



## House of Lords: Maiden and Valedictory Speeches, 2017–2019

### Summary

The first speech made by a Member of the House of Lords is known as a maiden speech. The second section of this Library briefing 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. A list of all Members' maiden speeches made in the House of Lords during the course of the 2017–2019 parliament can be found in the appendices.

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. During the 2017–2019 parliament only two Members chose to take up this opportunity. The third section of this briefing includes the full text of both speeches.

All the speeches in this briefing, both in full text and in the appendices, are listed in reverse chronological order of the date of the speech. Similarly, affiliations noted are those of the Member at the time of the speech. In addition, the speeches in full text include the full name of the Member concerned along with the date they joined, or retired from, the House of Lords. Further examples of both maiden and valedictory speeches can be found in a similar Library briefings compiled at the end of previous parliaments, [House of Lords: Maiden and Valedictory Speeches, 2010–2015](#) and [House of Lords Maiden and Valedictory Speeches, 2015–2017](#).

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction
  2. Maiden Speeches
  3. Valedictory Speeches
- Appendix 1: Maiden Speeches 2017–2019
- Appendix 2: Valedictory Speeches, 2017–2019

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Maiden Speeches</b>	<b>2</b>
Lord Hendy, Grenfell Tower Inquiry: Phase I Report .....	2
Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle, Queen’s Speech (Fourth Day) .....	4
Lord Caine, Report Pursuant to Sections 3(1), 3(6), 3(7), 3(8), 3(9) and 3(10) the Northern Ireland (Executive Formation etc) Act 2019 .....	6
Lord Reay, D-day: 75th Anniversary .....	9
Earl of Devon, Brexit: Food Prices and Availability (EUC Report).....	11
Baroness Osamor, Social Housing.....	14
Lord McCrea of Magherafelt and Cookstown, Brexit: Negotiations .....	15
Baroness Sater, Justice: Women’s Centres .....	17
Baroness Bull, Careers Education for Students.....	19
Bishop of Chichester, Higher Education .....	22
Baroness Boycott, Obesity .....	24
Baroness Barran, Mental Capacity (Amendment) Bill .....	25
Lord McNicol of West Kilbride, Overseas Aid: Charities and Faith-based Organisations .....	27
Baroness Bryan of Partick, Part-time and Continuing Education and the Open University.....	29
Bishop of London, Disabled People.....	30
Lord Hogan-Howe, Ivory Trade.....	32
<b>3. Valedictory Speeches</b>	<b>35</b>
Lord Higgins, Constitutional Convention .....	35
Lord Plumb, Agriculture, Fisheries and the Rural Environment .....	38
<b>Appendix 1: Maiden Speeches 2017–2019</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Valedictory Speeches, 2017–2019</b>	<b>43</b>

---

A full list of Lords Library briefings is available on the [research briefings page](#) on the internet. The Library publishes briefings for all major items of business debated in the House of Lords. The Library also publishes briefings on the House of Lords itself and other subjects that may be of interest to Members.

House of Lords Library briefings are compiled for the benefit of Members of the House of Lords and their personal staff, to provide impartial, authoritative, politically balanced briefing on subjects likely to be of interest to Members of the Lords. Authors are available to discuss the contents of the briefings with the Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public.

**Any comments on Library briefings should be sent to the Head of Research Services, House of Lords Library, London SW1A 0PW or emailed to [purvism@parliament.uk](mailto:purvism@parliament.uk).**

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

During the 2017–2019 parliament 43 Members made a maiden speech. These included speeches by four members of the Government, four bishops and seven hereditary Members elected by their peers. The majority, but by no means all, were made by Members who joined the House of Lords within that timeframe. Some maiden speeches are made within days of introduction, whilst others are not made until some years have passed due to commitments elsewhere.

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 speaker's 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 briefing 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 course of the 2017–2019 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](#) (2017 edition)—paragraphs 4.46–4.48. An index to all maiden speeches made during the course of the parliament can be found in Appendix I.

### ***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

---

<sup>1</sup> House of Lords, [Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords](#), 18 July 2019, HL Paper 413 of session 2017–19.

recommendation from the Procedure Committee that retiring Members be given the opportunity to make a valedictory speech:

We recommend that members who give written notice of their resignation under section 1 of the House of Lords Reform Act 2014 should be able to make a valedictory speech before the resignation takes effect. Such speeches would be afforded the same courtesies as maiden speeches and would be marked in Hansard.<sup>2</sup>

This was agreed by the House on 30 October 2014.<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, twelve Members have taken the opportunity to make a valedictory speech—two of which were during the course of the 2017–2019 parliament. The full text of both are included in section 3 of this Library briefing.

## 2. Maiden Speeches

### **Lord Hendy, 31 October 2019, Grenfell Tower Inquiry: Phase I Report**

John Hendy, Labour, joined 15 October 2019

My Lords, it is a sad thing to make a maiden speech in a debate on a tragedy such as this, but I have one point to make, albeit one that has already been referred to by the noble Baroness, Lady Brinton. But like the noble Baroness, Lady Sanderson, I begin with thanks. I am indebted to noble Lords for the kindness and warmth of welcome from all sides of this House since I was introduced last Monday, and the help that you have all given me. Mind you, I have to say that the well of gratitude is a little shallower than it might have been, as noble Lords introduced me to this House on Monday and on Wednesday decided to dissolve it, although I am told that there is no connection between the two. I also thank the amazing staff of the House who have been unfailingly helpful to me in giving me advice, telling me where to go and so forth.

It was not quite the same in East Ham magistrates' court when I started my practice at the Bar many decades ago. However, my life in crime was cut short because I spent the past 42 years in the practice of labour law—the law of the workplace, of workers, employers, employers' associations, trade unions and industrial relations. I mention that because I am conscious that, in coming to the House with that specialism and with that interest, I am attempting to follow in the footsteps of my late noble friend Professor Lord Wedderburn of Charlton, whom many noble Lords will remember. I can never hope to emulate his achievements, but he will be an inspiration to me in my time here.

<sup>2</sup> 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, p 3.

<sup>3</sup> [HL Hansard, 30 October 2014, cols 1314–7](#).

I have not spent all my time in labour law. I interspersed it with other areas of the law, and I should mention them because they are relevant to the point that I have to make. I had the privilege of being instructed in a number of public inquiries, the first of which was into the King's Cross Underground fire disaster, where I appeared on behalf of the Association of London Authorities. After that, I appeared for the bereaved and injured in the Southall train crash inquiry and then for the bereaved and injured in the Ladbroke Grove train inquiry. I appeared at the Potters Bar train crash inquest and for the bereaved and injured in the Lakanal House fire disaster, which has already been mentioned. I appeared for the National Union of Journalists in the Leveson inquiry, and I currently appear for the Fire Brigades Union in the Grenfell Tower fire inquiry. In speaking this afternoon, I do not pretend to speak for the Fire Brigades Union—I have declared the necessary interest—because I do not think it would be proper to do so in this House and, perhaps more significantly, because the Fire Brigades Union, particularly its general secretary Matt Wrack, has made its reaction to the publication of phase I of Sir Martin Moore-Bick's report into Grenfell Tower very clear over the past 48 hours.

All those inquiries shared a number of features, of which two are significant. One was, of course, that they were terrible tragedies which cast a long shadow over all those involved in any way. I speak not of that. The other was that they all involved the publication of reports. They were public inquiries. What is significant about that is that in every case the judge in charge of the inquiry, having written the report and prepared it for publication, gave it to the core participants 24 or 48 hours before it was released to the public. The reasons are obvious: so that those who were so deeply affected would have a chance to prepare themselves for the media onslaught that would follow, and those who were the subject of criticism would have a chance to speak to lawyers if the inquiry report might lead to prosecution.

Sir Martin Moore-Bick followed that process. On Monday, the report was released to the core participants, of which there are over 600. Every one of them was required to sign a non-disclosure agreement to keep that report confidential until the deadline of midnight on Tuesday night had passed. Somebody leaked it to the Daily Telegraph, as my noble friend mentioned. The Daily Telegraph then set journalists on to reading that report, cutting and pasting pieces in order to publish it in the next day's newspaper. Other responsible media outlets—the Guardian, the BBC and so forth—followed suit and cut and pasted from what the Telegraph had written. That leak is clearly reprehensible, and I trust that whoever did it will be discovered in due course, but the publication of that report, breaching a non-disclosure agreement and the embargo set by Sir Martin Moore-Bick, is absolutely outrageous. I hope that Sir Martin at least considers the possibility of summoning the editors involved and the director-general of the BBC to explain what conceivable public interest there could have been in releasing parts of that report verbatim before Wednesday morning.

I thank noble Lords for their patience in listening to me.

[\(HL Hansard, 31 October 2019, cols 1048–9\)](#)

**Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle, 17 October 2019, Queen’s Speech (Fourth Day)**

Natalie Louise Bennett, Green Party, joined 7 October 2019

My Lords, I am honoured to follow the noble Baroness, with whom I share a recently acquired—in my case—interest in fake ermine, and in many other animal welfare issues. I rise conscious that I have spent only a few days in this Chamber, yet already I have encountered great encouragement and kindness—something I will continue to rely on in the days ahead, as we face up to the stupendous chaos that is British politics.

That kindness is in spite of the fact that I am aware I am being looked at with some trepidation, arising from the knowledge that I am bringing into this House an unfamiliar kind of politics: the politics of Extinction Rebellion, of the anti-fracking stalwarts at Preston New Road and Misson Springs, and of the tree protection groups in my home city. I have been reminded of the words of a senior councillor in Sheffield who, when I invited him to join me in front of a tree-feller’s lorry in defiance of police orders, said: “You Greens are dangerous”, and scurried away. In introducing myself, I give noble Lords fair warning that we Greens are aiming to overturn the entire status quo. We want to radically transform our society, our economy, our environment and our politics. Yet I would argue—to borrow a phrase from the other side—there is no alternative.

Earlier, we heard the noble Lord, Lord Macpherson of Earl’s Court, referring to the Government’s growth strategy, yet we Greens know that there cannot be infinite growth on a finite planet. That is not politics; it is physics. This new kind of politics is just what your Lordships’ House, the other place, the whole country, needs. Things will not continue as they are. We must build something new, different and much better.

I speak regularly in schools, colleges and universities, sometimes through the excellent organisation Speakers for Schools, which I commend to noble Lords. Often, I begin with an apology. On behalf of my generation—I am 53—I say to this new generation: “I am sorry. We have made a right mess of things”. But my focus is always on hope. Together, all of the generations, from the climate strikers to the oldest Member of this House, can together build something new: a far better society.

I must, early on, offer my profound thanks to my noble friend Lady Jones of Moulsecoomb for her support. I know that she will enjoy hearing that phrase in the Chamber after the lonely years she has spent here working incredibly hard as the sole Green representative. I also pay tribute to the Herculean labours of Caroline Lucas in the other place. My noble friend Lady Jones has

set a standard that I hope to live up to, of using this Chamber and its processes to best effect while never getting too comfortable.

I address noble Lords today specifically about the agriculture Bill. My first degree is in agricultural science, and I continue to be fascinated by the amazing and still barely understood ecology of the soil on which all our lives depend. On other occasions, I will have cause to speak further on the subject of tardigrades and nematodes, mycelium and rhizobium, but you may be relieved to hear that I am not going to do any more soil science today.

I have not seen confirmation of whether the Government's agriculture Bill will match their previous versions. I would be delighted if the Minister, when answering, could shed light on that. I suggest that three key things should be changed. The first is the provision of healthy food as a public good—earlier, the noble Baroness the Minister referred to the Government's aims for farming, and food was not mentioned. Secondly, the Bill must ensure that the Secretary of State has a duty to act, rather than just the possibility of acting. Finally, the promotion of organic agriculture should be prioritised as the only form of agroecology that has a recognised system of registration.

