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Подана стаття присвячена розгляду політичного дискурсу Б.Обами у його зверненні до нації з точки зору синтаксично-стилістичного підходу. Предметом нашого дослідження є синтаксичні стилістичні засоби, які мають місце у зверненні президента Обами до свого народу, їх призначення і реалізація у тексті політичного дискурсу.

Дискурс є інтегративною одиницею мовлення. Виділення різних типів дискурсу і політичного дискурсу, зокрема, є досить актуальним з точки зору комунікативного підходу до мови. В нашій роботі ми розглядаємо політичний дискурс як дискурс, який має на меті «пропаганду тих чи інших ідей, емотивний вплив на громадян країни і спонукання їх до дії» [ 6, с. 11; 5, с. 107].

Згідно до теорії комунікативних актів дискурс передбачає наявність комунікантів: автора (промовця, адресанта ), співрозмовника ( слухаючого, адресата ) та третіх осіб. Будь-який дискурс має перлокутивний, іллокутивний та локутивний ефект [ 3, с. 160 ]. Іншими словами, будь який дискурс направлений як на самого адресанта, як на його адресата, так і на саме повідомлення. Це значить, що будь-який дискурс організований з метою про щось повідомити адресату, з метою вплинути на адресата для виконання ним певних дій, потрібних адресанту, та з метою реалізуватися адресанту як особистості.

Як відомо, дискурс ведуть особистості [ 4, с.15]. Особистість, яка створює дискурс, є центром цього дискурсу: вона задає тон комунікації, вона визначає вектор спілкування з адресатом і вона ж є відповідальною за наслідки спілкування з ним.

Треба зауважити, що особистість, яка створює дискурс, має трьохрівневу систему організації: вербально-семантичний рівень (лексикон особистості), лінгво-когнітивний рівень (тезаурус особистості), мотиваційний рівень (прагматикон особистості) [ 1, с. 51] . Тип особистості знаходить своє відображення в структурах дискурсу, який вона організує, що дозволяє виділити типове і особливе як в дискурсі даної особистості , так і в її лексиконі, прагматиконі та тезаурусі [ 2, с. 46].

Політичний дискурс Б. Обами у зверненні до нації є дискурсом масового впливу на адресата, який транслювався і був відображений у засобах масової комунікації: радіо, Інтернет, телебачення, преса. Б.Обама як організатор свого політичного дискурсу має співрозмовника - багатомільйонний народ США.

Свій дискурс у звернені до народу з приводу ситуації у Сирії він розпочинає у звичній для нього манері звернення:

*My fellow Americans…*

У кінці своєї промови він подякує слухачам з побажаннями всього найкращого їм і їхній країні, що свідчить про дотриманням ним певного етикету спілкування такого рівня:

*Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.*

Дискурс Б.Обами у зверненні до нації організований як монолог. Проте, саме звертання і подяка перетворюють монолог за формою у діалог за суттю.

У своєму звертанні до народу Б. Обама використовує значну кількість стилістичних засобів синтаксису.

У дискурсі президента Обами ствердження превалюють над питаннями, що говорить про інформативний характер його промови. Як правило, стверджувальні форми у його зверненні є складними реченнями як складнопідрядного, складносурядного, так і змішаного типу. Це свідчить про намагання автора зробити свою доповідь аргументованою, послідовною.

Кількість простих речень у зверненні Обами до народу незначна:

*1.I agree. 2.My answer is simple.*

Вони виникають на тлі чисельної кількості складних речень. Маючи ефект несподіваності, привертаючи увагу слухачів, вони перетворюються у речення підвищеного значення.

Звернення президента Обами до народу має єдину спонукальну конструкцію у кінці своєї промови:

*That’s what makes America different. That’s what makes us exceptional. With humility, but with resolve, let us never lose sight of that essential truth.*

Як відомо, кінцева та початкова форми є сильними позиціями будь-якого висловлювання, дискурсу, тексту, тому що вони мають досить потужну психологічну силу впливу на адресата. Б.Обама спонукає свій народ бути винятковими від інших народів, апелюючи до лідерства нації у всесвітній історії, і, навіть , у вирішенні питання з Сирією. Саме тому, це спонукальне речення має високий рівень впливу на адресата.

Звернення Б.Обами до народу містять значну кількість спонукальних конструкцій за формою, які мають значення ввічливої форми: *1. Let me explain why. 2. Let me make something clear.* Кількість питань у зверненні президента Обами до народу поступається у чисельності стверджувальним формам, але має якісний показник.

У звернення до народу Б.Обама використовує спеціальні питання, риторичні питання зі структурою *«:Why should we…»*, які не потребують відповіді, бо відповідь всім відома:

*Why should we get involved at all in a place that’s so complicated and where, as one person wrote to me, those who come after Assad may be enemies of human rights?*

Проте, Барак Обама дає аргументовану відповідь на риторичне питання, перетворюючи це риторичне питання у форм спеціального питання, знижуючи його первісний зміст, надаючи собі статуту вирішувати «невирішувальні» питання. Ця транспозиція риторичного питання у спеціальне свідчить про маніпулятивний характер звернення президента.

У дискурсі Б.Обами достатню кількість займають речення, які за своєю формою є ствердженнями, але за своєю суттю є питаннями:

*Finally, many of you have asked, why not leave this to other countries or seek solutions short of force?*

В цьому прикладі транспозиція ствердження у питання має інший характер. Транспозиція ствердження до форми питання призначена створити ефект діалогічного спілкування, коли комуніканти мають змогу ставити один одному питання. Проте, у своєму дискурсі Б.Обама сам собі ставить питання і сам на них відповідає. За своєю формою це нагадує внутрішню мову автора, але, завдяки транспозиції, монологічне висловлювання перетворюється на діалогічне. Такі трансформації свідчать про маніпулятивний характер звернення Б.Обами до народу, коли поверхнєва і глибинна структура дискурсу розходяться за змістом.

У зверненні Б.Обами до народу міститься значна кількість паралельних конструкцій з анафоричним повтором, які призначені емоційно вплинути на адресата, представити подану інформацію більш аргументовано, закарбувати в пам’яті адресата подану інформацію :

*In World War I, American G.I.s were among the many thousands killed by deadly gas in the trenches of Europe. In World War II, the Nazis used gas to inflict the horror of the Holocaust. Because these weapons can kill on a mass scale, with no distinction between soldier and infant, the civilized world has spent a century working to ban them. And in 1997, the United States Senate overwhelmingly approved an international agreement prohibiting the use of chemical weapons, now joined by 189 governments that represent 98 percent of humanity.*

Дискурс президента Обами у зверненні його до народу характеризується використанням емфатичних конструкцій для підсилення значення, яке закладене в ці конструкції:

*This is not a world we should accept. This is what’s at stake. And that is why, after careful deliberation, I determined that it is in the national security interests of the United States to respond to the Assad regime’s use of chemical weapons through a targeted military strike.*

В цьому прикладі низка емфатичних конструкцій типу “*This is… that/what…”* та конструкції *“that is why…”,* які, в свою чергу, є паралельними конструкціями з анафоричним повтором, наділені надзвичайною силою впливу на адресата з метою переконати його ( народ США) у правильності ведення міжнародної політики Б. Обами щодо застосування сили.

