

Reading materials for ‘Contemporary Britain’

Feb 20-18 June, 2022

Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Chapter 1 | <i>The Country and the People</i> | 1 |
| Chapter 2 | <i>Britain at War</i> | 6 |
| Chapter 3 | <i>Crown and People in the Early 20th Century</i> | 9 |
| Chapter 4 | <i>Beveridge Report</i> | 12 |
| Chapter 5 | <i>Commonwealth and Decolonization</i> | 16 |
| Chapter 6 | <i>The Role of Monarchy</i> | 19 |
| Chapter 7 | <i>The Working of the House of Commons</i> | 23 |
| Chapter 8 | <i>The Parliamentary Day</i> | 27 |
| Chapter 9 | <i>The House of Lords</i> | 31 |
| Chapter 10 | <i>The Legal Profession</i> | 35 |
| Chapter 11 | <i>What Makes Cambridge Special?</i> | 39 |
| Chapter 12 | <i>Annual Address of the Vice-Chancellor</i> | 45 |
| Chapter 13 | <i>The Importance of Scotland to the UK</i> | 51 |
| Chapter 14 | <i>Britain and Europe</i> | 56 |

Chapter 1 The Country and the People

Britain, Great Britain, the United Kingdom (UK for short), England, the British Isles----these different names are sometimes used to mean the same thing, and they are frequently used wrongly.

The name used at the United Nations is the 'United Kingdom'; in full, this is the 'United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland'. Strictly speaking, England, Great Britain and the British Isles ought only to be used as geographical names, since England is only a part of Great Britain; Great Britain does not include Northern Ireland, but the British Isles include Great Britain and the whole of Ireland, that is both Northern Ireland and the Republic of **Eire**.

The two political terms are confusing, 'Great Britain' is an older name, which was first used on the **accession** of James I in 1603. 'The United Kingdom' was first used in 1801, when Great Britain and Ireland were formally joined. It is now used for the political unit represented at the United Nations.

There is a further confusion. British people ought really to be called Britons, but they seldom are. Instead they are most often called Englishmen. This annoys the Welsh, the Scots and the Irish, who dislike being called English, even if they live in England.

The English are Anglo-Saxon in origin, but **the Welsh, the Scots and the Irish** are not. They are **Celts**, descendants of the ancient people who had crossed over from Europe to the British Isles centuries before the Roman invasion. It was these people whom **the Germanic Angles and Saxons** conquered in the fifth century A. D.

These Germanic conquerors gave England its name----'Angle' land. They were conquered in turn by the Norman French, when **William of Normandy** landed near Hastings in 1066. It was from the union of the Norman conquerors and the defeated Anglo-Saxons that the English people and the English language were born.

THE ENGLISH

Since 1066 the blood of many other races has been added to the original English mixture. Not only have Welsh, Scots and **Irishmen** made their homes in England, but also Jews, Russians, Germans---people from almost every country in Europe---as well as many West Indians, Indians, and others from the Commonwealth.

As the English are such a mixed people, local customs and accents in England vary a great deal and local pride is still strong in some parts of the country. The closer one gets to London, the less one notices such differences, for London is a melting-pot. People from all over Britain and from all over the world pour into the giant city. London tends to '**melt down**' and smooth out strong accents and **provincial customs**. Every year the influence of London spreads further and further into the country, north, south, east and west, but particularly into the south and south-east. In an effort to stop London from spreading any more, new '**overspill**' towns are being built forty to fifty miles outside London. London firms are encouraged to move to a new town, or at least to open new branches there instead of in another part of London.

The greater London region is roughly a circle, extending twenty to thirty miles from central London in the north and east, and thirty to forty miles in the west and south. Many of the **old country cottages** in the southern counties of Hampshire, Sussex and Kent have been turned into homes or weekend houses for well-off Londoners. Some people travel to work in London from as far as eighty miles away. Perhaps it is not surprising, therefore, that the Hampshire, Sussex and Kent accents are now rarely heard. Yet, strange to say, one of the strongest and most unusual accents is to be found in **the East End of London**, the home of **the cockneys**. A cockney is a Londoner who is born within the sound of Bow bells---the bells of the Church of St Mary-le-Bow in east London. The cockney 'language' is really more than an accent, since it includes many words and expressions that cannot be heard in any other part of the country. A cockney is very different from most people's idea of a typical Englishman. It is difficult to find a typical Englishman as it is to find a typical Briton.

THE WELSH

Centuries ago, the Welsh were simply separate Celtic tribes and small kingdoms which spent the summer fighting each other, and the winter composing poetry music. Then they were conquered by the English king Edward I (reign 1272-1307). For seven hundred years Wales has been united with England, and through all this time England and Wales have formed one single, undifferentiated political and administrative unit. King Edward I's first son was born in Caernarvon Castle and in 1301 he gave him the title of '**Prince of Wales**'. Over the centuries, the son and **heir of the monarch** is given the title 'Prince of Wales', but today this title has no political significance. The Welsh people are **predominantly** Celtic and have always kept a strong consciousness of their **ethnic distinctness**, and the Welsh language, which is Celtic and has little relation with English, still survives. The population of Wales in 2018 is about 3,138,000, mostly living in the coal-mining and industrial region of the south round Cardiff and Swansea, but many Welsh people have migrated to England and tend to regard themselves as Welsh at least until the second generation.

Almost the whole of Wales is mountainous, with much good scenery. The coal-mining villages of the south are in deep valleys among high hills, and the hills become higher towards the north. The highest mountain in the north, **Snowdon**, is 3,560 feet (nearly 1,100 metres) above sea level, and is higher than any point in England.

Among the best-known Welsh characteristics are a certain romanticism and love of poetry and music. The annual **bardic festival** known as the National **Eisteddfod** (Welsh for a 'sitting') of Wales has a 1,200-year-old history; choral singing, and particularly the singing of hymns, is a national art. Because of this great love of music and the music of words, **the art of oratory** seems to flourish more among the Welsh than among any of the other British peoples, and this may explain the remarkable success of Welshmen in British politics---notably **Prime Minister David Lloyd George** and **Aneurin Bevan**.

Welsh, which is a Celtic language, very different from English, and the only really

distinctive national feature, has remained the first language only in some remote westerly country districts, in some of which three-quarters of the people can speak it. In 1535 Welsh was forbidden as an official language, but in 1965 it was given equality with English for all official use in Wales. Nowadays some extreme nationalists demand that only Welsh should be used in the law courts in Wales, and on the road signs. To those who speak it, and even to those who do not, the Welsh language symbolizes the whole Welsh history and culture. The study of Welsh is now compulsory in primary and secondary schools in Wales, and television and radio services in Wales give about half their time to Welsh language programmes.

After the **Welshman Henry Tudor** became the king of England, he and his son Henry VIII brought peace and order to the land of their fathers. They personally owned most of the border lands, so it was not difficult to divide Wales into twelve **shires** and to **organize local government** on the English pattern. Although all Wales was now ruled by the King of England, she was still separate from England and local custom was mixed with English law. Since the twentieth century, some **devolution** has already been achieved in the matter of administration. In 1951 **the office of Minister for Welsh Affairs** was created in the United Kingdom Cabinet, but until 1964 the office was held by a member of the Cabinet who was also in charge of one of the normal Departments (latterly Housing and Local Government). When the Labour Party came into power in 1964 Welsh **sentiment** was at last given one of the things it had for long demanded: a Welshman as full-time **Secretary of State for Wales**, with **a seat in the Cabinet**. In 1960 a new step was taken, in response to Welsh demands, by the establishment within the House of Commons of a Welsh Grand Committee to which matters concerning Wales may be referred for debate.

The National Assembly for Wales

In 1997, 21% of the population said they spoke Welsh and in much of the rural north and west, Welsh remains the first language of much of the population. The Government of Wales Act 1998 established the National Assembly for Wales, giving the Welsh people greater control over their own affairs. It is elected in a similar way to the Scottish **Parliament** and is responsible for similar areas of spending and administration. However, unlike Scotland, Wales does not have distinct legal or education systems. The Government of Wales Act 2006 introduced the ability of the National Assembly for Wales to make its own legislation on **devolved** matters such as health, education, social services, local government. These will be a new category of Welsh laws called Assembly Measures, which can be made under the legal authority granted by the UK Parliament. This should speed up the time it takes to make laws for Wales, as **the National Assembly for Wales** will be able to **scrutinise** and approve Welsh laws itself, rather than competing for space in the UK **Parliamentary** programme.

The Scots

In area, Scotland is more than half as big as England. Its population is, however, only about one-eighth as great as that of England. Scotland was an independent

kingdom, often at war with England, until 1603. It had never been entirely conquered by the Romans, who advanced some distance into what is now Scotland, but for most of their four centuries in Britain remained mainly behind the great wall which they built in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, from sea to sea across the island of Great Britain, a little way to the south of the modern boundary between England and Scotland. In 1603 King James VI of Scotland became King of England too, as James I, and from then onwards the countries were under the same **monarch**, though **the Act of Union** was not passed until 1707. This Act incorporated Scotland with England in the United Kingdom, but the Scots kept their own legal system, religion and administration and still keep them now. Thus Scotland has never been united with England in the same way as Wales.

On the whole Scottish national consciousness is cultural and sentimental, and not much concerned with language. **The Gaelic language**, a Celtic form, is still used rather than English among the people of some remote Highland districts, but elsewhere most of the people are not of Celtic origin and would have no possible reason for wanting to introduce the Gaelic, which would be an entirely foreign tongue. The English language is spoken all over Scotland with a variety of regional accents. Also, there are many words and phrases which are peculiar to Scottish use, and this is felt to maintain national distinctness quite enough. At the same time, though there is much talk about the Scottish nation, there seems to be a subtle and **spontaneous** movement toward cultural **assimilation** with England, with many of the upper classes adopting standard English pronunciation and sending their sons to English public schools and universities.

During the nineteenth century much industrial development, based at first on coal-mining, took place in the region round **Glasgow** and **Edinburgh**, and now well over half of the total population is in this small area, and most of it in the western part; although Edinburgh is the capital, Glasgow has for a long time been the chief centre of commerce and industry.

The most interesting and beautiful part of Scotland---and of the whole of Britain---is the north and west, or the commonly called 'the **highlands** and islands'. Great **sea-lochs** (or fjords or lakes) alternate with wild and empty hills, and on some of the lochs there are farms which can only be reached by boat. The massive peak of **Ben Nevis**, Britain's highest mountain, dominates this region, and towards its summit (4,400 feet or 1,300 metres high) some snow lies all the year. This country is becoming popular with summer holiday-makers. Most part of Scottish Highlands, like the English **Lake District**, are still without a single chair-lift or other device for taking people up to the hilltops. Even Ben Lomond, close to Glasgow, can still only be climbed on foot from the level of the famous Lock whose name it bears. Many lovers of the Highlands are thankful for this comparative lack of touristic development. They want the tourists, but they do not want to damage the unspoiled character of the country which is what makes it attractive.

Education has for a long time been more easily accessible to the people and more democratic than in England. Scotland already had four universities by 1582, while England had only two until well on in the nineteenth century. Three hundred years ago

nearly every Scottish community had a good school, and for a very long time after, while most students at Oxford and Cambridge were the sons of rich men amusing themselves, the four universities of Scotland were full of poor students who had no means or **inclination** to do anything but study. Some became school teachers or church servants, but many others took the road to England to seek their fortunes and to use the abilities which education had developed in them. The process is sometimes called the conquest of England by the Scots, and it has not stopped yet.

Many Scotsmen have gone to England to seek their fortunes, but many others have gone farther from home. It has been estimated that there are millions of Scottish **extraction** in North America, Australia and other parts of the world. Two hundred years ago the typical Scotsman, hard-working, serious-minded and economical, was very noticeably different from the Englishman of the privileged classes, who tended on the whole to admire extravagance and a certain **frivolity**, and this contrast may have much to do with the development of the Scottish reputation for **meanness**.

Scottish law, based on Roman law, remains distinct from English. The Scottish courts are organized quite differently from the English, and the law itself is different---though on some matters **legislation** affecting Scotland has made the law the same in the two countries. Most cases in Scotland are tried in **sheriff** courts, which have no exact equivalent in England. A Scottish jury consists of fifteen persons instead of twelve, and is not bound to find an accused person guilty or not guilty; it may find a charge 'not proven'. Very serious criminal cases are tried by judges of the Court of Session who travel round the country on circuit.

Scotland had its own parliament until 1707 when the two parliaments agreed on forming a simple parliament for Great Britain. From then on till 1997, Scotland has no separate parliament, but has an appropriate number of seats in the United Kingdom House of Commons. Following a referendum in Scotland in 1997, the Scotland Act 1998 provided for the re-establishment of the Scottish Parliament and Executive. There are 129 Members of the Scottish Parliament elected for four years by a voting system.

The Scottish Parliament's responsibilities include health, education and training, local government, housing, economic development, home affairs and many aspects of civil and criminal law, transport, the environment, agriculture, fisheries and forestry, and sport and the arts. The Scottish Parliament can pass legislation and allocate expenditure in all these areas. It can increase or decrease the basic rate of UK income tax by up to 3 pence in the pound. The responsibilities of the UK Parliament remain unchanged over economic and monetary policy, overseas affairs, defence and national security.

Chapter 2 Britain at War

In the late nineteenth century Britain kept out of foreign politics as much as possible. Europe was divided into two camps: France and Russia in one, Germany, Austria and Italy in the other. Britain favoured the second group so long as France threatened her interests in Africa and the Russians threatened her Indian border. But Germany was growing too strong. The various **German states** had been united under the King of Prussia after his conquest of France in 1870. He was now Emperor of all Germany. He was Queen Victoria's son-in-law, but his ambitions took no account of such a tie. Britain watched him with growing mistrust.

The Germans already had the best army in Europe. By 1901, when Victoria died, they had begun to build a very large navy, which was not needed to protect their trade. It could only have one purpose, to fight its British rival. Edward VII had never shared his mother's faith in the Emperor's goodwill, and Britain now openly made friends with France. She would not make a defence treaty, but she showed that her sympathy would be with the French if the Germans attacked them. Plans were made for an army of 150,000 men which could be ready to cross **the Channel** at a moment's notice. When war came in 1914, this force managed to arrive just in time to save Paris.

Britain had no quarrel with Germany, and public opinion was divided on the question of supporting France. If the Germans had made a direct attack, they might have taken Paris before anyone interfered. But they attacked through Belgium. Their Emperor did not believe that Britain would go to war for 'a bit of paper', which was his **scornful** description of Palmerston's treaty. (Around 1839 **Lord Palmerston**, the then **foreign secretary of Britain**, arranged a treaty in which the **Great Powers** promised to respect Belgium's independence) However, when he attacked Belgium, all Britain united against him, and half the nations of the world were soon fighting in the muddy ditches of France. Every part of the Empire immediately joined the British side, and three years later the United States followed their example. When the war was won, both sides had suffered immense losses. The Empire's forces had lost a million men, and Britain had spent all her wealth.

The war destroyed the power of **the Liberal party**, which had been in office for eight years when fighting started. During that time it had done much to tax the rich and to help the poor, especially the old and the workless. It had introduced insurance against illness and industrial accidents, and it had arranged regular medical examination of children. **Local councils** were given more power but less independence; they were helped by government money but they suffered government interference.

The House of Lords did not like the ever-increasing taxes. In 1909 they refused to pass the budget, which is the government's yearly plan for getting and spending money. It included a Land Tax which the Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, had put in on purpose, knowing that the majority of **land-owning lords** would resist it. It was a clever trap, and they fell straight into it. For centuries, custom had allowed them to refuse an ordinary bill; but this time they were refusing a budget because it was against

their own interests. It was time that their power was reduced. The next year Edward VII died, and a new election showed that the people supported the government. Edward's son, now George V, had to make the Lords change their minds. He threatened to make new Liberal lords. The country was relieved to see that the royal power could still be used to support its will, and the position of the crown was strengthened.