Today, however, I will follow the tradition in telling noble Lords a little more about myself, and so will range back to the personal, which, as we feminists have long known, is intensely political. So that noble Lords do not have to sit there wondering, the accent comes from Australia. I am told that I am the second Australian-born woman to enter this Chamber, and I look forward to hearing the experiences of the noble Baroness, Lady Gardner of Parkes, who was sitting opposite me earlier. Her accent has long graced this chamber, but that voice has far older antecedents. Noble Lords may not know that the first woman to speak in the other place, the suffragette Muriel Matters, who achieved that feat by chaining herself to the grille in the Ladies' Gallery in 1908, was also Australian. At that time, my native land was known as "The Workingman's Paradise". It boasted the world's first Labour Government, and it rivalled Finland as a leading place in global social progress. Today, Finland still proudly holds that place—for example, with a schooling system that provides an education for life, not just exams—while, sadly, Australia's politics has deeply degraded.

My other political tradition is from Sheffield, or what was once known as the "People's Republic of South Yorkshire". Sheffield was home to the first women's suffrage society in the UK, founded in 1842—yes, before London's—and the adopted home of the socialist and gay rights campaigner Edward Carpenter. He was a Green before Greens had been invented. As proof, I offer the fact that he brought sandals to Britain, even making his own. Even earlier, Sheffield was home to the Chartist poet Mary Hutton, the wife of a pen-knife cutler, who wrote a poem entitled "On the Poor Laws' Amendment Bill", which spoke of the legislators and the great allowing the poor,

"To writhe with endless pain and misery".

Noble Lords, particularly those on the Benches opposite me, might care to consider the continuation of that suffering today, two centuries later, and the parallels with the endless pain and misery of universal credit. I would like to think that it is uncontroversial to say that the duty of the Government is to alleviate the suffering of those most in need rather than to add to it. This is one reason why I have long been a champion of a universal basic income, something you will be hearing a lot more about from me.

But I am aware of the time, and so will leave you with one key point. We on this planet, and in this country, have enough resources for everybody to have a decent life, for the natural world to be restored and for the climate emergency to be tackled, if we share those resources out fairly. As the Green Party has long said, economic and environmental justice are indivisible. That is a mountain for all of us to climb. I hope that noble Lords will join me in that, because, to quote the American suffragette Susan B Anthony, “failure is not an option”.

[\*\(HL Hansard, 17 October 2019, cols 217–20\)\*](#)

**Lord Caine, 9 September 2019, Report Pursuant to Sections 3(1), 3(6), 3(7), 3(8), 3(9) and 3(10) the Northern Ireland (Executive Formation etc) Act 2019**

Jonathan Michael Caine, Conservative, joined 2 September 2016

My Lords, it is a great honour and privilege to finally make my maiden speech as a Conservative and Unionist Member of this great House. I say “finally” because, despite taking my seat on 20 October 2016, I have until now been bound by a Cabinet Office rule that serving government advisers can sit and vote but not speak in your Lordships’ House. Following the events of 24 July, this is no longer the case for me, so it is with a sense of great relief and anticipation that I am now able to take my place as a fully functioning Member of the House.

I would at the outset like to give thanks to a number of people: noble Lords on all sides of the House for their understanding during my three years of enforced silence; the doorkeepers and other staff of the House, who carry out their responsibilities with such diligence, kindness and good cheer whatever the hour; my two supporters at my introduction in 2016, my noble friend Lord Black of Brentwood, who was my first head of section in the Conservative Research Department back in 1987, and my noble friend Lord Empey who, I am sure all noble Lords will agree, embodies all that is best in Ulster unionism; and the former Prime Minister David Cameron for giving me the opportunity to serve in this House. Leaving aside the referendum, if I may, I strongly believe that the Governments—plural—which he led achieved a great deal, particularly in restoring our economy, job creation and education reform. I was proud to have played a role in one of the seminal moments of his premiership when I helped to draft his statement on the events of Bloody Sunday.



While I join a number of former members of the Conservative Research Department and special advisers in this House, my route here—to use a phrase that will be familiar to friends from Northern Ireland—was hardly a traditional one. I was not born into the Conservative Party. In fact, I was born in a staunchly working-class area of Leeds called Harehills, where my late father was a builder and my mother a hairdresser. Yet their values were very much Conservative values, particularly those closely associated with the late Baroness Thatcher of hard work, enterprise and aspiration. It was that which led them to found a business and which allowed me, the product of a local state school in Leeds, to become the first member of our family to attend university.

That also enabled my parents to move to a relatively more prosperous part of Leeds, Temple Newsam, which forms the geographical part of my title. Temple Newsam is the ward on Leeds City Council where I was brought up and where I return most weekends. Leeds is also the part of the world where I currently pursue most of my interests outside this House, as a supporter of the Leeds Rhinos rugby league club and its charitable foundation that does such sterling work in the community to turn around young lives through sport, and as a patron of the Danny Jones Defibrillator Fund, which raises money to provide sports clubs with potentially life-saving defibrillators.

For most of my time in politics and public service, I have been deeply involved in the affairs of Northern Ireland. In the 1990s I was a special adviser to Lord Brooke of Sutton Mandeville, and then to the late Lord Mayhew of Twysden, both men of the utmost integrity whose contributions in Northern Ireland should never be underestimated. From May 2010 until July this year I advised two Prime Ministers and four successive Secretaries of State on Northern Ireland affairs. It was a period that encompassed the statement to which I have referred on Bloody Sunday, the G8 summit, the Stormont House and fresh start agreements, the EU referendum and the confidence and supply agreement, in which I confess to having played a small part. I say with respect to some noble Lords that hands-off it certainly was not. Regrettably, it also saw us go from the longest unbroken run of devolved government in Northern Ireland since the 1960s to over two and a half deeply frustrating years of no government at all. Like noble Lords across the House, I profoundly hope that devolved government is restored and fully functioning as soon as possible.

My involvement in Northern Ireland affairs has given me a deep and enduring affection for the place and all its people. It has strengthened my unshakeable belief in the union of our United Kingdom. I am an unashamed and unapologetic unionist who believes that the best future for Northern Ireland is, and always will be, within a stronger United Kingdom. I am, though, a unionist who deeply values and respects nationalism and who wants the closest possible relationship with our friends and neighbours in the Republic of Ireland, while always respecting the constitutional proprieties. Indeed, part of the genius of the 1998 Belfast agreement is that it enables all

traditions to be accommodated, through the constitutional framework it sets out, the institutions it establishes and the rights it guarantees for everyone. I remain a steadfast supporter of that agreement, in which my noble friends Lord Trimble, who was here earlier, Lord Empey and Lord Maginnis played such key roles.

Of course, I am acutely aware of the pressures created as a result of the 2016 referendum. One reason that I, as an instinctive Brexiteer, in the end voted remain was over my concern about the impact that leaving might have on the delicate and precious equilibrium established by the 1998 agreement. However, since the referendum I have been in no doubt that, for the sake of our democracy and for trust in politics, the result must be delivered and the UK must leave the EU. I remain convinced, however, that it must be done in an orderly and managed way that protects the 1998 agreement but preserves political stability on the island of Ireland and, of course, preserves the unity of our United Kingdom. I will always be a unionist before I am a Eurosceptic.

Turning briefly to the debate, I welcome the publication of the reports mentioned in the Motions of my noble friend Lord Duncan of Springbank, with whom I had the privilege of working in the Northern Ireland Office until recently. Indeed, I am pleased to see that some of my sentences have actually survived the change of administration. I wish to single out one of the reports for very quick comment: that relating to legacy cases and the prosecution of veterans. Many of my most difficult and moving meetings in Northern Ireland over many years have been with victims and survivors of the Troubles. It is clear that more needs to be done for them and I commend the work of the noble Lord, Lord Hain, and others towards a victims' payment. At the same time, as many people have said, we must ensure that there is not a disproportionate focus on former members of the security forces, to whom we owe an enormous debt. This is a complex and difficult area. I have always believed that everybody should be accountable to the law and I have a number of concerns about some of the remedies that have been suggested in this respect.

One possible way forward, which I have discussed with the Attorney-General for Northern Ireland at length, might involve modifications to Section 3 of the Criminal Law Act (Northern Ireland) 1967 around what constitutes reasonable self-defence. The purpose would be to give clearer legal meaning to the moral distinction between somebody who commits a split-second error of law while carrying out their duty and somebody who sets out with the clear and deliberate intention to commit murder. Now is not the appropriate time to pursue this in detail, but I hope to return to this matter on a future occasion and I hope that my noble friend the Minister will undertake to look at this option seriously. For now, however, conscious of the clock, I am grateful for the opportunity to open my account, so to speak,

in your Lordships' House and I look forward to playing a much fuller role from now on.

([HL Hansard, 9 September 2019, cols 1368–71](#))

### **Lord Reay, 4 June 2019, D-day: 75th Anniversary**

Aeneas Simon MacKay, Conservative, joined 28 January 2019

My Lords, before I begin I offer an apology to several noble Lords, who over the past few weeks were led to believe—largely by me—that my maiden speech would address broadband connectivity in rural areas. It is an issue close to my heart, but I am happy to save that speech for another day.

I am most grateful to my noble friend Lord Howe for introducing this important debate. How great an honour it is to participate and pay tribute to the allied troops who took part in the D-day landings. I thank noble Lords from across the House, who have been most welcoming and helpful during my initial few weeks, as have the staff and doorkeepers. As Mackay clan chief, I am delighted to join my distinguished kinsman, my noble and learned friend Lord Mackay of Clashfern. Some noble Lords may recall my father Hugh, who—like my grandfather, Shimi Lovat—served this House. I am proud to follow in their footsteps.

It is almost 390 years since my ancestor Donald Mackay was raised to the peerage. His was a doughty spirit, typical of the highlanders he lived among, and he loved a battle. Charles I was wise enough to harness rather than resist Donald's energies, and he sent him and his men to fight overseas in the Thirty Years' War on the side of the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus. Thanks to their many victories, most notably at the pass of Oldenburg, Mackay and his men became known as the "Scottish invincibles". I point out, however, that while Charles I was generous with titles, he was not so ready with his cash. The lack of payment for troops left Mackay in severe financial difficulties, from which he barely recovered. I trust a similar fate will not befall me as a result of my service to Parliament.

For several centuries the Mackay clan colonised Sutherland on the north coast of Scotland, an area of the country renowned for majestic scenery and excellent salmon rivers. It has recently become the prospective site of Britain's first international space station. Large numbers of the clan were soldiers. Since it was easier in those days to travel to Scandinavia and the Netherlands by sea than to go inland, they fought abroad. Many married into Dutch families and one member of the family, Aeneas Mackay, became Prime Minister of the Netherlands.

The Frasers of Lovat shared a similar fondness for military adventure. Shimi Lovat was integral to the establishment of the Commandos in 1940, having been given the personal blessing of not only Churchill but the highly decorated General Carton de Wiart. The latter gave approval while reclining

in his bath-tub, revealing World War I injuries including the lack of a hand and just one good eye—the other, alarmingly, uncovered. The Commandos played a key role during the Normandy landings. Lovat conducted his troops to Sword beach accompanied by his bagpiper, Bill Millin. When asked to pipe the men ashore, Millin hesitated, saying that the practice had been outlawed by the War Office. However, Lovat insisted that the Scottish war office had no such qualms. Years later Millin was to play at Shimi's funeral. Aptly, Lovat's Free French soldiers were the first to make land.

Five years ago, with about 100 Fraser relations, my family visited the Normandy beaches for the unveiling of a statue to my grandfather. Afterwards, at Pegasus Bridge, the wonderful Madame Arlette Gondrée, whose parents had played a prominent role in assisting the allied forces, hosted a magnificent lunch. It was at this scene on D-day that the Commandos achieved their primary objective of reinforcing Major John Howard's Airborne Division. Café Gondrée remains a hallowed destination for Normandy veterans to this day. Since the liberation, as a token of appreciation the veterans have not been permitted to pay for food and drink. Unfortunately this generosity does not extend to relatives.

The amphibious assault on D-day and the ensuing two and a half months of battle to secure Normandy resulted in over 200,000 allied casualties. Some 2 million crossed the channel and 20,000 French perished, as well as over 200,000 Germans. Thankfully, out of this tragedy a more peaceful Europe emerged.

