

# Special Inquiry Committee Proposals for 2022

Proposals submitted by 10 September 2021

## CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page</i>
Proposal 1: Letter from Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws	2
Proposal 2: Letter from Baroness Massey of Darwen	4
Proposal 3: Letter from Lord Dubs	8
Proposal 4: Letter from Lord Moylan and the Earl of Clancarty	10
Proposal 5: Letter from Lord Vaux of Harrowden and Lord Stevenson of Balmacara	12
Proposal 6: Letter from Lord Hylton	14
Proposal 7: Letter from Lord Knight of Weymouth	15
Proposal 8: Letter from Baroness Cox	18
Proposal 9: Letter from Lord Campbell-Savours and Lord Blunkett	20
Proposal 10: Letter from Baroness Hodgson of Abinger	21
Proposal 11: Letter from Lord Young of Cookham	23
Proposal 12: Letter from Lord Lipsey	24
Proposal 13: Letter from Baroness Young of Old Scone	25
Proposal 14: Letter from Lord Bird	27
Proposal 15: Letter from Lord Laming	29
Proposal 16: Letter from Baroness D'Souza	30
Proposal 17: Letter from Lord Hutton	32
<b>Appendix 1: Declarations of interest</b>	<b>33</b>

## Proposal 1: Letter from Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws

### *Assistance to lawyers and judges at risk globally*

#### *Description of the proposal*

According to OHCHR, at least 281 human rights defenders were killed in 2019. Since 2015, a total of 1,323 have been killed.<sup>1</sup> Many more have been subjected to violence, threats, harassment, intimidation and much more. Reports suggest that the situation is ever deteriorating.<sup>2</sup> Among them, lawyers and judges are at a particular risk. For example:

In Myanmar, lawyers representing people detained following the coup have themselves been detained, as have journalists covering the protests.<sup>3</sup>

In Afghanistan, women judges and lawyers are at high risk as the Taliban took over, not only because of their powerful positions, but also because some of them have been involved in prosecuting the Taliban over the years. In January 2021, two female judges have been killed by unknown gunmen in an ambush in Kabul.

In the Philippines, 61 lawyers were murdered during Duterte administration. According to Human Rights Watch, more lawyers have been killed in the five years since President Rodrigo Duterte took office than under any other government in Philippine history.

In Turkey, Arrested Lawyers Initiative reports that, between 2016 and 2021, 450 lawyers have been sentenced to a total of 2,786 years in prison on the grounds of membership of an armed terrorism organization or of spreading terrorist propaganda. More than 1,600 lawyers have been arrested by the police and 615 of those remanded to pretrial detention. More than 30 lawyers associations have been dissolved.

In Hong Kong, lawyers acting on behalf of pro-democracy protesters have been under attack as the Chinese government is tightening its grip on Hong Kong.

In Belarus, Government authorities have engaged in several tactics that interfere with the independence of lawyers in contravention of international law and standards. Lawyers have been threatened with prosecution or administrative, economic, or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards, and ethics. As a result, lawyers in Belarus are effectively prevented from carrying out their professional duties independently.

The special inquiry would look into the issue of attacks on lawyers and judges globally, the assistance provided by the UK Government through the FCDO,<sup>4</sup> Home Office and other departments, and identify proposals responding to the shortcoming.

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

The special inquiry would consider the UK Government's responses to attacks on lawyers and judges globally, in light of the growing evidence of the nature and severity of the issue.

---

1 UNHRC, *Final warning: death threats and killings of human rights defenders*, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Mary Lawlor (A/HRC/46/35)

2 *Ibid.*

3 *Ibid.*

4 United Kingdom, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, UK Support for Human Rights Defenders (July 2019)

The special inquiry would also consider the shortcomings in the current responses and identify proposals how these could be addressed with holistic approaches, including the option of imposing the Magnitsky styled sanctions in such cases and providing emergency visas for lawyers and judges at risk.

*Relevant member experience*

The inquiry would benefit from knowledge and expertise of many Members, including:

- Baroness Butler-Sloss Q.C.
- Lord Carlile Q.C.,
- Lord Brennan Q.C.
- Lord Pannick Q.C.
- Lord Mackay of Clashfern Q.C.

Other Members of the House whose expertise could contribute to the inquiry include:

- Lord Hannay of Chiswick, member of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on the United Nations, International Relations Committee.
- Lord Wood of Anfield, chair of the United Nations Association, UK and member of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on the United Nations.
- Lord Collins of Highbury, Opposition Whip (Lords), Shadow Spokesperson (International Development), and Shadow Spokesperson (Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs).

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Officials would be invited to submit evidence in oral session, including from:

- Foreign and Commonwealth Office
- Department of Defence
- Crown Prosecution Service
- Home Office

Former or current House of Lords Ministers could be asked to give evidence, including:

- Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon
- Baroness Warsi
- Lord Howell of Guildford
- Baroness Anelay of St Johns

*One-year timeframe*

Yes

***KENNEDY OF THE SHAWS***

## Proposal 2: Letter from Baroness Massey of Darwen

### Assisted dying

#### *Description of the proposal*

Since 1961 it has been lawful in England and Wales for individuals to end their own lives, but unlawful for them to be assisted in doing so. For at least as long, if not longer, assisted dying has therefore been a perennial public policy debate.

I am confident that the Liaison Committee is already familiar with the arguments both for and against legalisation, and therefore I will not rehearse them here. It will suffice to say that few of our colleagues are unsympathetic to the principle of assisted dying. Instead some have entirely legitimate reservations about its feasibility and practical implications.

It is for this reason, amongst others, that our House saw fit for a special inquiry to examine the merits of reform in 1994. And, following several developments over the next decade, to convene another inquiry in 2004.

In view of this, I recommend that a new special inquiry be formed to investigate the current law's operation and the desirability of different regulatory frameworks for potential reform. In the fifteen plus years since Parliament last scrutinised the issue on assisted dying in any detail, I believe that there has been a material change in the evidence; arguably to an even greater extent than between 1994 – 2004. This is underscored by three factors.

First, there has been a seismic shift in both popular and professional opinion. In 2014 a Sunday Times poll indicated that only 42% of the public supported assisted dying for the terminally ill and incurably suffering.<sup>5</sup> Whereas in 2019, a poll conducted by NatCen found that changing the law was favoured by up to 88% of the public.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, last year the British Medical Association members' survey found that half of all doctors personally support changing the law.<sup>7</sup> The BMA is likely to shift its position from opposition to neutrality when it holds its next annual meeting next week. What's more, according to an independent study of 140 UK disability rights organisations, 96% now do not oppose law reform.<sup>8</sup>

Second, in the last two decades successive countries – including Canada, Germany, Italy, New Zealand and parts of the United States and Australia – have changed or are due to change their laws on assisted dying.<sup>9</sup> These jurisdictions have created a wealth of new evidence for examination.