The war had been won by a united Liberal-Conservative government under Lloyd George, but it was followed by an unwise peace treaty. The spirit of revenge ruled France, which had suffered most, and Lloyd George would not listen to his more moderate advisers. The American quickly stopped taking an interest in the matter. An international parliament, called **the League of Nations**, was formed in Geneva; but America and Russia refused to join it. The severe treatment of Germany helped Hitler's rise to power, which the League was unable to stop.

The question of Irish independence was now settled at last. Protestant **Ulster** chose to remain in the United Kingdom. The rest of the island became a **dominion** until 1937, when it decided to leave the empire altogether and took the name of Eire. Eire kept out of the Second World War, but many of her men fought in the British forces.

Ulster has her own parliament in **Belfast** but she also sends twelve members to **the House of Commons**. **The Isle of Man** has its own parliament too, called **the House of Keys**. **The Channel Islands** are famous for their cattle, especially **Jersey and Guernsey**. They belonged to **William the Conqueror** and they still own their loyalty to **the crown**, not to any government in London. Many of their people still speak old Norman French.

The Irish settlement split Lloyd George's government, and in 1924 the Labour party took office for the first time. But they had not the necessary experience to guide the country at a time when all the world was in trouble.

The whole country was now so anxious to return to normal conditions that it took little notice of events in Europe. Only **Winston Churchill** had the courage to raise his voice in warning, and no one listened to him. The Americans still kept out of the League of Nations, which had no power to back up its views. Like everyone else, the British continued to believe Hitler's false promise of peace; Russia even made a treaty of friendship with him.

Hitler's broken promises included an attack on Poland, which Britain and France were bound by treaty to defend. But neither of them was armed in readiness for the Second World War, which began in September 1939. Within eight months France had fallen, and only Britain stood against Hitler's armies. The Empire supported her, but Russia and America still took no part in the struggle.

Then, in May 1940, Winston Churchill became **Prime Minister** of a government that combined all parties.

Later in the war, the army workshops had a saying: 'Difficult repairs are done at once; impossible repairs take a little longer'. Churchill had to make impossible repairs to his country's defences, and he made them at once. The British army of a quarter of a million men was rescued from the shores of **Dunkirk** (with a large part of the

French army also) by hundreds of little boats that sailed from every harbour of the south and east. It had to leave its arms behind, and the German army waited eagerly for orders to cross **the Channel** and to seize the unarmed island.

But how could they cross while **the Royal Navy** still guarded the seas, and **the Royal Air Force** guarded the skies? Hitler did not dare to bring out his navy. Instead, he sent his air force to destroy Britain's southern airfields and then London. He failed. In three months he lost over 2,000 aeroplanes. This was the Battle of Britain. It was won by the skill and courage of those who flew a few hundreds Spitfire and Hurricane fighters against Germany's thousands of more powerful machines. As Churchill said, 'Never...has so much been owed by so many to so few.'

But much was owed to Churchill himself. He formed a Home Guard. This was an army of citizens which would help to defend towns and villages if there was an enemy attack. Men and boys over seventeen armed themselves with any kind of weapon they could find. At the same time, Churchill's stirring speeches gave new hope and courage to the nation. They also influenced President Roosevelt of America, who was already planning to help Britain by sending arms.

'Hitler knows,' said Churchill, 'that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, will sink into a new Dark Age.'

Churchill was already planning the future. His aims, as he had said, were not only to defend Britain but also to set Europe free. While the German army waited to cross the Channel, he sent Britain's only **armoured division** round the south of Africa to the Suez Canal. Its duty was to prepare the way for those armies which would one day attack Hitler's empire from the south. The next year Hitler attacked Russia, and Japan attacked America; this gave Churchill two strong allies to help him finish the struggle.

When the war was over, Britain had to turn her attention to problems inside the Empire. Many of the peoples who had helped to win the war, now demanded their independence. Britain accepted their right to make this demand. She was already planning to turn the Empire into a **commonwealth** of free and equal members. The word *commonwealth* explains itself, for its members are united for their common profit.

Religious problems caused India's division into two new independent **states**, India and Pakistan, in 1947. The next year Ceylon also became independent. Other countries needed an urgent development programme to improve education, commercial production and public services before they were ready to stand on their own feet. This programme was soon carried out for Britain was pressed by the world opinion to hand over her responsibilities without delay. One by one, the former colonies became independent members of the British Commonwealth, and took their seats among **the United Nations**.

Chapter 3 Crown and People in the Early Twentieth Century

Victoria died in 1901 after six-four years as Queen. She had given the country a new idea of **royalty**. It was proud of her, as the head of a world-wide family of nations, but it also liked her simple tastes and orderly habits. Politically, her relations with the cabinet were correct and formal. She demanded to be kept informed of all that her government was doing. She discussed it with them. She objected to what she did not like. Often ministers accepted her advice, which was based on greater experience than theirs, but she left the decisions to them. It was fortunate for Britain that the growth of popular government was supported by closer understanding between crown and people.

Edward VII had been refused any share of royal duties by his mother while he was Prince of Wales. He now brought a new feeling of fashionable **gaiety** to public life. **The Victorians** had many good qualities, but they **were inclined to** be dull and serious. During the short **Edwardian** age, people could relax and began to enjoy life more light-heartedly.

It also produced a new fighting spirit among the nation's women. They already had the right to vote in local elections and to be members of **local government councils**. Why, they asked, could they not have the same rights **in respect of** parliament? Their **cause** was widely supported in parliament itself, but it was not helped by the violence of a small group of women who fought the police, chained themselves to lamp-posts outside ministers' houses, and threw bricks through the windows. When the war came, women proved in the arms factories that they could do men's work; when it ended, they were given the vote and the right to enter parliament.

King George V set the new fashion that keeps the royal family in daily touch with the people---visiting schools and hospitals, farms and factories. His **Jubilee Trust** provided playing-fields for children, for he had seen the dirty and ugly back-streets which formed the only playground for London's **cockney** children. London now has more than eight million people, but it has no more cheerful citizens than the cockneys, who are the natives of London's **east end**: in the worst moments of the last war, when their homes were destroyed by nightly air attacks, they still managed to keep their sense of humour.

When George VI was a young man, he used to run boy's holiday camps. He himself had only two daughters, Elizabeth and Margaret. He was quiet by nature and he never expected to become King. But his elder brother, Edward VIII, wanted to marry an American woman who had already been married twice. Since she could not be Queen, Edward did not want to be King. In December 1936, before he had been crowned, he left the country and his brother George took his place. Then war came. In spite of the government's advice, George VI refused to leave London. His daily visits to the forces, the factories and the damaged towns cheered his people everywhere, but he always returned to Buckingham Palace, his London home.

Elizabeth II was visiting Kenya when she became Queen in 1952 on her father's death. Like her father and grandfather, she has traveled all over the world to meet her

many peoples. She was brought up simply but carefully. Both she and her sister were **Girl Guides**, and during the war she received training in the women's branch of the army. Her marriage to Prince Philip of Greece in 1947 was extremely popular.

Philip is a descendant of Queen Victoria. He was brought up in Britain, and during the war he served with the Royal Navy. On his marriage he was given the title of Duke of Edinburgh. His great interest in science and industry, as well as in youth and sport, has fitted him to give the country a bold lead in matters outside politics.

Meanwhile, what was happening inside politics? The Labour party had become full-grown, and immediately after the war it had six years in office. It introduced a **national health service**, which had already been planned under Churchill's wartime government. It put the coal-mines and the railways under state control, and it aimed to extend this control to banking, insurance and all essential industry. The country liked many Labour ideas, but it did not quite trust the Labour to put them into practice without harmful effects. It saw that state control meant an army of government officials, with much waste of public money. After this first taste of Labour rule, the country put their Conservative rivals back into power for thirteen years before it let them try again. By then they had adopted more moderate ideas on government control.

British industry was built up by the personal efforts of hard-working men. They formed companies in which the public **bought shares**. Too often the management then passed into the hands of unsuitable friends and relatives. Bad employers harmed the industry, and the country, as the bad **trade unions** caused personal loss to the workers. The **shareholders** take even less interest in bad management than workers do in bad union leadership.

Though the problems of modern industrial relations are only slowly being solved, good wages and free social services have given the British worker a comfortable standard of living. His house may contain electric machines to wash clothes, to cook, to keep food cold, to heat the rooms. He can afford to wear good clothes, to drive a car, and to take his family for holidays abroad.

Such holiday travel has given him a closer personal interest in the affairs of other European countries, and this interest is reflected in the national press and in the schools. European languages---French, German, Spanish, Italian and Russian---are being more widely taught, not only in schools but in workers' evening classes.

Independence has loosened the ties of trade between the former colonies and Britain. This gives her the chance to play a fuller part in the commercial and industrial life of Europe. But her people are anxious not to weaken their friendship with the old dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which still attract many new British settlers every year.

In the meanwhile, Britain's children are growing up with a new outlook. To them, the empire is past history. They want Britain to be strong and respected, but they have no wish to be a World Power or to be responsible for keeping the peace in far-off places. Their international consciousness is expressed in support of world-wide causes like 'Save the Children', but their direct interests remain nearer home. Their future lies in closer union with the rest of Western Europe, where the English language is

already valued as a basis of commercial and political understanding between the nations of the world. In the common search for peaceful progress, they have much to offer and much to learn.

Chapter 4 Beveridge Report

Summary of Report by Sir William Beveridge
1942

ORIGIN AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

The survey, on which the recommendations of Sir William Beveridge's Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services are based, was **instituted** on 10th June, 1941.

The Committee's terms of reference were:

"To undertake, with special reference to the interrelation of the schemes, a survey of the existing national schemes of social insurance and allied services, including workmen's compensation and to make recommendations."

In January 1942, it was announced to be "within the power of the Committee to consider developments of National Insurance Schemes in the way of adding death benefits with any other risks which are at present not covered by such schemes."

The duty of survey was laid upon an interdepartmental committee. With the exception of the Chairman, Sir William Beveridge, its members were officials of the departments concerned with Social Security, namely Home Office, Ministry of Labour and National Service, Ministry of Pensions, Government Actuary, Ministry of Health, Treasury, Reconstruction **Secretariat**, Board of Customs and Excise, Assistance Board, Department of Health for Health, Registry of Friendly Societies and Office of the Industrial Assurance Commissioner.

The departmental officials acted as the Chairman's "advisers and assessors on the various technical and administrative matters with which they were severally concerned;" and the Report is the Report of Sir William Beveridge and not of the Committee. The Committee received evidence from more than a hundred organizations and individuals. A full list is given in Appendix C.; a selection of the **memoranda** submitted are to be printed in a separate volume.

SURVEY OF EXISTING SCHEMES

The immediate task of the Committee was to attempt a comprehensive survey of the whole field of social insurance and allied services, which have been developed during the last 50 years, and to show what provision is now made and how it is made for the different needs of the population.

The survey thus included health insurance, unemployment insurance, old age pensions, widows and orphans pensions, workmen's compensation for industrial accident and industrial disease, non-contributory and supplementary pensions for old age, public assistance and blind assistance. It does not attempt to deal with other social provisions such as housing, education or industrial welfare.

The results of this survey are set out in Appendix B. of the Report, which gives a short history with statistical details of the existing social insurance schemes. They show the gratifying fact that "provision for most of the many varieties of need through interruption of earnings and other causes that may arise in modern industrial communities has already been made in Britain on a scale not surpassed and hardly

rivaled in any other country in the world. In one respect only, namely limitation of medical service, both in the range of treatment which is provided as of right and in respect of the classes of persons to whom it is provided, does Britain's achievement fall seriously short of what has been accomplished elsewhere. It falls short, also, in its provision for cash benefit for **maternity** and funerals and through the **defects** of its system for workmen's compensation. The Report suggests that the existing provisions for social security require to be unified and their administration to be simplified so that certain present deficiencies, **anomalies** and lack of co-ordination may be removed.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CHANGES

The greater part of the Report is devoted to recommendations and changes proposed to that end. In making these proposals, the Report "uses experience but is not tied by experience;" the scheme is in some ways a revolution, 'but in more important ways it is a natural development from the past.' It suggests much that is new, it retains basic features which are familiar. In particular the finance of the Plan for Social Security rests on the present three part scheme of contribution, from workers, employers and the State, which was established in 1911, has been in force for thirty years and has won general acceptance.

The three **assumptions**: In the words of the Report no satisfactory scheme of social security can be devised except on the following assumptions:

(A) Children's allowances for children up to the age of 15, or if in full-time education up to the age of 16;

(B) Comprehensive health and **rehabilitation** services for prevention and cure of disease and restoration of capacity for work, available to all members of the community;

(C) Maintenance of employment, that is to say avoidance of mass unemployment.

These assumptions are discussed in Part VI of the Report. Sir William Beveridge uses the term Social Security to **denote** "the securing of an income to take the place of earnings when they are interrupted by unemployment, sickness or accident, to provide for retirement through age, to provide against loss of support by the death of another person, and to meet exceptional expenditures, such as those connected with birth, death and marriage. Primarily social security means security of income up to a minimum, but the provision of an income should be associated with treatment designed to bring the interruption of earnings to an end as soon as possible."

Social Security as **envisaged** in this Report is **pre-eminently** not a plan "for giving to everybody something for nothing and without trouble." It is a plan to secure to each citizen an income adequate to satisfy a natural minimum standard "on condition of service and contribution and in order to make and keep men fit for service."

The changes suggested therefore "**accord with** two views as to the lines on which the problem of income maintenance should be approached;" firstly, "that benefit in return for contributions rather than free allowances from the State is what the people of Britain desire." Secondly, "whatever money is required for provision of insurance benefits should come from a Fund to which the **recipients** have contributed.....".

The insured persons should not feel “that income for idleness, however caused, can come from a bottomless purses....The place for direct expenditure and organization by the State is in maintaining employment of the labour and other productive resources of the country.”

UNIFICATION

The twenty-three changes proposed in the Report are concerned, on the one hand to unify existing schemes, and on the other hand to extend these existing schemes to cover new classes or persons and new types of risks.

As regards unification, Sir William Beveridge suggests that there should be a Ministry of Social Security which would take over the duties of present Government Departments in respect of health, pensions, and unemployment insurance; the work of the Assistance Board; and the duties of local government authorities in respect of public assistance.

One stamp on one insurance document, payable weekly, would cover all social insurance schemes. The rates of benefit and the conditions of contribution and benefit would, generally speaking, be **assimilated**.

EXTENSION

As regards extension of social insurance, the plan covers all citizens without upper income limit, but the contributions made and types of benefit received would vary according to different needs of the six classes into which the population has been divided. The classes are:

- I. Employees (Insured by weekly contributions on employment book)
- II. Other gainfully occupied, including employers, traders and independent workers of all kinds. (Insured by contribution on occupation card.)
- III. Housewives, that is married women of working age. (Insured on marriage through housewife's policy.)
- IV. Others of working age who are not gainfully occupied, as for example students above the age of 16, persons of private means, and unmarried women engaged in domestic duties not for pay. (Insured by contributions on Security Card.)
- V. Persons below working age.
- VI. Persons retired above working age. (Insured by contributions paid during working age.)

All classes will be insured for medical treatment and funeral grant; children's allowances will be payable for Class V; retirement pensions to Class VI. The benefits available to married women, Class III are a special feature of the Plan for Social Security and are explained in paragraphs 339-347. Housewives are recognized as a distinct insurance class with benefits adjusted to their special needs. These include, in all cases, marriage grant, **maternity grant**, **widowhood** and separation provisions and retirement pensions. Share of the husband's unemployment for disability benefits and maternity grants differ, for reasons explained in the Report, between housewives who have no occupation outside their homes and those who are gainfully occupied.