It is particularly important that younger generations are reminded about the courage and selflessness that was shown during this time to preserve our freedom and independence. As a nation we owe a debt of gratitude to the United States; likewise for the sacrifices made by their nation on our behalf. Having spent over 11 years in America at university, and working in the financial sector, I feel particularly strongly that the vital role the United States played in our support during World War II should not be overlooked.

I would like to conclude with the address that Lovat made to his troops in Southampton on the eve of the landings. He spoke first in English and then French, and ended as follows: "I wish you all the very best of luck in what lies ahead: this will be the greatest military venture of all time, and the Commando Brigade has an important role to play. A hundred years from now, your children's children will say: 'They must have been giants in those days'".

Indeed, they were.

[\(HL Hansard, 4 June 2019, cols 43–4\)](#)

## **Earl of Devon, 25 April 2019, Brexit: Food Prices and Availability (EUC Report)**

Charles Peregrine Courtenay, Crossbench, joined 12 July 2018

It is a sobering honour to follow the noble Viscount, who is such an eminent expert in the field of environmental science.

A predecessor of mine named Ordwulf, the Saxon Ealdorman of Devon, ordered bread, cream and jam for workers rebuilding Tavistock Abbey after the Viking raids of 997 AD. Earls of Devon have been purveying the Devon cream tea—cream first, I say to the noble Lord, Lord Teverson—ever since. It would be sad if our current European entanglements were to endanger that ancient farming food legacy, as it appears they might if the current EU-wide tariffs on clotted cream are abandoned. I am grateful for the work of the noble Lord, Lord Teverson, and the committee, as well as for its report, which forensically dissects the risks to our crucial farming and food industries in these uncertain times.

I am glad to offer a maiden speech on a topic close to my heart. As convention requires, I will introduce myself without controversy, although that may be challenging given that I am an old Etonian hereditary Peer and the youngest of four siblings. In my defence, I chose none of those characteristics. I did, however, choose to take this seat. I shall explain why and what I offer to this House.

Here, I suffer from a split personality as I am one of the youngest and yet one of the oldest Members of your Lordships' House. As a youngster, I am father to Joscelyn and Jack, who have skipped school to be here today. I am husband to AJ, who has exchanged successful, sun-drenched California for damper Devon and the charms and challenges of a 700 year-old family-owned heritage and social enterprise centred on Powderham Castle. Those who have ridden the Great Western Railway beyond Exeter will have passed Powderham, and may have glimpsed its estuary-side marsh and farmland, which we have stewarded since the 1300s—an interest relevant to this debate. We principally farm venison and arable crops, while providing grazing for beef and sheep and foreshore for shellfish. We also host a food festival which celebrates Devon's farming and food heritage.

Professionally, I am another lawyer, but I offer some distinguishing characteristics. I was called to the Chancery Bar before a chance meeting in another bar—in Las Vegas—caused my relocation to the US. I became a California litigator, specialising in technology and intellectual property disputes. I continued to work on IP and technology matters, and now practise in Exeter and London. As a youngster, therefore, I offer the House the services of a relatively tech-savvy father of a school-age American immigrant family and a dual-qualified lawyer who passionately runs a local heritage SME in his spare time.

Turning to my alter ego, I am the Earl of Devon. In that capacity, I am one of the older Members of your Lordships' House, vying with Arundel, Shrewsbury and others for pre-eminence from the mists of medieval history. By repute, Empress Matilda first bestowed the earldom on Baldwin, who held Exeter Castle against the usurping King Stephen in one of England's earliest European entanglements. Baldwin's descendent, Hugh de Courtenay, was summoned to Parliament by Edward I in 1283. Your Lordships may recall that Parliament sat in Shrewsbury, not Westminster, that year—a regional precedent perhaps to be considered again when the Palace is being restored. Hugh was confirmed to the earldom in 1335. Since then, we have served almost every monarch while championing and defending the interests of Devon. That is the historic reason for my being here: simple public service, trying to do a job that is older than this venerable institution and for which many have lost their lives.

Indeed, far from occupying a comfortable hereditary seat for the past 700 years, we have actively engaged in this nation's narrative. Some examples are pertinent to this debate. We fought at Crécy and Poitiers, becoming founding Knights of the Garter; our arms adorn St Stephen's Hall as a result. A Courtenay cleric was Richard II's Chancellor and Archbishop of Canterbury; his arms sit alongside the Throne in this House. His nephew was keeper of Henry V's purse; he both financed and died on the Agincourt campaign and is buried beside Henry V in Westminster Abbey—a surprising grave-mate for our most heroic medieval king. The Wars of the Roses saw successive attainders and beheadings, but we backed both sides and survived; another Courtenay cleric thus officiated at Henry Tudor's coronation. A Courtenay was Henry VIII's champion at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, before losing his head to the Reformation. We provided six ships to fight the Armada and hosted William of Orange to dinner on his first night on English soil, welcoming the Glorious Revolution. We served King George and Queen Victoria alongside the Iron Duke from these red Benches, feasting on a diet of Corn Laws. My grandfather was one of the last on the beaches at Dunkirk; he took a bullet through his helmet in north Africa before devoting his life to defending his home from the ravages of time and the taxman, welcoming visitors for a Devon cream tea from 1959. He never made a maiden speech but my father did; he was the final hereditary Peer to do so by right in 1999.

If I can offer one consistent theme from this somewhat self-indulgent and appallingly patriarchal history, it is this nation's ever-ambiguous relationship with mainland Europe. Here we are in yet another passionate Brexit debate but, as our family story shows, for a millennium this country has not settled its relationship with the continent, and I do not expect it ever will. We are blessed and cursed in equal measure by our geography. As an island nation, we simply cannot control the equivocal nature of our physical relationship with Europe. We will always question whether we are in or out. What we can control is how we live with that ambiguity. I fervently hope that we can cease the hatred and invective and end the interminable years of political bickering over Europe, allowing us to focus on what truly matters and what

can really improve people's lives. It is notable that while this mother of all Parliaments fiddles over Brexit, our country and our environment literally burn. We saw wildfires in north Yorkshire on the hottest Easter Monday ever recorded—Earth Day, ironically—and London has been ablaze with climate change protests.

Turning to the report, in response to the committee's conclusion that tariffs will increase food prices in a no-deal Brexit, the Government repeat the tired refrain that food prices are much more subject to exchange rates, and global commodity and fuel prices, than tariffs. While there may be technical merit in that point, reference to escalating global commodity prices begs the obvious question of why, with climate change gathering momentum, we are devoting almost all of this nation's political energy to an ancient and insoluble argument over Europe, rather than focusing efforts on a climate catastrophe the like of which we have not seen before.

To echo the noble Lord, Lord Teverson, on food prices, my old preschool teacher, Mrs Wooldridge, runs a local food bank in Newton Abbot. It is our charity of the year this year. It reports ever-increasing food insecurity. Can the Government explain to Mrs Wooldridge why lower-income families in the heart of Devon—such a farming and food Mecca—are struggling to feed themselves healthy and affordable food? What specific efforts will be made to avoid escalating food-bank dependency if we ever exit Europe?

On farming, I agree with the Minister that Brexit affords a rare opportunity to revitalise agriculture. We all know that agriculture sits at the heart of trade and our nation's place in the global economy; the Woolsack reminds us of that every day, stuffed as it with our earliest tariffed export. I second the noble Lord, Lord Carrington. Can the Minister please let us know when we will see the Agriculture Bill and whether the Government will elevate the production of sustainable, local, affordable and healthy food to the top of the list of public goods that farmers are to deliver? Finally, on tariffs, please can the Minister explain the impact of a no-deal Brexit on the Devon cream tea, particularly the cream?

In conclusion, I thank all those who have enabled me to be here today: my family and the teams caring for Powderham and my practice; the remarkably able and patient staff of this House, including the doorkeepers and the security staff who risk their lives daily; and the many of your Lordships from all corners of this House who have been so welcoming and encouraging. I thank you all.

[\(HL Hansard, 25 April 2019, cols 756–8\)](#)

**Baroness Osamor, 31 January 2019, Social Housing**

Martha Otito Osamor, Labour, joined 26 November 2018

My Lords, it is a great pleasure and privilege to make my maiden speech in this very important debate, secured by my noble friend Lord Whitty. I wholeheartedly support the aims of his Motion: I believe that a safe and secure roof over one's head is a basic human right.

Since my introduction to this House, I have received a warm welcome from all sides, including from House officials and staff. I thank them all for that. I also extend my gratitude to my sponsors, my noble friends Lord Harris of Haringey and Lady Lawrence of Clarendon, and to my mentors, my noble friends Lady Wheeler and Lady Lister of Burtersett.

I am proud of my title: Baroness Osamor, of Tottenham in the London Borough of Haringey and Asaba in the Republic of Nigeria. It is a tribute to my late husband, Joseph, who died in a car crash, and to my father and mother.

I have been a proud member of Unite, my union, for over 40 years. It has afforded me many opportunities and I owe so much to it.

I was born in Nigeria in an era when very few girls went to school. My father, a progressive man, invested equally in all his children's education, breaking down all cultural and social barriers when he ensured this for us. I left Nigeria in 1963 to join my husband in the UK. Against all odds, he had managed to rent a room in Tottenham, a place I still call home. I was a fully trained teacher and my husband was training to be a lawyer. On arrival in the UK, I experienced at first hand the hatred and discrimination against black people.

It was commonplace to see discrimination in housing in the 1960s, with adverts that stated, "No Dogs, No Irish, No Blacks". During that era, the only viable housing option on offer for a young black couple was to accept very poor housing from landlords who exploited the bad situation. Most homes had no heating, no indoor toilet and/or no bathroom. We, like many others, felt the isolation and desperation of being on the receiving end of countless doors being slammed in our faces.

In contrast, back in Nigeria there were military coups, followed by the Biafran war, which initiated the displacement of my family. My family's home was taken over by the Nigerian military. These defining factors delayed the well-thought-out plan that my husband and I had to return to Nigeria.

Finally, my husband made that long voyage home but it proved his last ever journey. Sadly, we lost him in a fatal car accident. My husband's untimely death meant that I was now a widow in the UK bringing up a young family. When I look back at that time of mourning, it was the solidarity from my



neighbours and friends that kept me afloat. I have nothing but admiration for the people I lived side by side with.

It was at that juncture that my personal and political life collided, leading me to work on building improved social connections with my neighbours for the betterment of all our communities. Collectively, as a community, we lobbied and addressed the primary issues of concern that impacted on us all. My lived experiences of getting involved in community activities provided dividends and led to my securing a job at Tottenham Law Centre, which did lots of housing casework, including on disrepair and homelessness. One of my many duties was to work with the families affected by the sus laws of the 1980s. The law centre continued to work with these mothers and families to help improve their lives. Together, we established and facilitated the creation of jobs for many left-behind families. I am proud to say that together we set up enterprise workshops, a co-op, a defence committee, a mothers' project, a nursery and a youth association.

I look forward to sharing my lived experiences and knowledge in future debates. My commitment to change is a motto that I believe underpins my life. I finish with this quote from Maya Angelou:

“You may not control all the events that happen to you, but you can decide not to be reduced by them. Try to be a rainbow in someone’s cloud. Do not complain. Make every effort to change things you do not like. If you cannot make a change, change the way you have been thinking. You might find a new solution”.

([HL Hansard, 31 January 2019, cols 1184–5](#))

### **Lord McCrea of Magherafelt and Cookstown, 20 November 2018, Brexit: Negotiations**

Robert Thomas William McCrea, Democratic Unionist Party, joined 19 June 2018

My Lords, I am pleased and honoured to make my maiden speech today. I thank your Lordships for the kindness and support that I have received since entering this House. I particularly wish to thank my noble friends Lord Morrow of Clogher Valley and Lord Browne of Belmont for introducing me to the House. I am deeply grateful for the guidance and advice offered by all the officers and staff whom I have met, and I appreciate their helping me to learn the workings of this House in such a professional and gracious manner. I acknowledge the encouraging and welcoming words of noble Lords from across this House, many of whom I recall from my years in another place.

As a young man I had the privilege of entering local government in Northern Ireland, and served there for 37 and a half years. For 25 years I enjoyed the thrust of public debates in the other place and several years in the Northern Ireland Assembly. However, I confess to finding this a daunting experience,

having listened carefully to the richness of the contributions of noble Lords in this House today and in previous debates. Each brings a wealth of knowledge and experience, from so many walks of life.

