



HOUSE OF LORDS

Liaison Committee

2nd Report of Session 2016–17

New investigative committees in the 2017–18 Session

Ordered to be printed 20 March 2017 and published 21 March 2017

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

Liaison Committee

The Liaison Committee advises the House on the resources required for select committee work and allocates resources between select committees; reviews the select committee work of the House; considers requests for ad hoc committees and reports to the House with recommendations; ensures effective co-ordination between the two Houses; and considers the availability of Lords to serve on committees.

Membership

The Members of the Liaison Committee are:

<u>Baroness Eccles of Moulton</u>	<u>Lord Low of Dalston</u>
<u>Baroness Evans of Bowes Park</u>	<u>Lord McFall of Alcluith</u> (Chairman)
<u>Lord Foulkes of Cumnock</u>	<u>Lord Newby</u>
<u>Baroness Garden of Frognal</u>	<u>Baroness Seccombe</u>
<u>Lord Hope of Craighead</u>	<u>Lord Williams of Elvel</u>
<u>Lord Hunt of Kings Heath</u>	

Declaration of interests

A full list of Members' interests can be found in the Register of Lords' Interests:

<http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-interests/register-of-lords-interests>

Publications

All publications of the Committee are available at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/lords-liaison>

Parliament Live

Live coverage of debates and public sessions of the Committee's meetings are available at:

<http://www.parliamentlive.tv>

Further information

Further information about the House of Lords and its Committees, including guidance to witnesses, details of current inquiries and forthcoming meetings is available at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords>

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Philippa Tudor (Clerk) and Heather Fuller (Committee Assistant).

Contact details

All correspondence should be addressed to the Liaison Committee, Committee Office, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW. Telephone 020 7219 3130. Email hlliaisoncmttee@parliament.uk

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
An <i>ad hoc</i> select committee on Artificial Intelligence	5
An <i>ad hoc</i> select committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement	6
An <i>ad hoc</i> select committee on Political Polling and Digital Media	7
Post legislative scrutiny	9
Summary of recommendations	10
Appendix 1: List of Members and declarations of interest	11
Appendix 2: Committee proposals from Members of the House	12

New investigative committees in the 2017–18 Session

INTRODUCTION

1. The 2010–15 Parliament saw a significant increase in Select Committee activity, particularly in the number of *ad hoc* committees appointed each session. It also saw the introduction of post-legislative scrutiny committees. We published a review of Committee activity at the start of the 2016–17 Session and will undertake a substantial review in the 2017–18 Session.
2. In our 2nd Report of last Session, which was agreed by the House on 10 November 2015, we recommended the establishment of an International Relations Committee at the start of the 2016–17 Session. We also announced that we envisaged a total of four *ad hoc* Committees being appointed in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 Sessions. Last autumn the Chairman accordingly invited proposals from members of the House for new *ad hoc* Committees in the 2017–18 Session. Once again, we received a large number of proposals, which are included in Appendix 2.
3. We considered all the proposals received in accordance with our published criteria for selection, as follows:
 - Makes best use of the knowledge and experience of Members of the House;
 - Complements the work of House of Commons departmental select committees;
 - Addresses areas of policy that cross departmental boundaries; and
 - The activity proposed should be capable of being confined to one session.
4. We had difficult choices to make, and are grateful to those members who put forward their proposals, in many cases clearly putting a considerable amount of effort into doing so.
5. Following the appointment of the International Relations Committee, it was quick to establish itself. Its first report, published on 3 November 2016, was on the UK's priorities for the new UN Secretary-General inquiry, and it is now nearing the end of its inquiry into the transformation of power in the Middle East. In previous sessions the Liaison Committee had developed a practice of choosing a foreign affairs proposal for one *ad hoc* Committee. On balance, we did not think that any of the proposals on foreign affairs topics suggested by members for the next session were best suited to an *ad hoc* Committee of the House of Lords. We are keen to confirm, however, that we would be open to considering an *ad hoc* committee on a foreign affairs issue in subsequent sessions.
6. The increase in *ad hoc* Committees, from one to four each session, was a popular development during the 2010–15 Parliament, and its continued popularity amongst members is demonstrated by the large number of

members submitting proposals each session. Several members have drawn attention to the obvious disadvantage of *ad hoc* Committees compared to sessional committees, which is that the Committees do not continue once they have reported, and there are no dedicated resources to follow up their work, although the Liaison Committee itself has undertaken some follow-up activity, supported by briefing notes prepared by Library staff. The question of following up the work of *ad hoc* Committees will be considered by the review of House of Lords Committee activity which, as previously announced, will take place in the 2017–18 session.

7. This report sets out our recommendations to the House as to the subject of the four *ad hoc* Committees.

AN *AD HOC* SELECT COMMITTEE ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

8. This is a topical issue, given the ongoing pace of technological advances. While there are a number of interesting angles which the Committee might focus on, ranging from the rate of technological change, to economic and social issues, and even ethical issues, with some careful planning it is a topic which could be conducted within one session. It is also an issue which would not fit neatly within the remit of any existing Commons or Lords committee. A committee which considered technological issues alongside implications for the labour market and the ethical dilemmas posed by artificial intelligence would have the potential to add value in this area by considering the issues in the round. There is a range of expertise in the House in the various areas to be examined.

9. An *ad hoc* committee could take evidence on the arguments of the ‘techno-optimists’ versus the ‘techno-pessimists’ on the following topics:
 - Pace of technological change
 - Relationship between developments in artificial intelligence and productivity growth;
 - Creation of new jobs;
 - Sectors and occupations most at threat from automation.
 - Economic and social issues
 - The role of Government in the event of widespread job displacement;
 - Further education and training, for both children and adults;
 - Unemployment support, including the case for a universal basic income;
 - Government funding for artificial intelligence-related research and development.
 - Ethical issues
 - The Government’s role in monitoring the safety and fairness of artificial intelligence;
 - Transparency around the use of ‘big data’;
 - Privacy rights of individuals;
 - General principles for the development and application of artificial intelligence.

10. **We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider the economic, ethical and social implications of advances in artificial intelligence, to report by the end of March 2018.**

AN *AD HOC* SELECT COMMITTEE ON CITIZENSHIP AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

11. This is another issue which has received considerable interest within the House in recent years, amongst Members of all political parties and none. Whilst not an overtly party political issue, it is a matter of topical debate. With recent commentary on social division, particularly since the EU referendum in 2016 and with continuing terrorist attacks in Europe, there is a growing interest in the ways in which society as a whole can be unified and how citizens can be encouraged to integrate and work together. The topic clearly cuts across several departmental boundaries, and could not easily be covered as a whole by any of the Commons departmental committees, or any of the existing Lords committees. Three Members submitted proposals for *ad hoc* committees in this area. Whilst it is often not possible to combine proposals without ending up with an unwieldy inquiry which would be so diffuse as to be of limited value, in this instance aspects of their proposals could be combined relatively easily.
12. Some of the issues that an *ad hoc* committee might consider include:
- What does British citizenship mean? Does the definition need clarifying?
 - What ‘rights’ are attached to citizenship? Do these need codifying? Should they be promoted more to the public?
 - What ‘responsibilities’ are attached to citizenship? Should volunteering, or some sort of ‘national service’, be made compulsory or placed on a more formal footing?
 - How is civic engagement manifested in different parts of society and how does public policy help or hinder this?
 - What are the barriers to citizenship which affect particular parts of society, such as young people, people from a lower socio-economic background and marginalised communities?
 - How do the rights and responsibilities of citizenship compare between:
 - UK citizens born and living in the UK,
 - UK citizens born in the UK but living abroad,
 - UK citizens who were born abroad but have obtained citizenship through naturalisation, and
 - Dual-nationals?
 - How well does the UK educate people about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, particularly in schools, universities, citizenship classes and amongst the wider public?
 - Are there differences in the levels of civic engagement between those born in the UK and those who obtain citizenship through naturalisation? If so, what lessons can be learned about how to engage all citizens?
13. **We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider citizenship and civic engagement, to report by the end of March 2018.**

AN *AD HOC* SELECT COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL POLLING AND DIGITAL MEDIA

14. The results of political opinion polls have become an increasingly prominent feature of British politics, caused by parties reacting to changing economic and social trends, the media seeking more frequent measures of parties' standing, and technological innovation and falling costs in the polling industry. In the period between the 2010 and 2015 general elections, over 2,000 voter intention polls were conducted by polling companies—on average more than one poll per day for five years. Meanwhile, as the use of social media and online sources have increased, their influence on political discourse has also grown. There are a variety of 'official' ways in which the general public is encouraged to get online to influence political discussions in Parliament. In recent years, there has also been a growth in the number of independent websites and digital publications which encourage political dialogue and support online campaigns. While both political polling and social/digital media undoubtedly have an effect on political discourse, relatively little work has been carried out to assess the combined effects of both. An *ad hoc* committee might therefore wish to consider how the two factors interrelate, as well as how each issue affects politics on its own.
15. An *ad hoc* committee inquiry examining this topic could consider questions under the following themes:
- Polling methods and accuracy
 - To what extent are political opinion polls an accurate reflection of public sentiment? How do polling methods, sampling and weighting impact on accuracy? Should minimum standards be set in relation to political opinion polls? What measures could the Government take to improve the accuracy of political opinion polling?
 - Regulation of political opinion polling
 - Is the industry's self-regulation fit for purpose? Does the industry need regulation, for example to ensure that leading questions are not asked and reported? What standards should be expected of polling companies in relation to the wording of polling questions? Should the publication of political opinion polls be restricted in the run-up to elections and referendums?
 - Social/digital media coverage of polling—quality and impact
 - How accurate is online media coverage of opinion polls? To what extent do political opinion polls shape public discourse and understanding of politics, particularly in the lead-up to elections and referendums? What steps could be taken to improve the reporting of political opinion polls online?
 - The influence of social/digital media on political debate
 - To what extent do Government (both national and local), Parliament and public bodies utilise social/digital media to inform the public and to encourage political debate?