Політичний дискурс Б.Обами у зверненні до нації характеризується використанням синтаксичних конструкцій з полісиндетоном, що дозволяє зменшити темп перерахування у реченні і цим привернути увагу адресата до перерахованих речей:

*The world saw thousands of videos, cell phone pictures, and social media accounts from the attack, and humanitarian organizations told stories of hospitals packed with people who had symptoms of poison gas.*

Промова Обами до народу характеризується використанням великої кількості вставних слів та речень, які призначені надати додаткову інформацію щодо зображених подій, обє’ктів. Це, в свою чергу, сприяє аргументованому викладенню інформації з метою переконання адресата:

*But a targeted strike can make Assad -- or any other dictator -- think twice before using chemical weapons.*

Окрім того, вставні слова *now, moreover, meanwhile, however, finally, indeed* мають текстоформуючу функцію, поєднуючи окремі за змістом синтаксичні одиниці в єдине ціле, сприяючи послідовному викладенню інформації*.*

Особливою рисою дискурсу Б.Обами є використання ним реальних умовних речень, які дозволяють йому змалювати картину світу в майбутньому і цим вплинути на адресата. :

*If we fail to act, the Assad regime will see no reason to stop using chemical weapons.*

Таким чином, усі використанні президентом Обамою стилістичні мовні засоби синтаксичного рівня носять маніпулятивний, впливовий, аргументативний та емоційно-забарвлений характер. Їх використання направлене як на адресата, так і на реалізацію особистості адресанта.
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Indeed, I’d ask every member of Congress and those of you watching at home tonight to view those videos of the attack, and then ask, what kind of world will we live in if the United States of America sees a dictator brazenly violate international law with poison gas and we choose to look the other way?  
  
Franklin Roosevelt once said, “Our national determination to keep free of foreign wars and foreign entanglements cannot prevent us from feeling deep concern when ideas and principles that we have cherished are challenged.”  
  
Our ideals and principles, as well as our national security, are at stake in Syria, along with our leadership of a world where we seek to ensure that the worst weapons will never be used.  
  
America is not the world’s policeman. Terrible things happen across the globe, and it is beyond our means to right every wrong, but when with modest effort and risk we can stop children from being gassed to death and thereby make our own children safer over the long run, I believe we should act.  
  
That’s what makes America different. That’s what makes us exceptional. With humility, but with resolve, let us never lose sight of that essential truth.  
  
Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

|  |
| --- |
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## Margaret Thatcher Speech - Tribute To Ronald Reagan

*Washington DC  
1st March 2002*

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:   
  
It is an honour to join so many friends this evening in a tribute to freedom and a tribute to the President whose name is synonymous with it – Ronald Reagan.   
  
Ronald Reagan – Conservative   
  
Ronnie and I got to know each other at a time when we were both in Opposition, and when a good many people intended to keep us there. They failed, and the conservative 1980s were the result.   
  
But in a certain sense, we remained an opposition, we were never the establishment. We were opposed to big government, to fashionable opinion within the belt-way, and to the endless round of so-called liberal solutions to problems the liberals themselves had created. As Ron once put it: the nine most dangerous words in the English language are “I’m from the government, and I’m here to help”. As usual, he was right.   
  
Ronald Reagan helped America – and so America could help the world - because he rejected that approach. He believed, and he never stopped proclaiming, that the talents of a nation, not the wisdom of bureaucracy, forge a country’s greatness. Let our children grow tall – he urged - then they can reach out to raise others higher too.   
  
For our opponents, there are always a hundred reasons why the government must intervene to plan its children’s lives. For us, there’s one overwhelming reason why it shouldn’t – because men and women are born to be free.   
  
The world isn’t much used to hearing that kind of message now. We live in an era of sound bites and spin doctors, of false sentiment and real cynicism. That’s why just reading – or hearing as we shall - the words of Ronald Reagan is so refreshing. They remind us that men and women were born for high ideals and noble purposes.   
  
They remind us, too, that the world which so many now take for granted was won by struggle. And Ron had to struggle. The fact that he kept his composure and lifted us all with his humour testified to his inner strength, not to a life without hardship. And it also testified, as he never failed to add, to the boundless, enfolding love of Nancy.   
  
Reagan’s Achievement   
  
Ronald Reagan’s achievements can be summed up like this: he made America great again, and he used that greatness to set the nations free. Either of these achievements would qualify a President for the political pantheon: but to have succeeded in both marks out President Reagan as one of America’s very greatest leaders.   
  
All his policies were of a piece, and all reflected his own distinctive philosophy. He believed in America, and he believed in people.   
  
When the academics foretold American decline, he replied that there was nothing this nation couldn’t do, once given the chance.   
  
When the economists denounced his policies of tax cuts as simplistic, he didn’t mind if his answers were simple because they were true.   
  
When liberals doubted if Americans were willing to master events and make sacrifices, he replied (and I quote):   
  
“No weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women”.   
  
But nor did Ron ignore those arsenals of weapons. His build-up of American military might, sustained by a revived economy, was the decisive factor in winning the Cold War for the West and Liberty.   
  
But how they mocked him!   
  
Do you remember how he was told that the only way to deal with Soviet advances was to negotiate arms control?   
  
Do you remember how they said that toughness in dealing with the Soviets would only help the hard-liners in the Kremlin? And then came Gorbachev, and then an end to the Evil Empire itself!   
  
And do you remember how much they mocked an old man’s obsession with Star Wars? Well now we know, from the mouths of ex-Soviet officials no less, that SDI was crucial in forcing them to renounce military competition and to end the Cold War. And now President Reagan’s vision is the starting point for the world’s most necessary military programme – I mean, of course, Ballistic Missile Defence.   
  
Reagan’s Legacy and the World Today   
  
Missile Defence is just one example of the continuity between the world which Ronald Reagan and I faced in the 1980s and the world we know today. Now, as then, it is crucial to keep our defences strong and up-to-date. It’s particularly vital to ensure that America maintains its lead in military technology, which gives us mastery of the battlefield.   
  
But Missile Defence also illustrates how the world has changed since those Cold War years. No longer do two nuclear superpowers confront each other around the globe. Rather, we face threats from numerous different quarters – threats less potentially catastrophic it’s true, but grave… and graver still because all but impossible to predict and deter.   
  
Ronald Reagan’s political legacy is one where the captive nations have been freed, where democracy is dominant, where the march of capitalism is unchecked. The world is freer, fairer and richer.   
  
But yesterday’s conservatives never imagined that the end of the Soviet Union would usher in an end to danger – only the liberals, wrong now as in the past, thought that. Those liberals were all too influential. The West cut back its defences too far. It weakened its intelligence effort. It succumbed to the fatal illusion that government’s role is to make us comfortable, rather than to keep us safe. And so it was that those who hate America, fear liberty and attack progress, were able to prepare their wicked assault on this nation that fateful Tuesday last September.   
  
Since then the world has watched, with growing admiration and a rebirth of hope, how America has taken swift and devastating action against the West’s sworn enemies. This was an extraordinary feat of arms. It was also an inspiring example of leadership. What we have seen proves beyond doubt that America is in truth, not just name, the unrivalledglobal superpower. And it proves too that another great American President sits in the White House.   
  
I am pleased and proud that Britain, once again, has made an important contribution to this struggle against evil. Echoing both Bismarck and Churchill, President Reagan once remarked: “future historians will note that a supreme fact of this [twentieth] century was that Great Britain and the United States shared the same cause: the cause of human freedom”. My friends: in the continuation of the War Against Terror our countries must again stand firm.   
  
