly, for that of our children and our children’s children.

(HL Hansard, [cols 54–6](#))

Lord Lennie, 29 October 2014, Debate on Scotland: Devolution

My Lords, I speak for the first time in your Lordships' House and do so with a degree of humility, nervousness and some trepidation. My particular fear is that this piece of prompt technology will fail part the way through what I have to say. If it does, I have no doubt that someone will rush from somewhere to my aid, which has been my experience thus far in this House at every turn, or every wrong turn, that I have taken. I pay tribute to all the staff, officers and Members of this House on all sides who have been generous and kind, and have welcomed me here. I also thank my two supporters, my noble friend Lady Armstrong and my noble and learned friend Lord Falconer, who is unable to be here today—I will come to that in a minute—for doing me the great honour of introducing me to the House on Monday. Both have been my friends and political allies for many years and I hope will be for many more years to come.

With regard to my noble and learned friend Lord Falconer, I have an important leak to reveal to the House. A confidential source has revealed to me that he has been approached by a leading publisher to write a book. The working title is “The Ten Apples and Ten Cokes a Day Diet”. Noble Lords may have seen some pre-publicity about this in the Sunday Times this week. It was not just a puff piece—it was a strategically placed article. The plan is to publish this as a pre-Christmas stocking filler. The problem with the plan is, of course, that my noble and learned friend Lord Falconer, subject to his successful diet, can no longer fill a stocking, so the plans are somewhat in disarray as far as publication is concerned.

I start my comments about devolution. I am somewhat unusual in this House in that I have experience of an English region rejecting devolution of power. A decade ago, as my noble friend Lord Prescott has said, the north-east chose by a large margin not to accept my party's kind offer of a regional assembly. At that time I was the Labour Party director in the north of England. It is often said that we are shaped by our experiences. Having to explain the north-east rejection to my noble friend Lord Prescott certainly helped shape me.

Despite that defeat, I believed then, and I believe now, that there is an appetite for devolution of government in order that we improve lives, or seek to improve lives, and increase opportunities across England. For devolution to succeed, however, we must understand the reasons for its past failure in terms of what happened in the north-east. There was a disconnect between politics and people. That fundamentally explained the rejection of the regional assembly. The opponents simply asked voters whether they wanted more politicians at more cost, meddling more in their lives. The answer was a resounding no, thank you very much.

I suspect that the climate for politics is less favourable today than it was then. I may be wrong, but that is my suspicion. For devolution to succeed, the distance and disconnect between politicians and voters has to be narrowed, not just here at Westminster but in councils too. After all, an out-of-touch political elite is equally off-putting, whether clad in ermine or mayoral robes.

Devolution must not be something that politicians want to do to voters, but a change delivered with, by and for the people. Proposals bringing this devolution to English regions and cities must be judged not by how they solve the problems for political parties but by how they will make things better for citizens in every region of the country. There needs to be a convincing argument that devolution means government done at lower cost, with clear, tangible benefits to the electorate at large. That is a huge challenge.

How do we go about this? First, devolution in England needs to be considered purely on its own merits. Otherwise, voters will see English devolution proposals as the unforeseen or unintended consequence of the Scottish referendum. They will see politicians trying to apply a fix to a problem they themselves created.

Further, we need to be clear that English devolution and English votes for English laws—EVEL—are not the same issue. Today we have a hugely centralised English government; changing who votes on which legislation may be a good thing or a bad thing in reflecting an English will, but it devolves little power. It cuts no costs. It makes the delivery of government policy no more streamlined than before. If we want devolution, we surely have to look beyond the question of who votes in Westminster. That means that we must devolve the process of devolution. It is easy to say that you are in favour of devolution, but if your deeds undermine your words, you will fail to impress voters who you want to support your proposals.

We must reach beyond politics and ensure that whatever we put before the English voters commands public support from a broad consensus of civic society, who can then seek to reassure those who are suspicious of politics—and I believe that they are currently the many, not the few.

Finally, I would like to say that I chose the title of Longsands Tynemouth. It was featured in a photograph in the Times last Friday; your Lordships may have seen it. It is where I live; it is worth a visit; and if you go there, go to the wonderful beach bar, Crusoe's. It is where I spend much of my family time.

My home region, the north-east, is engaged and energetic and sceptical of easy promises. Those are qualities that I shall endeavour to replicate to the best of my ability. It is an honour beyond measure to be one of those of all parties and none who will speak up for my region in your Lordships' House.

(HL Hansard, [cols 1232–3](#))

Baroness Shields, 20 November 2014, Debate on the UN Convention on Rights of the Child: Digital Impact

My Lords, it is a great honour to make my maiden speech as a Member of the House. It is an even greater honour to do so on a topic that is this important and so close to my heart.

Before I begin, I want to thank your Lordships for the remarkably warm welcome that I received here after my Introduction. What is particularly touching is the kindness and graciousness that noble Lords have extended to me. Your Lordships have made me feel very much at home here in this great House. Although I am still finding my way around, I want to thank the clerks, the doorkeepers and the staff, who remain most kind to and patient with me. I also want to acknowledge my mentors and noble friends Lady Hanham and Lady Eaton for their wisdom and guidance, and my dear supporters, the noble Baroness, Lady Lane-Fox, and my noble friend Lord Marland, who encouraged me to make my maiden speech today. They know that this topic means a great deal to me, because I have spent my life in the pursuit of developing technology and innovation for good.

Today, I applaud the noble Baroness, Lady Kidron, for creating the iRights initiative, and her passion and determination to protect the rights of young people in this digital world. We are

on this quest together. I am grateful to her for making this her personal mission, and I am confident that the work that she is doing will make a great impact on empowering young people and encouraging them to make better and more informed choices.

Over the past 25 years I have had the privilege of building some of the world's largest technology companies, including Google, Facebook, Bebo and AOL. I feel fortunate to be asked to participate in the iRights initiative in my capacity as a technology industry veteran and as the Prime Minister's adviser on the digital economy. My desire is to contribute further to this most important work.

Children today live in an always-on social, digital and connected world. With the click of a button, they build relationships with people across the globe. Everything that they want to do and learn is simply available to them on demand wherever they are. The velocity of change in the world brought about by technology and inspired thinking is unprecedented. We should welcome it with open arms. But as guardians of the next generation, we should also keep our eyes wide open. We should ensure that the companies building digital products and services for our children use the premise of safety first in every aspect of their design and development, so that what they create is safe by design.

The reason that this is so important is that a minority of people will use technology to exploit and harm our children, to bully and harass them, and in some cases, with far direr consequences, abuse them for sexual purposes. The same technology that is allowing our children to turn their dreams into reality can turn their lives into a nightmare. During my tenure in government I have been working closely with the Home Office and the National Crime Agency, and I have seen at first hand the terrible harm that can be caused to children by people who abuse technology for criminal means.

In 2012–13, the UK's Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre, CEOP, received a staggering 18,887 reports relating to child sexual exploitation. In 2011, the US National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reviewed an overwhelming 17.3 million images and videos of suspected child pornography, which is nearly 4,000 percent more than in 2007. It saddens me beyond belief that 19 percent of the offenders identified had images of children younger than three years old on their devices; 39 percent of them had images of children under six years old; and 83 percent of them had images of children aged under 12. As I looked at these data in the summer of 2013 and at the trajectory of things, it was clear to me that we urgently needed a strong, effective strategy to protect our children online, and our Government took bold action.

The Prime Minister called together internet service providers and internet platform companies, and he set a challenge: to enlist their brightest minds in a mission to protect children all over the world from online abuse and exploitation. Last November, the Prime Minister and the President of the United States agreed to set up a joint UK–US task force to counter these horrendous crimes. The task force was established to focus on developing a better model for defending children in an increasingly digital world—a new level of co-operation to stop these horrific crimes.

As a result, working alongside Governments and law enforcement agencies, many of the leading technology companies have made much progress. I am happy to report that they are working side by side with government and NGOs in this pursuit. However, eradicating the crimes that threaten our children online remains a significant challenge. For every measure taken, the perpetrators of these crimes use new tools to change course and evade detection. To win this battle, we have no choice but to be faster, nimbler and more innovative than they are.

Luckily, the internet offers us a window into this offending behaviour—the tiny visible part of an otherwise hidden crime—and presents opportunities to identify the victims and perpetrators. As long as this window remains open, which may not be for ever, it is incumbent on government, law enforcement and industry to work together to do all that can be done to identify these perpetrators and protect their victims, who in all too many cases are unable to speak for or defend themselves.

In April this year, the technology industry came together in a first-ever industry alliance called We Protect. In that forum, technical experts representing 48 of the world's leading technology companies collaborated to develop breakthrough approaches for protecting children from online abuse and exploitation.

The people who work in our digital industries represent some of the brightest minds in the world. They are the kind of people who, when they set their minds to a challenge, are able to step up and develop solutions to the world's most difficult problems. The impact of cross-industry collaboration in developing these solutions cannot be overestimated. If we want to make a fundamental difference to the lives of vulnerable children all over the world, this *modus operandi* must continue.