Finally, there has been a profound change in the context in which the law operates. Recently, the Assisted Dying Coalition found that the number of Britons travelling to Switzerland for an assisted death has gone up sixfold over the last 15 years. In pre-Covid times, this meant at least one Briton travelled to Switzerland for an

---

5 YouGov, 'Sunday Times Survey Results' (July 2014): [https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus\\_uploads/document/ie4aa31iy7/YG-Archive-Pol-Sunday-Times-results-140704.pdf](https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/ie4aa31iy7/YG-Archive-Pol-Sunday-Times-results-140704.pdf)

6 Humanists UK, 'Public support for assisted dying now over 90% reveals study' (March 2019): <https://humanists.uk/2019/03/04/public-support-for-assisted-dying-now-over-90-reveals-study/>

7 Kantar, 'British Medical Association Survey on Physician-Assisted Dying' (October 2020): <https://www.bma.org.uk/media/3367/bma-physician-assisted-dying-survey-report-oct-2020.pdf>

8 G Box & K Chambaere, 'Views of disability rights organisations on assisted dying legislation in England, Wales and Scotland: an analysis of position statements' (January 2021): <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33402428/>

9 Humanists UK, 'New research maps global assisted dying laws for first time ever' (July 2021): <https://humanists.uk/2021/07/19/new-research-maps-global-assisted-dying-laws-for-the-first-time/>

assisted death every week.<sup>10</sup> Yet more worryingly, according to the campaign group My Death, My Decision, at least 30% of people who travel overseas for assisted deaths go undetected by the police – raising serious questions about whether the current law is capable of protecting vulnerable people, or relies instead upon Swiss safeguards to do so.<sup>11</sup>

### *Purpose of inquiry*

The basis and aims of an inquiry would be to take account of the above developments by examining:

- Whether s2 of the Suicide Act 1961 and its enforcement currently operates in a satisfactory manner;
- The desirability of alternative frameworks for the legalisation of assisted dying, including:
  - The effectiveness of safeguards internationally;
  - The desirability of different eligibility criteria; and
  - The relationship between legal assisted dying and palliative care;
- The role, if any, and ethical obligations, of the medical profession, were the law to change.

Beyond these specific aims, I believe that an inquiry would serve two further functions.

First, given the breadth of support for assisted dying across the whole of society – with advocates ranging from those directly affected by the law, to senior members of the clergy, celebrated disability rights campaigners, acclaimed medical practitioners, as well as eminent members of our police force and legal profession – an inquiry would demonstrate that our House remains responsive to changes in opinion and sensitive to the public’s overwhelming calls for a change in the law. This is important because special inquiries are after all a vehicle through which Parliament can acknowledge topics of grave public concern. Though it is worth noting that this would cut in both directions, since an inquiry would also provide a platform for the voices of those concerned by the prospect of legal assisted dying, as well as providing proponents of the status quo a fair hearing in which to present their case.

Additionally, as the Liaison Committee will no doubt be aware, later this year parliamentarians will be invited to debate the issue of assisted dying by considering Baroness Meacher’s Assisted Dying [HL] private members’ bill. Given this subject’s solemnity, I therefore think it is vital that our House is equipped with the latest information and evidence – though critically from a neutral and independent source – in order to conduct an informed debate. This necessitates the creation of an inquiry.

---

10 Assisted Dying Coalition, ‘Briefing: Number of UK citizens going to Switzerland to seek an assisted death’ (February 2019): [https://humanists.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019-2-1-KM-Assisted-Dying-Briefing\\_-\\_Number-of-UK-citizens-going-to-Switzerland-to-seek-an-assisted-death-1.pdf](https://humanists.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019-2-1-KM-Assisted-Dying-Briefing_-_Number-of-UK-citizens-going-to-Switzerland-to-seek-an-assisted-death-1.pdf)

11 My Death, My Decision, ‘Number of people travelling to Switzerland for assisted deaths without police detection’ (April 2021): <https://www.mydeath-mydecision.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Number-of-people-travelling-to-Switzerland-for-assisted-deaths-without-police-detection-.pdf>

*Relevant member experience*

This House is fortunate in that a number of its members' expertise directly relates to the subject of assisted dying. If selected, this proposal would therefore be capable of drawing upon the expertise and experience of acclaimed palliative care professionals, medical and social care practitioners, legal experts, philosophers, campaigners, and disability rights activists. What's more, the expertise of members sitting in the inter-parliamentary British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly could also feed into the work of a special assisted dying inquiry given ongoing assisted dying proposals under consideration in the Republic of Ireland and Jersey. The States Assembly of Jersey is currently considering proposals to legalise assisted dying, following the recommendation of a special citizens' jury earlier this year. Further, the Republic of Ireland is expected to examine the issue of assisted dying in the next year, following a recommendation from the Oireachtas Committee on Justice.

Finally, it is worth noting that this House would be capable of drawing upon a range of different perspectives when forming an inquiry. For example, from an ethical perspective it could seek representations from religious and belief groups, since both the All-Party Parliamentary Humanist Group and Church of England's health representative have separately called for an inquiry into assisted dying.<sup>12</sup>

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

There are three Government departments whose work cuts across the issue of assisted dying: The Ministry of Justice, the Home Office, and the Department of Health and Social Care. First, the Ministry of Justice is ultimately responsible for the human rights compatibility of s2 of the Suicide Act 1961, and indirectly responsible for the Director of Public Prosecutions' guidelines on assisted dying. Second, the Home Office is responsible for the enforcement of the Suicide Act 1961. Finally, the Department of Health and Social Care is responsible for the regulation of medical practitioners, the provision of palliative medicine, and overall social care policy. It would presumably be ultimately responsible for overseeing assisted dying provision, if it were legalised.

Although these departments have the most relevant connections to assisted dying, it is worth noting that the ban on assisted dying in England and Wales is a reserved matter. Thus, there may also be scope for the Office of the Secretary of State for Wales and the Welsh Ministers to contribute towards a special inquiry into the law.

A consequence of these overlapping responsibilities is that an inquiry into assisted dying fits uneasily into any of Parliament's existing Select Committees. Thus, in the absence of a special inquiry it is unlikely assisted dying would be scrutinised by any other committee.

*One-year timeframe*

In my view, a special inquiry into assisted dying could be completed within one parliamentary session, i.e. one year. This is for two reasons.

First, whilst there has never been an investigation into the developments noted above, inquiries into the issue of assisted dying are not novel for this House. On

---

12 BBC, 'Assisted Dying: Church of England Seeks An Inquiry' (July 2014): <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-28278324>. See also Humanists UK 'Henry Marsh announces advanced cancer, joins 56 MPs and peers in calling for assisted dying inquiry' (April 2021): <https://humanists.uk/2021/04/01/henry-marsh-announces-advanced-cancer-joins-56-mps-and-peers-in-calling-for-assisted-dying-inquiry/>

two previous occasions, in 1993 – 1994 and 2004 – 2005, the House of Lords has undertaken a one-year investigation into the law prohibiting assisted dying in England and Wales.<sup>13</sup> Thus there is no reason to assume a fresh inquiry would not be completed within a similar timeframe.

