



### **House of Lords: Maiden and valedictory speeches, 2019–2022**

Author: Venetia Thompson

Date published: 15 November 2022

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 first two sessions of the current 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 first two sessions of this parliament six members chose to take up this opportunity. The third section of this briefing includes the full text of some of these 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. Affiliations noted are those of the member at the time of the speech. 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 similar Library briefings compiled at the end of previous parliaments:

- [House of Lords: Maiden and valedictory speeches, 2017–2019 \(18 December 2019\)](#)
- [House of Lords: Maiden and valedictory speeches, 2015–2017 \(12 June 2017\)](#)
- [House of Lords: Maiden and valedictory speeches, 2010–2015 \(21 May 2015\)](#)

## **Contents**

1. Introduction	1
2. Maiden speeches	3
3. Valedictory speeches	51
Appendix 1: Maiden speeches 2019–2022	69
Appendix 2: Valedictory speeches 2019–2022	76

## 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 first two sessions of this parliament 85 members made a maiden speech. These included speeches by nine members of the government, four bishops and six hereditary members elected by their peers. Most 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

---

<sup>1</sup> House of Lords, '[Code of conduct for Members of the House of Lords](#)', June 2022, HL Paper 13 of session 2022–23.

debate with a speaker's list. The speech itself is expected to be short (within the advisory speaking time or, if there is none, less than 10 minutes)<sup>2</sup> 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 first two sessions of the current 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](#)' (2022 edition, paragraphs 4.52–4.54). An index to all maiden speeches made between January 2020 and April 2022 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 recommendation from the House of Lords 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

---

<sup>2</sup> House of Lords, '[Companion to the standing orders and guide to the proceedings of the House of Lords](#)', 2022, para 4.52.

same courtesies as maiden speeches and would be marked in Hansard.<sup>3</sup>

This was agreed by the House on 30 October 2014.<sup>4</sup> Valedictory speeches are subject to the same guidance and conventions that apply to maiden speeches.<sup>5</sup> During the period covered by this briefing six members have taken the opportunity to make a valedictory speech, four of whom were Lords Spiritual. The full text of some of these speeches are included in section 3 of this Library briefing.

## 2. Maiden speeches

### **Lord Sedwill, 25 February 2022, Ukraine**

Mark Philip Sedwill, Crossbench, joined 11 September 2020

My lords, I thank your lordships for permitting me to make my maiden speech in a debate of such seriousness. I hope noble lords will understand if I do not go through the usual personal reminiscences that are customary on such an occasion and use my time to focus on the issue at hand. But let me start with one: I was a junior diplomat in training when the Berlin Wall came down, and I was on duty the weekend that Saddam Hussein's Iraq invaded Kuwait. I am haunted by those experiences right at the

---

<sup>3</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>4</sup> [HL Hansard, 30 October 2014, cols 1314–7.](#)

<sup>5</sup> House of Lords, '[Companion to the standing orders and guide to the proceedings of the House of Lords](#)', 2022, para 4.55.

beginning of my career as we face a much more serious challenge today.

For the reasons that the noble lord, Lord Robertson, has set out, we must take Vladimir Putin at his word. Many thought that he hoped to consolidate Crimea, to intimidate Ukraine and to re-establish the Moscow–Washington channel as the only means of dialogue about European and wider security—but he does not. He wants to reverse the outcome of the Cold War, for the reasons that several noble lords have set out, and we must assume and act in accordance with that.

I suggest that there are three things that we should do, beyond the measures that the government, along with our allies, have already taken. I commend the government for the robust stance that they have taken throughout this crisis, blending diplomacy with defence and strong action on sanctions. The key to sanctions is to impose a higher price than was expected by the offender in the first place. We did that after Salisbury; we must do so again now. Much of what we have seen so far will have been priced in by the Putin regime. For the reasons that we have heard, we should go further, not only with economic sanctions but, for example, dismantling the intelligence networks around the world on which Russia depends—which we dismantled after the Salisbury attack but many others did not. We can provide other countries with the material that they need to do that.

We should also attack the Putin regime on exactly the point that the noble lord, Lord Robertson, just made: its fear of its own people. When the regime gets bogged down in Ukraine, as is likely, it is important that we reveal the truth to Russia's own people as well as to other countries that are in play. We should do that

through all of the classic means, such as the media, the BBC World Service, Russian-speaking services and so on, but through modern means as well—cyber, social media and information campaigns of the kind that the regime uses against us. One of the only heartening things that we have seen in this very sorry episode was the speedy resistance of some brave Russians to the actions of their government; we need to encourage that as well.

We must support the Ukrainian resistance with the military and other capabilities that they need as their resistance to the Russian invasion shifts from conventional to unconventional, from military to militia. It is really important that our intelligence services and others have not only the capabilities but the legal frameworks to do so; we have struggled with that in other conflicts elsewhere.

Finally, as the noble lord, Lord Robertson, said, we must ensure that NATO itself is ready for the next phase. For too long—for the whole period of my career since the fall of the Berlin Wall—we have assumed that the “new world order”, as the first President Bush referred to it, was something on which we could rely and globalisation something we could take for granted. It is now clear that we cannot, so, as well as deploying additional forces to reassure the eastern European nations that NATO will stand by them—that article 5 is an absolute guarantee covering not only every inch of territory but any cyberattacks or other kinds of unconventional warfare that they might face—NATO must also reaffirm its intention to modernise and deter further Russian aggression. That means every nation not only meeting but exceeding the 2% and quickly putting in place programmes to achieve a proper, integrated NATO capability that can be deployed against Russia or any

other adversary, and working through some of the fractiousness that, my word, looks trivial now, between NATO, the EU and other headquarters as they try to try to address those capabilities.

My final point is this: other autocrats are clearly watching us very carefully, as we have heard already, and some of them have territorial ambitions too, but not every authoritarian state, or every state that does not share our democratic values, will be comfortable with what they have seen of Russia trying to breach the borders of another country. Therefore, our diplomacy must encompass those states as well and encourage the collective international response to a breach of not just the rules-based order but the global rule of law.<sup>6</sup>

### **Bishop of Exeter, 18 November 2021, Climate change: Cop26**

Robert Ronald Atwell, Bishops, joined 10 September 2021

My lords, arriving as Bishop of Exeter eight years ago, I have become a Devonian by adoption and grace. Although proud of my Essex roots, I now know that the only way is Devon.

As I listen to Devonshire farmers grappling with environmental land management schemes or residents in south Devon who are increasingly anxious about coastal erosion, or engage with scientists at the Met Office in Exeter, I am conscious of the urgency and immensity of the task confronting us.

---

<sup>6</sup> [HL Hansard, 25 February 2022, cols 462–3.](#)



In scripture, we learn that Joseph—of technicolour dreamcoat fame—interpreted Pharaoh’s dreams of times of plenty and times of famine and advised Pharaoh to prudence in managing the nation’s resources, and we know that Noah heard God’s voice warning him of a devastating flood. Today’s prophets are the scientists and environmentalists who present us with stark choices that demand action.

The Church of England is responding to their warnings. In 2017, we set up the Transition Pathway Initiative, a joint initiative between us and the Environment Agency Pension Fund. Aimed at investors, it assesses companies’ preparedness for the transition to a low-carbon economy. It has already evolved into a global initiative, with over \$39tn of combined assets under management and advice.

In the diocese of Exeter, we are taking coordinated action towards a target of net zero by 2030, including investing in a net-zero officer. With nearly 600 churches, three-quarters of which are medieval buildings, your lordships will realise that this is challenging. That said, the majority of our church buildings are the ultimate in sustainability: built centuries ago with local materials, they are still meeting the needs of local communities, with a very low carbon footprint.

Our churches, situated in the heart of the majority of communities across the county, are well placed to spot opportunities such as installing solar panels on underused land, planting trees, better insulating a village hall or improving recycling facilities. I recognise that this is a complex subject, and I feel very much the amateur. I console myself, however, with the knowledge that

whereas the Ark was built by amateurs, the ‘Titanic’ was built by professionals.

I have one final thought. My diocese is twinned with the Province of Melanesia. The bonds of friendship were laid over 150 years ago when John Coleridge Patteson left Ottery St Mary to take the Gospel to the Solomon Islands, where he was beaten to death by islanders who mistook him for a slave trader. The very island on which he was martyred is now virtually uninhabitable because of rising sea levels, and within five years it will have disappeared. It is small developing countries with relatively low carbon footprints, such as Melanesia, which are being asked to pay a heavy price for the rest of the world’s wastefulness.

Cop26 may be over but, as the noble baroness, Lady Young, reminded us, the United Kingdom remains in the chair for a year. Her Majesty’s Government must seize the opportunity for international leadership.<sup>7</sup>

### **Lord Harlech, 28 October 2021, Land use framework**

Jasset David Cody Ormsby Gore, Conservative, joined 21 July 2021

My lords, it is an honour and a privilege to be speaking in your lordships’ House for the first time. This is a defining moment for me personally, but I join the House when it is also a defining moment for our country, as we seek to face, head on, the triple challenge of the pandemic, our independence from the EU and climate change. These are serious responsibilities.

---

<sup>7</sup> [HL Hansard, 18 November 2021, cols 437–8.](#)

Over the past few months, I have taken the advice to listen and observe proceedings, rather than diving straight in. I have been hugely impressed by the contributions in your lordships' House in debates such as those on the Environment Bill, the passionate but courteous deliberation in the Assisted Dying Bill of the noble baroness, Lady Meacher, and the heartfelt and moving tributes paid to the late Sir David Amess.

I place on record my thanks for the help given to me by so many: the doorkeepers, special advisers, the clerks and Table Office staff, the librarians, and the catering and security personnel. I am also grateful for the mentorship of my noble friends Lord Borwick, Lady Bloomfield and Lady Sanderson, and for the support from friends in the other place.

The Harlech barony was created in 1876. My forebears were a distinguished lot: MPs, ministers, soldiers and public servants. I take my duty seriously to follow their example. I will also take inspiration from Lord Elton, a distinguished servant of your lordships' House, to whose place I am proud to have succeeded.

My grandfather David, both as MP for North Shropshire and as a foreign office minister, worked hard to bring countries and peoples together. As British ambassador to the United States during the Kennedy administration, he fostered the personal relationships upon which the special relationship grew, ensuring that British views were given proper consideration during events such as the Cuban missile crisis. Can personal relationships still prove decisive today? I suspect they can.

I had a rural upbringing in Shropshire and Wales, where I

would accompany my father on his duties around the estate. We frequently stopped at farm kitchens thick with smoke for non-stop cups of tea. Like his father, he understood the importance of building personal relationships, listening to people, giving them time and always making them feel valued. It is no secret that my father had his afflictions, but he always championed Wales and rural issues, and cared deeply for the countryside and its people.

My mother did an incredible job of raising two children—essentially as a single parent, while forging a successful career as a consultant to some of the pre-eminent designers of her generation in the fashion houses of Europe. Her incredible work ethic, creativity and passion for all the arts greatly influenced the career path I took.

After completing school, I moved to London to study design at Central St Martins. The rich and diverse culture of the city, its music, people and places, had a profound impact on me and shaped my views as much as my rural heritage did. After graduating, I went on to work in medical communication, media production and property management.

On my father's passing, I returned to north Wales. There, we have invested in organic farming, implementing renewable technology and undertaking the vital restoration of heritage assets. It was on a platform of being a voice for Wales, its people and the rural economy, that I stood in the hustings.

I should also mention that I am an army reservist. The army teaches the importance of courage, discipline, teamwork, integrity, respect for others and selfless

commitment. These values shape my approach to public office and my duties to this House.