FINANCE

The Plan for Social Security is based on the contributory principle. The Report considers the alternative of financing the whole scheme from general taxation but rejects this method in favour of the contributory principle. Only two items which enter into the Social Security Budget will be financed wholly out of taxation; these are children's allowances and national assistance. All the cash benefits other than these two items will be financed out of a Social Insurance Fund into which will be paid the contributions of insured persons, employers and an Exchequer grant. There will also be paid from this Social Insurance Fund a contribution towards the total cost of the health and **rehabilitation** services.

The total expenditure on all items covered by the Social Security Budget is estimated at £ 697 million in 1945, rising to £ 858 million in 1965. Details of the expenditure are given in Table XII. (Page 104 of the Report)

Chapter 5 Commonwealth and Decolonization

I. Statute of Westminster, 11th December 1931 (Chapter 4)

An **Act** to give effect to certain resolutions passed by Imperial Conferences held in the years 1926 and 1930.

Whereas the delegates of His Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom, the **Dominion** of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State and Newfoundland, at Imperial Conferences holden at Westminster in the years of 1926 and 1930 did **concur** in making the declarations and resolutions set forth in the Reports of the said Conferences:

And whereas it is meet and proper to set out by way of **preamble** to this Act that, inasmuch as the Crown is the symbol of the free association of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and as they are united by a common **allegiance** to the Crown, it would be **in accord with** the established constitutional position of all the members of the Commonwealth in relation to one another that any **alteration** in the law touching the Succession to the Throne or the Royal Style and Titles shall hereafter require the **assent** as well of the Parliaments of all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom:

And whereas it is in accord with the established constitutional position that no law hereafter made by the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall extend to any of the said Dominions as part of the law of that Dominion otherwise than at the request and with the **consent** of that Dominion:

And whereas the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State and Newfoundland have **severally** requested and consented to the submission of a measure to the Parliament of United Kingdom for making such provision with regard to the matters **aforesaid** as is hereafter in this Act contained:

Now, therefore, be it **enacted** by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament **assembled**, and by the authority of the same, as follows:---

1. In this Act the expression "**Dominion**" means any of the following Dominions, that is to say, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State and Newfoundland.

2.---(1) The Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, shall not apply to any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion.

3. It is hereby declared and **enacted** that the Parliament of a Dominion has full power to make laws having **extra-territorial** operation.

4. No Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this Act shall extend, or **be deemed to** extend, to a Dominion as part of the law of that Dominion, unless it is expressly declared in that Act that that Dominion has requested, and **consented to**, the enactment thereof.

...

11. Notwithstanding anything in the Interpretation Act, 1889, the expression "Colony" shall not, in any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this Act, include a Dominion or any Province or State forming part of a Dominion.

12. This Act may be cited as the **Statute** of Westminster 1931.

II. The Commonwealth

The origins of the Commonwealth lie in Britain's former colonial empire. Until 1949, the member states of today's Commonwealth were united through common **allegiance** to the British Crown. After the Second World War, many countries sought their independence. Soon after attaining independence in 1947, India declared that it wished to adopt a republican constitution, but also wanted to remain within the Commonwealth. This was accepted in the London Declaration agreed at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in 1949, provided that India accepted King George VI as "the symbol of the free association of the independent Member Nations and as such Head of the Commonwealth". Following his death, the Commonwealth leaders recognised Queen Elizabeth II in that **capacity**.

Over the next two decades, British rule ended in many parts of Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, the Mediterranean and the Pacific. With a few exceptions (such as **Myanmar**, formerly known as **Burma**), the newly independent countries joined the Commonwealth and recognised King George VI and, following his death, Queen Elizabeth II, as Head of the Commonwealth.

The London Declaration made it possible for the Asian and African states of the former Empire, most of which wished to become republics, to remain within the Commonwealth upon attaining independence. This has led to the development of the contemporary Commonwealth.

Throughout Queen Elizabeth II's reign, the Commonwealth has grown from just eight nations to a voluntary association of 54 independent countries representing two billion people. Member countries of the Commonwealth can therefore have different **constitutions**, in practice the difference is normally of no importance: a republic with a president as Head of State (such as India and South Africa), an **indigenous** monarchy (for example, Lesotho, Malaysia, Swaziland and Tonga), a **sultanate** (Brunei), an elected **Paramount Chieftaincy** (Western Samoa), or a **realm** recognising The Queen as Sovereign (for example the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and **Barbados**). A Commonwealth Realm is a country which has The Queen as its Monarch. There are 14 Commonwealth Realms in addition to the UK.

As a symbolic and unifying Head, the Queen personally reinforces the links by which the Commonwealth joins people together from around the world. One of the ways of strengthening these connections is through regular Commonwealth visits. Besides, the Queen keeps in touch with Commonwealth developments through regular contact with the Commonwealth Secretary-General and her **Secretariat**. This is the Commonwealth's central organisation. Based in London, it co-ordinates many Commonwealth activities. Each year, The Queen attends the Commonwealth Day

celebrations in London. Since 1977, Commonwealth Day has been celebrated throughout the Commonwealth on the second Monday in March.

Since 1971, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) has been held every two years, at locations throughout the Commonwealth. The Queen is usually present in the **host** country, during which she has a series of private meetings with the Commonwealth countries' leaders, attends a CHOGM reception and dinner, at which she makes a speech. The Queen has been present at every CHOGM since 1973 to witness the tremendous change and progress the Commonwealth has made with every meeting.

The term 'Commonwealth' was first used by British Liberal politician Lord Rosebery in Adelaide, Australia, in 1884. During a famous speech, he referred to the British Empire as 'a Commonwealth of Nations'. The Commonwealth symbolises the transformation of the Crown from an **emblem** of dominion into a symbol of free and voluntary association.

Chapter 6 Queen's Role in Government

As Head of State The Queen has to remain strictly neutral with respect to political matters. By **convention**, The Queen does not vote or stand for election, however Her Majesty does have important ceremonial and formal roles in relation to the government of the UK. The Queen's duties include opening each new **session** of Parliament, granting **Royal Assent to legislation**, and approving **Orders and Proclamations** through the **Privy Council**.

The Queen also has a special relationship with the Prime Minister, retaining the right to appoint and also meeting with him or her on a regular basis. In addition to playing a specific role in the UK Parliament based in London, The Queen has formal roles with relation to **the devolved assemblies** of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Queen and Parliament

The Queen has an important formal and ceremonial relationship with Parliament. The formal phrase 'Crown (or Queen) in Parliament' is used to describe the British legislature, which consists of the Sovereign, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Of these three different elements, the Commons, a majority of whom normally supports the elected Government of the day, has the dominant political power.

The Queen's role in Parliament is:

- **Assenting to** Bills passed by Parliament, on the advice of Ministers;
- **Giving audiences to** Ministers, at which Her Majesty may be consulted, encourage and warn;
- **Summoning** new Parliaments and, on the advice of her Government, appointing the date of its first meeting;
- Opening and closing (**proroguing**) each session of Parliament

The role of the Sovereign in the **enactment** of legislation is today purely formal, although The Queen has the right 'to be consulted, to encourage and to warn' her ministers **via** regular audiences with the Prime Minister. The Sovereign's assent is required to all **bills** passed by Parliament in order for them to become law. Royal Assent (**consenting to** a measure becoming law) has not been refused since 1707.

It is also a long established convention that The Queen is asked by Parliament to provide **consent** (which is different to assent) for the debating of bills which would affect the **prerogative** or interests of the Crown. Where Queen's Consent is given it is signified in each House of Parliament and recorded in Hansard. Consent has not been withheld in modern times, except on the advice of Government.

In the annual State Opening of Parliament ceremony, The Queen opens Parliament in person, and **addresses** both Houses in The Queen's Speech. Neither House can proceed to public business until The Queen's Speech has been read. This speech is drafted by the Government and not by The Queen. It outlines the Government's policy

for the coming session of Parliament and indicates forthcoming legislation.

Under the terms of the Fixed-term Parliaments Act (2011), each Parliament consists of five twelve-month sessions. While each session is opened by The Queen in person at the State Opening, the session is closed (prorogued) in The Queen's name with a speech read in the House of Lords, and in the presence of the Commons, by the Leader of the Lords.

When Parliament is summoned after a Royal proclamation there must, according to the Representation of the People Act 1918, be a period of at least twenty days before Parliament meets. This period can be extended, but only for fourteen days, according to the Prorogation Act 1867.

There is only one occasion on which Parliament meets without a Royal summons, and that is when the Sovereign has died. In such circumstances, the **Succession** to the Crown Act 1707 provides that, if Parliament is not already sitting, it must immediately meet and sit.

The Meeting of Parliament Act 1797 provides that, if the Sovereign dies after Parliament has been dissolved, the immediately preceding Parliament sits for up to six months, if not prorogued or dissolved before then.

The Queen and Prime Minister

The Queen has a special relationship with the Prime Minister, the senior political figure in the British Government, regardless of their political party. Although she is a constitutional monarch who remains politically neutral, The Queen retains the ability to give a regular audience to a Prime Minister during his or her term of office.

The Queen gives a weekly audience to the Prime Minister at which she has a right and a duty to express her views on Government matters. If either The Queen or the Prime Minister are not available to meet, then they will speak by telephone. These meetings, as with all communications between The Queen and her Government, remain strictly **confidential**. Having expressed her views, The Queen **abides** by the advice of her ministers.

After a general election, the appointment of a Prime Minister is the prerogative of the Sovereign. In appointing a Prime Minister, the Sovereign is guided by constitutional conventions. The main requirement is to find someone who can command the confidence of the House of Commons. This is normally secured by appointing the leader of the party with an overall majority of seats in the Commons, but there could still be exceptional circumstances when The Queen might need to exercise **discretion** to ensure that her Government is carried on.

When a potential Prime Minister is called to Buckingham Palace, The Queen will ask him or her whether he or she will form a government. To this question, two responses are realistically possible. The most usual is acceptance.

If the situation is uncertain, as it was with Sir Alec Douglas-Home in 1963, a potential Prime Minister can accept an **exploratory commission**, returning later to report either failure or, as occurred in 1963, success. After a new Prime Minister has been appointed, **the Court Circular** will record that "the Prime Minister Kissed Hands on Appointment". This is not **literally** the case. In fact, the actual kissing of

hands will take place later, in Council.

There have been thirteen British Prime Ministers during The Queen's reign:

- Winston Churchill 1951-1955
- Sir Anthony Eden 1955-1957
- Harold Macmillan 1957-1963
- Sir Alec Douglas-Home 1963-1964
- Harold Wilson 1964-70 and 1974-1976
- Edward Heath 1970-1974
- James Callaghan 1976-1979
- Margaret Thatcher 1979-1990
- John Major 1990-1997
- Tony Blair 1997-2007
- Gordon Brown 2007-2010
- David Cameron 2010-2016
- Theresa May 2016-2019
- Boris Johnson 2019-Present

The Queen and Privy Council

The Queen is Head of the Privy Council. This is the oldest form of **legislative assembly** still functioning in the UK, responsible for a number of executive responsibilities. Its origins date from the **court** of the Norman kings, which met in private - hence the description 'privy'.

Until the seventeenth century, the king and his Council were the **government**, with Parliament's role limited to voting funds. Today, in a system of constitutional monarchy, the Privy Council retains some limited, formal functions. For example, the Privy Council is concerned with the affairs of **Chartered Bodies**, the 400 or so institutions, charities and companies who are **incorporated** by Royal Charter. The Privy Council also has an important part to play regarding certain UK **statutory** regulatory bodies covering a number of professions (mainly in the healthcare field) and in the world of higher education.

The Privy Council is involved in the arrangements for the appointment of the High **Sheriffs** of England and Wales, except for the **Duchy** of Lancaster and Cornwall, and for many Crown and Privy Council appointments to governing bodies. The Privy Council also has certain judicial functions. It is the court of final **appeal** for the UK overseas territories and **Crown Dependencies**, and for those Commonwealth countries that have retained the appeal to Her Majesty in Council, including Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize and Tuvalu.

The Privy Council meets on average once a month, at Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, or, occasionally, Balmoral. Councils are held by The Queen and are attended by Ministers and the Clerk of the Council. At each meeting the Council will obtain The Queen's formal approval to a number of Orders which have already been discussed and approved by Ministers, much as Acts of Parliament become law through the giving of the Royal Assent after having been debated in Parliament.

In addition, The Queen approves Proclamations through the Privy Council. These

are formal notices which cover issues such as the summoning of a new Parliament, **coinage** and the dates of certain Bank Holidays. Privy Council meetings are reported in **the Court Circular**, along with the names of Ministers attending (usually four in number).

The Orders made at each Council are in the **public domain**, and each bears the date and place of the Council at which it was made. There is therefore nothing at all 'secret' about Privy Council meetings today. There are 400 Privy **Counsellors**. They consist of all members of the Cabinet, a number of middle-ranking government Ministers, leaders of the opposition parties, senior judges and some appointments from the Commonwealth.

Chapter 7 The Working of the House of Commons

Government in Britain is called '**parliamentary government**', but that expression no longer means the same thing as it did a hundred years ago. Then, it was true to say that the ministers held office only for so long as they continued to be supported by a majority in the House of Commons; now the possibility that they should be defeated in the House of Commons is normally so small that the Government's vulnerability in 1974 and 1977-79 was exceptional. Nevertheless, the whole system still has its centre in Parliament, and can only be described through its working Parliament.

The two Houses of Parliament, the Lords and the Commons, share the same building, **the Palace of Westminster**. The present buildings of the Palace, including the Commons **Chamber** itself, were badly damaged in the **air-raid** in 1941, and have been rebuilt since 1945.

The Commons occupy the north part of the Palace, the Lords the south end. The part of the Palace of Westminster used by members and officials of the House of Commons includes some hundreds of rooms, among which are the library, restaurants, committee rooms, and private or shared office rooms for **M. P.s**.

The Commons debating chamber is only one of the many rooms of the Palace, but is usually called '**the House**'. It has seats for only about 370 of its total membership of over 600. The rebuilt chamber is the same size and shape as the old one was, though it has modern air-conditioning, lighting and microphones. Members do not have special seats. On big occasions the chamber is overcrowded, but most of the time the benches provide more than enough room for all the members who are present. The shape and arrangement of the House are of great political significance. It is **rectangular**, with the Speaker's chair at one end, and with five straight rows of benches running down one side along its whole length, and five rows on the other side, so that the rows of benches face each other across the floor. One side of the House is occupied by the Government and the members who support it, the other, facing them, by Her Majesty's **Opposition**---all the Members who are opposed to the Government of the day, and who hope that at the next general election their party will be in a majority so that they can form the Government. The arrangement of the benches in the House of Commons suggests a two-party system, and the Leader of the Opposition receives a salary from state funds as if he were a minister.

Members of the House of Commons have been paid salaries since 1911. The rate in early 1980s has been nearly twice the average industrial worker's wage. Since 1965 the allowances for travel, living in London, and paying part-time secretaries and research assistants have all been improved. The Library has been extended; its greatly-increased staff help M. P.s to get the information they need for their work. But many M. P.s say that they need to have outside earnings, through journalism, work in the law courts or business, to enable them to live at the standard they expect.

Anyone who is interested in what happens in Parliament can buy a copy of the **stenographic record**, which is put on sale at big newspaper shops and the shops of Her Majesty's **Stationery Office**, the government printer. This 'Official Report' is

popularly called '**Hansard**', because Thomas Hansard started to produce these reports privately in 1803. He began this publication **in defiance of** a parliamentary rule forbidding any such reporting, but what began as a forbidden venture has become part of Parliament's own services. 'Hansard' is now available on the website of Parliament.