For as President Bush has reminded us, though a great battle is over, the war itself is not. Our purpose must be to strike the other centres of Islamic terrorism wherever they are. And we must act equally strongly against those states which harbour terrorists and develop weapons of mass destruction that might be used against us or our allies.   
  
The recent shameful European reaction to President Bush’s State of the Union Speech reminds me of nothing so much as that which greeted President Reagan’s words two decades ago. Americans shouldn’t take too much notice. Fear masquerading as caution, pique posing as dignity, words substituting for thought – we have been there many times before. Whatever the protests of the faint-hearts, it is high time to take action against the Rogue States which are arming against us.   
  
In particular, Saddam Hussein constitutes unfinished business. And he now needs to be finished – for good. First rate intelligence, the support of opposition elements within Iraq, and overwhelming force will probably all be required. Butthe risks of not acting far outweigh those of allowing Saddam to continue developing his weapons of war. I hope and trust that Britain will support to the hilt the action your President decides to take.   
  
Trust America   
  
America today is not just the only global superpower. She enjoys a superiority over any other power or combination of powers greater than any nation in modern times. This also places on her shoulders an awesome responsibility. For the United States, as for any country, national interest must come first – and without apology. But America’s interests are so vast that no region lies beyond them. This, my friends, has three implications – each full of significance for the future.   
  
On the first I have touched already. America must remain strong. She must again, as under Ronald Reagan, rebuild, reshape and modernise her defences. President Bush’s military budget and Secretary Rumsfeld’s visionary plans demonstrate that this lesson has already been heeded.   
  
The second implication is that America needs trustworthy allies in every region. America is mighty, but no democracy will tolerate becoming the whole world’s policeman. My advice is: pick your allies wisely, support and reassure them – and then insist that they fulfil their promises and commit their resources.   
  
Third – and here may I step just over the line of political even-handedness – America will know that particularly in times like these the Leader of the Free World must be seen by your friends and foes alike to speak with unqualified authority. The world does not much understand the doctrine of the Separation of Powers. But it respects America more when it knows that the promises and warnings of the US Commander-in-Chief are endorsed by the other main organs of elected government. That message is powerful politics – and it has the still greater merit of being true.   
  
Liberty   
  
My friends, one further golden thread connects Ronald Reagan with the Republican Party today – the love of liberty. So it is doubly fitting that this should be your theme tonight.   
  
President Reagan didn’t just abhor communism, mistrust socialism and dislike bureaucracy, he truly loved liberty – he loved it with a passion which went far beyond anything else in his political life. It was what brought moral grandeur to his vision of America and to his dreams for a better world. It was directed not mainly at earthly powers and principalities but rather at the infinitely precious, utterly unique human being, wherever he or she was yearning to breathe free. The thought is memorably expressed by the poet Byron :   
  
‘Eternal spirit of the chainless mind! Brightest in Dungeons, Liberty! Thou art, For there thy habitation is the heart – The heart which love of thee alone can bind; And when thy sons to fetters are consigned – To fetters, and the damp vault’s dayless gloom, Their country conquers with their martyrdom, And Freedom’s fame finds wings on every wind’   
My friends, God Bless Ronnie - and God Bless America!

### Margaret Thatcher Speech - Tribute To Ronald Reagan

# House of Lords

## Wednesday, 8 May 2013.

## Queen’s Speech

##### 11.30 am

*The Queen, seated on the Throne and attended by Her Officers of State, commanded that the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod should let the Commons know that it was Her Majesty’s pleasure that they attend Her immediately in this House.*

*When they had come with their Speaker, Her Majesty was pleased to speak as follows:*

“My Lords and Members of the House of Commons, my Government’s legislative programme will continue to focus on building a stronger economy so that the United Kingdom can compete and succeed in the world.

It will also work to promote a fairer society that rewards people who work hard.

My Government’s first priority is to strengthen Britain’s economic competitiveness. To this end, it will support the growth of the private sector and the creation of more jobs and opportunities.

My Ministers will continue to prioritise measures that reduce the deficit, ensuring interest rates are kept low for home owners and businesses.

My Government is committed to building an economy where people who work hard are properly rewarded. It will therefore continue to reform the benefits system, helping people move from welfare to work.

Measures will be brought forward to introduce a new employment allowance to support jobs and help small businesses.

A Bill will be introduced to reduce the burden of excessive regulation on businesses. A further Bill will make it easier for businesses to protect their intellectual property.

A draft Bill will be published establishing a simple set of consumer rights to promote competitive markets and growth.

My Government will introduce a Bill that closes the Audit Commission.

My Government will continue to invest in infrastructure to deliver jobs and growth for the economy.

Legislation will be introduced to enable the building of the High Speed 2 railway line, providing further opportunities for economic growth in many of Britain’s cities.

My Government will continue with legislation to update energy infrastructure and to improve the water industry.

My Government is committed to a fairer society where aspiration and responsibility are rewarded.

To make sure that every child has the best start in life, regardless of background, further measures will be taken to improve the quality of education for young people.

Plans will be developed to help working parents with childcare, increasing its availability and helping with its cost.

My Government will also take forward plans for a new national curriculum, a world-class exam system and greater flexibility in pay for teachers.

My Government will also take steps to ensure that it becomes typical for those leaving school to start a traineeship or an apprenticeship, or to go to university.

New arrangements will be put in place to help more people own their own home, with government support provided for mortgages and deposits.

My Government is committed to supporting people who have saved for their retirement.

Legislation will be introduced to reform the way long-term care is paid for, to ensure the elderly do not have to sell their homes to meet their care bills.

My Government will bring forward legislation to create a simpler state pension system that encourages saving and provides more help to those who have spent years caring for children.
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Legislation will be introduced to ensure sufferers of a certain asbestos-related cancer receive payments where no liable employer or insurer can be traced.

My Government will bring forward a Bill that further reforms Britain’s immigration system. The Bill will ensure that this country attracts people who will contribute and deters those who will not.

My Government will continue to reduce crime and protect national security.

Legislation will be introduced to reform the way in which offenders are rehabilitated in England and Wales.

Legislation will be brought forward to introduce new powers to tackle anti-social behaviour, cut crime and further reform the police.

In relation to the problem of matching internet protocol addresses, my Government will bring forward proposals to enable the protection of the public and the investigation of crime in cyberspace.

Measures will be brought forward to improve the way this country procures defence equipment, as well as strengthening the Reserve Forces.

My Ministers will continue to work in co-operation with the devolved Administrations.

A Bill will be introduced to give effect to a number of institutional improvements in Northern Ireland.

Draft legislation will be published concerning the electoral arrangements for the National Assembly for Wales.

My Government will continue to make the case for Scotland to remain part of the United Kingdom.

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

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons, my Government will work to prevent conflict and reduce terrorism. It will support countries in transition in the Middle East and north Africa, and the opening of a peace process in Afghanistan.

My Government will work to prevent sexual violence in conflict worldwide.

My Government will ensure the security, good governance and development of the Overseas Territories, including by protecting the Falkland Islanders’ and Gibraltarians’ right to determine their political futures.

In assuming the presidency of the G8, my Government will promote economic growth, support free trade, tackle tax evasion, encourage greater transparency and accountability while continuing to make progress in tackling climate change.

Other measures will be laid before you.

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons, I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your counsels”.