I turn to today's debate, tabled by the noble baroness, Lady Young of Old Scone. Allow me to state the obvious. As a country, we need to produce more food; grow more trees; better manage our forests; and reverse the decline in biodiversity. They are serious challenges—but, to judge by Tuesday's debate on the Environment Bill and, indeed, by today's debate, they are ones about which we are no longer in denial. I sense that, as a country, we are readier than ever to pick up the gauntlet.

I began by saying that this was a defining moment—a time of monumental challenges for Britain, the world and this House. I want to end on an optimistic note. Like so many of my generation, I see monumental opportunity in these challenges, and this is especially true of the challenges facing the British countryside. Treat the countryside with the respect it deserves; listen to it; understand its complexities and possibilities; and decide that you will give it half a chance. Above all, give it the connectivity and digital connectivity it needs, and I guarantee that the rural economy—and, with it, rural community life and culture—will spring into action in ways and to an extent that will surprise you. We can do farming and tourism very well, but that is by no means all we can do or wish to do.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> [HL Hansard, 28 October 2021, cols 928–30.](#)

## **Baroness Davidson of Lundin Links, 22 October 2021, Assisted Dying Bill [HL]**

Ruth Elizabeth Davidson, Conservative, joined 16 July 2021

My lords, I rise in trepidation. Having canvassed extensively on the etiquette of a maiden speech for your lordships' House, the advice was legion: be funny; spend a good proportion of your time explaining your background and how you got to this place; do not talk on contentious issues or say anything that could be considered controversial. So here I am, talking on one of the gravest and most personal of issues, which encompasses and bisects faith, family, love, pain, medical ethics and the sanctity of life itself—what it means to die, what it means to live, what agency we have over our own existence and what role the state plays in protecting life, prohibiting choice and prosecuting those who have been left behind.

It is not the place, therefore, for a long CV or my best stand-up material. So I find myself breaking political convention—not for the first time, and, in truth, not being able to guarantee that it will be the last time, either. But there was one piece of advice on maiden speeches that I did take wholeheartedly, and that was to thank all those who have welcomed me to this place: the doorkeepers, who have with unfailing courtesy explained so many of the place's ways and kindly directed me as I found myself lost yet again; all staff, both party and parliamentary; and those colleagues who have extended a welcoming hand. I thank them all.

I come here after a decade serving in the Scottish Parliament. The reason I wanted to speak in today's

debate, brought forward by my friend the noble baroness, Lady Meacher, is that I have voted on this issue in Holyrood on another private member's bill six years ago, and it has nagged at my conscience ever since. It was not, I may say, the bill brought by the noble lord, Lord Purvis, but a subsequent one. In truth, the manner of the bill's drafting was so poor that many of us, myself included, were able to strike down the text without ever fully taking on the difficult, emotional or conflicting subject matter. My Christian faith, the position of my Church and the views of my sister, an NHS doctor, all played a part in my voting against. Even at the time it felt like cowardice. Every life change and signpost since then has pointed me in only one direction: it is time for the law to change.

The intellectual arguments have not changed. It is surely wrong that people seeking release are kept in pain; that every eight days a terminally ill Briton travels to Switzerland to end their life; that that route is open only to those with the £10,000 to pay for it; that up to 650 terminally ill people in the UK end their life at home with no medical oversight; and that many more try and fail. For me, it was something more personal and elemental. First, it was going through the process of IVF and the ability to have such agency at the start of life. The systems and processes of egg retrieval, embryo implant and choosing donor materials, sifted by everything from eye colour to family medical history, blow apart the mystique of birth as something uniquely God-given or planned. It has always struck me as a great conundrum that my Church has so little to say on the 50,000 people in the UK who choose medical interventions to start life but much to say on those desperate for agency over their own end of life.

The second thing that changed my thinking was watching a number of people close to me develop dementia and seeing the person they were being consumed by a disease that stripped them of themselves. Like IVF, this seems a tangential point, as no one with a cognitive impairment would come under the scope of the bill; in fact, they would be expressly prohibited. But it made me consider that to have the body able and the mind slowly dissolve is one thing; for the mind to stay clear and the body to be crippled in unendurable pain, with the certain knowledge of a slow-death outcome, where the law says “Endure you must”, goes beyond conscience.

I conclude by thanking those I spoke to ahead of today’s debate: the doctors, the patients, the relatives they left behind. I particularly want to thank a 37 year-old woman called Kit with advanced stage 4 cancer, who told a group of MPs and peers that “It feels unfair that those who don’t have a terminal illness are making decisions on behalf of those of us who do”. For myself, I think there is a greater imbalance. Those such as Kit who wish this—who desperately want it—are not imposing the same outcome on those who do not. But those who are arguing against are denying others even the choice. That is an imbalance that we here can start to address.<sup>9</sup>

### **Viscount Stansgate, 14 October 2021, Inequalities of region and place**

Steven Michael Wedgwood Benn, Labour, joined 15 July 2021

My lords, I rise today to make my maiden speech. I hope the House will allow me to record with appreciation what a warm welcome I have received from members

---

<sup>9</sup> [HL Hansard, 22 October 2021, cols 435–6.](#)



and staff alike on all sides of the House. I know I have much to learn from you all.

When I was very young, my grandfather told me that one of the characteristics of this House was the “almost intolerable good will”. I hope to benefit from some of that today, although I feel obliged to point out that the last time I made a public political speech as an elected member was 31 years ago across the river in the chamber at County Hall, and the government of the day promptly abolished the body to which I made it.

In the time since then, I have dedicated my professional life to strengthening the links between science and Parliament. This has involved all the major events that science holds in the House, including the annual Parliamentary Links Day and the regular parliamentary affairs committee, which brings together scientists and engineers from all over the UK to discuss matters of mutual interest. In the course of doing so, I have worked with many of your lordships right across the House. Time does not permit me to mention them all, but I would be a bit remiss if I did not mention at least the noble lord, Lord Willis of Knaresborough, and the noble baroness, Lady Blackwood, both of whom chaired the Select Committee on Science and Technology in another place; the noble lords, Lord Broers and Lord Rees, from the Cross Benches; the noble lords, Lord Willetts and Lord Lancaster; Lord Sainsbury of Turville, although he has now left the House; and my noble friend Lord Anderson of Swansea, all of whom have been such staunch supporters of science.

Overwhelmingly, this work has been done on a cross-party basis. Science should not be an overtly partisan area of public debate, but there are issues on which the

government really do need to take action. This brings me to today's debate, and I thank my noble friend Lord Liddle for his excellent opening speech. As we talk about levelling up, which is apparently the government's central economic and political objective, let us make the case for the role that science and technology can play in tackling inequalities of place.

This country is rightly proud of its national academies. Indeed, only this week the president of the Royal Society wrote in the Times about the need to fund science properly. I support that. Indeed, a number of national bodies have also written to the chancellor this week to express concern that, in effect, a cut may be on the way if the government shelve their £22bn commitment on R&D by 2024–25 in favour of a vaguer commitment stretching out to 2027.

We cannot be a science superpower unless and until the government finance science and R&D properly. That means levelling up to the level of our competitors, and it is a very competitive world. The House will be familiar with the basic figures: the UK spends 1.7% of its GDP on science; the OECD average is about 2.5%; and countries such as the USA, France and China are spending far more. The government's announced commitment of a target of 2.4% by 2027 is very welcome but nowhere near being reached yet.

I welcome the appointment of the current minister for science and wish him well in view of the challenges ahead. The secretary of state for BEIS last night addressed the Foundation for Science and Technology and talked about the UK Innovation Strategy. He said, if I may put it this way, broadly all the right things, but I just hope that the BEIS secretary can secure the level of funding needed

with the chancellor—always assuming that they are still on speaking terms and “in discussions”.

We have in this country a wide range of scientific societies and organisations, all of which have expressed their concerns about the inequalities of place; for example, the Royal Society of Biology, the Nutrition Society, the Council for the Mathematical Sciences, the British Pharmacological Society, the Institute of Physics, the RSC, the Geological Society, the Royal Astronomical Society and many others. The House should take every opportunity to listen to what they have to say, especially as they have members from all over the country. That is why we should also listen to the persuasive argument of the Campaign for Science and Engineering, in its document *The Power of Place*, that the government should use the UK shared prosperity fund to

“give greater emphasis towards supporting scientific research and innovation to tackle regional inequalities and promote UK-wide economic growth”.

As a major science country, which we are, and however proud we may be that we are punching above our weight, which we do, we cannot really be the science superpower that we aspire to be unless we make full use of the scientific expertise throughout the UK and unless the government recognise the inequalities of place and really do more to end them.

We hold an annual STEM for Britain event here in Parliament, and every year it shows that there are brilliant early-career research scientists from every part of the UK. It is vital that they are funded, nurtured and

encouraged, because not to do so would be a shocking waste of a diverse and talented science base. And besides, you can never be sure from where the next scientific breakthrough may come. You do not have to be a scientist to know that all the major challenges that the world faces—climate change, the biodiversity crisis, energy supply, food security, health or access to water—will depend on science and technology and engineering to help solve them.

The Covid crisis and the development of the vaccines has been a triumph for science, and the UK rightly takes its share of the credit, yet we live at a time when there is a discernible anti-science movement. If science is under attack, it is all the more important that Parliament and this House stand up for it. We need science now more than ever. I look forward to the minister's reply and commend my noble friend's motion to the House.<sup>10</sup>

### **Lord Coaker, 17 May 2021, Queen's Speech**

Vernon Rodney Coaker, Labour, joined 3 February 2021

My lords, I stand humbly in this historic Chamber today. I am humbled by the warm welcome of my fellow peers and the support of all the officers and staff; I wish to thank each and every one of them. I am truly humbled by the enormity of the honour that I feel—a pride that I know is shared by my family, my friends, and so many of my former constituents in Gedling, whom I was proud to represent for 22 years, the people of Nottingham City, the people of the county of Nottinghamshire and beyond.

As I stand here discussing this Queen's Speech on the

---

<sup>10</sup> [HL Hansard, 14 October 2021, cols 1983–5.](#)

theme of communities, voices from my past are calling out to me. I can hear my 94 year-old father, a former metropolitan police officer, saying, “Don’t forget neighbourhood policing”. I can hear the man I was named after, my uncle, who is buried in a war grave dated 6 June 1944 in Ranville, in Normandy near Caen, saying, “Never take democracy and freedom for granted”. I hear the voices of Nottingham school pupils, many from disadvantaged backgrounds and growing up in poverty, whom I taught for some 20 years, saying to me, “Make sure every pupil succeeds, whatever their ability, and that we end the academic/vocational divide”.

I can hear the pleas of the many former constituents of mine who needed help with claiming their welfare benefits when the state often made it incredibly difficult for them to do so, when their only crime was poverty. I can hear the voices of young people, including my own grandchildren, demanding that we save the planet for them, if not for ourselves. I can hear so many voices, including me as a younger man, an idealistic socialist standing on the miners’ picket lines or ferociously protesting on behalf of local councils and communities for a better deal. All of them, including the younger me, are calling out: “Vernon what are you going to do with this privilege and this honour you have?”

I say to them, as I say to all noble lords—this is something we all share, whatever our party background—that I will stand up and speak out, as others have already done on these and other issues, through this House as a proud, working Labour peer. I say to the minister that I am no cynic about these things. I know that change has occurred and will occur. However, if the pandemic has shown us anything, it is the power of the state, both at local and national level, to act swiftly and

decisively for the benefit of all communities in every region. Why does the state not act with the same level of urgency now for the sake of our communities? I do not want another peer to be raising in 30 years' time exactly the same issues of poverty and inequality in our communities as I am.

I wonder what Lord Stanley of Alderley would think. He spoke of the need for a Notification of Poverty Bill, in which he raised many of the issues we still discuss today concerning the working poor. That was in 1935. In discussing welfare and all these other issues, it cannot be right for 2.5 million people to rely on food banks, 980,000 of them children. It cannot be right for over 6 million people to depend on universal credit to survive. It cannot be right for 14.5 million people in our country, including 4.3 million children, to live in relative poverty. It cannot be right for life expectancy, health outcomes and so on still to depend on where you live and where you come from.