I am happy to report that our work is paying off. I am proud and delighted to be able to tell noble Lords that next month, at the Prime Minister's global summit to combat online child sexual exploitation, we will be presenting solutions created as a result of this new model. We will also be showcasing a number of breakthrough innovations that will be implemented by the world's largest search engines, communication platforms and social networks. Real progress has been made, which means that our children are already safer online and incidents of actual harm to our children have been prevented.

The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child requires that states act in the best interests of the child. Yet technology, without enlightened leadership, respects no rights or boundaries. The most popular internet platforms reach more people every day than there are in any sovereign country. By establishing a new paradigm of co-operation and collaboration with industry, NGOs and experts, we are creating an atmosphere of willingness and we can make real change in the way that we protect our children in the digital world.

Every child has the potential to dream, invent and amaze the world, but they must be able to do so creatively, knowledgeably and fearlessly. By working across national borders and using the skills of our brightest in business, I am happy to say that we are starting to give our children the future that they deserve. Thank you.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 579–81](#))

Baroness Brady, 4 December 2014, Debate on Sport: Governance

My Lords, it is a great honour to speak for the first time in your Lordships' House. I want to begin by thanking your Lordships for the wonderfully warm welcome I have received from all sides of the House. The assistance and, above all, patience shown to me by noble Lords from across the Chamber and by the clerks of the House and all the staff whom I have encountered since I took my seat here have been truly wonderful—so, thank you.

My career in sport started in 1993 when, at the age of 23, I became the managing director of Birmingham City Football Club. There I was, desperate to look at least 25, turning up with my big shoulder pads and my big hair. During those early days, I was banned from boardrooms, ridiculed as a publicity stunt and displayed in the media as everything from a ball-breaker to a bimbo—all because I was a woman, and a young woman at that. However, when, at the end of my first year, my football club made a profit for the first time in its modern history, people began to raise an eyebrow. When I sold the club in 2009, it was profitable, playing in the Premier League with an award-winning stadium, a community programme and sell-out crowds and, notably, 75 percent of the senior management team were women. A lot more than an eyebrow was raised—a whole hairline! It has been a wonderful journey of knocking down stereotypes and encouraging women and young people into my industry, and I have been fortunate enough to meet and work with many people whose lives have been transformed by sport.

Sport is an industry worth more than £20 billion. Our Premier League, considered the greatest league in the world and in which my team, West Ham United—I declare my interest—is fifth, is one of the UK's best exports, with a global audience of 4.6 billion. It is clear that sport helps to ensure that our country maintains its status on the global stage, but it is at a much more local level that I have seen sport at its most effective. Its ability to break down barriers and provide opportunity, particularly to young people and those who need it most, is its true power, as is seeing it being utilised to promote equality and diversity. That is why I have chosen to make my maiden speech on the governance of sport, which I hope will act as a catalyst for debate both inside and outside Parliament.

The Governance of Sport Bill, which my noble friend Lord Moynihan presented to the House, provides the background to our debate today. It seeks to capture the inspiration of a nation looking to government to deliver a sports legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games—a lasting legacy capable of transforming the sporting landscape of the United Kingdom in terms of facilities and opportunities, especially for children, able-bodied and disabled, in all our schools.

One need only look back to London 2012 to witness how sport can bring people, and in this case our entire nation, together. At West Ham, we were delighted when Mayor Boris Johnson made the historic decision, which he described as,

“a truly momentous milestone for London’s Olympic Stadium, ensuring its credible and sustainable future”,

to award us as the anchor tenant who will occupy the stadium from 2016. The Olympic stadium and, indeed, Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park as a whole, presents a real opportunity to rejuvenate and regenerate the east of London. It will be a hub for commerce, culture, education and sport, but it also provides the unique opportunity to reconnect communities. Football may be a sport, but it is also a language that seeks to unite people. We have always known that we have a crucial role, which West Ham United will play in acting as the focal point for this powerful community convergence. As my noble friend Lord Coe himself said of our proposals:

“It lives with the commitment we made in Singapore”.

Our move to Stratford will create more than 700 jobs, provide over a million visitors to the park each year and be an opportunity to help tens of thousands of disadvantaged youngsters through our community outreach. I assure noble Lords that work is already well under way to

begin to deliver a lasting Olympic legacy for London. West Ham's own Community Sports Trust has offered 1.5 million opportunities and developed an extensive model of health, education and sports development programmes. Social mobility is the key driver for the trust. This year alone, 10,000 youngsters in Newham and 8,000 in Tower Hamlets engaged with our Kickz scheme, which has had a tangible impact on reducing anti-social behaviour. Our Inspire centre provided out-of-school study support to 6,000 underachieving children in Newham, and these numbers will grow exponentially now that our move is confirmed. My personal passion, our employability, training and mentoring scheme, has engaged with more than 15,000 youngsters via our programmes this season, but our delivery in this area is now set to double as a result of the move. Our partnership with Leadership Through Sport reaches young people whom employers may otherwise struggle to find. Every single trainee has an east London postcode and, for us, it is wholly unacceptable that local youngsters grow up within earshot of a flourishing Canary Wharf and yet, too often, are effectively worlds apart. Schemes such as these will, little by little, change that through sport.

Encouraging engagement with sport can result in wonderful things; it changes people's lives for the better. Sport has enabled me to change and develop two great clubs in this country, to pioneer charities that support causes close to my heart, to champion equality and enjoy the camaraderie that fighting for a common goal can often achieve. I am honoured to be in this House, and I hope that from within Parliament I can continue to encourage and promote the aims of sport, the benefits of good governance and the realisation of the dreams and aspirations of young people; and thus work on an all-party basis in this House for the betterment of life through sport and recreation throughout the United Kingdom.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1464–5](#))

Lord Goddard of Stockport, 11 December 2014, Debate on Economic Leadership for Cities

My Lords, listening to other Peers' maiden speeches has been quite a revelation for me; some have been amusing, some quite touching. Anyone who had the privilege of hearing the maiden speech of the noble Lord, Lord Farmer, must have been moved by his highly personal story. On the other hand, I now know that there are seven Smiths in the House—a quite useless fact but one that I cannot get out of my head. I thank everyone who has made my introduction and my stay here so welcoming: my long-suffering supporters, my noble friends Lord Lee of Trafford and Lord McNally, and my mentor, my noble friend the one and only Lord Addington.

I also thank the officers, the staff and of course the legendary doorkeepers. On my second day in the House, I decided to come in early—be my own man. I took my place on the third row, in prime position. The House began to fill up. To my surprise, a doorkeeper came across to me. “Lord Goddard?” he politely asked. “Yes, I am.” “Lord Goddard of Stockport?” “Yes, yes.” He actually knows who I am after one day in the House. “Lord Goddard of Stockport, the Liberal Democrat Peer?” By now, I am the emperor penguin, chest out and proud as punch: “Yes, I am that Member”. The doorkeeper leans in and whispers in my ear: “Perhaps the noble Lord will wish to follow me across the Floor to the Liberal Democrat Benches. You are actually sat in the Labour Benches”.

As the realisation of my predicament dawns on me, I slowly follow him down the steps and across the Floor of the Chamber. I can see the Members politely smiling at my mishap right around the Chamber. I go from emperor penguin to Donald Duck in 30 seconds. At the

bottom of the stairs he mercifully administers the coup de grace: “My Lord, I’m sure you will be safer sitting here”. Many new Members are confused by the geography of the Palace of Westminster, but I managed to get confused over the geography of this Chamber. Noble Lords will be pleased to know that I will not be putting my name forward for overseas visits in the foreseeable future; I fear that I could be lost to the House for ever.

I turn to the Motion being debated today, which I am grateful to my noble friend Lord Shipley for tabling. I want to spend a short time reflecting on Greater Manchester’s journey towards achieving greater control over the decisions that affect us all locally. It is a journey that has been made in partnership with government, recognising not only the economic potential of English city regions but their leaders’ capacity to make the right decisions for those places. Greater Manchester’s 10 leaders have an unrivalled history of collaboration, characterised by consistent leadership and hard work over many years, first through the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities, established in 1986, and then through the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, the first in the country, marking a new phase in our collective ambitions. The combined authority provides us with strong and effective governance and has statutory responsibilities for transport, economic development and regeneration. As a Liberal Democrat vice chair of the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities, I was uniquely placed to help frame and deliver those unique opportunities.

Our leadership has evolved from a “bottom up” approach—it is vital that Members understand that—to meet the Greater Manchester agenda and ensure the ownership and commitment of the 10 leaders. We have worked out which functions are best delivered at the Greater Manchester level and which are best delivered at local level. We also have been able to develop a highly effective partnership with business leaders, helping to shape the strategic direction and oversee the delivery of key growth functions. There is no equivalent comprehensive partnership anywhere else in the country.