Second, internationally there have been several inquiries into assisted dying with comparable terms of reference which have only taken one year to complete. For example, New Zealand’s Justice Select Committee’s Inquiry on the End of Life Choice Bill closed its submissions on 6 March 2018 and delivered its report on 9 April 2019;<sup>14</sup> the Parliament of Victoria’s Inquiry into End of Life Options opened its public submissions on 28 May 2015 and reported its recommendations on 09 June 2016;<sup>15</sup> and the Canadian Parliament’s Report of the Special Joint Committee on Physician-Assisted Dying was convened on 11 December 2015 and issued its report in February 2016.<sup>16</sup>

**MASSEY OF DARWEN**

- 
- 13 House of Lords Session 1993-94, Report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics, London: HMSO. 1994; House of Lords Session 2004 - 2005, Report of the Assisted Dying for the Terminally Ill Bill Committee, London: HMSO. 2004
- 14 New Zealand Justice Committee 2018 - 2019. Report on the End of Life Choice Bill: [https://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-NZ/SCR\\_86640/c5b7adfc7598b85747ff94855bc46bfb40470db0](https://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-NZ/SCR_86640/c5b7adfc7598b85747ff94855bc46bfb40470db0)
- 15 Parliament of Victoria 2018 - 2019, Inquiry into End of Life Choices (08 December 2016): <https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/402-lsic-lc/inquiry-into-end-of-life-choices>
- 16 Parliament of Canada 2015 - 2016, *Medical Assistance in Dying: A Patient Centred Approach*, Report of the Special Joint Committee on Physician-Assisted Dying (February 2016): <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/PDAM/report-1>

### **Proposal 3: Letter from Lord Dubs**

#### *Devolution in England*

##### *Description of the proposal*

Power and decision-making in England is highly centralised around Westminster. Outside Westminster, England is an uneven patchwork of local government power, shared out variously between mayors, County and District Councils. While we now have a devolution settlement in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland there is a political vacuum as regards devolution in England.

The aim of this inquiry would be to investigate the balance of power in England between Westminster and England's regions, to establish if current power arrangements are optimal and to evaluate how they could be improved. The inquiry would examine the drawbacks and benefits of existing models and previous devolution proposals.

Although this proposal is relevant to the present arguments about devolved power to Local Authorities and regions as a result of COVID-19, the aim of the inquiry would be much broader, looking well into the future, beyond the pandemic.

##### *Purpose of inquiry*

This inquiry would not concern itself with the balance of power between Westminster, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, rather it would examine whether some powers in Westminster could be devolved to other parts of England. The inquiry would cover everything from setting up new structures to devolving power to Local Authorities, or combinations of Local Authorities and other existing structures.

The inquiry would have to consider other examples of devolved structures, such as in Germany, Italy and Australia. It would also examine previous attempts to establish devolved centres of power, including the last Labour government's proposal, drawn up by Lord Prescott, to establish regional elected assemblies, which was rejected in a referendum by the voters of the North East.

It would explore the potential for a new constitutional settlement, either based on existing centres of power, such as Local Authorities, or on new ones. It would examine whether it would be right to consider new regional elected bodies or a combination of new bodies and existing structures.

##### *Relevant member experience*

This House is ideally placed to carry out an inquiry of this kind because of the breadth of knowledge of its members, among whom are former Council leaders, government ministers including those who have had responsibility for the three devolved administrations and representatives of business and trade unions.

##### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Emphatically, this proposal crosses every departmental boundary apart from defence and foreign affairs.

Finance and taxation are obviously crucial elements and one key issue would be the extent to which devolved authorities should have income-generating powers.

*Year-long timeframe*

Yes

*Additional comments*

As a Northern Ireland Minister, I took the Northern Ireland Act through the Lords and I was therefore involved in many discussions about the powers of the future Northern Ireland Executive and Assembly. I still recall the debates that resulted in the separation of powers as they are today for example broadcasting and social security remained in Westminster and health, education, transport and agriculture were devolved.

***DUBS***

## Proposal 4: Letter from Lord Moylan and the Earl of Clancarty

### *Enforcement powers of local authorities*

#### *Description of the proposal*

Over the past 20 years, local authorities have taken on a wide range of new enforcement powers, issuing an increasing number of penalties, carrying out patrols, and issuing new legal orders. This trend has continued in lockdown, with new powers and funding to issue legal orders and penalties, and a new patrolling role for Covid Marshals. Over time, local authorities have been increasingly released from legal and governmental checks on how powers are used.

In 1997, local authorities issued only 727 fixed penalty notices (FPNs) for littering, and 292 for dog fouling. Today, annual penalties have reached 250,000 penalties for littering, 4.7 million for parking, 1 million for moving traffic offences, and 10,000 for anti-social behaviour. There are also now penalties for handing out leaflets without a licence, putting items in the wrong bin, and for violating legal orders issued by the local authority. Unlike the police, local authorities retain civil fines income, creating a potential dependency on this source of income.

Covid legislation has extended local authorities' enforcement roles, with penalties issued for failing to prevent mingling, for violations of the Rule of Six, and for people dining in mixed household groups. In addition, new Covid-related road closures starting in July 2020 led to 222,702 penalties by the end of 2020. In 1998 local authorities acquired powers to issue anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) through a court. In 2014, they gained the powers to issue personal legal orders to individuals (Community Protection Notices and Community Protection Warnings, CPNs and CPWs), as well as public legal orders (Public Spaces Protection Orders, or PSPOs), without going through a court. There are now hundreds of PSPOs in place, with implications for freedom of movement in the public realm. These powers are exercised using markedly varying criteria by local authorities, resulting in differences in application of the law across the country. While it is undoubtedly the case that local authorities seek to exercise this relatively recent access of enforcement powers prudently and responsibly, there has been no review of their total impact.

There appears to be no centrally held data on the income accruing to local authorities from these various sources. Apart from individual cases highlighted in the press, usually sensationally, there is no way for policy-makers to judge if local authority behaviour is being influenced by the prospects of increasing enforcement income.

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

The purpose of the inquiry would be to undertake a comprehensive and open-minded review of the changing nature of local authority activity, the effect of legislation on the behaviour of local authorities in regard to enforcement, the financial implications for local authorities, including any incentive created for local authorities to become over-zealous in enforcement, and whether there is evidence of an altered relationship with local communities arising from an increased enforcement role.

The inquiry would be limited to English local authorities.

*Relevant member experience*

The inquiry would engage with issues to do with local authorities, policing and local government finance. It would be important to look at equalities aspects as well, and at implications for freedom of speech and parity of treatment in the public realm. The House is richly endowed with Members with experience in all these fields.

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

The proposal engages policy issues relevant to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (responsible for local authorities), the Home Office (responsible for policing), the Ministry of Justice (in relation to the role of the courts and tribunals in regard to appeals), HM Treasury (as regards the effect on total local government financing) and (given the large amount of traffic and parking offences that underlie much of the fine income), the Department for Transport.

*Year-long timeframe*

Provided Government is forthcoming with necessary financial information, yes, with ease.