It cannot be right for 793 million people across the world to face starvation and for so many of our elderly not to have the social care they need and deserve. We have to act with greater urgency. The cry from communities and the demand from those who were on the frontline during the pandemic, often the poorest paid, is that they want something different. Indeed, is that not the cry from every community? My task, through the vehicle of the Labour Party, will be to play my part, however small, saying that my vision is, "It does not have to be like this". The state needs to act, and I say to the minister that that is how this Queen's Speech will be judged.

To quote the great romantic poet, Percy Shelley:

“...to hope until hope creates  
From its very own wreck the thing it contemplates”.

What inspiring words. My hope, my vision, is to do all I can for a fairer, more equal society. To those voices of my past and present, I say, I have heard you. The power of our words needs to ring out across our nation. The dream of a better future is one we all have to make a reality, and as soon as we can.<sup>11</sup>

### **Lord Kamall, 23 March 2021, Renewables Obligation (Amendment) Order 2021**

Syed Salah Kamall, Conservative, joined 27 January 2021

My lords, thank you for the opportunity to give my maiden speech in this debate today. I start by thanking noble lords on all sides of the House, as well as Black Rod and her staff, doorkeepers, police officers, advisers and all the other wonderful staff for their warm welcome and guidance, especially during these tough and challenging times. I am also grateful to my noble friends Lord Flight and Lord Callanan for introducing me to the House last month. Both have offered me friendship and advice over the years; I will not say it has always been good advice.

When my appointment to this House was announced, a friend said to me, “It’s an awful long way from Lower Edmonton to the upper House for the son of an immigrant bus driver”. I am sure some of you may be thinking, “Oh no, not another one”; after Sajid Javid and

---

<sup>11</sup> [HL Hansard, 17 May 2021, cols 338–9.](#)

Sadiq Khan, in British politics it seems you wait ages for the son of an immigrant bus driver and then three come along at once.

My father, who sadly passed away a few months ago, would often tell us that there is no limit to what you can achieve if you believe in yourself, believe in God, and work hard. But he would also remind us that not everyone can be as fortunate, that we should not forget those who are left behind, and we should look for ways to help them. During my time as an MEP for London, I worked to highlight the work of local community non-state projects that were tackling poverty and social exclusion, and I hope to continue to do so in the future. I also hope that I can honour my father's memory by making a difference and inspiring others to make a difference too.

If my father was the talker, my mother—like in many marriages, I suspect—was the doer. When I did not get into the local grammar school, despite getting good grades, my mother marched me down to the office of the local Member of Parliament, Ted Graham, later Lord Graham of Edmonton. His first question to me was, “Young man, what do you want to do when you grow up?”, to which I immediately replied, “I want your job”. Although he was pleased that I did get into the school thanks to his help, as a Labour MP I suspect that he was probably relieved that I did not get his job. But by following in his footsteps and adopting the title of Edmonton, I hope that in time, I will earn the same respect that he did during his time in this House.

Turning to the subject of today's debate, given that we have this scheme of renewables obligation certificates with a mutualisation mechanism, it makes sense to review



the threshold, especially since it was first introduced in 2005. But in the absence of market mechanisms, the challenge for any government central planner is to set a threshold that finds the right balance between the interests of renewables generators and those of electricity suppliers and consumers, especially if renewable energy is seen to mean higher prices for the poorest customers.

As someone who studied engineering as an undergraduate and then went on to work for an economic think tank, I am really excited by the innovations that we are seeing in renewable energy, especially the increased efficiency of renewable power generation—wind, solar and other forms of renewables. I hope that one day soon, renewable energy will be cheap enough to be competitive in a market environment and that we will no longer need state interventions, such as the renewables obligation certificate and the government setting thresholds.

Once we see a breakthrough in battery storage capacity, this will open up huge new possibilities and could have huge implications for utilities, with local renewable energy regeneration and storage, both on and off grid. This decentralisation will present both opportunities and challenges for electricity suppliers. Furthermore, using renewable energy for electrolysis also offers the potential of green hydrogen providing a clean transport solution for the future.

Innovation, new technology and the fight against poverty are subjects that I hope to return to in future interventions, but for now, I thank your lordships for

listening, and look forward to working with noble lords across the House for many years to come.<sup>12</sup>

## **Baroness Shafik, 28 January 2021, Financial Services Bill**

Nemat Talaat Shafik, Crossbench, joined 30 September 2020

My lords, it is a great honour to make my maiden speech today and I begin by thanking your lordships and the staff of the House, who have been so welcoming. I am particularly grateful to my sponsors: the noble lord, Lord O'Donnell—Gus O'Donnell—who was both my mentor and manager in the Civil Service, and the noble lord, Lord Stern—Nick Stern—who was my teacher and is now my colleague at the London School of Economics and Political Science. It has been a strange time to join this great House, but my induction has proceeded very capably through digital means and I thank Black Rod, the Garter and the noble and learned lord, Lord Judge, for their guidance.

I was born in Alexandria in Egypt, although my connection to the UK began with my grandfather, who came on a scholarship to do his undergraduate and doctorate degrees at Imperial College in the 1920s. My father was born and raised in Notting Hill, before it was fashionable, and the family eventually returned to Egypt, where my grandfather retained a love of croquet and lawn bowling well into his 90s. My maternal grandfather studied in France and my mother was sent to a French Catholic school by her forward-thinking Muslim mother, who believed that everyone should learn about other

---

<sup>12</sup> [HL Hansard, 23 March 2021, cols 788–9.](#)

people's religions. I wish that they could all be here today.

My family's prospects changed radically with the nationalisations in Egypt in the 1960s, when we lost most of our property and went from being well-off to being immigrants in the United States, where my father had studied. For my father, who had a PhD in chemistry and little else, education was the only path to success. His mantra was, "They can take everything away from you except your education". Those experiences—seeing how people's fortunes could rise and fall because of economic shocks and the importance of education for social mobility—instilled in me a deep curiosity about the architecture of opportunity in a society. That curiosity led me to a career in economics that spanned the World Bank, the UK Department for International Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Bank of England and the London School of Economics.

While I spent 18 years in universities, most of my career has been in the trenches of policy-making in some of the poorest countries in the world and some of the richest. I have worked with politicians from across the political spectrum. In the UK I was a permanent secretary under both the Labour government and the coalition between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. In my years at the World Bank, DfID and the IMF, I travelled to over 100 countries, working with politicians of every imaginable political stripe. I saw clearly the benefits of sharing experience across countries.

I have had jobs that are primarily about making good things happen—lifting people out of poverty at the World Bank and DfID and spreading education at LSE. I have also had jobs that are primarily about preventing

bad things from happening—fighting international financial crises at the IMF and maintaining monetary and financial stability at the Bank of England. Making good things happen is often more fun and one's colleagues tend to be more optimistic. Organisations that prevent bad things tend to be populated by people whose job is to worry and look for risks, but their work is vital because, as the pandemic has shown us, bad events can swiftly destroy decades of progress.

These experiences are why I have chosen the Financial Services Bill for my maiden speech. It is first and foremost intended to prevent bad things from happening, as well as to create opportunities for new good things. It is the first important step in defining a distinct UK regulatory framework after leaving the EU and restoring the regulatory philosophy embedded in the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, with improvements based on the lessons from the 2008 financial crisis. That philosophy is based on legislation setting out the policy objectives and operationally independent expert regulators translating that into technical regulation and supervision.

It is reassuring that the government remain committed to the highest standards of regulation to avoid future bad events. Robust standards are essential for the stability and fairness which make our financial markets attractive to global investors and ensure consumers are protected. Chasing competitive advantage through lower regulatory standards and financial services is a chimera.

At the IMF, we used to describe the UK's financial sector as a global public good because of its systemic importance to the world economy. The success of the UK's regulatory framework has far-reaching

consequences, and maintaining active engagement in global standard-setting, such as through the Basel Committee and the Financial Stability Board, is the best way of remaining the most global financial centre in the world. For example, when I was at the Bank of England it worked with central banks around the world to shape the first global standard for the foreign exchange market—the largest financial market in the world with a turnover of \$6.6tn every day, over 40% of which occurs in London.

There is a huge opportunity, as many noble lords have said today, for the UK to set global standards on green finance, from mandatory disclosure and the development of green investment products to defining regulatory approaches to climate-related stress-testing, which will be done for the first time this year. The return of full independence in setting the regulatory framework for financial services to the UK also provides an opportunity to rethink the framework for accountability and scrutiny in a system that relies heavily on experts. I have to confess, I like experts. I know members of this House fall comfortably into that category, and the expertise in this House adds enormous value to the legislative process. But as the noble lord, Lord King, has said, experts must resist the pressure for an illusion of certainty. It is best to listen to many views and subject expert judgment to challenge.

I hope that I can add my voice to the well-informed and lively debates in this House and bring an especially global perspective to our deliberations. Hopefully, we can prevent many bad things happening as well as enable

many good things to progress. I look forward to working with all of your lordships in the future.<sup>13</sup>

**Baroness Fox of Buckley, 20 October 2020,  
Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions)  
(No. 2) (England) (Amendment) (No. 5)  
Regulations 2020**

Claire Fox, Non-affiliated, joined 14 September 2020

My lords, it is a great pleasure to speak for the first time in your lordships' House. I thank all the wonderful staff here, especially the security guards, who have taken me under their wing and ensured that I have found everywhere from the Salisbury Room to the smoking outpost, and of course to the doorkeepers, who have gone out of their way to find me a seat each day so that I can watch the Chamber close up and learn.

I am particularly honoured that my two supporters are both renowned public intellectuals whom I have admired for years: the noble baroness, Lady Wolf, whose invaluable educational research has ensured that those young people who do not go to university are not forgotten, focusing on the importance of training and the further education sector, where I lectured for many years; and the noble lord, Lord Glasman, who has long been an inspiration, with his advocacy of communities and their values, and who never shies away from speaking truth to power.

And I thank you, my lords, for being gracious enough to accept me. Let us be frank: my appointment is not uncontentious. I believe in speaking frankly, but mainly I

---

<sup>13</sup> [HL Hansard, 28 January 2022, cols 1840–3.](#)

stand before you as a democrat. While I am not formally accountable, I consider myself answerable to over half a million voters who elected me as a Brexit Party MEP for the north-west, and to the millions who recently declared forcefully, “We want more control over our laws, our lives, our liberties”.

These aspirations might have been temporarily suspended by emergency measures such as those being discussed today. However, the new normal should not mean riding roughshod over people’s freedom. Civil liberties, hard fought for by our forebears, should not be dismissed as a secondary inconvenience, some libertarian eccentricity. Regulations that pose a threat to the livelihoods, social bonds and public life of our fellow citizens need the fullest possible debate.

Debate is the bedrock of democracy and close to my heart. In 2000, inspired by the Enlightenment slogan “nullius in verba”—“on the word of no one”—I set up the Academy of Ideas. Since then, we have organised myriad conferences, salons, the annual Battle of Ideas festival and an international school debating competition, all to expand the boundaries of public debate.

However, debate is increasingly threatened by the mantra, “You can’t say that”. Friday’s barbaric beheading of a teacher in Paris is an extreme example of a growing censorious climate in which saying, “I find that offensive”, is used to silence people. I hope I will find allies in this House, with centuries of debate to its name, who will challenge this new cancel culture, which makes many fearful of speaking their minds.