In March 2012 I was one of the four leaders from Greater Manchester who pitched for, and were successful in securing, the first city deal in the country. That city deal secured a broad-ranging set of arrangements to deliver jobs and growth to Greater Manchester. Three aspects of that merit particular attention.

The earn-back model is a ground-breaking tax-increment financing scheme which means that £1.2 billion of investment made by our councils can be earned back as real economic growth is delivered, to then be reinvested in further schemes.

The Greater Manchester Investment Framework combines different government funding streams into a single pot, making it easier for investors to access the finance they need. Because the fund is a loan, not a grant, it can be recycled to make better use of scarce resources. New skills pilots will deliver an extra 6,000 apprenticeships via small and medium-size businesses.

The devolution agreement, signed in November, is quite simply an agreement designed to drive growth and reform public services in the quickest possible way.

I recognise that the full devolution of Greater Manchester’s public spending will take many years to deliver. Our road map proposes that the functions and resources for public services be devolved in a staged manner to enable the city region to be financially sustainable and economically successful, providing early wins for both Greater Manchester and the Government.

Finally, I thank Sir Howard Bernstein, chief executive of Manchester City Council, and Eamonn Boylan, chief executive of Stockport Council, for their support over many years. Today Sir Howard and I share a wider smile, following our beloved Manchester City's win in Rome last night against all the odds. As my mother used to say to me, "Do good things for others and sometimes good things will happen to you". Thank you.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1931–3](#))

Lord Cooper of Windrush, 17 December 2014, Recall of MPs Bill

My Lords, the history of this place and the solemn, central role that it fulfils bring a profound feeling of responsibility to a new Peer joining your Lordships' House. The wisdom, experience and expertise concentrated here are extraordinary and also humbling, as is the warmth of the welcome to new Members from all sides of the House. Being here is an honour far beyond anything that I ever expected.

I thank my mentor, my noble friend Lady Morris of Bolton, and those who supported me at my Introduction a few weeks ago: my noble friends Lord Mawhinney and Lord Finkelstein. They have all given me wise and patient advice as I acclimatise to your Lordships' House.

My noble friend Lord Mawhinney is a man of great wisdom; nevertheless, 20 years ago he took a reckless decision, which was to hire me to run the Conservative Party's private opinion research, inadvertently setting me on a path that my career has followed ever since. My immediate boss in that job was my noble friend Lord Finkelstein, who has been a close friend since we met at the LSE 30 years ago and he introduced me to the joys of wonton soup, Karl Popper and Diet Coke.

I have spent most of the last two decades studying public opinion and what shapes it. I earn my living by helping political organisations and businesses understand what the people who matter to them really think—and why. I know that there is a common view that polling and focus groups have had a pernicious effect on politics. However, I have never understood the idea that it is better not to know what voters are thinking. As my friend Lord Gould of Brookwood put it in his maiden speech here 10 years ago, there is nothing to fear in:

"Discovering the voice of the people".—[Official Report, 29/11/04; col 308.]

I think that every serious politician ought to want to understand what the voters think, just as every successful business makes sure that it knows what its customers think.

I meet many whose objection to the use of polling is a dislike of leaders who just follow whatever focus groups tell them. However, in my experience, such politicians are a myth, whereas there is a very long list of politicians who were ejected from office because they did not understand or respond to the concerns of the electorate.

I spent half of this Parliament working in 10 Downing Street. It provided a fascinating insight into how government works but it also brought the disagreeable consequence of occasionally being the subject of press interest. The *Mail on Sunday* accorded me the cartoonishly tabloid description of the "gay marriage guru"—a title that I am honoured to have but do not deserve—while the *Daily Mail* told its readers that I do not blow my nose without first consulting a focus group. I can assure the House that in all the focus groups I have ever conducted, my nose is one subject that has never come up.

One of my favourite focus group moments came when, in about the middle of the last Parliament, I asked a group of floating voters which Conservative politician, apart from the then leader of the Opposition, David Cameron, they had noticed making an impact. There was a very long pause and then a woman said confidently, “Ed Miliband”—to which someone else instantly added, “Yes, and his brother, Ed Balls”. In that anecdote lies an important truth, which is that most voters have little interest in politics, and still less in the minutiae that many people in Westminster obsess over.

In an era of cynicism, most people discount what politicians say, judging them on how they behave and what they do. It was, of course, the behaviour of politicians in the last Parliament that led to the Bill that we are debating today. Voters were shocked by the expenses scandal, but most were not surprised by it. However unfair, the feeling that our politicians were only in it for themselves was already widespread. Confidence in parliamentary politics collapsed in the aftermath. The idea of recall of MPs was a direct reaction to that. The principle is backed by a large majority of the public. As other noble Lords have pointed out, it was also included in all the main party manifestos—so not to introduce a system of recall would deepen even further the widespread view that politicians can never be believed.

The detail is crucial, of course, and there is undoubtedly a fine balance between empowering voters and protecting the principles of a representative democracy. As the Bill progresses, every aspect of the detail must be scrutinised, and this House is expert at that. In my maiden speech I will suggest only that the in-principle case for recall of MPs is clear. If it is true, as voters want and would like to believe, that “They work for you”, it follows that voters should have the power to fire MPs found guilty of serious wrongdoing, just as members of the public who are guilty of wrongdoing in their workplaces would expect to be fired and not remain in their jobs until the end of their employment contract.

The Bill before us will not, on its own, renew the faith of voters in the integrity of our politics. The problem is deeper and it demands more fundamental change. This House has a vital role to play in debating that because it is less tribal, confrontational and partisan, and because political differences can be transcended here and the bigger view taken. I hope that I will be able to contribute to that debate in your Lordships’ House in the years ahead.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 186–7](#))

Baroness Pinnock, 22 January 2015, Debate on the Local Government Finance Settlement

My Lords, I am fortunate indeed to have been given the great privilege and wonderful opportunity of joining your Lordships’ House. Over the past few weeks, I have been listening and observing in this historic Chamber, and I am left wondering how my background and experience can add to the wealth of knowledge here.

Some 30 years ago, with a young family and a career in teaching, I was motivated to become involved in saving our local school from closure. The success of this campaign gave me a taste for being where the action is. After 28 years’ continuous service to my town of Cleckheaton in West Yorkshire as its elected councillor, I can still say that being able to serve the community where I live is a role I love.

My supporters, my noble friends Lord Shutt of Greetland and Lady Bakewell of Hardington Mandeville, have likewise devoted many years of distinguished service to their local communities and local democracy. I thank them for their patient help and support while I make many errors in your Lordships' House.

When I first entered your Lordships' House, I was overwhelmed by the grandeur of the buildings and the ease with which I got lost. I had nothing to fear as the doorkeepers, attendants and indeed all members of staff in all parts of the House have been unstinting in their time in helping me learn both my way around the House and the protocols. I thank them for that.

Kirklees Council, of which I was leader for six years, serves over 400,000 people in West Yorkshire, with the Victorian woollen towns of Huddersfield and Dewsbury at its heart, but including my own town of Cleckheaton as well as large rural areas best illustrated as the setting for the television series, "Last of the Summer Wine". Noble Lords may remember that it was a sitcom about a group of elderly rabble-rousers, including a man called Clegg—something with which I am sure many on these Benches can empathise.

The finances of local councils have been complained about in each of those 28 years, and this year is no different. I can tell noble Lords about the impact on services for local people in Kirklees—for let us not make the mistake of presuming that reductions in funding of this severity will not have an impact on services provided.

One thing I learnt early on as a councillor is that it is virtually impossible to compare funding year on year, simply because of the changes that take place to different elements of the central government grant. The better care fund, the transfer of the public health function and the transfer of the council tax benefit scheme have added around £75 million to Kirklees's finances—with, of course, the greater responsibilities that go with that. On a national scale, these significant transfers mask what has happened to funding via the revenue support grant.

In Kirklees, a total of £152 million of spending on services is being taken out of the budget between 2011 and 2018. Obviously, with schools' budgets being ring-fenced, and my council rightly protecting as far as possible services to vulnerable adults and children, the cuts fall heavily on the other services on which people rely. The current Kirklees proposals to meet this budget deficit include a 15 percent reduction in spending on services for vulnerable adults; and, despite rising numbers, as a third of the council's controllable budget is spent on vulnerable adults, this expenditure has also inevitably had to be reduced.

Another proposal is to reduce the number of fully funded libraries from 26 to two, and to reduce spending on parks and open spaces by 30 percent, with the result that some recreation areas will not have their grass cut at all. Road maintenance has already been reduced by 15 percent, with the inevitable consequences for road users. Sponsorship of concerts and music education is being removed altogether. So local government in Kirklees is facing challenging times. This is confirmed by a report by the National Audit Office on the financial sustainability of local authorities, which states that local government's spending power has been reduced by 25 percent over the life of this Parliament.