Each chamber has **galleries**, parts of which are kept for the use of the public, who are described, in the language of Parliament, as '**strangers**'. It is usually possible to get a seat in the strangers' gallery of the House of Lords at any time, but it is not so easy to get into the House of Commons gallery, particularly in the summer, when London is full of visitors. In order to get a place for the beginning of a day's business at 2:30 p. m., in time for the question hour, it was usually necessary to write in advance to a Member of Parliament for a ticket, though foreign visitors could sometimes get tickets through their embassies. Now the application is open to public via the website of the Parliament. A person who comes without a reservation has usually to wait for a long time, one, two or three hours, until a place becomes free, though very late in the evening it is often possible to get in without waiting.

Standing Orders set out the main formal rules of procedure, but not by any means all the actual rules, many of which are practices established by custom and precedent. In 1844 Sir Thomas Erskine May, who was then Clerk of the House of Commons, published his great *Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*. Revised editions of the Treatise have been published from time to time. It is used and followed in other Parliaments of the Commonwealth besides the British. As anyone who reads it can quickly see, very many of the rules are derived from individual decisions of **successive Speakers**. A Speaker's decision on some particular point may establish a **precedent** in much the same way as a Court's decision on a matter of law. So the **office** of the Speaker (or President of the Chamber) has a special importance.

The choice of a new Speaker is made by a vote of the House after the party leaders have consulted their supporters and privately agreed beforehand on a particular person. Once a man has been made Speaker he is customarily reappointed to his office in each new Parliament, even if the majority in the House has changed, until he wishes to retire. When he accepts office as Speaker he is expected to **renounce** all party politics for the rest of his life, this means that the people of his **constituency** have no normal **partisan** representative in Parliament. When he retires he is at once made a **peer**, and goes to the House of Lords. Three other members hold office as **deputy-speakers**, and they take turns at occupying the Chair. The three deputies abstain from all party activity for so long as they hold office, but may---and sometimes do---return to ordinary political activity after a time.

The centre rule of procedure is that every debate must relate to a specific proposal, or '**motion**'. Some Member **moves** (proposes) a motion; the House debates it and finally decides whether to agree or to disagree with. A motion may propose that the House should take some action (for example, give a 'second reading' to a bill), or that it should express some opinion. When a motion has been moved, another Member may propose to '**amend**' it, and in that case his proposal is debated. When the house

has decided on the amendment it goes back to the original motion, which is now in a new form if an amendment to it has been accepted. A debate ends either (1) when every Member who wants to speak has done so, or (2) at a time fixed in advance either by informal agreement between the parties or by a vote of the House (that is, by the Government without the agreement of the Opposition), or (3) when the House, with the Speaker's consent, votes that it shall end.

At the end of every debate the Speaker puts the question whether or not to accept the motion that has been debated. If there is disagreement, there is a '**division**' and Members vote by walking through corridors called '**lobbies**', being counted as they do so. The names of Members voting are recorded and published. **The 'Aye' (yes) lobby** runs down one side of the outside wall of the chamber, **the 'No' lobby** down the other side. Six minutes after the beginning of the division the doors leading into the lobbies are locked. The practice of allowing six minutes before Members must enter their lobbies gives enough time for them to come from any part of the Palace of Westminster. Bells ring all over the building to summon Members to the chamber to vote. Members often vote without having heard a debate, and perhaps without knowing exactly what is the question; they know which way to vote because **Whips** (or party managers) of the parties stand outside the doors, and Members vote almost automatically with their parties.

The House of Commons meets every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday at 2:30 in the afternoon, and normally sits until 10:30 p. m., although often it may continue to sit later still---often until eleven or twelve, and occasionally until one or two o'clock in the morning or even all through the night. On Fridays it meets at 9:30 in the morning and finishes at three p. m. A light at the top of the clock tower, where the famous Big Ben strikes, is kept on for so long as the House is sitting.

Many Members go to their constituencies, whether their homes are there or not, during the weekends. They need to see their local party organizers from time to time, and to be available to citizens who wish to discuss **grievances** or other problems. They also make speeches, not only in their **constituencies** but in other places too. On Sundays they can try to arrange things so that they can be with their families. But they also have holidays of about four weeks over Christmas, two weeks each at Easter and **Whitsun**, and about eleven weeks---from early August to mid-October---in the summer.

The life of Parliament is divided into periods called '**sessions**'. At the end of every session Parliament is '**prorogued**'; this means that all business which has not been completed is abandoned, and Parliament cannot meet again until it is formally summoned by the Queen. Every new session begins with a clean **slate**. A session normally lasts for about a year, from late October of one year to about the same date of the next year, though if a general election is held in the spring or summer the normal rhythm of the sessions is interrupted.

The beginning of a new session, called '**the State Opening of Parliament**', is a fine ceremonial occasion, beginning with the royal carriage procession from Buckingham Palace to the Palace of Westminster. **The Household Cavalry** are there, also the Lord Great Chamberlain, Gold Stick in Waiting, the Master of the Horse, the

Gentlemen at Arms, the Yeomen of the Guard and the Ladies of the Bedchamber, and of course the **trumpeters**, the crowds along the **proceSSIONal route**, and now the television cameras. The ceremony takes place in the House of Lords, with a few leading members of the House of Commons standing crowded together at the end of the chamber opposite to the **Throne**, within the four walls of the room, but **technically** outside the 'House of Lords' itself.

The Queen takes her place on the throne and reads out the 'Queen's Speech', which is a document, about a thousand words in length, prepared by the Government, in which the Government gives a summary of the things which it intends to do during the session which is about to begin. The members of the House of the Commons then go back to their own chamber, and a member of the Government party proposes that a humble address should be presented to the Queen to thank her for her gracious speech. A debate on this proposal then begins, and lasts for five or six days; it is really a succession of debates on particular aspects of the Government's policy as set out in the Queen's Speech. Usually the Opposition propose to add to the address to the Queen some expressions of regret about some part of the Speech or about some omissions from it; at the end of each debate there may be a vote of the Opposition's amendment. If the Government lost such a vote it would **presumably** have to resign or ask for a general election.

Chapter 8 The Parliamentary Day

Except on Friday, each day's business begins, after prayers and some minor **preliminaries** which take about five minutes, with 'Question Time'. This is a period of about fifty-five minutes, ending at 3:30 p. m., during which Members may address questions to ministers, which ministers normally answer, although they are not obliged to do so. At 3:30 p. m. any minister who has a statement to make, or any other Member who wishes to make a personal statement, says what he has to say and questions may be asked about the statement; also various other things may be done. Exciting but brief arguments often take place at this moment, and the House is usually rather full.

One any day the **miscellaneous** items which begin at 3:30 p. m. may take together no time at all, or ten minutes, or perhaps half an hour or an hour. When they are finished, the main business of the day begins, and normally continues until 10 p. m., which under **the Standing Orders** is the hour at which the business should end; sometimes, however, the House has already decided at 3:30 p. m. to allow the main business to continue after 10 p. m. Then there are various special types of business which may be taken after 10 p. m., even under the Standing Orders; and finally, when everything else is finished, thirty minutes are allowed for any Member to make a speech on some subject '**on the adjournment**', and for the appropriate minister to reply to him.

The question hour at the beginning of each day's **sitting** is the most widely-known procedural device of the British House of Common. This form of procedure was not created or invented; during the early part of the nineteenth century some Members sometimes addressed questions to ministers and received answers, and gradually the practice became so popular that Standing Orders were introduced to regulate the process and to give questions to ministers a definite place in the daily timetable. Two features of this procedure are mainly responsible for its usefulness and success: the use made of the supplementary question and the shortness of all the questions and answers. From thirty to fifty questions and up to a hundred supplementaries are asked and answered during the hour each day.

Every question must be handed to the officials of the House in writing at least 48 hours before the answer is to be given. The officials transmit the questions very quickly to the ministers who will have to answer them, and the answers are prepared by civil servant. For the sake of convenience, questions are not answered exactly in the order in which they have been asked. An informal **rota** of ministers is arranged, and each day two or three or more ministers deal in turn with the questions to themselves which have accumulated during the period---normally one or two weeks---since they last had their turns at answering. Thus on a typical day there may be eight questions for the minister who is first to answer, twenty for the second, and so on. The Prime Minister is outside the rota; he answers questions addressed to him (on general policy) at 3:15 p. m. on two days a week.

All the questions for answer on a particular day are printed, together with the

names of the **interrogators**, on the day's programme-sheet (called the '**Order Paper**'), and each question has a serial number. The Speaker begins the proceedings by calling out the name of the Member who is to ask the first question, and that Member simply stands and says 'Question No.1'. The minister to whom it is addressed then reads out the reply (or, possibly, gives the reply without reading). Then the Member who asked the question may ask a 'supplementary' question asking for further **elucidation**, and the minister is expected to reply at once to that also; he and his civil servants have tried to foresee all possible supplementaries, and to be ready with answers. Then other Members may also ask further supplementary questions, and so on until the Speaker decides that it is time to go on to the next question on the paper. He does this by calling out the name of the Member who is to ask Question No. 2. The Speaker has to try to keep down the number of supplementaries enough to allow a reasonable number of questions to be dealt with, but not so much that ministers are excessively protected against awkward supplementaries. This is a very difficult task.

It is not at all easy to classify or analyse parliamentary questions. Some are asked for the purpose of embarrassing the Government, some in order to try to persuade ministers to adopt new courses of action, either in dealing with individual cases or in their general policies. Certainly everybody knows that if any official anywhere in the administration does anything stupid or harsh, it is quite likely that the person **aggrieved** will write to his Member of Parliament, who will first write or talk to the minister privately about the case, and then, if it seems that justice has not been done, ask a question in all the publicity of the House of Commons. So question time is not only interesting, besides often being a good opportunity for the display of skill and wit; it also helps in a very positive way to prevent the administrative machine from working without due humanity.

If a Member is dissatisfied with a minister's answers, it is quite easy for him to raise the subject again, **at greater length**, not by putting down another question for a later day but by putting down his name to speak about it during the final half-hour '**debate on the adjournment**' at the end of some future day's business. Then he will have time to develop his complaints more thoroughly; but he will have the disadvantage that there will probably be only a few Members present to listen to him. If there is a really serious scandal and there is real urgency about the matter, he may even be able to make use of the procedure which allows the planned order of business to be changed so as to allow about three hours to be spent at once, or on the next day, in debating something that must be debated quickly if at all. This procedure was for a time much restricted, but has now been made less difficult.

There are always more questions asked by members of the Opposition party than by supporters of the Government. Ministers do not address questions to their own colleagues, but it is commonly accepted that a member of the Government's party who does not hold any office ought not to hesitate to ask a question, even if it will be embarrassing to his own minister, if he thinks that there is good reason to ask it. In fact, there are always some Members on the Government **benches** who are readier to ask awkward questions than the majority of their colleagues. The House of Commons,

like any group, always includes some **personalities** on both sides who are more forward than the average; it seems that in general some fifty or sixty Members together ask about half of all the questions, while 200 others hardly ever ask any at all.

After question time and the short items of business which sometimes follow it, the House of Commons goes on to the main debate of the day, to which it can usually give about six hours. Sometimes there are two or three short debates in succession, but usually one debate lasts for the whole of the time available.

In a typical session lasting one year the House sits on about 160 days. On twenty-four of these days the subject of discussion is chosen by 'private Members'---that is by individuals, neither the Government nor the Opposition; twenty-eight days must be given nominally to discussing the Government's requests for authority to spend money---though in fact these twenty-eight days are really days on which the Opposition chooses the subject of debate; about six to ten days are needed for discussion of taxation, six, as we have seen, for the debate on the Queen's Speech, and a further fifteen or twenty days for a great variety of matters which have to be fitted into the year's programme. There remain, usually about sixty days for discussion of the bills (proposals for new laws or changes in old laws) which the Government wants to have passed.

There is no formal steering committee to arrange the order of business; except on the twenty-four 'private Members' days' which are now allowed in each session, the decision how the time is to be allotted is made at private and informal meetings between the Chief Whips, or party managers, of the Government and Opposition parties. Each Thursday at 3:30 p. m. or a little latter, the Leader of the House (always a prominent minister) announces the programme of business for the following week, and although members may then complain briefly about the shape of the programme, they make their complaints mainly in order to get publicity for their own ideas which are not to be debated.

On a typical day the main debate lasts from about 3:45 or 4 p. m. until 10 p. m. It is opened by a minister or by an Opposition spokesman, as the case may be. If the first speaker is a member of the Government, it is most probably the minister in charge of the department immediately concerned with the topic which is to be discussed. He speaks from the place on the Government front bench which is opposite the '**dispatch box**'---a kind of reading-desk on the long table which stands in front of the Speaker and between the two front benches. The minister thus faces the Opposition and has his back towards his own supporters. His speech will probably last for thirty or forty minutes, or perhaps even longer. When he has finished, the Opposition spokesman makes his speech, of about the same length, from the place in front of the similar dispatch box which stands on the Opposition side of the table. Afterwards the debate is continued by ordinary Members (collectively called 'unofficial' or 'private' members, or sometimes 'back-benchers') until a time, probably nine o'clock, at which it will have been agreed that a second Opposition spokesman will begin a speech to **wind up the debate** for his party. Then at 9:30 p. m. a second Government spokesman will have his turn and when he has finished the debate is ended.

There are thus about four hours on such a typical day, from about five until nine in the evening, during which back-benchers may make their speeches. The average speech lasts for about fifteen minutes (though there is no formal time limit), so about fifteen Members are able to speak in a typical debate. They speak as they are called upon by the Speaker or Deputy-Speaker, who always calls upon Members from the two sides of the House alternately, so far as possible. There is no predetermined order of speaking; as soon as a Member on the Government side has finished, all the Opposition Members who want to intervene stand up in the hope of being called, and the Speaker calls on one of them. He has absolute **discretion** in his choice. He may give preference to a Member he knows to have special knowledge of the subject under discussion, or to one who represents some particular minority opinion. A new Member who has never spoken before is always given priority.

This lack of plan about the order of speaking is often criticized, because it causes so many Members to come to the House with speeches specially prepared, only to find the debate ending without their ever having been called upon to speak; but in general it is felt that by this means **spontaneity** is best preserved.

Interruptions during speeches are quite frequent. If a Member making a speech sees another stand up, he may sit down and allow a brief interruption. He is not obliged to give way, but his reputation will suffer if he **obstinately** refuses to do so.

Chapter 9 The House of Lords

I. Will the House of Lords survive?

Britain is unique in keeping a second house of Parliament with a mainly **hereditary** membership. Hardly anyone seriously defends this survival from the past till 1999, but attempts at fundamental reform have been frustrated by disagreements about proposed solution. One change, allowing women to be included, was made in 1958, against the sole objections of an 83 year-old eighth holder of an **earldom** going back to 1703. To be a member you must either inherit a peerage, from father or ancestor, or have a **peerage conferred** on you by the Queen, on the Prime Minister's advice. The numbers are not fixed, and have increased up to the total of round 1,200 in 1980s. Of these, nearly 800 have inherited their peerages, while about 400 have had peerages conferred on them, including about 50 women.

A body with such a composition cannot feel justified in exercising real power in a modern state. Since the 1949 Parliament Act the House of Lords had had only a power: to delay the enactment of a new law from one session of Parliament to the next, and it has not intentionally used even this power. There is also one special power of absolute veto, if the House of Commons should pass a bill to extend its own life, without a new general election, beyond five years from the previous election. The Lords could have used this power in 1915 and 1940, but did not do so, because all parties agreed that a general election in wartime would be inconvenient.