I believe it is also important that I nail my colours to the masthead. For 50 years I served as a Christian minister in Magherafelt and only recently stepped down from my responsibilities there. With deep humility, I thank God for all the years He has given me as a preacher of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus and, by His Grace, I will seek to take my stand for Him in this House.

I am humbled to be given this honour of speaking in such an important debate today, sitting among your Lordships and contributing to the deliberations. This take note debate on the Statement by the Prime Minister has great relevance and importance to the people of Northern Ireland; it has major implications for the future, regarding not only our exit from, and relationship with, the European Union, but the future of our precious union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I come from a Province that has endured years of IRA terror; many of our fairest and bravest men and women were murdered defending the union. For over 30 years bombs and bullets bombarded us, seeking to break the spirit of our people and our determination to remain part of the United Kingdom. It is true that on many occasions these terrorists broke our hearts, but they never broke our resolve.

We are proud to be a part of the United Kingdom but I believe the deal presented by the Prime Minister threatens the integrity of that union. If these proposals were implemented, we in Northern Ireland would have to take rules from a body without any representation, governed by laws which, even if they damaged our economy, could not be changed and on which we would have no say. These proposals drive a coach and horses through the devolution settlement and our constitutional practices to suit the European Union. The nominal excuse for this is to avoid a hard land border. They have not resolved it; they have moved it and plan to implement a sea border inside our own country instead.

The Government claim of a United Kingdom customs solution is simply untrue. Northern Ireland will be in the EU customs territory while Great Britain will not. If Great Britain were to leave then the EU has the right to impose a customs border. Northern Ireland is the hostage to prevent GB leaving or the sacrifice if it does. In the last week, a European customs expert has made it clear that the hard land border is a “fictitious problem” but, based on this fiction, Northern Ireland is to be pushed further away from Great Britain. Even the Prime Minister of the Irish Republic says there will be no hard border. For a backstop that is never to be used, it takes up a substantial chunk of the withdrawal agreement. The backstop is never to be used, they say, but if it were, it would be only temporary. Then we are told it is a wonderful thing—that long-term investments could ultimately be made upon it.

The people of Northern Ireland have a respect for straight talking. They do not stand anyone seeking to pull the wool over their eyes. There are those who have called for another referendum. The people have spoken. Had the people voted the other way, I wonder how many would be calling for a second referendum. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland must leave the European Union on equal terms. The present proposals are not a good deal for the United Kingdom and should be rejected. My party, the Democratic Unionist Party, will do the honourable thing and vote against them.

[\(HL Hansard, 20 November 2018, cols 181–3\)](#)

**Baroness Sater, 12 September 2018, Justice: Women’s Centres**

Amanda Jacqueline Sater, Conservative, joined 20 June 2018

My Lords, it is an honour and I am most grateful for the opportunity to speak in this debate today, which touches on many issues with which I have been closely aligned before coming to this House. First, I would like to thank everyone in this House from all sides for their kindness and support. Black Rod and her staff, the doorkeepers, the attendants and the police officers have been incredibly helpful and given me so much guidance and direction. I cannot thank them enough.

My induction into this House, although a nerve-wracking and humbling experience, was made less stressful by my wonderful supporters—the noble Lord, Lord Carrington of Fulham, who has been a friend and mentor to me for too many years to mention, and the noble Baroness, Lady Chisholm of Owlpen, who not only took on the role of supporter but wanted even more punishment as my mentor. Thank you both. I am truly grateful.

I have been involved with the justice system for nearly a quarter of a century, much of it as a magistrate. One of the most difficult duties of a JP is, where there is no alternative, to send an offender to custody. It is not a decision that is taken lightly. This is particularly the case when imprisoning women because of the impact that such a sentence has not just on them but, all too often, on their children and families.

None the less, in order to ensure that public safety remains a top priority and to address the rightful needs of victims, prison is and will continue to be the only appropriate option for those women who commit the most serious crimes. For other women offenders—those who commit the less serious, non-violent offences—there are alternatives. This is why I believe strongly in the ability of women’s centres to improve outcomes in the justice system. I am grateful to the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Gloucester for introducing this debate, not least because we know that the reoffending rate, after a custodial sentence of less than 12 months, is far too high.

All too often, I have seen at first hand, not only as a magistrate but as a former trustee of Addaction, the impact on women and children of not having had the start or support in life to help them with the many difficult challenges and trauma that come from being victims of domestic abuse, sexual abuse and exploitation, or from suffering from poor mental health or addiction to drugs or alcohol. Regrettably and sadly, these circumstances often lead to a downward spiral into criminality. Women's centres provide specialist treatment services to help precisely those women whose lives have taken a wrong turn and who need to get back on track.

During a recent visit to the Nelson Trust women's centre in Gloucester, it was evident that female offenders are frequently among the most vulnerable individuals in society with very complex needs. I was extremely impressed by the successes achieved as the result of the tireless work of those working at the trust. There are many others like them who dedicate their lives to helping vulnerable women in need and I pay tribute to them all.

I therefore welcome the Government's decision to pilot residential women's centres. They will provide an additional option to manage women in the community on a sentence that is more intense and robust but that enables them to maintain their ties with their families and support them to stay in stable housing and employment. Such centres can provide the wide-ranging and holistic services that are now the norm for young offenders, both female and male.

Of course, the ideal would be to tackle issues before they lead to criminality. During the three years that I recently spent as a member of the Youth Justice Board, I worked to improve early interventions and rehabilitation for children and to give them an opportunity to live crime-free lives. One area that I believe offers great benefits and potential for both adult and child offenders to find new opportunities as well as to improve their health and well-being is sport. In my case, tennis played a significant part in my childhood, growing up in Wales. Playing competitively provided life skills and confidence from which I have benefited greatly, even if I was no Virginia Wade.

In turn, I have been keen throughout my career to turn my personal sporting experience to the benefit of others, not least to provide them with similar opportunities to get on in life and to reach their full potential. It was through the Youth Justice Board, under the chairmanship of my friend the noble Lord, Lord McNally, that I was introduced to StreetGames and subsequently became its chairman. The charity delivers sports into disadvantaged communities, giving children real opportunities to develop life skills and confidence and eventually to improve their prospects of employment. If we can help youngsters before they take the wrong turn, how much better off they are and how much better off society is.

For now, though, we must accept the reality that there are young and adult women who have, for whatever reason, committed offences. It behoves us

to treat them as individuals and provide the most appropriate place to address their needs. Women's centres can and should play a critical part in their rehabilitation. It has been a privilege to contribute to the broad criminal justice system, whether as a magistrate, working with those with addiction or affording opportunities through sport. It is an honour now to have the opportunity to play a role, however small, in your Lordships' House.

[\(HL Hansard, 12 September 2018, cols 2359–61\)](#)

### **Baroness Bull, 6 September 2018, Careers Education for Students**

Deborah Clare Bull, Crossbench, joined 11 July 2018

My Lords, it is a great honour to speak here for the first time and to follow such a passionate and cogent case for the creative industries from the noble Lord, Lord Gilbert of Panteg. The welcome I have received from all parts of the House could not have been kinder. The support from Black Rod, the Clerk of the Parliaments, the noble and learned Lord, Lord Hope of Craighead, and all their staff has been invaluable. At every turn, I have had cause to thank the omniscient and omnipresent doorkeepers and I have already benefited from the excellent service of the Library staff. I am indebted to my supporters, my noble friends Lady D'Souza and Lord Hall of Birkenhead, and my noble friend Lord Clancarty for acting as my mentor and meeting all my questions with patience and sound advice. I also pay tribute to the late Baroness Jowell, who did me the great honour of supporting my nomination to join this House.

My route here has been somewhat unconventional. For 20 years, I was a dancer with the Royal Ballet. I progressed, via a career in the media, to the Royal Opera House, where I became creative director. I then went to King's College London, where I serve as vice-principal for London. I now have the great privilege of joining your Lordships' House. Mine may well be an unusual career trajectory but this life of careers, in contrast to a career for life, could well prove the norm for young people in future. I am grateful to my noble friend Lord Aberdare for securing the debate and allowing me to make my debut on this stage on a subject that is so close to my heart.

As we have heard, good careers guidance is about so much more than helping young people to get a job. It is about an individual's well-being and fulfilment. It is about meeting the needs of future employers and ensuring the success of the economy. It is about reducing the costs on society of people not in employment or training. Crucially, it is about equality and fairness: we are all created equal but we are born into a world that is not.

Our ideas about what we might do in our adult lives are shaped by our experiences and by the examples around us. If you are brought up in a community where the majority of employment, where it exists, is in low-skilled sectors, your expectations are likely to be shaped accordingly. How

else can we explain the fact that in 2017 only 4% of doctors, 6% of barristers and 11% of journalists came from working-class backgrounds? We know that just 24% of pupils eligible for free school meals go on to higher education, compared to 42% of their peers from better-off families. Over a quarter of this gap in participation relates to students with the same levels of attainment at GCSE, so this is not a question of academic ability but of the choices that these pupils perceive as being available to “people like us”.

For this reason, good careers advice is of disproportionate value to pupils from disadvantaged families. It does not just open doors—by exposing young people to a variety of previously unimagined professions, to self-employment or entrepreneurship as a viable career, it reveals that those doors exist. It connects students with individuals who have themselves broken the mould—people whose lived examples help to raise aspirations, tackle stereotypes and challenge choices that may be based on gender, ethnicity or class. This is why I take part in Robert Peston’s excellent Speakers for Schools initiative, which puts inspirational speakers into state schools. It was set up in 2011 when he noticed that all the invitations he received to speak came from independent schools.

In addition to this important role in enabling social mobility, good careers guidance is vital to help young people navigate the changing employment market, and to ensure that the skills they gain during education match the needs of the jobs that they will go on to fulfil. Now, more than ever, it is very difficult to predict what the future of work will be. According to the World Economic Forum, 65% of pupils entering primary school this week will find themselves working in a job that does not yet exist. One of the key skills they will need in order to thrive in this uncertain future is creativity—the capacity to imagine and then to invent the roles that they themselves will fulfil. Too often, creativity is seen as the preserve of artists—of people like me—but it is as important to the scientist or the engineer as it is to the musician and the dancer. The world’s most pressing challenges will never be addressed by technology alone, but when creativity is employed to imagine how machines can best serve human needs, the results can change the world. It is notable, and no coincidence, that many of our leading tech entrepreneurs and Silicon Valley CEOs are graduates, not of science and maths but of arts and humanities. All the evidence shows that arts-based learning is key to developing the creativity that drives innovation.

Much airtime has been given to STEM subjects in discussions about looming automation, but with machines set to take on the more routine elements of work, human skills such as creativity will be at a premium. The global innovation foundation, NESTA, has concluded that creative occupations—not just artists, but roles that depend on a high degree of originality and the production of new artefacts and ideas—will be much more resistant to automation than other jobs. And they are likely to grow: workforce projections used in the industrial strategy suggest that creative jobs will grow at double the rate of the UK economy as a whole over the next six years.

I know that it is not the business of a maiden speaker to court controversy but, given everything we know about the future of work, can it really be controversial to challenge the prioritisation of STEM subjects in the otherwise laudable Gatsby benchmarks that the Government's 2017 careers strategy adopts? The statutory guidance issued in January encourages schools to arrange meetings with a range of professionals that,

“should emphasise the opportunities created for young people who choose maths or science subjects”.

Why only these, when we know that creativity will be such a vital skill, and that creative occupations will be the most futureproof to computerisation?

Mine was an education in which careers advice had no part, focused as it was, from the age of 11, on a singular destination. I was among the 1% who the noble Lord, Lord Storey, alluded to: I dreamt of becoming a ballerina and I became one. I come from a family with no history of participation in higher education but I had the benefit of powerful role models in my parents, to whom I am eternally grateful: a mother who was determined that her four daughters would imagine a world beyond our own backyard, and a father with the courage to enter further education at the age of 30, moving a young family from Derby to Kent to take up his hard-won place at Rochester Theological College. I also had the inestimable benefit of an education in which arts and culture were never considered as secondary or an inferior choice.

