



HOUSE OF LORDS

Conduct Committee

---

1st Report of Session 2023–24

# The conduct of Lord Skidelsky

---

Ordered to be printed 8 November and published 9 November 2023

---

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

HL Paper 4

### *Conduct Committee*

The Conduct Committee reviews and oversees the Codes of Conduct and the work of the House of Lords Commissioner for Standards. Recommended changes to the Codes are reported to the House and take effect when agreed by the House.

### *Membership*

The Members of the Conduct Committee are::

Lord Blair of Boughton  
Cindy Butts (lay member)  
Mark Castle (lay member)  
Andrea Coomber (lay member)  
Dr Vanessa Davies (lay member)  
Lord Garnier  
Baroness Mallalieu  
Baroness Manningham-Buller (Chair)  
Lord Scriven

Address: The Clerk to the Conduct Committee, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW

Email: [lordsconduct@parliament.uk](mailto:lordsconduct@parliament.uk)

Telephone: 020 7219 3325

Website: <https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/402/conduct-committee>

### *Registrar of Lords' Interests*

The Registrar of Lords' Interests advises members of the House and their staff on their obligations under the Codes of Conduct.

Address: The Registrar of Lords' Interests, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW

Email: [lordsregistrar@parliament.uk](mailto:lordsregistrar@parliament.uk)

Telephone: 020 7219 3112/3120

### *Registers of Interests*

A list of interests of members and their staff can be found online:

<https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests>

### *Commissioners for Standards*

The independent Commissioners for Standards are responsible for considering any alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct.

Address: The Commissioners for Standards, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW

Email: [lordsstandards@parliament.uk](mailto:lordsstandards@parliament.uk)

Telephone: 020 7219 7152

Website: <https://www.parliament.uk/hl-standards>

### *Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme helpline*

Telephone: 0808 168 9281 (freephone)

Email: [support@ICGShelpline.org.uk](mailto:support@ICGShelpline.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page</i>
<b>Report from the Conduct Committee</b>	<b>3</b>
Background	3
Summary of the case	3
Lord Skidelsky's appeal against the Commissioner's proposed sanction	4
The Committee's findings	5
<b>Annex A: Report from the House of Lords Commissioner for Standards on the conduct of the Lord Skidelsky</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Complaint and investigation</b>	<b>9</b>
Summary of complaint	9
Relevant aspects of the Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords	9
Preliminary assessment	10
Written responses	11
Oral evidence from Lord Skidelsky's former staff members	12
Oral evidence from Lord Skidelsky and other evidence	14
Centre for Global Studies	15
Funding arrangements	16
Demarcation between parliamentary and charity work	17
Registration of interests	17
Financial benefits	18
Staff support	19
Use of House of Lords facilities	20
Notification of Clerk of the Parliaments about the Charity Commission investigation	22
<b>Chapter 2: Findings and outcome</b>	<b>23</b>
Findings	23
Lord Skidelsky's response to the draft factual report and findings	26
Outcome	26
<b>Appendix 1: Lord Skidelsky's response to the draft factual report and findings</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 2: The Commissioner's response to Lord Skidelsky's response to the draft factual report and findings</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Lord Skidelsky's email exchange with the former Clerk of the Parliaments, April 2019</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Charity Commission disclosures</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Annex B: Lord Skidelsky's written appeal</b>	<b>44</b>



# The conduct of Lord Skidelsky

## REPORT FROM THE CONDUCT COMMITTEE

---

### Background

1. The Conduct Committee has considered a report by the House of Lords Commissioner for Standards, Martin Jelley QPM DL, on the conduct of Lord Skidelsky (see Annex A). We have also considered a written appeal submitted by Lord Skidelsky, in which he appeals against the Commissioner's recommended sanction of one month's suspension from the service of the House (see Annex B). Lord Skidelsky has not appealed against the Commissioner's findings that he breached various provisions of the Code.
2. The procedure followed by the Conduct Committee in considering reports and appeals is set out in paragraphs 193–196 of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.<sup>1</sup> Under this procedure an appeal must be made in writing; the Committee may hear from the member in person, though in this case we have decided not to do so; nor have we sought further input from the Commissioner.

### Summary of the case

3. The investigation was launched after the Commissioner for Standards received a disclosure of information from the Charity Commission for England and Wales ('the Commission'), in accordance with section 56 of the Charities Act 2011, which permits the Commission to share information with another public authority for the purposes of enabling or assisting it to discharge its functions. The information supplied by the Commission suggested that there was a *prima facie* case that Lord Skidelsky might have breached the Code of Conduct, so in accordance with paragraph 130 of the Guide the Commissioner for Standards sought the agreement of the Conduct Committee to launch an investigation. The Committee agreed to this request on 19 April 2023.
4. The investigation related to a charity, the Centre for Global Studies ('CGS'), which was established in 2002 with Lord Skidelsky as Chair of the Trustees. He registered this role under Category 10, as a non-financial interest. The charity's formal aim was, in paraphrase, to advance public education in the economic, social and political sciences. In practice its primary function was to support Lord Skidelsky in both his parliamentary and his academic work. Lord Skidelsky confirmed, for instance, that since 2009 all staff supporting him in his parliamentary and academic work had been paid by the CGS. His parliamentary office was the registered address of the charity until April 2019, when the then Clerk of the Parliaments advised that it was not appropriate to use parliamentary accommodation as a trading address for the charity or any other organisation. Lord Skidelsky then changed the registered address of the CGS, but the staff paid by the charity continued to work out of his parliamentary office.

---

<sup>1</sup> All paragraph references are to the twelfth edition of the Code of Conduct and Guide, which was in force during the Commissioner's investigation, rather than the thirteenth edition which was published in September 2023.

5. In May 2022, following the Government’s sanctioning of the two Russian businessmen who had been the main funders of the CGS, donations ceased. Lord Skidelsky removed the CGS from his entry in the Register of Interests on 30 April 2022, telling the Commissioner that this was because it had become dormant and he intended to wind it up. In the event, though, the charity remained in existence, and in August 2022 the Charity Commission launched an investigation into its affairs. Lord Skidelsky re-registered his interest in May 2023, shortly after the Commissioner for Standards launched his investigation. At the time of writing Lord Skidelsky’s role with the CGS continues to be listed in the Register under Category 10.
6. During his investigation the Commissioner considered written and oral evidence from Lord Skidelsky, and interviewed two of Lord Skidelsky’s former members of staff. After considering this evidence, alongside the materials provided by the Charity Commission, and Lord Skidelsky’s comments on the draft factual report and findings, the Commissioner concluded that Lord Skidelsky had breached the Code of Conduct by:
  - prematurely removing his interest in the CGS from his entry in the register in May 2022, and not reinstating it until May 2023, when in fact the charity continued to exist during that period (paragraphs 12(a) and 15 of the Code);
  - not fully registering advances and royalties he received for his various publications (paragraph 12(a));
  - not registering the support he received from staff paid by the charity as a benefit, since at least 2009 (paragraph 12(a));
  - contravening the rules on the use of House facilities by using his parliamentary office as the headquarters of his charity (paragraph 12(c)); and
  - not informing the Clerk of the Parliaments about the decision by the Charity Commission in August 2022 to launch an investigation into the charity (paragraph 20).
7. Given the number of breaches, the prolonged period over which some of them took place and other considerations, the Commissioner recommended that Lord Skidelsky be suspended from the House for one month.

### **Lord Skidelsky’s appeal against the Commissioner’s proposed sanction**

8. Lord Skidelsky did not appeal against the Commissioner’s findings, as summarised in paragraph 6 above.
9. Lord Skidelsky did appeal against the Commissioner’s proposed sanction, on the grounds that it was “in the circumstances, too severe, disproportionate, and that an alternative sanction was and is available and appropriate”. He also argued “that it would have been appropriate for the Commissioner to consider engaging with [him] to discuss alternative possible remedial action before making a recommendation”.
10. Lord Skidelsky made the following points in support of his appeal:
  - the breaches were “technical and inadvertent”;

- there was no intention to profit from membership of the House, provide parliamentary advice or services or confer an exclusive benefit on third parties, and the Commissioner did not “focus robustly” on the absence of such motives;
- in breaching the Code he did not intend to “deceive or benefit”, and the breaches “had no consequences”;
- the severity of the recommended sanction implied a “moral culpability” and the Commissioner’s reference to his “lack of contrition” was not relevant;
- the sanction “leaves a moral stain on [his] parliamentary career, which will damage any future [he has] either in the Lords or in public life”.

11. Lord Skidelsky suggested, as an alternative to the proposed suspension:

- that he should make a “clear and sincere apology to the House for the breaches ... in terms to be agreed but which also reflect that these breaches were inadvertent and no findings of moral turpitude”;
- that he should undertake “an appropriate training course” on how to comply with “the numerous and increasingly complex requirements of the Code of Conduct”. This, he argued, would be a “positive and effective sanction rather than a punitive one”.

### **The Committee’s findings**

12. As noted above, Lord Skidelsky argues that “it would have been appropriate for the Commissioner to consider engaging with me to discuss alternative possible remedial action before making a recommendation”. Paragraph 160 of the Guide to the Code of Conduct describes remedial action as follows:

“Remedial action may be agreed if the complaint, though justified, is minor and is acknowledged by the member concerned ... remedial action involves ‘putting the record straight’, for instance by making an amendment to the Register”.

13. We have accordingly considered, first, whether the breaches described in the Commissioner’s report were indeed “minor”. The Commissioner addresses this point in paragraph 78 of his report. While breaches of the rules on registration of interests are generally less serious than those on, for instance, the provision of parliamentary services in return for payment, he highlights both the length of time over which the breaches in this case occurred and Lord Skidelsky’s refusal to accept that his role in the CGS constituted either an external or a pecuniary interest. It is clear to us that Lord Skidelsky received tangible and substantial benefits from the charity: the staff supporting him in his parliamentary and academic work were paid by the charity over many years; their support in turn helped him in writing and publishing several books, from which he benefited financially; family members also received money directly from the charity. At no point were any of these tangible benefits received from the CGS registered.

14. We are also conscious of the source of funding for the charity (see paragraph 5 above), and while we have seen no evidence to suggest that donors to CGS sought or received any benefit in return for their financial contribution, we endorse the Commissioner’s comment in paragraph 80 of his report that

given their donations Lord Skidelsky should have exercised “particular care” in complying with the obligations of the Code.