The House of Lords is the continuation into modern times of the original Norman King's Court, to which the King summoned the great men of the land. Each was summoned individually, and the right to be summoned passed to the eldest son. Later the right was associated with the grant of a specific hereditary title (lord). From time to time new peerages were conferred. Some soon became extinct through the lack of any heir, others survived through many generations. In 1976 the 16th Duke of Norfolk died, and was succeeded by the 17th Duke, as holder of a dukedom dating back to 1483---and this was not as old as the barony of Lord Mowbray (1283).

The House of Lords was abolished in 1649, by **resolution** of Cromwell's House of Commons ('the House of Lords is useless and dangerous and ought to be abolished'). With the **restoration of the monarchy** in 1660 the old House of Lords was restored too, and it resumed its existence as though nothing had happened. Soon the Commons insisted that the Lords should not concern themselves with taxation or expenditure, and the Lords **acquiesced** until 1909, when an attempt at interference led to a reduction of their powers. Otherwise there was little formal change until the Life Peerages Act of 1958 (allowing non-hereditary peerages to be conferred) and the Peerage Act of 1962, enabling a peer to **renounce** his peerage and so to become **eligible**, as a 'Mr', for election to the Commons, where all serious politics happen. The first to renounce his title was the second Lord Stansgate, who was soon re-elected to the Commons as Tony Benn; he was soon followed by the 14th Earl of Home, who became Conservative Prime Minister in 1963 as Sir Alec Douglas-Home.

Fundamentally the system has never changed before 1999, though from the

eighteenth century all new peerages have been given on the Prime Minister's advice. Two survivals from the past are the inclusion of the 26 senior bishops of the Church of England, and the function of the House of Lords as the highest court of appeal in the judicial system. However, its work as a court of law is effectively quite separate from its functions as part of the Legislature. The nine appeal judges hold non-hereditary peerages of a special kind, based on a law of 1876. They occasionally speak on legal issues, and the bishops on social problems, but both these groups tend to avoid getting **embroiled** in partisan politics.

Until about 1700 new peerages were given very **sparingly**, and at that time there were only 70 **temporal** peers. Gradually the number of new peerages conferred increased, and in the nineteenth century most M. P.'s who had been ministers in the Cabinet received peerages when they retired. So, too, did the biggest industrialists and a few generals and public officers. Until 1958 every newly-created temporal peer was succeeded by his eldest son, and then by succeeding generations; so the membership of the House of Lords increased beyond a thousand. By 1958 there were 800 holders of inherited peerages. About half of these peerages were less than a hundred years old, but most of their holders owned **estates** in the **country**, and were easily **assimilated** with the older **aristocracy**.

Since the Life Peerage Act of 1958, about 15 to 30 new peer have been added to the House of Lords each year, all on the Prime Minister's recommendation; but each Prime Minister has included, not only his own party men and women, but people suggested by the Opposition and Liberal leaders, trade union officials and a greatly increased number of non-political people with experience of widely differing aspects of business and social affairs.

Some significant changes came in around 2000:

The House of Lords Act 1999 removes the right of most hereditary peers to sit and vote in the House. During the passage of the legislation an amendment is accepted, enabling 92 hereditary peers to remain until further reform is proposed.

The Constitutional Reform Act 2005 separates the House's judicial function from Parliament and ends the Lord Chancellor's combined role as head of the judiciary, a member of the executive and Speaker of the House of Lords.

The House holds its first election for a Lord Speaker and Baroness Hayman is elected on 4 July 2006.

The House's judicial function is transferred to the new UK Supreme Court. Law Lords became the first justices of the Supreme Court in 2009.

The Lords has three main roles: Making laws; In-depth consideration of public policy; Holding government to account.

Making laws: Members spend more than half their time in the House considering bills (draft laws). All bills have to be considered by both Houses of Parliament before they can become law. During several stages, members examine each bill, line-by-line, before it becomes an Act of Parliament (actual law). Many of these bills affect our everyday lives, covering areas such as welfare, health and education.

The Lords consider every bill in detail, and make many hundred of amendments to bills in every year. Whatever the government in power, many of these amendments are proposed by the government, or willingly accepted by it, usually as some kind of compromise. But many other proposals to amend bills are controversial and decided by vote, mainly on party lines.

In-depth consideration of public policy: Members use their extensive individual experience to investigate public policy. Much of this work is done in select committees - small groups appointed to consider specific policy areas. In the 2016-17 session, House of Lords select committees produced 41 reports on subjects including the Brexit process with six Brexit reports in six days. Many select committee meetings involve questioning expert witnesses working in the field which is the subject of the inquiry. These meeting are open to the public.

Holding government to account: Members **scrutinise** the work of the government during question time and debates in the chamber, where government ministers must respond. In the 2016-17 session, members held the government to account with 7,380 oral and written questions and 154 debates on topical issues and public policy ranging from the role of libraries and independent bookshops to the impact of Brexit on the NHS and social care. The public is welcome to visit and sit in the galleries overlooking the chamber during business.

II. Titles and Honours

British titles are complicated and confusing, because of their long history. When a man or woman is made a peer he or she may choose to continue to use the family name for the title, or alternatively take a place-name. Former Prime Minister Attlee became Earl Attlee, but Eden became Earl of Avon, Avon being the river flowing past the town of Warwick, which he had represented in the House of Commons. If the family name is used, it must have added to it the words '(of some place)', and if there are two or more lords with the same name as their title, this additional name is generally used so as to avoid confusion.

In 1970 George Brow was given a peerage. He had earlier been deputy-leader of the Labour Party and Foreign Secretary, and M. P. for Belper since 1945. There was already a Lord Brown, and a Lord Belper, so he could not be called by either of those names, and it would have been rather dull to be called Lord Brown of Belper. He would have liked to be called Lord George Brown, but 'Lord (or Lady)---Christian name---Surname' is a style reserved for the younger sons (or daughters) of dukes and marquesses, who are not members of the House of Lords. So he found a marvelous compromise: Lord George-Brown. It was accepted.

Peerages form only a small part of the intricate system of British honours. Every year about 150 men are made knights, in one of the seven **Orders** which are graded in **prestige**. A knight is called 'Sir---Christian name---Surname' (e.g. Sir Laurence Olivier or more familiarly 'Sir Laurence' or even just 'Olivier', but never 'Sir Olivier') and his wife is called 'Lady' instead of 'Mrs', though with the wife the Christian name is not used---e.g. Lady Olivier. The title of Dame is a female equivalent to knighthood, but even now there only about 250 Dames compared with 3,000 Knights.

Knights and Dames remain commoners and have no special privilege apart from the title, and their sons are plain 'Mr's. Their titles are not hereditary.

Honours lists are published twice a year under the Prime Minister's responsibility, though the real work of choosing people is done by a network of offices, who ensure a liberal distribution of knighthoods and lesser honours to civil servants and the armed forces according to their rank. There are several Orders, of which people may be made Knights or merely Commanders, Companions or Members. The largest of the Order and the graded distinctions of C. B. E., O. B. E. and M. B. E. are distributed to hundreds of worthy citizens who are judged to have done good work either in their jobs or in voluntary organizations. Equivalent grades, including knighthoods, in the more prestigious orders of the Bath, St. Michael and St. George, etc. are given to civil servants according to **abstruse** rules.

British people are by no means indifferent to all these titles and honours. The letters after people's names are always used in lists of directors of companies or of **patrons** of good causes; the presence of names with titles or letters after them is considered to enhance the prestige of a company or other body. The recipients of titles and other awards enjoy the process of receiving them; they generally go to Buckingham Palace to receive them at the hands of the Queen at a ceremony known as an **investiture**. Thus the honours conferred by the state share some of the mysterious magic of royalty, which still holds most British people under its spell.

Chapter 10 The Legal Profession

The legal profession consists of two elements, **barristers** and **solicitors**, and the two elements must be clearly distinguished. Solicitors, who are sometimes called the junior branch, are much the more numerous. When a person needs the assistance of the law, either because he has a dispute, or because he is in trouble, or because he is buying or selling a house or other property, or concerned with a question of inheritance of property, he must go to a solicitor. The average problem, particularly a straightforward transfer of property, can be dealt with finally by solicitors, who can also speak for their clients in **magistrates'** courts. If a case, **civil** or **criminal**, is more serious or difficult, or has to be **heard** in a higher court, a client's solicitor engages a barrister to whom he hands over the task of representing the client in the court.

In order to become a solicitor a person must spend some time working in the office of **an already established firm** of solicitors, and successfully pass the examinations of the Law Society. Solicitors usually work together in partnerships, or 'firms', being helped by clerks and having the usual **array** of any office.

To be a barrister a man must be a member of one of the four **Inns of Court** and pass the Bar examination. He must also keep twelve terms as a student at his Inn; to do this he must attend on six evenings during each term for the purpose of eating dinner in the Hall. He may do this while is earning his living, provided that he is not earning it by working as a solicitor or solicitor's clerk, or he may do it while he is a student at a university. When a young barrister begins his professional career he must join the 'chambers' of an established barrister, and for some years is usually able to earn very little money. If he is efficient and enjoys good luck, however, he can do very well once he becomes well established in profession. Eventually he may have an opportunity of being appointed a Queen's Counsel; if he does '**take silk**' (as this process is called), he may then only appear in court as a leader, assisted by another established barrister. Very big incomes and great reputations can be won by a Queen's Counsel, but a really successful barrister must live a life of exceptionally hard work. The House of Commons includes about ninety barristers among its members. If they are appointed as judges they must give up their seats in the House of Commons.

There is no judicial profession in England; high court judges, circuit judges and full-time paid magistrates or **stipendiaries** are appointed from among barristers of long standing. If a barrister accepts a job as a stipendiary magistrate or as a circuit judge he is unlikely to be promoted to a higher judicial post.

Although judges are well paid their current earnings are less than those which successful barristers can make. An established barrister may accept appointment as a full-time judge, even at some sacrifice of current income, for any of a combination of reasons: higher status, easier life, and the prospect of a pension when he retires. The basic grade is that of a circuit judge. There are about 300 circuit judges, each working mainly in one area of the country.

At a higher level are nearly 50 high court judges, of the Queen's Bench Division, paid 50% more than circuit judges. They have the title 'Mr Justice Smith', etc. and are

all based in London, but spend some of their time visiting the more important **provincial** crown courts to **hear** the most important and most difficult cases. There are also about 30 other judges in the **Chancery and Family Divisions** of the High Court of Justice, who deal only with civil case, almost all in London.

The High Court of Justice has several Divisions. The Chancery Division consists of the Lord Chancellor and ten judges, and deals with questions of company law, bankruptcy, trusts, the administration of the estates of people who have died, and some other matters of the same general type. The Probate, Divorce and **Admiralty** Division has been replaced by a new Family Division, which deals with divorce and questions arising out of wills. All the judges of these two Divisions remain in London. **The Queen's Bench Division** consists of **the Lord Chief Justice** and about fifty other judges. These divide their time between civil work in London, **the Central Criminal Court (or 'Old Bailey')**, also in London, and visits to the provincial crown courts. The old ceremonial which used to be associated with the **assize** courts was abolished with the reform of 1972, though the high court judges still wear **robes** and big **wigs** in court, and other judges and barristers wear very formal clothes, and small light grey wigs, which are rather uncomfortable in hot weather.

The reforms of 1972 have not made **litigation** any cheaper. The high earnings of barristers are paid for by the people who are unwise enough or unfortunate enough to need to employ them, but there is a system of legal aid through which poorer people's legal costs are paid.

The English legal system enjoys a reputation for fairness. A person accused of an offence is sure of a fair and open trial, and enjoys protection against the possibility of an unfair decision. Justice, both civil and criminal, operates with reasonable speed and the system of free legal aid and advice to people with low incomes is of great benefit. The magistrates' courts are often criticized on the ground that **the Justices of the Peace** are not professionally trained, but their critics may forget that the most important part of their work, that of imposing penalties on minor wrongdoers, is essentially social rather than legal in character. At the same time there is very much less complaint about the lack of social or **criminological** training of some of the High Court Judges who have to pass sentence in the more serious cases.

The Courts and their Judicial Officers

There are two main kinds of courts, and two kinds judicial officers to correspond with them. Courts of first instance are worked by magistrates, who are normally Justice of the Peace; higher courts ('Crown' courts) by judges, or in some cases, senior barristers specially appointed to perform judicial functions for part of their time.

Magistrates Courts

Every person charged with an offence is summoned to appear before a local magistrates' court, which may impose a fine up to a general limit of £2,000 or twelve months' imprisonment, though for some specified offences the laws **prescribe** maximum penalties below these limits. With 98% of cases the magistrates on the

bench decide on guilt or innocence, and if necessary what penalty to impose. With more serious cases the magistrates can decide only to send them for trial in a crown court, where the decision on guilt or innocence will be made by a jury of twelve citizens chosen by chance, and if necessary the penalty decided by the presiding judge, helped by two Justices of the Peace (J.P.s). A person accused before a magistrates' court may demand to be sent for trial before a crown court, even if the case is one with which in general the magistrates could have dealt themselves.

A magistrates' court normally consists of three J.P.s (occasionally two or four or more). The J.P.s are ordinary but worthy citizens who have been appointed to their positions by the Lord Chancellor on the advice of local appointing committees. J.P.s have no formal qualifications; they are chosen merely for their good reputation, often with the support of political parties or approved voluntary bodies. Once appointed, they are expected to attend a few weekend courses of instruction about their work, and to read material sent to them at intervals. There are about 25,000 J.P.s in England; each of them works in the courts on about 30 to 50 days a year. Those who have jobs must take time off, and receive a small compensation for loss of earnings; but otherwise the J.P.s receive no payment for their work. Attempts are now being made to ensure that J.P.s are of widely differing social backgrounds, but inevitably most are middle class.

In their courts the J.P.s are advised on points of law by their Clerks, who are professional lawyers; otherwise they decide each case brought before them according to their sense of what is fair and suitable, within the limits of their powers, and with some attention to general guidance which they receive. There are a few special exceptions to the general pattern. Some of the courts in London and in ten other towns have stipendiary magistrates, who are qualified lawyers, work full time and are paid salaries; but there are only fifty **stipendiary magistrates** in England, and a few in Wales.

Crown Courts

When a criminal case is not dealt with finally in a magistrates' court it goes for trial in a crown court. The court is presided over by a judge, but the decision on guilt or innocence is made by a jury of twelve citizens **chosen by lot** from the list of persons entitled to vote in elections. The judge's functions are, first, to see that the trial is properly conducted, second, to give guidance to the jury before asking it for its **verdict**, and finally, if the jury finds the accused 'guilty', to decide upon the penalty and 'pronounce sentence'. For this last decision the judge is helped by two J.P.s who have been sitting beside him throughout the **proceedings**.

About a hundred towns have crown courts, but only a quarter of these are '**first-tier**' courts, at which the most important civil and criminal cases are heard before high court judges. Other cases may be heard before circuit judges, whose full-time appointments are mostly attached to one or other of the six regional '**circuits**'. Appeals are heard in London before three appeal judges.

Judges are either **practicing** or former barristers. The judge in a crown court may be one of the several types of people, but all share two things in common. First, they

are all qualified, professional and experienced lawyers, chosen for their competence in the law but with no formal sociological qualifications to help them with the business of sentencing prisoners, and second, they are paid for their work.

Chapter 11 What Makes Cambridge Special?

Alan Macfarlane

Many people who passed through Cambridge University have contributed to the stock of human knowledge over the centuries. This was not until recently through organized research programmes, doctoral theses, laboratories and so on, but through being a place where people learned to enjoy ideas and value knowledge, where they learnt an enthusiasm for the pursuit of beauty and truth.