- How might ‘official’ online platforms be further developed and advertised to the public as an ‘authoritative’ source of information for online political debate, particularly in advance of elections and referendums?
 - To what extent does political opinion on social media reflect the opinion of the general public more widely?
 - What importance is placed by politicians on online campaigns and polls, compared to other forms of opinion polls? Have they got the balance right?
 - Should there be any form of regulation or moderation of websites which run online polls or petitions, particularly in the run-up to elections and referendums?
 - To what extent has social/digital media enabled people to come together in support of a common cause, and to what extent has it fostered divisions within society?
 - Should there be any oversight or regulation of crowdfunding sites raising money for political purposes, particularly in the run-up to elections and referendums?
16. **We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider the effects of political polling and digital media on politics, to report by the end of March 2018.**

POST LEGISLATIVE SCRUTINY

A post-legislative scrutiny committee on the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)

17. Since the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act came into force, there have been a number of legislative changes which have amended or undone some of the provisions of the Act. A decade has passed since Royal Assent, and post-legislative scrutiny in the 2017–18 session would be a timely review of whether the provisions have had sufficient time to embed and develop, and how well they are working. Post-legislative scrutiny is now an established role for *ad hoc* committees in the House of Lords. This inquiry could make a welcome change from some of the more technical Acts considered in recent years. It covers issues which are fairly understandable by the general public, and about which there is likely to be much public interest, including conserving biodiversity, the promotion of open spaces and open-air recreation, and rural needs. This topic would make very good use of expertise in the House, given the number of Members with experience of rural issues. It should also be fairly straightforward to confine the scrutiny to one session, especially if the Committee focusses on particular sections of the Act.
18. Amongst other things, a post-legislative scrutiny committee might consider the following:
 - How well Natural England has performed its functions, and whether the architecture of public bodies in this area is optimal in light of the wide-ranging responsibilities (and significantly larger budget) of the Environment Agency;
 - The impact of the abolition of the Commission for Rural Communities, the subsequent demise of the Rural Communities Policy Unit, and whether current arrangements for representing rural needs are adequate;
 - The operation, a decade on, of the duty to ‘have regard’ to biodiversity, particularly in comparison to the Scottish duty to ‘further’ biodiversity, and the enhanced biodiversity duty introduced in Wales in 2016;
 - Arrangements for consulting upon, designating and constituting National Parks, and whether these remain appropriate.
19. **We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* post-legislative scrutiny committee to consider the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, to report by the end of March 2018.**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider the economic, ethical and social implications of advances in artificial intelligence, to report by the end of March 2018. (Paragraph 10)
2. We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider citizenship and civic engagement, to report by the end of March 2018. (Paragraph 13)
3. We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to consider the effects of political polling and digital media on politics, to report by the end of March 2018. (Paragraph 16)
4. We recommend the establishment of an *ad hoc* post-legislative scrutiny committee to consider the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, to report by the end of March 2018. (Paragraph 19)

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF MEMBERS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee that agreed the report

Baroness Eccles of Moulton
 Baroness Evans of Bowes Park
 Lord Foulkes of Cumnock
 Baroness Garden of Frognal
 Lord Hope of Craighead
 Lord Low of Dalston
 Lord McFall of Alcluith (Chairman)
 Lord Newby
 Baroness Seccombe
 Baroness Smith of Basildon
 Lord Williams of Elvel

Declaration of interests

Baroness Eccles of Moulton
Shareholder in Vodafone Group plc

Baroness Evans of Bowes Park
No relevant interests declared

Lord Foulkes of Cumnock
No relevant interests declared

Baroness Garden of Frognal
No relevant interests declared

Lord Hope of Craighead
No relevant interests declared

Lord Low of Dalston
No relevant interests declared

Lord McFall of Alcluith (Chairman)
No relevant interests declared

Lord Newby
Receives advice and technical assistance from BFC Marcomms Ltd in relation to his use of social media to support his parliamentary work and other political activities

Baroness Seccombe
No relevant interests declared

Baroness Smith of Basildon
No relevant interests declared

Lord Williams of Elvel
No relevant interests declared

APPENDIX 2: COMMITTEE PROPOSALS FROM MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Letter from Lord Harris of Haringey

Artificial Intelligence

It is proposed that there should be an *ad hoc* Select Committee in the 2017–18 Session to consider “The Implications of Artificial Intelligence for UK Society and the Measures that should be taken by the Government to Respond to Developments in Artificial Intelligence”.

Artificial Intelligence (a computer program that automatically learns and improves with experience) is already having a significant effect on society: AI-based systems “trade on the stock market, filter our email spam, recommend things for us to buy, navigate driverless cars, and in some places can determine whether you are paid a visit by the police”.¹ Some even claim that AI developments present an existential threat to the human race.²

The pace of development is extraordinarily rapid. 2015 was regarded as a landmark year, but if anything the pace of change is “actually speeding up” according to Jeff Dean a senior fellow at Google.³ In recent years machines have surpassed humans in the performance of certain tasks, such as some aspects of image recognition. It is expected that machines will reach and exceed human performance on more and more tasks. The Report prepared by US President’s Science and Technology Council concluded that:

“AI can be a major driver of economic growth and social progress, if industry, civil society, government, and the public work together to support development of the technology, with thoughtful attention to its potential and to managing its risks.

Government has several roles to play. It should convene conversations about important issues and help to set the agenda for public debate. It should monitor the safety and fairness of applications as they develop, and adapt regulatory frameworks to encourage innovation while protecting the public. It should support basic research and the application of AI to public goods, as well as the development of a skilled, diverse workforce. And government should use AI itself, to serve the public faster, more effectively, and at lower cost. ...

As the technology of AI continues to develop, practitioners must ensure that AI-enabled systems are governable; that they are open, transparent, and understandable; that they can work effectively with people; and that their operation will remain consistent with human values and

1 Future Advocacy, *An Intelligent Future?*, October 2016: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5621e990e4b07de840c6ea69/t/580f8f6cb8a79b1ed436ebe3/1477414774159/An+intelligent+future-3.pdf> [accessed 15 March 2017]

2 Elon Musk: artificial intelligence is our biggest existential threat, *The Guardian* (27 October 2014): <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/oct/27/elon-musk-artificial-intelligence-ai-biggest-existential-threat> [accessed 15 March 2017]

3 Why 2015 Was a Breakthrough Year in Artificial Intelligence, *Bloomberg* (10 December 2015): <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-08/why-2015-was-a-breakthrough-year-in-artificial-intelligence> [accessed 15 March 2017]

aspirations. Researchers and practitioners have increased their attention to these challenges, and should continue to focus on them.”⁴

Most AI systems in use so far are focused on narrow tasks. They improve and massively speed up the sorting of data and its analysis, identifying patterns and predicting outcomes.

There are potentially enormous social and economic opportunities as a result, driving improvements in economic productivity, enhancing the efficiency of public services, and facilitating scientific and engineering developments in agriculture, environment, education, banking and for security.

This raises questions for Government about whether the UK is developing and training sufficient people with the skills to take forward these opportunities. More people will be needed with the relevant skills to support and advance AI.

However, the AI revolution will also have massive disruptive effects on some employment markets. It is predicted that by the end of this decade AI will have had a major impact in some sectors affecting all jobs from blue collar to management. For example, it may put an end to some tasks currently carried out by human resources departments (Jobaline, a job-placement site, already uses intelligent voice analysis algorithms to evaluate job applicants).⁵

It is likely to have a big impact on the transportation sector with self-driving vehicles taking over delivery tasks and public transportation (Uber are already experimenting with driver-less cars in California) with the aim of increasing efficiency and reducing accidents.

It will affect the finance sector, where AI and big data is already being used by financial institutions to predict stock market trends buying and selling stock accordingly, and to monitor the share market for suspicious trading activity. Some accountancy firms are already envisaging that they will need to recruit far fewer accountants in future.

In other sectors, customer service will be transformed for example, DigitalGenius helps companies automate question and answer chats with customers. Healthcare will also be very much affected by AI, and major medical and pharmaceutical companies are already using AI⁶ (Google’s artificial intelligence company DeepMind are collaborating with the NHS on projects where software is being taught to diagnose cancer⁷ and eye disease from patient scans.)⁸

4 Executive Office of the President USA , National Science and Technology Council, Committee on Technology, *Preparing For the Future of Artificial Intelligence*, (October 2016): https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/whitehouse_files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/preparing_for_the_future_of_ai.pdf [accessed 15 March 2017]

5 Kolbjornsrud, V., and Amico, R., and Thomas, R. “The promise of artificial intelligence. Redefining management in the workforce of the future” *Institute for High Performance, Accenture* (2015): https://www.accenture.com/t00010101T000000_w_/gb-en/_acnmedia/PDF-32/AI_in_Management_Report.pdf#zoom=50 [accessed 15 March 2017]

6 The Fow Community Blog, *5 Industries Being Most Affected By Artificial Intelligence*: <https://www.fowcommunity.com/blog/future-work/5-industries-being-most-affected-artificial-intelligence> [accessed 15 March 2017]

7 ‘Google DeepMind targets NHS head and neck cancer treatment’, *BBC News* (31 August 2016); <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-37230806> [accessed 15 March 2017]

8 ‘The real risks of artificial intelligence’, *BBC News* (10 November 2016): <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20161110-the-real-risks-of-artificial-intelligence> [accessed 15 March 2017]

The policy question is then what will happen to the people whose jobs are displaced? There is clearly a task for Government in considering how such people can be reskilled and supported into alternative employment.

The increasingly sophisticated analysis of personal data will no doubt mean that services can be targeted precisely to those who want them but will also have profound implications for privacy. How will an individual's privacy rights be safeguarded? More generally, can the use of big data be made transparent, so that all those affected understand what is being done with their personal information? Finally, the scope of facial recognition technology is likely to lead to substantial societal changes.⁹

The use of AI to replace humans in decision-making is going to raise ethical questions. For example, in driverless cars the AI steering the cars will have to make decisions that may directly concern the physical integrity and even the life or death of individuals. This raises issues about legal liability and insurance, but also how the algorithms used to determine the least harm in a crash will make judgements about the relative harm to property as opposed to people (or adults as opposed to children). Then there are the concerns about the security and integrity of the systems in use: are they vulnerable to cyber-attack and manipulation?

Healthcare decision-making algorithms will raise ethical questions too. For example, what implicit assumptions will be built in about which patients are most “deserving” of treatment? And AI can only be as good as the data it learns from and serious mistakes are possible. One example cited is of “a system trained to learn which patients with pneumonia had a higher risk of death,¹⁰ so that they might be admitted to hospital. It inadvertently classified patients with asthma as being at lower risk. This was because in normal situations, people with pneumonia and a history of asthma go straight to intensive care and therefore get the kind of treatment that significantly reduces their risk of dying. The machine learning took this to mean that asthma + pneumonia = lower risk of death”.¹¹

Then there is the area of military decision-making. Although AI will make weapons more precise, it needs to be ensured that weapons are used in a manner consistent with international humanitarian law, including the principles of distinction (parties need to distinguish between the civilian population and combatant and between civilian object and military objectives) and proportionality (prohibition of incidental loss of civilian life, injury of civilians, damage to civilian objects ...).¹²

As Future Advocacy point out: “The UK was the crucible of the industrial revolution and is one of the key crucibles of the intelligence revolution. It is home to world-leading AI companies and world-leading academic centres of AI research,

9 38th International Privacy Conference Marrakech 2016, *Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, Privacy and Data Protection*, (October 2016): https://secure.edps.europa.eu/EDPSWEB/webdav/site/mySite/shared/Documents/Cooperation/Conference_int/16-10-19_Marrakesh_AI_paper_EN.pdf [accessed 15 March 2017]

10 Rich Caruna, Yin Lou, Johannes Gehrke, Paul Koch, Marc Sturm and Noémie Elhadad, *Intelligible Models for HealthCare: Predicting Pneumonia Risk and Hospital 30-day Readmission*: <http://people.dbmi.columbia.edu/noemie/papers/15kdd.pdf> [accessed 15 March 2017]

11 ‘The real risks of artificial intelligence’, *BBC News* (10 November 2016): <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20161110-the-real-risks-of-artificial-intelligence> [accessed 15 March 2017]

12 Executive Office of the President USA, National Science and Technology Council, Committee on Technology, *Preparing For the Future of Artificial Intelligence*, (October 2016) p 37: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/whitehouse_files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/preparing_for_the_future_of_ai.pdf [accessed 15 March 2017],

and is well placed to reap great economic and social benefits from the development of AI.”¹³ What should Government be doing to build on this?