I promise not to fulfil a role in your Lordships' House as some kind of cultural “Thought for the Day”, inserting arts or creativity into every possible debate. But if I look back over the journey that has brought me here today, it is clear that what has sustained me in a career beyond the arts are the skills I learned through an education in which arts were integral: collaboration, communication, originality, resilience and creativity. These are exactly the skills that the Federation of Small Businesses is calling for in future employees and they are the kind of skills that NESTA predicts will be most in demand in 2030.

Given all this, we surely need to recognise that any advice that fails to position on equal terms careers in both STEM and creative occupations can never be considered either high quality or fit for the future.

I am honoured to have had the chance to contribute to this debate and I look forward to working as a part of this House on this and many other issues.

[\(HL Hansard, 6 September 2018, cols 1973–6\)](#)

**Bishop of Chichester, 19 July 2018, Higher Education**

Martin Clive Warner, Non-Affiliated, 3 January 2018

My Lords, I begin by recording my thanks for the welcome and encouragement that I have received both today and on so many occasions since being introduced into your Lordships' House.

I came to the See of Chichester in 2012 after ministry in inner-city parishes in Plymouth and Leicester, as the priest administrator of the Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham in Norfolk, a canon at St Paul's Cathedral, and all-too-short a time in the diocese of York as Bishop of Whitby, which was always about more than Dracula and goths. In each context, the Church's contribution to learning and the arts has been a significant element of my ministerial experience, perhaps exemplified most strikingly by the centuries-old work of St Paul's Cathedral School, which today offers choristers a free education in music of an international standard. Many choristers have become professional musicians in adult life, sustaining and enriching Britain's cultural life.

I often feel overwhelmed by the scale of this inheritance and by the best accomplishments of my predecessors. Bishop George Bell made Chichester famous for its contribution to learning and the arts, and he was building on solid foundations. In a tenure of just four years, his predecessor, the remarkable Bishop William Otter, established a teacher training college that has joined with another local institution to become the University of Chichester. Otter was inspired by the tradition of learning nurtured by Christian Europe, and from which, even post Brexit, the Church of England will continue to draw. His academic credentials lay in the founding of King's College London in 1829 as an explicit expression of Christian commitment to higher education.

It is no accident that today the arts form a central part of the university's life in Chichester, drawing on rich resources in the cathedral's outstanding musical tradition, the art in Pallant House Gallery and the Chichester Festival Theatre, presently enjoying summer performances of "Me and My Girl". The theatre runs a vibrant youth theatre for more than 800 people of school age. Its workshops for young people and adults with special needs represent a remarkable achievement of social inclusion.

This inheritance in Chichester demonstrates that in a creative, balanced and economically sound society, the arts, science, engineering and technology need each other. As we consider the value to the UK economy of higher education as an export, the Church of England, a foundational stakeholder in higher education, is also concerned with the quality and scope of the offer we make to overseas students. The Church of England holds fast to the question of what education is for, believing it right to ask how learning gives moral value to economic activity. It is right to pay constant attention to the flourishing of human life and society. Further, particularly with foreign



students in mind, the work of our chaplaincies not only addresses their pastoral, emotional and financial needs, but also ensures the dignity of their access to religious worship, which is particularly important to their identity. The Church of England is of course also concerned with the right to nurture the wisdom that will govern well our stewardship of the earth.

The benefits of access to learning and the arts can and must be open to all, especially in areas of deprivation in this country, where they provide unique opportunities to combat some of the symptoms of social dislocation and its consequences, and to build greater levels of racial understanding. I was delighted to learn that it was back in the 1950s that the Glyndebourne Festival took a production of “Fidelio” into HMP Lewes as part of a rehabilitation programme for prisoners, seeking to build the social integration for which we still long.

However, the challenges to sustaining this access and integration through higher education are substantial. Last year saw a 39% drop in the number of A-level music students and a 31% drop at GCSE. The impact of this is catastrophic in higher education as an export and its maintenance of our place as a world-class centre for music and the arts. Moreover, fears that there is growing social segregation in access to the arts are strengthened by the realisation that only one in 10 pupils from a disadvantaged background in Hastings or Eastbourne in my diocese will go to university. In this context, the University of Chichester seeks to make a distinctively positive contribution to the arts and to economic regeneration locally where it is most needed, and as an international export offering an experience that is always more than money can buy. One example of the university’s commitment is the new engineering and digital technology park in its Bognor Regis campus, which aims to serve the Hampshire and West Sussex coastal region—an area seriously disadvantaged by low levels of skills, business growth and earnings. Only one in five people in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton has higher-level qualifications.

Finally, I believe we should demonstrate a duty of care for students, locally from home and international students, that stretches beyond the academy. At present, 40% of Chichester’s graduates leave the region within a week of completing their courses because affordable accommodation is unavailable. This is a crippling outcome for the future economic and cultural life of provincial towns and cities such as Chichester. Similarly, we have a duty to sustain the relationships we are building with overseas students who are our exports to ensure that the bonds of learning and culture forge a greater sense of international trade and security that will build a peaceful and better future.

I have no sense of being equal to the noble achievements of my worthy predecessors but, encouraged by your Lordships’ welcome, I look forward

to playing an active role in the work of your Lordships' House in the years to come.

([HL Hansard, 19 July 2018, cols 1314–6](#))

### **Baroness Boycott, 18 July 2018, Obesity**

Rosel Marie Boycott, Crossbench, joined 9 July 2018

My Lords, first I am grateful to the noble Lord, Lord McColl, for this debate, which has enabled me to make my maiden speech so early, and to noble Lords for their kind words and welcome. I am incredibly honoured to stand here before you today. The first thing I would like to say is how very grateful I am to everyone from all parts of the House for their kindness towards me, to the noble Baronesses, Lady Kennedy and Lady Jenkin, who introduced me, and to my noble friend Lady Kidron who has been such a splendid mentor. I will always be very grateful to all the people who work in this amazing building for showing me where to go, providing a welcoming smile and always making me feel, literally from the moment I walked in, really welcome and at home.

After a long career, which has included founding a feminist magazine *Spare Rib* when I was 21 and editing three national newspapers, in 2008 I accepted the post of chair of the London Food Board, working first for Boris Johnson and then for Sadiq Khan. For the past decade, all aspects of food have been central to my life and my professional life: food policy; food poverty; urban food growing; the effects of the way we eat and grow food on climate change; children's holiday hunger; animal welfare; and—you name it—very much so, obesity.

Life does not happen without food. Its construction is a miracle. We are all ultimately powered by plants, which in turn are powered by the sun. Food builds our bodies and provides our daily fuel, and what nature gives us is precisely calibrated to enable us to thrive. No one in this building or in this country would dream of filling the tank of their precious Ferrari with Coca-Cola, yet we are happy to fill the world's most complex machine—the human body, the bodies of our little babies—with weird, highly processed junk which bears scant relationship to what I would call food. Yes, of course, it is tasty. It is tasty beyond belief. It is salty, sugary and spicy. I am far from immune, but this availability has triggered a health crisis which is, across the world, spinning out of control.

Food-related disease is now the world's number one killer, but it is not so just as a result of heart disease and cancers. Bad diets lead to obesity which means living with ill health for much of your life, and it is sadly the poorest in our society who carry the biggest burden here. Diabetes, one of the possible outcomes of obesity, is not a pretty disease; it leads to lost limbs, loss of energy and kidney failure. Twenty limbs are amputated every day in this country as a result of diabetes. Did you know that last year in Vietnam they

chopped off more limbs than they did at the height of the Vietnam War because of diabetes?

For me, obesity is not an individual problem. We are quick to blame the individual as a fat failure, but all the evidence points to the culprit being the ready availability of high-fat, high-sugar foods—foods that overwhelm the impulse control of children, young adults and adults, which are packaged and promoted to create the impression that they are fun, cool and life-enhancing. Many are placed in shops where children are bound to encounter them: at the tills and at grasping height. If noble Lords need further evidence, in this country 99.8% of advertisers' budgets is spent on what I would call unhealthy food and only 1.2% on fruit and vegetables.

Changing diets can completely transform health outcomes in lots of ways. It is time for an integrated approach to food policy with it no longer being sectioned out to different departments. We must recognise that the huge burden that is being placed on the National Health Service, which other noble Lords have referred to, could be lifted if we all ate better. It is not just about obesity. One of the things that shocked me when I was chair of the London Food Board was to discover that, in this great city of ours, one of the prime reasons that the elderly go into hospital in London is malnutrition and dehydration. So a council saves—let us be generous here—£15 a day on a meals-on-wheels and a person ends up in a high dependency £600-a-night hospital bed. This is because of cuts. Councils cannot afford it. Why can we not rethink this system? One pot of money. We all deserve to eat well.

I am both humbled and very excited to be amid so many of you who care so much about a subject that I care so much about. I hope that by adding to your number, I can add to your strength. We can, through food policy, achieve a better world—one that is fairer, that calls a halt to the inequalities that we see now where the poorest in our society are not only condemned to poorer lives, but all too often to poorer health outcomes. I know that food lies at the heart of many of the problems we need to fix, but it is also the route to so many of the solutions where everyone, whatever their background, can enjoy a good life, made possible through good food. It is my privilege and my pleasure to join your Lordships to work to that positive outcome.

[\(HL Hansard, 18 July 2018, cols 1267–8\)](#)

### **Baroness Barran, 16 July 2018, Mental Capacity (Amendment) Bill**

Diana Francesca Caroline Barran, Conservative, joined 21 June 2018

It is a huge honour and privilege to address your Lordships' House today. I would like to start by thanking your Lordships for the very warm welcome that I have received from everyone on all sides of the House. I am grateful to Black Rod and her team for their care and attention to detail, and particularly to the doorkeepers who have manoeuvred me to the right side

of the Chamber with a tactful “Where are you planning to sit, my Lady?”, or gently explained that “Morning” and “Afternoon” take on a whole new meaning in your Lordships’ House.

My supporters, the noble and learned Baroness, Lady Butler-Sloss, and my noble friend Lady Williams of Trafford, were superb at putting me at my ease during my introduction, and my noble friend Lord Sherbourne has been masterly in answering my questions with the utmost patience and encouragement. And encouragement is the word that best sums up the past two weeks. All your Lordships have been consistently, and at times almost fiercely, encouraging, and I feel extraordinarily lucky to be here.

Prior to joining this House, I worked for over 20 years in the City, founding one of the first European hedge funds, before going on to advise philanthropists and foundations on their charitable giving, as well as joining the boards of Comic Relief, the Henry Smith Charity and, most recently, the Royal Foundation.

Fifteen years ago, my life changed course when I asked several small charities what they thought was the biggest human problem that was the hardest to raise money for. They all gave me the same answer: domestic violence and abuse. As a result, the charity SafeLives was born on my kitchen table in 2004, with a focus on keeping victims and children safe in their homes wherever possible and holding perpetrators of abuse to account while still helping them to change. As chief executive, I worked with voluntary and statutory agencies across the fields of criminal justice, substance use, mental health, social care, children’s charities and the family courts. I was guided by many victims and survivors of domestic abuse, and today I pay tribute to their extraordinary courage.

Throughout, I have been supported by some exceptional mentors and have had the chance to try to tackle some truly important problems. I think I am safe in expecting that both those things will continue in this House.

Very high up on the list of important problems that this Bill seeks to address is that of when and how to deprive someone who lacks mental capacity of their liberty while upholding their rights. In preparing this speech, I spoke to several organisations working in this field: L’Arche UK, Shared Lives Plus and Gentoo. As a non-lawyer, I focused on the practical aspects of how the Bill will work and asked them all, “What works least well with the current Act in relation to deprivation of liberty safeguards, or DoLS?”. One person smiled and said, “Try and imagine doing this. We put an automatic reminder on our calendars every month to write to the local authority to authorise the DoLS. We rarely, if ever, hear back. If we don’t do it, we’re penalised by the CQC in our inspection”. They all highlighted practical problems with apparently pointless bureaucracy, a lack of consideration of the feelings of friends, families and carers, a disconnect between the views of social care and health professionals, and a lack of capacity to provide independent mental capacity advocates. They spoke of their frustration at an opportunity

missed to protect vulnerable people, with an apparently uniform and blunt approach.