I shall not dwell long on the contribution, but it is worth noting that it stretched from the 'softest' of the arts, like poetry and music, to the 'hardest' of the sciences, like physics. These were not held in opposition. In poetry, from Thomas Wyatt, Edmund Spenser and Christopher Marlowe in the sixteenth century, through John Donne, George Herbert, John Milton, Andrew Marvell and John Dryden in the seventeenth, William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge in the eighteenth, to Lord Byron and Alfred Lord Tennyson in the nineteenth and through into the twentieth with A.E.Houseman, Siegfried Sassoon, Rupert Brooke and others, something like two thirds of the greatest poets in the English language passed through Cambridge.

At the other extreme, in physics, the discovery of magnetism and elements of electricity in the late sixteenth century was made by William Gilbert, then Isaac Newton in the seventeenth, James Clerk Maxwell, the investigator of electro-magnetism and Sir J.J.Thomson, the discoverer of the electron, through to Ernest Rutherford, James Chadwick, Paul Dirac and many other great physicists, the tradition is notable.

There are numerous others in every field of human creativity, including mathematics, philosophy, law, history, anthropology, computing, biology, music and drama who have enriched our world. The University provided training for many of them in high **aspirations** and a sheltered ground for creative work. This is one of its roles.

Another role is in training those who are trained to lead, run, organize and provide inspiration for others. Cambridge trained many of the lawyers, doctors, teachers, clergymen, economists and administrators. It provided the thinking tools, the confidence and the network of ties which would hold together a complex civilization.

Most societies have some kind of mechanism, for turning children into adults, some form of **puberty** or other **ritual**. Spending a few years at Cambridge was such a ritual device for the British middle and upper middle class. At times, especially in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century, Cambridge had an intake of students with a high proportion from the upper and upper middle classes. Yet for much of its history it catered for the large '**middling sort**', the minor gentry, richer farmers, tradesmen and merchant's sons. For them it acted as a **life-cycle stage**.

A teenager would move into a partly-free, partly sheltered environment in which the university and college acted in **loco parentis**, in place of the parents. There was a movement way from the strict supervision of school and direct control of parents to

one where people could experiment with being adults, organizing their own lives, making their own decision and friends, but in a half protected environment where their mistakes would not be too costly. This is still largely a central function of a **Collegiate university** such as Cambridge.

At the heart of the role of the University was the aim of developing the mind of the growing child. The student was to learn that most difficult of skills, to think for themselves. In this way he would complete his education through moving beyond school into the higher reaches of whichever discipline he was studying.

Yet learning to think was only one part of the mission. Equally important was how to feel and how to behave. The University had started from **monastic** roots, and there remained a mission to teach a 'rule of life' in the old Benedictine or Cistercian sense. This stretched from practical etiquette, how to eat complicated meals, how to drink in company, how to walk, laugh, run, dance, hunt, relax. And beyond these it was meant to **instil** deeper values.

These values included as how to make and retain real friends, how to work closely with colleagues so that the team-work needed in order to solve complex problems could be effective, how to lead without **domineering**, how to keep and exchange **confidences**, how to trust and be trusted, how to share rewards, how to recover from setbacks, how to charm and amuse others, how to retain one's curiosity and application in the face of apparent failure.

The University continued the boarding-school training in setting up the individual to be both an effective member of a group, but also able to face loneliness and isolation, mental, moral and physical. In a word, it was to turn the late adolescent into a 'young gentleman' who was worthy of being called 'Sir' by the **Porters** and other College servants who waited upon him. It was to instil that calm independence and **stoicism** famously portrayed in Kipling's poem 'If'.

The aim may strike us as over-ambitious, for it was no less than an attempt to construct, or re-construct, the whole man – and nowadays the woman too. It was partly about the mind and the tools of thought. Yet it was equally about the body through the heavy emphasis on sport and other physical activities.

We now tend to think of Universities as strictly about 'Education' in the narrow teaching sense – learning a subject, history, economics, biology. Yet Cambridge was an attempt to learn about 'life' in all its variety. Even in its disciplinary range, where all arts, humanities, social sciences, physical and natural sciences were encouraged, it was broad **spectrum**.

All this happened with great intensity in the three, eight-week, terms in a place which, is in some ways '**sacred**' or set apart from ordinary life, surrounded by walls and rituals so that it has a bounded, out of time and space, feeling. This was possible because Cambridge was a **liminal** place, neither in nor out of the world, a no-man's land, an **oasis** or neutral **arena**. It was in the world in that there were many connections of an economic, social, personal and other kinds so it was not an '**asylum**' in the sense that the anthropologist Erving Goffman describes prisons, boarding schools and monasteries. Yet it was also out of the world in that many of the pressures and values of individualistic, capitalist, society were muted.

It is a neutral stage where the young person or aged **don** can move without too much **friction**, can largely feel free for a few months at a time. It has something of the feeling of a holiday, an 'Ivory Tower', a time of diminished weight, a sort of lightness of being, at least in ideal if the worries of student debt or future unemployment or the next teaching assignment do not weigh too heavily. The pleasure and privilege of this experience is what often makes it difficult for students who have been through this to re-join what is sometimes called 'the real world'. The honeymoon is over, but the memories often remain and, for a few highly fortunate individuals such as myself, the honeymoon has continued for almost all of my life.

How then has Cambridge tried to fulfil these varied roles, how has it tried to encourage and discipline the mind, body and spirit, over its 800 years?

One area to inspect may be termed the mechanism to encourage the growth of the whole person is to create meaningful sub-communities within the University. Humans seem to be happiest and work best together within face-to-face communities of a few dozen or so. They can share, exchange, play and gossip with friends in an atmosphere of equality and trust where there are borders and a feeling of 'we' and 'us'. The Collegiate structure, which has only survived in its full form in Oxford and Cambridge, and which has not been transferred successfully even to America, provides this 'genius of scale' as the **anthropologist** Marilyn Strathern calls it.

Like the tribal group described by anthropologists, a person belongs to a special community which shares a multi-dimensional space – social, political, economic and spiritual. There are libraries and teaching rooms, dining halls and kitchens, playing fields and gardens, bars and **common rooms**, chapels and music rooms. It is a **corporation** – a body – which has existed for centuries and is expected to exist for ever. A person becomes part of this body through an **incorporation ritual** and stays on, perhaps, as in my case, from quite early in their lives until death.

Yet, unlike tribal groups, these meaningful entities of '**Fellows** and students' are not recruited on the basis of birth, that is blood and kinship – or even marriage, but supposedly through a certain kind of **aptitude and merit**, including intellectual ability. A College combines the sentiments, the feelings, the warmth of something permanent, which 'Community' in the sociological sense gives, the confidence of **multi-stranded**, enduring and intimate ties. Alongside there is the flexibility and openness of contract or Association, the ability to leave or join if one wants.

It is difficult to explain all this to those who have not experienced an Oxbridge College. **Colleges** increasingly feel strange in our mobile and fragmented world. The place of work is also a place of social meaning, there is often life-time assurance, those who work together also eat, play and relax together. It is something like this, but rather than being focused round the production of electronic goods or cars, it is focused round things of the mind – teaching, learning discovery.

The Colleges are immensely important for intellectual collaboration because they are not based on a subject or discipline. Certain Colleges may be famous for certain subjects, **Trinity** for mathematics, **Caius** for medicine, **Trinity Hall** for law, **King's** for music. Yet most disciplines are taught and studied. So that when, as is strongly encouraged, people relaxing over meals – lunches, dinners and even breakfast – it is

with people in other disciplines.

This enforced intellectual sociality around food and drink, whether in the College bars, dining halls, wine rooms, common rooms, or in the numerous pubs and coffee shops in Cambridge, means that much of the real intellectual work happens outside the class room. A person has to explain the interest and importance of what s/he is doing to others in distant topics. One learns about surprising new developments so that new worlds of ideas are constantly opening up.

To be a student at Cambridge is a total experience for those short weeks. It is not a nine to five, 'going to the office', way of life confined to the week-days. It goes on into the evenings, over the week-ends, over meals and in many side-activities. A student does not just read or study a subject. They become a student. It is a mode of being, a kind of calling or vocation.

While the Colleges provide much of the social and spiritual side of life and organize and provide much of the undergraduate supervision, they are complemented by a world of associational forms which prevent them from becoming a trap, a **stale, inbred** and limited experience.

Many who look back on their days at University particularly remember these more focused groups. It is here that they often learn what their real passion for life will be – acting in the Footlights or Marlow society, politics and debating in the Union Society, music in the multitude of high level choirs and orchestras, sport in the international level teams, writing and poetry – almost anything. And they also find in the numerous parallel organizations, the Department, Faculties, Laboratories, bookshops, museums and elsewhere, places where they can expand their talents and learn how to organize a rich world which complements the purely intellectual.

This multitude of groups is one reason why Cambridge is such a rich and varied place. But it does mean that it is impossible to describe an average or normal **trajectory**. The small bubbles of activity through which people pass often overlap only a little, friendships grow around these shared passions, status and ability is measured, and often the first serious love affairs occur in these sheltered days.

As I have witnessed over my fifty years since becoming an undergraduate, the student intake has broadened immensely from that white, middle-class, Anglo-Saxon set of males who predominated when I went to Oxford in 1960. Now there are, especially at the postgraduate level, possibilities of chance **encounters** with a much richer set of people from many different ethnic, national, class backgrounds – and of course at least half of the students are women. All that really unifies them is that they know that entry has been based on an estimate of intellectual potential and enthusiasm and that most of those a person meets will share **a liberal, enquiring and committed attitude** to things of the mind.

When Cambridge was founded, supposedly eight hundred years ago this year, it was set up in a context where teachers taught such subjects as **rhetoric, logic, mathematics, music, grammar, astronomy**, not in a closed way, in order just to repeat and pass on the wisdom of the ancestors, but to build on this and to devise new insights and knowledge through **ingenuity** and experimental thinking.

This unusual European tradition was given a particular force by two specifically

English features of the medieval period. One was the importance of a customary and oral tradition of the **English Common Law**. The universities trained lawyers and were often run by lawyers. In English law, the basic tool is confrontational argument, trying to extract the truth through disagreement and persuasion, putting forward one's best proofs and best logic in order to **outwit and outmanoeuvre** the other. The great Cambridge trained lawyer Francis Bacon **institutionalized** this approach and applied it to the natural as well as the human world in his *Advancement of Learning* in the early seventeenth century. Yet the method was in itself already old.

These methods of proofs, logic and argument were the ones which young students were encouraged to bring to their studies. A student was set a problem or question, told where he might find some preliminary answers in previous writings, and then told to come back and explain his answer to an older and practised 'Master of Arts' or teacher. Such a Master's role was to direct and sharpen the student's minds, to watch them develop. They were like swordsmen or potters of the mind, being taught a **craft** or mystery, but in this case the craft was a mental **agility and ingenuity** which would sustain them through life. A Master was keen that, if possible, they would think for themselves. Resting on authority was not enough; they should explore and, if possible, cast old wisdom in a new light.

This tradition was made possible by the fact that, as today, much of the teaching was done face-to-face, one to one, through conversation. Each week the student would come with his 'essay' or other assignment, his thoughts on a problem, and the tutor's job was to explore its weaknesses and strengths. This is a very strange way of teaching, not just punishing mistakes of memory or logic, or writing up things to be copied down, but encouraging to a certain extent risk, intuition, wit, new thoughts, when they seemed fruitful.

It was also based on another peculiarity of England. In most societies, to argue with one's elders is not possible. They are the teacher, they instruct, they know the wisdom. Age and perhaps social status creates a **chasm** between teacher and pupil. Because of peculiarities of the English age and class structure, it was possible, at least temporarily and within the confines of the university, to assume enough equality between master and student for there to be a real conversation, a reasonably equal game between opponents. I have experienced this many times in practice. My English students usually treat me with some respect, yet not with such **deference** that they are not prepared to engage in intellectual games. They challenge me and in the best of relationships I learn as much from them as they do from me.

On the other hand, of course, as Tocqueville noted and modern educationalists have endorsed, there is a danger of too much equality. If all hierarchy is lost, respect for knowledge goes and there is no reason for students to listen to teachers. There are considerable pressures to **fragment** education into a consumer-driven service with many disconnected but hopefully attractive modules.

A University can become a supermarket of the mind, with students wheeling their intellectual **trollies** through – a tin of pre-Socratic philosophy here, a jar of Renaissance poetry there, a bag of bio-chemistry tossed on top in a series of modules. This is something which Cambridge partly allows through some combinations of

courses and easy movement between a Part I and a Part II, but does not take to the American extreme.

It is often assumed that people make break-throughs of a high level, discover the laws of electricity, gravity, the circulation of the blood, the evolution of species or the basis of life in DNA, largely by hard work. All of these happened in Cambridge, but not just through hard work.

Among the factors for creativity are the encouragement of curiosity through a supportive institutional context, relative equality so that younger minds are not crushed, the absence of too much jealousy, the tolerance of **eccentricity** and deviance, a situation which allows an easy flow between **specialisms**, the avoidance of too much routine and boring teaching or administration, the absence of **cynicism**, enough time to develop complex thoughts, conversations, accumulated intellectual resources such as libraries, museums and laboratories.

For real discovery, there needs to be a high level of chance or luck – but chance can be encouraged if there is a right mix of high-level talents, a feeling of belonging to an interesting ‘club’ or endeavour, the meeting of exciting minds. People must not be too risk **averse** and the costs of failure must not be too high. As well as the patient assembly of ‘facts’ one needs **intuition**, guesswork, an almost playful attitude. People need to become more than specialists, to realize as Einstein put it, ‘it is better to be roughly right rather than precisely wrong’.

In Cambridge University the normal tendency of intellectuals to become withdrawn from the material and social world has been **mitigated**. There are pure mathematicians and **armchair** anthropologists. Yet there has also long been a **tinkering**, strings and ceiling wax, love of making and doing and acting in the world to complement the lonely voyages of the mind.

Perhaps I can say good-bye to a certain part of my life in Cambridge in the following words.

‘Cambridge stands for curiosity, openness, fellowship, wonder, humour, playfulness, awe, delight, argument, competitiveness, modesty, **subversion**, ceremonial, kindness, tolerance, beauty, utility, liberty, conformity and a whole bundle of often colliding and clashing values. Those who have navigated its still pools and **rapids** are attracted to many of these features in differing times and to different degrees.

Combined with its charm and a feeling of **otherworldly** magic, it seldom fails to make a deep impression, even if a person appears to forget or reject it. Like any powerful parent, it affects the rest of their lives, whether they like it or not. It **evokes** strong emotions.

Above all, Cambridge gives me, and many, a sense of hope. Here is a place which has preserved a set of ideals within beautiful surroundings for over three quarters of a **millenium**. Much of the treasure it has accumulated is not in its physical buildings, but in ‘living national treasures’. The poets, scientists, philosophers and others, dead or alive, are its greatest gift, along with the large number of students who have passed through it and gone on to their diverse careers.’

Chapter 12 The Annual Address of the Vice-Chancellor

Dame Alison Richard

2008

As Vice-Chancellor, I sign many documents in the name of the Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University. Our historic identity is deeply **embedded** in that **sonorous** phrase, but it does not fully reflect the composition of the Cambridge community today. The University continues to attract some of the best “Masters and Scholars” in the world, but its composition has changed and broadened, and its capacity and identity have evolved along with its composition. For example, Cambridge is a community of men and women today, and a large number of postgraduate students, postdoctoral and research staff, and administrative and professional staff have joined its ranks in recent decades. These changes require imagination and commitment from all parts of the University and the Colleges, adapting our institutions and customs to include new members while maintaining the best traditions of this scholarly community. Much good work has already been done to this end, although I think we all acknowledge that more can and must be accomplished.