This is a topic especially suitable for the enormous breadth of talent, experience and knowledge amongst members of the House.

It will complement the work of House of Commons Committees. The Commons Science and Technology recently published a report on “Robotics and Artificial Intelligence”.¹⁴ This has produced a useful report, but the Committee’s enquiry was brief with only two oral evidence sessions. There will be the opportunity for a much fuller enquiry if this topic is selected for an *Ad Hoc* Committee.

The topic crosses many Departmental boundaries: BEIS, HMT, MoD, DoH, DfE, DfT, HO, DWP and DCLG all have an interest. The inquiry will not only have the opportunity to look at the technical and scientific issues, but the ethical questions posed by the technology, along with the impact on industrial strategy, employment and training, and on the public finances. There will be issues for defence, health, education and skills, transport, security and policing, social security, and local government.

I would envisage an inquiry lasting a year with perhaps some twenty oral evidence sessions allowing some in depth consideration of the range of issues presented by the topic.

Lord Giddens supports this proposal.

HARRIS OF HARINGEY

Letter from Lord Balfre

Benefits for senior citizens in a post 2020 world

I would like to suggest that we have a committee to look at benefits for the senior citizens in a post 2020 world.

At the moment the achievement of a certain age comes with the right to certain benefits. Many of them are automatically bestowed such as a bus pass or winter fuel payment. Some come at a later age such as free TV licences. Many are tax free but not of course the State pension. What all benefits in these categories have in common is an entitlement unrelated to need. At the last two general elections the parties have made promises about the index linking, maintenance or triple locking of various benefits.

Alongside these we have an apparent crisis in care with beds being blocked and a certain, not to be exaggerated, level of hardship amongst a portion of the elderly. This manifests itself in financial and other ways such as fuel poverty.

Finally we are encouraged to save for old age but the tax incentives have little to do with relative wealth whilst in employment in that the wealthiest get the most tax relief.

To what extent within the same resource package could benefits be reorganised to get a more equitable spread. The cry is always against cuts and for more resources

13 Future Advocacy, *An Intelligent Future?* October 2016: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5621e990e4b07de840c6ea69/t/580f8f6cb8a79b1ed436ebe3/1477414774159/An+intelligent+future-3.pdf> [accessed 15 March 2017]

14 Science and Technology Committee, *Robotics and Artificial Intelligence* (Fifth Report, Session 2016–17 HC 145)

but this is an easy sloganizing solution I would like us to look at rebalancing the same amount of resource to obtain a better outcome for the same amount of public money.

In Belgium there is a charge for transport passes for those not in receipt of the equivalent of Social security top ups. In some countries such as Denmark I understand winter fuel supplements and home assistance is charged for but provided by the state. Free TV licences are not as I understand it either common or universal for any age group. There are lessons to be learnt from our similarly wealthy European neighbours.

I do not see this proposed committee as raking over the rights or wrongs of current provision so much as seeking to lay out a possible direction of travel for the period from the next election onwards.

BALFE

Letter from Lord Teverson

Businesses: their nations, communities and stakeholders—closing the gap

The issue

There is a growing distrust of business in terms of both in the economy and in society, yet successful businesses are the foundation of a healthy society. Companies have strong responsibilities to their shareholders. But to bridge the widening gap of trust with society they need have a stronger relationship with their various stakeholders whether it be local communities, taxpayers, employees, suppliers, civil society, the environment, customers etc.

Many companies have corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes, but generally these are small time in comparison to the macro economy.

Problems include: local people feel lack of control, tax avoidance, environmental damage, casual hire and uncertainty through zero hours contracts, large political donations by either companies or their wealthy owners, no national responsibility or accountability due to globalised multinationals that can be footloose, monopolies and rent seeking behaviour, level of payments to top managers.

This is not just about economics or corporate management it is equally a social and behavioural issue

Remit

To produce a report that identifies how the business and corporate sectors can be brought closer to communities and society so that trust and mutual benefit are again achieved and seen to work.

The solution may include better and broader CSR programmes, global/OECD agreements on corporate behaviour, taxation strategies, national legislation, reform of director duties, corporate reporting, better local plans, greater devolution, cultural changes.

TEVERSON

Letter from Lord Higgins

Causes of congestion and pollution in London

May I suggest “The causes of congestion and pollution in London” as a suitable subject? TFL are creating a disastrous situation but there does not seem to be any way of holding them to account.

HIGGINS

Letter from Lord Cromwell

Citizenship

Why?

- There is vigorous interest—as well as considerable experience—in the House on areas of developing citizenship and democratic participation.
- It could complement the work of House of Commons select committees (Education; Communities and Local Government; Home Affairs; Subcommittee on Education, Skills and Economy; Women and Equality).
- This is a cross cutting issue - DOE, DCMS, Cabinet Office et al.
- It could be tasked practically with producing output within one parliamentary term.

Citizenship education is something that many members have strong concerns about—and in particular that many young people are growing up disaffected with, and disengaged from, our democratic processes or even knowledge of what these are.

Areas that could form foci for the committee to take evidence and produce recommendations on include:

- (1) Citizenship education: present provision, issues, gaps and opportunities
- (2) Voter registration: present situation, issues, gaps and opportunities
- (3) Democratic engagement by young people: lessons from success/failure, areas for action.

There are of course things happening in these areas already across the public and voluntary sectors, but there is a definite view among many in the House—and many in society more widely—that they are not achieving to potential or reaching where they need to and that this issue needs further scrutiny and support.

The committee’s work would play a very useful part in developing clear understanding as well as identifying best practice and producing focussed recommendations.

The committee would not re-invent the wheel. Rather it would pull together informatively current practice and be tasked with making specific recommendations as to what policy, legislative and other actions would be useful.

From discussions around the House I am in no doubt that this committee would many and very able participants and contributors.

CROMWELL

Letter from Lord Wallace of Saltaire

Citizenship

The concept of (British) citizenship has come up in a range of debates and exchanges in the Lords in the current session. It was discussed—and challenged, and diversely understood—in the committee and report stages of the National Citizen Service Bill, with passing consideration of whether a more ambitious approach to the idea of citizenship obligations, to be fulfilled in some form of ‘national’ service, would be desirable or practical. On 14th December the Minister for Civil Society announced a consultation exercise, to be conducted through 2017, on ways of extending full-time volunteering, particularly among young people, including how far legal changes would help to encourage greater ‘civilian service’. This may well look at German and other models of citizen service.

Baroness Lister recently called for consideration of ‘citizenship rights’ in intervening on a Lords Question on welfare benefit cuts. Lord Cormack raised again the issue of citizenship education in the Archbishop’s debate on shared values, in early December.

Lord Lexden chaired a cross party committee last year which examined the case for extending the right to vote in UK elections to all UK citizens overseas, regardless of how long they had lived outside the UK; this has now been adopted as a government proposal. There are considerable difficulties in establishing how many UK citizens there are outside the UK, how many of them have dual nationality, and how many of these have substantial links to the UK; neither the FCO nor the Home Office have estimates of which they are confident. The Lexden proposals extend citizen voting rights as far as the USA, but do not propose to extend citizen obligations—to submit tax returns to the federal authorities while living abroad—on a similar basis. The historic responsibility, included in UK passports, to provide protection and assistance to UK citizens abroad has been successfully challenged by for example Iran and China, which refuse to recognise that their own native-born can cease to be citizens by accepting another nationality.

British citizenship is loosely defined, and—like the British constitution—is in its current form the outcome of historical evolution and incremental changes. Irish citizens have greater rights in the UK than American or French. Commonwealth citizens have greater rights than citizens of other countries; Maltese and Cypriot citizens resident in the UK were for example entitled to vote in June’s Referendum on EU Membership, though Italian and Greek residents in the UK were not. The concept of EU citizenship, with the extension of rights of residence and free movement, and to vote in local and European elections, has also been introduced through revisions of the EU Treaties; a recent Lords Question enquired what would happen to these ‘acquired rights’ when the UK leaves the EU. There has, in addition, been continuing controversy about the ‘right’ to donate to political parties: whether non-resident and non-taxpaying UK citizens as well as non-citizens should be entirely excluded.

Rising pressures from would-be immigrants to establish residence—and then citizenship—in the UK in recent years has created rising resistance within the UK to these inward flows. Consideration of the 2015–16 Immigration Bill in the Lords included debate on current rules for issuing UK visas—including the controversial Tier 1 Investor Visa category, through which an increasing number of wealthy Chinese, Russian and Central Asian citizens had been able to gain accelerated rights of residence—and in time of UK citizenship—for themselves and their families.

The most recent review of UK citizenship was conducted by Lord Goldsmith in 2007–8, and presented to Prime Minister Gordon Brown: *Citizenship: our common bond*. It notes the ‘blurring of citizenship’ through increases in cross-border migration—both short-term and long-term, through the establishment of diaspora communities with dual national ties, and of permanent non-citizen residents within the UK for whom the government accepts some responsibility (including in working for the release of a number imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay). It also notes the intricacies of distinguishing between the rights of resident citizens, non-resident citizens and non-citizen residents when access to services—such as free health provision, or social housing—become significant issues. In what it describes as the ‘classic’ concept of citizenship, a clear line was drawn between citizens and resident aliens in terms of status, rights and responsibilities, which is no longer clear. But—it does not say—the extension of such rights to services to recent arrivals in the country, whether naturalised as citizens or not, has become a growing source of resentment to many native-born citizens, as became clear in the 2016 Referendum campaign.

The Goldsmith Report goes on to note that there are currently 6 different categories of British citizenship, which makes it “hard to see a positive and strong link between British citizenship as such and commitment to, and participation in, British societyWhat there has, however, never been is any attempt at a comprehensive statement of the rights and responsibilities of citizens” (p.19)¹⁵. It notes that in the final stages of parliamentary consideration of the 1981 Nationality Act the minister concluded that “the suggestion that the Bill should also cover civic rights and obligations was self-evidently an unrealistic aim.”¹⁶ The Report in its turn deals in detail with ways of improving education and preparation for those applying for citizenship, and of enhancing citizenship ceremonies, but shies away from these broader questions of rights and obligations.