15. Finally, we note Lord Skidelsky’s acknowledgement that, until his correspondence with the then Clerk of the Parliaments in 2019, he had breached the rules on the use of facilities by using his parliamentary office as the registered address for the CGS. In his response to the Charity Commission, which was disclosed to the Commissioner and is annexed to the Commissioner’s report, he indicated that “assuming standard costs in central London, the Charity’s ability to use my parliamentary office for its business saved it about £600,000, or one quarter of its donated income”. Both the financial benefit to the CGS resulting from Lord Skidelsky’s misuse of parliamentary accommodation and the total income received by CGS (which by Lord Skidelsky’s own account amounted to some £2.4 million) were substantial.
16. We therefore cannot agree with Lord Skidelsky that the breaches described in the Commissioner’s report are “minor”.
17. The second criterion for remedial action is that the breaches should be “acknowledged by the member concerned”. In a technical sense it is true that Lord Skidelsky has “acknowledged” his breaches of the Code, but in so doing he continues to describe them as “technical and inadvertent”, seeking to minimise their significance. He argues, for instance, that his breaches “had no consequences”. The purpose of the Code, as paragraph 3(b) states, is “to provide the openness and accountability necessary to reinforce public confidence in the way in which members of the House of Lords perform their parliamentary duties”. The potential consequences of breaches of the kind described in the Commissioner’s report are therefore clear: they could undermine the essential purpose of the Code and thus public confidence in the House.
18. Lord Skidelsky also states that any apology should make clear that his breaches were “inadvertent”, avoiding any implication of “moral turpitude”. He criticises the Commissioner’s reference to his “lack of contrition”, which he describes as “a theological usage linked to sin and repentance. I have to deny the relevance of this concept to my case”.
19. In fact, the Commissioner’s report, at paragraph 78, describes Lord Skidelsky’s “lack of contrition” as an “aggravating factor”. This is an entirely appropriate reference: both aggravating and mitigating factors are given due weight in the Commissioner’s report and inform his recommended sanction. Lord Skidelsky’s continuing insistence that his breaches were “inadvertent”, and his lack of understanding of their significance, demonstrate why remedial action would not have been an appropriate course in this case.
20. Finally, we note Lord Skidelsky’s suggestion that he undertake “an appropriate training course” on how to comply with “the numerous and increasingly complex requirements of the Code of Conduct”. This appears to be an attempt to shift at least some of the blame for his breaches onto the perceived complexity of the Code. We acknowledge that in some areas the rules set out in the Code and Guide are complex. A degree of complexity is unavoidable, though we will continue to seek to simplify and clarify the rules where appropriate. But we also emphasise the following:



- Members are themselves responsible for reading, understanding and abiding by the Code and Guide, including the provisions on registration (Code, paragraph 17).
  - All members sign an undertaking to abide by the Code when they take the oath or make the solemn affirmation upon introduction and at the start of each Parliament (Code, paragraph 4).
  - The requirement to register relevant interests dates back almost 30 years, and has not changed in substance during that time.
  - All members, when in doubt, are encouraged to seek the advice of staff, including the Registrar of Lords' Interests (Code, paragraph 33).
21. Taking all these factors into account, we do not consider that remedial action, or an apology to the House in the terms proposed by Lord Skidelsky, would be an appropriate outcome.
  22. Finally, we have considered whether a suspension of one month is appropriate in this case. The Commissioner's report, at paragraphs 78–81, clearly sets out the various aggravating and mitigating factors he considered when deciding to recommend this sanction. We endorse his analysis, and his recommendation.
  23. **We therefore dismiss the appeal, and recommend that Lord Skidelsky be suspended from the service of the House for a period of one month.**



# Annex A: Report from the House of Lords Commissioner for Standards on the conduct of the Lord Skidelsky

## CHAPTER 1: COMPLAINT AND INVESTIGATION

---

### Summary of complaint

1. On 26 March 2023, my<sup>2</sup> office received a disclosure of information from the Charity Commission for England and Wales (“the Charity Commission”), under section 56 of the Charities Act 2011, which permits the Charity Commission to share information with another public authority for the purposes of enabling or assisting it to discharge its functions. The disclosure is in Appendix 4.
2. The Charity Commission’s disclosure confirmed that it was investigating a registered charity called the Centre for Global Studies (“the charity”), which was chaired by Lord Skidelsky. During its investigation the Charity Commission received and identified information it believed may be of interest to the Commissioners for Standards.
3. The information provided by the Charity Commission suggested there were *prima facie* breaches of the Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords (“the Code of Conduct”) by Lord Skidelsky.
4. On 11 May 2023 the Charity Commission publicly confirmed that it had opened a statutory inquiry into the Centre for Global Studies on 8 August 2022.<sup>3</sup>

### *Relevant aspects of the Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords*

5. My investigation into the conduct of Lord Skidelsky took place when the twelfth edition of the Code of Conduct was in force. In September, shortly after my investigation concluded, the thirteenth edition of the Code entered into force.<sup>4</sup> As there have been no substantive changes to the provisions of the Code which Lord Skidelsky’s conduct engaged in the thirteenth edition, I reference the provisions of the twelfth edition in this report and refer to the new paragraph numbers in the thirteenth edition in footnotes where appropriate.

---

2 This investigation and report was completed by Martin Jelley QPM DL

3 The Charity Commission, ‘Regulator announces inquiry into London-based educational charity’ (11 May 2023): <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regulator-announces-inquiry-into-london-based-educational-charity> [accessed 29 September 2023]

4 *Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords, Guide to the Code of Conduct, Code of Conduct for House of Lords Members’ Staf*, (Thirteenth edition, September 2023, HL Paper 255): <https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/lords-commissioner-for-standards/hl-code-of-conduct.pdf>

6. Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct states:

“... In discharging their parliamentary duties members of the House of Lords draw substantially on experience and expertise gained outside Parliament.”

7. Paragraph 12<sup>5</sup> of the Code of Conduct states:

“In order to assist in openness and accountability members shall:

(a) register in the Register of Lords’ Interests all relevant interests, in order to make clear what are the interests that might reasonably be thought to influence their parliamentary actions;

(b) declare when speaking in the House, or communicating with ministers or public servants any interest which is a relevant interest in the context of the debate or the matter under discussion;

(c) act in accordance with any rules agreed by the House in respect of financial support for members or the facilities of the House.”

8. Paragraph 15<sup>6</sup> of the Code of Conduct states:

“Members are responsible for ensuring that their registered interests are accurate and up-to-date. They should register any change in their relevant interests within one month of the change.”

9. Paragraph 20<sup>7</sup> of the Code of Conduct states:

“Members must, within 10 working days of being notified by the relevant authority, inform the Clerk of the Parliaments if they are ... placed under investigation by a body which regulates the occupation which they practise ...”

### **Preliminary assessment**

10. I carried out a preliminary assessment and, based on the disclosure I received from the Charity Commission, concluded that it would be appropriate to investigate whether the conduct of Lord Skidelsky constituted breaches of the Code of Conduct.

11. Paragraph 130<sup>8</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct states that:

“A complaint made by a third party is the usual basis for the Commissioners to start an investigation. In exceptional circumstances however, and with the agreement of the Conduct Committee, they may start an investigation in the absence of a complaint, either at the request of the member concerned, or if by other means they become aware of evidence sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case that the Code of Conduct has been breached.”

12. Since the disclosure by the Charity Commission was not a complaint, I therefore required the Conduct Committee’s agreement to investigate. On

---

5 Paragraph 14 of the thirteenth edition of the Code of Conduct.

6 Paragraph 17 of the thirteenth edition of the Code of Conduct.

7 Paragraph 21 of the thirteenth edition of the Code of Conduct.

8 Paragraph 131 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

19 April the Committee agreed to my request to launch an investigation into this matter.

13. Before beginning my investigation, I needed to satisfy myself that the complaint did not engage the House’s *sub judice* resolution, or that it was unlikely to do so during my investigation. I was aware that Lord Skidelsky had appealed the Charity Commission’s decision to appoint interim managers to the charity, in place of the trustees, and that a tribunal hearing to consider this matter was pending. Therefore, I needed to be mindful of how my investigation might be affected by any subsequent civil proceedings, and vice versa.
14. Paragraph 144<sup>9</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct requires an investigation to be suspended if related proceedings (criminal or civil) become *sub judice* within the meaning of the House’s *sub judice* resolution.<sup>10</sup> The *sub judice* resolution covers active civil proceedings and is subject to waiver. After making further inquiries, I was satisfied that any civil proceedings were not active, within the meaning of the House’s *sub judice* resolution, when my investigation concluded in September 2023. Furthermore, I was satisfied that there was no overlap between my investigation and the specific matters which would be considered by the tribunal.
15. I wrote to Lord Skidelsky on 25 April to inform him that I had determined there was sufficient evidence to establish there was a *prima facie* case and that I was opening an investigation into whether paragraphs 12, 15 and 20 of the Code of Conduct for Members had been breached. I invited him to provide me with a written response. My letter requested responses to five specific questions:
  - “1. Is your role as Chair of the Centre for Global Studies (“the Centre”) still a live interest?
  2. What advice did you receive from the Clerk of the Parliaments about the use of your parliamentary office for charitable purposes? When did you receive this advice?
  3. Are your staff members paid for by the Centre? Have any of your previous staff members been paid for the Centre?
  4. If your staff members were paid for by the Centre, why did you not record this under category 6 (sponsorship) in your entry in the Register of Interests?
  5. As per paragraph 20 of the Code of Conduct did you consider notifying the Clerk of the Parliaments about the investigation by the Charity Commission?”
16. In the same letter I told Lord Skidelsky that I intended to arrange an interview with him following receipt of his written submission.

### Written responses

17. Lord Skidelsky responded to my five questions on 2 May. He said:

---

<sup>9</sup> Paragraph 145 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

<sup>10</sup> See The Companion to the Standing Orders, paragraphs 4.68 to 4.73

“1 ... The Charity is moribund. It has no revenue. The Trustees decided to close it in May 2022, but the freezing of the Charity’s bank balance by Santander bank has delayed. This account was now closed by the bank, and the balance of funds returned to me. However, the process of closing the charity is now in train.

2 ... Without documentation to hand I cannot tell you the precise date when I received the advice from the Clerk of [the] Parliaments about the use of my office. You will have received a copy of my statement to the Charity Commission, dating it from 2018. I acted immediately on it, and from that moment my parliamentary office ceased to be the registered office of the Charity.

3 ... Since the Centre for Global Studies was established as an independent think tank in 2002, my staff members have been paid by the charity, with the exception of office expenses claimed for parliamentary attendance. The contracts with staff members were and are contracts with the charity. However, as I explained to the Charity Commission, these employees have worked in two capacities: (a) as researchers and administrators of the Charity, and (b) as parliamentary assistants to myself. They obtained passes as parliamentary assistants ... in order to gain access to the House of Lords Library for research [purposes].

4 ... As I understand it, category 4 not 6 deals with sponsorship,<sup>11</sup> where it says that ‘types of support which should be registered under this Category include: the services of a research assistant or secretary whose salary, in whole or in part, is met by an outside organisation or individual’. In retrospect, I should have registered research help provided by the Centre for Global Studies. The reason I failed to do so is that it never occurred to me that research help provided for my academic work might be construed as financial payment to support a particular political cause or lobby. I have always thought of myself as an academic peer - a Cross Bencher since 2001 - whose research fed his parliamentary work, particularly on select committees like the Economic Affairs Committee.

5 ... I now realise that I should have informed the Clerk of Parliaments that the Charity Commission had opened an inquiry into the Centre for Global Studies. However, it was an enquiry into the Centre of Global Studies, not an inquiry into my conduct as a parliamentarian. It was also launched on 8 August 2022 in the middle of the summer recess, so it might have slipped my mind even had it entered it in the first place.”