##### 11.42 am

*The House adjourned during pleasure.*

##### 3.30 pm

*Prayers—read by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield.*
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## Select Vestries Bill

### *First Reading*

##### 3.36 pm

*The Bill was read a first time pro forma.*

## Queen’s Speech

### *Debate (1st Day)*

##### 3.37 pm

**The Lord Speaker (Baroness D’Souza):** My Lords, I have to acquaint the House that Her Majesty was pleased this morning to make a most gracious Speech from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament assembled in the House of Lords. Copies of the gracious Speech are available in the Printed Paper Office. I have, for the convenience of the House, arranged for the terms of the gracious Speech to be published in the *Official Report.*

*Motion for an Humble Address*

*Moved by Lord Lang of Monkton*

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty as follows:

“Most Gracious Sovereign—We, Your Majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, beg leave to thank Your Majesty for the most gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament”.

##### 3.38 pm

**Lord Lang of Monkton:** My Lords, when I first came to your Lordships’ House, I asked my noble friend the late lamented Lord Mackay of Ardbrecknish what would happen after the State Opening. His answer was that some old codger on the Government side would be asked to propose an humble Address. Your Lordships may understand, therefore, that proud and privileged though I am to undertake this role, it brings with it a certain poignancy, as in the crossing of a threshold, as I come to realise that I am now a fully fledged member of SOCs, the society of old codgers. To my fellow members around the House I say this: we know who you are and we are all in this together.

The mood lifts instantly, however, since my first and pleasurable task is to express our gratitude and appreciation that Her Majesty the Queen has once again honoured this House with her presence to deliver the gracious Speech from the Throne. Her Majesty’s sense of duty and her vitality continue to inspire us all. Her example is followed to the letter by His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, whose unstinting support of Her Majesty at all times earns our enduring admiration and respect. We were also honoured today by the most welcome presence of their Royal Highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Cornwall. His Royal Highness works tirelessly in support of countless good causes, as can be shown by just one example, that of the Prince’s Trust which is now celebrating 30 immensely successful years of helping young people to get a good start in life.
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In our own world, another more modest but much cherished reign has ended with the retirement from the Front Bench of our former Leader of the House, my noble friend Lord Strathclyde. His well-rounded style, if I may call it that, invested our affairs with a charm that turned away wrath, quality of judgment, and a grasp of the business of politics that has brought benefit to us all over his 25 years of public service. We shall miss his bounteous hospitality.

Happily, his successor, my noble friend Lord Hill of Oareford, is cast in the same mould—metaphorically speaking. He won instant recognition on entering the House when he so effectively secured the passage of the coalition’s important education legislation. His courteous manner at the Dispatch Box and the intense work he has undertaken in his new role as our Leader win praise, I believe, from all quarters. It is an encouraging sign that, in his room here, the Leader drinks from a mug that bears the legend, “Make tea, not law”. He shares with my peerless noble friend Lady Anelay of St Johns, and, I feel sure, with the greatly esteemed noble Baroness, Lady Royall of Blaisdon, the strong conviction that courtesy and restraint are the essential watch-words for an effective self-regulating House. All three demonstrate it impressively.

The politics of any coalition are never easy, and parties can become frustrated. There are a few loose slates on the roof. However, I recall clearly how, after the general election, our two parties, acting in the national interest, each put aside its own agenda and combined in order to bring stability to the nation’s government after a near calamitous collapse of our economy. Looking back on that crisis, which was years in the making and will take years to surmount, put me in mind of the George Best school of economics. When the famous footballer was asked, towards the end of his life, how he had managed to lose his fortune, he replied that he had spent most of it on wine, women and song and the rest he had just wasted.

Putting the nation first was not mere rhetoric. We needed discipline and a new direction to avoid the abyss. To have reduced the deficit—although not yet the national debt—by one-third, and to have seen more than 1.25 million new private sector jobs created in the past two and a half years despite a state of chronic recession in the eurozone, our biggest export market, has been quite an achievement. I pay renewed tribute to Sir John Major, who won for this country the right to stay out of the euro. I welcome the continuing commitment expressed in the gracious Speech to promoting economic competitiveness through the rigorous reining back of unaffordable increases in public expenditure and to the maintenance of low interest rates. These constitute the two most fundamental of policies for growth. If we gave up on them, the burden of past extravagances would come back to haunt us. As a certain Lady once said, “There is no alternative”. In that regard, I acknowledge in particular the courage of my right honourable friends George Osborne and his Chief Secretary, the articulate and unflappable Danny Alexander. They personify the coalition at its best: stalwart, steady and united, they continue to put the nation first.
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Some pundits thought that coalition would be a recipe for paralysis. However, at this half-way stage in the Parliament, it is notable how much really major legislation has reached the statute book. I am thinking of the giant strides of my right honourable friend Michael Gove in education and of my right honourable friend Iain Duncan Smith in tackling the wasteful and damaging morass of the world of welfare. These are great and far-reaching breakthroughs, of Beveridge proportions, from which one may feel sure that the nation will benefit for years to come and of which many single-party Governments, over an entire term, would be proud. Now, in the gracious Speech, there is more to come in both areas.

Indeed, the gracious Speech reveals no loss of impetus, with many significant new measures, for example on pensions and immigration. There is the long-term care and support Bill, a matter surely of compelling interest to your Lordships—we will all have to declare our interest when speaking on it. It is a measure of vital long-term importance to a growing proportion of the population. Another Bill will tackle anti-social behaviour—to which the other place may wish to pay specific attention.

A pro-business agenda is reflected in the deregulation Bill and in the employment assistance proposals. As for the HS2 paving Bill, to bring London closer to the cities of the north, as Sir Humphrey would say, “Courageous, Minister”. As one who travels regularly by train between Westminster and my home in Scotland, I feel sure that my grandchildren may benefit from it—in old age.

**Noble Lords:** Oh!

**Lord Lang of Monkton:** Contentious though it may be, the need to upgrade our infrastructure and to improve access to the country away from the south-east must surely resonate with your Lordships. Business, too, will welcome that.

In my early years here, I used to raise Scottish issues—always to be told, “That is a matter for the Scottish Parliament”. Now when Scotland features in our deliberations, it usually means trouble: most recently the Scotland Act and the order to allow a Scottish independence referendum to take place. Troubles come not singly.

Scotland is a great nation but that greatness has been achieved within the United Kingdom. The Scottish Enlightenment came after 1707; so did the great industrial growth and the global breakout, when Scots travelled the world, keeping the Sabbath—and anything else we could lay our hands on. We are the land of inventions: from the steam engine to the bicycle, the mackintosh, the television, the Glenlivet, the Glenfarclas, the Glenfiddich and the Glenmorangie—and of course the cloning of Dolly the sheep. Not many people know that copper wire was invented by two Aberdonians quarrelling over a penny.

**Noble Lords:** Oh!

**Lord Lang of Monkton:** If the forthcoming referendum were to take Scotland out of the United Kingdom, we would all suffer, but Scotland most of all. Your Lordships will have noted the passing reference in the gracious Speech to,
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“co-operation with the devolved administrations”.

One cannot tell yet what that may mean but co-operation is a two-way street. I believe that constitutional fracking leads to fragmentation, so I trust that Her Majesty’s Government will always concentrate on strengthening the United Kingdom and do nothing that might weaken it. In this Parliament of our nation state are found the emblems of all its parts. The thistle stands proudly alongside the rose. I welcome the strong leadership of my right honourable friend the Prime Minister on this matter, and his commitment, echoed in the gracious Speech, to fight with unwavering determination to save the union.