Our democratic reaction to this immense change could be hand-wringing. That may be satisfying but it will not get us very far. Those of us committed to providing essential services must think outside the box. As my noble friend Lord Tope said, one thing we need to do is seriously loosen the ties with central government, find new ways to raise local finances, and

challenge central government to devolve responsibility for services such as Jobcentre Plus and community health services. If those measures are combined with greater accountability, our councils may—just—be able to survive the current financial desert and start to bring new vitality and involvement in local democracy once more.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1454–5](#))

Baroness Wolf of Dulwich, 10 March 2015, Debate on Soft Power and the UK’s Influence (Select Committee Report)

My Lords, it is an enormous honour and privilege to join your Lordships' House and speak in this debate. I would like to express my gratitude for the welcome and kindness shown to me by everyone here since my arrival. Preparing for today I was also greatly relieved to discover that a large number of other people also spent their first few weeks discovering that they had no sense of direction. If it were not for the outstanding staff here, I would probably be wandering the corridors still.

I also thank my two distinguished supporters, the noble Lords, Lord Sutherland of Houndwood and Lord Rees of Ludlow, for their help and support. Both, as I am sure noble Lords know, are eminent academics. I should explain perhaps that I am also an academic and a social scientist. My own work is largely on vocational education and training, and higher education.

I thank the noble Lord, Lord Howell of Guildford, for securing and introducing this debate and for giving me the opportunity to say a little about universities and soft power. Professor Joseph Nye, whose work first defined the idea of soft power, believes that the role that Britain plays in educating people in British universities is a major soft power resource for this country. The committee agrees, and I am more than happy to agree myself. However, I was surprised at how little was said by witnesses to the committee about what universities actually do that translates into soft power in this way. A few—very few—individual witnesses talked of how our universities exposed students to British values and shaped the thoughts of the world’s future elites. However, the research councils mostly emphasised international research collaborations, and the membership organisations tended to dwell more on numbers, money and, of course, visas.

Universities UK offered one anecdote about a Chinese central banker with a Cambridge PhD, who said that in negotiations with the Bank of England he was “emotionally bonded” to the UK. That is wonderful, but I think most noble Lords would agree that this could reflect memories of happy days on the river and friendships made, rather than anything important that we, the universities, actually did. And so I should like to take this opportunity to spell out in a little more detail what goes on in universities—week after week, year after year—that can make them an important source of soft power for this country.

I know that many noble Lords are, like me, academics by trade, and what I say will therefore sound very familiar. I should like to start with my own recent week. Last week was when our course teams at my university, King’s College London, finalised and agreed the questions on summer examination papers and drew up indicative answers that would go out to external examiners. In doing so, it was striking how often we would require students to “examine critically” a particular statement or question. We would demand that they contrast and evaluate opposing views. We would reiterate in our notes the importance for a good answer of both tight theoretical argument and the marshalling of empirical evidence.

Last week, I was also marking and commenting on coursework—that is, the long written papers that in almost every university now contribute substantially to a final degree. Among the most important coursework marking criteria in every British university I know are, first, a full bibliography, properly set out; and, secondly, that all assertions made are properly and fully referenced and supported. Any quote must be easily traced by provision of the exact page or other reference marker. Our students, understandably, often find us compulsive and nitpicking on this point. But this is fundamentally how we convey and hopefully instil some core values. This is about respect for evidence—all evidence, not just the evidence in one’s own comfort zone. It is about accuracy, scrupulous attention to detail and transparency. We also reward independent judgment, but provided it takes place within those bounds. This, I have to say, is far from universally true across the world.

In UK universities today, there is a real tension between the demands of research, the pressure to expand numbers and the labour-intensive process of teaching, marking and feedback that I have just described. But this latter process is central to how we instil norms and values. They, in turn, are a critical part of our universities’ potential for soft power.

We tend to talk about power as a zero-sum game—“If I have some, you have less”. But there are important aspects of the world where things are not zero-sum but, on the contrary, can make life better for everyone. I do not think that I am contravening the rule for maiden speeches in suggesting that that is true of the values that I have described. They are good for the whole planet. They are good for everyone. If people respect evidence, can formulate a logical argument and take for granted the importance of considering opposing views and justifying their disagreement, this has to be a good thing for the world.

Professor Mary Kaldor of the LSE, in her written evidence, told the committee that British universities “are global institutions” that “contribute to global debates about the construction of rules and norms”. It would clearly be naive to think that by educating many of the world’s future elite here, as we do, we would automatically spread peace, good will and collaboration across the planet. However, conveying academic values by the way we teach, assess and respond to students is a core part of what all British academics are, and should be, about. It is very important, and I hope that in any discussion of university soft power noble Lords will duly give it centre stage.

In conclusion, I again thank noble Lords for their welcome and support, and I look forward very much to contributing to the work of this House in years to come.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 567–9](#))

3. Valedictory Speeches

Lord Jenkin of Roding, 16 December 2014, Pension Schemes Bill

My Lords, last month the House, in its wisdom, accepted the recommendation of the Procedure Committee that a Peer who has given notice of his wish to retire might have an opportunity to make what they christened “a valedictory speech”. I would point out that a number of noble Lords have retired recently, their retirements having been announced by the noble Baroness the Lord Speaker, and they have not felt it necessary to bother the House with any valedictory speech. However, when I see just how conspicuous this first valedictory speech

has become, I wonder why I did not take the same decision. I suppose that one excuse I could offer is that I seem to have given the experts on pensions, to whom I have been listening for the last hour or so, a bigger audience than perhaps they might otherwise have attracted—although whether that is regarded as an advantage I do not know. However, I feel humbled, in a sense, by the numbers—their curiosity seems to have overcome their apprehensions—who have come this evening. I only hope that they will not regret it.

One undertaking I can give is that, in view of the very kind things that have already been said in this debate, I think I can be extremely brief. The Procedure Committee said not more than ten minutes; I hope I will be rather less than that. I can give the House one further assurance. I have been advised that it is not necessary in a valedictory speech for the speaker to address the subject of the legislation in which he has chosen to make the speech. If my noble friends on the Front Bench and others will forgive me, I will not do so. I have been enormously impressed by the expertise that has been demonstrated. As a former Minister in charge of pensions, I am lost in admiration and realise that it is just as well that I am not trying to talk about this legislation.

In recent weeks, I have been approached by a number of noble Lords from all parts of the House asking, sometimes with some asperity, why I am retiring. After all, I am getting on a bit and I realise that, but I have two answers; one is very short and the other is slightly longer. The short one is that after 50 years in Parliament—a number of noble Lords have already made reference to that—and at the age of 88, I feel that I have done enough. I have done what I can offer, and it is best to bow out and let others carry on.

The slightly longer answer is that, if this House is to continue to perform its hugely important functions in the running of this country, I totally believe that there has to be a constant infusion of new blood introduced into the House, with people who have current experience and whose experience of business or whatever field they have operated in is completely up to date. They can bring their advice and guidance to the House. If the House is not to remain too big—there seems to be a fairly widespread if not universal view that, as the second largest legislature in the world after the Chinese congress, we are a little big—it seems incumbent on oldies to hand over to a younger generation. Everyone must make their own decisions about that: there is no sense of compulsion. I have made my decision and that is why I stand here before this House today.

Last month, a number of us were fortunate to attend what I found to be an inspiring thanksgiving service at Westminster Abbey for the late Mary Soames. Talking to people coming away from it afterwards, there was one phrase that was repeated by people: it really is the end of an era. When Winston Churchill's youngest child passes on, that is the end of an era. I am conscious of having lived through much of that era. I was privileged in 1964 to follow Sir Winston as the Member of Parliament for Woodford, which was later renamed Wanstead and Woodford. I look back to the maiden speech that I made in the House on that occasion, where by convention the new Member is expected to say something nice about his predecessor. I thought, "What on earth can I say about that great man that would not be said with far greater eloquence by others?". I therefore looked up his maiden speech to see what he had said on 18 February 1901. I was struck by a passage that impressed me. If nothing else, Sir Winston was a great parliamentarian. At the age of 26, just home from the Boer War, which was still going on, he said:

"In my opinion, based upon the experience of the most famous men whose names have adorned the records of the House, no national emergency short, let us say, of the actual

invasion of this country itself ought in any way to restrict or prevent the entire freedom of Parliamentary discussion”.—[Official Report, Commons, 18/2/1901; col 407.]

That was 40 years before Dunkirk, when the Nazis threatened the invasion of these islands. At the age of 26 he had such foresight. He was absolutely unique. Of course, during that war, as Prime Minister, he led this country to victory in 1945 and made sure that Parliament was always able to hold Ministers to account during that period. We should be very proud of that.

Here we are now in December 2014, 50 years after the 1964 general election. I look back and I have been very fortunate. I have had a very eventful life. It has had its tragedies. I never have the slightest hesitation when answering a question as to what for me was the biggest tragedy in that period. It was the death of my hero Iain Macleod, one month after he became Chancellor of the Exchequer. I see the noble Lord, Lord Armstrong, there. I have never forgotten—he was the Principal Private Secretary at No. 10 who rang us up early in the morning to give us the tragic news. For the rest of that day—indeed, for the weeks that followed—it was an appalling disaster and a huge loss for this country. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that.