This morning, however, I want to consider a different dimension of the changing make up of the Cambridge community. About 2,800 of our former students work for the University or the Colleges; yet the total number of living former students approaches 200,000. Over the last quarter-century, the relationships of departing students with their Colleges and the University have deepened and the importance of their role to the Cambridge community has grown. Today, the value of these developments is ever clearer, but so too are the questions to which they give rise. It is about these matters I will speak this morning.

Let me begin with a word about **nomenclature**. In modern **parlance**, the Chancellor remains indomitably such while “Masters” may be loosely **parsed** as “academic staff”, and “Scholars” have become “students”. The translation is universal in everyday language at Cambridge, with the original usages reserved for formal contexts. There, they reflect our long history and foundations, and also remind us of initial conceptions of the University community.

The use of “*alumni* and *alumnae*” to refer to former men and women students is by no means universal at Cambridge, and is viewed by some as a distressing **incursion** from the New World. But, in fact, John Evelyn is recorded as having introduced the word into English vocabulary in 1645, and only in 1696 did it migrate to Boston, Massachusetts, with another diarist, Samuel Sewall. Universities in the United States subsequently adopted the term and gave it currency in the twentieth century.

Here in Cambridge, the term “senior members” is sometimes used to describe the generality of graduates of the University, and I am sure that phrase will persist in the University’s lexicon. But for my own taste I find it clearer to follow John Evelyn’s lead and use “*alumni*” and “*alumnae*”, internationally accepted terms for former students. Besides, I like this borrowing from Latin with its philological echoes of

nourishment.

The past

For most of Cambridge University's history, the community consisted of men of varying age who taught, studied, or were Cambridge-educated. With the exception of undergraduates, they participated in the **substantive** business of the University, through individual administrative roles, committees, and, collectively, the debates and votes of the formal bodies.

Looking back at the University's first seven centuries, to my eyes the most prominent change in the composition of this community of men and boys had to do with social **inclusivity**. From the outset, the University afforded opportunities to students from poor backgrounds. Indeed, the earliest recorded donation to Cambridge, around 1284, was 50 marks for the support of poor students. But in the eighteenth century, undergraduate education became a fashionable affair, and the sons of privilege came to dominate the **ranks** of undergraduates. Over the last sixty years, we have been unmaking that piece of the past, first in parallel with the social changes set in motion by the 1944 Education Act and, more recently, by the energy, time and resources that Collegiate Cambridge pours into raising the aspirations of talented school pupils and encouraging them to apply, regardless of their background.

This effort, important for Cambridge and society alike, sits alongside other significant changes in the University community's composition and governance in the twentieth century. These changes have been in the direction of greater diversity and inclusivity. The most dramatic, and welcome, has been the gradual inclusion of women – as academics, students, and administrative staff, as well as their increase within the assistant staff.

But one sharp move away from inclusivity stands out. It took place in 1926, when the modern **Regent House** was created and former students, as members of **the Senate**, were formally excluded from control of the substantive business of the University. Henceforth, they could only expect to participate in largely formal and ceremonial matters, eventually restricted to the election of the Chancellor and the **High Steward**. It was a **disenfranchisement** of sorts.

Of course, there is a long tradition of alumni-run associations, particularly in the Colleges but also in support of academic departments. These subject- and College-based groups complement the more than 200 alumni societies around the world, some going back a century or more. But as best I can tell, though valued by the participants, these activities were generally regarded with **benign indifference** by the University. It is in the last quarter-century that the institutions of Cambridge have come to value relationships with alumni, and to treat those relationships seriously.

The evidence of change, a **re-imagining** of the role of alumni in the life of the University, is all around us. Every College now has an active alumni relations programme. For 18 years, the University has published CAM magazine and distributed it to all contactable alumni. More than 50,000 alumni now receive a University alumni **e-bulletin** six times a year, and many Departments and Faculties publish regular alumni **newsletters**. Alumni Weekend has grown in strength and

success over a period of almost twenty years, taking pride of place in an array of activities organised voluntarily by staff of the University and Colleges. Building on the foundations established by the American Friends, Cambridge in America provides support and outreach to the more than 14,000 alumni in the United States. And last year, the University and the Cambridge Society agreed to **merge** their alumni activities into a new, strengthened Cambridge Alumni Relations Office.

The importance of alumni

Why are these developments important? The common answer, “it’s all about money”, is profoundly incomplete – although funding matters, to be sure.

In growing numbers and with mounting generosity, alumni contribute financially to their Colleges and the University. Currently, more than 20,000 alumni give annually, and the total raised toward the Campaign goal so far is well ahead of our milestone targets. The percentage of alumni who give and the level of giving are still behind our **peers** in the US, but we are gaining ground.

The financial generosity of alumni and friends is absolutely vital to our future as one of the world’s great universities. Their gifts help us maintain an **edge** of excellence in undergraduate education otherwise unachievable; they support innovation; they help us compete for staff and postgraduate students; they reinforce the collegiate system; and they diversify our sources of finance, thereby strengthening our position of “honest independence”. In order to sustain our high ambitions, the inter-generational transfer of wealth through gifts, modest and large, must become a significant and enduring feature of the financial landscape of Collegiate Cambridge.

Less clearly recognized or appreciated are the critically important contributions to Collegiate Cambridge made by alumni that have nothing to do with money. They are our ambassadors, talking and writing about us, opening doors, and encouraging **prospective students** to apply; they help create and reinforce the University’s many flourishing partnerships with the private sector, not-for-profit organisations, and institutions of government; and they are a great pool of **experience and expertise**. Having spent a lot of time over the past five years in conversation with alumni around the world, I am convinced that they are an **institutional asset** whose value we have not yet fully realised.

The advantages to Cambridge of greater alumni involvement are clear, but what are the advantages to our alumni? For some, in my experience, it is the sheer interest of the place; for others, the opportunity to give back in gratitude for what Cambridge has given them; for still others, the **exasperated** hope that perhaps Cambridge can be persuaded to change its ways. Simply feeling part of the Cambridge community is surely a motivation too. Supported by new technologies, new forms of community **proliferate** in these times and Cambridge communities are no exception.

Championing the University

Fostering a sense of community among Cambridge alumni is of great importance: Cambridge has urgent reason to **articulate** its values clearly and explain the full range of its contributions, and we need as many voices speaking on our behalf as we can

muster. I believe the **informed** voices of alumni can make a critical difference, for they speak with the passion of direct experience as well as the **acquired wisdom** of their lives.

Over the last decade, the national and international recognition of the relevance and importance of universities has grown. This is a most welcome development, and it increases yet further the importance of ensuring that the fundamental **mission** and contributions of universities are fully understood and appreciated. At this University, our mission is to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels. In three areas in particular, I believe this statement needs further **articulation** and explanation.

The first has to do with undergraduate education, about which I spoke two years ago. Cambridge undergraduates are here to learn how to think deeply, rigorously, and independently. The content of their learning, and the particular skills they acquire, are important and the academic programmes of the University prepare them for several professions. But a Cambridge education is not simply or primarily about professional or vocational training, or the **acquisition of skills**. I believe that alumni, having been educated at Cambridge themselves, have an intuitive understanding that their years here amounted to far more than the content of the books they read. They are potentially the strongest advocates and expositors of the value of the education we offer.

The second area concerns the continuing and vital importance of the arts, humanities, and social sciences, alongside science and technology. Our contributions to cultural wealth and **societal** understanding are as significant as those we make to technological innovation and human health and prosperity, and rare is the problem in the modern world that does not demand the **full panoply of disciplines** for its solution. Climate change and energy sufficiency are not simply technological challenges, any more than religious conflict is merely a matter of clashing theologies. We have many accomplished alumni who have made great contributions to society and who deeply appreciate their education in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. They are not only voices for, but also examples in support of, the value of education in these fields.

The third area has to do with the meaning of relevance in the context of research. There is much evidence, not least from Cambridge's **track record**, that fundamental research is often at the heart of innovation and transformational changes in the world, and increasingly today fundamental research is in fact undertaken with considerations of use. But discovery, in the fullest sense, must remain at the heart of our research programmes, with strong funding directed to its support.

Common to all three of these issues is the more particular matter of the public perception of Cambridge. Our contributions as an institution are global in their reach and impact. We play a significant economic and societal role in the UK, and we are of **pivotal** importance to this country's university system, a system that is one of the UK's greatest assets. We need to work hard to explain to all our **constituencies** both the excellence of our work, and the value of our many contributions.

Well-informed alumni can speak **cogently** to these contributions. In my annual

letters over the last four years, I have written to alumni about some of these issues precisely because we need their help in making the case for the value of the entire spectrum of Cambridge's activities in research and education.

The limits of engagement

As we seek the greater involvement of alumni, we must also ensure that the limits of that involvement are understood and observed by all concerned. The 1926 decision to exclude the Senate from control of the substantive business of the University remains a good one, and the re-involvement of recent years is not without risk, even though it is on quite different terms.

In building these closer relationships, could the influence of alumni come to dominate the business of the University? The structural arrangements of Collegiate Cambridge make this unlikely in my view. Alumni play important roles on the **University's Council** and other central bodies, but they serve at the request of the University with the approval of the Council or the **Regent House**. A growing number serve as invited members of advisory committees across Collegiate Cambridge. But the advice of these committees is open to challenge and **demur**, and the academic community has ample opportunity to exercise a moderating effect on alumni influence.

Could alumni, as donors, **encroach** upon the University's freedom and independence by imposing conditions on their gifts that go beyond proper and reasonable **accountability**? Yes in theory, but such gifts can be declined, and so too can those that would support activities in which the University is not interested. But let us not forget that from the present 800th Campaign stretching back into the past, there are abundant examples of academic and institutional innovations led by the **vision**, ideas and generosity of donors. The fact that something is not our idea does not make it a poor idea.

To my mind, the one real concern amidst the positive developments of recent years is the possible creation of inequalities running counter to the broad interests of the institution. This could happen if donations **clustered around** particular academic fields, or if **differential** contributions between the University and the Colleges or between the Colleges themselves, seriously unbalanced institutional interdependencies, and undermined the high quality we see and expect of every part of Collegiate Cambridge.

I believe the risk is manageable. Collegiate Cambridge already has mechanisms for the internal redistribution of funds, and examples of **farsighted** generosity on the part of individual Colleges are well known to us. At Cambridge, an intensely competitive atmosphere mixes with a certain culture of **altruism** and enlightened self-interest. These conditions **bode** well for developing additional ways to transfer wealth between our interdependent parts. And develop them we must.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the re-emergence of our former students as an important **constituency** represents a significant change **afoot** in the Cambridge community

today. In considering the consequences, I suggest three kinds of action are called for.

First, the build-up of recent efforts **notwithstanding**, we must push hard to engage and inform alumni. Memories of life as a student here are important to many of us, but for those who no longer live or work here, Collegiate Cambridge must also be brought to life as it is today: an institution living fully in the present, with its eyes on the future. To connect the past experiences of alumni with the present Cambridge, we must communicate more consistently and substantively than we have done in the past.

Second, the Colleges and University must continue to work together as we **gear up** these efforts. Through the 800th Anniversary Campaign, we have successfully established our capacity to do this in the context of fund-raising. Learning from that experience, we must keep developing broad and comfortable collaboration in the context of alumni relations.

Third, we must confront the possibility of cumulative inequalities resulting from **discrepant** effort or success in fund-raising. With **vigilance** and determination, we can and must ensure that the great sweep of academic endeavour characteristic of Cambridge is sustained, together with the interdependent strengths of the University and Colleges.

I end on a note of celebration. Next year will be the 800th since the University's foundation. Its identity as a community has undergone significant change, and this surely contributes to Cambridge's stature today. We are fortunate indeed to have educated some of the brightest students in each generation, and now we are fortunate to have the opportunity as well as the need to bring these former students more fully into the Cambridge community – today, and for the future.

Chapter 13 The Importance of Scotland to the UK

David Cameron
2014

The Prime Minister called on people across the UK to speak out in favour of the UK and against Scottish independence.

I want to thank Glasgow Caledonian for co-hosting this event.

This is a fantastic, forward-looking university, and we are very grateful for your support today, as we are to the Lee Valley Velo Park for hosting us in this magnificent space.

Less than 2 years ago, this place was a **cauldron** of excitement. Chris Hoy was ripping round at 40 miles per hour. I was up there. Three more golds – an incredible night. But for me, the best thing about the Olympics wasn't the winning; it was the red, the white, the blue. It was the summer that patriotism came out of the shadows and came into the sun. Everyone cheering as one for Team GB. And it's Team GB I want to talk about today. Our United Kingdom.

Last year, the date for the Scottish **referendum** was fixed. The **countdown** was set. And today we have just over 7 months until that vote. Centuries of history hang in the balance. A question mark hangs over the future of our United Kingdom. If people vote yes in September, then Scotland will become an independent country. There will be no going back. And as I have made clear, this is a decision that is **squarely** and solely for those in Scotland to make.

Now, I believe passionately that it is in their interests to stay in the United Kingdom. From **Holyrood** they can decide what happens in every hospital, every school, every police station in Scotland. And in the United Kingdom, Scotland is part of a major global player. Now those are the arguments that we will keep on putting until 18th September, but it is their choice, their vote.

But my argument today is that, while only 4 million people can vote in this referendum, all 63 million of us are profoundly affected. There are 63 million of us who could wake up on 19th September in a different country, with a different future ahead of it. That's why this speech is addressed not so much to the people of Scotland but to the people of England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Within these countries, there are a whole range of different views about this referendum.

There are those I'd call the 'quiet patriots' – people who love the United Kingdom, love our flag and our history, but think there's nothing much that they can do to encourage Scotland to stay in the UK, so they stay out of the debate.

Then there are the 'shoulder shruggers' – people who are **ambivalent** about the outcome, who think this doesn't matter much to anyone south of the border. Their view is that, if Scotland left the UK, then yes, that would be sad, but we could just wave them a **wistful** goodbye and carry on as normal.

And then there are those – only a few – who think we'd be better off if Scotland did leave the UK; that this marriage of nations has run its course and it needs a divorce.

Now, today I want to take on all these views: the idea we'd be better off without Scotland; the idea that this makes no difference to the rest of the UK; and the idea that, however much we might care, we in England, Wales and Northern Ireland can have no voice in this debate because we don't have a vote. All of the above are wrong.

We would be deeply diminished without Scotland. This matters to all of our futures, and everyone in the UK can have a voice in this debate. I want to make this case by putting forward what, to me, are the 4 compelling reasons why the United Kingdom is stronger with Scotland within it.

The first is our connections with each other. Over 3 centuries we have lived together, worked together and frankly we've got together: getting married, having children, moving back and forward across our borders. Such is the fusion of our bloodlines that my surname goes back to the West Highlands and, by the way, I am as proud of my Scottish heritage as I am of my English or my Welsh heritage.

The name Cameron might mean 'crooked nose', but the clan motto is 'let us unite', and that is exactly what our islands and our nations have done. Today, 800,000 Scots live elsewhere in the United Kingdom, and more than 400,000 people who were born in the rest of the UK now live in Scotland. And there are millions of people who do business over the border every single day, like the farmers in Lincolnshire who grow some of the **barley** that's used in Scotch **whisky**.

The United Kingdom is an **intricate tapestry**; millions of relationships woven tight over more than 3 centuries. That's why for millions of people there is no contradiction in being proud of your Scottishness, your Englishness, your Britishness – sometimes all at once. Now some say that none of this would change with independence, that these connections would stay as strong as ever. But the fact is all these connections, whether it's business or personal, they are eased and strengthened by the institutional framework of the United Kingdom.