*Additional comments*

Lord Moylan served as a local councillor for 28 years (until 2018), during which time the importance of income from enforcement activities became ever more apparent. His concern is what this forbodes for the relationship of local authorities with their communities.

This proposal is supported by Lord Clement-Jones.

**MOYLAN AND CLANCARTY**

## Proposal 5: Letter from Lord Vaux of Harrowden and Lord Stevenson of Balmacara

### *Fraud*

#### *Description of the proposal*

Fraud, whether originating online, by mobile phone or text, and whether perpetrated on individuals or businesses, is becoming an ever-growing problem. According to the Government's recently issued Beating Crime Plan, fraud now accounts for 42% of all crime against individuals, costs society at least £4.7 billion a year and is growing. The Beating Crime Plan says "It affects the security of online activity and it undermines our ability to communicate because of fraudulent messages claiming to be from Government or business".

The Victims' Commissioner has pointed out how it is often the most vulnerable in our society who are targeted, and the devastating impact fraud can have on people's lives, not only through the loss of life savings and pension funds, but also the impacts on mental health. Very few people will not have experienced at least an attempted fraud – many of us experience this almost daily. Yet, as the Victims' Commissioner says, "Fraud is under-reported, under-prioritised, under-investigated, and most importantly of all in my view, its victims are under-supported".

There are a number of current and forthcoming pieces of legislation that could be relevant to solving the problem, including the Online Safety Bill and the Telecommunications (Security) Bill. DCMS is intending to review online advertising, and the Home Office is intending to prepare a fraud action plan. The voluntary banking code is under review. The Government is consulting on improving and extending audits to cover fraud. Action Fraud is to be replaced, although it is not clear what with. Technology solutions are increasingly possible. So, the time is right for the House of Lords to carry out an inquiry to help inform and influence the debate.

For the purpose of the proposed inquiry, fraud would be defined as the use of trickery or deception to gain a dishonest advantage, usually financial, over another person. The inquiry would not be intended to look at the wider questions of online or cyber crime (such as hate crime, disinformation/fake news or disruption of infrastructure), but would concentrate its efforts specifically on identifying practical ways to reduce levels of fraud and support victims.

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

To inform and influence the debate on how to reduce the current high levels of fraud, including making practical and achievable recommendations.

#### *Relevant member experience*

An inquiry into fraud would require input from a wide range of expertise, including technology and social media, banking and financial services, accounting, pensions, policing and crime, business and legal amongst others, experience with which the House is well equipped.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Fraud is covered by DCMS (Online Safety, telecommunications, advertising), the Home Office (policing and crime), BEIS (business), HM Treasury (Financial

regulation, banking and payment regulation), DWP (pension scams) and the FCO (many scams originate from other countries).

*One-year time frame*

The special inquiry would be completed by November 2022.

This proposal is supported by Baroness D'Souza and Lord Vaizey of Didcot.

***VAUX OF HARROWDEN AND STEVENSON OF BALMACARA***

## **Proposal 6: Letter from Lord Hylton**

### *Global refugee situation policy*

#### *Description of the proposal*

World situation for refugees, in particular planned resettlement to prevent temporary camps from becoming permanent. NB Commonwealth countries particularly affected: Bangladesh, Kenya, Australia.

#### *Purpose of the inquiry*

Focus attention on a major global issue, to develop maximum co-operation between individual states, regional groups, UN agencies and voluntary organisations.

Preventing wars before they break out will probably be the best way to stop future flows of refugees.

#### *Relevant member experience.*

Many members of the House have experience of overseas aid and development, UN and international voluntary agencies, and of work directly with refugees.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

FCDO, Home Office, Charity Commission, MoD etc.

#### *One-year time frame*

20 or more sessions might be needed as well as a call for evidence.

#### *Additional comments*

If more detail is required, I can probably supply this.

***HYLTON***

## Proposal 7: Letter from Lord Knight of Weymouth

### *Government's strategy for ending digital exclusion*

#### *Description of the proposal*

As face-to-face services locked down, the true extent of digital exclusion amongst adults was exposed. Hundreds of thousands were left isolated because they didn't have the essential digital skills for life and work. And millions more were disadvantaged by a lack of access to affordable devices. In particular, this put parents in an unenviable bind – making them choose between their jobs and their childrens' education.

The inquiry will focus on the Government's approach to digital exclusion amongst the adult population, a hidden issue but a crucial dimension of social/economic exclusion and extremely damaging to opportunity and prosperity. Latest figures show that 2.6 million people are completely offline, with almost 15 million engaging with the internet in only a limited way: unthinkable figures for a leading economy in the 21st century, and impossible to defend in light of the irreversible acceleration of digitisation in our lives and work as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Despite positive statements made by Ministers, concrete, cross-government action on closing the digital divide for excluded working age adults has yet to emerge, and has arguably taken a backwards step with the end of the Department for Education's Future Digital Inclusion programme.

Meanwhile, the overarching focus of Government action on the digital divide during the pandemic was securing suitable devices for children to learn at home. The introduction of free courses at FE colleges and training providers by the DfE was and remains welcome, but by itself does little to address the deepening digital divide amongst the most vulnerable adults in our communities.

Good Things Foundation have noted that spending just 2% of the Government's investment in broadband on digital inclusion would halve the UK digital divide in 4 years, but this has not happened. Furthermore, at the time of writing, the lack of an updated digital strategy from the Government means that there is little indication of future progress.

In light of the extent of digital exclusion highlighted by the pandemic, the proposed committee would examine the Government's approach to fixing the digital divide. The committee would assess the social and economic implications of digital exclusion and what action Ministers are taking to address these. The committee would further examine whether the Government has a coordinated, cross-department approach to digital inclusion, or whether there are gaps and overlaps between departments.

The inquiry would also assess what action the Government is taking to ensure all have access to a minimum, acceptable and affordable level of connection to the internet, devices, and digital skills. We propose excluding broadband roll-out and internet speeds from the inquiry. Furthermore, the committee would assess whether the essential digital skills criteria are fit for purpose.

Importantly, the inquiry would assess whether the UK is lagging behind our international partners in ensuring vulnerable adults are digitally excluded and left behind.

*Purpose of inquiry*

The inquiry would be trying to secure a Government commitment to a coordinated, cross-government plan for digital inclusion, one which highlights the gaps and overlaps between department approaches to date.

*Relevant member experience*

This enquiry builds on the previous Digital Skills enquiry led by Baroness Morgan and will be informed by the Covid committee led by Baroness Lane-Fox.

Given the rapid digital transformation of public services and society in general, digital exclusion is an issue which cuts across several fields, providing many opportunities for Members across the House to contribute. Indeed, whilst of course we need the perspectives of those with experience in tech and digital, this inquiry would benefit from contributions from Members with backgrounds in many other areas. These include financial inclusion, community cohesion, loneliness, economic growth, health outcomes and health inequalities, and regional development.