Then, later on, the election of the first Thatcher Government was the start of six years' service in her Cabinets. I have one disappointment. We always lined up every year for a Cabinet photograph, in two rows: the seated at the front with the Prime Minister and the standing at the back. I never made the front row. That gives one a very clear indication of where one stands on things. Those years saw successes and failures. I am not going to stand here and spell out the failures. There was a marvellous book published by two Essex University professors last year—a very revealing book—called *The Blunders of Our Governments*, by Professors Anthony King and Ivor Crewe. I have to tell your Lordships that my sins are ruthlessly exposed in that book.

I am sometimes asked what legacy one can point to. I am not sure that I am the right person to do that, but I offer two suggestions. In the other place I became Secretary of State for Industry and inherited six very major state-owned nationalised industries. As a former Chief Secretary, I could tell their chairmen and chief executives that there was no way they were going to get their investment requirements funded by the Treasury. I started with British Telecom and told the chairman that, if he wanted to have his £28 billion investment programme or whatever it was, he would have to go to the market and have 51 percent from the private sector. I look back at that decision: I was able to persuade first the Prime Minister and then the Cabinet that BT should be privatised. Other noble Lords were responsible for subsequent stages, but the decision to publish the White Paper and introduce the Bill was when I was Secretary of State. I look back on that with some pride. Nobody has ever suggested that that one should be reversed and I think it set a pattern.

What about this House? Some have pointed to the Science and Technology Select Committee report *Science and Society* of 1999. It was this report that convinced the scientific community—not just in the UK but across the world—that, if you wanted the public to support and understand, you had to engage with the public and not just preach down to them, and not just on the public understanding of science. It took a while for the message to get across, but there are very few national scientific bodies in this country or anywhere else that do not have their science and society activity, of which, quite rightly, they are very proud. Ten years after that report was published, the British Council organised a conference in London to celebrate the report. It was attended by the representatives of more than 55 different countries. As someone who never did any science at school or university at all, I felt rather pleased with that. It has not stopped: only last week at a gathering downstairs, to which I had

been invited but did not attend, my son accepted an award for what is called “outstanding contribution to science”. It was meant for me. I am completely flabbergasted. However, there it is.

I am over my time. I must end by thanking all those who have made these 50 years possible, including my former constituents in Wanstead and Woodford, the clerks and staff of both Houses, and all the people who keep the wheels turning over and make it possible for us to do our job in the way that we do: the Library staff, the catering staff, the security staff, the police, the doorkeepers, the Printed Paper Office and many others. I offer to them all my heartfelt thanks. Above all, I thank my colleagues for their friendship and forbearance, and for their patience in listening to me this evening. My Lords, I will miss you all dreadfully.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 141–3](#))

Viscount Tenby, 19 March 2015, Debate on the Inquiries Act 2005 (Select Committee Report)

My Lords, I thank noble Lords for the many generous remarks made this morning about someone I do not recognise. As a Welshman and a Lloyd George, I find myself almost lost for words—which, I think noble Lords will agree, is a pretty kettle of fish.

I begin by apologising to the noble Lord, Lord Shutt, and to the Minister for gate-crashing an important debate on the Inquiries Act. In an ill-informed bow to the subject of this most important Select Committee report, I merely observe that with the ever-increasing need for inquiries, it must make sense to have some central body or “unit”—to quote the noble Lord, Lord Shutt—to oversee all the issues; and, without being too restrictive, a set of generally agreed requirements which would make such inquiries more cost-effective and less time-consuming.

I imagine that intruders into the parliamentary timetable are no more welcome than gate-crashers at a teenager’s birthday party—but, in their wisdom, and with some sensitivity, the authorities have decided that such a privilege should be available. Indeed, Lord Jenkin of Roding, who has served his country with such distinction in both Houses, memorably took the plunge last December. As an inadequate token of appreciation, I will undertake not to take too much of the House’s time. In other words, I will not repeat two of my pet aversions over the years: a long Second Reading speech on Report, or starting by saying, “I had not intended to speak in this debate”, before making a beautifully crafted speech lasting at least 10 minutes.

After I made my maiden speech some 26 years ago on alternatives to custodial sentencing, I thought, “Well, that’s one terrifying experience I won’t have to go through again”—but how wrong I was. It has been an immense pleasure to have participated in the work of the House over these past years. During that time I have been both proud and privileged to have served five outstanding Convenors of the Cross Benches, who happily are all now with us save for the much missed late Lord Weatherill, with whom, in a junior role of course, I was able to play some small part in the first stage of Lords reform. I pay tribute and give thanks to all of them, and to my fellow colleagues and friends.

My retirement will bring to an end—almost to the day—125 years of continuous parliamentary representation in my immediate family. Perhaps due to family interest in the subject, I was a member of what may well have been in recent times the earliest committee to turn its

attention to Lords reform back in 1995, and I like to think that some of our commentaries and suggestions then have stood the test of time. I have been fortunate in being able to continue that interest, not least as a long-serving member of the campaign for an effective second Chamber—I see certain distinguished members of that group in their seats today. We seek to bring clarity and common sense to the discussions on the future composition of this vital revising Chamber, which does not make laws and which—rightly, in a democracy—gives way to the elected Chamber.

As a personal experience, I will say how rewarding it was to be a member of a House that helped to bring in legal and criminal justice Bills—it seems like every year; I think it was—while at the same time being able to judge their efficacy as chairman of a Bench of over 100 magistrates. It should be noted, in any future composition of a second Chamber, that election is not necessarily an all-embracing panacea. I hope that any future House will contain a large number of Members appointed for their knowledge and experience, so that the close examination of legislation may continue to be professional and thorough.

However, the principal reason I welcome the chance to speak here today is that it enables me to thank most warmly the very many splendid servants of this remarkable place: secretaries, officials, clerks, officers, attendants, the post room, the Printed Paper Office, all the catering and banqueting staff, the Library, accounts, the information office, police and security—I could go on and on, and I apologise to those I have inadvertently omitted. Together, ladies and gentlemen, you are the life-blood which makes this House what it is, and I thank you one and all, most sincerely, for your unstinting help over the years.

In my early days here, I enjoyed the friendship and advice of a noble Lord now sadly long-departed—the late Lord Allen of Abbeydale, for whom the evocative phrase “Civil Service luminary” might well have been coined. Often, if I was making a set-piece speech, I would go to him for advice. In his later years, when ill health prevented him from attending the House, he would ring up to find out how the day had gone. I would always give him the same reply: “Well, at least my trousers didn’t fall down”—which invariably seemed to satisfy him. Fortunately, mine still seem to be in place today, so, without wishing to press my luck to destruction, I wish your Lordships the greatest good fortune and constitutional success in the years to come. I thank you one and all. I have enjoyed my time here immensely.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1150–1](#))

Lord Lloyd of Berwick, 26 March 2015, QSD on Immigration: Detention

My Lords, I will speak first to the subject matter of the debate since I was a member of the group which produced this report.

The basic legal principle is not in doubt: executive detention is lawful if, but only if, there is a realistic prospect of removing the detainee within a reasonable time. When we debated the Immigration Act this time last year, my noble friend Lady Williams of Crosby, who I am more than glad to see in her place, moved an amendment which would have limited the period to 60 days. The noble Lord, Lord Taylor of Holbeach, resisted the amendment on the ground that the principle is well established, with which, of course, I wholly agree.

However, the noble Lord went on to argue that the application of that principle should and could be left safely in the hands of the judges. I would normally welcome that argument with open arms but in this particular instance I am afraid to say that the judges have let us down. For example, in one case, an offender was detained pending his deportation to Somalia. He was eventually released but only after he had been detained for three years and five months. On no possible view could that be regarded as reasonable, yet his claim failed. I refer to some of these cases at page 18 of the report.

We are the only country in Europe which allows indefinite detention of this kind. In France, the maximum period is 45 days. In Spain, it is two months and in Italy it is three months, so we are way out of line with these countries. In the end, the group came to the view that we should have a maximum limit of 28 days. In coming to that view, we were much influenced by the corrosive effect which prolonged uncertainty has on the detainees themselves. There was much evidence to that effect, both from the detainees and the experts. I therefore hope that we will be hearing from others taking part in the debate about the reasons why we took that view.

Meanwhile, I must turn to my so-called valedictory speech, which I prefer to call my swan-song. I have been incredibly lucky to have what amounts to a second career in this House after I retired as a Law Lord in 1999. I have made many, many friends among Members and the staff. I particularly thank those members of staff to whom I come most frequently—namely, those in the Public Bill Office and the Printed Paper Office. I am sure that they will know to whom I am referring. I regard them as great friends and will miss them very greatly.

However, the fact is that I shall be 86 in May and feel that it is time to go, if only because I am beginning, I have to say, to feel my age. Not only that but I am also afraid that my age is beginning to show. I know that because whenever I get on to an underground train, if it is at all crowded, I find that men and women of all ages offer me their seats. That would be a good test for us all to apply.