I believe that the Bill goes some significant way to addressing those concerns. There is a clear intention to simplify the bureaucracy involved and to listen to the views of families, friends and those who know and care for the individual, while providing more skilled resource to resolve the most complex cases. Welcome, too, are other practical aspects—the portability of the authorisations between settings and the extension of their duration from one to three years.

However, the key to success with this Bill when it becomes law will lie in the quality of its implementation. Does my noble friend the Minister agree that it is both helpful and necessary to give the responsible bodies and care providers absolute clarity, through the code of practice, about the Government's expectations of them, particularly regarding those sections that aim to give agency and protection to those impacted by this legislation? I refer, in particular, to the training, qualifications and availability of IMCAs and approved mental capacity professionals as well as to the need to give timely responses when renewing authorisations and in the case of an appeal. This would give assurance to the family and carers of those lacking capacity that their rights and wishes will be upheld as well as their needs met.

The novelist and Nobel Prize winner, Pearl Buck said:

“The test of a civilisation is in the way that it cares for its helpless members”.

I am sure that your Lordships will agree that this Bill and how it is implemented locally go to the very heart of that test.

[\(HL Hansard, 16 July 2018, cols 1068–70\)](#)

### **Lord McNicol of West Kilbride, 12 July 2018, Overseas Aid: Charities and Faith-based Organisations**

Iain Mackenzie McNicol, Labour, joined 21 June 2018

My Lords, it is a great honour and privilege to join your Lordships' House and to speak in this debate. I thank noble Lords on all sides of the House, all officials and staff for their very warm and hospitable welcome. I also extend heartfelt thanks to my two distinguished supporters, my noble friends Lord Kinnock and Lady Smith of Basildon.

I was touched to be able to take the geographic title of Lord McNicol of West Kilbride, a village on the west coast of Scotland where I grew up and where my political mind and views were forged. My title is a tribute to that community, but also, and more so, to my father, Iain, and my late mother, Zoe, who instilled the belief in me that all of us can achieve great things.

Today is only my fourth day in your Lordships' House and, although I feel a little—well, a large amount of—trepidation, it is great to be speaking in such an important debate. As an inexperienced newbie, as we just saw, if I make mistakes on procedure or protocol, please forgive me. In my 35 years working in the trade union and labour movement, I have had the good fortune to work with many amazing people who dedicated their lives to improving those of others. Politics and politicians often get maligned, sometimes deservedly, but I have never failed to be impressed by the dedication and passion for doing good that exists within.

Looking back at my time as general secretary of the Labour Party, I have nothing but admiration for the people I got the opportunity to work with. My only regret is that we did not win and thus make the difference, as we have in the past. I also owe so much to my union, the GMB, including the opportunities and experience it gave me over the years I served as an industrial and political officer. I hope to be able to share some of those experiences and knowledge in some of your Lordships' debates that help shape the legislation that is so important to our country's future. I do not think I could have joined your Lordships' House at a more politically turbulent time. That makes the contributions we all put in even more significant. If we let down the people of these countries, they, their children and their children's children will not forgive us.

Turning to the debate, I pay tribute to the noble Baroness, Lady Stroud, for securing such an important debate. The UK has a long and proud tradition of supporting those in need on the international stage. Small charities and faith-based organisations often form the bedrock of such help. I am delighted that this House has the opportunity today to recognise their contributions. Indeed, 37% of the UK's aid spending is delivered through multilateral organisations. While much of this is through the larger NGOs or intergovernmental campaigns, the support and help provided by smaller groups saves and improves innumerable lives every year. It is important that the Government remain committed to spending 0.7% of gross national income on international aid and, although I am pleased that the Government have met this obligation thus far, I urge the Minister to give greater consideration to how smaller charities and faith-based organisations can be engaged in delivering this commitment.

The Minister will be aware that, through initiatives such as UK Aid Direct and UK Aid Connect, grants are offered and awarded to NGOs of all sizes, but, for smaller charities with limited resources, funding rounds can often open and close before they have been noticed. So I encourage the Government to work with charities of all scales and sizes to ensure that UK aid funding opportunities are well publicised.

I also encourage the Government to engage with small charities to help them navigate the often difficult application processes. As we have just heard, while larger NGOs will have extensive teams dedicated to completing such lengthy funding proposals, small charities, including those applying

through schemes such as the Small Charities Challenge Fund, will often need support and advice. I hope that the Government can give assurances that such advice will be readily available.

I intend to use my time here to continue campaigning on issues that are important to me: those of workers' rights and social mobility. But there is one specific area I believe this House has the ability to make progress on, and that is housing and homelessness. I believe that the homelessness crisis we face in the UK is a national shame. We must come together to find the ways and means to tackle it in all its forms. We have used those powers and means to act. We did it before in the late 1990s and early 2000s—act rather than step over or walk past with our eyes averted. I will work with all those organisations and individuals who want to put the plans and resources in place to end it. Thank you.

([HL Hansard, 12 July 2018, cols 1029–31](#))

### **Baroness Bryan of Partick, 5 July 2018, Part-time and Continuing Education and the Open University**

Pauline Christina Bryan, Labour, joined 20 June 2018

My Lords, it is with considerable surprise that I find myself here today making my maiden speech in your Lordships' House—you will appreciate that I will have to be brief. I have received nothing but kindness and encouragement since I arrived. The staff in Black Rod's office, and Black Rod herself, are so helpful, as are the doorkeepers and all the staff and Members who have helped me feel so much at ease. I owe particular thanks to my supporters, my noble friends Lady Hayter and Lady Chakrabarti, who both gave me moral support at my introduction but were also ready to catch me if I keeled over.

In my early political life, I was a member of the Independent Labour Party, so I cannot help but reflect on the ILP members who graced this place: Fenner Brockway, Neil Carmichael, Barbara Castle and, of course, Jennie Lee. Jennie Lee understood the value of education. She came from a mining village in Fife and, unusually for a working-class woman, gained a university degree. She was the first woman to be elected as a Labour MP in Scotland. She was only 24, but had 10 years of campaigning and public speaking experience. A maiden speech held no terrors for her—lucky woman. Many decades later, Harold Wilson gave her responsibility for establishing a University of the Air. She felt that adult education should be more than,

“dowdy and mouldy ... old-fashioned night schools and ... hard benches”.—[Official Report, Commons, 2/4/65; col. 2062.]

She wanted a university to match the best available anywhere.

As an Open University graduate, I have a first-hand appreciation of the high standard of its courses. The downside when I was a student was that the courses ran right through the summer. Fellow students could easily spot one another at airports or on beaches because of the heavy course books that never left their side.

I know that in recent years lecturer contact with students has been reduced and that the OU has closed most of its regional offices, but worse could still be to come. Its lecturers say that the latest round of cuts will,

“destroy the OU as we know it”,

by reducing it simply to “a digital content provider”. Instead of being part of a learning community, students will be dependent on “virtual” support from staff and fellow students. There will be only limited opportunities for face-to-face contact and working in collaboration with fellow students.

For many students, the OU is the only realistic way to access higher education, but, as with other higher education institutions, the cost creates a barrier. The OU has a better record than most in reaching disadvantaged students, but the cost can still be prohibitive.

When I was an OU student in Scotland more than 25 years ago, I studied the same courses as students in the rest of the UK and, significantly, paid the same fees. Now, an OU student in Scotland pays only one-third of what a student from the rest of the UK has to pay.

Being able to offer people a second chance for learning or to take part in lifelong learning should be valued in every part of the UK. We should pool our resources to make sure that the Open University lives up to its aims, which were described by Jennie Lee as being,

“a great independent university which does not insult any man or any women whatever their background by offering them the second best, nothing but the best is good enough”.

[\(HL Hansard, 5 July 2018, cols 653–5\)](#)

### **Bishop of London, 28 June 2018, Disabled People**

Sarah Elisabeth Mullally, Non-affiliated, joined 10 April 2018

My Lords, I thank noble Lords for their warm welcome and am grateful for the practical support I have received from the officers and staff. I am humbled by the knowledge and wisdom represented in your Lordships’ House and I am very conscious that it is a privilege to be a Member. It is a responsibility that I will take seriously. I pay tribute to the noble and right reverend Lord, Lord Chartres, my predecessor as the Bishop of London, and his service in this House. I am glad that he continues to serve in his new



capacity on the Cross Benches. When it was announced that I was to be the 133rd Bishop of London, my friend, the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Salisbury, said that I was a nurse to my fingertips and a modern Boadicea. In this speech, I will try to channel more of the former and suggest that noble Lords speak to my right reverend friend about the latter.

I became a Christian as a teenager so my choice of career as a nurse was a vocation. It was an opportunity to reflect the love of God that I had come to know. I specialised as a cancer nurse and became a ward sister at the old Westminster Hospital just around the corner from here, and then later the director of nursing at the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital on the Fulham Road. In 1999 I was appointed the Government's Chief Nursing Officer for England. While in that role I trained for ordination in the Church of England.

When I moved into the Church of England, I continued to contribute to health, first as a non-executive NHS board member and more recently as a member of the council of King's College London. I am a passionate supporter of the NHS. It has touched my life in many ways: as a parent; at the time of the death of my parents; and, of course for many years as a nurse. I have seen examples in this country of world-class care and, as we celebrate 70 years of the NHS, I pay tribute both to those who had the courage and vision to set up the NHS and to those who continue to care within the NHS today.

They say you can take the nurse out of nursing, but never nursing out of the nurse. I am the Bishop I am today because of that first vocation to nursing, and compassion and healing are constants at the heart of who I am. I would not go so far as to say that this House needs a ward sister, for fear of being taken the wrong way; but I hope that in my time here and with my background, I can bring as much to this place of the pastoral and spiritual as I can of the professional.

I worked in London both as a nurse and as a priest before moving to the south-west as Bishop of Crediton in the diocese of Exeter. The people of Devon are thrilled that, as the Bishop of London, I come to your Lordships' House with some understanding of rural life. Alas, the diocese of London has fewer farms. We serve a population of four million, covering 277 square miles of Greater London, north of the Thames and west of the Lea, from the Isle of Dogs in the east to Staines in the west and as far north as Enfield. Your Lordships will be delighted to know that you are sitting in my diocese.

London is of course world-facing. It is multicultural and multi-faith. It is a city of energy and diversity, open to all. But it is also a city of inequality and deprivation. As we have seen most recently in the tragedy of Grenfell Tower, it is also a city where people can feel ignored, marginalised and—often justifiably—angry. I am the Bishop of London, but I intend to be a bishop for London. And I will do so alongside those other distinguished bishops for London in this House, my right reverend friends the Bishops of Chelmsford and Southwark.

Along with celebrating 70 years of the National Health Service, I have been delighted to celebrate 70 years of the Paralympic movement. At evensong at St Paul's Cathedral earlier this month we watched a demonstration of wheelchair fencing under the dome. It was a reminder of how sport can enable people with disabilities to flourish. We should not lose sight of the fact that in the UK, one in five of the population has a disability of some sort, the majority of those people acquiring their disability in later life.

Our churches, like our society, need to up their game when it comes to being welcoming and accessible places for people with disabilities. There are some good examples, including the Disability Advisory Group at St Martin-in-the-Fields, here in London. The driving force for their mission is to change attitudes towards those with disabilities—as not simply people presenting pastoral or practical challenges, but equals who bring unique potential to aid our renewal and mission as a church. In wider society, unlocking potential for those with disabilities brings benefit to us all.

As we celebrate 70 years of the NHS I am aware that for people with disabilities, going into general hospitals can be one of their biggest challenges, because their specific needs—such as their spinal needs—are often not met. Therefore, hospitals disable them. I know that as we move forward, there will be more challenges for the NHS and more difficult decisions, which is why I welcomed the recommendation in 2016 of the Equality Act 2010 and Disability Committee, chaired by the noble Baroness, Lady Deech, which called for a cumulative impact assessment of the decisions made in the public sector on disabled people.

I am immensely grateful to all who have welcomed me today, and look forward to the rest of the speeches in this debate, and the many debates to come.