### **Oral evidence from Lord Skidelsky’s former staff members**

18. I interviewed Lord Skidelsky’s former members of staff, Mr Erik Schurkus and Miss Jessica Tomlinson, separately, on 24 May. Michael Torrance, Standards Clerk, was also in attendance.
19. Mr Schurkus told me he was responsible for managing Lord Skidelsky’s diary, including the mailbox and checking *House of Lords Business* for any speeches he wanted to deliver, as well as arranging stationery and travel. His role was his first job after graduating. While Lord Skidelsky began paying his salary from June 2022 onwards, he confirmed he was still providing support for the Centre for Global Studies. He confirmed the parliamentary office

---

<sup>11</sup> This is incorrect.

was the main base of the charity's operations and that, to his knowledge, all previous staff employed by the charity had been based there.

20. Mr Schurkus told me he believed that "the charity was set up as a business vehicle to support Lord Skidelsky in any matter he is working on, on parliamentary work. So, what we mainly do is lectures, books and speeches for the House." He saw no distinction or demarcation between the work of the charity and Lord Skidelsky's parliamentary role. He said that "Lord Skidelsky is the charity and the charity's sole purpose is to support the work that he does" and that he understood that the charity was "more the financial hub of the workings that Lord Skidelsky does basically, so just to streamline and make it easier for accountancy purposes." He said the charity used the services of the House of Lords Library to provide research briefings on bills, but that it did not reserve rooms or organise events for the charity on the Parliamentary estate.
21. Miss Tomlinson told me that she began working for Lord Skidelsky in October 2021 as a research assistant after graduating. Like Mr Schurkus, she said it was difficult to draw a distinction between the work for the charity and his parliamentary role. She told me that the purpose of the charity was "entirely to support Robert's academic things. So, in that sort of capacity I ... draft articles. He has a monthly column. I conduct research ... he ... has worked on a number of books while I've been his research assistant, so conducting research for that, editing, et cetera. I've edited a number of articles. I've written articles of my own. I provide reports, briefings ... which can be used both for his academic work and in Parliament as well." In her written submission before our interview, Miss Tomlinson told me that "The Centre for Global Studies aims to support Lord Skidelsky's parliamentary work. Thus, the Centre's interests are identical to Lord Skidelsky's in Parliament."
22. Miss Tomlinson confirmed that the charity paid her salary until May 2022, after which she was paid by the Skidelsky Consultancy,<sup>12</sup> and then Lord Skidelsky directly from March 2023 onwards. She said she was no longer providing support to the charity as it had "been entirely defunct since April 2022." However, she emphasised that her role was "never about providing support to the charity as such; it was just always about providing academic support to Lord Skidelsky"; her job description had not changed in any respect. She went on to tell me that, as far as she was aware:
 

"the charity was a vehicle ... through which Lord Skidelsky would be provided with donations to help support his academic work. Through the charity he published a number of books and ... pamphlets [and] it [also] assisted his travel abroad for lectures, for example. He made a number of grants to young scholars ... through the charity."
23. She told me that she had frequently used the House of Lords Library to request books and articles, most recently to support to the production of Lord Skidelsky's new book called *The Machine Age*. Like Mr Schurkus, she said that she had not booked any rooms on the parliamentary estate for the purpose of charity meetings and related activities.

---

<sup>12</sup> A company owned 100 per cent by Lord Skidelsky which is registered in his entry in the Lords' Register of Interests.

### Oral evidence from Lord Skidelsky and other evidence

24. I interviewed Lord Skidelsky on 8 June. Michael Torrance, Standards Clerk, was in attendance again.
25. Ahead of the interview, the Standards Clerk drew Lord Skidelsky's attention to the rules on the use of facilities. In response, and to inform the interview, Lord Skidelsky emailed me on 7 June and said:

“One of the problems I had in answering the Commissioner's questions was the restrictive use of the word ‘interest’ in the Code of Conduct. This applies also to the registration of interests, use of office, payment of salaries.

In dictionary terms interest means anything one is interested in, or curious about. But the Conduct of Conduct uses it in the sense of ‘benefit’ or ‘advantage’. [...]

Interest here is conceived of as having a commercial interest or stake in the outcome of a piece of a piece of legislation or regulation. As I understand it, the Code was designed to ensure that members do not accept money to influence legislation or regulation. I have no quarrel with this and support it.

However, to call the CGS an ‘outside’ interest or a ‘trading’ body is to apply a commercial criterion to an organisation which had no interest whatsoever in this sense, nor could it be reasonably construed as having one. Like any other think tank, its purpose was to think not to lobby, and to offer the fruits of its thinking to the public. To call CGS an ‘outside’ or ‘incidental’ interest in relation to my parliamentary work makes no sense to me. It was integral to my parliamentary work.

I have never conceived my role in Parliament as being to speak or act ‘on behalf’ of any ‘interest’ in the Code sense. I have never accepted money, or any other obligation, to do so. Nor have CGS donors ever attempted to influence my views or actions as a member of Parliament. To my mind, CGS was a research facility, a vital help to me to continue functioning as a thinker once I retired from Warwick University in 2007. Its fruits are my many publications, my speeches in Parliament, and my uninterrupted service on committees of the House between 2002 and 2022.

In short, CGS was not an ‘incidental’ interest or ‘outside’ interest in the meaning of the Code. It provided me with the research, technical and organisational help I would have received from my university. That is why it never occurred to me to treat the CGS as separate from my parliamentary work. Nor did it occur to my parliamentary assistants to register an ‘outside’ interest.

In my submission such breaches of the Code of Conduct as have occurred have been minor, inadvertent, and not in breach of paras 9 (b), (c) or (d), of the Code of Conduct.

Rules Governing the Use of Facilities, Appendix 1

Para 183 [of the Handbook on facilities and services for members and their staff]. Members may use [a parliamentary office] for ‘incidental



purposes'. [...] I have now obtained more accurate information about the change of office address than was available to me when I replied to you on 2 May. I wrote to Mr. Ollard [the then Clerk of the Parliaments] on 26 April 2019 for advice about the use of my parliamentary office at Millbank House as the 'trading' address of the Centre for Global Studies. He replied on 26 April that, whatever might have been sanctioned in the past, this was an inappropriate use of the office. I replied the same day saying that I would change the address at once. On 30 April I changed the address of the Charity from Millbank House to my London flat.

[...]

There was no conflict of interest between the CGS and my parliamentary duties, nor did any of my researchers feel this. Since 2002 when I became a Cross Bencher and the CGS was registered as a charity my parliamentary work (speeches, service on committees) has been completely consistent with the aims and activities of the CGS."

### *Centre for Global Studies*

26. During the interview, I began by asking Lord Skidelsky about the origins of the Centre for Global Studies. He told me that the charity's origins were as an "outgrowth" of the Social Market Foundation, a think tank which became a charity in 1992 with him as its first chair. He went on to tell me that he:
 

"resigned from being chairman of the SMF in 2002, and took that organisation, the Centre for Post-Collectivist Studies, out with [him] and set up a separate charity for it, which became the Centre for Global Studies. Its mission ... was really to educate the public in economic and social affairs. So, it was a small think tank taken out of the larger think tank."
27. Lord Skidelsky told me he was "the intellectual galvaniser or leader/director of the ... Centre for Global Studies ... And we published our books, we published our papers, and I lectured and so on, on behalf of it."
28. I asked Lord Skidelsky about the charity's objective, and he referred me to the stated objective in its entry in the Register of Charities.
29. My office checked how the charity's role and purpose was described in publicly available online resources:
  - (a) The charity's entry in the Register of Charities says the Centre for Global Studies was established "to advance the education of the public in the economic, social and political sciences including the study of markets and the social framework within which they operate. Whether in the UK or worldwide, particularly by the provision of research and the dissemination of such for the public benefit." The Register also says the charity's activities include the "Organisation of educational conferences and publication of works of research" and that it helps the "General Public/mankind". The charity's annual report for 2021-22

does not refer to any parliamentary activities. Neither do the previous annual reports that are available online.<sup>13</sup>

- (b) The charity has a corporate arm, registered with Companies House. The entry with Companies House says the nature of the Centre for Global Studies' business is "technical and vocational secondary education".<sup>14</sup>
- (c) The charity's website says the Centre for Global Studies is a "London-based think tank that aims to improve economics education and public understanding of economics. To that end, the CGS runs symposia and conferences, and supports and publishes research on a wide range of economics-related topics. We also campaign for a more pluralist economics curriculum in universities." The website also refers to several publications and programmes - none of which have an obvious parliamentary dimension - as well as providing the address and phone number of Lord Skidelsky's parliamentary office as the contact details for the charity.<sup>15</sup>

### *Funding arrangements*

- 30. During my investigation, I noted that the Centre for Global Studies received funding from donors. On 7 June Lord Skidelsky told me that these donors had never "attempted to influence [his] views or actions as a member of Parliament."
- 31. During my interview with Lord Skidelsky on 8 June, he told me that the funding the charity received from the donors paid for the majority of the charity's staff costs until May 2022.
- 32. On 12 July I asked Lord Skidelsky for more further information about the Centre for Global Studies' funding arrangements, including the identity of the donors. On 24 July he replied to say that:

"The main funders were Mikhail Gutseriev, a Russian businessman (2007-2021), the Institute for New Economic Thinking (New York) 2012-2019, and Said Gurseriev, son of Mikhail Gutseriev, 2021-2022. There has been no further external funding of any kind since May 2022. Donations from Mikhail Gutseriev ceased in 2021 when he was sanctioned by the UK Government for allegedly supporting the Lukashenko government in Belarus. Donations from Said Gutseriev ceased in May 2022, when he was sanctioned for being his father's son. The only thing to add to this is that at no time did [the] Gutserievs ask for any particular output from the Charity."

---

13 Charity Commission for England and Wales, The Centre for Global Studies—Charity number: 1094442, Governing document: <https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/3990637/governing-document> [accessed 29 September 2023]

14 Companies House, The Centre for Global Studies— Company number 04375608: <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/04375608>. As at September 2023 there was an outstanding application to strike the company from the register. [accessed 29 September 2023]

15 WordPress, The Centre for Global Studies: <https://centreforglobalstudies.wordpress.com>

33. The reasons for the UK Government’s decisions to sanction the individuals in question are articulated in the UK Sanctions List.<sup>16</sup>

*Demarcation between parliamentary and charity work*

34. I asked Lord Skidelsky if the work of the charity and his role as a parliamentarian could be demarcated. He told me:

“I don’t think it’s easy to make that distinction; they fed each other. The work ... that the charity did, the investigation of economic and political issues, fed into my parliamentary work, fed into my parliamentary speeches, and especially into my membership of the Economic Affairs Committee of the House of Lords. I’ve been continuously on the Economic Affairs Committee or other committees for the last 20 years, ever since the Centre for Global Studies started. So, it fed that work. And then, of course, it also published things, and therefore spread through its publications and through my own work in Parliament - it spread the idea of the social market, which had been the original inspiration for the Social Market Foundation ...”

He went on to say:

“In retrospect, I think the Centre for Global Studies should probably not have been set up as a charity. In retrospect, I think I wouldn’t do it the same way now, but I didn’t see any conflict of interest in my two roles at the time. I thought one was supporting the other. I was more effective as a Member of Parliament ... because of this input.”

35. Lord Skidelsky provided my office with a bound volume of his various parliamentary speeches, which he said had been informed by the charity’s work.