When we were all much younger, there was a very popular musical called, “Salad Days”, which I hope some of your Lordships will remember. In it there was a rather sentimental song. Unless your Lordships insist, I will not sing it, but the refrain was:

“I’ll remind you to remind me we said we wouldn’t look back”.

When the time comes, one does look back, of course. It is the natural thing to do, and that is what I propose to do, with your Lordships’ consent.

I made my maiden speech in 1993 but did not, as the police say, come to notice until 2005. I was strongly opposed to the abolition of the Lord Chancellor. Your Lordships will remember how it happened. The Lord Chancellor was abolished by a *fait accompli* in a press release from 10 Downing Street. But at the end of the Second Reading, I moved an amendment—it has to be said, with the encouragement of the noble Lord, Lord Strathclyde—to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, which then happened. It was, of course, very soon discovered that the Lord Chancellor simply could not be abolished. He is far too deeply embedded in our history and constitution. Instead, the title of the Bill was changed and the Lord Chancellor was to be modified. That was a piece of luck because it enabled me to argue that the modified Lord Chancellor should continue to be a Member of this House and have some experience of the law. Those amendments were carried easily in this House but, unfortunately, late one night, they were defeated on ping-pong—and so we are now where we are.

My next appearance was as chairman of the Select Committee on the Speakership of the House of Lords. We were lucky to have as our clerk an up-and-coming young man who is now the Clerk of the Parliaments. He kept us straight as to the meaning of self-regulation, and I owe him a lot. We started our discussions a long way apart but, as often happens in these cases—indeed, as I pointed out during my speech—we slowly inched closer together. That is what we did, and we produced a report that I think one can say has stood the test of time.

I have already mentioned new friends that I have made while I have been a Member of the House. There is one friend in particular whom I would like to mention. He was one of the most remarkable men that I have ever known. His name was Lord Morris of Manchester, better known as Alf.

Our friendship came about in this way: I had presided in this House in a case which concerned the meaning of the noble Lord's great pioneering Act, the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970. I called that Act a "noble aspiration". When Lord Morris made his maiden speech in this House, he quoted those words. I was listening as he did so, so one thing led to another and we became friends.

At that time, Lord Morris was much concerned with the fate of returning veterans from the first Iraq war, suffering, as we all now know, from Gulf War syndrome. The Government had refused to hold an independent inquiry, so he did the unusual thing of holding his own independent inquiry of which he asked me to be the chairman, which I said I would.

We listened to a great deal of evidence, including from the noble and gallant Lord, Lord Craig, whom I am also glad to see sitting in his seat, and from the veterans and all sorts of experts. We were not at that time able to identify the cause of Gulf War syndrome, but we at least established that it existed, which the Government had up till then refused to acknowledge. We also pointed out that the veterans had been very badly treated. For that, we also secured for them an apology, but that was all.

I come to terrorism, with which I shall deal briefly because it is controversial. This has been my subject for 20 years. As it is controversial, I will provide just a few facts, which I know your Lordships know. Currently, there are 2.5 million Muslims in this country who are as loyal and law-abiding as we are, but there are some 100,000 Muslims who are inclined to a greater or lesser extent towards the terrorist cause. Our task, as I see it, is to win them over and keep them to our way of life and our way of thinking. This will take a very long time, probably a generation, as was the case with Irish terrorism. In the meantime, whatever we do, we must not alienate those 100,000 Muslims. We must try to keep them on our side.

And so I come to my last stopping-off point—just in time—which brings me back very close to where we started. I refer to the prisoners who are currently serving indeterminate sentences for the protection of the public. I have often given your Lordships the facts, but I will do so for one last time. There are currently 5,000 prisoners serving IPP sentences, a form of sentence which was abolished in 2012. I am concerned with only 650 of them, who are serving tariffs of less than two years which they were given more than eight years ago. About a third of them have been assessed as being unlikely to reoffend. Of the 650, eight were sentenced to a tariff of less than three months; 22 to less than six months; 27 to less than nine months; yet they are all still in prison.

Mr Grayling was given a power in 2012 to change the release test for those prisoners so as to secure their early release, but he has declined to exercise that power. I have received many

letters from those prisoners because they know that I am their champion and I have met members of their families. They have no means of knowing, even now, when, if ever, they will be released.

If I were allowed one last wish at the end of my swan-song, it would be that all seven of the political parties should enter into manifesto commitments that will meet those people's needs as soon as the new Government are elected. They should do so if only on the grounds that it will save £40 million a year, but I hope that they would do so on grounds of simple humanity. These prisoners have suffered a grave injustice, and it is high time that we came to their rescue.

(HL *Hansard*, [cols 1565–8](#))

Appendix I: Maiden Speeches 2010–15

Maiden Speeches, Session 2014–15

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Oxford and Asquith, E	Liberal Democrat	24/03/2015	EU and Russia (EUC Report)	Cols 1331–3
Kinnoull, E	Crossbench	19/03/2015	International Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Students (S&T Committee Report)	Cols 1202–4
Hay of Ballyore, L	Democratic Unionist	17/03/2015	Corporation Tax (Northern Ireland) Bill	Cols 1017–9
Wolf of Dulwich, B	Crossbench	10/03/2015	Soft Power and the UK's Influence (Select Committee Report)	Cols 567–9
Fox, L	Liberal Democrat	23/01/2015	International Development (Official Development Assistance Target) Bill	Cols 1557–8
Pinnock, B	Liberal Democrat	22/01/2015	Local Government Finance Settlement	Cols 1454–5
Southwark, Bp	Bishop	22/01/2015	Local Government Finance Settlement	Cols 1457–8
Callanan, L	Conservative	15/01/2015	Natural Environment	Cols 910–1
Suri, L	Conservative	15/01/2015	Mental Health	Cols 957–9
Evans of Weardale, L	Crossbench	13/01/2015	Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill	Cols 690–3
Green of Deddington, L	Crossbench	13/01/2015	Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill	Cols 700–2
Cooper of Windrush, L	Conservative	17/12/2014	Recall of MPs Bill	Cols 186–7
Goddard of Stockport, L	Liberal Democrat	11/12/2014	Economic Leadership for Cities	Cols 1931–3
Scriven, L	Liberal Democrat	11/12/2014	Economic Leadership for Cities	Cols 1936–7
Janke, B	Liberal Democrat	11/12/2014	Economic Leadership for Cities	Cols 1941–3
Rose of Monewden, L	Conservative	04/12/2014	Autumn Statement	Cols 1423–5
Brady, B	Conservative	04/12/2014	Sport: Governance	Cols 1464–5

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Harding of Winscombe, B	Conservative	02/12/2014	Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Bill	Cols 1262–4
Evans of Bowes Park, B	Conservative	27/11/2014	Schools: Arts Education	Cols 1073–5
Smith of Newnham, B	Liberal Democrat	25/11/2014	EU: UK Membership	Cols 821–2
Shields, B	Conservative	20/11/2014	UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: Digital Impact	Cols 579–81
Cashman, L	Labour	17/11/2014	Modern Slavery Bill	Cols 259–61
Chisholm of Owlpen, B	Conservative	17/11/2014	Modern Slavery Bill	Cols 265–7
Mobarik, B	Conservative	17/11/2014	Modern Slavery Bill	Cols 286–9
Rebuck, B	Labour	06/11/2014	Women: Homelessness, Domestic Violence and Social Exclusion	Cols 1749–52
Farmer, L	Conservative	06/11/2014	Women: Homelessness, Domestic Violence and Social Exclusion	Cols 1757–9
Lennie, L	Labour	29/10/2014	Scotland: Devolution	Cols 1232–3
Ely, Bp	Bishop	16/10/2014	Social Justice Strategy	Cols 368–70
Richards of Herstmonceux, L	Crossbench	23/06/2014	Armed Forces	Cols 1082–4
Bamford, L	Conservative	10/06/2014	Queen's Speech	Cols 266–8
Durham, Bp	Bishop	10/06/2014	Queen's Speech	Cols 281–3
Chelmsford, Bp	Bishop	09/06/2014	Queen's Speech	Cols 148–51
Glendonbrook, L	Conservative	09/06/2014	Queen's Speech	Cols 157–9
Rochester, Bp	Bishop	05/06/2014	Queen's Speech	Cols 53–4

*Tables compiled with the assistance of Ben Sayle and Niamh Walsh (work experience students)