When the Acts of Union were passed, the role of the state was limited to things like defence, taxes and property rights. Since then the state has transformed beyond recognition and our institutions – they have grown together like the roots of great trees, fusing together under the foundations of our daily lives.

You don't need a customs check when you travel over the border; you don't have to get out your passport out at **Carlisle**; you don't have to deal with totally different tax systems and regulations when you trade; you don't have to trade in different currencies.

Our human connections – our friendships, relationships, business partnerships – they are underpinned because we are all in the same United Kingdom, and that is number 1 reason why we are stronger together.

The second is our prosperity. Some people look at the United Kingdom only in terms of debit and credit columns, tax and spend, and how that gets split between our 4 nations. But that completely misses the bigger picture. This is a world that has been through massive economic storms, where economic competition is heating up as never before, where we have to work harder than ever just to make a living.

And in that world of uncertainty, we are quite simply stronger as a bigger entity. An open economy of 63 million people; we're the oldest and most successful single

market in the world, and with one of the oldest and most successful currencies in the world. That stability is hugely attractive for investors. Last year we were the top destination for foreign direct investment in Europe. That is a stamp of approval on our stability and I would not want to **jeopardise** that.

But let me be clear. The central part of my economic argument for the UK is not about what we'd lose if we pulled apart, but about what we could gain in this world if we stay together. This government has set out a long-term economic plan for Britain: getting behind enterprise, dealing with our debts, a plan to give the people of this country peace of mind and security for the future.

And it's not just a plan; it is a vision. The United Kingdom as the big European success story of this century – moving from an island sinking under too much debt, too much borrowing, too much taxation to a country that is dynamic, exporting, innovating, creating. And Scotland is right at the heart of that vision. Why? Well, I could give you the list of the Scottish strengths, the historic universities like Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Glasgow and St Andrews; the great industries, from food processing to financial services, from ship-building to science. But it's not about Scotland's strengths as some sort of **bolt-on** extra. It's about what we, the **constituent** parts of the United Kingdom, can achieve together – the power of collaboration. It is there in our past.

When the Scottish enlightenment met the industrial revolution, intellectual endeavour and commercial might combined to shape global economic ideas. And that power of collaboration is there today. Together we're stronger at getting out there and selling our products to the world.

Take Scotch whisky. Whether I'm in India or China, there is barely a meeting abroad when I don't **bang the drum** for whisky abroad. Now, of course, the First Minister fights hard for those deals too, but the **clout** we have as a United Kingdom gives us a much better chance of getting around the right tables, **bashing** down trade barriers, getting deals signed. And the result: Scotch whisky adds £135 to the UK's balance of payments every single second.

And together we're stronger to lead in the industries of the future. Take green energy. We have the wind and the waves of Scotland, decades of North Sea experience in Aberdeen and, with the rest of the UK, a domestic energy market of tens of millions of people to drive and support these new industries. 2 years ago we set up the Green Investment Bank. Based in Edinburgh, it's invested across the United Kingdom, helping a Scottish **distillery** to fit sustainable **biomass** boilers, financing a new energy centre at Addenbrooke's Hospital in Cambridge. This is what happens when we collaborate.

We have come through the great **recession** together: our **deficit** down by a third; our economy growing; our exports to China doubled. And I believe we stand a much, much better chance of building a prosperous future together.

Now, the third reason we're stronger together is our place in the world. Together, we get a seat at the UN Security Council, real **clout** in NATO and Europe, the prestige to host events like the G8. Together we've got the finest armed forces on our planet. I think of the fighter pilots originally operating from RAF Lossiemouth who flew

sorties over Libya; the legendary Scottish titles now part of the Royal Regiment of Scotland, like the Black Watch and the Highlanders. I think of the shipyards on the Forth and Clyde, where – alongside shipyards in the rest of the UK – they are building the Queen Elizabeth aircraft carrier, launching this year to secure the seas and to keep us safe.

Now to some all this might sound like national vanity. It's the view that, if the UK split up and our role in the world shrank, would that really matter so much. But this is a country that earns its living through its international ties with millions of our citizens living abroad. When ships are **ambushed** on lawless seas, that hits our trade. When the middle class in China is set to grow by millions a year that presents huge opportunities for our jobs back home here in the UK. The world shapes us, so our place in the world – that really matters.

And make no mistake: we matter more as a United Kingdom – politically, militarily, diplomatically and culturally too. And our reach – our reach is about so much more than military might; it's about our music, our film, our TV, our fashion.

My wife, Samantha, is an ambassador for the British Fashion Council and she sees and **raves** about the international impact of our fashion, helped along massively by Scottish designers like Christopher Kane and Jonathan Saunders. Sometimes we can forget just how big our reputation is – that the world over the letters 'UK' stand for unique, brilliant, creative, **eccentric, ingenious**. We come as a brand – and a powerful brand. Separating Scotland out of that brand would be like separating the waters of the River Tweed and the North Sea. If we lost Scotland, if the UK changed, we would **rip the rug** from our own reputation. The fact is we matter more in the world if we stay together.

These are all, I believe, compelling practical reasons for the United Kingdom to stick together. But, **pounds and pence**, institutional questions – that's not really what it's about for me. It's about the slave who escaped his master after the American Revolution because he was offered liberty and land by the British crown. In gratitude, he named himself this: British Freedom. This is a country that stands for something. And this, really, is why I'm standing here today: our shared values. Freedom. Solidarity. Compassion. Not just overseas, but at home.

In this country, we don't walk on by when people are sick, when people lose work, when people get old. I know when you talk about an Englishman, a Welshman, a Scotsman, a Northern Irishman, it might sound like the beginning of a bad joke, but it's actually how we started our NHS, our welfare system, our state pension system. And these values, they're not trapped in the pages of a history book – they're live. When the people of Benghazi were crying out for help, when a girl in Pakistan was shot for wanting an education, when children around the world are desperate for food or for aid, we don't walk on by.

And let's be clear. Our values are not just a source of pride for us; they are a source of hope for the world. Our Parliament, our laws, our way of life – so often, down the centuries, the UK has given people hope; that resolution is found not through the bullet, but the **ballot box**. Our values are of value to the world. In the darkest times in human history there has been, in the North Sea, a light that never goes out. And if this

family of nations broke up, something very powerful and very precious the world over would go out forever.

So there is a moral, economic, **geopolitical**, diplomatic and yes – let's say it proudly – emotional case for keeping the United Kingdom together. But still, however strongly we feel, we can be a **reticent** nation. It can seem **vulgar** to fly the flag. Some people have advised me to stay out of this issue, and don't get too sentimental about the UK. But frankly, I care too much to stay out of it. This is personal.

I have an old copy of *Our Island Story*, my favourite book as a child, and I want to give it to my three children, and I want to be able to teach my youngest, when she's old enough to understand, that she is part of this great, world-beating story. And I passionately hope that my children will be able to teach their children the same; that the stamp on their passport is a mark of pride; that together these islands really do stand for something more than the sum of our parts; they stand for bigger ideals, nobler causes, greater values. Our brilliant United Kingdom: brave, brilliant, **buccaneering**, generous, tolerant, proud – this is our country. And we built it together, brick by brick: Scotland, England, Wales, Northern Ireland. Brick by brick. This is our home, and I could not bear to see it torn apart.

I love this country. I love the United Kingdom and all it stands for, and I will fight with everything I have to keep us together. And so I want to be clear to everyone listening: there can be no **complacency** about the result of this referendum. The outcome is still up in the air and we have just 7 months to go: 7 months to do all we can to keep our United Kingdom as 1; 7 months to save the most extraordinary country in history. And we must do whatever it takes.

So to everyone in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, everyone like me, who cares about the United Kingdom, I want to say this: you don't have a vote, but you do have a voice. Those voting, they're our friends, they're our neighbours, they're our family. You do have an influence. So, get on the phone, get together, email, tweet, speak; let the message ring out from Manchester to Motherwell, from Pembrokeshire to Perth, from Belfast to Bute, from us to the people of Scotland. Let the message be this: we want you to stay. Think of what we've done together, what we can do together, what we stand for together.

Team GB. The winning team in world history. Let us stick together for a winning future too. Thank you.

Chapter 14 Britain and Europe

I. Britain's Entry into Europe

With the aim of ending the frequent and bloody conflicts that culminated in the Second World War, European politicians begin the process of building what we know today as the European Union. The European Coal and Steel Community, founded in 1951, is the first step in securing a lasting peace. In 1957, the Treaty of Rome establishes the European Economic Community (EEC)---the Common Market, and a new era of ever-closer cooperation in Europe.

In 1971 one of the big public issues was whether or not Britain should join the Common Market. The original six member countries of the Common Market are Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany. The 'six' are politically independent of one another, but they have abolished all customs and trade barriers. No passports or **work permits** are needed.

Public opinion was divided. In 1970 a majority was in favour of entry, but in the first part of 1971, when the possibility became a probability, the majority were against entry. The Conservative Party firmly believed that this was the result of ignorance and that when people learned more of the facts about the Common Market, the majority would again be in favour of entry. Indeed, as 1971 progressed, the majority against entry did become smaller.

Euro-sceptics think that closer union would **inhibit** Britain's freedom to make its own decisions about its political and economic future---that Britain would become a minor region of a 'one-state' Europe dominated by a centralised **bureaucracy**. They see this as a radical break with the tradition of **parliamentary sovereignty**.

Pro-Europeans see it as essential to Britain's national interest that Britain has a voice in the direction of policy in Europe, otherwise Britain will be **marginalized** with little power as Europe continues to develop into a more **cohesive** power. Economic union and a single currency are seen as foundations for closer political union.

Britain officially became a member of the Europe Economic Community on January 1st 1973. It was Britain's third attempt to join since 1960.

Since then, European Union (EU) is a growing community. Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom join the European Communities on 1 January 1973, raising the number of member countries to 9. In 1981, Greece becomes the 10th member of the European Communities, and Spain and Portugal follow 5 years later. Austria, Finland and Sweden join the EU in 1995. The split between Eastern and Western Europe is healed when 10 new countries join the EU in 2004, followed by Bulgaria and Romania in 2007. By early 2022, there are altogether 27 member countries.

In 1993, the single market is launched with the '4 freedoms' of free movement for people, goods, services and money. A small village in **Luxembourg** gives its name to the Schengen agreement that will gradually allow people to travel to large parts of the EU without passport checks. On 1 January 1999, the euro was born, but Britain stayed out of it.

In a referendum held on 23 June 2016, the majority of those who voted chose to leave the European Union. At 11pm on 31 January 2020, the UK left the EU and entered a transition period.

At 11pm on 31 December 2020, the transition period ended and the United Kingdom left the EU single market and customs union. The UK leaves the European Union after 47 years of membership, opening a new chapter in its relationship with the EU.

II. Brexit

Queen's Speech in Parliament

14 October 2019

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons,

My Government's priority has always been to secure the United Kingdom's departure from the European Union on 31 October. My Government intends to work towards a new partnership with the European Union, based on free trade and friendly cooperation. My Ministers will work to implement new **regimes** for fisheries, agriculture and trade, seizing the opportunities that arise from leaving the European Union.

An **immigration bill**, ending free movement, will lay the foundation for a fair, modern and global immigration system. My Government remains **committed to** ensuring that resident European citizens, who have built their lives in, and contributed so much to, the United Kingdom, have the right to remain. The bill will include measures that reinforce this commitment.

Steps will be taken to provide certainty, stability and new opportunities for the financial services and legal sectors. My Government's new economic plan will be **underpinned** by a responsible **fiscal** strategy, investing in economic growth while maintaining the **sustainability** of the public finances.

Measures will be brought forward to support and strengthen the National Health Service, its workforce and resources, enabling it to deliver the highest quality care. New laws will be taken forward to help **implement** the National Health Service's Long Term Plan in England, and to establish an independent body to investigate serious healthcare incidents.

My Government will bring forward proposals to reform adult social care in England to ensure **dignity** in old age. My Ministers will continue work to reform the Mental Health Act to improve respect for, and care of, those receiving treatment.

My Government is committed to **addressing violent crime**, and to strengthening public confidence in the criminal justice system. New **sentencing laws** will see that the most serious offenders spend longer in custody to reflect better the **severity** of their crimes. Measures will be introduced to improve the justice system's response to foreign national offenders.

My Government will work to improve safety and security in prisons and to strengthen the **rehabilitation** of offenders. Proposals will be brought forward to

ensure that victims receive the support they need and the justice they deserve. Laws will be introduced to ensure that the **parole** system recognises the pain to victims and their families caused by offenders refusing to disclose information relating to their crimes .

A new duty will be placed on public sector bodies, ensuring they work together to address serious violence. Police officers will be provided with the protections they need to keep the population safe. They will also be awarded the power to arrest individuals who are wanted by trusted international partners.

My Government will bring forward measures to protect individuals, families and their homes. Legislation will transform the approach of the justice system and other agencies to victims of domestic abuse, and minimise the impact of divorce, particularly on children. My Ministers will continue to develop proposals to improve internet safety, and will bring forward laws to implement new building safety standards.

My Ministers will ensure that all young people have access to an excellent education, **unlocking their full potential** and preparing them for the world of work. My Government will take steps to make work fairer, introducing measures that will support those working hard. To help people plan for the future, measures will be brought forward to provide simpler **oversight** of pensions savings. To protect people's savings for later life, new laws will provide greater powers to tackle irresponsible management of private pension schemes .

To ensure that the benefits of a prospering economy reach every corner of the United Kingdom, my Ministers will bring forward a National **Infrastructure** Strategy. This will set out a long-term vision to improve the nation's digital, transport and energy infrastructure. New legislation will help **accelerate** the delivery of fast, reliable and secure broadband networks to millions of homes. An **aviation** bill will provide for the effective and efficient management of the United Kingdom's airspace Air Traffic Management and Unmanned Aircraft Bill. Proposals on railway reform will be brought forward.

A white paper will be published to set out my Government's ambitions for **unleashing** regional potential in England, and to enable decisions that affect local people to be made at a local level.

My Government is committed to establishing the United Kingdom as a world-leader in scientific capability and space technology. Increased investment in science will be complemented by the development of a new funding agency, a more open visa system, and an ambitious national space strategy.

My Ministers remain committed to protecting and improving the environment for future generations. For the first time, environmental principles will be **enshrined** in law. Measures will be introduced to improve air and water quality, tackle plastic pollution and restore **habitats** so plants and wildlife can **thrive**.

Legislation will also create new legally-binding environmental improvement targets. A new, world-leading independent **regulator** will be established in **statute** to **scrutinise** environmental policy and law, investigate complaints and take enforcement action. Proposals will also be brought forward to promote and protect the welfare of

animals, including banning imports from **trophy** hunting.

The integrity and prosperity of the union that binds the four nations of the United Kingdom is of the utmost importance to my Government. My Ministers will bring forward measures to support citizens across all the nations of the United Kingdom.

My Government remains committed to working with all parties in Northern Ireland to support the return of devolved government and to address the legacy of the past.

My Government will take steps to protect the integrity of democracy and the electoral system in the United Kingdom.

My Government will continue to invest in our **gallant** Armed Forces. My Ministers will honour the Armed Forces Covenant and the NATO commitment to spend at least two per cent of national income on defence.

As the United Kingdom leaves the European Union, my Government will ensure that it continues to play a leading role in global affairs, defending its interests and promoting its values.

My Government will be at the forefront of efforts to solve the most complex international security issues. It will **champion** global free trade and work alongside international partners to solve the most pressing global challenges. It will **prioritise** tackling climate change and ensuring that all girls have access to twelve years of quality education.

Members of the House of Commons. Estimates for the public services will be laid before you.

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons. Other measures will be laid before you.



Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to Windsor