Furthermore, as this inquiry is seeking to achieve a coordinated approach from the Government, contributions from Members with experience of the Cabinet Office would be most welcome, as would any input from other Members with an insight into how departments can work more closely together.

Fundamentally, this inquiry –and the issue of digital exclusion more broadly – would not succeed in its aims if only those with experience of digital, tech, and DCMS were to contribute.

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

The digital divide is a cross departmental problem that needs solving. Only by addressing policies across departments will we succeed and close the digital divide once and for all.

In an increasingly digital world, digital inclusion is necessary for full financial inclusion, for accessing welfare support, for health management, legal services, and more. Digital inclusion is an issue which cuts across several departments. A recent report from the APPG on Loneliness highlighted how digital exclusion impacts health outcomes, whilst a new report from IPPR North called for digital skills training at all levels of the education system. Government services across departments are moving online and, without action, those without digital skills and access will be left behind, exacerbating existing inequalities.

The inquiry would assess whether Government interventions to support health, jobs, and education were designed with digital inclusion in mind, and what is needed to ensure that future programmes recovery plans work to support those who are digitally excluded.

This inquiry is also pertinent to the Government's levelling up approach, which itself cuts across many departments including but not limited to HMT, BEIS, DCMS, DfT, DfE, and DHSC. Digital exclusion is an issue which reflects regional inequalities, thus having a deeper impact in areas such as the South West and North East of England.

*One-year timeframe*

Yes. As a cross-cutting inquiry, I expect this to require the standard 20 hours of evidence sessions, so as to fully examine the extent of digital exclusion and the methods required to address it.

*Additional comments*

Covid has exposed the deep divide left by digital exclusion. It is essential that we understand the Government's plans to address this, to ensure we get a strong recovery and leave no-one behind.

***KNIGHT OF WEYMOUTH***

## Proposal 8: Letter from Baroness Cox

### *Islamic marriage and divorce in England and Wales*

#### *Description of the proposal*

The focus of the inquiry is gender equality. It is an inquiry into the problems experienced by Muslim women in unregistered marriages, who find upon divorce or the death of their 'husband' they have limited rights.

An estimated 100,000 women are married in Islamic ceremonies but are not married under English law. Many suffer grave disadvantages because they lack legal protection. What is more, they can be unaware that their marriage is not officially recognised. Since 2011, I have introduced numerous Private Member's Bills to draw attention to this issue. The need for legislative reform is also emphasised by campaign organisations Equal and Free ([www.equalandfree.org](http://www.equalandfree.org)) and Register our Marriage ([www.registerourmarriage.org](http://www.registerourmarriage.org)) and in several high-level reports:

- The Casey Review, Paragraph 8.50, December 2016: "All marriages, regardless of faith, should be registered so that the union is legally valid under British laws. We have heard strong arguments that the Marriage Act should be reformed to apply to all faiths and that faith institutions must ensure they are properly registered and operate within existing legislation."
- Independent Review into the Application of Sharia Law, February 2018: "By linking Islamic marriage to civil marriage it ensures that a greater number of women will have the full protection afforded to them in family law and they will face less discriminatory practices. This will be a positive move aimed at giving women maximum rights should the marriage end in divorce."
- Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Resolution 2253, January 2019: "[We call on the UK to] review the Marriage Act to make it a legal requirement for Muslim couples to civilly register their marriage before or at the same time as their Islamic ceremony."
- Civitas Report, 'Fallen Through The Cracks', August 2020: "[We recommend] amending current legislation to make mandatory the registration of all religious marriages in the United Kingdom, in line with the proposals of the Marriage Act 1949 (Amendment) Bill."

The Government responded to escalating concerns by committing in 2018 to "explore the legal and practical challenges of limited reform relating to the law on marriage and religious weddings", following which the Law Commission launched a consultation on proposals to modernise and improve weddings law. To date, however, the Government has ensured no meaningful action.

#### *Purpose of the inquiry*

There are increasing concerns that, due to the Government's failure to act in this area, many Muslim women continue to suffer from systematic gender discrimination. The inquiry will act as a catalyst for much-needed legislative and policy change, with a focus on simplifying weddings law to benefit Muslim women. It will represent an important opportunity for redress for vulnerable Muslim women, some of whom are suicidal because they have unequal rights and/or are so ostracised by their community.

*Relevant member experience*

Many members of the House have great legal and professional knowledge and experience of addressing issues relating to gender discrimination, the operation of arbitration/mediation tribunals (including Sharia councils, where many Islamic wedding ceremonies take place), the complexities of weddings law, support for victims of abuse, and appropriate statutory responses.

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

The investigation, analysis and findings relate to the Home Office, Ministry of Justice and the government's Equalities Office.

*One-year time frame*

The proposed special inquiry committee would be completed within one year.

**COX**

**Proposal 9: Letter from Lord Campbell-Savours and Lord Blunkett**

*National identity cards*

*Description of the proposal*

Can I suggest a Liaison Committee inquiry into the introduction/use of national identity cards?

*Purpose of inquiry*

The areas I would like to see covered would include:

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

And more!

***CAMPBELL-SAVOURS AND BLUNKETT***

## Proposal 10: Letter from Baroness Hodgson of Abinger

### *ODA cuts*

#### *Description of the proposal*

This Special Inquiry would identify:

- Where the ODA cuts have been made
- The basis for the selection of the cuts
- Whether women and girls' programmes been more severely cut compared to general programmes in percentage terms
- Whether these cuts affected the delivery of the UK National Action Plan on UNSCR 1325, jointly owned by FCDO and MOD
- Whether these cuts affected the delivery of the PSVI (Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative)
- Whether there is effective tracking of funds to women and girls
- Whether the cuts affect the delivery of girls education, a present focus for development, as without the range of programmes on women and girls' empowerment, health and access to justice, girls' education may not be able to be delivered effectively
- How the cuts have affected funding to SRHR
- Identify how any damaging effects of the ODA cuts may be mitigated

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

To get an understanding of how the ODA cuts were selected and whether they have affected some of the long-term objectives of UK overseas development aid on gender.

#### *Relevant member experience*

There is strong interest in overseas development on all sides of the House as has been demonstrated in recent debates about the issue; this proposal is supported by Peers from all parties.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Both the Women, Peace and Security agenda and the Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative, although primarily owned by FCDO are also jointly owned by the MOD. Sexual Health and Reproductive Health and Rights also gives a health angle to this proposal.

#### *One-year time frame*

I think that it will be possible to complete such an Inquiry in the necessary time.

#### *Additional comments*

The UK was considered a world leader on International Development, being the first G7 country to hit the 0.7% GNI target laid down by the UN. Global Britain is enhanced by its soft power and it is important to be able to identify if the cuts to ODA will damage the UK's international reputation and, if this is considered to be the case, how this might be mitigated.

The UK 'holds the pen' at the UN Security Council on Women, Peace and Security and thus is considered a world leader on this agenda.