Maiden Speeches, Session 2013–14

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Portsmouth, Bp	Bishop	09/04/2014	Higher Education	Cols 1335–7
Palumbo of Southwark, L	Liberal Democrat	06/03/2014	Women: Contribution to Economic Life	Cols 1464–5
Peterborough, Bp	Bishop	25/02/2014	Social Welfare Law	Cols 902–4
Allen of Kensington, L	Labour	24/02/2014	Children: Competitive Sports	Cols 313–4GC
Goldie, B	Conservative	30/01/2014	Scotland: Independence Referendum	Cols 1384–5
Williams of Trafford, B	Conservative	16/01/2014	City of Bradford Metropolitan District	Cols 183–4GC
Haughey, L	Labour	08/01/2014	Commonwealth Games 2014	Cols 1576–8
Sheffield, Bp	Bishop	12/12/2013	Health: End of Life	Cols 918–9
Verjee, L	Liberal Democrat	12/12/2013	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria	Cols 960–2
St Albans, Bp	Bishop	05/12/2013	Education: Contribution to Economic Growth	Cols 363–6
Sherbourne of Didsbury, L	Conservative	05/12/2013	Education: Contribution to Economic Growth	Cols 370–2
Carrington of Fulham, L	Conservative	05/12/2013	Banking: Parliamentary Commission on Banking Standards	Cols 477–9
Balfe, L	Conservative	03/12/2013	Pensions Bill	Cols 161–3
Holmes of Richmond, L	Conservative	28/11/2013	Economy: Broadcast Media	Cols 1525–7
Grender, B	Liberal Democrat	28/11/2013	Economy: Broadcast Media	Cols 1534–6
Purvis of Tweed, L	Liberal Democrat	28/11/2013	Economy: Broadcast Media	Cols 1537–9
Humphreys, B	Liberal Democrat	28/11/2013	Economy: Broadcast Media	Cols 1544–6
Jones of Moulsecoomb, B	Green Party	28/11/2013	Police: Public Trust	Cols 1588–90
Judge, L	Crossbench	25/11/2013	Consumers: Paper Billing	Cols 1255–6
Finkelstein, L	Conservative	21/11/2013	Human Rights	Cols 1081–2

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Kennedy of Cradley, B	Labour	21/11/2013	Human Rights	Cols 1086–8
Suttie, B	Liberal Democrat	21/11/2013	Human Rights	Cols 1090–2
Mendelsohn, L	Labour	21/11/2013	Human Rights	Cols 1096–8
Carlisle, Bp	Bishop	21/11/2013	Church of England: Holistic Missions	Cols 1124–6
Lawrence of Clarendon, B	Labour	21/11/2013	Church of England: Holistic Missions	Cols 1129–31
Hodgson of Abinger, B	Conservative	07/11/2013	Middle East: Situation for Women	Cols 127–9GC
Neville-Rolfe, B	Conservative	07/11/2013	United Kingdom and China	Cols 343–5
Whitby, L	Conservative	07/11/2013	United Kingdom and China	Cols 352–3
Bourne of Aberystwyth, L	Conservative	07/11/2013	Magna Carta	Cols 426–8
Bakewell of Hardington Mandeville, B	Liberal Democrat	31/10/2013	Housing: Affordability and the Underoccupancy Charge	Cols 1700–2
Leigh of Hurley, L	Conservative	30/10/2013	Tackling Corporate Tax Avoidance: EAC Report	Cols 1631–3
Paddick, L	Liberal Democrat	29/10/2013	Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Bill	Cols 1509–11
Wrigglesworth, L	Liberal Democrat	24/10/2013	EU: UK Membership	Cols 1194–6
Horam, L	Conservative	22/10/2013	Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Bill	Cols 916–8
Manzoor, B	Liberal Democrat	17/10/2013	Drugs	Cols 664–6
Livingston of Parkhead, L	Conservative	17/10/2013	Ageing: Public Services and Demographic Change Committee Report	Cols 746–7
Borwick, L	Conservative	17/10/2013	Ageing: Public Services and Demographic Change Committee Report	Cols 753–4
Truro, Bp	Bishop	20/06/2013	Schools: Bullying	Cols 413–5
Walker of Gestingthorpe, L	Crossbench	22/05/2013	Intellectual Property Bill [HL]	Cols 866–7
Berkeley of Knighton, L	Crossbench	14/05/2013	Queen's Speech	Cols 283–6

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Ridley, V	Conservative	14/05/2013	Queen's Speech	Cols 293–5
Winchester, Bp	Bishop	14/05/2013	Queen's Speech	Cols 298–301
Lane-Fox of Soho, B	Crossbench	13/05/2013	Queen's Speech	Cols 159–60

Maiden Speeches, Session 2012–13

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Coventry, Bp	Bishop	07/03/2013	International Women's Day	Cols 1626–8
Nash, L	Conservative	04/02/2013	Education: Academies and Free Schools	Cols 92–5
Trees, L	Conservative	11/01/2013	Leveson Inquiry	Cols 375–7
Kidron, B	Crossbench	13/12/2012	Care Services: Abuse of Learning Disabled	Cols 1242–3
Deighton, L	Conservative	08/11/2012	Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012	Cols 1105–8
Phillips of Worth Matravers, L	Crossbench	01/11/2012	Armed Forces: Reserve Forces	Cols 736–7
Worcester, Bp	Bishop	28/06/2012	English Cathedrals	Cols 342–4
O'Donnell, L	Crossbench	11/06/2012	Financial Services Bill	Cols 1174–6
Durham, Bp (now Archbishop of Canterbury)	Bishop	16/05/2012	Queen's Speech	Cols 421–3
Ashton of Hyde, L	Conservative	16/05/2012	Queen's Speech	Cols 430–32

Maiden Speeches, Session 2010–12

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Heseltine, L	Conservative	22/03/2012	Economy: Budget Statement	Cols 1050–3
Curry of Kirkharle, L	Crossbench	06/02/2012	EU Committee Report: Agriculture	Cols 25–7GC
Wolfson of Aspley Guise, L	Conservative	01/12/2011	Eurozone Crisis	Cols 107–9GC
Singh of Wimbledon, L	Crossbench	01/12/2011	International Development Policy	Cols 435–7
Gold, L	Conservative	10/11/2011	Transparency	Cols 358–60
Shackleton of Belgravia, B	Conservative	07/11/2011	Children: Secure Children's Homes	Cols 90–2
Colville of Culross, V	Crossbench	03/11/2011	Creative Industries	Cols 1362–4
Williams of Baglan, L	Labour	27/10/2011	Middle East: Water	Cols 954–6
Feldman of Elstree, L	Conservative	13/09/2011	Welfare Reform Bill	Cols 670–2
Magan of Castletown, L	Conservative	18/07/2011	Finance (No 3) Bill	Cols 1160–4
Glasman, L	Labour	01/07/2011	Remembrance Sunday (Closure of Shops Bill) [HL]	Cols 1989–90
Strasburger, L	Liberal Democrat	23/06/2011	House of Lords: Reform	Cols 1220–1
Stephen, L	Liberal Democrat	15/06/2011	Barnett Formula	Cols 857–8
Edmiston, L	Conservative	14/06/2011	Education Bill	Cols 702–4
True, L	Conservative	12/05/2011	Communities	Cols 1031–4
Noon, L	Labour	12/05/2011	Communities	Cols 1036–8
Fellowes of West Stafford, L	Conservative	05/05/2011	Disabled People	Cols 609–11
Berridge, B	Conservative	27/04/2011	Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill	Cols 154–6
Newlove, B	Conservative	27/04/2011	Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill	Cols 160–2
Blencathra, L	Conservative	27/04/2011	Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill	Cols 178–80

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Fink, L	Conservative	04/04/2011	Education: 16 to 18 Year-olds	Cols 276–8GC
Kestenbaum, L	Labour	31/03/2011	Economy: Growth	Cols 1352–4
Popat, L	Conservative	31/03/2011	Economy: Growth	Cols 1355–6
Wood of Anfield, L	Labour	31/03/2011	Economy: Growth	Cols 1358–9
Collins of Highbury, L	Labour	31/03/2011	Economy: Growth	Cols 1363–4
Worthington, B	Labour	31/03/2011	Economy: Growth	Cols 1366–8
Hussain, L	Liberal Democrat	24/03/2011	Economy: Government Policies	Cols 858–60
Stedman-Scott, B	Conservative	24/03/2011	Economy: Government Policies	Cols 865–6
Framlingham, L	Conservative	24/03/2011	Adapting to Climate Change: EU Agriculture and Forestry (EU Committee Report)	Cols 926–8
Storey, L	Liberal Democrat	17/03/2011	Children: Early Intervention	Cols 401–2
St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Bp	Bishop	17/03/2011	Children: Early Intervention	Cols 405–7
Riberio, L	Conservative	10/03/2011	British Overseas Territories	Cols 1781–3
Dannatt, L	Crossbench	10/03/2011	Zimbabwe	Cols 1813–5
Grade of Yarmouth, L	Conservative	04/03/2011	Live Music Bill [HL]	Cols 1317–9
Randerson, B	Liberal Democrat	04/03/2011	Live Music Bill [HL]	Cols 1325–7
Brinton, B	Liberal Democrat	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1192–3
Jenkin of Kennington, B	Conservative	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1196–8
King of Bow, B	Labour	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1200–2
Lister of Burtersett, B	Labour	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1204–6
Morgan of Ely, B	Labour	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1210–2
Heyhoe Flint, B	Conservative	03/03/2011	International Women's Day	Cols 1189–90