Meanwhile, the assumption that there is only one correct

view, whether on statues or lockdowns, makes a mockery of freedom of conscience. There is not only one way to deal with this pandemic, in fact, so let us not shy away from difficult conversations. Physical lockdown should not mean that free speech is locked down. I hope this House will lead robust national debates on Covid, but also on threats to freedom of expression itself. I am glad to be with you.<sup>14</sup>

### **Lord Field of Birkenhead, 13 October 2020, Social Security (Up-rating of Benefits) Bill**

Frank Field, Crossbench, joined 11 September 2020

My lords, I want first to say a huge thank you. I was told before I came to this place that the welcome would be warm, and it most certainly has been, both from before taking the oath and in the lead-up to today's debate. People said, "What's on the tin you'll find in the box", and I certainly did—until the last part of taking the oath, when my eye caught the screen. It said, "Motion of Regret". I hoped that that did not apply to me, but, if it does, I hope that the execution may be delayed a little so that I might make a contribution today.

I want briefly to touch on the three themes that most concern me at the moment and that I know very much affect your lordships. I thought that I would be standing today, but, sitting here and thinking about my parents and the difference between my life and theirs, which was brought about largely by the great Attlee government, I cannot but think what a springboard to freedom education was. I say to my noble peers—I will get under my belt how I refer to everyone shortly; I hope that you are all my noble friends today—that it is really important

---

<sup>14</sup> [HL Hansard, 20 October 2020, cols 1446–7.](#)



that we think about education. My noble friend Lord Blunkett has made such a contribution here. We should think about both the foundation years or early years and the possibilities the government create for apprenticeships. I cannot see the government being able to fulfil their one-nation policy unless we are much more successful on apprenticeships than we have been up to now. I am looking to my noble friend at the other end of the Room. I know about his interest and I hope that, like me, he will express a particular concern on this issue.

The second issue in a sense relates to the bill and has been touched on by the right reverend prelate who spoke before me and others. One of the most important things that the government did as this terrible plague descended on us was to give people on universal credit a £1,000-a-year uplift. We could argue that that was making good cuts which the scheme suffered in its implementation, but, as two speakers have already said, it has made such a difference to people totally dependent on universal credit. When I was an MP, I saw the effect on breaking the avenue to destitution which many of our fellow citizens faced with that particular cut. My pledge is to work with as many of you here who wish to to defeat any government plan, should that be their aim, not to continue to pay the £1,000-a-year extra in universal credit.

Noble lords have already commented on the different roles of social security. One is when we are dealing with a class of people who are poor, where one very much needs universal provision. As other speakers have said, a number of us, as pensioners, are now moderately well off, so should any increase above inflation-proofing not go to those groups who have suffered most from social security changes? That means people below retirement

age and, strangely, those who do not have children. They are the group who have suffered most.

The third theme, on which a number of noble lords have been very active, is modern slavery. Hobbes talked about life being “nasty, brutish, and short”. It is certainly nasty and brutal for people sold into slavery, though not always short. Noble lords will know that your period of slavery comes to an end only when you cannot earn enough and you are thrown out. I hope that, as this House develops its programme over the coming months, we can look very carefully at how we need to strengthen the pioneering act which the previous prime minister, Mrs May, put on to the statute book, to her eternal credit.

I have one last comment to make about modern slavery. People were kind enough to say that they expected some sort of fireworks from me today. Indeed, if this was not my maiden speech, I could have given a speech saying this, that or the other. But I have one last comment to make, if I may, about modern slavery and the brutality and horror of seeing people and knowing of people destroyed in this manner. One amendment that we might make, to give power to justices, is to think about statues for modern slave users in our society. My plea to Black Lives Matter, an incredibly important movement, is that it is very important to bring its campaign up to date, given the slavery that exists in this country here and now.

Maybe this is one way of concentrating the minds of employers who know so much about taking dividends but so little, it appears, about the conditions in which their workers earn their fortunes for them. We might put these individuals on a plinth to remind ourselves that, sadly, this evil of modern slavery exists in our society and

that one purpose of this place is to put a lot of salt on the tails of those slave owners.<sup>15</sup>

### **Lord Clarke of Nottingham, 28 September 2020, Coronavirus Act 2020: Temporary provisions**

Kenneth Clarke, Conservative, joined 4 September 2020

My lords, for about 50 years now, I have been in the habit of making parliamentary speeches quite regularly. I retired from that when I left the other place in November last year. So I am particularly honoured to find that I can now resume this practice in this most illustrious setting with such distinguished colleagues on all sides, including many old friends. I trust I will not abuse the privilege of being back in parliamentary debate, but my maiden speech will be the first time I have ever attempted to make a speech subject to a four-minute time limit. Many of my noble friends will be, at this moment, doubting my ability to manage that.

I echo what my former Commons colleague the noble baroness, Lady Clark, said about the welcome new peers receive here. This is, in every way, a remarkable institution. Fellow peers—not just old friends—are especially welcoming, and I share her gratitude to all the staff here, who go out of their way to help people utterly baffled by the rabbit warren of corridors and the somewhat strange new practices we have to take on.

The major change I am having to face is that I find that this historic Chamber has all its logistics based on the use of IT of various kinds which I have previously scorned. It is most surprising that, in this particular House, a 20th-

---

<sup>15</sup> [HL Hansard, 13 October 2020, cols 285–6GC.](#)

century man is being forced to get into the 21st century. Trying to open and switch on a laptop and an iPad, then contemplate how to use them, is my biggest problem at the moment, because of the generosity of all those who are helping me in every other way.

On this subject I can only say that I have every sympathy with the government, as a former secretary of state for health and a former chancellor of the exchequer. This is the worst health crisis to have hit this country and the worst depression—no, recession, so far—and economic crisis that has occurred in my lifetime. The difficulty of dealing with it is that it is shrouded in total uncertainty. All forecasts on all fronts are quite useless because the disease is new, its behaviour is unknown and therefore the range of scientific and medical opinion about the way in which it can be controlled and what is going to happen is not a unanimous science: it is immensely varied. Quite unprecedented choices have to be made on the tensions between the life-saving prospects of doing one thing and the damaging economic consequences that step will have. Everybody is going to second-guess every decision that ministers come to as they go along. As we are now in the days of public inquiries, with the wisdom of hindsight everybody will be able to see what should have been done in the light of what we know has happened, and everybody will say how obvious it was that steps should have been taken.

Yes, the government have made mistakes; every western government have made mistakes. The mistake at the beginning was not being tough enough. It is quite obvious that we should have gone into lockdown probably about three weeks before we did. It is quite obvious that we should have quarantined flights in from places such as Spain and Italy almost instantly. We should obviously

have been more aware of the dangers to the residents of care homes and ended the practice of discharging patients from hospitals to care homes without testing before doing so. But, if the government had done those things at the beginning of March, they would have faced all the protests about civil liberties, excess infringements, controls and so on that we are hearing now. We must not repeat that. The policy succeeded after that because we had only about 60,000 excess deaths and, although we are as bad as almost any other country in the world, people have now got used to the small level of deaths—each of them tragic—and disaster we are having. The demand now is: let us have more liberty and protect our freedom and let us not step things up.

The government should subject themselves to more parliamentary scrutiny of the next steps. I totally agree with all who have voiced that. It would strengthen them and give them more authority. It would give them a better defence when they make an obvious mistake—and they will make more. The position now is that they would also be strengthened by the support they would get. The majority of the public support the measures that the government are now taking. The rule of six is not particularly severe, while closing pubs at 10 pm takes us back to the days of my teens but is not actually a tremendous infringement of civil liberties. Opinion polls show that the public would accept tougher measures from the government and I think that, after proper debate and scrutiny, the majority in Parliament would allow most of them. That would, however, save us from the occasional strange dilemmas and slips that we know have occurred. The government, the public and the nation will be held together better if we scrutinise more firmly, but not on the basis that we second guess every

decision that any minister makes and start politicising it in this extremely dangerous world.<sup>16</sup>

## **Bishop of Manchester, 21 September 2020, Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Bill**

David Stuart Walker, Bishops, joined 28 July 2020

My lords, I begin by expressing my thanks to the parliamentary staff and fellow members of this House, who have both welcomed me and helped me understand something of the workings of this place. I also congratulate the noble lord, Lord Vaizey, on his excellent and entertaining maiden speech reminding us of the importance of rehabilitation—not only for sacked government ministers. I declare my interest as chair of the Greater Manchester police’s Ethics Committee, which is recorded in the register.

I believe I may be unique among the Lords Spiritual in serving as bishop of the diocese in which I was born, brought up and educated: I am a bishop from Manchester as well as Bishop of Manchester. My education at the Manchester Grammar School taught me the proud history that Manchester and its surrounding towns have in women’s suffrage, the trade union movement and the extension of parliamentary democracy as well as this region’s place at the innovative heart of the industrial revolution.

In Manchester, I learned my love of numbers, going on to read and research mathematics at King’s College, Cambridge, before the blossoming of my Christian faith took me to Birmingham to study theology and, hence,

---

<sup>16</sup> [HL Hansard, 28 September 2020, cols 43–5.](#)

into church ministry. I may be the only member of your lordships' House able to tackle that medieval conundrum—"How many angels can dance on a pinhead?"—from two distinct academic disciplines.

The culture of Manchester is best represented by the city's iconic image of the worker bee. However, bees are not only hard-working—they work together. Self-interest is subservient to the well-being of the hive. Manchester drew hard on that culture following the Manchester Arena terrorist attack of May 2017, to which noble lords have already referred in this debate. It was my privilege to help lead my city in its response, and it is why I feel particularly called to speak in today's debate. When the authors of terrorism sought to divide us, we came closer together, linking arms across the diversity of our city and region, which is among our principal strengths. I am fiercely proud of how Manchester held its head up high in the aftermath of an attack not only on innocent concert-goers but aimed at our very way of life.

I support the aspirations of this bill and many of the measures included in it. Our first response to the threat of terrorism must be to improve the ways we prevent terrorist atrocities being planned and executed. Reducing the risk to the public from particular known individuals, especially those who already have convictions for offences linked to terrorism, has a vital role in preventing would-be terrorists from forming and carrying out their plans.

However, we will not defy terrorism through legislation that provides a recruiting sergeant for those who wish us harm. Long prison sentences, such as that properly handed out in the recent trial for the Manchester Arena attack, send a strong signal about our commitment to

public protection. However, we must remember that they extend the isolation of prisoners from their families and the moderating influence of the wider community while keeping them for longer in close proximity with those who might seek to increase or reinforce radicalisation. This is particularly a concern for the youngest offenders.

Secondly, reducing the level of proof required for some sanctions, such as TPIMs, to well below the balance of probability may give rise to a sense of injustice, one that stretches far beyond the individual to whom the sanction applies, undermining the support from across the community, which is our strongest weapon in the fight against radicalisation. I urge ministers to provide this House, during the various stages through which this bill will pass, with clear evidence that the positive impacts of the proposals will outweigh the unintended negative ones.

In this House, we have a responsibility to ensure that the bills we pass into law unite our society rather than divide it. If we apply a legal sanction that protects us from one individual—but at the price of radicalising three others—we will not control the threat. Terrorist ideology has its own replication number, every bit as deadly as coronavirus. Our challenge is to pass legislation that brings together the diverse voices of our land and carries confidence across the broad range of political, religious and other communities with whom we share a common life.

I hope that we will listen to those voices, both from within and beyond this Chamber as we debate this bill, and will make improvements to it that will win the trust of those who we will need as allies in what is our



common cause to protect the people of our nation and the values upon which Britain is built. I look forward to continuing to be a voice in this House for the diverse communities that make up Manchester and, especially, for those who are not so often heard.<sup>17</sup>

**Baroness Hallett, 11 February 2020, Sentencing (Pre-consolidation Amendments) Bill [HL] (Law Commission Bill)**

Heather Carol Hallett, Crossbench, joined 11 October 2019

My lords, as a barrister for 27 years and a judge for 20 years, I am accustomed to speaking in public, yet I confess that I find the task before me now somewhat daunting—a feeling that has been exacerbated by the relatively long wait today. The good news from your lordships’ point of view is that, as every hour passed, I deleted yet another passage from what I had intended to say.