36. On 24 July, Lord Skidelsky wrote to me and said:

“The relevance of [my] books to my work as a peer is twofold: first, it is a reputational advantage to the House of Lords that one of its members should be considered a global thought-leader; secondly, as part of the ‘output’ of the CGS, these publications contributed directly to my work as a peer. My continuing academic work in the sphere of political economy constituted the special expertise which I brought to the proceedings of the Lords.”

*Registration of interests*

37. We discussed the status of the charity in Lord Skidelsky’s entry in the Register of Interests. Lord Skidelsky said that the charity had stopped being a live interest between spring and summer 2022 when it stopped receiving funding from its donors, its bank account was frozen, and it started to be investigated by the Charity Commission. He told me that:

“... at that point the charity ceased to exist except for the fact that it was registered as a charity and a company. Well, at that point, I wanted to wind it up ... because there was no further income and there was

---

<sup>16</sup> Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, ‘UK Sanctions List’ (29 September 2023): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-uk-sanctions-list> [accessed 29 September 2023]. The List states that Mikhail Gutseriev was designated, or sanctioned, on 9 August 2021, and Said Gutseriev was designated on 29 June 2022.

no further activity possible ... But I couldn't, nor could the trustees. I mean, they all wanted to wind it up. They said the charity, in effect, was moribund; it was a corpse.”

38. Lord Skidelsky told me that this attempt to wind up the Centre for Global Studies, both with the Charity Commission and with Companies House, had been prevented by the Charity Commission's decision to open an investigation. He explained that he had amended his entry in the Lords Register of Interests in April 2022 because of his intention to wind up the charity, but he had re-registered this interest in May 2023 as the process was taking longer than he had anticipated.

*Financial benefits*

39. I asked Lord Skidelsky if he had derived any financial benefit from the charity. He made it clear to me that he had not derived any financial benefit from the charity and had, in his view, experienced financial loss.
40. After the interview, I requested a further disclosure from the Charity Commission concerning any evidence of financial benefit Lord Skidelsky may have derived from the Centre for Global Studies. The Charity Commission provided me with a further disclosure, which included information about monetary benefits that Lord Skidelsky had received from the charity, as well as members of his family. This further disclosure is in Appendix 4, alongside the original disclosure. I wrote to Lord Skidelsky on 12 July, to provide him with a copy of the further disclosure. My letter also included the following questions:
- (a) On reflection, do you consider that any of the financial transactions detailed in the disclosure should have been registered in your Register of Interests?
- (b) Please provide more detail about the cost of publishing the books and articles that are detailed in the disclosure, including any subsequent profits.
41. Lord Skidelsky responded on 24 July. In response he told me:

“If the thought behind this question is that the output of the CGS assisted-work was a source of ‘profit’ to me and that therefore I should have declared every ‘financial transaction’ which gave rise to this output on my register of interests, I cannot accept that I should have done so. It was sufficient, it seemed to me, to declare the CGS as a non-remunerated interest.

[...]

“My memory is that all the external contributors [to four CGS multi-authored volumes] were offered honoraria for their contributions, with profits accruing to the Centre. I was not aware of any ‘profits’, I doubt if sales ever covered the costs of publication. But this is true of practically all multi-authored books, as any publisher will tell you.

... Since 2002 there have been seven [of my own books]: (1) Keynes: The Return of the Master (Allen Lane, Penguin Books, 2009-2010); (2) Keynes: A Very Short Introduction (OUP 2010), (3) with Edward Skidelsky, How Much is Enough? (Allen Lane, Penguin Books, 2012),

(4) *Britain since 1900: A Success Story?* (Vintage Books, 2014) (5) *The Essential Keynes* (Penguin, Random House 2015), (6) *Money and Government* (Penguin Books Ltd, 2018), (7) *What's Wrong with Economics* (Yale University Press, 2020). An eighth, *The Machine Age*, published by Penguin Books is due out this autumn.

There was never any stipulation by any CGS donor that I ‘pay back’ the charity for any proceeds from the sale of my writings, for the simple reason that the time I spent writing them was not a cost to the charity: rather, it was an unpaid benefit. It was for this reason that I did not feel the need to declare the ‘financial transactions detailed in the disclosure’.

To elaborate. All my own books (as distinct from the other products of the Charity) were commissioned by a publisher, I was paid an advance, and received royalties from sales. Each book took two or three years to write. They all had both British and American publishers and were translated into many languages -15 languages for two of them. The advances, in the order of £20,000 to £30,000 a book, dependent on delivery, were my ‘wage’; the royalties-amounting typically to 10% of the publisher’s sales proceeds - were my ‘profit’. It can readily be seen that, given the time the books took to gestate, my ‘wages’ were far less than the ‘minimum wage’; my profits or ‘literary earnings’ have generally covered the publishers’ advances and for me have constituted a small income of about £3000 to £4000 annually, which naturally falls to near zero over time as sales from existing books drop off. No one who writes the kind of books I do writes for a ‘profit.’”

### *Staff support*

42. We discussed the support he had received from different staff members since the charity was established. Lord Skidelsky confirmed that, since 2009, 20 different members of staff had worked for him and all had been paid by the charity, until May 2022. I asked him why he had never registered this staff support under Category 6 in his entry in the Register of Interests. He said that because he did not consider his staff to be working for an external body, he did not consider it necessary to register this.
43. Regarding the charity’s financial arrangements, Lord Skidelsky explained that the charity had always employed two members of staff except when additional staff had covered special projects in the past, which had sometimes involved grant-funding for a separate office. He told me that “there was basically one big donation every year ... and that paid the salaries of the staff.” On 21 September, as part of feedback on my draft report, Lord Skidelsky told me that the “donor funding paid for all the activities of the Charity” and that he used the House of Lords daily allowance to cover travel and subsistence expenses when he attended Parliament.
44. My office checked with the Registrar of Lords’ Interests if any of Lord Skidelsky’s former staff had registered an interest in the charity. The Assistant Registrar confirmed that no former staff had registered any outside interests except one individual, who had registered an interest in 2017 as an assistant to Skidelsky Consultancy Ltd. Noting paragraph 128<sup>17</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct, which requires members to ensure their staff are “aware of the importance of complying with the Code of Conduct

---

17 Paragraph 130 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

for House of Lords Members' Staff and any other applicable rules", I asked Lord Skidelsky if he had drawn his staff members' attention to the Code of Conduct for Members' Staff, including its requirement to register outside employment. He thought he had drawn his staff's attention to the Code of Conduct for Members' Staff but could not be certain about this. He told me:

"I never alerted them to the fact that the Centre for Global Studies was a special interest ... an outside interest ... They thought that it was simply a contributor to my parliamentary work and to my non-parliamentary work, but my non-parliamentary work was not an interest in the sense - and I also make this point in my written submission - [it] is defined in the Code of Conduct. To me, what having an - what the Code of Conduct sees as an interest - is getting some kind of benefit, normally financial, from the work that is being done, or having some sort of stake - financial stake. You see, that never occurred to me, and I don't think it occurred to any of the employees. They thought they were employees of the Centre for Global Studies, and the Centre for Global Studies was a think tank ... and its interest was in thinking ... and not in actually lobbying or fighting for a particular cause."

45. Regarding the work carried out by his staff, Lord Skidelsky was unable to provide a split in the charity and parliamentary work but told me that his staff were employed to support him with organising conferences, preparing briefs for, and speeches on, related topics in the House, as well as giving international lectures. He considered all these activities to be "closely intertwined".
46. After some discussion, Lord Skidelsky appeared to accept that the wording of the Guide to the Code of Conduct was clear and that, in retrospect, he should have registered his staff support in his entry in the Register of Interests. He said that: "It was a bit messy, and I wouldn't do it the same now ... I think over the years there's been more emphasis on accountability and very exact accountability, and I've tried to keep up with the times, but not always successfully."
47. On 24 July, Lord Skidelsky told me, by email, that:
- "The Centre's employees were employed [for] five main purposes: (a) helping me with my books, (b) briefing me on speeches and special committees of the House on which I served, (c) research [for] lectures at universities, in the UK and abroad, (d) helping to set the agenda and organise the Centre's conferences, (d) keeping my diary."

### *Use of House of Lords facilities*

#### *Parliamentary office*

48. Prompted by Lord Skidelsky's reference to having received advice from a former Clerk of the Parliaments about the use of his parliamentary office as the registered address for the Centre for Global Studies, my office contacted the office of the present Clerk of the Parliaments on 28 April to request further details about this advice. On 9 May, the private secretary to the Clerk of the Parliaments provided a copy of an email exchange between Ed Ollard (the former Clerk of the Parliaments) and Lord Skidelsky which took place on 26 and 27 April 2019. My office provided Lord Skidelsky with a copy of this email exchange, which is reproduced in Appendix 3.

49. We discussed the advice he received from the Clerk of the Parliaments. Lord Skidelsky confirmed that the only action he had taken in response was to change the registered address of the charity so that it was no longer his parliamentary office in Millbank House. Otherwise, the work of the charity continued to mainly take place from his parliamentary office.
50. We noted that the facilities rules say members' parliamentary offices are provided on the basis that they are primarily used to support their parliamentary duties, but that members "may need to use office accommodation for incidental purposes relating to their outside interests, including their commercial interests." I asked Lord Skidelsky if he considered the use of his parliamentary office to support the charity's work to be 'incidental'. Lord Skidelsky's responded by saying:

"No, but on the other hand ... I don't accept the concept of incidental in this. I mean, first of all, it's not defined, and, secondly, the charity's work was not incidental in any way to my role as a parliamentarian. It was actually integral to it because they provided me with the research base for my parliamentary activity. And I particularly emphasise service on the Economic Affairs Committee ... also my speeches ... and also on all the lecturing I gave as well. So, the word "incidental" simply doesn't cover it. I mean, it was part of my life, and I didn't separate my life into these different compartments. Perhaps I should have. Perhaps I shouldn't ever have been a Member of the House of Lords. Perhaps it's now not a viable thing to do with this level of surveillance or scrutiny. But I didn't think I was doing anything wrong at all. I mean, I was an academic Peer ... and I needed to function as such, and this was a research support for me."

*Library facilities*

51. We noted that the facilities rules say that:
- "Library facilities and services are intended to assist members in carrying out their parliamentary duties. However, it is acceptable for a member to use readily available Library facilities to pursue enquiries relating to outside interests, including commercial or business interests, so long as those facilities are not required by another member for use for parliamentary purposes. For the avoidance of doubt, research services may only be used for parliamentary purposes."
52. I asked Lord Skidelsky if he considered it to be appropriate for his staff to use Library facilities in the furtherance of non-parliamentary work, including the production of books and the delivery of speeches outside Parliament. Lord Skidelsky replied that he did not consider there to be any issues in this regard. Lord Skidelsky went on to say: "I think the kind of separation of functions and activities that may be required here are actually impracticable for the kind of Peer I was ..."
53. In the light of Lord Skidelsky's response to the further disclosure from the Charity Commission, in which he was candid about using the Library to support the production of some of his books, my office contacted the House of Lords Librarian on 24 July to enquire about this matter further.
54. The Librarian responded on 27 July, saying:

“I have had a look through the requests made by the member since 2018. Out of 75 requests, only six were for research. The others are for books, articles, general reference enquiries. The research requests do not raise concerns, with one of them clearly being for an [oral question]. The book loans, while possibly not directly relevant to immediate business in the Chamber or Grand Committee, are also not of concern to me, in light of the appointment of members to the House for their expertise and knowledge. It would seem odd for the Library not to support that within reason and within the rules set out below—which I think we do and we tread a careful line on this. The reference enquiries again do not raise concerns.”