It is an irony that might have delighted Messrs Gilbert and Sullivan that, in so elegantly moving this Motion last year, my noble friend Lord Cope of Berkeley was able to draw attention—with that subtle blend of loyalty and realism that is the province of all Chief Whips—to a proposed Bill for the reform of this House. That proposal was not altogether welcome here. This year, by contrast, many of your Lordships look eagerly for such a measure, but in vain. Of course, last year, for some it was a case of reform by abolition; for most, our ambitions are, I believe, more modest but more practical. One might argue that there is nothing wrong with this House that would not be solved by a little bit of quantitative easing, but there is no mention of reform of the House in the gracious Speech, so I should not speak of it and I will not—except to say:

“We are the very model of a Chamber constitutionalWe simply try to better Bills with changes quite profusionalWe are not revolutional; our aims are evolutionalNot to want to welcome that is surely just delusional”.

When King George V was asked by the minister of Crathie Kirk what he should preach about in his next sermon, it is said that he replied, “About seven minutes”. Happily, your Lordships have four days in which to debate the gracious Speech. The debate will range widely and one may be sure that it will benefit from the great expertise and experience to be found in all parts of the House but perhaps especially on the Cross Benches. There may even be time to contemplate those tantalising perennial words that appear at the end of every gracious Speech:

“Other measures will be laid before you”.

On one occasion, a Welsh farmer, watching the State Opening on television and hearing those words, turned to his wife and said, “Udder measures, Megan? The English must be having trouble with their cows again”.

Finally, I return to the terms of the Motion to recall that this year marks the 60th anniversary of Her Majesty the Queen’s coronation. But an even earlier occasion also springs to mind. In a broadcast marking her 21st birthday, Her Royal Highness Princess Elizabeth pledged her future life, whether it be long or short, to the service of this country. That vow has chimed like a clear bell through all the years since, as Her Majesty has fulfilled it with dedication and grace. Long may she continue to reign over us, for hers is a reign that will shine through history.
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##### 3.51 pm

**Lord German:** My Lords, it is a great privilege and a pleasure to second the Motion moved by my noble friend Lord Lang, especially after such a witty, clever and thoughtful address, which I am sure that this House greatly appreciated. My noble friend, as you will know, served with great distinction as a Minister. He held many ministerial posts, including two as Secretary of State. As well as holding the business portfolio, he was also Secretary of State for Scotland.

It may not have escaped your Lordships’ notice that this is a wholly non-English team commencing the debate on the humble Address. Your Lordships may be pleased that I will not dwell on the fact that 10% of the FA Premier League is now represented by Wales; nor will I dwell on the recent Six Nations triumph or on the captaincy of the British Lions—and all this with just 5% of the population. However, it demonstrates how important the link is between Wales and England—different but together. I know that both the noble Lord, Lord Lang, as he has just expressed, and I share a common aspiration: we are proud to be playing our part within the United Kingdom. Therefore, in the referendum in Scotland which is less than 500 days away from now—I suspect that this statement accords with the majority view of your Lordships’ House—Scotland’s interests will best be served by remaining within the United Kingdom. We are better together than apart. As Ernest Bevin put it in 1951:

“My policy is to be able to buy a ticket at Victoria Station and go anywhere I damn well please”.

Mind you, he may have thought again if he had seen the current price of second-class supersaver returns.

Just a few weeks ago, I was in Lesotho working with the charity of which I am the honorary president. Lesotho is a small mountain kingdom in southern Africa and a member of the Commonwealth. I discovered that, at about this time, they, too, will have a state opening of their Parliament. Their king, as constitutional head of state, will process with horse-mounted troops alongside to their Parliament to deliver the address containing the programme for the coming session. I discovered the pride with which people view this event and the importance of the occasion. Therefore, we can be justifiably proud of the events here today in London, which have been exported elsewhere in the world.

However, the similarities do not end there. Lesotho is also facing difficult times, but its crisis is one of food security. It has also recently elected a coalition Government, although it has gone one step further than us with a three-party Government. My noble friends in front of me and to my left can therefore be comforted by this export of our new British way of life.

The ceremonial that we have seen today would be recognisable across many centuries, with only slight differences. In 1854, for example, Ministers also took part in the procession. The *Illustrated London News* reported it as follows:

“Her Majesty’s Ministers drove rapidly along the line of route, and those of them who were recognised—were cheered”.

Ministers cheered in the streets, my Lords; there is a thing.
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In a full legislative programme, the gracious Speech rightly focused on creating a stronger economy and promoting a fairer society. However, it is my observation that a real sign of strength of purpose is a Government prepared to take big decisions in difficult times. Perhaps being a coalition makes this easier. Members coming from different parties are required to hold a more open debate on the problems faced than the debate which happens within a single-party Government. Perhaps historians of the future will be able to observe on that possibility.

However, the gracious Speech that we have heard today faces up to two of the major problems of our time, problems which have lurked in the “too difficult” pile for many years. I refer to the announcement of measures relating to social care and single-tier pensions. Those are indeed bold measures in tough economic times. They put in place the architecture for major policy change that allows for financial improvement once times become better and extra money becomes available. An ageing but healthier society with greater longevity lies behind both those policies. The measure to deal with the problems caused by the high cost of social care is the culmination of a multitude of reports, commissions, studies and investigations, not least the one headed by Andrew Dilnot.

The most important matter to be dealt with is that of certainty—certainty of knowing what costs will fall on individuals, to replace the high costs which fall almost at random on many older people and their families, with many having to sell their homes. No one knows if he or she will be the one person in 10 who is hit with the enormous cost of long-term care. That problem is worsened as people live longer. I commend the Government for tackling a deep-seated issue, now finally to be addressed.

The reform to pensions will create a simple, decent state pension set above the basic means test. It is to happen sooner than intended. The new state pension will be fairer to the low paid, the self-employed and carers, and make it easier for people to understand what they will get from the state when they reach state pension age. However, regrettably, there are many noble Lords to whom this reform will not apply. It will not be retrospective. I know that your Lordships generally take a dim view of that practice, but I take comfort that I am not alone in your Lordships’ House in missing the boat.

By introducing the single tier in 2016, everyone affected by the changes that the Government have made to the state pension age in this Parliament will now have access to the new state pension. By starting the new pension a year earlier, about 400,000 more people will reach state pension age under the single tier, including every woman affected by the acceleration of the equalisation of the state pension age.

This reform is a once in a generation opportunity, providing justice for women and a massive simplification and reduction in complexity. People will pay the same rates of national insurance contributions and, in return, they will get the same pension. The single-tier pension, coming after the triple-locked pension and working alongside the rollout of automatic enrolment into
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workplace pensions, will encourage more people to save for their retirement. It will provide fairness for today and fairness for tomorrow.

I conclude with some remarks about openness, which is not normally mentioned in the gracious Speech, but it was today. It is a thread which runs through the fabric of this Government. It may be the case that having a coalition Government ensures openness; it might be a factor of the parties working together. However, this Government should be praised for their attitude towards provision of information. They have set the government information switch firmly to open, where that is possible and practical, rather than to close, with the outside world having to rely on leaks and squeezing out information in bits and pieces.