My feelings of trepidation stem from the knowledge that becoming a member of this noble House is both an honour and a privilege. I am extremely grateful to those who played a part in my appointment and to my supporters, especially my noble and learned friend Lord Brown of Eaton-under-Heywood, who left his sick bed to be with me on the day of my introduction. I shall do my utmost to prove that their trust in me is well placed.

I am also extremely grateful to the staff, to officials and to noble lords and baronesses who have proved so helpful and welcoming since my arrival. I should also like to

---

<sup>17</sup> [HL Hansard, 21 September 2020, cols 1628–30.](#)

thank my noble and learned friend Lord Judge and the noble lord, Lord Thomas, for their kind remarks. If I had to leave the justice system—which I did because of an Act of Parliament and I was getting too old—I can think of no better place to be. The justice system will, however, remain close to my heart.

My father, as noble lords have heard, was a police officer, who taught me at an early stage the importance of the justice system. I am proud to have played a part in it, particularly as I was told more than once that people from my background, especially women, could not cut it as lawyers.

I shall therefore follow with interest steps taken to ensure that the justice system of this country remains one of the best in the world. A fully functioning and properly funded justice system is essential to a healthy democracy. We have the excellent business and property courts, but they are only part of the equation; we must not allow other parts of the system to crumble. It is the system as a whole that makes this country a desirable place to invest, to do business and to litigate, and it provides access to justice for all our citizens.

This is not the time to list the problems that beset judges, magistrates and practitioners. The bill aims to address just one of them. The idea is simple, as noble lords have heard. It is to streamline the sentencing process; it is not about outcomes. It is the sentencing process that affects hundreds of thousands of cases each year. The aim of the bill is to make it quicker and easier for a sentencing judge and practitioners to find the relevant sentencing provisions.

As your lordships have heard, at present sentencing provisions are extraordinarily complex. Experienced judges and lawyers struggle to interpret them even when, in the Court of Appeal, there is rather more time than is available to the sentencing judge in the Crown Court, who may have nine other cases in her busy list that day. The provisions are scattered among several statutes, and in the case of one defendant different statutes may be in play.

Back to that busy judge, who has a list of 10 cases—one of them involves four defendants, one of whom is under 17, one was 17 at the time of the commission of the offence and is 18 at the time of sentence, one may attract the dangerousness provisions, and one may be lucky to get away with a suspended sentence and possibly a community penalty. I cannot tell your lordships how many statutory provisions would be involved in the judge trying to work out how to sentence the four—and do not forget that she also has nine other cases to deal with that day. The scope for error is huge.

As vice-president of the Court of Appeal Criminal Division until last October, I promise your lordships that I lost count of the number of unlawful sentences put before us, costing time and money to rectify and, in the process, causing unnecessary distress to the victims of crime, who were uncertain of the sentence passed on the perpetrator of the crime against them and who were extraordinarily, and obviously rightly, angry when we were forced to quash a sentence because it was unlawful.

When Professor David Ormerod QC first announced that, as a law commissioner, he intended to embark upon a codification of the sentencing process, many experienced criminal lawyers—and I confess that I was

one of them—thought it was an impossible task. But with the help of parliamentary counsel the Law Commission has done it, and after much consultation, the code has been greeted with acclaim by the informed legal community.

It is worth repeating that, if enacted, the code will not: alter any maximum sentences currently available for offences; subject any offender to a harsher penalty than could have been imposed at the time of the offence; or affect the release dates as currently set. Those are all matters that may have to be considered on another occasion, as will the point about the principles of sentencing, rehabilitation, deterrence and the like. But that is not for today.

This bill is about process. It will, at a stroke, simplify sentencing, save unnecessary distress, money, time and effort, and it will not cost any money. I know of no criminal lawyer or judge who objects to it. On the contrary, they are impatient for it to be enacted. They have been disappointed twice; there is no reason for them to be disappointed a third time.<sup>18</sup>

### **Baroness Wilcox of Newport, 6 February 2020, NHS: Targets**

Deborah Ann Wilcox, Labour, joined 14 October 2019

My lords, to begin at the beginning, I thank the doorkeepers who have guided me more than once along different corridors, parliamentary staff who supported my induction, my party colleagues and the front bench team who patiently explained the rules and regulations of this

---

<sup>18</sup> [HL Hansard, 11 February 2020, cols 2243–5.](#)

House. I have been shown great kindness and I appreciate the privilege that it is to be here. My parents are no longer here to share this day, but I have a wonderful partner who has always made sure that our life together over 30 years has allowed me the freedom to pursue a political career, which is not always conducive to family life. I will always be grateful to her for her love and support.

A girl from the Rhondda, I attended the Central School of Speech and Drama and then had a teaching career in London and south Wales that lasted almost 35 years. I was an elected member of Newport City Council from 2004, the first woman to lead that council and subsequently the first woman to lead the Welsh Local Government Association. I am immensely proud of the work of local government, running public services day in and day out despite all the difficulties, and working in such ventures as city deals. I now look forward to the future of the ground-breaking collaboration across both countries and both governments, with the innovative Western Gateway project that stretches from Swindon in the east to Swansea in the west, bringing breadth and depth to the model of economic growth.

I thank my noble friends Lord Hain and Lady Morgan of Ely for supporting me through my introduction on 4 November, the day that marked the 180th anniversary of the Newport Rising at the Westgate Hotel. We owe the Chartists an enormous group debt of gratitude for their immense bravery and sacrifice in fighting for the vote for ordinary people. I was keen to have my introduction on that day and to remember that Newport is indeed the UK's city of democracy.

I am pleased to make my first contribution to the House

on the NHS. Wales is the inspirational source for this great institution and I feel entirely comfortable offering personal reflections. But I intend to do this through the prism of well-being and, in particular, as the former leader of Newport City Council, I will concentrate on the crucial impact of social care. Noble lords will know that the additional NHS funding will be wasted if we do not deal with the continuing and growing problem of social care. I am from that tradition of socialism that seeks workable answers to people's problems. Social care has been subject to a plethora of reports, commissions and solutions. The promised government green paper was postponed at least six times and Simon Bottery, a senior fellow at the King's Fund, has described it as the

“zombie of modern policy debate, stumbling unsteadily around in circles”.

All governments of various hues and all political parties have failed our communities on this issue. If we are to solve the problem of what amounts to the most pernicious means test in the welfare state, a new political consensus is required. Genuine attempts by recent political leaders of all hues to do something different blew up in the face of blunt political onslaughts.

The prime minister announced in his first speech last August that

“we will fix the crisis in social care once and for all with a clear plan we have prepared to give every older person the dignity and security they deserve”.

A fully worked-up plan is desperately needed, not

another rough draft. No one doubts the difficulty of delivering a solution. Contextually, those in local government have had to deal with a decade of austerity. I can testify to the day-to-day grind of trying to protect the public realm—which libraries and leisure centres do I cut to protect the looked-after children’s budgets? Can we afford to maintain those CCTV cameras and at the same time sustain direct payments for disabled adults and young people?

In Wales, our Welsh government and Welsh councils resolved to protect social care. We put in place the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 with all attention aimed at supporting those who rightly desire independent living. Furthermore, in Wales, no one who is eligible for care at home is expected to pay more than £90 a week towards it. But I am not claiming that we have solved the problem. Huge efforts are under way to find new funding models, including a common social insurance scheme. A report by the economist Gerry Holtham is looking at an emerging preference from that work for a simpler social care tax in Wales to pay for social care. Indeed, the idea that there is a magic solution that does not involve paying more tax is disingenuous. In a statement to the Assembly just this week, the health minister told assembly members that the cost of care is expected to grow between £30mn and £300mn by 2023. If the government seriously want to improve the quality and reach of care, it will require more funding. If members say they do not want to raise more taxes, they have to identify where the money will come from. Raising money from elsewhere will target other areas for cuts. After a decade of austerity, there is little more that public services can absorb.

Our responsibility as politicians is to tell the truth on

this. My plea is simple: let us work together to find a solution. It will not happen overnight and it will cost billions, but it is the greatest political imperative we face since the founding of the NHS over 70 years ago. More delay or failure is not an option for those who need that care.<sup>19</sup>

### **Lord Mann, 13 January 2020, European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill**

John Mann, Non-affiliated, joined 28 October 2019

My lords, it is a privilege to contribute for the first time. I thank the staff of the House for their kindness, wisdom and wit in recent weeks, and my introducers, the noble lords, Lord Sacks and Lord Clarke of Hampstead. The rabbi and the postman; how my parents would have smiled.

I suspect that all of you will have heard much of the Battle of Cable Street, but not of the Battle of Holbeck Moor. Two weeks before Cable Street, Mosley and 1,000 Blackshirts assembled on Holbeck Moor in Leeds. Some 30,000 local people turned out, and the fascists were promptly removed from the city. There is no written testimony, and there are no photographs or artists' drawings; it is a silent history. For 70 years my family lived alongside Holbeck Moor in those two-up, two-down, back-to-back terraces and cobbled streets. I cannot claim with certainty that one of them threw the cobble that put Mosley in hospital, but there were 30,000 heroes yet nothing recorded.

The true face of this country and the true story of the

---

<sup>19</sup> [HL Hansard, 6 February 2020, cols 1895–6.](#)



election is this: in Derby North, Christopher Williamson got 635 votes and lost his deposit. In West Bromwich East, George Galloway got 489 votes and lost his deposit. This is the innate decency of the British people yet again. Across the entirety of the country, people are saying, very vocally and unequivocally, “We reject the extremism of antisemitism”.

I wish to pay tribute to Theresa May. Three people have gone to prison in the last two and half years who targeted, among others, me, my family and my staff. She stood by me and my family at that time when some others did not. I salute the integrity and courage she displayed in setting up the Hillsborough inquiry and the national child abuse inquiry when she did not have to. I represented 30 survivors of child abuse—I advise some still—and I thank my staff who assisted in empowering those 30 people; they had to go to hell and back in learning their testimony. So thank you, Theresa May, for that.

We have power: the question is what we choose to do with it. I look at this curious place today. I shall hold my peace for the moment, but now is the time for an era of enlightenment. The northern working-class communities where I come from expect the dignity of being heard. Are their views, their visions, their votes not as valuable as the next person’s? There is no greater poverty than that of being discounted. Imagine retired coal miners who spent 12 months on strike and the women who stood tall alongside them while their children went without. Their anguish at this last election is incalculable, but their determination to see through their democratic decision is not. But that is not for me the defining image of the election, so let me conclude on what is. In north London on election day an elderly Jewish couple, who had voted

Labour their entire lives, wept as they went into the polling station, sobbed as they voted and cried as they left it.

I have a role now on antisemitism. I am rightly independent and, as ever, I shall work cross-party, but I will be no bystander in driving out the stench of intolerance from the party that in 1906 my family helped to create in the city of Leeds, in the streets around Holbeck Moor.<sup>20</sup>

### **Baroness Blower, 9 January 2020, Queen's Speech**

Christine Blower, Labour, joined 15 October 2019

My lords, I rise to make this brief maiden speech and in doing so I wish to thank my noble friends Lord Dubs and Lord Knight for their assistance both prior to and at my introduction, which I am bound to say now seems a long time ago. I also wish to place on record my thanks for the warm welcome I received on entering your lordships' House and to thank the staff of the House, whom I have found unfailingly patient and helpful in all circumstances.

I know that much expertise and wisdom is gathered here, from which I hope to learn and to which, in some small part, I hope in time to contribute. Having served as general secretary of the National Union of Teachers and serving currently as president of the European Region of Education International, which covers the education unions in 52 countries, my interest is indeed in education, although I am quite prepared to accept that there are noble lords who have a far greater in-depth knowledge

---

<sup>20</sup> [HL Hansard, 13 January 2020, cols 473–4.](#)

and experience of many phases and sectors of education than I do.