The referendum campaign reflected, among many other inter-related issues, a sense from among many native-born British citizens that the line between citizens and aliens should be drawn more sharply: that the rights of British citizens by birth had been diluted by the continuing influx of new non-citizens. Global population growth, instability across Africa and the Middle East, exacerbated by the impact of climate change, makes it likely that even after leaving the EU Britain will continue to be affected by immigration pressures. The case for attempting to clarify the rights and duties of British citizenship, and the best ways to inculcate understanding of citizenship, both for the native-born and for citizens who have come to the UK from other countries, therefore seems strong.

I propose that a sessional committee should examine:-

- (1) Our understanding of British citizenship, and whether there is a case for clarifying and simplifying its definition.
- (2) Education for citizenship, both in British schools and for those applying for British citizenship.
- (3) What rights, in terms of protection, participation in public life, access to public services, etc., attach to citizenship.

15 Lord Goldsmith QC, Citizenship Review, *Citizenship: Our Common Bond*, p 19: <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Politics/documents/2008/03/11/citizenship-report-full.pdf> [accessed 15 March 2017]

16 Lord Goldsmith QC, Citizenship Review, *Citizenship: Our Common Bond*: <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Politics/documents/2008/03/11/citizenship-report-full.pdf> [accessed 15 March 2017]

- (4) What obligations citizens owe, in return, to their community and their state: in terms of participation in public life, contributions to their community, etc.
- (5) As a sub-set of (4), whether there is a case for expanding National Citizen Service further to require, in some form, a period of communal service for all citizens, most likely at the point of transition from school to work.

WALLACE OF SALTAIRE

Letter from Lord Cromwell and Lord Wallace of Saltaire

Citizenship

Lord Wallace of Saltaire and Lord Cromwell are aware that they have each submitted a proposal for a committee on Citizenship. We have compared our proposals and met to discuss them.

We agree that they are complementary; they arise from similar concerns and address many of the same issues.

We hope that the committee will consider the submission of two such similar proposals as evidence of the continuing discussions across the House on these issues, and the case for an in-depth enquiry focused on practical outcomes within the required timetable.

CROMWELL AND WALLACE OF SALTAIRE

Letter from Lord Empey

Devolved administrations

Have you given any thought to looking at the accountability of the Devolved Administrations for the block grants they receive and spend? We seem to be in an era of devolve and forget. Ministers in the regions can see London as a giant ATM machine and nobody seems to realise where the money comes from.

EMPEY

Letter from Lord Triesman

Extent and consequences of the sexual abuse of children in sport in the UK

There is extensive experience in the House of the (a) protection of children; (b) the administration of sport at the most senior levels; (c) the development of children and their well-being; and (d) volunteering.

Whilst there is obvious interest in this matter in the House of Commons, it bridges a number of Select Committee areas and is not in the specific remit of any one of them. There are good reasons to believe such an enquiry would be welcomed by Members of the House of Commons.

The issues do cross departmental boundaries. They cover the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Department for Education, and Justice. There is also likely to be Home Office interest in respect of policing and, perhaps, other matters.

The issue is both pressing and of great importance to children, parents and sports organisations. All will want a timely Enquiry into the issues now emerging (and

whether they were known to have emerged in the past but without appropriate action being taken). There is no reason whatever the Enquiry should take longer than one session.

There is every reason to believe there will be strong support for this proposal in the House.

I am aware that the most recent issues have emerged as a result of great personal courage on the part of victims in football. However, it is possible there are comparable issues in other sports. The Inquiry envisaged should certainly pay significant but not exclusive attention to football.

I am also aware The FA has announced it will hold an ‘internal inquiry’ and has appointed a QC to assist. While I should say at once that I know the QC and that she is a very highly competent, experienced and exceptional lawyer, The FA has conducted internal inquiries before with less than helpful results. First, it is unable to compel witnesses to attend or to offer suitable protection to those who do attend and need such protection. This has resulted in unacceptable gaps in the evidence collected. Second, the processes have seldom resulted in any significant public disclosure of the facts or bases for conclusions, where conclusions are reached. Nor are recommendations seen through to conclusions. Third, The FA is finally answerable to The FA Council which contains many of those who served on The FA Board at the times when it has been alleged the assaults and rapes took place and information was allegedly provided to the Board. Thus there is an inappropriate structure for accountability. Finally, the proposal will not cover other sports where issues are believed to have arisen.

It may be said that the police forces in various parts of the country are looking at allegations. I cannot say whether this will be a rapid process or not. What I can say is that current parents will not wish to expose their children to risk until there has been a serious inquiry and this is injurious to the prospects for these children and the sports themselves. Some clubs have said they will enquire into themselves and while this is welcome it is a limited and non-influential process. On the face of it, this does not inspire confidence. It is not known what any club can compel former employees to do and they certainly will not have the authority of Parliament. Nonetheless their investigations may provide valuable insights to an *Ad Hoc* Committee.

However, real confidence is only likely where the process is transparent and independent.

I believe an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the House will command support and respect, and provide a degree of comfort to everyone both in terms of powers and process, and the efficacy of findings and recommendations. This will be enhanced because it will then be open to Parliament to consider whether and how to act on recommendations, giving a sense of purpose lacking in all other approaches.

May I respectfully suggest this is an urgent matter and suited to the *Ad Hoc* Committee approach?

May I add that I think the case is still more pressing. There is considerable discussion among sports organisations about two key issues. The first is that the proposed internal FA inquiry is likely to be of very considerable length and those involved, while I have no doubt they value thoroughness, are drawing the conclusion they will not have had a proper consideration of the issues within any kind of reasonable time. It adds to their sense that they feel they have never been

able to submit their experience to an authoritative body and even on this occasion it is likely to be so protracted they may never hear an authoritative outcome. Indeed, the internal character of the FA proposal raises fears that its full outcomes may never be known (people will feel unable to tell the full story without the protection of parliamentary privilege and The FA may not publish for fear of libel actions, not an unusual situation in sports bodies);¹ and that The FA is not independent in the way the House of Lords manifestly is.

The second issue is that the wider problems in sport will not be captured in a football led inquiry even if it can realistically proceed to disclosing the facts. There is evidence of anxiety in a number of sports. For example, people in swimming administration have expressed anxieties about their sport particularly in some regions.

We have a unique opportunity to understand the depth of a current problem in a way which will not be available, I suggest, to others. Given the terrible nature of such crimes, and the lasting consequences for the victims, made worse if matters cannot be effectively aired, I do urge that we fulfil the responsibility.

TRIESMAN

Letter from Lord Hylton

Food and fuel poverty in England

I would like to put forward two proposals for *ad hoc* committees in 2017–18 session:

- (1) Food and fuel poverty in England
- (2) How to provide non-custodial or semi custodial sentences in order to reduce the numbers of non-violent offenders sent to prison.

HYLTON

Letter from Baroness Thomas of Winchester

Halving the Disability Employment Gap

This subject is a Government aim. There are many strands to it, and it is not at all clear how on earth it is going to be achieved, even though everyone is in favour of it. It is not party political because all are in favour.

It cuts across at least four and probably five Government Departments—DWP, BEIS, Health and Education, and Transport. And then HMRC also because it would bring in more tax.

An all-party group has done some useful work, but only on the employment side. No-one is looking at the whole picture.

It would build brilliantly on the Equality and Disability Committee Report.

The Government are consulting on this in a Green Paper—'Work, Health and Disability: Improving Lives'. However, this sets out the challenge, and the goal, and asks a lot of questions, but presumably the answers will only come in a Bill.

THOMAS OF WINCHESTER

Letter from the Countess of Mar

Health services' response to early presentation of non-specific symptoms that may point to underlying serious illness

How will health services respond in the future to early presentation of non-specific symptoms that may point to underlying serious illness, such as blood poisoning, neurological conditions, zoonoses and low level chronic exposure to toxic substances.

MAR

Letter from Lord Borwick

Health implications of Air Pollution

From the Great Stink of 1858 to the Great Smog of 1952, population growth and industrialisation have reduced the quality of the air in the UK, especially in big cities. The Clean Air Act of 1956 was perhaps the earliest significant attempt to enshrine in law the protection of air quality. Science is delivering more knowledge on air pollution, so Parliament has to be ahead of the changes and pressures that the future will bring.

Individuals and government departments often think that they cannot improve air quality through voluntary actions alone. This special committee will facilitate work across government and between national and devolved governments to tackle air pollution.

While much is known about CO₂ and its impact on climate change, there is far less awareness of the harm to public health caused by particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) and nitrogen oxides (nitrogen dioxide and nitric oxide).

Both are a result of the combustion process (road transport is the largest source of nitrogen oxides in the UK) and exposure can lead to inflammation of the airways, cardiovascular and respiratory illness. Public Health England has estimated that PM_{2.5} alone is responsible for nearly 29,000 deaths a year in the UK and costs the health service up to £16 billion pa. Emerging research has also linked diesel emissions to type 2 diabetes and dementia.

There have been a number of policy developments over the last year which make this a particularly timely issue for a special committee to consider:

- The UK government's air pollution plans have been found by the High Court to be inadequate due to the fact they are not expected to reduce vehicle emissions, particularly nitrogen dioxide, to legal limits. DEFRA have been tasked with developing new, stronger plans by summer 2017. There is an opportunity for the special committee to advise on the content of the new plans and scrutinise them once complete.
- Following the referendum to leave the European Union, the government are expected to bring current EU air quality laws into domestic legislation via the Great Repeal Bill next year. This will create an opportunity for the government and both Houses of Parliament to reconsider our laws with and lead the way by creating the strongest air pollution framework in the world. The special committee would have a role to play in scrutinising this process.

If the UK is to succeed in improving air quality, it needs to be prioritised across all government departments and levels of government, with specific emphasis

from the Department of Health. This committee will make recommendations for improvement in all areas. It will complement the work being undertaken by the House of Commons EFRA committee. In particular it will focus on:

- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs—has overall responsibility for air quality and supporting local authorities to reduce emissions.
- Department for Health—Public Health England’s outcomes framework includes a requirement to reduce mortality attributable to particulate air pollution while the health impacts of poor air quality are leading to increased pressure on NHS services.
- Department for Transport—has a role in promoting greener private transport and minimizing the impact of public transport on the nation’s health.
- Department for Education—children are particularly susceptible to air pollution; the department has a role in supporting schools to improve the lung health of their pupils by protecting them from the effects of air pollution.
- Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy—this new department will also be responsible for addressing climate change (predominantly CO₂) and can drive lower emissions through cleaner energy.

BORWICK

Letter from the Earl of Listowel

How best to distribute the benefits of globalisation to low income families

I am writing to you with a proposal for an *ad hoc* committee. This might be entitled, ‘inquiry into how best to distribute the benefits of globalisation to low income families’.

Areas that it might explore are housing, early intervention (including perinatal health, health visiting, high quality early years education and care, couple and parenting support, adult education for parents with no qualifications in numeracy or literacy, or who do not have English as a first language) and proximate intervention (interventions to protect children and young people on the point of crisis from school exclusion, entry to the criminal justice system, child and adolescent mental health services or local authority care).

Further areas it might explore are the use of mentoring and other support for children growing up without contact with a father, nuanced employment support for low income parents and investigation of welfare arrangements under Universal Credit for low income families.