The PSVI (Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative) was launched in 2012 by William Hague and Angelina Jolie, bringing world attention to the horrors of sexual violence in conflict. The UK has led the way on this Initiative and Lord Ahmad is the Prime Minister's Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

The UK has historically been a world leader in promoting sexual and reproductive health and rights, through both their advocacy in international forums and international development programmes. This position is at risk with reported cuts to SRHR funding of up 85%.

This proposal is supported by Baroness Goudie, Lord McConnell of Glenscorrodale, Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne, Lord Purvis of Tweed, Baroness Stern, Baroness Sugg and Baroness Hussein-Ece.

***HODGSON OF ABINGER***

## Proposal 11: Letter from Lord Young of Cookham

### *Online fraud*

#### *Description of the proposal*

Increasingly consumers are being scammed by online fraud, with prospects of compensation varying from bank to bank. The Online Harms Bill as drafted does not cover online advertising, or direct emails and phone calls. Pensions Freedom has provided fresh targets. Action Fraud have been shown to be incapable of dealing with the volume of complaints, and local police do not have the resources or expertise to track down fraudsters. The banks plead commercial confidentiality for not reporting progress. It is moving up the scale of public concern.

#### *Purpose of the inquiry*

It could recommend additional steps banks should take before opening accounts for fraudsters; bring a common approach to compensation; improve consumer awareness and look at fresh legislation if necessary.

#### *Relevant member experience*

The House contains members with banking experience, digital knowhow, and representatives of consumer interest, as well as former civil servants familiar with the subject.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Online Fraud concerns the Treasury, Home Office, BEIS and – all of whom have some responsibility for this increasingly prevalent crime.

#### *One-year time frame*

The inquiry would be completed by November 2022.

#### *Additional Comments*

Lord Young suggested reading the news article by The Times '[Online fraud: where are the police when the cyber-scammers strike?](#)' as supporting information to his proposal.

**YOUNG OF COOKHAM**

## Proposal 12: Letter from Lord Lipsey

### *Pay review bodies*

#### *Description of the proposal*

NHS pay has been a recent subject of controversy with the body recommending more than the government proposed but less than staff wanted. But there are a number of such bodies and the subject crosses departmental boundaries. It is not clear where in government responsibility lies for taking an overall view as opposed to a view of each individual body.

Questions arising include:

- The status of government evidence/recommendations to the review bodies
- Their independence and how it is meant to be, and actually is, assured
- The relative weight they give to national policy including restraint on public spending and the facts pertaining to actual groups of workers and their employees
- The status of recommendations: in particular what happens if they make a recommendation which the government is not prepared to fund
- Liaison between the various review bodies.

***LIPSEY***

## Proposal 13: Letter from Baroness Young of Old Scone

### *Pressures on land use and the decision-making framework for competing priorities for land*

#### *Description of the proposal*

The pressures on land are increasing. The needs for land for climate change carbon sequestration including a massive increase in tree planting, for adaptation to the effects of climate change, for increasing production of healthy, affordable food, and to enable the UK to become more self-sufficient in timber are growing. Land is being used to protect water quality, improve the quality of our air and to manage flood risk. We need to ensure there is land for the recovery of our declining biodiversity. Land is needed for access to green spaces for people's health both physical and mental. We need more land for housing and for infrastructure and for jobs as the UK population is estimated to grow by a further 10 million. The Cambridge University Institute for Sustainability has estimated that to meet all Society's needs for land that are forecast in the next two decades we need 1/3 more land again than we already have. We aren't making land any more!

The other three nations of the UK have land use frameworks which allow them to establish principles to guide decisions at a national and local level on competing land use requirements and to develop multifunctional land use where the same land fulfils a number of functions rather than simply trading off competing functions against each other. England has no such framework. A different set of pressures and decision mechanisms exists in the marine environment and comparisons and differences could usefully be examined.

The pressure for an in-depth examination of land use policy is growing. The House of Lords Select Committee Enquiry into the Rural Economy called for a land use strategy. The Climate Change Committee has also highlighted the need. The Commission on Food Farming and the Countryside also stated the need and is now taking forward pilots at local levels. The Henry Dimbleby Food Strategy Report this year called for a systematic analysis and a land use framework. The Royal Society is due to produce a report this year on multifunctional landscapes. The forthcoming Planning legislation needs to be informed by such analysis. Examples exist internationally of interesting approaches to land use policy and the resolution and integration of competing needs which the inquiry could draw on. Our current decision-making process in England is hampered by those decisions being made by a range of government departments in silos with imperfect or no join up. Local government and the planning system focusses mostly on urban and development issues only.

The subject is overdue for detailed scrutiny.

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

The inquiry would examine and quantify the demands for land for the future, the mechanisms and policies being developed for greater integration of decision making to ensure that competing requirements can be rationalised and multifunctional land use delivered. It would draw on current dilemmas across a range of government departments particularly Defra, Transport, Housing, Communities and Local Government, BEIS and Treasury. It would set the scene and condition the debate which is slowly emerging across government and external bodies or a more rational and thoughtful way forward to meet society's future needs for land.

*Relevant member experience*

Members of the House are well placed to contribute. We have a depth of experience and knowledge in environmental science, climate change, planning policy and practice, practical land management, agriculture, transport and other infrastructure, housing, rural and urban policy, health, wildlife conservation and the management of green open spaces and economics.

*Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Land use is a truly cross departmental issue. Current decisions are made too often in silos and there is a need for an integrated approach, involving a range of government departments including Defra, MHCLG, BEIS, and of course, involving local government where the currently competing cross departmental issues are often left for local government to attempt to resolve.

*Year-long timeframe*

I believe the special inquiry could be completed within a year. It is a complex subject but some legwork has already been done by Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland and by bodies like the Climate Change Committee the report on land use, the Food and Farming Commission, the Dimbleby report on Food Strategy and a range of academic bodies and NGOs. International input is now more readily available remotely. What is needed is synthesis and focus which is the very stuff of a Special Select Committee Inquiry.

This proposal is supported by Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle, Baroness Brown of Cambridge, Earl of Caithness, Lord Cameron of Dillington, Lord Curry of Kirkharle, Lord Foster of Bath, Baroness Hayman, Lord Inglewood, Baroness Jones of Whitchurch, Earl of Kinnoull, Lord Krebs, Baroness Mallalieu, Baroness Parminter, Lord Randall of Uxbridge, Lord Teverson and Lord Whitty

**YOUNG OF OLD SCONE**

*Additional comments from Lord Cameron of Dillington*

I do indeed support the idea of a task and finish Lords' Cttee to look into land use in England or even the UK. We produce some 54% of our own food and I do not think it should ever get below 50%. But meanwhile the Gov plan to plant thousands of square miles of new trees, new habitats, new houses and even new solar parks and wind farms. They also want more and more of our countryside to be available for sport and access. Something will have to give, or something will have to be planned. This sort of cross departmental enquiry is just the sort of thing that the Lords is very good at, and if we Peers don't think about it and do the work, I cannot see who else will. It is going to be a very important Cttee for the future of our country.