I began to wonder what Sir Humphrey would have made of that. Noble Lords may recall Sir Humphrey’s words in “Yes, Prime Minister”. I apologise to all noble Lords who have occupied Sir Humphrey-type positions in the past. Sir Humphrey said: “We should always tell the press, freely and frankly, anything that they can easily find out”. This exchange on Ministers also took place, with Sir Humphrey telling Bernard: “Ministers should never know more than they need to know. Then they can’t tell anyone. Like secret agents, they could be captured and tortured”. “Oh”, said Bernard, “You mean by terrorists?”. “No”, said Sir Humphrey, “by the BBC”. I rest my case.

I have a final “Yes Minister” quote, which is that Bernard said to Sir Humphrey, “I think the Prime Minister wants to govern Britain”. Sir Humphrey replied, “Well stop him, Bernard”. Despite all the pressures and difficulties, the Government have today demonstrated their resolve in governing this country to strengthen our economy and work towards a fairer society. They are to be commended.

*Motion to Adjourn*

*Moved by****Baroness Royall of Blaisdon***

That this debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

##### 4 pm

**Baroness Royall of Blaisdon:** My Lords, I wish on behalf of the Opposition to give my thanks to Her Majesty the Queen for delivering the gracious Speech. However, I am not so sure that I can extend the same courtesy for the content of the gracious Speech to the Government Benches that produced it.

Before I turn to the Government’s legislative programme, as set out in the gracious Speech, it is a great pleasure to congratulate the noble Lords, Lord Lang of Monkton and Lord German, for their speeches this afternoon. The noble Lord, Lord Lang, of course has a distinguished record, not just as a member of SOCs—an organisation whose membership I certainly aspire to—but as a former senior MP and Cabinet Minister. His membership of the Commons neatly coincided with the entire period of the previous Conservative Administration; he won his seat in May 1979 and lost it in May 1997. He rose through the ministerial ranks to be Secretary of State for Scotland—never the easiest job in government, especially not when succeeded
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in office by the now noble Lord, Lord Forsyth of Drumlean. He then became President of the Board of Trade, which is also not the easiest job in government, particularly not when succeeding in that office the now noble Lord, Lord Heseltine.

However, navigating his way through such highly dangerous, shark-infested Tory waters meant that the noble Lord, Lord Lang, was a natural to play a central role in John Major’s “Back me or sack me” re-election campaign as leader of the Conservative Party in July 1995. The then Prime Minister was trying to rid himself of those in the Conservative Party who were on one side of the Tories’ fundamental divisions over Europe from the late 1980s and early 1990s onwards. I will not use in your Lordships’ House the term that the then Prime Minister used for them, but your Lordships may recall that it seemed to closely question their parentage.

The experience of the noble Lord, Lord Lang, in helping to handle that kind of thing means, I suspect, that he knows a thing or two about divisions. So it is probably of no comfort to him to be seeing something of a replay of those years in interventions such as that yesterday from one of the noble Lord’s then colleagues: the former Chancellor, the noble Lord, Lord Lawson of Blaby. However, it is a replay with a difference. Last time, it was just the Conservative Party ripping itself apart. This time, with the prospect of an in-out referendum on our membership of the EU, the stakes are so much higher. The noble Lord, Lord Lang, has been a distinguished Member of your Lordships’ House for many years, and I take this opportunity to pay particular thanks and tribute to him for his role as the chair of the Advisory Committee on Business Appointments.

On behalf of the whole House, I thank the noble Lord, Lord German, for his speech in celebration of the coalition Government, or in celebration of coalition in general. When I worked, as at one point I did, for the European Commission in Wales I knew Mike German. I think lots of people, especially in Wales, will know him better as that. We worked well together on the enlargement of the European Union and I am of course pleased to see him as a Member of your Lordships’ House, even as a Liberal Democrat. Mike is a former leader of the Liberal Democrats in Wales—yet again, not the easiest job in the world—and his lifelong involvement and interest in education has led him inevitably to see all the ups and downs of public life.

As a Welshman, the noble Lord, Lord German, will, I know be interested in the Government’s attitude towards the Silk commission on fiscal devolution and the powers of the Welsh Assembly, but as a loyal Liberal Democrat I noticed that he was far too polite to mention its omission from today’s gracious Speech. As a former Deputy First Minister in a Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition Administration in Wales who is now serving on the coalition Benches in Westminster, we can only speculate as to which coalition partner he has felt more comfortable with.

We now have before us the legislative programme from the Government for this new, coming Session of Parliament. It is such a thin programme that it was relegated to second position on the lunchtime news by
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the resignation of Sir Alex Ferguson, a great manager and a great Labour man. Little of the programme is new because so much of it has been very kindly leaked in advance by the Government. As the Government have found, however, briefing out policies in advance does not always work to their advantage.

The Government might expect the *Guardian* columnist, the ever excellent Polly Toynbee, to summarise the legislative programme in today’s gracious Speech as a collection of “dismal offerings”, but they might well not have expected similar flak from rather different parts of the political spectrum. So only this week, the normally Conservative-cheerleading *Daily Mail*newspaper described today’s legislative programme in the following terms:

“It’s a shame there’s so little to commend the rest of the speech’s predicted contents, which are largely measures we already knew about”.

The *Daily Mail* went on to describe the measures in today’s speech as “gimmicks”, and despite apparently hoping against hope that the Prime Minister would have a “few surprises” up his sleeve today, it summed up the Government’s legislative programme as: “Must do better.” Today the *Daily Telegraph*, in its online edition, goes even further. Commenting after the gracious Speech had been delivered, the *Daily Telegraph*’s view was that the Government have passed their “High Noon”. It concludes:

“The sun is setting on the Coalition.”

I pray the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Telegraph* in aid not because they are supporters of my party, but for precisely the opposite point: with friends like these does the legislative programme we have before us today need enemies?

Today’s gracious Speech is important because it puts before both your Lordships’ House and the people of this country the final serious remaining legislative programme of this coalition Government. Final because this time next year the coalition Government—if they are is still in place by then as a single entity—will be bringing forward a legislative programme which will come to its conclusion in a wash-up ahead of the general election due in May 2015.

So what do we have in this year’s programme? Well, it is difficult to tell because we do not actually know what will happen to the measures announced today in the Queen’s Speech. Take, as an example, last year’s legislative programme. The centrepiece of the programme, as set out in the gracious Speech in May 2012, was reform of this, your Lordships’ House, as mentioned by the noble Lord, Lord Lang. The gracious Speech could not have been clearer:

“A Bill will be brought forward to reform the composition of the House of Lords”.—[*Official Report*, 9/5/12; col. 2.]

As we know, a Bill was brought forward, but within months, the House of Lords Reform Bill was in trouble. The Bill was voted against by 91 rebelling Conservative MPs, and so much of a rebellion it was that the Conservative MP leading the supposed rebellion has now very particularly been favoured by the Prime Minister by being appointed to the Prime Minister’s principal policy review committee. Finally, it was abandoned and withdrawn by the Government. The Bill moved, within months, from being the flagship of
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the Gracious Speech this time last year to not being a Bill at all. So we have little idea whether, as with last year’s flagship measure, any of the measures in today’s legislative programme will survive the huge fissures of difference between the component elements of the coalition. They might, but they might not. We just do not know.

Even when we get Bills, we do not really know what is in them because of the way the Government deal with the legislative process. So we have the Government making significant amendments at the last minute, often in your Lordships’ House, when Bills have already passed through the other place. The Government’s pernicious abolition of the Agricultural Wages Board in the last Session was a clear example of a poor way of making policy. We have no idea, for instance, whether more Bills will come forward as a result of the spending review due next month.