*Notification of Clerk of the Parliaments about the Charity Commission investigation*

55. We discussed the obligation on members to inform the Clerk of the Parliaments, within 10 working days of being notified by the relevant authority, about being placed under investigation by a body which regulates the occupation which they practise. Before and during our interview, Lord Skidelsky acknowledged that he should have notified the Clerk of the Parliaments about the investigation by the Charity Commission, as he was a trustee of the Centre for Global Studies, a registered charity.
56. At the conclusion of my investigation, Lord Skidelsky had not yet informed the Clerk of the Parliaments about the Charity Commission investigation.



## CHAPTER 2: FINDINGS AND OUTCOME

---

### Findings

57. In investigating and adjudicating allegations of non-compliance with the Code, I am bound to act in accordance with the principles of natural justice and fairness. It is also a requirement that the civil standard of proof (balance of probabilities) is adopted by me to find the allegation proven against a member.
58. Throughout this investigation, Lord Skidelsky has responded fully and in a timely manner to all my requests for evidence.
59. Having reviewed all the evidence in this case, it has been clearly demonstrated that:
  - (1) Lord Skidelsky updated his entry in the Register of Interests to record that his non-financial interest in the Centre for Global Studies ceased on 30 April 2022. In May 2023 he re-registered a non-financial interest as chair of trustees at the charity. Yet the charity's entries in the Register of Charities and with Companies House have remained live throughout.
  - (2) Lord Skidelsky has not registered the support he has received from staff paid by the Centre for Global Studies, under category 6 in his entry in the Register of Interests, since 2009.
  - (3) Lord Skidelsky used his parliamentary office to support the work of the Centre for Global Studies.
  - (4) The Charity Commission began investigating the charity in August 2022. Lord Skidelsky has not notified the Clerk of the Parliaments that he is under investigation by the Charity Commission.
60. In his email to the former Clerk of the Parliaments in April 2019, Lord Skidelsky told him the charity “exists to promote research into economic and political issues, and to that end, publishes books, organises symposia, and makes grants to scholars. To some extent these non-commercial activities support my parliamentary interests.” The charity's entries in the Register of Charities and with Companies House also emphasised its educational role with no mention of any parliamentary dimension. However, in his written submission and during the interview Lord Skidelsky maintained the charity's activities and his parliamentary work was “interwoven very closely”. One of Lord Skidelsky's former staff also told me that that the interests of the charity and his role as a parliamentarian were “identical”. This belief that there was no clear demarcation between the activities of the charity and his parliamentary office appears to be why Lord Skidelsky believed he was not subject to the provisions of the Code of Conduct in several respects.
61. However, the evidence I received in this respect was not consistent with the above belief. In his written response, Lord Skidelsky said his staff worked for him in two capacities: (a) as researchers and administrators of the [Centre for Global Studies] and (b) as parliamentary assistants. Lord Skidelsky also said the inquiry into the Centre for Global Studies by the Charity Commission was not an inquiry into his “conduct as a parliamentarian”. Moreover, during our interview, Lord Skidelsky referred to his staff supporting his

non-parliamentary work and said that the Centre for Global Studies was a “think tank”. When I interviewed his former staff, one of them referred to the Centre for Global Studies as being a “vehicle” through which Lord Skidelsky could be provided with donations to support his academic work, which is what they considered their role to be primarily supporting.

62. Paragraphs 17–18<sup>18</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct recognise that members “have a wide range of outside interests and careers and the House thrives on their expertise. The Code in no way seeks either to curtail these interests or careers”, but also that members have a resultant responsibility “to maintain a clear distinction between their outside interests and their parliamentary work”.
63. Lord Skidelsky referred to his status as an “academic peer” and suggested that the Code of Conduct did not necessarily understand this status. How Lord Skidelsky chooses to define his membership of the House is a matter for him – and it does appear to be an accurate one – but it has no material impact on his obligations under the Code of Conduct, which applies equally to all members. Lord Skidelsky told me that he considered the establishment of the Centre for Global Studies in 2002 to be a means of continuing his academic work after he became a member of the House, and that since then his parliamentary work has been completely consistent with the aims and activities of the charity. This may well be true, though I note that some of the charity’s activities (such as the publication of various books, supporting the delivery of academic lectures abroad and making grants to scholars) are not obviously parliamentary. But this is all beside the point: the question is whether the charity trusteeship and the support it provided needed to be registered under the terms of the Code, and the answer is that they clearly did.
64. In his submissions and during the interview, Lord Skidelsky emphasised that he did not lobby for outside interests, and that the charity’s donors had never attempted to influence the work of the charity. Again, this may be true, but the interests still needed to be registered.
65. Lord Skidelsky also misconstrued the definition of interests in the Code of Conduct as being mainly commercial in nature. The Code of Conduct does in fact define the meaning of “interest” (paragraphs 13 and 14)<sup>19</sup> and it is clear members must register and declare both financial and non-financial interests.
66. It also became clear during our discussions that Lord Skidelsky had not understood the Code’s registration requirements with respect to the benefits he derived from his publishing and journalistic activities, as well as the support he received from his former staff when they were paid by the charity. Paragraph 65 of the Guide to the Code of Conduct requires members to register “Occasional income or benefits from speeches, lecturing, broadcasting, royalties, journalism or freelance work which exceeds £1,000 in the course of a calendar year from a single source” under category 2 in their entries in the Register of Interests, including identifying that source. While Lord Skidelsky has registered a specific category 2 interest in Project Syndicate, he has also registered a more generic interest in “Fees for authorship and lecturing; journalism”, Either Project Syndicate is

---

18 Paragraphs 12–13 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

19 Paragraphs 15 and 16 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

Lord Skidelsky's sole interest in this regard—in which case the generic entry is not required—or there were others, in which case the specifics should also have been registered.

67. Paragraph 84<sup>20</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct also requires members to register 'sponsorship' under category 6 in their entries in the Register of Interests. This includes the "services of a research assistant or secretary whose salary, in whole or in part, is met by an outside organisation or individual ..."
68. **Because Lord Skidelsky decided to establish the Centre for Global Studies as a registered charity and associated company, it is clearly a distinct entity—and therefore external—to Lord Skidelsky's parliamentary role. As a result, the Code of Conduct required this interest to be registered in several ways in the interests of transparency. It is worth noting that, even if Lord Skidelsky had opted to receive the donations directly and personally, rather than through a charity, they would still have been registrable.**
69. **Lord Skidelsky's decision to remove his interest in the Centre for Global Studies in May 2022 was premature and represents a clear breach of paragraph 12(a) of the Code of Conduct, which requires members to register in the Register of Lords' Interests all relevant interests in the interests of openness and accountability. Lord Skidelsky's failure to keep his entry in the Register of Interests up to date was also a breach of paragraph 15 of the Code. While Lord Skidelsky eventually re-registered this interest in May 2023, I note this only occurred after my investigation commenced in April 2023. Despite his clear statement to the contrary, it is also clear Lord Skidelsky benefitted financially from the Centre for Global Studies (as did members of his family), so this interest should also have been registered as a pecuniary interest under category 2 rather than as a non-financial interest under category 10.**
70. **The advances and royalties Lord Skidelsky received for his various publications should have been registered under category 2 in his entry in the Register of Interests. Furthermore, the support provided by Lord Skidelsky's former staff when they were paid by the Centre for Global Studies, since at least 2009, should have been registered as a benefit under category 6 in his entry in the Register of Interests. As a result, these represent further breaches of paragraph 12(a) of the Code.**
71. **On the balance of probabilities, I do not consider that the use of the House of Lords Library by Lord Skidelsky, and his staff, to support the production of his external publications constituted a breach of the rules on the use of facilities, and therefore paragraph 12(c) of the Code of Conduct.**
72. **However, on the balance of probabilities, I consider that Lord Skidelsky's decision to use his parliamentary office as the headquarters for the Centre for Global Studies did constitute a breach of the rules on the use of facilities and paragraph 12(c) of the Code of Conduct, as the use of the office for this purpose was far more than 'incidental', and the change of registered address in**

---

20 Paragraph 86 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

**2019 was not material. The fact that his parliamentary office was used as the charity’s headquarters for more than twenty years is also a significant factor, as Lord Skidelsky himself acknowledged when he suggested the charity had saved approximately £600,000, which it would presumably have incurred over the same period if it had been required to rent and operate premises on a commercial basis.**

73. **Paragraph 20 of the Code of Conduct requires members to inform the Clerk of the Parliaments, within 10 days of being notified by the relevant authority, if they are placed under investigation by a body which regulates the occupation they practice. Lord Skidelsky was, in my view, as a trustee of the Centre for Global Studies, which is a registered charity and subject to the regulatory oversight of the Charity Commission, subject to this provision. As the Charity Commission commenced an investigation into the Centre for Global Studies in August 2022, paragraph 20 of the Code was breached. While Lord Skidelsky has acknowledged this, he did not subsequently inform the Clerk of the Parliaments about the investigation.**
74. **I would like to remind members about the importance of seeking advice from the Registrar of Lords’ Interests when there is uncertainty about the registration requirements of the Codes of Conduct.**

#### **Lord Skidelsky’s response to the draft factual report and findings**

75. In accordance with paragraph 169<sup>21</sup> of the Guide to the Code of Conduct, Lord Skidelsky was provided with a copy of the draft factual report and my provisional findings and was offered the opportunity to provide comments. Lord Skidelsky was also offered the opportunity to provide any material he wanted me to take into account when considering a recommended sanction.
76. Lord Skidelsky’s response is reproduced at Appendix 1. My response to the points he raised is included at Appendix 2.
77. I did not make any substantive changes to the report after reading Lord Skidelsky’s response but did take the opportunity to clarify some of the content as noted in my response.

#### **Outcome**

78. While Lord Skidelsky was forthcoming about his failure to notify the Clerk of the Parliaments about the Charity Commission investigation, he was less candid about the other breaches of the Code, which he told me were “minor and inadvertent” in nature. In particular, he refused to accept that the Centre for Global Studies constituted an external interest or that he had any sort of pecuniary interest in the charity. I consider the sustained period during which some of those breaches occurred, as well as Lord Skidelsky’s limited insight and lack of contrition, to be aggravating factors in this case.
79. I acknowledge that as the purpose of the Centre for Global Studies was to support his work as an academic and parliamentarian, there is no evidence that it had a separate agenda that Lord Skidelsky was seeking to advance. While I consider this to be a mitigating factor, members still have a responsibility to maintain a clear and transparent distinction between their outside interests and their parliamentary work.

---

21 Paragraph 170 of the thirteenth edition of the Guide to the Code of Conduct.

80. With respect to the funding arrangements for the Centre for Global Studies, I also acknowledge Lord Skidelsky's clear statement that the charity's former donors did not expect, or request, any particular outcome in return for their financial contribution. I did not receive any evidence to dispute Lord Skidelsky's account. However, with reference to the grounds on which the donors in question were subsequently sanctioned by the UK Government, as well as paragraph 35 of the Guide to the Code,<sup>22</sup> I also believe Lord Skidelsky should have exercised more caution about the potential public perception of this association - especially considering his position that most of the charity's activities "fed" or "shaped" his parliamentary work - including the need to take particular care in abiding with his obligations under the Code of Conduct in that context.
81. **I considered very carefully whether it would be proportionate for Lord Skidelsky's conduct to be settled by remedial action, specifically by a personal statement of apology to the House. However, considering the various breaches of the Code of Conduct, some of which took place over a significant period, as well as the factors outlined above, I consider a short suspension to be justified in the circumstances. Accordingly, I recommend that Lord Skidelsky be suspended from the House for one month.**

---

22 Para 35 says: "In dealing with foreign governments, and organisations and individuals under their control, members must uphold the integrity of the parliamentary process and do nothing which could reasonably be deemed contrary to the seven general principles of conduct identified by the Committee on Standards in Public Life. Members should be especially cautious when coming into contact with representatives of corrupt or repressive regimes."

## APPENDIX 1: LORD SKIDELSKY'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT FACTUAL REPORT AND FINDINGS

---

My comments follow ... the paras of the draft report<sup>23</sup> which seem to me to call for comment.

### Paragraph 43 (funding of the charity)

The first para of my reply is nonsense, and shows that I was not thinking clearly, possibly as a result of the effects of medical treatment I was receiving. Daily attendance allowances went to my personal bank account and were used for travel and subsistence. Contributions to charity were paid into the Charity's account. So, there was no 'pot'. The donor funding paid for all the activities of the Charity; the attendance allowance [paid] all the expenses connected with my physical presence in Parliament.

### Paragraph 62

I agree. But the distinction between outside interests and parliamentary work makes sense to me only where the 'interest' may be reasonably thought to influence the member's parliamentary views and conduct. I have always denied that the CGS was a relevant interest in this sense, and I think that most reasonable people would agree with me.

### Paragraph 63

What is meant by "I do not consider it to be reasonable for Lord Skidelsky to assume that becoming a member of the House necessarily meant his ongoing academic work becoming parliamentary work."? I never made this ridiculous claim. Of course, my academic work did not NECESSARILY become parliamentary activity. In practice the bulk of the academic work supported by the charity shaped my parliamentary activity. The Commissioner is right that a lecture abroad is not the same as a speech in parliament. But it might prepare the ground for a speech in parliament or a contribution to parliamentary committee, and that is what in practice most of my lectures did.

### Paragraph 65

What exactly is being complained of here? I certainly registered "occasional income or benefits from speeches, lecturing, broadcasting, royalties, journalism or freelance work which exceeds £1,000 in the course of a calendar year from a single source". For example, I have been a monthly columnist for Project Syndicate since 2003; this is remunerated interest which should be, and was, registered.

### Paragraph 66

Yes of course it is a distinct entity. I deny that it is a distinct interest. As I have told the Commissioner, had I had any inkling that registering the CGS as a Charity in 2003 would expose me to this kind of inquisition from both the Charity Commission and the Commissioner for Standards twenty years later, I would never have done so.

---

<sup>23</sup> The paragraph numbering in Lord Skidelsky's response does not correlate with the paragraph numbering in the final report.

## Paragraph 67

I never made this assertion, nor did members of my staff. What I did state on different occasions (see especially para.33) is that the research provided by the Centre for Global Studies ‘fed into my parliamentary work’. Miss Tomlinson stated the matter perfectly accurately; “the charity was a vehicle ... through which Lord Skidelsky would be provided with donations to help support his academic work”.

## Paragraph 68

When the Commissioner states that it is ‘doubtful how some of the charity’s stated activities...were germane to [Lord Skidelsky’s] parliamentary activities’, he should specify which of the activities he considers were not germane to his work as a parliamentarian. He could consult Appendix 2 ‘Outputs’ of the Trustees Reply to the Charity Commission, dated 30 August 2023 which lists the output of the Centre for Global Studies from its inception onwards. Which parts of this output does the Commissioner consider ‘not germane’ to my parliamentary activities?

## Paragraph 69 (registration of interest in CGS)

Guilty as charged. I decided to remove my interest from the Charity in May 2022, the Trustees having decided to close it. The first attempt to close it was discontinued because Santander Bank had frozen its bank account, and therefore the account could not be closed. The second attempt to close it was prevented by the Charity Commission in May 2023 when the CGS was placed under administration. So, for one year (May 2022 to May 2023) I failed to register an interest in a moribund entity. In pleading guilty I should add that it is rather disheartening to have this technical fault, which had no consequences, swelled into what looks like a deliberate attempt to ‘hide’ some interest which should have been revealed.

I am also guilty of breaching para. 15 of the Code which requires a member to ensure that their registered interests are ‘up to date’. However, I wonder whether the Commissioner has given any thought to the burden being placed on a peer without access to specialised and expensive legal and accountancy resources to keep in their head for purpose of registering in timely fashion every small change in their financial circumstances? (The Register, we are told, is updated every 15 minutes!). When I am asked by a newspaper to contribute an opinion on (say) the Budget, I do not immediately think: ‘Ah, I must remember within a month to register a change of interest’, but this seems to be what the Registry requires.

## Paragraph 69 (pecuniary interest in CGS)

My ‘interest’ in the CGS was not ‘pecuniary’ [OED: relating to money] of the kind identified by the Register: ‘remunerated office, employment, profession’. I was not ‘paid’ anything by the CGS. The paid employees of the CGS were the two assistants who worked in my office, under contract with the CGS. The work I did for the CGS was voluntary. I ‘benefited’ financially’ from the CGS in exactly the same way as a peer (unlike an MP) ‘benefits’ from attending the Lords. I don’t understand why the Commissioner finds it so hard to grasp this point.

## Paragraph 70 (receipt of advances and royalties)

In [my] Category 2: Remunerated employment, office, profession etc 2022-3 it is stated: Journalism and articles for the New Statesman (interest ceased

13 May 2022) Journalism and articles for the Guardian (interest ceased 13 May 2022) Monthly column, Project Syndicate (media organisation) Fees for authorship and lecturing; journalism \* I wonder what more the Commissioner expected. Would a reasonable person expect to be told that a peer received £1500 over a single year for writing two columns for the Guardian?

Paragraph 70 (support received from former staff)

See my reply to para.84 of the Guide [below].

Paragraph 72

As I frequently explained to the Commissioner for Standards, I did not regard the CGS as an outside interest impinging ‘incidentally’ on my parliamentary work. It was integral to my parliamentary work. I changed the address of the CGS as soon as I was asked to.

I think all ‘scholar’ or ‘academic’ peers need to be made aware that their scholarly work is regarded by the Commissioner of Standards as ‘incidental’ to their parliamentary work and that parliamentary offices should be as little as possible contaminated by its presence.

Paragraph 84

I have already pleaded guilty to not registering the Centre of Global Studies as an ‘outside’ interest ‘sponsoring’ my work, because I did not view it as ‘interest on its own’ separate from mine. If an interest in thinking should be registered, then I am guilty of not registering it.



## APPENDIX 2: THE COMMISSIONER'S RESPONSE TO LORD SKIDELSKY'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT FACTUAL REPORT AND FINDINGS

---

Dear Lord Skidelsky,

Thank you for your letter of 21 September and your feedback on my draft report which I have carefully considered.

With reference to the relevant paragraph of my draft report,<sup>24</sup> I address each of your points below ...

### Paragraph 43

This paragraph will be revised to reflect your feedback in the final version of my report.

### Paragraph 62

While you may not agree that the charity is an “outside interest”, it certainly is within the terms of the Code of Conduct: it is a registered charity with external funding.

### Paragraph 63

This paragraph will be revised to reflect your feedback in the final version of my report.

### Paragraph 65

While noting your registered interest in Project Syndicate, I am referring to your separate registered interest in “Fees for authorship and lecturing; journalism”. The latter interest either needs to be itemised, with each separate source noted in the registration, or if you do not have any other such earnings other than from Project Syndicate, it should be deleted. This paragraph will be clarified in the final version of my report.

### Paragraph 66

The Code and the Guide requires all charity trusteeships and outside support to be registered, regardless of how you perceive these interests may have influenced your parliamentary role.

### Paragraph 67

On 27 April, in her written submission at the beginning of my investigation, Miss Tomlinson told me that: “The Centre for Global Studies aims to support Lord Skidelsky’s parliamentary work. Thus, the Centre’s interests are identical to Lord Skidelsky’s in Parliament.” This evidence was omitted from the draft report but will be included in the final version of my report.

Consistent with my response to your feedback on paragraph 63, this paragraph will also be revised in the final version of my report.

---

<sup>24</sup> As with Lord Skidelsky’s response in Appendix 1, the paragraph numbering in the Commissioner’s response does not correlate with the paragraph numbering in the final report.

#### Paragraph 68

This paragraph will be revised to reflect your feedback in the final version of my report.

I have added the list of your charity's 'outputs' to my final report at the end of the second disclosure from the Charity Commission.

#### Paragraph 69 (registration of interest in CGS)

I do not consider a one-year gap in your entry in the Register of Interests to be a "technical fault".

The Code and Guide are clear that a member must update their register within one month of any changes, rather than every 15 minutes, which I consider to be a reasonable and realistic timeframe. Please note that this requirement has been agreed by the House as part of the Code of Conduct and the Guide, rather than by the Commissioners for Standards.

#### Paragraph 69 (pecuniary interest in CGS)

The full description of this category is "Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation which is remunerated or in which the member has any pecuniary interest." For the reasons I set out in the report I believe it to be clear that you had several different types of pecuniary interests in the charity.

#### Paragraph 70 (regarding advances and royalties received)

As per my response to your feedback on paragraph 65, your registered interest in "fees for authorship and lecturing; journalism," either require to be itemised or deleted. If there were no interests of this kind other than the ones you registered, then please let me know and I would be happy to make clear that there is no breach in this area – though I would still advise you to delete the generic entry which poses more questions than it answers.

#### Paragraph 70 (regarding support received from former CGS staff)

I have already responded to this point in my earlier responses.

#### Paragraph 72

I believe that you have misunderstood my finding on this point, and my report articulates why I consider the charity to be an outside interest under the terms of the Code. Even if you had opted to receive the donations directly and personally, rather than through a charity, they would still have been registrable. This point will be included in my final report.

My use of the term "incidental" is not intended to describe your academic or charitable activities, but to find that your charity's use of the facilities of the House of Lords was more than incidental, which is the amount of external use permitted by the rules on the use of facilities for outside interests.

#### Paragraph 84

I have already responded to this point in my earlier responses.

For these reasons, beyond the revisions I've identified above, I do not intend to amend the substance of my report and will shortly be sending my final report to the Conduct Committee and writing to you with details of the appeals process.

For the avoidance of doubt, I should remind you that the requirements of confidentiality remain in place until any report is published.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Jelley QPM DL

Commissioner for Standards

### APPENDIX 3: LORD SKIDELSKY'S EMAIL EXCHANGE WITH THE FORMER CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS, APRIL 2019

---

#### Lord Skidelsky to Ed Ollard on 26 April 2019

Subject: Office as business

Dear Mr. Ollard, I would appreciate your advice.

The Members' Handbook (p.167) states that '...it is accepted that Members may need to use office accommodation for incidental purposes relating to their outside interests...'

For several years now a small, registered charity, the Centre for Global Studies, (annual income £125,000-£150,000), of which I am chairman, has used my parliamentary office as its trading centre. It has banked with the Bank of Scotland, and bank statements come to my office. The charity, I should say, exists to promote research into economic and political issues, and to that end, publishes books, organises symposia, and makes grants to scholars. To some extent these non-commercial activities support my parliamentary interests.

The Trustees intend to transfer the charity's account from the Bank of Scotland to Santander Bank, and Santander has requested confirmation that my office is indeed the charity's trading centre. The slight complication is that my office has recently moved from Fielden to Millbank house, as Fielden House is being reconstructed, so there is some confusion as to what the address of the charity is.

That is not the main point, though. Before proceeding any further, I would appreciate confirmation that, in giving my parliamentary office as the 'trading address' for the charity's bank account, I am not in breach of any parliamentary protocol. I did establish this when I talked to your predecessor some years ago, but it may be things have changed since then.

I would be happy to come and see you if need be - if so, would you be free any of the next three working days -Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday 29,30 April,1 May)?

Yours sincerely,

Robert Skidelsky

#### Ed Ollard to Lord Skidelsky on 26 April 2019

Thank you for this.

I note that you say that this arrangement may have been sanctioned in the past, but I am afraid that I do not think that it is an appropriate use of the accommodation facilities of the House. I don't think that using the House as a trading address could be construed as an "incidental purpose". You should accordingly cease to use any House of Lords address as a trading address for this or any other organisation or enterprise.

I am very grateful to you for drawing this to my attention and I hope that rectification of the situation can be achieved as quickly as possible. From what you say, it should not I hope involve you in any particular complication.

Yours sincerely

Ed Ollard

Clerk of the Parliaments

**Lord Skidelsky to Ed Ollard on 26 April 2019**

Dear Mr Ollard, Thank you for your quick and helpful reply. I shall act on it right away.

Robert Skidelsky

**Ed Ollard to Lord Skidelsky on 27 April 2019**

Dear Lord Skidelsky,

Many thanks.

Yours

Ed

## APPENDIX 4: CHARITY COMMISSION DISCLOSURES

---

### Initial disclosure, 26 March 2023

This disclosure is provided under the Charity Commission’s statutory information sharing gateway provided by section 56 of the Charities Act 2011, and on the basis that:

- the recipient is a public authority and that the disclosure is made for the purposes of assisting in the discharge of its functions; and
- no part of the information provided should be disclosed further by the recipient authority, or used for any other purpose, without prior consultation with and agreement of the Charity Commission.

[...]

For context, the Commission currently has a statutory inquiry (‘the Inquiry’) open under section 46 of the Act into the registered charity The Centre for Global Studies (‘the Charity’). Lord Skidelsky (‘LS’) is the chair of trustees of the Charity and has been since its incorporation in 2002. As the Charity is a company limited by guarantee, it is also registered at Companies House (the register of companies is publicly available).

[...] we consider that some of the information provided in the House of Lords Register of Interests regarding LS may be false and/or misleading and that this may be something for the Commissioners to make enquiries into/investigate. [...]

### Register of Interests—Lord Skidelsky

I have taken extracts from the publicly available Register of Interests and similarly from the register of companies at Companies House and the Commission’s Register of Charities (‘the Register’)

#### Category 3: Person with significant control of a company (PSC)

- **Interest amended 24 May 2023** Skidelsky Consultancy Ltd (member’s company owned 100 per cent by him; dormant) (originally added 5 July 2017)
- **Interest deleted 4 May 2023** The Centre for Global Studies (interest ceased 30 April 2022) (originally added 28 August 2020)

Source: UK Parliament, ‘Register of Interests—Members of the House of Lords’: <https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests?SearchTerm=lord+skidelsky&ShowAmendments=True>

This entry for LS on the Register of Interests records him as a person with significant control of the Charity since August 2022 with this interest ceasing on 30 April 2022. This is directly contradicted by Companies House records.

**1 active person with significant control / 0 active statements****Lord Robert Jacob Alexander Skidelsky** **ACTIVE**

Correspondence address

**Flat 15, Westrovia Court, 5 Moreton Street, London, England, SW1V 2PW**

Notified on	Date of birth	Nationality
<b>7 February 2017</b>	<b>April 1939</b>	<b>British</b>

Country of residence

**England**

Nature of control

**Has significant influence or control over the trustees of a trust**

Source: Companies House, The Centre for Global Studies— Company number 04375608: <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/04375608/persons-with-significant-control>

Companies House Register of Companies records LS role as a person with significant control as being current as at today's date, with no gaps recorded since the entry was recorded in 2017.

Similarly, a non-financial interest is declared for LS on the Register of Interests regarding his role in the Charity. This records LS's interest in the Charity as ceasing on 30 April 2022.

**Category 10: Non-financial interests (e)**

- **Interest amended 16 May 2022** Chairman, The Centre for Global Studies (registered charity) (interest ceased 30 April 2022) (originally added 26 April 2010)
- **Interest deleted 31 August 2020** Trustee, Daedalus Trust (registered charity) (interest ceased 31 December 2017) (originally added 15 June 2011)
- **Interest deleted 16 May 2022** Chairman, Centre of Global Studies (registered charity) (originally added 28 August 2020)
- **Interest amended 28 August 2020** President, Brighton College (independent school) (originally added 28 August 2020)
- **Interest amended 15 September 2022** Director, At Home Foundation (charity providing support to immigrants from Hong Kong) (originally added 15 September 2022)

Source: Source: UK Parliament, 'Register of Interests—Members of the House of Lords': <https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests?SearchTerm=lord+skidelsky&ShowAmendments=True>

This is incorrect, both the Commission’s Register and Companies House’s register record LS as being a director and trustee of the Charity.

Companies House’s Register of Companies records LS as a director of the Charity and that this is ‘active’ (as at today’s date) and that he has been a director of the Charity since 2002.

<b>SKIDELSKY, Robert Jacob Alexander, Lord</b>		
Correspondence address		
<b>Flat 15, Westrovia Court, 5 Moreton Street, London, England, SW1V 2PW</b>		
Role	Date of birth	Appointed on
<b>Director</b>	<b>April 1939</b>	<b>18 February 2002</b>
Nationality	Country of residence	Occupation
<b>British</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>Academic</b>

Source: Companies House, The Centre for Global Studies— Company number 04375608: <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/04375608/persons-with-significant-control>

The Commission, as part of the Inquiry has been in contact with the Charity’s trustees both pre and post the opening of the Inquiry. At no point has LS advised the Commission that he considers he is not a trustee/director of the Charity.

The extract from the Charity’s entry on the Register—records LS as the Chair of trustees along with two other recorded trustees. You’ll see from the extract below that LS is also recorded as a trustee of another registered charity, the School of Civic Education. This is recorded on LS’s Register of Interests under 10(a).



**Trustees** are the people responsible for controlling the work, management and administration of the charity on behalf of its beneficiaries. Generally trustees are treasurer, chair, board member etc. The trustees are responsible for keeping this list up to date and can do this by updating their details as they happen through the [online service](#)

### 3 Trustee(s)

Name	Role	Date of appointment	Other trusteeships	Reporting status of other trusteeships
LORD ROBERT JACOB ALEXANDER SKIDELSKY	Chair		None on record	
LADY AUGUSTA SKIDELSKY	Trustee	13 March 2018	None on record	
Christopher Phillips	Trustee	13 March 2018	None on record	

Source: Charity Commission for England and Wales, *The Centre for Global Studies*—Charity number: 1094442, Governing document: <https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/3990637/trustees> [accessed 29 September 2023]

The Commission is unclear as to what constitutes a ‘non-financial interest’ for the purposes of the House of Lords Register of Interests. From information obtained by the Commission and the Inquiry – it is evident that LS has received financial payments from the Charity. Once we have a clearer understanding of what constitutes a ‘non-financial interest’ we can share information that we hold

that may be of assistance to the Commissioners if any of the payments received by LS appear to be contrary to the declaration.

[...]

In sharing information with the Commissioners regarding the entries on the relevant registers of interest, the Commission is not competent to make a determination as to whether such declarations are false and/or misleading etc. The disclosure is made to the Commissioners to assist them in determining whether or not there has been a breach of any code for peers etc. It would be of assistance to the Inquiry, in due course, to understand the Commissioners determination in this regard.

[...]

Extract from response to section 47 direction from LS to the Commission—  
September 2022

‘Because the Charity’s purposes were interwoven so closely with my own work it was not easily possible to distinguish my charity work from my activity as a working peer, especially as the two kinds of work were mostly organised from the same office. Until 2018 the Charity’s registered address was the address of my parliamentary office. However, the Clerk of Parliaments then advised me that, while it was perfectly legitimate for me to use my parliamentary office for non-parliamentary business, it was undesirable that the parliamentary office should be the registered address of such business. So the registered address of the Charity was changed to my London flat. But the Charity’s work continued to be done mainly from the parliamentary office. Both the Charity’s researcher and Charity’s administrator had desks there. For practically the whole of its existence, the Charity has not had to rent an office or pay the costs of telephone, lighting, heating, computers, etc. Assuming standard costs in central London, the Charity’s ability to use my parliamentary office for its business saved it about £600,000, or one quarter of its donated income.

I was entitled to claim an attendance allowance from the House of Lords to cover travel, secretarial, and living expenses arising from my parliamentary business. This was paid monthly into my personal account at HSBC on the basis of the record of attendance. Wherever the purposes of the activity were clearly distinguishable I paid for them with two separate debit cards – the charity card issued by HBOS (and later Santander) and the HSBC card. For instance, I never used charity money to pay for my London accommodation. However, it was not feasible to divide every activity into two parts. My researcher, though employed by the Charity, was also my parliamentary researcher; the Charity’s secretary/administrator was in charge of both my charity and parliamentary diary. I took care never to use my charity card for purely personal business –ie., to go to the cinema or to eat out with family or friends. I believe that the payments to me from the charity account were, in general, properly incurred, with receipts kept. However, mistakes were made, and there was a collapse of proper administration for a period between 2020 and 2022, during lockdown and following the departure of Nan Craig. (See answer to question 22). I have itemised where I think such mistakes occurred in the detailed replies below. They were a tiny fraction of the Charity’s outgoings and its saving from the use of the parliamentary office’.

### Further disclosure, 6 July 2023

I am writing ... to disclose the information you have requested in relation to (a) financial benefits that Lord Robert Skidelsky has received from the Centre for Global Studies (hereafter ‘the Charity’ or ‘CGS’), (b) payments to Lady Skidelsky and (c) payments to Edward Skidelsky.

- (a) Lord Skidelsky

In response to a section 47 Direction, issued by the Commission on 30 August 2022, Lord Skidelsky confirmed that:

‘The identifiable and measurable output produced by the CGS in its years of operation from 2002-2022 is the most important justification for its existence. Over that time the Charity supported the publication of 29 books and learned articles, 5 singly authored by Robert Skidelsky’. The titles of the books and articles are set out in an Annex attached to this email.

In response to the Direction, Lord Skidelsky also stated that the ‘output (of his published works) depended heavily on research and logistic support from the CGS.’ Lord Skidelsky was the beneficiary of the proceeds of sale of the books/articles authored by him – for which the Charity’s resources were utilised – which represents a financial benefit from the Charity.

The Commission is not to date aware of the total value of the proceeds Lord Skidelsky has received from the sale of the books. As part of his response to the Direction, Lord Skidelsky advised that none of his publications have been a commercial success. He has further confirmed that an additional book ‘Automation and the Human Future’, which has been authored by him, utilising the Charity’s resources, is due to be published in Autumn 2023.

(b) Lady Augusta Skidelsky

In response to a section 47 Direction, issued by the Commission on 30 August 2022, Lady Skidelsky confirmed that:

‘Prior to becoming a trustee and subsequently, I handled some of the administrative paperwork for the charity for which I received a small fee of £160 pcm.’

The Charity’s bank statements show that 47 separate payments, totalling £7,520, were made to Lady Skidelsky between April 2018 and April 2022.

(c) Edward Skidelsky

In response to a section 47 Direction, issued by the Commission on 30 August 2022, Lord Skidelsky confirmed that:

‘The decision to support Edward Skidelsky to take a year off teaching at the University of Exeter, where he was a Lecturer in Philosophy, to work on his book, *The Language of the Virtues*, was based on the quality of the proposal and his long association with the Centre [CGS]. Its scholarly background was his pioneering book, *Ernst Cassirer: The Last Philosopher of Culture* (Princeton University Press, 2009). His connection with the Charity dates back to the 1990s, when it was located within the SMF (Social Market Foundation).’

The Charity’s bank statements show that Edward Skidelsky received 10 payments totalling £25,000 (£2,500 each), between September 2018 and August 2019.

Please note that the trustees’ responses to the Commission’s section 47 Directions, dated 30 August 2022, were verified by Statutory Declaration.

### List of publications

2003:

Robert Skidelsky and Pavel Erochkin, *Russia’s Choices: The Duma Elections and After*, 82 pp.

2006:

Pavel and Vladimir Erochkine, 'Russia's Oil Industry: Current Problems and Future Trends', 98 pp.

2008:

Robert Skidelsky intr., Igor Yurgens ed. *Russia's Future under Medvedev*.

Robert Skidelsky, 'Russia's Place in the World in the 21st Century', based on a lecture given to the Global Policy Institute, London Metropolitan University, 2008.

2009:

Robert Skidelsky, *Keynes the Return of the Master*, published by Allen Lane in 2009, tr[anslated] into 15 languages.

2010:

Robert Skidelsky ed., *The Economic Crisis and State of Economics* (published by CGS, Palgrave Macmillan).

Robert Skidelsky, 'Crisis of Capitalism - Keynes v Marx' (Indian Journal of Industrial Relations). 'What would Keynes say' - dialogue between Robert Skidelsky and Tim Congdon (Standpoint)

2011:

Robert Skidelsky et al. 'Blueprint for a British Investment Bank'. (CGS)

Robert Skidelsky and V.R. Joshi 'Keynes, Global Imbalances, International Monetary Reforms Today' in S. Claessens et al. (eds.) *Rebalancing the Global Economy, a primer for policy making*.

Robert Skidelsky 'The relevance of Keynes', Cambridge Journal of Economics, Volume 35 No.1, 1-13

Robert Skidelsky, *Skidelsky on the Economic Crisis: Articles and Speeches 2008-2015* (Enlarged edition *Articles and Speeches 2008-2015*).

Lai, Hairong (2011) 'Synthesizing Chinese and Western Values', CGS, intro. Robert Skidelsky

2012:

Robert Skidelsky and Edward Skidelsky, *How Much is Enough* (London, NY). Tr[anslated into] 16 languages.

2014:

Robert Skidelsky and Edward Skidelsky eds., *Are Markets Moral?* (CGS, Palgrave Macmillan)

Robert Skidelsky, 'Israel-Palestine Diary', 2014 (CGS)

Robert Skidelsky, *Britain Since 1900: A Success Story?* (Vintage Books) 496 pp

2015:

Robert Skidelsky, *The Essential Keynes*, Penguin Classic, April 2015, 550 pp.

2016:

Robert Skidelsky and Nan Craig eds, *Who Runs the Economy: The Role of Power in Economics*, Palgrave Macmillan, 146 pp.

2017:

Robert Skidelsky and Nicol Fraccaroli eds, *Austerity versus Stimulus: The Political Future of Economic Recovery*, 196 pp

Robert Skidelsky, 'How Would Keynes have analysed the Great Recession of 2008 and 2009' in Tim Congdon ed. *Money in the Great Recession: Did a Crash in Money Growth Cause the Global Slump?*

Robert Skidelsky, 'Stylized Facts', *Acta Economica*, vol. 67, pp. 31-55

2018:

Robert Skidelsky, *Money and Government* (London, New York), 491 pp.

2019:

Two sets of ten filmed Lectures on 'Problems in Economics', delivered in London and New York by Robert Skidelsky (1) and Professor Ha Joon Chang (2) in partnership with the Institute of New Economic Thinking, March/April 2019.

2020:

Robert Skidelsky, "Foreword" to *Economic Crisis and Economic Thought: Alternative Theoretical Perspective on the Economic Crisis*. Eds. Tomasso Tabellini, Simon Gasperin, Alessi Moneta, July 2019.

Robert Skidelsky (assisted by Rachel Kay), 'The Case for a Shorter Working Week' published jointly by the CGS and the Progressive Economic Forum, September 2019.

Robert Skidelsky and Nan Craig eds. *Work in the Future: the Automation Revolution*, January 2020, 211 pp.

Robert Skidelsky, *What's Wrong with Economics: A Primer for the Perplexed*, Penguin, Yale, March 2020.

2021:

Robert Skidelsky, 'Is technological progress inevitable?' in *The Routledge Handbook of Smart Technologies: An Economic and Social Perspective*.

2022:

Robert Skidelsky, 'Economic Sanctions: A Weapon Out of Control?' (CGS), 35 pp.

In 2022 Robert Skidelsky completed his book *Automation and the Human Future*, which is now with the publishers.

## Annex B: Lord Skidelsky's written appeal

1. I am appealing to the Committee of Conduct to vary the recommended sanction of the Commissioner for Standards in his Report dated 29 September 2023 that I be suspended from the House for a period of one month. I do so on the grounds that it is, in the circumstances, too severe, disproportionate, and that an alternative sanction was and is available and appropriate. I also appeal the Commissioner's recommended sanction on the grounds that it would have been appropriate for the Commissioner to consider engaging with me to discuss alternative possible remedial action before making a recommendation.
2. My reading of the Report suggests that the Commissioner found moral culpability, when in my submission, the breaches in the Code were technical and inadvertent. In my submission a more meaningful sanction would have been a requirement that I undergo compulsory training in the increasingly complex meaning, interpretation and requirements of the Code, which also would serve as a model to other noble Lords who might find themselves in the same or similar position.
3. In respect of none of the breaches was there any intention on my part to profit from membership of the House or accept payment in return for providing parliamentary services (Code Para 16) or seek to confer exclusive benefit in return for a financial reward (Para. 24). Had the Commissioner focused robustly on the absence of such motives, the recommended sanction would be shown to be disproportionate.
4. My breaches in failing to register my interests were inadvertent, were without any intention to deceive or benefit, and had no consequences.

Turning to the individual findings:

- (4.1) The Commissioner described my deleting the Centre for Global Studies ('CGS') from my Register of Interests in April 2022 as 'premature' (para.69). In a technical sense I can accept that it was. But as I had sought to explain to the Commissioner at some length, both in writing and in meeting, when I removed the CGS from the Register I had every expectation that it was about to be closed down. I further sought to explain why the closure of CGS was protracted and delayed by factors beyond my control as a Trustee. The Commissioner correctly notes that 'the charity's entries in the Register of Charities and with the Companies House have remained live throughout' but gives no weight to the fact that since April 2022 the Charity has remained entirely dormant and in no way relevant to, or impactful on, my conduct as a Parliamentarian.
- (4.2) The Commissioner (Para. 69) states that I should have declared the CGS a pecuniary interest under category 2 'since 'he benefited financially' from the CGS. My question to the Commissioner, to which I never received a proper answer, was: In what sense did I benefit financially from the Centre for Global Studies? I repeat this question now. I was not a remunerated employee of the CGS; it provided me with no money

to promote a cause. It provided me with research support for scholarly activity. I should perhaps have understood this as a pecuniary interest defined by the Code, but I regretfully did not interpret it that way at the time, nor did the Commissioner enlighten me on the point.

- (4.3) Sponsorship. The Commissioner correctly states that I failed to register support I received from staff paid by CGS under category 6 ‘ which covers any support from which the member receives financial or material benefit in his or her role as member of the House of Lords ... The types of support include the services of a research assistant or secretary whose salary in whole or in part is met by an outside organisation or individual ... ..’ I explained to the Commissioner that this was because I did not consider the CGS to be an outside organisation in any sense relevant to the conduct of my parliamentary duties. However, I do of course now accept and recognise that in taking this view and being under this misapprehension, I breached the Code.
5. The charge is that I used my office for non-parliamentary business. (para. 48) The Commissioner acknowledges that in 2019 on the advice of Mr. Ollard, then Clerk of Parliaments I immediately changed the registered address of the Charity from the parliamentary office to my home address, but notes disapprovingly that ‘otherwise the work of the charity continued to mainly take place from his parliamentary office’ . The ‘breach’ arises from the fact that a peer’s office is supposed to be used primarily to support their parliamentary duties, but may be used ‘incidentally’ for purposes relating to their outside interests, including their commercial interests’. My use of my office as a ‘think tank’ cut across this distinction between parliamentary and incidental use of the office, and I accept that I should have been more sensitive to this. In mitigation, it is the case that no one pointed out this ‘misuse’ of my office till 2019. The fact that the Lord Cross Bench Convenor, allocated me, most unusually for a backbencher, an office on my own from 2003 to the present, demonstrates that he was aware that my office was being used for more than ‘incidental’ purposes.
6. Severity of the Sanction. A month’s suspension might be considered ‘light’ punishment. Nevertheless it implies a moral culpability—an intention to deceive or profit—which I deny. The Commissioner refers to my ‘lack of contrition’, a theological usage linked to sin and repentance. I have to deny the relevance of this concept to my case, and do not believe that the Report or my interaction with the Commissioner reflects this. The sanction leaves a moral stain on my parliamentary career, which will damage any future I have either in the Lords or in public life.
7. I respectfully suggest I suggest two variations on the Commission’s recommended sanction.

A. My clear and sincere apology to the House for the breaches which have been found by the Commissioner under Sections 1 and 2 of the Code in terms to be agreed but which also reflect that these breaches were inadvertent and no findings of moral turpitude.

B. That I undergo an appropriate training course on the question of registration of interests and on the numerous and increasingly complex requirements of the Code of Conduct. This would be a positive and effective sanction rather than a punitive one. This suggested exercise would also be a useful precedent for a general scheme

of regular training for peers. If my breaches bring to light, difficulties facing all peers in interpreting the Code of Conduct, it will have served a useful purpose.

I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have in person.

Signed Robert Skidelsky