Given that a young person's domestic circumstances contribute in part to their potential success or lack of it in the education system, I am also interested in and concerned about child poverty and adverse childhood experiences. Figures on child poverty in every constituency are available from the organisation End Child Poverty. They indicate that overall 4.1 million children are trapped in poverty in the UK—30% of children in the UK, or the equivalent of nine in every class of 30. That is an unthinkable high number. Child poverty fell consistently from 1998 to 2010, but is now on the rise with the Institute for Fiscal Studies predicting that 5.2 million children will be living in poverty by 2022.

While social and economic disadvantage should never be proposed as an excuse for lack of education success, it is certainly a contributory factor and reason. In a survey of its members, the National Education Union asked what impacts on children's learning could be attributed to poverty. Some 78% of respondents talked about fatigue in children and students; 76% talked of very poor concentration; and 57%—significantly more than half—talked of students experiencing hunger. Hungry children find it much more difficult to learn.

While it is laudable that there are warm words from the government about ensuring that

“every child receives the best possible education—wherever they grow up”,

these will remain nothing more than words without a

determined poverty reduction strategy. There is an indication of increased spending in education; however, analysis by the School Cuts coalition demonstrates that 83% of schools will still be worse off in April 2020 than they were in April 2015, in real terms. Schools will have £20bn less spending power in 2020–21 than they did in 2015–16, and this when pupil numbers are rising.

Compared with 2015, we have 420,000 more pupils in schools and, by the way, there are 3,500 fewer teachers. Recruitment and retention of teachers continues to be a problem, with almost a third of teachers—32% to be precise—leaving within the first five years of joining the profession. Numbers in teacher training recruitment continue to fall. The government have indicated a commitment to raise teachers' starting salaries to £30,000 by 2022–23. However, this will return pay only to its 2010 level, in real terms.

Anyone can see, therefore, that we really need a funding system based on the bottom-up need of what it really costs to educate all our children and young people. In Australia, some years ago, David Gonski, a businessman, was commissioned by the government to look at a funding model. His commission ascertained what input was really needed to work out the actual amount that we need to educate everybody. Noble lords who have had the opportunity to look at the Library briefing on children's rights know that there have been enormous problems with this over the years. It means both a focus on poverty reduction and significant spending on education, which is the investment that we need in our nation's future and a significant matter. The £780mn to address issues of special needs may well be insufficient.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> [HL Hansard, 9 January 2020, cols 349–50.](#)

### 3. Valedictory speeches

#### **Bishop of Newcastle, 3 November 2021, Budget statement**

Christine Elizabeth Hardman, Bishops, retired  
30 November 2021

My lords, these past six years during which I have served as Bishop of Newcastle and as a member of your lordships' House have, in a good way, been the most extraordinary years of my life. After a lifetime of living in the south, these six years in the north-east have helped me to see things from a different and much richer perspective.

The usual way to assess a budget, the one we see in the newspapers, is to identify the winners and losers. I want strongly to resist this approach. When, aeons ago, I studied for my degree in economics, I learned that the way we spend our money shows what we value, what really matters to us. The question that matters is not what will I or we get out of this, but what kind of values does this budget embrace—what is the moral framework undergirding it?

In Newcastle diocese I am well known—indeed, probably notorious—for citing the words of Archbishop William Temple, and references to him have not been unknown in speeches I have made in your lordships' House. I was therefore delighted to hear that Edward Heath shared my enthusiasm. He wrote that the impact of William Temple on his generation was immense and that the reason was not far to seek: William Temple was foremost among the leaders of the nation, temporal or spiritual, in posing challenging, radical questions about the

nature of our society and its economic basis. Archbishop Temple did not often offer solutions, believing that the bishops lacked the technical expertise to do that, but he insisted that the answers to his questions had to be founded on a moral code. Archbishop Temple's key priorities, were, first, that every child should find itself a member of a family housed with decency and dignity; secondly, that every child should have an opportunity of an education until years of maturity, which should make possible the full development of their aptitudes; and thirdly, that every citizen should be secure in possession of such income as would enable them to maintain a home and bring up children.

What would Temple make of the budget we are debating today and what questions would he ask? Much of the chancellor's scope for making spending commitments depends on the forecast for economic growth, which is now expected to be 6.5% this year. Thinking of Temple's priorities, and as chair of the North of Tyne Combined Authority Inclusive Economy Board, I believe the key question here is who will benefit from this growth. Experience suggests that the poorest are often left behind.

In terms of Temple's priorities, there is much to welcome in this budget, in particular the rise in the national living wage to £9.50 an hour, and it was so good to see Iain Duncan Smith's satisfaction that the 8% cut in the universal credit taper rate at last gives us the universal credit system he designed. I also welcome the £1.7bn levelling-up fund to be invested across the United Kingdom, which will begin to create greater interregional equity. I note that the levelling-up funding has so far focused on hard infrastructure, when we know that social infrastructure is needed as well if our communities are to

flourish. I urge the government to move further along the path of devolving funding to the regions and to trust regional and local government to make the best decisions for the areas and people they serve and know best.

One of my concerns about the budget is that the poorest people in the world will continue to be impacted by the cut in foreign aid spending, which it seems will not be restored until at least 2024, and I remain deeply anxious for people who are on universal credit but not in work. This is a real concern in the north-east, with our relatively high level of unemployment. I understand, but nevertheless deeply regret, the chancellor's decision to remove the £20 a week uplift. This is a decision which hurts the most vulnerable, including many families with children.

This brings me to the question that concerns me most: are we doing the very best we can for our children and young people and the future flourishing of our country? The IFS analysis suggests that since 2010, health spending has increased by 40% while education spending will have increased by only 3%. As health spending disproportionately benefits people of my generation and older, this leads to an extraordinary and unacceptable situation of intergenerational injustice, which has been exacerbated by the pandemic. As a country we spend 5% of our GDP on education but 10% and rising on health. We should ask ourselves whether this is right. Increasing education spending will mean taking money away from something else, so there are no easy answers, but in the Temple tradition, I will not let that stop me asking to what extent we are prepared to invest in the future for our nation and our children, and what we are prepared to give up in order to achieve that.

In my maiden speech in your lordships' House, I said:

“The north-east is not a problem to be solved by the rest of the country but an asset to be valued”.—  
[Official Report, 25/5/16; col 419.]

I have fallen deeply in love with the north-east, and most especially her people, who are warm, hospitable, proud and resilient. Human flourishing in all its forms, including economic flourishing, depends above all on our most precious resource—our people. The challenge to us as a nation is to invest in our people, particularly our young people, to equip them to thrive in the world they will live in.

I began my maiden speech by speaking of the wonderful kindness and warmth of welcome I received from your lordships, the staff and all who work in this place. I conclude by saying that this early experience has been borne out in every way during my time here. I thank you all from the bottom of my heart and will hold your work deeply in my prayers.<sup>22</sup>

### **Lord Tyler, 21 October 2021, Integrity of electoral processes**

Paul Archer Tyler, Liberal Democrat, retired 28 October 2021

My lords, at the outset, I want to pay tribute from my own personal experience to Sir David Amess. He was a truly honourable member, and I appreciate enormously his family's call for more co-operation and working

---

<sup>22</sup> [HL Hansard, 3 November 2021, cols 358–60GC.](#)



together. That is something I have tried to do throughout my 30 years in this Parliament.

It is perhaps sad but necessary to start by taking note of the deterioration in the public and political dialogue since David and I were first elected. During the whole of my service here, I have been privileged to work with colleagues from other parties and from none on a number of projects, not least in areas of direct relevance to the subject of this debate. It was a particular privilege to work with the late Robin Cook to reform the Commons—successfully—and try to reform this House, not quite so successfully. I have been able to co-operate closely with Conservative allies, too, in such notable reformers as Ken Clarke, Sir George Young, William Hague and Andrew Tyrie, as they then were. I have also had very constructive shadow relationships with Commons agriculture ministers such as John Gummer, Douglas Hogg and Nicholas Soames. At this stage in their careers, they will perhaps forgive me for blighting their preferment prospects with No. 10 by mentioning their names now.

What has changed, especially in the past two years, is that that constructive co-operation with Conservatives—now in the Johnson mould—has become impossible. That tradition of Conservative principle, combined with a pragmatic pursuit of shared values and objectives, has simply vanished. I am sorry to say that the once great Conservative and Unionist Party has become a narrow, dogmatic cult. I know that many great figures of the past and present on the benches opposite know this to be true, though they cannot say it. Andrew Rawnsley admirably summed this up 10 days ago under the headline, “Like all cults, Borisology is detached from reality and destined to end badly”.

He wrote:

“The Conservative and Unionist party is no more. It has ceased to be. It has expired and gone to meet its maker. It’s kicked the bucket, shuffled off its mortal coil, run down the curtain and joined the choir invisible. This is an ex-party”.

The present leadership do not care about conserving the union. They do not feel obliged to conserve Britain’s reputation in the world—not even by maintaining the legal obligation for realistic international aid—so destroying the UK’s soft power role. They have no time for conserving business ethics, failing to apply due diligence to the award of huge contracts to their political friends and donors. They demean such core elements of our constitution as respect for the rule of law. They have even threatened the constitutional position of the monarch, with their underhand attempt at an illegal prorogation of Parliament. Was that conservative? Likewise, tearing up international agreements signed with people the prime minister calls friends and partners is not conservative. It now appears that ministers intend to opt out of the European Convention on Human Rights, for which Churchill worked so hard. Is that conservative?

I owe my time in this Parliament to the people of my beloved ancestral county of Cornwall. They are feeling the distinctly unconservative, scorched-earth nature of this government particularly keenly. It is easy to underestimate quite how badly people feel let down by the level of deceit, misrepresentation and deliberate distortion—downright leaver lies—that has become all too common since the 2016 Brexit referendum. Both the prime minister and Mr Gove promised that the level of EU investment funding for Cornwall, as a region of

generally very low household incomes and below-average economic activity, would be fully replicated in the new post-Brexit national support programme. Tory MPs repeated that promise. EU structural fund support this year would have been some £100mn. As Cornwall Council now warns, the actual UK support now firmly promised is only £3mn. Even if the proportion of SPF is matched, the maximum would be £57mn. So much for levelling up.

Further, to add blatant insult to injury, we have just learned that ministers have torn up their promise, made to me in this House during debates on the then Trade Bill, that all existing protections for Cornish speciality food products under the excellent EU scheme would be fully retained in future trade deals. My noble friend Lord Purvis of Tweed pointed out on Thursday that the agreement with Norway and other countries has ditched that commitment. There is no protection there for Cornish pasties, clotted cream and so on. The minister could only splutter in reply:

“You cannot get all that you ask for, of course, when you negotiate these agreements.”—[Official Report, 14/10/21; col. 2021.]

Did they even ask for this important protection? What is happening with all the other trade negotiations? It is this cavalier relationship with the truth that divorces today's Conservative Party from its past and betrays the legacy of Macmillan, Heath, Major—and, yes, even Thatcher.

Eventually, I believe that the time of this clique will be over, both in the country and in the Conservative Party. But for now, the Johnson junta is making an insidious

attempt to defy electoral gravity in perpetuity by weighting the entire system in its favour. Last week, the chair of the official Committee on Standards in Public Life said:

“It is essential ... that parties obtain funding in ways that are free from suspicion that donors receive favours or improper influence in return ... I doubt many would argue that our current system meets this test”.

That was a masterclass in understatement.