To be fair to this coalition Government, they are trying to learn from experience. Rather than bringing forward measures which will fall apart because the coalition cannot agree them, this year the coalition has adopted an exciting new strategy of simply not including in its legislative programme measures which it knows it will be divided over. So, no legislation, shamefully, to put into statute the coalition’s explicit commitment to earmark 0.7% of gross domestic product on overseas aid. I am, however, delighted that the gracious Speech included the commitment that the Government will work to prevent sexual violence in conflict world wide.

Neither is there any legislation on establishing a register of lobbyists: what the Prime Minister once described, ahead of the general election in 2010, as,

“the next big scandal waiting to happen”.

Why not? We saw an appalling example of outrageous lobbying by News Corporation over its bid for BSkyB, for instance. The Government’s current proposals on lobbying are inadequate. They need to get serious about lobbying transparency. This Queen’s Speech was an opportunity to do so—an opportunity missed.

Neither is there any legislation on the sale of cigarettes in plain packaging—again, a commitment promised and abandoned because of the efforts of the tobacco lobby. It was also abandoned in the face of a political challenger, the leader of UKIP, who was seen in interview after interview last week, after so many Conservatives had defected to his party, celebrating that success with a pint in one hand and a fag in the other. One wonders about the influence of Mr Crosby, who lobbied so hard on the issue in Australia. Neither is there any legislation as floated on public health, or on minimum alcohol pricing. Those are just the measures which have been floated in advance of the Queen’s Speech, but which are not in the programme. What about anything on this Government’s other proud boasts?

Where is anything, for example, on the environment, from a Government who bragged that they would be the greenest ever? Where is anything on media plurality and ownership, or anything to help housing in this country—to help people who need social housing, as

**8 May 2013 : Column 14**

well as those aspiring to own their own home? We know that building houses rebuilds Britain and provides jobs.

Where is anything on child poverty? There is nothing, despite the coalition’s pledge to maintain Labour’s goal of ending child poverty in the UK by 2020, and today’s report from the Institute for Fiscal Studies, which says that one in four children in this country will still be living in poverty by 2020, and that this Government’s tax and benefit reforms, introduced since the last election, are responsible.

So what do we have? We have a gracious Speech which actually mentions 15 specific new Bills, as the Health Secretary, Mr Hunt, very helpfully told us on the “Today” programme this morning—insultingly, four hours before the gracious Speech was actually given. Mind you, given that the Prime Minister himself was out on Twitter this morning about the legislative programme, mentioning various Bills—again, well before the gracious Speech was given—I suppose that Mr Hunt’s behaviour, for this Government, is nothing special.

We have legislation promised in government briefings on social care, anti-social behaviour, dangerous dogs, local audit, pub management, consumer rights and asbestos-related cancer—all of which we, as a constructive Opposition, will look at and to which we will determine our response.

The proposed legislation on social care and carers, outlined by the noble Lord, is particularly important. That is age, you see. Our society would be in enormous difficulty without carers, but we will want to ensure that this issue is not used by this Government as a means of transferring extra responsibility to local authorities without the means to deliver. Today’s report from the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services on the serious reduction in services due to budgetary cuts should be a stark warning to the Government.

We have legislation on pensions, on police powers, on HS2, on intellectual property, and on offender rehabilitation, which we will examine closely and measure against tests of fairness and effectiveness. We have legislation that is clearly aimed at attempting to stave off for the Tories what they see as the threat from UKIP—on immigration, for example—by proposing to put in place, among other measures, a bureaucratic nightmare requiring private landlords to check their tenants’ immigration status. I trust that this legislation will not waste the opportunity to deal with the big issue of exploited foreign workers undercutting local workers. But we shall see.

These are dismal offerings. This is a Government who legislated for a five-year Parliament, but as this legislative programme so clearly shows, they have run out of steam after only three years. This is a Government who have already lost momentum.

What we need, but do not have, is the legislation that we have proposed in Labour’s alternative Queen’s Speech. This includes, for example, a jobs Bill to put in place a compulsory jobs guarantee, and a finance Bill that would kick-start our economy and help make work pay with a 10p rate of tax. We also propose a housing Bill that would take action against rogue landlords and extortionate fees in the private rented
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sector. What we have, however, is a legislative programme that does not even begin to meet the economic challenges which people, families, communities and the country are facing. It does not begin to address the scale of anxiety and disillusion throughout the country, which was shown clearly not just in the results of last week’s elections but in the shameful 29% turnout. We have legislation that will not do much if anything for individuals, young people, families and communities who are now so hard-pressed by being squeezed by the Government’s economic policies that many of them barely know how to make ends meet. They have to borrow from family and friends, and take up people’s generosity by making use of the rapidly burgeoning number of food banks. They worry not just about themselves and their children’s future but about getting food on the table. Yet the Government just say there will be no change in their economic plans for this country, just more of the same—more friends appointed to No. 10 and more being out of touch with the reality of people’s lives.

We have a legislative programme that does not address people’s problems, that is about the coalition’s priorities rather than the priorities of the people, and that is out of kilter with the people of this country. We have before us today a Government who are running scared. They are running scared of themselves and of what the other side in the coalition will do, whether over reform of your Lordships’ House or boundary changes. They are running scared of the economic arguments that we in this party, on these Benches, have put forward, which have now been taken up by virtually every serious economic and international organisation that worries about the UK’s lack of economic growth. They are running scared of UKIP and their own defections to a fourth party. Above all, they are running scared of the people of this country. These people’s lives are hurting and they want something different. They want to see jobs and growth, and they know that this coalition is falling apart at the seams. They want to see real change.

They will get their chance for change in the general election that is due two years from now. If the rise of UKIP and the poor performance of both coalition partners in last week’s council elections and by-election mean that the parties on the Benches opposite are not looking forward to that point of decision, we on these Benches certainly are. In the mean time, we face the last even remotely serious legislative programme of this coalition Government. We the Opposition will support it where it is right and oppose it where it is not. We will take our work seriously, scrutinising and amending legislation and holding the Government to account.

We want the Government in this House to take their own responsibilities as seriously, so we urge them to return to the efficient practice—cost efficient and time efficient—introduced by the party on these Benches that aligned the sittings of this House with those of the House of Commons. We want to see the Government Benches manage their programme more efficiently than they did in the previous Session, so that the House will not be forced off suddenly into extra recesses. We want to see better answers from government spokespeople in the House. We want to see the open
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policy articulated by the noble Lord, Lord German. We want answers that are based on content and that respect the House.

We on these Benches will get on and do our job. As the Opposition in this House, we will scrutinise this legislative programme and look hard at what the Government propose. We will hold the Government to account, and we will start with the debate on the gracious Speech that will begin in this House tomorrow.

I beg to move that the debate be adjourned till tomorrow.

##### 4.18 pm

**The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord Hill of Oareford):** My Lords, it is a great honour to stand here as Leader of your Lordships’ House and to reflect on the previous Session and look ahead to the new one. My first few months in the job have brought home to me time and again the importance of the contribution that the House makes both to the legislative process and to our wider political debate. They have also made me realise how fortunate we all are to receive such outstanding support from those who work in the House. To that end, and on behalf of the whole House, I place on record our gratitude to Black Rod and all the staff for organising such a superb day.