**CAMERON OF DILLINGTON**

*Additional comments from Lord Foster of Bath*

I am very happy to strongly support the proposal that arises, in part, from a recommendation in the report of the Rural Economy special inquiry which I chaired.

**FOSTER OF BATH**

## Proposal 14: Letter from Lord Bird

### *Prevention in policy-making*

#### *Description of the proposal*

Prevention describes a range of potential policies to intervene in people's lives to ward off bad outcomes. This ranges from existential risks such as pandemics, to environmental risks associated with climate change and social justice issues such as homelessness and poverty. Specific examples include supporting families at risk of eviction, preventing older people from being admitted to hospital unnecessarily, sexual health services, alcohol abuse programmes and population-wide COVID public health messaging and vaccination programmes.

Preventing issues arising is better than, and cheaper than, dealing with them after they have arisen. There is ample evidence to show the early-years policy to prevent adverse childhood experiences can have long run effects on income and mental and physical health.

Currently, millions of people in this country are behind on household bills, half a million are in rent arrears and nearly 200,000 homeowners are in financial difficulty. This is against a background of 1.9m jobs at risk of permanent loss from the pandemic and some of the highest number of adults and young people in referral to mental health services. At the same time government spending has skyrocketed – last year the government borrowed £300bn, the highest figure since records began. Tough policy choices need to be made in this difficult economic context.

One particularly tough challenge the government will face is how much to invest in or how much to cut services that are preventative – those government actions that reduce risks faced by society, be they risk of unemployment and homelessness, health issues, or risk of future pandemics. These long-term prevention decisions require a clear vision of the future (ie. long-term objectives and outcomes), an awareness of the unintended consequences, and an acceptance that measurable change may not be immediately obvious.

Maintaining investment in long-term preventative policy was probably one of the key challenges of the last economic recovery (see reports by the [NAO](#) (p9), the [House of Lords](#) (#28-#42), the [Joseph Rowntree Foundation](#) and the [Institute for Government](#) (e.g. p43). We need to understand why, in order to ensure that our post-Covid recovery does lead us down a path of quick-fixes to balance the books, leading to the same unintended (and costlier to manage) long-term consequences; it is a core feature of Government's responsibility, after all, to protect people from harm, over both the short- and long- term.

Governments can, however, do preventative spending well (in early years in particular). Preventative policymaking benefits from clear evidence and modelling, and a heavy dose of risk taking – an approach which the government is already adopting in the context of becoming a science and technology superpower – but is yet to be fully embedded in the context of a fair and prosperous UK. A House of Lords special inquiry is the ideal tool to both learn the lessons from the past period of economic recovery and from parts of government that are doing prevention well and ensure that government is well equipped to make good value-for-money long-term preventative decisions going forward.

The pandemic has provided the opportunity for a “a great reset” in the way we think about personal and national resilience, and planning for, and investing in,

the future. It is vital that the decisions made over the coming months and years are even more visionary - and impactful - than ever before, to prevent today's challenges seeding tomorrow's crises.

This inquiry will consider:

- How to ensure that fiscal responses to crises – eg. Covid – do not contribute to long-term disadvantage
- Evidence of “what works” in preventative spending across a cross-departmental set of policy areas
- The challenges of preventative spending – where to focus efforts, how to ensure value for money, how to balance emergency responses with the needs of future generations, and how to measure long-term investment in (intangible) social and environmental outcomes

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

The inquiry would be established with the key objective to highlight the opportunities and challenges of preventative policymaking, drawing together the academic, operational and real-life evidence at a local and national scale of such policy. The end result would be a clear set of evidence across a diverse range of policy areas, drawing links and learning lessons from Covid, and providing a “toolkit” of evidence which Government and policymakers can use.

#### *Relevant member experience*

Preventive policymaking requires broad and wide-ranging knowledge in areas ranging from climate change to social and economic policy. Reviewing the opportunities and limitations of preventive policymaking in a UK political context also requires political expertise. A House of Lords committee would be the ideal place to convene such technical and political knowledge.

Furthermore, the Members of the House often utilise a longer-term outlook than the Commons, as they are not restrained to the same immediate pressures of election cycles. Such a review, focused on long-termism and prevention could be overlooked by the Commons and by Government but would be well suited to the Lords.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

Preventive policymaking is applicable to every single government department – from housing to health, and education to technology policy.

This inquiry builds on the work departments have set in motion during the pandemic (ie. limiting the negative impact of the closing down of the economy on families, children, businesses and workers – a clear form of emergency preventive policymaking), ensuring that departments can learn from each other's best practice and establish long-term preventive policy practice.

#### *One-year time frame*

We expect that 10-20 x 1-hour evidence sessions should be sufficient.

**BIRD**

## **Proposal 15: Letter from Lord Laming**

### *Residential Care Services for adults*

*A review of the diverse needs currently to be met by the Residential Care Services for adults*

#### *Description of the proposal*

A consequence of greater life expectancy and improved health care services is that more of our fellow citizens require residential care services. In recent years the range of different needs of those with learning difficulties, severe physical disabilities, mental health problems, drug abuse and elderly people including those with dementia, necessitate a review of specialist facilities, range of providers, access and costs of services and the training of staff. Such a review is desperately needed and the House of Lords has in its membership a wide range of expertise well able to contribute to the task.

#### *Purpose of the inquiry*

It would be both timely and informative and a positive response to experiences gained during the recent pandemic.

#### *Relevant member experience*

As mentioned above the House has a great deal to offer in tackling this most important subject.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

A wide range of issues emerged during the past 18 months which are cross cutting government, the NHS, local government, independent and charitable providers and the growing expectations placed upon staff in the provision of quality care for residents with profound and diverse needs.

#### *One-year time frame*

The inquiry would be completed by November 2022. Many of the issues have been already highlighted. A coherent response is now needed.

**LAMING**

## **Proposal 16: Letter from Baroness D’Souza**

### *Responses to the Daesh atrocities (criminal accountability)*

#### *Description of the proposal*

The inquiry would review Her Majesty’s Government’s responses to the Daesh atrocities, focusing on the issue of criminal accountability, but also other legal responses to the crimes.

The inquiry would review how many investigations and prosecutions Her Majesty’s Government’s has conducted in relation to the Daesh foreign fighters, whether British citizens or others based on the principle of universal jurisdiction.

The inquiry would consider the charges brought against the Daesh fighters and the result of the proceedings (including the conviction rate, penalties applied). The inquiry would further consider the challenges faced by Her Majesty’s Government’s that prevented further investigations and prosecutions of the Daesh fighters and identify the needed law changes to address the issues.

The inquiry would consider the cooperation between Her Majesty’s Government’s and UNITAD and how it helped to improve the responses to the Daesh atrocities.

Lastly, the inquiry would look into other legal responses to the Daesh atrocities, including the use of freezing orders, sanctions and other available legal avenues.

#### *Purpose of inquiry*

The inquiry would be trying to analyse Her Majesty’s Government’s responses to the Daesh atrocities, learn from the example, and consider the necessary changes to help Her Majesty’s Government to provide more comprehensive responses to similar atrocities in the future.

