

News story: Natural History Museum Reappointments

Hilary Newiss

Hilary Newiss is a lawyer and former partner in Denton Hall solicitors, now Dentons. She specialised in intellectual property law and, since retiring from full time legal practice, has served on several public bodies and charities in the science, innovation, health, and ethics fields. She is currently a Chair of National Voices (an umbrella group of 160 Health and Social Care charities), sits on the Accelerated Access Collaborative, and is a Director of the Cell and Gene Catapult UK. Previously, Hilary was a Non-Executive Director of the Francis Crick Institute and a trustee of Charleston, the artists house museum in Sussex. She has also served on the Human Genetics Commission, the National Information Governance Board for Health and Social Care, the Advisory Panel for Public Sector Information and the Animals Procedures Committee. She is a former First Tier Tribunal Judge.

Simon Patterson

Simon Patterson joined Silver Lake in 2005 and is a Managing Director. He is currently a board member of Dell Technologies, ZPG and FlixBus, and previously served on the boards of Cegid, Intelsat, Skype, MultiPlan, and Gerson Lehrman Group. Prior to joining Silver Lake, he was a member of the founding management team of the logistics software company GF-X (acquired by Descartes) and worked in various management roles at the Financial Times. He is a Trustee of the Natural History Museum in London, a Trustee of the Royal Foundation of The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge and Prince Harry, and a Non-Executive Director of Tesco plc. Mr. Patterson holds an M.A. from King's College, Cambridge University and an M.B.A. from the Stanford University Graduate School of Business, where he was an Arjay Miller Scholar and received the Alexander Robichek Award for Finance.

These reappointments has been made in accordance with the [Cabinet Office's Governance Code on Public Appointments](#). The appointments process is regulated by the Commissioner for Public Appointments. Under the Code, any significant political activity undertaken by an appointee in the last five years must be declared. This is defined as including holding office, public speaking, making a recordable donation, or candidature for election. Hilary has declared no such activity. Simon has declared that he made a £25,000 donation the official remain campaign (Britain Stronger in Europe) during the 2016 referendum.

Speech: Air pollution is a health emergency

I'm here, as Health Secretary, because air pollution is a health emergency.

When it comes to our health, there's lots of things we can take personal responsibility for: what we eat, how we exercise and whether we smoke, for instance.

And I'm no nanny state politician. I believe personal responsibility is important.

But around a third of what determines the length of our healthy life is the environment we live in – the things we can't, alone, do anything about.

And of those environmental causes of healthy life expectancy, the biggest factor is the air we breathe.

The biggest single environmental cause of death is air pollution. Air pollution causes chronic conditions, and shortens lives.

In short: air pollution kills. Clean air saves lives.

And it's worse than that – because the impact of air pollution is even bigger on children, as their lungs are growing.

I know this. I know more about air pollution than most people.

For a decade, almost, I lived next to a very busy main road.

I'd constantly have to clean the dirt – these horribly black specs that became a carpet – off my window sill.

And to this day I feel guilty that I brought my children into the world living next to the A40.

I'm delighted that I was able to move my family away, but I know not everyone is in a position to do that.

And contrast that with my constituency in West Suffolk where you're much likelier to breathe fresh, clean air blown in from the sea – it might as well be 2 different worlds.

We are the fifth richest country in the world. We've just put an extra £20.5 billion into the NHS. Its budget will be £148 billion a year – £3,000 for every man, woman and child in this country.

Yet air pollution causes around 36,000 deaths each year, and puts extra, preventable strain on the NHS through increased incidents of heart disease, stroke, lung cancer and child asthma.

Surely we can afford to stop killing ourselves with entirely preventable filth, and give every child clean air, no matter where they live, so we can give every child the best possible start in life.

Much of the technology exists, and where it doesn't, let's invent it.

Every new development and new technology should be clean by design – like the NHS is leading the way on.

We all have a part to play. Cycling or walking short journeys instead of driving not only helps our own health, it reduces the health risk to others by helping cut air pollution.

But this isn't something we can each do alone. It takes concerted, far-sighted government action, like the visionary action being proposed today by my brilliant friend Michael Gove.

That's why we are working so closely together. It's why I feel so strongly about these plans. For your children and for mine.

I'm very proud to do my bit, proud of this Conservative government demonstrating bold, progressive, energetic, popular action this day to improve the lives of millions, to deliver for our citizens, and make Britain fit for the future.

Speech: PM's Brexit speech in Stoke-on-Trent: 14 January 2019

Tomorrow, Members of Parliament will cast their votes on the Withdrawal Agreement on the terms of our departure from the European Union and the Political Declaration on our future relationship.

That vote in Westminster is a direct consequence of the votes that were cast by people here in Stoke, and in cities, towns and villages in every corner of the United Kingdom.

In June 2016, the British people were asked by MPs to take a decision: should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or should we leave?

In that campaign, both sides disagreed on many things, but on one thing they were united: what the British people decided, the politicians would implement.

In the run-up to the vote, the government sent a leaflet to every household making the case for remain. It stated very clearly: 'This is your decision. The government will implement what you decide.'

Those were the terms on which people cast their votes.

If a majority had backed remain, the UK would have continued as an EU member state.

No doubt the disagreements would have continued too, but the vast majority of people would have had no truck with an argument that we should leave the EU in spite of a vote to remain or that we should return to the question in another referendum.

On the rare occasions when Parliament puts a question to the British people directly we have always understood that their response carries a profound significance.

When the people of Wales voted by a margin of 0.3%, on a turnout of just over 50%, to endorse the creation of the Welsh Assembly, that result was accepted by Parliament.

Indeed we have never had a referendum in the United Kingdom that we have not honoured the result of.

Parliament understood this fact when it voted overwhelmingly to trigger Article 50.

And both major parties did so too when they stood on election manifestos in 2017 that pledged to honour the result of the referendum.

Yet, as we have seen over the last few weeks, there are some in Westminster who would wish to delay or even stop Brexit and who will use every device available to them to do so.

I ask them to consider the consequences of their actions on the faith of the British people in our democracy.

The House of Commons did not say to the people of Scotland or Wales that despite voting in favour of a devolved legislature, Parliament knew better and would over-rule them. Or else force them to vote again.

What if we found ourselves in a situation where Parliament tried to take the UK out of the EU in opposition to a remain vote?

People's faith in the democratic process and their politicians would suffer catastrophic harm.

We all have a duty to implement the result of the referendum.

Ever since I reached an agreement with the EU on a Withdrawal Agreement and declaration on our future relationship I have argued that the consequences of Parliament rejecting it would be grave uncertainty – potentially leading to one of two outcomes.

Either a 'no deal' Brexit, that would cause turbulence for our economy, create barriers to security cooperation and disrupt people's daily lives.

Or the risk of no Brexit at all – for the first time in our history failing to implement the outcome of a statutory referendum and letting the British people down.

These alternatives both remain in play if the deal is rejected.

There are differing views on the threat that a no deal exit poses.

I have always believed that while we could ultimately make a success of no deal, it would cause significant disruption in the short term and it would be far better to leave with a good deal.

Others in the House of Commons take a different view and regard no deal as the ultimate threat to be avoided at all costs.

To those people I say this: the only ways to guarantee we do not leave without a deal are: to abandon Brexit, betraying the vote of the British people; or to leave with a deal, and the only deal on the table is the one MPs will vote on tomorrow night.

You can take no deal off the table by voting for that deal. And if no deal is as bad as you believe it is, it would be the height of recklessness to do anything else.

But while no deal remains a serious risk, having observed events at Westminster over the last seven days, it is now my judgment that the more likely outcome is a paralysis in Parliament that risks there being no Brexit.

That makes it even more important that MPs consider very carefully how they will vote tomorrow night.

As I have said many times – the deal we have agreed is worthy of support for what it achieves for the British people.

Immigration policy back in the hands of people you elect – so we can build a system based around the skills people have to offer this country, not where they come from, and bring the overall numbers down. Sovereign control of our borders.

Decisions about how to spend the money you pay in taxes back under the control of people you elect – so we can spend the vast annual sums we send to Brussels as we chose, on priorities like our long-term plan for the NHS. Sovereign control of our money.

UK laws, not EU laws, governing this country – so the people you elect decide what the law of the land in our country is. Sovereign control of our laws.

Out of the Common Agricultural Policy – with our farmers supported by schemes we design to suit our own needs.

Out of the Common Fisheries Policy – so we decide who fishes in our waters and we can rebuild our fishing fleets for the future.

Retaking our seat at the World Trade Organisation, so we can strike trade deals around the world that work for British businesses and consumers.

The rights of valued EU citizens here guaranteed and reciprocal guarantees for UK citizens across Europe.

The partnerships between our police forces and security services, that protect us every day from threats that know no borders, sustained.

An implementation period that ensures our departure from the EU is smooth and orderly, protecting your jobs.

And yes a guarantee that the people of Northern Ireland can carry on living their lives just as they do now, whatever the future holds.

These are valuable prizes.

The deal honours the vote in the referendum by translating the people's instruction into a detailed and practical plan for a better future.

No one else has put forward an alternative which does this.

Compare that outcome to the alternatives of no deal or no Brexit.

With no deal we would have: no implementation period, no security co-operation, no guarantees for UK citizens overseas, no certainty for businesses and workers here in Stoke and across the UK, and changes to everyday life in Northern Ireland that would put the future of our Union at risk.

And with no Brexit, as I have said, we would risk a subversion of the democratic process.

We would be sending a message from Westminster to communities like Stoke that your voices do not count.

The way to close-off both of these potential avenues of uncertainty is clear: it is for MPs to back the deal the government has negotiated and move our country forward into the bright future that awaits us.

I have always believed that there is a majority in the House of Commons for a smooth and orderly exit delivered by means of a withdrawal agreement.

That is why the government tabled the motion for the meaningful vote last month.

But it became clear that MPs' concerns about one particular aspect of the deal – the backstop preventing a hard border between Northern Ireland and Ireland in the event that we cannot reach agreement on our new relationship before the end of the implementation period – meant that there was no prospect of winning the vote.

So I suspended the debate to allow time for further discussions with the EU

to address those concerns.

Today I have published the outcome of those discussions in the form of letters between the UK government and the Presidents of the European Commission and European Council.

I listened very carefully to the concerns that MPs from all sides expressed, particularly the concerns of my fellow Unionists from Northern Ireland.

In my discussions with the EU we explored a number of the suggestions made by MPs, both about how the backstop would operate and for how long.

The EU have said throughout that they would not renegotiate the Withdrawal Agreement or reopen its text for alteration, and that remained the case throughout my discussions at the December European Council and since.

I also pursued in these discussions a proposal for a fixed date – with legal force – guaranteeing the point at which the future partnership would come into force. Because that is the way to bring an end to the backstop – by agreeing our new relationship.

The EU's position was that – while they never want or expect the backstop to come into force – a legal time limit was not possible.

But while we did not achieve that, we have secured valuable new clarifications and assurances to put before the House of Commons, including on getting our future relationship in place rapidly, so that the backstop should never need to be used.

We now have a commitment from the EU that work on our new relationship can begin as soon as possible after the signing of the Withdrawal Agreement – in advance of the 29 March – and we have an explicit commitment that this new relationship does not need to replicate the backstop in any respect whatsoever.

We have agreement on a fast-track process to bring the free trade deal we will negotiate into force if there are any delays in member states ratifying it, making it even more likely that the backstop will never need to be used.

We now have absolute clarity on the explicit linkage between the Withdrawal Agreement and the Political Declaration, putting beyond doubt that these come as a package.

And finally the EU have confirmed their acceptance that the UK can unilaterally deliver on all the commitments made in our Northern Ireland paper last week, including a Stormont lock on new EU laws being added to the backstop, and a seat at the table for a restored Northern Ireland Executive.

The legal standing of the significant conclusions of the December Council have been confirmed. If the backstop were ever triggered it would only be temporary and both sides would do all they could to bring it to an end as quickly as possible.

The letters published today have legal force and must be used to interpret the meaning of the Withdrawal Agreement, including in any future arbitration.

They make absolutely clear the backstop is not a threat or a trap.

I fully understand that the new legal and political assurances which are contained in the letters from Donald Tusk and Jean-Claude Juncker do not go as far as some MPs would like.

But I am convinced that MPs now have the clearest assurances that this is the best deal possible and that it is worthy of their support.

Two other areas of concern raised and reflected in amendments tabled to the meaningful vote were on the protection of workers' rights and on environmental standards.

I could not have been clearer that far from wanting to see a reduction in our standards in these areas, the UK will instead continue to be a world leader.

We have committed to addressing these concerns and will work with MPs from across the House on how best to implement them, looking at legislation where necessary, to deliver the best possible results for workers across the UK.

This afternoon I will set out in greater detail to MPs what is contained in the correspondence I have published today and what it means for our withdrawal.

And tomorrow I will close the debate.

But as we start this crucial week in our country's history let's take a step back and remember both what is at stake and what we stand to gain by coming together behind this agreement.

Settle the question of our withdrawal and we can move on to forging our new relationship.

Back the deal tomorrow, and that work can start on Wednesday.

Fail and we face the risk of leaving without a deal, or the even bigger risk of not leaving at all.

I think the British people are ready for us to move on.

To move beyond division and come together.

To move beyond uncertainty into a brighter future.

That is the chance that MPs of all parties will have tomorrow night.

And for our country's sake, I urge them to take it.

Thank you.

News story: Improving wifi in our criminal courts

Good and reliable wifi is important in our courts and tribunals to ensure court visitors and legal professionals can work effectively in our buildings. We currently see over 46,000 active users a week using our wifi networks, 30,000 in criminal courts and 16,000 in civil and family courts and tribunals, exchanging 66TB of data, equivalent to over 29 million typewritten pages, over 106,000 CDs or over 14,000 DVDs. That is why we have started work to put the infrastructure in place to deliver better wifi in our criminal courts.

Our new full-building GovWifi allows more people to use the enhanced wifi network from a single logon – meaning easier access to online systems, less paper and improved ways of working for people who need to work out of multiple courts.

Wifi is already available in all courts and tribunals. All civil and family courts and tribunals have already got enhanced full-building wifi coverage. We are currently six months into a three-year programme to deliver faster wifi in all criminal courts by 2021. This new full-building wifi network will be in addition to the existing PCU wifi network already available in courts and tribunals.

Feedback has been positive and the earlier than previously planned roll-out of GovWifi to all courts, even where wifi has not yet been upgraded to full-building coverage, has already benefited local authority advocates, youth offender teams, presenting officers, UK visas and immigration in the Home Office, CAFCASS, and legal professionals visiting our court and tribunal buildings. We recognise that where wifi has not yet been upgraded, the bandwidth is not yet sufficient for downloading large case files and video clips but this will be improved as the infrastructure programme is delivered.

The following list shows where we now have full building coverage, improved bandwidth, and a resilient design in 31 criminal courts. We have prioritised Crown and Combined courts:

- Birmingham Crown Court
- Bradford Law Courts – Crown
- Bristol Crown Court
- Cardiff Crown Court
- Chelmsford Crown Court
- Coventry Combined Court
- Croydon Crown Court
- Derby Combined Court
- Inner London Sessions House Crown Court
- Isleworth Crown Court

- Kingston upon Thames Crown Court
- Leeds Combined Court
- Leicester Crown Court
- Lewes Combined Court
- Liverpool Crown Court
- Luton Crown Court
- Maidstone Combined Court
- Manchester Crown Court – Crown Square
- Newcastle Combined Court
- Norwich Combined Court
- Portsmouth Combined Court
- Preston Combined Court
- Reading Crown Court
- Salisbury Combined Court
- Sheffield Crown Court
- Snaresbrook Crown Court
- Southwark Crown Court
- Teesside Combined Court
- Wood Green Crown Court
- Woolwich Crown Court
- Wolverhampton Combined Court

Court visitors and professional users can text “GO” to 07537 417417 to set up a GovWifi account. Once an account has been set up it can be used at any GovWifi-enabled location. If a location you are visiting is using GovWifi it will appear as an available network to connect to on your device, and if your device is set up to connect automatically it will do so.

Advice to legal professionals is to connect to the wifi ahead of going into court.

If you have problems setting up the GovWifi account or connecting to the network please contact the helpdesk on 0845 600 6909.

This upgrade is another important step in the ongoing modernisation of the courts and tribunals system as part of the reform programme, bringing new technology and modern ways of working to the justice system.

[News story: Improving wifi in our criminal courts](#)

We are rolling out more reliable wifi across our criminal courts.