Today is a great state occasion, which means one thing: briefly, I get to be nice about the Leader of the Opposition. I thank the noble Baroness, Lady Royall, for moving the Motion to adjourn. For the first two minutes of her speech, I agreed with everything she said; and while she and I do not always agree on content of what is before the House, I know that we have a shared affection for it and a shared idea of how it should work. I am grateful to her for the professionalism and courtesy that she has always shown me and the usual channels. I know how hard she works on behalf of her party and Back-Benchers and, indeed, the House as a whole, and I look forward to continuing to work closely with her in the coming Session. I also greatly appreciate the parts played in the work of this House by my noble friend the Deputy Leader of the House, and the noble Lord, Lord Laming, as Convenor of the Cross Benches. They, too, are fundamental to what this House is about.

In praising the work of the usual channels of today, I should also like to pay tribute to my predecessor, my noble friend Lord Strathclyde, who was a mainstay of the usual channels for almost 20 years. He was a quite outstanding Leader of this House and leader of my party and I, along with many others, am greatly in his debt. Now, I know that my noble friend was sometimes accused of being wily. That is an accusation that I categorically reject. It is a grotesque understatement. His explanation to me of what it would involve to be Leader of the House was not wily: it was a flagrant breach of the Trade Descriptions Act.

In looking back over my noble friend’s remarkable career in this House, for which he was rightly made a Companion of Honour, I was struck by an odd pattern. He first became a government Minister in 1988, the year when the SDP merged with the Liberal Party. In 1994, the year when the Liberal Democrats took Eastleigh from the Conservatives, he became government Chief
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Whip. In 1998, the year when the Liberal Democrats overtook the Conservatives in local elections, he became Leader of the Opposition. In 2010, when he became Leader of this House, the first coalition Government for more than 60 years was formed between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. Is this coincidence, or has my noble friend in fact been a Liberal Democrat sleeper for all these years?

That is not something of which I would ever accuse my noble friend Lord Lang. I am especially delighted that he said yes to the invitation to propose the humble Address, and I know I speak for the whole House when I congratulate him on performing his role with such wit and style this afternoon. For those who know of his early career, this comes as no surprise. A member of the Cambridge Footlights with John Cleese and Peter Cook, he went on to write scripts for “That Was The Week That Was”. What better preparation to be a Conservative Cabinet Minister than training as a satirist? First, as Scottish Secretary, and then as Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, my noble friend served in the Cabinet for seven years with great distinction. As a mark of his particular skill, he was the only Cabinet Minister I can remember appearing on programmes such as “Question Time” in 1997 without being booed. I say to my noble friend, “Don’t relax”—we might have to call on him again.

It is also a pleasure to congratulate my noble friend Lord German on his speech this afternoon. He may be a more recent entrant to your Lordships’ House, but he is no newcomer to the political world, with a career in Welsh politics spanning three decades. I see that he is also a member of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Cyprus, where I fear his surname may prove something of an embarrassment at the moment. A former music teacher, he continues to put his musical talents to good use, until recently chairing the parliamentary choir. To coin a phrase, where there was discord, he brought harmony. I am particularly intrigued by what I understand is my noble friend’s party trick of singing the words of one carol to the tune of another. This is, of course, a great skill for life in a coalition government. I will be perfectly happy if from now on he sings from the same hymn sheet as me.

The year since Her Majesty last opened a new Session of Parliament has seen the success of the Olympic and Paralympic Games and, of course, the Diamond Jubilee celebrations. Those in particular underlined the great affection in which she and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh are held. They continue to set an example of public service which is quite remarkable. It was a particular pleasure that this year they were accompanied by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cornwall.

I cannot promise that the legislative programme of the coming parliamentary Session will be as enjoyable as the events of last summer, but I am sure that there will be fireworks of another kind. I think that noble Lords will agree that in the gracious Speech Her Majesty set out a full legislative programme designed to address some of the biggest challenges facing our country.
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The gracious Speech included a range of measures to build a stronger economy, to cut the deficit, to invest in infrastructure and to remove unnecessary regulation. It offered help for parents with the cost of childcare, help for those who have saved for their retirement and help for those who find themselves faced with the costs of long-term care. It will address crime and rehabilitation, national security, immigration and defence. A number of measures will be published in draft in line with the Government’s commitment to consultation and pre-legislative scrutiny.

Five new Bills will start their passage in this House. These are Bills to reform the care system, to reform the way that offenders are rehabilitated, to make it easier for businesses to protect their intellectual property, to ensure that sufferers of mesothelioma receive payments and to close the Audit Commission. The early business of this House will also include four Bills from the House of Commons carried over from the previous Session. These are the Children and Families Bill, the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Bill, the Energy Bill and the Financial Services (Banking Reform) Bill.

I do not expect that all sides of the House will agree on every aspect of every Bill. I do, however, think we will agree that the Bills are certain to leave this House in better shape than when they arrived. Having taken legislation through your Lordships’ House, I know the very real change and improvement that its scrutiny brings. I know that this House will, in this Session as always, take its duties as a revising Chamber seriously and fulfil them wisely.

However, vital as it is, the business of this House is not just the passing of legislation. The previous Session saw a wide range of debates, some led by government Ministers and many more by Back-Bench Members, addressing issues of national and international importance, while our Select Committees have continued to produce excellent and thought-provoking work. Our new ad hoc committees have demonstrated the House at its best, complementing the work of the House of Commons and making use of a wider range of the expertise available among our Members. The same is true of the first dedicated post-legislative scrutiny committee that we set up last year to look at the statute law on adoption and consider draft clauses in the Children and Families Bill. Since the start of this Parliament, we have also seen an increase in the number of Joint Committees of both Houses conducting pre-legislative scrutiny, a trend which continued last Session, with five such Joint Committees appointed.

As Leader of this House, I am keen to provide opportunities for as many Peers as possible to participate in our work, especially newer Members or Members who are able to attend less frequently, so that as a Chamber we are able to make the most of their contributions. As part of this, I look forward not only to the House’s legislative work in the next Session but to the establishment of a series of new Select Committees, including three ad hoc committees and two post-legislative scrutiny committees, which will allow a wider range of Members to serve on a committee. We will also be creating new opportunities for Back-Bench Members
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to lead debates. This will include a regular weekly slot for a topical short debate on the Floor of the House as well as making more use of the Moses Room for short debates to double the number of opportunities for Members to have debates there, so I can safely say that we will be busy in this new Session. We will be busy with legislation, busy with scrutiny and busy in shaping our country’s political debate. As we set about those tasks, I look forward to working with the Leaders and Members of all Benches in your Lordships’ House. It is in that spirit that I am delighted to support the noble Baroness’s Motion to adjourn the debate.

*Debate adjourned until tomorrow.*

## Chairman of Committees

##### 4.29 pm

*Moved by****Lord Hill of Oareford***

That the noble Lord, Lord Sewel, be appointed to take the Chair in all Committees of the House for this Session.

*Motion agreed nemine dissentiente.*
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## Principal Deputy Chairman of Committees

##### 4.30 pm

*Moved by****Lord Hill of Oareford***

That the noble Lord, Lord Boswell of Aynho, be appointed Principal Deputy Chairman of Committees for this Session.

*Motion agreed nemine dissentiente.*

## Stoppages in the Streets

*It was ordered that the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis do take care that the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Lords to and from this House during the sitting of Parliament; or to hinder Lords in the pursuit of their parliamentary duties on the Parliamentary Estate; and that the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioner.*

## 

*House adjourned at 4.30 pm.*
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