#### *Relevant member experience*

Members of the House with particular expertise on these issues include:

Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws Q.C., Baroness Butler-Sloss Q.C., Lord Carlile Q.C., Lord Brennan Q.C., Lord Pannick Q.C., Lord Mackay of Clashfern Q.C., Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne, Baroness Cox, Lord Forsyth of Drumlean, Lord Marlesford, Lord Campbell of Pitternween, Baroness Helic, Lord Alton of Liverpool.

#### *Cross-cutting departmental boundaries*

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

- Foreign and Commonwealth Office
- Ministry of Defence
- Ministry of Justice

Former or current House of Lords Ministers could be asked to give evidence, including:

- Baroness Northover
- Baroness Warsi
- Lord Howell of Guildford
- Baroness Anelay of St Johns
- Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon

*Year-long timeframe*

The proposed special inquiry committee is capable of being completed in one year with an attempt to finalise it within a shorter period of time. The inquiry will conduct between 5 and 10 expert witness sessions of up to 2 hours per session. The witnesses will include experts from the above identified departments, legal academics and practitioners, and others with relevant expertise.

*Additional comments*

The inquiry could also involve a public call for evidence from individuals or groups with relevant expertise to ensure that the inquiry is as comprehensive as possible to significant contribute to the debates on the topic.

**D'SOUZA**

**Proposal 17: Letter from Lord Hutton***The economic and social costs of achieving net zero by 2050**Description of the proposal*

A special inquiry into the social and economic cost of getting to net zero in 2050 is arguably the biggest public policy challenge we face. It has the potential to radically change most aspects of our lives. It also raises some fundamental issues of fairness and equity- how are we to make these changes in a fair way with those on modest and low incomes participating fully in the transition to a carbon free society.

Moving to net zero is also a cross Government agenda involving every individual Department. I believe there are many Peers with expertise and subject specific knowledge who will be able to contribute to such an inquiry.

Understanding the choices and costs involved in this transition is perhaps the most undeveloped area of policy. There is scope therefore for an inquiry to make a significant contribution to improving public understanding. It will also generate considerable media interest.

**HUTTON**

## APPENDIX 1: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

---

Baroness Bennett of Manor Castle

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Bird

*Sponsor of the UK Wellbeing of Future Generations Bill*

Lord Blunkett

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Brown of Cambridge

*Chair of the Adaptation Committee of the Climate Change Committee*

Earl of Caithness

*No interests declared*

Lord Campbell-Savours

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Cameron of Dillington

*No interests declared*

Earl of Clancarty

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Clement-Jones

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Cox

*I am secretary of the APPG on ‘Honour’-Based Abuse, which has heard numerous testimonies from Muslim women in religious-only marriages.*

*My Private Member’s Bill [Marriage Act 1949 (Amendment) Bill] seeks to ensure greater legal protections for married, divorced or widowed Muslim women. Its provisions require a religious marriage to be civilly registered before or at the same time as the religious ceremony.*

*My previous Private Member’s Bill [Arbitration and Mediation Services] placed a duty on public bodies to ensure that couples in religious-only marriages are made aware of their (lack of) legal rights under English law. The Bill was introduced in six consecutive Parliamentary Sessions and received three Second Reading debates in the House of Lords, with widespread cross-party support.*

*The above Bills are strongly supported by many organisations concerned with the suffering of vulnerable women, including Equal and Free, Karma Nirvana, the Council for Muslims Facing Tomorrow, British Arabs Supporting Universal Women’s Rights (Basira) and the Muslim Women’s Advisory Council.*

Lord Curry of Kirkharle

*Trustee of Clinton Devon Estate*

Baroness D’Souza

**Responses to the Daesh Atrocities (Criminal Accountability)**

*Co-founder and Patron of Hazara School for Girls in Afghanistan.*

**Fraud**

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Dubs

*My experience as a Northern Ireland Minister in the three years running up to the Good Friday Agreement and the establishment of the Executive and the Assembly. I have been a local councillor and an MP.*

Lord Foster of Bath

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Goudie

*Please see register of interests*

Baroness Hayman

*Co-Chair of Peers for the Planet*

Baroness Hodgson of Abinger

*Co-Chair of the APPG on Women, Peace & Security*

*Set up and run the Afghan Women's Support Forum*

*Hon. Col of Outreach Group, 77th Brigade*

*Trustee of the Armed Forces Parliamentary Scheme*

Baroness Hussein-Ece

*No interests declared*

Lord Hutton

*Chair of EnergyUK*

Lord Hylton

*No interests declared*

Lord Inglewood

*Please see the register*

Baroness Jones of Whitchurch

*Member of the South Downs National Park Authority*

Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws

*Director of the International Bar Association Human Rights Institute*

Earl of Kinnoull

*I have interests as a landowner and organic farmer in my own right.*

*I also have non beneficial interests as a Trustee of 2 substantial estates in Scotland whose holdings aggregate to around 100,000 acres, The Blair Charitable Trust (BCT) and the Dunlossit Trust. BCT also manages significant other land holdings on behalf of others.*

Lord Knight of Weymouth

*Co-chair: The Digital Poverty Alliance*

*Chair: The Centre for the Acceleration of Social Technology (is funded to improve the digital capacity of the charity sector).*

*Former Chair and Patron of Good Things Foundation, a digital inclusion charity*

Lord Krebs

*Sustainability advisor to Drax PLC*

*Member of the Advisory Board of the Energy and Climate Intelligence Unit*

Lord Laming

*I have a personal and career interest*

Lord Lipsey

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Mallalieu

*I actively farm a smallholding (40 acres) on Exmoor*

*President of the Countryside Alliance*

Baroness Massey of Darwen

*Secretary to the All-Party Parliamentary Humanist Group*

Lord McConnell of Glenscorrodale

*Please see the register*

*In addition to those interests listed in my Lords Register, I participate in programmes managed by the Westminster Foundation for Democracy, which is in part funded by UK ODA*

Lord Moylan

*No current interests to declare*

Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Parminter

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Purvis of Tweed

*Associate: GPG. GPG has previously delivered programmes under the UK Government of which elements of these have been UK ODA.*

*I have charitable interests which are non-remunerated*

*Took through the Lords the 2015 legislation.*

Lord Randall of Uxbridge

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Stern

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Stevenson of Balmacara

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Sugg

*Member of the International Relations and Defence Select Committee*

*Ex-FCDO minister*

Lord Teverson

*Chair: Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Nature Partnership that deals with some land use issues*

Lord Vaizey of Didcot

*Adviser to The Investing and Savings Alliance*

Lord Vaux of Harrowden

*Non-practicing member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales*

Lord Whitty

*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Young of Cookham

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Young of Old Scone

*Chair of the Woodland Trust,*

*Member of the Food and Farming Commission*

*Member of the Steering Group for the Royal Society Report on Multifunctional Landscapes.*

*Previously a member of the Climate Change Committee Adaptation Sub Committee.*

A full list of members' interests can be found in the Register of Lords' Interests: <https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests>