

What should the Prime Minister put in the King's speech?

If all goes as planned Parliament will end the current session this week and prepare for a King's speech and a State Opening.

Given the state of the polls and recent by elections I assume this Parliament has at least a year to run before the next election to give the PM more time to demonstrate the competence he talks about and to deliver his five pledges.

The main opportunities he has to show the change he says the public wants rest on the year's legislative agenda to be set out in the King's speech, and changes made in the November and April budgets to come. I will be presenting detailed proposals for the budget shortly. Today I am interested in your ideas for legislation.

My own priorities are unlikely to appear. I would like to see

1 A small boats Bill to make clear to UK courts that Parliament does not want Human Rights Law to impede decisions and removals of illegal migrants from the UK

2. The completion of the Northern Ireland Protocol Bill to remove the problems with the Windsor Framework, restoring UK government of NI.

3. Restoration of the full EU Retained Law Bill with more EU law repeals and amendments.

4 Tax Reduction and Simplification Bill

5. A Wider Ownership Bill setting out more ways to promote ownership of homes, shares and businesses

6. A public sector productivity Bill creating opportunities for state employees to buy out their managerial and administrative tasks in government through an employee buy out.

7 A privatisation Bill to facilitate the sale of all remaining shares in Nat West and to sell Channel 4. Bill to be fast tracked to complete sales next year.

8. A People's BBC Bill as discussed here before

Covid Lockdowns

I do not have a worthwhile view on the efficacy of the vaccines or of the balance of good and harm from them . I have not read enough of the literature and have no medical training . Yesterday I reported the NHS line and the questions raised by some MP s over the vaccines.I have myself raised other big issues over the way government responded to the pandemic. At the time I raised queries about the statistics presented for infections and deaths.I did not presume to advise my constituents as some non medically qualified MP s did over getting vaccinated. If asked I suggested they talked to a medical adviser they trusted.

During the covid period I did have strong views on the economic damage done by extensive lockdowns. I worked with a small group of MP s to press for Parliament to be up and running and then for the earlier return of an active in person Parliament. I saw the need for more scrutiny of the wide ranging actions being taken to direct the economy and to spend large new budgets on healthcare. I argued for concentrating protections on the vulnerable and helping them safely avoid contact with possible disease carriers, rather than getting most of us to avoid contacts outside our own family or bubble. I voted and argued for less extensive lockdowns.

I also pressed for more work on the possible approval and use of existing medicines to blunt the virus and help with symptoms for those infected. I argued for isolation hospitals to be separate from other general hospitals, for the Nightingale capacity to be used, for more use of the private sector hospitals for non covid patients, for better air flow and air cleansing in hospitals and other public buildings. I have subsequently sent in these issues for the Covid Enquiry to consider when they can spare time from examining the issues over how Ministers behaved. To produce a good report they need to examine the scientific work, forecasts , NHS management of greatly increased resource and medical advice offered as it evolved during the waves of the virus.

I have not published all contributions from yesterday. The share prices of pharmaceutical companies generally have fallen this year for a variety of reasons. The lawsuits I see raised as contributors to share declines are about infringement of patents, rather than harms from covid vaccines. Governments often issued some exemptions from liability to speed introduction of vaccines that they thought would save lives.

Governments and medical experts continue to recommend a range of covid vaccines, and have made decisions now about which ones they prefer to use. Anyone thinking of having vaccinations can now find plenty of information about side effects and about what has happened to a small proportion of people who have experienced greater harm than a sore arm and feeling a bit under the weather for a few days. Those who do dislike these vaccines can make their own decisions as they are free to do and can study outcomes so far from using these treatments.

Vaccines harm and compensation

On Friday Parliament debated the issues surrounding vaccines and in particular the various covid vaccines. Christopher Chope produced a private members bill to improve payments to anyone badly affected by vaccine. The Minister reminded the House that anyone can claim a one off £120,000 payment if they have proof of disability and harm from taking an NHS vaccine. This applies to any vaccine including one against covid. The government added the anti covid treatments to the list of those items covered. The Minister explained that the one off payment does not exclude benefit payments for disability and sickness which may be necessary for anyone badly affected by a vaccine as well as by other more usual causes of disability and ill health. The one off payment is not compensation. The Minister argued that such incidence was unusual for covid and for other approved vaccines. It is unlikely the Bill will pass as it seems that the government and the Opposition disagree with it, thinking current arrangements to make payments are sufficient subject to admin improvements to ensure prompt payment.

The Adjournment debate is a half hour debate at the end of the day's business when a single member can be allotted the time to make a case they think important and hear a Minister's reply. Andrew Bridgen secured this slot to point out that there were too many excess deaths continuing in the UK and to argue these were related to the covid vaccination of most people.

The Minister drawing on her NHS medical advice agreed that excess deaths were continuing at higher levels than before covid, but denied this resulted from the vaccinations. She argued that because 93.6% of the population had been vaccinated it was true most people dying were those who had the vaccine. It did not prove or mean the vaccine caused those deaths. Nor did she detect a lower death rate amongst the minority who had not been vaccinated. She said there was some inconclusive evidence that non vaccinated people suffered a higher death rate than vaccinated. She argued that there were a variety of causes of continuing excess deaths, including the backlog of treatments, bad outbreaks of flu, and a range of other killers running higher.

Work on the sudden death of young people from blood clots we are told has revealed a small number of cases brought on by vaccines, but we are told more people die of blood clots from contracting covid. The Opposition supported the government in the debate of the Chope Bill and made clear their belief in the efficacy and success of the vaccines administered by the NHS.

I set this out as I know some constituents and readers are concerned about these matters. I have no medical knowledge or evidence to challenge the NHS/Ministerial view that these vaccines like all such treatments adversely affected a small number of people per million injected but are not the main cause of the current continuing spate of excess deaths. I offer people the

chance to debate this further but will not publish contributions that potentially libel the NHS or drug companies based on coincidence or circumstantial evidence with no proof of causation. It was of course open to people not to take the vaccine if they did not like what was said about possible side effects, or about the balance between possible harms and possible benefits of taking it. The authorities always said there could be some side effects and put in place a reporting system to monitor them. The issue for some Health staff is different if they had to take it. Everyone was aware these vaccines were developed at pace and approved to offer some defence against the virus when understanding of it was evolving.

I followed the debate carefully but did not contribute as I do not have any special knowledge or evidence to present to disagree with the NHS view. The argument that excess deaths today result from the vaccine need to show strong evidence of more excess deaths for the vaccinated than the unvaccinated and to show causes of death are clearly linked to the vaccine impact rather than resulting from higher levels of death from a range of causes from dementia to flu.

By election messages

The main messages from the two. Y elections are that many Conservative voters do not like what the government is doing or not doing, nor do they want to vote Labour.

The secondary message is if frustrated Conservatives vote Reform they can tip the balance between a Conservative and a Labour MP but they are miles off winning a seat even in by election conditions.

It confirms my view that the government needs to cut taxes urgently, control spending better, make a substantial reduction in legal migration and follow through on its pro drivers pro personal freedoms policies.

My second Intervention on the Energy Bill

I am grateful to the Minister for giving way. Did he notice that the hon. Member for Bath (Wera Hobhouse) would not give way? She was arguing—the typical position of her party—that it knew all the answers before the consultation, yet it still wanted a very long, drawn-out consultation to

avoid doing the answers.

Andrew Bowie, (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Minister for Nuclear and Networks):

My right hon. Friend is absolutely right. I also noticed that—

We cannot respond to a consultation that has not been launched yet. We are in the process right now of working with the community energy contact group. In fact, it has already met. Work is under way right now to develop the consultation, identify what the barriers to market are, and get out there and support the community energy sector, as the Government are determined to do. Lib Dem's specialise in expensive consultations which they then ignore if they do not agree with the public views sent in. Hobhouse said they knew the answers so why propose a consultation? Why would we trust them to accept the replies when they have made up their minds?