Yet, far from achieving cross-party and independent consensus on how to achieve transparency and safeguards, the government’s Elections Bill actually increases the chance of elusive foreign financial inducements. It is demonstrably designed to inflate the influence of Tory millionaires while disfranchising millions of citizens who are less likely to vote Tory. It is deliberately partisan and a real threat to the basic integrity of our electoral system.

For about 150 years—since 1883, in fact—the law of the land has sought to prevent rich men buying the constituency elections that determine who will govern Britain. Candidates and their agents have been held responsible for all expenditure intended to advance their cause. This government, in their own party interest, are attempting to reverse the 2018 Supreme Court judgment which reinforced that essential safeguard. In a feigned pursuit of “clarification”, the bill would enable huge sums of money to be invested by the richest party in marginal seats while its candidate and his or her agent took no

responsibility for it. There would be no effective control or limit.

To this, they add an attempt to change mayoral and PCC elections from the relatively fair supplementary vote system to the self-evidently less fair first past the post system, which cheats so many electors of any impact. Perhaps the most compelling line in the government's 2019 manifesto was the promise that they would be

“making sure that every vote counts the same—a cornerstone of democracy”.

In today's multiparty democracy, that clearly requires the end of first past the post for the House of Commons. Parliament has legislated to make this happen in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. MPs should perhaps recall the admonition, “Physician, heal thyself”. That would be an initiative on which we could all work together, co-operate and seek consensus.

I could hardly leave the House without reflecting on a lifetime commitment to changing how members get here. I recall being accused of being “an old man in a hurry” when I was an enthusiastic proponent of the coalition government's substantial and sincere attempt to reform this place in 2012. I pointed out then that progressing to elections a century after they had first been envisaged in the Parliament Act 1911 could only be considered “hurried” in this Chamber. At that time, there was real cross-party consensus for promising elections—just no consensus on delivering them.

Among the deluge of reports and submissions on electoral and political reform that I have been wading

through in my office, clearing the decks for departure, I came upon a previous submission by the then leader of the opposition here, the noble lord, Lord Strathclyde, entitled “Delivering a Stronger Parliament”. I will read only a short extract:

“The Senate should have 300 members called Senators ... All political members should be directly elected in largely county-based, three-member constituencies. There should be an end to the abuse of patronage of the Blair years”.

But there was a footnote:

“It is truly alarming to think that the prime minister could believe the perpetuation of patronage on the recent scale was appropriate to any century, least of all the 21st”.

Yet today’s prime minister has again turned places in this parliament into an instrument of patronage, to be purchased at party dinners. I hope the noble lord, Lord Strathclyde, will do me a parting favour by repeating his former words to Mr Johnson.

We cannot escape some criticism of the media for creating the destructive atmosphere that we see today. Some of the media has had a really divisive role in the past five years. Today is Trafalgar Day: “England expects that every man will do his duty”. However, marine historians remind us that at least 10% of the crews in Nelson’s fleet were not English; they were foreigners. In the Brexiteer media, they would be branded as unpatriotic immigrants.

I plead with true Conservatives—in both Houses and beyond—to reclaim their party. For many years, I have had staring at me on my desk the reminder from Edmund Burke: “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good people to do nothing”. For all my reservations about the leadership of this government, I sincerely believe that this House is a place full of good people. My lords, I wish you well.<sup>23</sup>

### **Bishop of Salisbury, 7 June 2021, Environment Bill**

Nichoals Roderick Holtam, Bishops, retired 3 July 2021

My lords, I have not been in the House in person since the first week of February. Sitting on the Front Bench earlier with the right reverend prelate the Bishop of Lincoln, I found myself wondering whether both of us had misjudged the timing of our retirements. I have led on the environment for the Church of England for seven years and have been a member of the House for six. It has been a privilege as well as a responsibility and I am grateful to noble lords who have spoken kindly of what has been achieved; of course, it could never be enough.

With an eye towards retirement, I had thought that last year, 2020, would have provided a good conclusion, with the Lambeth Conference of Bishops from the Anglican Communion, Cop26 and this Environment Bill. All were postponed, so I find myself standing for the last time in this House without the prospect of being able to engage in the detailed scrutiny and revision that will make what is, in many ways, a good bill better. Of course, my colleagues will contribute, as the right reverend Prelate

---

<sup>23</sup> [HL Hansard, 21 October 2021, cols 290–3.](#)

the Bishop of Oxford has already. I thank the minister for meeting the Bishops in preparation for this debate.

The care of creation is an important theme for Christians and all faith communities, but young people repeatedly say that we are not doing enough. At the last General Synod in person before the pandemic, a motion I proposed was amended for the Church of England to aim for net zero by 2030. I resisted it unsuccessfully. Those making the amendment said that we have to respond to the climate emergency and pick up the pace of our own change. This is complicated and there is a big difference in temperament between realists and prophets. The impact of that vote, however, has been to energise the Church of England in a new way and we are working towards the 2030 target with more urgent realism.

I say all this because, while I welcome the bill, in a parliament that has recognised the climate emergency, the government are nothing like ambitious enough. We need to make the most of this opportunity to replace EU legislation and exceed its ambition and effectiveness in addressing fundamental issues of the environment and about the way we live. It matters a great deal that we address the role of the OEP and bottom out its relationship with the government and the excellent Climate Change Committee, and that we establish how targets will be set.

The bill ought to shape the work of every government department. Individuals make choices within the framework of legislation which makes the market. The bill will and ought to shape the way we live now, not just in the middle distance and long-term future. This is a time of enormous change. We can be encouraged by the scale of changes in our behaviour in response to the pandemic



and daunted that a similar scale of change is needed every year to 2030 if we are to meet the 2050 target for carbon neutrality of the Paris Agreement.

There is an obvious spiritual dimension to the bill. Gus Speth, a scientist who used to be the director of the Natural Resources Defense Council in the United States, said:

“I used to think that top environmental problems were biodiversity loss, ecosystem collapse and climate change. I thought that thirty years of good science could address these problems. I was wrong. The top environmental problems are selfishness, greed and apathy, and to deal with these we need a cultural and spiritual transformation. And we scientists don’t know how to do that”.

Politicians, or any of us alone, cannot do that either.

Last September, Christiana Figueres showed the bishops a cartoon, which has since become well known, of a series of increasingly large waves crashing in on a small, urban shore: the pandemic, the economy, the climate and the environment. Although each needs to be addressed in its own terms, Pope Francis is right to see them as a single piece and as a challenge to the way we understand ourselves in relation to God, one another and the whole creation. The world’s faiths are all a resource for the way in which we live together in this one room of God’s creation. In our ecumenism, we have to pay attention to the economy—helpfully understood in the way of the Dasgupta review—and to the laws, ecology and wisdom of the house.

We cannot depend on techno-optimism to dig us out of a hole and we will need to answer questions about restraint. What is enough? We cannot continue to consume as we do. A new creativity is needed. There are opportunities for the UK to exercise leadership in our hosting of the G7, this week, and Cop26 in November. The big lesson of the pandemic is that we are local and global, and that in the existential issues we face no one is safe until everyone is safe. The golden rule of every religion and philosophical tradition is to do to others as we would have them do to us; it is enlightened self-interest. That has implications for the global vaccination programme and for overseas aid.

The bill addresses the legislative framework for our care of the environment but what underlies it is the way we human beings see ourselves. In the diocese of Salisbury, which is one of the most ancient settled landscapes in Europe and has a wonderful geology hundreds of millions of years old, this bishop knows something about the humility needed in our care of the earth, as well as the creative wisdom and ambition that has given such progress to human well-being. Most people want to do the right thing. We need a legislative framework that will help us to do so, and courageous politicians capable of seeing the need for new-world thinking in the light of what we are learning from our present experience.

It has been a privilege to make a small contribution to the workings of this House and to pray for this one small room in God's big house. I thank your lordships for your purposeful and expert collaboration and companionship. I thank the staff of the House for their unfailing helpfulness and courteousness, and the former and present Lord Speakers and their deputies. I wish your lordships well in

your consideration of this crucial bill and will continue to pray for you in all your deliberations.<sup>24</sup>

### **Lord Cavendish of Furness, 30 December 2020, European Union (Future Relationship) Bill**

Richard Hugh Cavendish, Conservative, retired 5 January 2021

My lords, on the penultimate day of my membership of this House, my intervention this afternoon seeks to cover my considered views of this bill and 30 years in Parliament, all in three minutes. I must disappoint the noble baroness, Lady Hayter: there is no time, alas, for oysters.

I thank my noble friend the Leader of the House for her excellent opening speech. I look forward to supporting her this evening.

In campaigning to leave the European Union, I was guided by two overriding principles: first, to preserve and protect the very ancient settlement under which the people of these islands are governed by consent, and secondly, to defend this country from the horrors of unaccountable power. I believe the conduct of the EU's institutions run counter to those principles and promise in future to diverge further still.

For most of my adult life, I have wondered how to arrest the erosion of our freedoms and the imposition of a form of government at odds with the character of the British people. Small wonder then that I feel a profound sense of gratitude to my noble friend Lord Frost and to our

---

<sup>24</sup> [HL Hansard, 7 June 2021, cols 1276–8.](#)

country's brilliant team of negotiators, to my right honourable friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and most of all to my right honourable friend the prime minister, for bringing me this peace of mind as I enter old age.

But let me be clear: I have no quarrel with the people of Europe, only with the institutions that govern them. It even occurs to me that these events could become the wellspring of a new train of political thought. I can imagine Europe's political leaders beginning to press urgently the question of whether and for how long the EU's direction of travel commands the consent of the people who elected them. One might echo the words of William Pitt after Trafalgar when he said:

“England has saved herself by her exertions and will, I trust, save Europe by her example”.

I fervently hope that, as this chapter draws to a close, we will recognise how much our friends in Europe, as well as here, have been puzzled and bruised by the Brexit process. I believe it is the duty of every one of us, and certainly, it is the duty of the government, to move with energy and imagination in the months and years ahead towards finding ways of healing these wounds and divisions. Government can do practical things and I believe it will. The more meaningful change in the mood music needs to come from all of us. Christians and non-Christians alike understand the teaching of “Love thy neighbour”; there has surely never been a better time to put that into practice.

I close by putting on record my profound appreciation for the unfailingly generous help and support I have

received from the staff of this House and, likewise, from all the officials I have had the pleasure of encountering. I will long remember with gratitude numerous kindnesses.

I say with sadness that I do not think the health of your lordships' House is good; in fact, I think its condition is possibly life-threatening. I am consoled however by the thought that the collective genius of this House is more than equal to restore it to what it should be; I will watch with interest.

Membership of your lordships' House has been a unique privilege and a tremendous pleasure, at least for most of the time. Something that will endure in my memory is my most recent experience, which was to have participated modestly in two committees upstairs, brilliantly led respectively by the noble baroness, Lady Donaghy, and the noble earl, Lord Kinnoull.

I thank my noble friend the Leader of the House for her friendship and support, my noble friend Lord True as a friend and outstanding minister, the Government Whips' office for its patience, and special thanks go to my noble friend Lord Borwick, who has sought to keep me in order, his whip barely visible.