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Cormack, L	Conservative	01/03/2011	Fixed-term Parliaments Bill	Cols 952–4
Empey, L	Ulster Unionist	16/02/2011	Postal Services Bill	Cols 709–11
Dobbs, L	Conservative	16/02/2011	Postal Services Bill	Cols 731–3
Tyler of Enfield, B	Liberal Democrat	10/02/2011	Marriage	Cols 370–2
Flight, L	Conservative	10/02/2011	NATO	Cols 399–401
Stirrup, L	Crossbench	10/02/2011	NATO	Cols 406–8
Lingfield, L	Conservative	03/02/2011	Children: Parenting for Success in School	Cols 1472–4
Oxford, Bp	Bishop	03/02/2011	Children: Parenting for Success in School	Cols 1478–80
Stowell of Beeston, B	Conservative	03/02/2011	Children: Parenting for Success in School	Cols 1482–3
Ahmad of Wimbledon, L	Conservative	03/02/2011	Children: Parenting for Success in School	Cols 1487–9
Bakewell, B	Labour	03/02/2011	Arts: Funding	Cols 1512–3
Wasserman, L	Conservative	03/02/2011	Arts: Funding	Cols 1526–8
Lexden, L	Conservative	01/02/2011	Education: Children with Diabetes	Cols 350–2GC
Wigley, L	Plaid Cymru	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1118–20
Wheatcroft, B	Conservative	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1123–5
Palmer of Childs Hill, L	Liberal Democrat	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1127–9
Stoneham of Droxford, L	Liberal Democrat	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1131–2
Marks of Henley-on-Thames, L	Liberal Democrat	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1135–7
Risby, L	Conservative	27/01/2011	Tourism	Cols 1140–2
Kramer, B	Liberal Democrat	21/01/2011	Rehabilitation of Criminals (Amendment) Bill [HL]	Cols 647–9
Doocey, B	Liberal Democrat	21/01/2011	Rehabilitation of Criminals (Amendment) Bill [HL]	Cols 652–4
Loomba, L	Liberal Democrat	21/01/2011	Rehabilitation of Criminals (Amendment) Bill [HL]	Cols 657–8

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Sharkey, L	Liberal Democrat	13/01/2011	Turkey	Cols 1550–2
Jolly, B	Liberal Democrat	13/01/2011	NHS; Front-line and Specialised Services	Cols 1620–2
Green of Hurstpierpoint, L	Conservative	12/01/2011	Health: Maternal Health	Cols 1464–6
Lothian, M	Conservative	03/12/2010	House of Lords Reform Bill [HL]	Cols 1699–1700
Hennessy of Nympsfield, L	Crossbench	03/12/2010	House of Lords Reform Bill [HL]	Cols 1706–09
Hollins, B	Crossbench	02/12/2010	Human Rights	Cols 1592–4
Faulks, L	Conservative	25/11/2010	Health and Safety: Common Sense Common Safety	Cols 1188–90
Bannside, L	Democratic Unionist	18/11/2010	Active Citizenship	Cols 877–9
Blair of Boughton, L	Crossbench	18/11/2010	Active Citizenship	Cols 883–4
Birmingham, Bp	Bishop	12/11/2010	Strategic Defence and Security Review	Cols 411–3
Hutton of Furness, L	Labour	12/11/2010	Strategic Defence and Security Review	Cols 418–21
Howard of Lympne, L	Conservative	11/11/2010	Health: Cancer	Cols 298–300
Monks, L	Labour	11/11/2010	Diplomacy	Cols 345–6
Allan of Hallam, L	Liberal Democrat	01/11/2010	Comprehensive Spending Review	Cols 1491–3
Nye, B	Labour	01/11/2010	Comprehensive Spending Review	Cols 1509–11
Healy of Primrose-Hill, B	Labour	01/11/2010	Comprehensive Spending Review	Cols 1516–8
Boswell of Aynho, L	Conservative	27/10/2010	Higher Education: Funding	Cols 1244–6
Stevenson of Balmacara, L	Labour	21/10/2010	Education: Special Educational Needs	Cols 951–4
Reid of Cardowan, L	Labour	14/10/2010	Cyberattacks: EU Committee Report	Cols 677–80
Browne of Ladyton, L	Labour	14/10/2010	Cyberattacks: EU Committee Report	Cols 685–8
Macdonald of River Glaven, L	Liberal Democrat	13/10/2010	Bloody Sunday Inquiry	Cols 543–5
Eaton, B	Conservative	07/10/2010	Rural Communities: Prince's Countryside Fund	Cols 233–5

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Taylor of Goss Moor, L	Liberal Democrat	07/10/2010	Rural Communities: Prince's Countryside Fund	Cols 237–9
Younger of Leckie, V	Conservative	07/10/2010	Rural Communities: Prince's Countryside Fund	Cols 241–2
Armstrong of Hill Top, B	Labour	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 36–8
Wills, L	Labour	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 40–2
Sherlock, B	Labour	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 46–9
Benjamin, B	Liberal Democrat	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 53–5
Wheeler, B	Labour	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 57–60
Ritchie of Brompton, B	Conservative	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 64–7
Beecham, L	Labour	05/10/2010	Charitable Sector	Cols 70–2
Hughes of Stretford, B	Labour	27/07/2010	Terrorist Asset-Freezing etc Bill [HL]	Cols 1263–5
Davies of Stamford, L	Labour	27/07/2010	Terrorist Asset-Freezing etc Bill [HL]	Cols 1267–70
Spicer, L	Conservative	26/07/2010	Finance Bill	Cols 1176–7
Browning, B	Conservative	26/07/2010	Finance Bill	Cols 1184–5
Boateng, L	Labour	22/07/2010	Poverty	Cols 1098–100
Donaghy, B	Labour	22/07/2010	Poverty	Cols 1103–5
Shipley, L	Liberal Democrat	22/07/2010	Poverty	Cols 1110–12
McFall of Alcluith, L	Labour	22/07/2010	Poverty	Cols 1118–20
Deben, L	Conservative	21/07/2010	Women in Society	Cols 1004–6
Drake, B	Labour	21/07/2010	Women in Society	Cols 1008–9
Parminter, B	Liberal Democrat	21/07/2010	Women In Society	Cols 1013–5
Kennedy of Southwark, L	Labour	21/07/2010	Women in Society	Cols 1017–9
Liddell of Coatdyke, B	Labour	21/07/2010	Women in Society	Cols 1022–4

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Black of Brentwood, L	Conservative	21/07/2010	Women in Society	Cols 1035–7
Smith of Basildon, B	Labour	21/07/2010	Women In Society	Cols 1040–2
Hussein-Ece, B	Liberal Democrat	15/07/2010	Criminal Justice System	Cols 781–3
German, L	Liberal Democrat	15/07/2010	Criminal Justice System	Cols 792–4
Prescott, L	Labour	14/07/2010	Environment: Low Carbon Technologies	Cols 738–40
Hayter of Kentish Town, B	Labour	09/07/2010	Defamation Bill [HL]	Cols 436–7
Willis of Knaresborough, L	Liberal Democrat	09/07/2010	Defamation Bill [HL]	Cols 447–9
Gardiner of Kimble, L	Conservative	08/07/2010	Housing	Cols 394–6
McConnell of Glenscorrodale, L	Labour	08/07/2010	Africa: Post-Conflict Stabilisation	Cols 358–60
Touhig, L	Labour	08/07/2010	Housing	Cols 402–5
Derby, Bp	Bishop	01/07/2010	Local Communities	Cols 1865–7
Knight of Weymouth, L	Labour	01/07/2010	Local Communities	Cols 1869–71
McAvoy, L	Labour	01/07/2010	Local Communities	Cols 1877–9
Maples, L	Conservative	01/07/2010	Foreign Policy	Cols 1900–2
Liddle, L	Labour	24/06/2010	Latin America	Cols 1445–7
Wei, L	Conservative	16/06/2010	Social Policy	Cols 1010–3
Grey-Thompson, B	Crossbench	14/06/2010	Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012	Cols 840–2
Sassoon, L	Conservative	08/06/2010	UK: Competitiveness	Cols 632–5
Hill of Oareford, L	Conservative	03/06/2010	Queen's Speech	Cols 375–9
Hall of Birkenhead, L	Crossbench	03/06/2010	Queen's Speech	Cols 385–7
Guildford, Bp	Bishop	03/06/2010	Queen's Speech	Cols 401–4

Member	Affiliation	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Kakkar, L	Crossbench	03/06/2010	Queen's Speech	Cols 409–11
Bichard, L	Crossbench	27/05/2010	Queen's Speech	Cols 156–8

Appendix 2: Valedictory Speeches

Member	Affiliation	Date of Valedictory Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Lloyd of Berwick, L	Crossbench	26/03/2015	Immigration: Detention	Cols 1565–8
Tenby, V	Crossbench	19/03/2015	Inquiries Act 2005 (Select Committee Report)	Cols 1150–1
Jenkin of Roding, L	Conservative	16/12/2014	Pension Schemes Bill	Cols 141–3