[\*\(HL Hansard, 28 June 2018, cols 308–10\)\*](#)

### **Lord Hogan-Howe, 21 December 2017, Ivory Trade**

Bernard Hogan-Howe, Crossbench, joined 7 November 2017

My Lords, I rise to speak for the first time in your Lordships' House. Many noble Lords may remember feeling as I do now, but without fear there is no courage, and therefore I shall plunge on. I should probably have made sure that my maiden speech was not preceded by the maiden speech of a former President of the Supreme Court, variously and accurately described as “brilliant” and “excellent” and as having been delivered with great flair. Again, I will plunge on. I thank the noble Lord, Lord Carrington, for this important debate on the impact of the trade in ivory on animal welfare.

Recently, during my first appearance on the BBC's “Question Time”, a poor woman collapsed just after my contribution. The programme ended early for

the first time in 30 years. Your Lordships can rest easy on their Benches—I will be neither contentious nor lengthy.

I thank many people for assisting me in my introduction to this House. My supporters, the noble Lords, Lords Alton and Lord Dholakia, are different men with common traits of sincerity, courage and judgment. I hope that noble Lords will understand if, first, I need to thank the police who keep us safe here. I also thank the doorkeepers, our catering staff, and Black Rod and his team—in fact, everyone who has helped me to negotiate my first steps through the maze of these corridors. I have found it a warm place. I find myself surprised to be standing here at all, and I am sure that many of your Lordships will have a similar feeling—perhaps even about their own elevation.

I was born in the great city of Sheffield, the proud son of a single unmarried mother. I grew up initially in a slum clearance house adjacent to the stainless steel works that made Sheffield's name, followed by various council flats in the city. I mention my start only to emphasise that I have never judged people by their wealth, their status or their start in life—only by how they treat other people. A privileged start is no guarantee that a person will have a happy life; nor will a challenging start inevitably make someone caring or socially aware.

After school, I worked for a short time for the National Health Service in a histopathology lab. However, I was hungry for challenges and, looking for excitement, I joined the police. The police were and remain my heroes, stepping in to confront bullies. The routine is never predictable. Every day one meets new people and crises. I loved my 38 years as a police officer. I have walked the streets of Sheffield, Liverpool and London. I found I was good at arresting thieves and burglars. I have never lost the thrill of arresting the bad guy to protect the good guy.

I remember one night being angry at being taken away from my foot patrol to sit with a prisoner. The night before I had chased and caught a car thief. I was sure I would do so again that night. Little did I know that the man whom I sat with for a few hours was the Yorkshire Ripper. An interesting conversation took place.

I have arrested someone at every rank. I was the only chief constable in Merseyside to accompany the winner of the Grand National on horseback. In the Met, I uniquely patrolled with mounted branch at every London football ground—even Millwall, which I have to say I found to be incredibly peaceful, with caring staff and supporters, and I wrote to the chairman to point that out.

The police supported me through an education at Merton College, Oxford. I will always be grateful and will be their champion, but not without seeing their flaws at times. My colleagues and friends will always agree that one of my traits is to be challenging—and sometimes they mean it in a kindly way. I

hope to bring that skill to this House, combining it with the ability to listen, enabling me to be both passionate and caring in my judgment.

We need to apply forensic judgment to the trade in ivory. At present, the bad guys are getting away with it. As we have heard, the poachers are slaughtering an elephant every 25 minutes—equivalent to 20,000 elephants a year. The largest demand for ivory worldwide is from China, Thailand and Vietnam. However, as noble Lords have already said, we must accept that legal domestic ivory markets contribute to this horror in two ways: by fuelling demand for ivory and by providing a hiding place for illegal modern ivory to be laundered through the legal market, and the UK is a significant trading place for legal ivory.

In those circumstances, I want to make it clear that I support a total or quasi ban on the trading of ivory in the UK for both domestic sale and export. I could support a total ban on ownership but there are still so many unanswered questions, as has been sketched out here today, about how to implement such a ban. In this connection, I would like to make the following points.

First, if it were only the UK that implemented a ban, how could this be effective worldwide? Until 2015, the UK had the largest amount of ivory exports in the world by a very significant degree. This unexplained trend started in 2010. Even today, we account for four times more ivory trading than the next country on the supply league table. So, both practically and symbolically, our effort would have a significant worldwide effect.

However, as we have heard, innocent owners of antique and modern ivory could at a stroke lose significant assets and might have a reasonable claim for compensation from the state. Great works of art might be lost or destroyed. Therefore, until I hear clearer answers to how a total ban on ownership might be implemented, I will reserve judgment.

I support the government proposals to ban the trade in ivory in the UK, but with three considerations that are important for me. First, the proposals talk entirely of banning sales but not gifts. If gifts and exchange are still allowed then a ban may be harder to police. It also provides a potential defence to allow a suspect to claim that they transferred the ivory to a new owner but did not sell it to them.

Secondly, I would want to see far more emphasis placed on recovering criminal assets from ivory poachers and those they sell to. I know from experience, as will police officers here and those I have worked with, that organised crime is always about profit. Criminals may trade in drugs, sometimes human beings, firearms or, as we have heard today, ivory, but always for profit. Take out the cash and you stop the crime; follow the cash and you will find the criminal.

Finally, I am concerned by one of the four exemptions to banning the sale of ivory, which proposes continuing to allow the sale of items of artistic, cultural or historic significance. In my view that is too subjective and too broadly drawn. I worry about the ability of the trade entirely to police itself.

I thank your Lordships for your patience and support in this, my first speech in this place. I greatly look forward to contributing to the important work that the House undertakes to keep our people safe, healthy and economically strong.

([HL Hansard, 21 December 2017, cols 2274–6](#))

### 3. Valedictory Speeches

#### **Lord Higgins, 13 December 2018, Constitutional Convention**

Terence Langley Higgins, Conservative, retired | January 2019

My Lords, I congratulate the noble Lord, Lord Foulkes of Cumnock, on his speech and the Motion he has tabled. He has been fortunate to find time for it. I thank him most sincerely for his extremely kind remarks about me. They are greatly appreciated.

It has been noticeable with the relatively new practice of valedictory speeches that they are often attached to debates that have nothing whatever to do with them, but that is certainly not so in this case. I am here because of the significant constitutional change whereby it was decided that Members of the House of Lords could retire—after centuries and centuries when that was not so. I therefore find myself here today, having reached the conclusion that I ought to retire.

I should make it clear why. I am absolutely convinced, as many others have been, that the House of Lords is too large. The Lord Speaker has initiated a series of actions, including the reports from the noble Lord, Lord Burns, on how it can be reduced and that programme of reduction is now proceeding through various people retiring or by natural causes and so on. I have come to the conclusion that since I have always believed that one's vote should follow one's voice and that, if possible, actions should follow one's vote, I should take action as part of the campaign that has been initiated to reduce the size of the House. That is my only reason for retiring, but I should also say that it would be quite absurd if existing Members decided that they should retire, for the reasons I have given, and we then find the numbers creeping up again. The crucial outstanding point in the report of the noble Lord, Lord Burns, is that once we have reduced the size there should be a cap on that size, regardless of complications with regard to the royal prerogative.

I was first elected to the House of Commons as the Member for Worthing on 15 October 1964. I had not stood before and, despite the assurances of

my agent, I was very worried about what the outcome would be; in the event, I was elected with a majority of 18,883. I am glad to say that while that majority somewhat declined since, my former constituency, which was split up, is now represented by two outstanding Members of Parliament: West Worthing by Sir Peter Bottomley, and East Worthing and Shoreham by Mr Tim Loughton. I am happy to say that my former constituents are very fortunate to have such good Members of Parliament and very clever to return them with what are, even now, extremely large majorities.

I served in the Commons from 1964 to 1997—33 years—and then in your Lordships' House from 1997 until now, which is 21 years. That is a total of some 54 years and one naturally looks back at some events in that period. One that stands out is the problem with Rhodesia, over which I had some difference of opinion with my constituents culminating in a public meeting of 1,200 people. I do not think that kind of thing happens nowadays but, at all events, that was one problem. Another problem was with the Ugandan Asians. I was in government at that time and we had serious trouble with Mr Idi Amin. Various solutions were proposed, such as that we might have a better relationship with him if we made him a field-marshal in the British Army. That solution was rejected but Ted Heath set up a very small Cabinet committee consisting of Robert Carr, as Home Secretary, Paul Bryan and me to make recommendations. We came out by saying very strongly that the refugees from the crisis in that country should be admitted to this country. That has had considerable economic benefit to this country and it is something of which I am rather proud.

I made my maiden speech in the other place on the plight of old age non-pensioners who had been left out of the original scheme, but nothing happened until I arrived in the Treasury, when I was able to rectify that injustice and make sure that at least they got that part of the pension not been covered by national insurance contributions.

Many things in political life are transitory, so one inevitably thinks about what one has done which might pass the test of time. I notice three in particular. One is decimalisation. I was put in charge of it on arrival in the Treasury in 1970. Ian Macleod had advocated a 10 bob unit. Jim Callaghan had argued for a pound unit, on the grounds of the international prestige of the pound, but a few weeks later he devalued the pound, which rather undermined his argument, and I was left with the problem when I arrived at the Treasury. We went ahead with the situation that we inherited and I think, on the whole, it has worked pretty well. Indeed, although the latest coin is very attractive compared with the ones I introduced, the situation has been resolved quite satisfactorily.

More important was the huge taxation reform I brought in with Ian Macleod by abolishing purchase tax and selective employment tax and replacing them with VAT. That has certainly stood the test of time. The basic rate is now double, or rather more, what it was when I introduced it. We went for a single positive rate with zero rating for essential items so that the tax would

not be regressive. The problem with that was that, as I carried the reform through the House of Commons, endless amendments went down stating that this or that item should be zero rated, but we survived that, with one exception—children’s clothes and shoes. I see that some Members opposite remember that. An amendment had been put down by one of my colleagues to zero-rate it and I stood up to make my usual speech saying that it was a universal, wide-ranging scheme and so on, and then I received a note from the Whip saying, “Do you realise that everyone on this side is at the Royal Garden Party?”, so I succeeded in announcing that there would be a special inquiry into this item, and as a result children’s shoes and clothes are zero rated, which they would not have been before.

I am conscious of the time. In the Lords I went straight on to the Front Bench when I left the Commons and served there for a period in opposition against Lady Hollis of Heigham, whom we all greatly miss as she recently left us. It is a huge advantage in opposition to have someone against you who knows all about the subject. Indeed, she knew more about the subject than anyone else in the world. It was a very enjoyable period in my political life. I sat on a number of committees, including the Committee on the Speakership, the Committee on the Conventions on the Relationship between the two Houses of Parliament and various other ad hoc committees, which I enjoyed. I have been particularly engaged with the Campaign for an Effective Second Chamber, which was initiated by my noble friend Lord Cormack and supported by my noble friend Lord Norton of Louth, both of whom are in their place. I think we are very grateful for the work which that all-party committee has done, which has certainly improved the constitutional changes that have been made. I hope there will be further constitutional changes in future.

I think it is true to say that your Lordships’ House is probably more effective now than it has been at any time in its history. It is making an outstanding contribution, it has taken on a great deal of the legislative burden from the other place—which I do not think is fully appreciated—and, generally speaking, it operates extremely well. It is an extraordinary place. The mass of expertise and experience that your Lordships devote to business of the House is very important. It is also a quite extraordinarily friendly place, which I have greatly appreciated.

In conclusion, I thank very much all the staff of the House—the badge messengers, the staff in the catering department and so on. If I may, I will say how grateful I am for the support I have received throughout from my wife and family. That is very important; one cannot do a good job here or in the Commons without it. I thank noble Lords for the kind remarks that I have received, and I appreciate very much the opportunity to say this today.

[\(HL Hansard, 13 December 2018, cols 1416–9\)](#)

## **Lord Plumb, 2 November 2017, Agriculture, Fisheries and the Rural Environment**

Charles Henry Plumb, Conservative, retired 3 November 2017

My Lords, I thank my noble friend Lord Lindsay for raising this issue and putting forward this important Motion. It is equally important that we debate the issue a little more often than we have done in the past. It is good for us to know where our food comes from, who produces it and how and where it might come from if we do not produce it here.