This would be a cross cutting investigation examining the work of, please forgive the acronyms, DCLG, the Department for Education, the DWP, the MoJ, the DoH, the MoD and the home office. It would complement the work of the education and health select committees in the Commons and build on Lord Sutherland’s inquiry into affordable childcare and Baroness Corston’s into young people left behind and overlooked.

A BGIPU visit to Berlin in February 2016, which I will be joining, may provide opportunities to establish contacts able to furnish information on best practice in Germany in supporting low income families. I hope that the *ad hoc* committee might look to international and local best practice for new approaches.

I recognise that this would be an ambitious inquiry and would be glad to take advice on how to ensure it is adequately focused and within the capacity of the time and resources available. Frank Field MP has suggested to me that an inquiry of this kind focused on the first five years of our children's lives and billed as a report into social mobility would be most helpful.

LISTOWEL

Letter from Baroness Royall of Blaisdon

How to ensure high levels of civic engagement among young and marginalised communities

An *ad hoc* select committee designed to make recommendations that tackle our democratic and civic crisis by getting young citizens engaged in traditional forms of civic society. This work remains timely because the levels of political disengagement amongst our youngest generations, is still much lower than the rest of the population and is an issue globally. It is right and appropriate that parliament should lead the way in this area.

The behaviour emerging from the results of both the US presidential election and the EU referendum means that we can no longer dismiss democratic engagement by saying 'nothing ever changes' and 'they are all the same', two lines far too often used by younger generations to dismiss civic engagement. The rise of the far right, hate speech and xenophobia across many parts of the western world means that 'sound bite' politics, fuelled by division and fear, is causing friction among different parts of society. We are failing in our collective responsibility for the well-being of the planet and future generations—meaningful engagement has never been more necessary.

Young people's disengagement in politics and the decisions affecting their lives and futures, is a big societal issue in many parts of the world. Everyone should be involved in the change-making process, to understand and take up their role and responsibility in helping to shape society, to the benefit of all, whilst understanding the need for compromise. Meaningful community engagement can bring people together, despite their differences, to play a more active role when it comes to tackling issues they care about, whilst developing an understanding of different views and opinions and compromises that may be needed to form solutions. The EU referendum provided clear and frightening evidence that we are a divided society in terms of wealth, geography, education and age. Civic engagement should be an important means of reducing the divide.

Many members have participated in debates, early day motions and tabled Bill amendments on the issues surrounding civic engagement. This committee could harness the cross party expertise to recommend innovative and sustainable ways to tackle some of the root causes of poor civic engagement. Recommendations that harness government channels of communications, NGO's and the business sector. We have seen some great pilot initiatives that could and should be marked as best practice and scaled up accordingly.

This is an area that every member of our House and the Commons should hold in high regard. It was clear from debates on the NCS Bill that civic engagement and responsibility do not fall within the remit of one specific government department and is therefore prone to fall within the gaps. The Political and Constitutional Reform Committee did some important work in the last Parliament but more is needed. It is a cross-cutting issue and the work of an *ad hoc* committee could

provide valuable input for many departments including the Department for Education, DCMS, DCLG and the Ministry of Justice.

I cherish the fact that this is the people’s parliament but for this to be a reality, the foundations of active participation need strengthening so that everyone, including the young, understand that it is vital to play an active role in our democracy.

ROYALL OF BLAISDON

Letter from Lord Warner

Human Rights implications for Palestinians of a One-State solution

I would like to propose a subject for an *Ad Hoc* Select Committee next year to mark the centenary of the 1917 Balfour Declaration.

There is now widespread concern that the level of settler development on the West Bank and East Jerusalem has rendered impracticable a two-State solution to the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. Certainly this is supported by my own visit with a Parliamentary delegation to the West Bank and East Jerusalem earlier this year. Much as we all wish that this was not so, we now have to consider the de facto alternative of a one-State solution. This then poses a host of human rights issues both for Palestinians and Israelis alike, but also for the international community and not least the British Government, given its previous UN Mandate responsibilities in Palestine.

My suggestion is that it would be a very constructive use of the legal and human rights expertise in the House of Lords, to establish an *Ad Hoc* Select Committee to undertake a dispassionate analysis of the human rights implications of such a solution for the Palestinian citizens of such a State. The terms of reference I have in mind would be along the lines:

“To mark the centenary of the Balfour Declaration, to consider the human rights implications for Palestinians in any one-State solution that emerged if a two-State solution to the conflict proved impracticable; and to identify the issues for consideration but without making any recommendations.”

I believe that an inquiry of this kind could provide a useful and independent analysis for a range of interests, including the UK government, without taking sides. It would make good use of the expertise within the House; could complement the work of other committees; would not be confined to a single government department; and could be carried out within a single session.

Wherever one stands on the Palestinian/Israeli conflict it can only do good to better understand, through an independent analysis, the human rights implications of failing to secure a two-State solution.

WARNER

Letter from Lord St John of Bletso

The increasing threat of cyber security both to the public and private sector

I would like to propose an *ad hoc* committee being established to look at the increasing threat of cyber security both to the public and private sector. The extent of the problem is huge both financially and personally and sadly far too little is

being done to coordinate a workable solution. John Reid is an expert and I have a lot of expert knowledge having run data centres and having served on the advisory board of Silicon Valley bank. The House has a raft of experts on the subject.

ST JOHN OF BLETSO

Letter from Baroness Deech

Legal Services Act 2007: Post legislative scrutiny

The regulation of legal services under the Legal Services Act 2007 is widely regarded as unsatisfactory, cumbersome and in need of overhaul, though so far there has been no agreement as to what should be changed. The various front line legal regulators, and their overseer, the Legal Services Board, have been holding meetings for over a year to plan changes to the Act. The LSB has published its “vision” of the future of regulation, but it is not agreed by the other regulators which it oversees. It is high time that the Legal Services Act 2007 had post-legislative scrutiny. Such a review would necessarily encompass troublesome developments in representation of litigants in court (self-representation, McKenzie friends), due to cuts in legal aid, and the future of legal services in the UK post-Brexit.

DEECH

Letter from Lord Campbell-Savours

National Identity Cards

Can I suggest a liaison committee enquiry into the introduction/use of national identity cards?

The areas I would like to see covered would include

- (1) Their use as entitlement cards in accessing public services
- (2) The use of the cards in combatting fraud
- (3) The use of the cards in providing identity on request
- (4) The benefit of the cards post Brexit
- (5) The experience of other European States in their use
- (6) The use of technology biometrics on the card
- (7) The use of the card and benefits to the taxpayer arising out of their use.

And more!

Lord Blunkett, Lord Clark of Windermere, Baroness Corston, Lord Grocott, Lord Forsyth of Drumlean, Lord Harrison and Lord Reid of Cardowan support this proposal.

CAMPBELL-SAVOURS

Letter from Baroness Eaton

Next steps following the publication of the Casey Review

I am writing in response to the Liaison Committee’s request for proposals for *ad hoc* select committees for the next session. I would like to propose a select

committee that will look at next steps following the Casey Review, published in December.

The Casey Review set out in stark terms the segregation that is experienced by far too many people in Britain today. The review highlights the increasing isolation of white working class and ethnic minority communities. Almost all ethnic minority groups in Britain experience unemployment levels which are double the national average, and the picture particularly stark for women—especially in some Muslim communities. 44 per cent and 36 per cent of women born in Bangladesh and Pakistan now living in the UK are unable to speak English well or at all, compared to 20 per cent and 13 per cent of Bangladesh and Pakistan-born men. In 2015, these women were nearly three times more likely to be economically inactive than men from the same background.

In order to break a vicious generational cycle, the interplay between deprivation, quality of education, influence of religious leadership, and low status employment and economic inactivity must be tackled.

A select committee would examine how to take forward the review's first recommendation about practical steps that Government can take to build the resilience of local communities in the areas where the greatest challenges to social cohesion can be found. The select committee could examine:

- Setting expectations about living in Britain either when or before arriving in Britain
- Women's equality, access to employment and understanding of rights (including Sharia law and Sharia marriage)
- English language proficiency for first generation immigrants
- Education and raising attainment
- Supporting schools in decision making and encouraging mixing between young people from different backgrounds
- Out of school/home schooling.

A select committee of this nature would be able to take evidence from a wide range of individuals and organisations, included but not limited to:

- Dame Louise Casey (Author, Casey Review)
- Peter Clarke (Education Commissioner, author of Report into allegations concerning Birmingham schools arising from the 'Trojan Horse' letter)
- Amanda Spielman (Her Majesty's Chief Inspector, Ofsted)
- Sunder Katwala (Chief Executive, British Future)
- Muslim Women's Network
- Headteachers from schools in areas such as Bradford, Birmingham etc
- Leaders and Directors of Education from relevant local authorities.

The select committee's proposed work will cut across Government departments: the Department for Education, the Home Office, Government Equalities Office, and the Department for Communities and Local Government. It will also complement the work already undertaken by House of Commons select committees such as

the Women and Equalities Committee inquiry into employment opportunities for Muslim women in the UK.

EATON

Letter from Lord McColl of Dulwich

Obesity

As half the expenditure in the NHS is due to the complications of the obesity epidemic which the worst epidemic for 97 years we face a national disaster. The authorities are not taking this seriously. We need an *ad hoc* committee.

MCCOLL OF DULWICH

Letter from Lord Green of Deddington

Outlook for UK population growth and its likely consequences

The UK population has grown continuously for most of the past century. In recent decades migration has taken over from births as the main driver and has led to an acceleration of population growth which is the greatest since 1901–11. There is no current sign that this population growth will moderate. Indeed, the latest projections from the ONS indicate that, at current levels of net migration, the UK population (now 64 million) will reach 75 million in 2037. As it is now 65 years since the subject was thoroughly considered (by the Royal Commission on population 1949 Cmd 7695 HMSO), the time is now ripe for a review.

The first phase might involve an examination of the development of the three main determinants of population growth (births, deaths and migration) in the very different circumstances of each constituent part of the UK. Of these, migration is the most variable and has the most effect on population growth. It is also the only one capable of being significantly influenced by government policy.

A second phase would examine the consequences of such continued population growth if it were to come about. While the Office for Budget responsibility makes detailed forecasts for the economic impact of a growing population, they consistently emphasise that judgements about the optimum scale of immigration lie outside their remit.

It is clearly important that such judgements are properly made and take account of, for example:

- The impact on infrastructure, roads rail etc.
- The effect on demand for housing
- Pressures on education and health services
- The impact on our environment and quality of life.

However, government seems not to have taken any real steps to inform itself or Parliament about the implications of continued rapid population growth. This is a matter in which the wide ranging experience of the House of Lords could make a valuable, and perhaps unique, contribution.

GREEN

Letter from Lord Foulkes of Cumnock

Political Opinion Polling

Political Opinion Polling: the reliability of various polling methods, the effect of the publication of polls on political discourse and whether there should be any regulation of political opinion polling.

FOULKES OF CUMNOCK

Letter from Lord Sharkey

Principles for the Government's proposed new single body to provide publicly funded financial guidance be created.

Background

On the 9 October 2016, the Government announced its intention to create a new single public financial guidance body to provide debt advice, money and pensions guidance. Their stated ambition is to make it as easy as possible for consumers to access the financial guidance they need. The new body will replace the Money Advice Service, the Pensions Advisory Service and Pension Wise.

Financial guidance can help people make the most of their income and avoid financial difficulties. This support is increasingly important to families' financial security as people are given more freedom and choice around their pensions and interest rate rises become more likely.

The FCA collects three separate levies to fund financial guidance: a money advice levy, a debt advice levy and a pensions levy. In 2015/16, the debt advice levy raised £46 million, the money advice levy £34 million, and in 2016/17 the pension levy was £22.6 million.

The Treasury Select Committee, the National Audit Office and, most recently, the Farnish Review have found that the use of the money advice levy by the Money Advice Service does not deliver value for money. Last year the Work and Pensions Committee concluded that the “freedom to choose” reforms to pensions introduced in April 2015 are insufficient, and that people must have the freedom to make a well-informed choice.

Rationale

Not enough people get help managing their money. Last year, up to 23 million people were not offered advice at key moments in their lives when they may have taken it.

The Government's intended single body is a unique opportunity to bring together all money related advice and provide a seamless service for people.

However, this is not a simple task. The government will need to learn the lessons of the past. For example, previous inquiries into the Money Advice Service concluded that such a delivery body risks duplication of existing services, and consumers are more likely to get help from recognised services in communities rather than a central body. There are also important decisions to be made about the oversight of the new body, how it will be held to account, and its operating role, whether it should deliver services or just commission them.

An *ad hoc* select committee on financial guidance would support the Government's ambition by bringing together the breadth of knowledge and experience present in

the House of Lords to examine consumer need, identify lessons from the past and recommend design principles the new body should adhere to.

Focus on the issue of financial guidance at this time would be a meaningful intervention by the House of Lords, as the Treasury and the Department for Work and Pensions, plan to consult on the best way to design a single body model in the New Year. It builds on and complements the work of the Work and Pensions Select Committee and the Treasury Select Committee.

People have the freedom to take increasingly difficult and complex financial decisions. At a time when the Pensions freedoms continue to bed in, Universal Credit rollout is expanding and interest rates could be about to rise, being able to access the right financial guidance is critical to the wellbeing of individuals and the wider economy.

Scope

The *ad hoc* committee would take evidence to examine consumer need, the lessons to be learnt from the past, and recommendations for the future design principles—including oversight and the high level operational role—of the single body.

The activity proposed could be confined to one session with witnesses drawn from the following:

1. Current statutory commissioners of financial guidance, the Money Advice Service, the Department for Work and Pensions and The Pensions Advisory Service
2. Authors of previous investigations into this area such as:
 - (i) MPs involved in the Treasury Select Committee inquiry into the Money Advice Service
 - (ii) Christine Farnish
 - (iii) MPs involved in the Work and Pensions Select Committee inquiry into the pension freedoms
 - (iv) The National Audit Office
3. Delivery partners including:
 - (i) Citizens Advice
 - (ii) Stepchange
 - (iii) Money Advice Trust
4. Creditors who fund the money and debt levy
5. Regulators: namely the FCA, The Pensions Regulator
6. Other consumer groups and representatives:
 - (i) Money Saving Expert—Martin Lewis
 - (ii) Financial Journalist—Paul Lewis, Presenter of Radio 4’s Moneybox
 - (iii) Which?
 - (iv) UK Government: HMT and DWP (ministerial level).

Possible Inquiry Outcomes

Recommend design principles—including oversight and high level operational role and framework—the new body should adhere to, based on the committee’s examination of consumer need and lessons from the past.

SHARKEY

Letter from Lord Beecham*Prison Reform*

I suggest prison reform as a suitable candidate.

BEECHAM

Letter from Lord Alton of Liverpool*Prosecution of those responsible for genocide and crimes of humanity*

An inquiry to examine: how determinations of genocide and crimes against humanity are made; what obligations the UK has under the Convention on the Prevention of Genocide; the role of the Security Council and International Criminal Court bringing to justice those responsible.

Context

The current policy of the UK Government is to refrain from expressing an opinion as to whether or not a genocide has occurred, insisting instead that this determination is a matter for international judicial bodies. The International Criminal Court relies on the United Nations Security Council to instruct action. At present, no regional or *ad hoc* tribunals exist, contributing to a cycle of inertia. The government is collecting evidence of crimes committed by Daesh but has no mechanism for moving prosecutions forward for crimes committed by members of Daesh, the Assad Regime, their allies, and others.

The Government has repeatedly promised action against those who commit genocide and crimes against humanity. Before taking office, the Foreign Secretary published his opinion that the actions of Daesh constitute genocide. Since his appointment, Mr Johnson has urged the UN ‘to begin the vital gathering and the preserving, of evidence of Daesh’s crimes.’¹⁷ The Foreign Secretary has assured Parliament that the Government is ‘assembling the evidence ... most suited to bringing these people to justice’.¹⁸

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office promises that ‘People seeking to travel to engage in terrorist activity in Syria or Iraq should be in no doubt that the UK will take the strongest possible action to protect national security, including prosecuting those who break the law.’¹⁹ Despite these statements, no suspected perpetrators of genocide or crimes against humanity in Iraq and Syria have been prosecuted by the UK Government.

17 Foreign and Commonwealth Office, *Our aim has got to be justice for all of Daesh’s victims*. (19 September 2016): <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/our-aim-has-got-to-be-justice-for-all-of-daeshs-victims> [accessed 16 March 2017]

18 HC Deb, 3 November 2016, [Col 1084](#)

19 Foreign and Commonwealth Office, *UK action to combat Daesh*: <https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/daesh/about> [accessed 16 March 2017]

Key events

- On 21 December 2015, 75 members of both Houses wrote to the Prime Minister urging action in support of religious and ethnic minorities in the Middle East.
- On 18th January 2016, senior jurists, including the former Chancellor, wrote to the Prime Minister lamenting the inability of a judicial mechanism with which the UK could declare that it believed the legal threshold for genocide to be met.
- Throughout 2016 numerous international bodies have declared the actions of Daesh to be genocide, including, the US Congress, the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Council of Europe, Iraqi Parliament, Australian House of Representatives, and the Commission on International Religious Freedom.
- On the 17th March 2016, US Secretary of State John Kerry declared the actions of Daesh to be genocide.
- On the 18th March 2016 the International Association of Genocide Scholars, the world’s largest organisation of experts on genocide, called upon the United Nations and all its member states to declare that the crimes committed by Daesh genocide.
- On the 20th March 2016, the House of Commons voted unanimously to declare the actions of Daesh genocide.
- On the 21st March 2016, in resisting an amendment which sought to create a judicial mechanism for the determination of genocide, it was suggested by the Minister that a Motion for debate should be tabled. The Motion appeared as an “Other Motion” the following day, and has been on the Order Paper every sitting day since. The Government has not allocated time to debate the motion.
- On 19 September 2016, the UK government (together with the Belgian and Iraqi governments) announced its plan to bring the Daesh perpetrators to justice.

“Makes best use of the knowledge and experience of Members of the House”

Colleagues with particular expertise which have spoken recently on these issues include:

Baroness Butler-Sloss Q.C., Lord Carlile Q.C., Lord Brennan Q.C., Lord Pannick Q.C., Lord Mackay of Clashfern Q.C., Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne, Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws Q.C. Baroness Cox of Queensbury, Lord Forsyth, and Lord Marlesford.

Other expert colleagues capable of making extremely valuable contributions include:

Lord Williams of Baglan, formerly based in Cambodia as Deputy Director for Human Rights; in former Yugoslavia as Director for Information; Geneva as Adviser to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and New York as Director, Office for Children and Armed Conflict.

Lord Hope of Craighead, former Deputy President of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom.

Lord Stirrup, former Chief of Defence Staff, has a detailed knowledge of Iraq.

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean, former junior Foreign Office Minister, former Minister of State for the Middle East. Member EU External Affairs Sub-Committee.

Lord Judge, former Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales.

Lord Trimble, as former First Minister for Northern Ireland, professor of law and barrister. Experience as an observer to the Israeli special independent public Turkel Commission of Inquiry into the Gaza flotilla raid. Member of the Human Rights Joint Committee and the National Security Strategy Joint Committee.

Lord Woolf, as former Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales and as a member of the Privy Council he conducted a review of the working methods of the European Court of Human Rights.

Lord Hannay of Chiswick, member of the All Party Parliamentary Group on the United Nations, International Relations Committee, Intergovernmental Organisations Committee, vast experience as former ambassador to the UN. Lord Hannay is a member of UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.

Lord Wood of Anfield, chair of the United Nations Association, UK and member of the All Party Parliamentary Group on the United Nations, emeritus fellow of Politics at Magdalen College Oxford, and Fellow of Practice at the Blavatnik School of Government in Oxford.

Baroness Kinnock of Holyhead, former Shadow Spokesperson for International Development, former Minister of State for Africa and UN and former Minister of State for Europe. Member of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Genocide Prevention. Baroness Kinnock is also Council Member of the European Council on Foreign Relations.

Lord Evans of Weardale, was Director-General of the British Security Service, the United Kingdom's domestic security and counter-intelligence service.

“Complement the work of Commons Departmental Select Committees”

The proposed Committee would complement but not replicate the current work of numerous House Committees.

Open inquiries undertaken by the Foreign Affairs Committee include, Human Rights: Annual review of the work of the FCO, The fight against ISIL, UK policy on Libya and UK policy on Syria.

The Home Affairs Committee is running an inquiry on Countering Extremism.

There is also scope for crossover with the International Development Committee and the Justice Committee.

“Address areas of policy that cross departmental boundaries”

It is envisaged that officials would be invited to submit evidence in a focused session. Witnesses could be drawn from some of the following departments, and submissions sought from others.

Ministerial Departments	Non-Ministerial Departments
Foreign and Commonwealth Office	Crown Prosecution Service
Ministry of Justice	Government Legal Department
Ministry of Defence	National Counter Terrorism Security Office
Home Office	The Security Service
Attorney General's Office	

“Be capable of being confined to one session”

On 20 April 2016, the House of Commons voted to recognise genocide of ethnic and religious minorities in Iraq and Syria. Since then, the Government has reverted to its position that determination of genocide must be a matter for the international judicial system.

The international judicial system is ill-equipped to approach the matter in the absence of political pressure from constituent governments, which itself depends upon having legal mechanisms providing a platform for action.

Creative thinking is needed to find a way out of this catch-22. This inquiry would not seek to reach a global diplomatic consensus on approached to suspected genocide and crimes against humanity, but to examine technical ways that the U.K. may move forward. With the concentration of expertise in the House of Lords and narrow nature of the brief, the necessary ground could be covered in a single, well-managed session divided into evidence-taking and problem-solving sections.

The following Resolution, passed 15 December 2016 by the European Parliament is also relevant to the submission above.

EP (16.12.2016): In a resolution adopted this Thursday 15 December, MEPs expressed overwhelming dismay over the ongoing discoveries of new mass graves in Iraq and Syria. They condemn “without reservation” the continuing atrocities and crimes against humanity committed by ISIS/Daesh and express their condolences to all those in Iraq who have suffered as a result.

The Iraqi authorities should “take urgent steps” to protect the gravesites around the newly recaptured Mount Sinjar area, where thousands of victims are reportedly buried, in order to ensure accountability. Protecting these gravesites is essential to achieving justice for the Yazidi victims of mass killings by ISIS/Daesh, which amount to genocide, stress MEPs.

Parliament reiterates its “full support to the Iraqi army, the armies of the global anti-ISIS/Daesh coalition, the Peshmerga forces of the KRG and their allies in their efforts to liberate Mosul and other parts of the country from ISIS/Daesh presence.”

The full resolution is available at <http://bit.ly/2gFhDBp>²⁰. Here is the part detailing the stance of the European Parliament:

20 European Parliament resolution of 15 December 2016 on mass graves in Iraq (2016/3028(RSP))

The Parliament

1. Condemns without reservation the continuing atrocities and flagrant violations of international humanitarian and human rights law committed by ISIS/Daesh; notes with overwhelming dismay the ongoing discoveries of new mass graves in Iraq and Syria, which are evidence of the terror committed by ISIS/Daesh; expresses its condolences to all those in Iraq who have lost their relatives as a result of the crimes against humanity and war crimes committed by ISIS/Daesh and its affiliates;
2. Strongly appeals to the international community, in particular to the UN Security Council, to consider the reported mass graves in Iraq as further evidence of genocide and to refer ISIS/Daesh to the International Criminal Court (ICC);
3. Calls on the Iraqi authorities, including the KRG, to take urgent steps to protect the gravesites around Mount Sinjar that became accessible after the area was recaptured from ISIS/Daesh, and to take all other necessary measures to preserve the evidence of the war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by ISIS/Daesh, in order to ensure accountability;
4. Calls on the Iraqi authorities to invite international forensic experts, including those with experience of working before criminal tribunals, to map all the mass graves and help preserve and analyse the evidence found in newly accessible mass graves, since exhumations without forensic experts can destroy critical evidence and greatly complicate the identification of bodies;
5. Calls for the EU, its Member States and other potential international donors to facilitate and lend their full support to the Government of Iraq in setting up the human resources and infrastructure needed for the preservation and analysis of evidence that could be vital to future domestic and international accountability processes aimed at addressing war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide;
6. Is particularly alarmed by the situation of women and children in the conflict, in particular the Yazidi women and children who are victims of persecution, executions, torture, sexual exploitation and other atrocities; insist that a full range of medical services should be made available, in particular for rape victims; calls, as a matter of urgency, for the EU and its Members States to work closely with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and to support it to this end; calls for the immediate release of all women and children who remain captives of ISIS/Daesh;
7. Reiterates its full support to the Iraqi army, the armies of the global anti-ISIS/Daesh coalition, the Peshmerga forces of the KRG and their allies in their efforts to liberate Mosul and other parts of the country from ISIS/Daesh presence, as well as its support for Iraq's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty;
8. Recalls that the Iraqi authorities must take concrete steps to protect civilians during the campaign, including by taking all feasible precautions to avoid civilian casualties and human rights violations during the assault; stresses that the forces on the ground must abide by international humanitarian and human rights law during their operations;

9. Expresses its support for the Republic of Iraq and its people in recognising a politically, socially and economically viable and sustainable province in the Nineveh Plain, Tal Afar and Sinjar regions, consistent with lawful expressions of regional autonomy, as guaranteed by the Iraqi constitution;
10. Stresses that the right to return to their ancestral homeland for the displaced indigenous peoples of the Nineveh Plain, Tal Afar and Sinjar - many of whom are displaced within Iraq - should be a policy priority of the Iraqi Government, supported by the EU, including its Member States, and the international community; emphasises that, with the support of the Government of Iraq and the KRG, these peoples should have their human rights, including political equality, fully guaranteed, as well as their property rights, which should supersede any claims of property rights by others;
11. Urges Iraq to become a member of the ICC in order to make it possible to prosecute ISIS/Daesh for war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity;
12. Calls on the international community, including the EU Member States, to bring to justice ISIS/Daesh members within their jurisdiction, including by applying the principle of universal jurisdiction;
13. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, the Governments and the Parliaments of the Member States, the Government and the Council of Representatives of Iraq, and the Regional Government of Kurdistan.²¹

ALTON OF LIVERPOOL

Letter from Lord Faulkner of Worcester

Prostitution Law Reform

Different approaches to reforming the law are being adopted in various countries—e.g., decriminalisation in Australia and New Zealand, criminal sanctions against purchasing sexual services in France and the Scandinavian countries—but the law in Britain has changed little in recent years, with the Policing and Crime Act 2009 and the Sexual Offences Act 2003 being the two pieces of legislation which seek to regulate the “sex industry”.

The BBC website has posted this:

“What is the current law on prostitution?”

The laws around prostitution in England and Wales are far from straightforward. The act of prostitution is not in itself illegal—but a string of laws criminalises activities around it. Under the Sexual Offences Act 2003, it is an offence to cause or incite prostitution or control it for personal gain.

The 1956 Sexual Offences Act bans running a brothel and it’s against the law to loiter or solicit sex on the street. Kerb-crawling is also banned, providing it can be shown the individual was causing a persistent annoyance.

Adverts placed in phone boxes have been banned since 2001. Human trafficking, a component of modern prostitution, is also covered by the law.

21 European Parliament resolution of 15 December 2016 on mass graves in Iraq ([2016/3028\(RSP\)](#))

There are also general laws on public nuisance and decency which can be used to target the sex trade.”²²

A new select committee could gather evidence from around the world, review the state of the law in Britain (particularly from the standpoint of the police and local authorities), and perhaps come to a view on what sort of changes were desirable.

FAULKNER OF WORCESTER

Letter from Lord Hylton

Provision of non-custodial or semi custodial sentences in order to reduce the numbers of non-violent offenders sent to prison

I would like to put forward two proposals for *ad hoc* committees in 2017–18 session:

- (1) Food and fuel poverty in England
- (2) How to provide non-custodial or semi custodial sentences in order to reduce the numbers of non-violent offenders sent to prison.

HYLTON

Letter from Baroness Jay of Paddington

The relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States of America at a time of change in international politics.

The trans-Atlantic partnership has always been seen as a central pillar of the UK’s global policy. After the BREXIT vote and the election of President Trump, who campaigned on a platform of “America First”, major changes are expected. There are wider ranging questions about the future of policy cooperation, trade security and defence which mean the UK needs to look again at some of the assumptions which have underpinned the so called special relationship.

This may be seen as a topic to be examined by the new International Relations Committee but, in my view, it goes well beyond the conventional areas of foreign affairs. Any *ad hoc* Committee would take evidence about cultural, economic, educational issues as well as questions of security, diplomacy and defence. It would draw on a wide variety of witnesses from different disciplines, and the broadly based expertise of members of the House of Lords.

JAY OF PADDINGTON

Letter from Baroness Berridge

Religion and Foreign Affairs

Countering violent extremism is a high level priority for the UK, particularly in light of recent bombings carried out across the world in the name of religion which have claimed countless lives. Understanding the nexus between religion and foreign policy is of utmost importance to provide the necessary policy solutions to some of the most pressing issues of this generation.

Factoring in the role of religion in foreign policy has often been side-lined across Government departments despite its fundamental role in many foreign policy issues. The threat of terrorism has paved the way for a renewed recognition that

22 ‘Q&A: UK Prostitution Laws’, *BBC News* (19 November 2008): <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7736436.stm> [accessed 16 March 2017]

careful dialogue about religion's place in international affairs should perhaps be obligatory rather than optional. The committee could therefore consider issues surrounding the interplay between religion, foreign policy, security and sustainable development.

Such a committee may also wish to explore the space religion occupies in global politics, addressing concerns related to conflict resolution, human rights, asylum and refugees. It could additionally serve as a forum to discuss a comprehensive understanding of security and its relationship with human rights, including the right to freedom of religion or belief. An inquiry of this nature could be confined to a single session.

Makes best use of the knowledge and experience of Members of the House

Many Members of the House have consistently raised issues related to religion and foreign affairs in the House. Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which relates to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, has been spoken about in a number of House of Lords debates on topics including: International Development Policies; Conflicts and Violence; Cultural Property: Hague Convention; Iran: Human Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, Baroness Anelay, Foreign Office Minister for Human Rights, makes regular reference to the issue of freedom of religion or belief in her contributions.

Complements the work of Commons select committees

The Foreign Affairs, International Development, Joint Committee on Human Rights and Home Affairs, committees have all received written and oral evidence on the role of religion in different policy areas as well as on how religious minorities are affected by world events and policies from respective States. This covers a broad range of countries including Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Nigeria.

Addresses areas of policy that cross departmental boundaries

This is additionally an area which is relevant across departmental bodies from the Foreign & Commonwealth and Department for International Development to the Home Office and Ministry of Defence. Assessing the role of religion in foreign affairs also inherently fits in with the cross-departmental Stabilisation Unit's work in tackling instability overseas. Persecution on grounds of religion has been a driving factor for refugees fleeing their homes; for instance, for Yazidis and Christians who have fled Iraq and Syria into Turkey, Jordan and Greece. This is an issue that has been raised with the Home Office and DfID as to how the UK can provide further support via resettlement and aid to the most vulnerable religious minorities who have been targeted for their religious identities.

BERRIDGE

Letter from Lord Freyberg

Role of NHS data in supporting the UK in cost effective health quality improvement and medical innovation

I am writing to put forward a proposal for consideration for one of the *ad hoc* committees in 2017–2018 session.

Proposal

An *ad hoc* committee to explore the role of NHS data in supporting the UK in cost effective health quality improvement and medical innovation.

The right data, used in the right way can save lives and cost in the NHS, or be used to accelerate science and health product development. However, the data landscape in the NHS is highly fragmented, the underlying data are often medically sensitive and privacy protected in statute and practice, and where there are islands of best practice (such as Salford, Suffolk or Birmingham) they generally do not scale beyond their local areas. As a result, the NHS lacks critical parts of the data needed to manage and commission care well, such as routine clinical outcomes in many diseases and interventions. Finally, in the era of precision medicine there is a need for very large disease specific datasets to establish which medicine work on which subtypes of patient. The NHS could be an ideal global partner for industry in this, but so far lacks the processes, capabilities and trusted governance to allow such engagement.

This committee would take evidence on

- What is international and UK regional best practice in health data management and exploitation for quality and innovation?
- How effective is the NHS being in driving data driven care quality improvement?
- What are industry's needs in real world health data both in R&D and commercially?
- What are the opportunities on both a health and wealth agenda to use health data better?
- What challenges, such as privacy and public trust, need to be overcome?
- How should the NHS best organise to develop data in a way acceptable to patients, especially in the light of Brexit?

This agenda cuts across

- The Department of Health, NHS England, PHE and the devolved bodies as the controllers of much of routine health data, clinical audits and registries
- Business Innovation and Skills and the Office for Life Science given
 - The research funders, as investors in new forms of health data research, such as the Farr institutes, genomics and large cohorts like UK biobank
 - The role of Innovate UK in supporting health data innovation via various catapults and other initiatives
- The Treasury given their focus on the Enterprise and growth agenda, especially in Life Science
- The Department for Brexit, given that data privacy law is currently heavily shaped by the EU, especially the recent GDPR (General Data Privacy Regulations)

Lord Giddens, Lord Lucas, Baroness Neuberger, Baroness Walmsley and Lord Wills support this proposal.

Letter from Lord Harries of Pentregarth

To explore and identify the shared values underpinning our national life and their role in shaping public policy priorities

This was in fact the motion of the Archbishop of Canterbury for his recent Friday debate, which attracted a large number of speakers. The recent Casey Review has revealed how fragmented we now are as a society and the urgency of taking steps to strengthen the bonds which hold us together as a society.

There would be no attempt to replace the British values now being taught in our schools but as I said in my speech in the Archbishop’s debate

“Here I share a concern expressed by the Commission on religion and belief in British public life, and indeed much more widely, about the way that teaching on British Values has been introduced into the school curriculum. I am a passionate believer in those values, and I want them to be taught in our schools and to underpin our national life. According to Ofsted these are

- “democracy.
- “the rule of law.
- “individual liberty.
- “mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs and for those without faith.

“The worry is that these values have been championed with a very heavy emphasis on the qualifying word “British” and as part of the counter-terrorism strategy. Because of this some communities have felt “othered” by their introduction into the syllabus, alienated rather than included. They are indeed British values and I am deeply grateful that they are, but they are not only British. We should emphasise that these are shared values and they can be nurtured by the insights of all religions as well as by those who do not belong to any.”²³

One of the great strengths of Lords Committees is that they can take evidence from a wide range of individuals and bodies, not just established institutions but groups whom it is easy to overlook. This would be of huge service in letting a number of communities in our society who now feel marginalised be heard. They would explore and identify those shared values in which “British values” are only one strand. Of course the government holds consultations, but a Select Committee can do this in much more depth over a wider range of bodies. This process of being heard would I believe itself be of great use in furthering social cohesion. It could well be achieved in one session. It is work that the House of Lords is well equipped to do because of the good representation of different religious and secular views amongst its members, and it is work that is unlikely to be done by the House of Commons. It would I believe be better done by a Lords select committee than by a Royal Commission.

The Committee would not just be a talking shop to identify the values we share as a society but make recommendations about their implications for public policy priorities. This would mean that its recommendations would inevitably cross departmental boundaries. Such a committee would I believe have widespread cross party support.

HARRIES OF PENTREGARTH

Letter from Lord Forsyth of Drumlean

Size of the House of Lords

Could I ask the Committee to consider establishing *ad hoc* select committees on the following two subjects.

- The size of the House of Lords
- The case for a national identity card scheme

FORSYTH OF DRUMLEAN

Letter from Baroness Pitkeathley

Social Care

The Liaison Committee will be familiar with recent headlines about social care:

- (a) Social care is at a tipping point
- (b) Social care funding not fit for purpose
- (c) Bed blocking crisis hits a new high.

In summary the problems are as follows:

There is a major shortfall of about £3 billion between what is available and what is required. 4 out of 5 Local Authorities do not have enough provision and at least one million people are going without the care they desperately need. More stress is falling on family carers who are finding it increasingly difficult to cope. Care providers are going out of business as they cannot make the provision of domiciliary or residential care pay.

The situation is bad for local authorities, bad for the NHS, bad for family carers, bad for businesses and most of all bad for the frail, elderly and disabled people who need care.

One ray of hope in this difficult situation however is that at long last there seems to be some consensus about the need for reform of the system. Various attempts have been made to address it in recent years such as the Royal Commission of 1998, the Wanless Review of 2006, the Dilnot Review of 2013 and the Barker Commission of 2015 but no government response has been sufficient and there is now agreement that what is needed is a long term, cross party approach which takes an open and honest look at the system and is open and honest with potential care recipients about what they can expect from the care system.

The problem could not be solved in a single parliament and requires long term planning and commitment but a House of Lords Committee could bring a unique focus to the issues involved and encourage the importance of taking a cross party view.

There is a huge amount of expertise on this subject in the House as previous legislation and debates will show. It would build on the work of the current *ad hoc* Committee on the sustainability of the NHS since a great deal of their evidence is focussed on the inadequacies of social care. Moreover the policy issues are not confined to health because housing, social security and business are of importance also.

I hope the Committee will consider this and other requests for a Committee on Social Care.

PITKEATHLEY

Letter from Lord Selkirk of Douglas

Violation of the United Nations Article on freedom of religious worship

It seems to me that one of the major issues in the world is the persecution of individuals for their faith. The Article of the United Nations claiming that freedom of religious worship should be a basic human right is constantly being violated and people of Christian religion have been killed in large numbers as a result.

I think that this is a subject which has increased in scope so much that different aspects of it should be looked into by your committee.

I believe it is becoming of sufficient international importance for this subject to be pursued.

SELKIRK OF DOUGLAS

Letter from Baroness Prosser

1970 Equal Pay Act : Post Legislative Scrutiny

I would like to suggest the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee to conduct a post legislative enquiry into the 1970 Equal pay Act.

The Act was introduced in 1970 and became fully operational in 1975. Since that time the world of work has changed in very many ways.

In 1970/75 public sector employees were directly employed rather than employed via sub-contractors thereby creating a separate employee relationship for those working to carry out the programme of one authority, health service or educational establishment for example.

Part time work was almost entirely female and confined to certain “shifts” rather than as a mix of workers engaged in a particular task or tasks.

There were no employees on “zero hours” arrangements.

The “gig” economy was unheard of.

The 1970 Act was amended by the Equal Value Regulations in 1983 and has subsequently been amended by the sex Discrimination Act 1975 and the Equality Act 2010.

None of these changes have, I believe influenced the 1970 Act so that it can address today’s employment realities.

PROSSER

Declarations of Interests

Lord Alton of Liverpool

Trustee or Patron of several charities that provide help to victims of genocide and crimes against humanity.

Lord Balfe

Involvement in the Pensions industry for some years mainly at a European level.

Member, CERN Pension Fund Actuarial and Technical Committee (ATC); a fee is paid per meeting attended plus travel, hotel and any incidental expenses.

Serves on the advisory board of the European Pensions Fund Investment Forum.

Chairman, European Parliament Members' Pension Fund

Was a member of the House administration committee of the European Parliament for ten years which dealt with social security issues.

Degree in Social Policy and Administration from the LSE.

Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society since 1974.

Dealings with Social Policy issues most of working life from being Research Officer to the Committee on One Parent Families (The Finer Committee) 1970 to 1972 to being the Last Prime Ministers Envoy to the Trades Union Movement 2007 to 2012.

Lord Beecham

Unpaid consultant in the solicitors' firm of which Lord Beecham was a partner.

Baroness Berridge

Co-chair of the APPG on International Freedom of Religion and Belief.

Project director of the Commonwealth Initiative on Freedom of Religion or Belief based out of the University of Birmingham.

Lord Blunkett

No interests declared.

Lord Borwick

Up till the beginning of December was a Trustee of the British Lung Foundation.

Lord Campbell-Savours

No interests declared.

Lord Clark of Windermere

No interests declared.

Baroness Corston

No interests declared.

Lord Cromwell

Director of The British East-West Centre—which carries out election monitoring in the former Soviet countries for OSCE under contract to FCO.

Baroness Deech

Former chair of the Bar Standards Board.

Baroness Eaton

No interests declared.

Lord Empey

No interests declared.

Lord Faulkner of Worcester

No interests declared.

Lord Forsyth of Drumlean

No interests declared.

Lord Foulkes of Cumnock

Member of the House of Lords Liaison Committee.

Lord Freyberg

No interests declared.

Lord Giddens

No interests declared.

Lord Green of Deddington

Chairman of Migrationwatch (unpaid).

Lord Grocott

No interests declared.

Lord Harries of Pentregarth

Trustee of the Woolf Institute in Cambridge for the study of Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

Lord Harris of Harringey

No interests declared.

Lord Harrison

No interests declared.

Lord Higgins

No interests declared.

Lord Hylton

No interests declared.

Baroness Jay of Paddington

No interests declared.

Earl of Listowel

Owns commercial, residential and agricultural property—a couple of shops in London and flats above them and an estate in Nottinghamshire.

Trustee of the Brent Centre for Young People (a mental health service for adolescents in North London).

Trustee of the Michael Sieff Foundation (a child welfare charity currently mainly working on reforms to the youth justice system).

Trustee of the Child and Family Practice Charitable Foundation (a mental health service for children and families).

Lord Lucas

No interests declared.

Countess of Mar

Chair of Forward-ME.

Patron of a number of ME/CFS charities.

Patron of GCAQE who campaign for clean air on commercial aeroplanes.

Direct experience of organophosphate poisoning from sheep dip.

Lord McColl of Dulwich

No interests declared.

Baroness Neuberger

Chief Executive of the King's Fund 1997–2004.

Chaired Camden and Islington Community Health Services NHS Trust 1993–1997.

Was a member of both the MRC and the GMC.

Baroness Pitkeathley

Vice President of Carers UK.

Patron of Herefordshire Carers Support.

Baroness Prosser

Deputy Chair of the EHRC until about 4 years ago.

Previously a member of the EOC.

Lord Reid of Cardowan

No interests declared.

Baroness Royall of Blaisdon

Strong supporter of Bite the Ballot and NCS, a trustee of City Year UK and a member of the advisory council of Step up to Serve, all of which work with young people and foster the ethos of being a good citizen.

Lord Selkirk of Douglas

Member of the Church of Scotland.

Lord Sharkey

Lib Dem Lords Spokesperson for Personal Finance.

Lord St John of Bletso

Recently on the advisory board of Silicon Valley Bank. The advisory board has recently been disbanded.

Ran a data centre business for 6 years more than 10 years ago.

Lord Teverson

Director, KCS Trade Print Ltd (card & label products).

Director, Wessex Investors Ltd.

Director, Wessex Hotel Operators Limited (interest ceased 27 April 2016).

Director, KCS Holdings Ltd.

Director, Anchorwood Developments Limited (property).

Sole owner and Director, Cornish Pasta Co.

Trustee of RegenSW.

Baroness Thomas of Winchester

No interests declared.

Lord Triesman

No interests declared.

Lord Wallace of Saltaire

No interests declared.

Baroness Walmsley

No interests declared.

Lord Warner

No interests declared.

Lord Wills

No interests declared.