I have gained something from every peer I have encountered these last 30 years; I have made friendships that I value highly from all sides of the House; I have learned hugely, laughed extravagantly, and with that, all that is left is to bid your lordships an affectionate and slightly emotional farewell.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> [HL Hansard, 30 December 2020, cols 1820–1.](#)



**Appendix I: Maiden speeches 2019–2022**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Harrington of Watford, L	Conservative	06/04/2022	<a href="#">Ukraine: Refugees</a>	cols 318–26GC
Strathcarron, L	Conservative	18/03/2022	<a href="#">Cultural Objects (Protection from Seizure) Bill</a>	cols 580–1
Sedwill, L	Crossbench	25/02/2022	<a href="#">Ukraine</a>	cols 462–3
Moore of Etchingham, L	Non-affiliated	23/02/2022	<a href="#">Elections Bill</a>	cols 240–3
Offord of Garvel, L	Conservative	20/01/2022	<a href="#">Oil and gas: Subsidies and licensing</a>	cols 272–5GC
Stevens of Birmingham, L	Crossbench	07/12/2021	<a href="#">Health and Care Bill</a>	cols 1791–2
Leicester, E	Conservative	30/11/2021	<a href="#">Dissolution and Calling of Parliament Bill</a>	cols 1296–8
Exeter, Bp	Bishops	18/11/2021	<a href="#">Climate change: COP26</a>	cols 437–8
Spencer of Alresford, L	Conservative	04/11/2021	<a href="#">Creative sector</a>	cols 1353–5
Harlech, L	Conservative	28/10/2021	<a href="#">Land use framework</a>	cols 928–30
Davidson of Lundin Links, B	Conservative	22/10/2021	<a href="#">Assisted Dying Bill [HL]</a>	cols 435–6

<sup>26</sup> Affiliation at time of speech.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Stansgate, V	Labour	14/10/2021	<a href="#">Inequalities of region and place</a>	cols 1983–5
Altrincham, L	Conservative	13/10/2021	<a href="#">Critical Benchmarks (References and Administrators' Liability) Bill [HL]</a>	cols 1897–8
Sandhurst, L	Conservative	14/09/2021	<a href="#">Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill</a>	cols 1318–9
Black of Strome, B	Crossbench	15/06/2021	<a href="#">Skills and Post-16 Education Bill [HL]</a>	cols 1807–9
Fleet, B	Conservative	26/05/2021	<a href="#">Dormant Assets Bill [HL]</a>	cols 1044–5
Udny-Lister, L	Conservative	19/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 599–600
Fullbrook, B	Conservative	18/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 479–80
Morse, L	Crossbench	17/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 343–4
Coaker, L	Labour	17/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 338–9
Merron, B	Labour	13/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 215–6
Fraser of Craigmaddie, B	Conservative	13/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 204–6
Lebedev, L	Crossbench	12/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 62–3
Blake of Leeds, B	Labour	12/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen's Speech</a>	cols 57–8
Godson, L	Conservative	22/04/2021	<a href="#">Integrated review of security, defence, development and foreign policy</a>	cols 1994–5



<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Kamall, L	Conservative	23/03/2021	<a href="#">Renewables Obligation (Amendment) Order 2021</a>	cols 788–9
Chapman of Darlington, B	Labour	22/03/2021	<a href="#">Health Protection (Coronavirus, International Travel) (England) (Amendment) (No. 7) Regulations 2021</a>	cols 639–40
Etherton, L	Crossbench	18/03/2021	<a href="#">Public Health (Coronavirus) (Protection from Eviction) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2021</a>	cols 466–7
Benyon, L	Conservative	12/03/2021	<a href="#">Budget statement</a>	cols 1921–2
Cruddas, L	Conservative	12/03/2021	<a href="#">Budget statement</a>	cols 1918–9
Khan of Burnley, L	Labour	12/03/2021	<a href="#">Budget statement</a>	cols 1909–10
Frost, L	Conservative	04/03/2021	<a href="#">Space industry</a>	cols 507–11 GC
Johnson of Marylebone, L	Conservative	04/03/2021	<a href="#">Space industry</a>	cols 502GC
Parker of Minsmere, L	Crossbench	04/03/2021	<a href="#">Space industry</a>	cols 499–500GC
Hannan of Kingsclere, L	Conservative	04/03/2021	<a href="#">Police and Crime Commissioner Elections (Welsh Forms) Order 2021</a>	cols 1267–9

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
McDonald of Salford, L	Crossbench	02/03/2021	<a href="#">Economic partnership agreement: Kenya</a>	cols 122–3
Woodley, L	Labour	04/02/2021	<a href="#">National Security and Investment Bill</a>	cols 2350–1
Shafik, B	Crossbench	28/01/2021	<a href="#">Financial Services Bill</a>	cols 1840–43
Hammond of Runnymede, L	Conservative	28/01/2021	<a href="#">Financial Services Bill</a>	cols 1817–9
Wolfson of Tredegar, L	Conservative	21/01/2021	<a href="#">Anti-Semitism: University campus incidents</a>	cols 93–6GC
Wharton of Yarm, L	Conservative	08/01/2021	<a href="#">EU-UK trade and cooperation agreement</a>	cols 371
Austin of Dudley, L	Non-affiliated	30/12/2020	<a href="#">European Union (Future Relationship) Bill</a>	cols 1844–5
Sharpe of Epsom, L	Conservative	16/12/2020	<a href="#">Taxation (Post-transition Period) Bill</a>	cols 1674–6
Darroch of Kew, L	Crossbench	26/11/2020	<a href="#">Comprehensive economic partnership (EUC Report)</a>	cols 49–50GC
Davies of Brixton, L	Labour	25/11/2020	<a href="#">Coronavirus Act 2020 (Expiry of Mental Health Provisions) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 13–5GC
Walney, L	Non-affiliated	11/11/2020	<a href="#">Covert Human Intelligence Sources (Criminal Conduct) Bill</a>	cols 1072–4
McLoughlin, L	Conservative	11/11/2020	<a href="#">Covert Human Intelligence Sources</a>	cols 1059–60

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
			<a href="#">(Criminal Conduct) Bill</a>	
Stewart of Dirleton, L	Conservative	11/11/2020	<a href="#">Covert Human Intelligence Sources (Criminal Conduct) Bill</a>	cols 1042–7
Mendoza, L	Conservative	10/11/2020	<a href="#">Organic Products (Production and Control) (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 984–5
Dodds of Duncairn, L	Democratic Unionist Party	03/11/2020	<a href="#">Defence and Security Public Contracts (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 665–6
Botham, L	Crossbench	03/11/2020	<a href="#">Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention, Levy and Safety Net and Levy Account: Basis of Distribution) (Amendment) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 653–4
Hoey, B	Non-affiliated	29/10/2020	<a href="#">Sanctions (EU Exit) (Consequential Provisions) (Amendment) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 405–6
Lancaster of Kimbolton, L	Conservative	27/10/2020	<a href="#">Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020</a>	cols 157–8
Sikka, L	Labour	27/10/2020	<a href="#">Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020</a>	cols 154–6
Fox of Buckley, B	Non-	20/10/2020	<a href="#">Health Protection (Coronavirus,</a>	cols 1446–7

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
	affiliated		<a href="#">Restrictions) (No. 2) (England) (Amendment) (No. 5) Regulations 2020</a>	
Hayman of Ullock, B	Labour	19/10/2020	<a href="#">United Kingdom Internal Market Bill</a>	cols 1302–3
Sarfraz, L	Conservative	19/10/2020	<a href="#">United Kingdom Internal Market Bill</a>	cols 1348–9
Moylan, L	Conservative	14/10/2020	<a href="#">Health Protection (Coronavirus, Local COVID-19 Alert Level) (Very High) (England) Regulations 2020</a>	cols 1133–4
Stuart of Edgbaston, B	Non-affiliated	13/10/2020	<a href="#">Social Security (Up-rating of Benefits) Bill</a>	cols 292–3GC
Field of Birkenhead, L	Crossbench	13/10/2020	<a href="#">Social Security (Up-rating of Benefits) Bill</a>	cols 285–6GC
Herbert of South Downs, L	Conservative	01/10/2020	<a href="#">Fire Safety Bill</a>	cols 327–330
Morrissey, B	Conservative	28/09/2020	<a href="#">Coronavirus Act 2020: Temporary provisions</a>	cols 72–4
Clarke of Nottingham, L	Conservative	28/09/2020	<a href="#">Coronavirus Act 2020: Temporary provisions</a>	cols 43–5
Clark of Kilwinning, B	Labour	28/09/2020	<a href="#">Coronavirus Act 2020: Temporary provisions</a>	cols 39–40
Manchester, Bp	Bishops	21/09/2020	<a href="#">Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Bill</a>	cols 1628–30

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Vaizey of Didcot, L	Conservative	21/09/2020	<a href="#">Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Bill</a>	cols 1625–7
Blackburn, Bp	Bishops	08/09/2020	<a href="#">Trade Bill</a>	cols 686–7
Grimstone of Boscobel, L	Conservative	08/09/2020	<a href="#">Trade Bill</a>	cols 673–7
Derby, Bp	Bishops	06/05/2020	<a href="#">Income equality and sustainability</a>	cols 494–5
Greenhalgh, L	Conservative	05/05/2020	<a href="#">Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020</a>	cols 414–7
Ranger, L	Conservative	10/03/2020	<a href="#">International Women’s Day</a>	cols 949–51
Hallett, B	Crossbench	11/02/2020	<a href="#">Sentencing (Pre-consolidation Amendments) Bill [HL] (Law Commission Bill)</a>	cols 2243–5
Brownlow of Shurlock Row, L	Conservative	07/02/2020	<a href="#">Access to Palliative Care and Treatment of Children Bill [HL]</a>	cols 2036–8
Wilcox of Newport, B	Labour	06/02/2020	<a href="#">NHS: Targets</a>	cols 1895–6
Hunt of Bethnal Green, B	Crossbench	05/02/2020	<a href="#">Divorce, Dissolution and Separation Bill [HL]</a>	cols 1816–8
Penn, B	Conservative	30/01/2020	<a href="#">Defence, diplomacy and development policy</a>	cols 1582–4
Choudrey, L	Conservative	29/01/2020	<a href="#">Social mobility</a>	cols 1483–4
Goldsmith of Richmond	Conservative	23/01/2020	<a href="#">Fisheries: EU landing obligation (European</a>	cols 1182–7

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Date of Maiden Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Park, L			<a href="#">Union Committee report)</a>	
Morgan of Cotes, B	Conservative	23/01/2020	<a href="#">Digital inclusion starred question</a>	cols 1155–6
Mann, L	Non-affiliated	13/01/2020	<a href="#">European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill</a>	cols 473–4
Barwell, L	Conservative	13/01/2020	<a href="#">European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill</a>	cols 465–7
Blower, B	Labour	09/01/2020	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 349–50
Davies of Gower, L	Conservative	08/01/2020	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 206–8
Parkinson of Whitley Bay, L	Conservative	08/01/2020	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 198–200
Ritchie of Downpatrick, B	Non-affiliated	07/01/2020	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 62–3

## Appendix 2: Valedictory speeches 2019–2022

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Date of Valedictory Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Winchester, Bp	Bishops	02/02/22	<a href="#">Building Safety Bill</a>	cols 939–41

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Date of Valedictory Speech</b>	<b>Debate Title</b>	<b>Hansard Reference</b>
Newcastle, Bp	Bishops	03/11/2021	<a href="#">Budget statement</a>	cols 358–60GC
Tyler, L	Liberal Democrat	21/10/2021	<a href="#">Integrity of electoral processes</a>	cols 290–93
Salisbury, Bp	Bishops	07/06/2021	<a href="#">Environment Bill</a>	cols 1276–8
Portsmouth, Bp	Bishops	12/05/2021	<a href="#">Queen’s Speech</a>	cols 71–2
Cavendish of Furness, L	Conservative	30/12/2020	<a href="#">European Union (Future Relationship) Bill</a>	cols 1820–1

---

## About the Library

A full list of Lords Library briefings is available on the [Library's website](#).

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.

Library briefings are produced for the benefit of Members of the House of Lords. They provide impartial, authoritative, politically balanced information in support of members' parliamentary duties. They are intended as a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in Lords Library briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

## Disclaimer

The House of Lords or the authors(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice. The House of Lords accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties.

This information is provided subject to the conditions of the [Open Parliament Licence](#).

Authors are available to discuss the contents of the briefings with Members of the House of Lords 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 [hlresearchservices@parliament.uk](mailto:hlresearchservices@parliament.uk).**