As I move towards retirement, after 30 years and a rewarding and enjoyable education among so many distinguished colleagues, I thank the clerks and the staff for their tolerance and understanding in recent times. I thank in particular my Whip, my noble friend Lord Sherbourne, and the Chief Whip, my noble friend Lord Taylor.

As I look back over a long life and career, I recognise that agriculture has been at the very core of it, in both practice and political interest. My formal education was cut short in March 1940, when my father and headmaster both agreed that the war could not last more than six months and so I could return to my studies in the autumn. Therefore, I had to leave and go back to work on the farm. That suited me fine as I was not too happy at school, but I was in at the deep end and well into hard work and a lot of responsibility, with bombs falling round us on land between Coventry and Birmingham. But then the land girls came to the rescue as farm workers.

You could say that my politics started through the Young Farmers' Movement, an organisation able to advise and provide mentorship for young entrepreneurs in agriculture and rural business. My CV reads as if I was a collector of presidencies. My father used to say that anyone can become a president. Well, I have proved him right. I moved from the Young Farmers' Movement to the presidency of the National Farmers' Union in 1971, as noble Lords have heard. My path then took me from the presidency of the Society of Ploughmen to Chancellor of Coventry University, and from non-executive roles in finance and business to a fellowship at Ohio University, where the agricultural faculty was created in 1860 by Professor Charles Plumb. The Plumbs get around everywhere in interesting times.

Among other organisations, I was best known through the NFU. I remember a farmer once complaining, "If you're joining this old common market, don't hold it on a Wednesday because that buggers up ours". Negotiations on our entry, changing from one policy to another, required six steps in five years to change to the common agricultural policy. I ask the Minister: will this happen in reverse? I was an enthusiast for our membership and the opportunity it presented for co-operation and competition for the food market of 500 million people. However, with a £22 billion deficit with European countries on food and farming products alone, our exit will not be



successful without government assistance and encouragement, and changes in the method of support.

Retiring from the NFU presidency came at a time when it was agreed that we should hold direct elections to the European Parliament. Discussing this with my son, who had just come back from Argentina, I said that I would welcome his advice. “If I come home instead of going elsewhere, where do I start?”, I asked. His reply was short and sharp. “You can start by sweeping the yard because you always complain that it is untidy when you get home”. So I decided to stand for membership of the European Parliament. It was a pleasure to represent the people of the Cotswolds over the 20 years I was there. It was a great experience.

In Parliament I had no particular ambition to get too involved, but I found myself as the first chairman of the 50-strong agriculture committee, with Barbara Castle as a member. I then became leader of the Conservative Group for Europe, which also included members from Northern Ireland, Spain and Denmark. In 1987 I was elected President of the whole Parliament, as your Lordships have heard, and I can now say that I was—and, presumably, will be—the only Brit to have been elected to that position. I was a bit surprised when I received a very complimentary letter from Mrs Thatcher inviting me to become a working Peer. It did not happen at once but it certainly happened later—and I have enjoyed my 30 years.

Even our friends in New Zealand and Australia, after some years of heavy criticism, accepted that by joining Europe we had helped at least to widen the world market for their products. We had of course helped to shield them when we joined Europe by obtaining import quotas for their products—quotas on which in later years they were no longer dependent.

Whenever agriculture is debated, in this House or elsewhere, there is always a tendency to underestimate its importance in the life and the economy of the nation. Some 0.7% of GDP does not sound like a lot, but let us not forget the sector’s massive input into the food and drink industry, which employs some 14% of the workforce and generates £96 billion-worth of business. It is a major part of our economy. Therefore, we must not think of agriculture purely in terms of its product; as we have already heard, we must remember its jobs and its contribution to our GDP. It is a major factor in determining the success or otherwise of our national environmental policies.

My noble friend Lord Ridley, who unfortunately is not with us today, is right to predict that we can all reap rewards from robotised farms—what he means by that is for your Lordships to imagine—drawing on existing technical and scientific advice. Developments have taken and are taking place. However, I enter the two caveats that matter as regards development. First, we have to ensure that the rural environment is not negatively industrialised. The character of our countryside is something rightly precious to all of us, wherever we live. Furthermore, as we face the challenge of increasing agricultural production, whatever happens we must keep a

weather eye on the land available for that purpose—farming. For example, the HS2 rail project alone is estimated to require 100,000 acres of agricultural land and, of course, the need to increase housebuilding will make further significant demands. I do not say that that is wrong, but it is a fact as we see it at the moment.

With a food trade gap of over £22 billion, we need to increase production and it is not obvious that all the countries which are supposed to be queuing up to do a deal with the UK are motivated by sentiment; the US, Canada, China, Australia, New Zealand, Brazil and the like all have their own interests. We are also in danger of losing benefits from joint research and development with our European friends.

In today's debate many have not taken on board that agricultural support post Brexit is not something over which the UK will have an entirely free hand. The fact is that whatever the UK will do must fall within the framework of rules set by the WTO. The reason why the cap changed so radically over the years was not principally because EU politicians saw the light about the need for reform; it was much more because world trade agreements made the reform inevitable.

We have to admit that it is difficult to imagine precisely what the world, the EU and the UK will look like on the other side of our withdrawal. At the end of what we hope will be a successful negotiation, we will pass across the yet-to-be-designed bridge of an implementation stage. The media are currently focusing the national gaze on that period of five years or so as our “future”. As I look back on almost five decades of the European project, I also look far beyond those mere five years.

The UK is moving on—but in ways not yet agreed upon in detail, because inevitably the EU will also move on. It will be for another generation altogether, both here and there, to determine whether the respective directions of travel will tend to diverge or converge. My instinct tells me that the future generations in Britain and Europe will favour a reconvergence.

I hope to spend some time in the future with many young people, encouraging them to develop their skills in rural affairs, business and enterprise, and always to remind them that they make a living by what they do but make a life by what they give. I am sure that agriculture will provide many of them with many opportunities to do just that and still be proud to be British.

[\(HL Hansard, 2 November 2017, cols 1448–50\)](#)

**Appendix I: Maiden Speeches 2017–2019**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Woolley of Woodford, L	Crossbench	31/10/2019	<a href="#">Grenfell Tower Inquiry: Phase I Report</a>	cols 1051–3
Hendy, L	Labour	31/10/2019	<a href="#">Grenfell Tower Inquiry: Phase I Report</a>	cols 1048–9
Sanderson of Welton, B	Conservative	31/10/2019	<a href="#">Grenfell Tower Inquiry: Phase I Report</a>	cols 1044–6
Bennett of Manor Castle, B	Green Party	17/10/2019	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 217–20
Bristol, Bp	Non-Affiliated	17/10/2019	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 184–6
Randall of Uxbridge, L	Conservative	30/09/2019	<a href="#">Non-Domestic Rating (Lists) Bill</a>	cols 1568–71
Caine, L	Conservative	09/09/2019	<a href="#">Report Pursuant to Sections 3(1), 3(6), 3(7), 3(8), 3(9) and 3(10) the Northern Ireland (Executive Formation etc) Act 2019</a>	cols 1367–71
Ravensdale, L	Crossbench	13/06/2019	<a href="#">Inequalities</a>	cols 536–8
Reay, L	Conservative	04/06/2019	<a href="#">D-day: 75th Anniversary</a>	cols 43–4
Devon, E	Crossbench	25/04/2019	<a href="#">Brexit: Food Prices and Availability (EUC Report)</a>	cols 756–8
Carrington, L	Crossbench	28/02/2019	<a href="#">Safety of Medicines and Medical Devices</a>	cols 340–1
Blackwood of North Oxford, B	Conservative	05/02/2019	<a href="#">Healthcare (International Arrangements) Bill</a>	cols 1445–9
Osamor, B	Labour	31/01/2019	<a href="#">Social Housing</a>	cols 184–5
McCrea of Magherafelt and Cookstown, L	Democratic Unionist Party	20/11/2018	<a href="#">Brexit: Negotiations</a>	cols 181–3
Tyrie, L	Non-Affiliated	09/10/2018	<a href="#">Counter-Terrorism and Border Security Bill</a>	cols 52–5

<sup>4</sup> Affiliation at time of speech.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Garnier, L	Conservative	09/10/2018	<a href="#">Counter-Terrorism and Border Security Bill</a>	cols 38–42
Sater, B	Conservative	12/09/2018	<a href="#">Justice: Women's Centres</a>	cols 2359–61
Meyer, B	Conservative	11/09/2018	<a href="#">Trade Bill</a>	cols 2222–3
Bull, B	Crossbench	06/09/2018	<a href="#">Careers Education for Students</a>	cols 1973–6
Bethell, L	Conservative	06/09/2018	<a href="#">NHS: Healthcare Data</a>	cols 1907–9
Anderson of Ipswich, L	Crossbench	19/07/2018	<a href="#">Referendums: Parliamentary Democracy</a>	cols 1352–4
Pickles, L	Conservative	19/07/2018	<a href="#">Referendums: Parliamentary Democracy</a>	cols 1348–50
Chichester, Bp	Non-Affiliated	19/07/2018	<a href="#">Higher Education</a>	cols 1314–6
Boycott, B	Crossbench	18/07/2018	<a href="#">Obesity</a>	cols 1267–8
Barran, B	Conservative	16/07/2018	<a href="#">Mental Capacity (Amendment) Bill [HL]</a>	cols 1068–70
McNicol of West Kilbride, L	Labour	12/07/2018	<a href="#">Overseas Aid: Charities and Faith-based Organisations</a>	cols 1029–31
Lilley, L	Conservative	12/07/2018	<a href="#">Economy: Personal Savings</a>	cols 972–5
Haselhurst, L	Conservative	09/07/2018	<a href="#">Rural Areas: Public Services</a>	cols 837–9
Bryan of Partick, B	Labour	05/07/2018	<a href="#">Part-time and Continuing Education and the Open University</a>	cols 653–5
London, Bp	Non-Affiliated	28/06/2018	<a href="#">Disabled People</a>	cols 308–10
Geidt, L	Crossbench	22/03/2018	<a href="#">Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting 2018</a>	cols 439–42
Lincoln, Bp	Non-Affiliated	15/03/2018	<a href="#">Economy: Spring Statement</a>	cols 1824–6
Houghton of Richmond, L	Crossbench	18/01/2018	<a href="#">United States: Foreign Policy</a>	cols 748–50
Hogan-Howe, L	Crossbench	21/12/2017	<a href="#">Ivory Trade</a>	cols 2274–6

Member	Affiliation <sup>4</sup>	Date of Maiden Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Neuberger of Abbotsbury, L	Crossbench	21/12/2017	<a href="#">Climate Change: Health</a>	cols 2244–7
Fairhead, B	Conservative	27/11/2017	<a href="#">Exports: Africa and the Commonwealth</a>	cols 584–8
Thomas of Cwmgiedd, L	Crossbench	07/11/2017	<a href="#">Growing up with the Internet (Communications Committee Report)</a>	cols 1747–9
Agnew of Oulton, L	Conservative	02/11/2017	<a href="#">A Manifesto to Strengthen Families</a>	cols 1538–42
Vaux of Harrowden, L	Crossbench	17/10/2017	<a href="#">Brexit: Agriculture and Farm Animal Welfare (European Union Committee Report)</a>	cols 554–5
Wyld, B	Conservative	12/10/2017	<a href="#">Future of Work</a>	cols 349–50
Duncan of Springbank, L	Conservative	09/10/2017	<a href="#">Devolution (Constitution Committee Reports)</a>	cols 92–5
Colgrain, L	Conservative	26/06/2017	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 213–5
Mountevans, L	Crossbench	26/06/2017	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 204–6

## Appendix 2: Valedictory Speeches, 2017–2019

Member	Affiliation	Date of Valedictory Speech	Debate Title	Hansard Reference
Higgins, L	Conservative	13/12/2018	<a href="#">Constitutional Convention</a>	cols 1416–9
Plumb, L	Conservative	02/12/2017	<a href="#">Agriculture, Fisheries and the Rural Environment</a>	cols 1448–50