

House of Commons
Public Administration Select Committee

The Honours System

Written Evidence

List of written evidence

- 1 Sir Garth Morrison (HS 01)
- 2 David Younger (HS 02)
- 3 David Lindsay (HS 03)
- 4 Susan Cunliffe-Lister (HS 04)
- 5 Sir Paul Ruddock (HS 05)
- 6 Clare Russell (HS 06)
- 7 Ingrid Roscoe (HS 07)
- 8 G Clark (HS 08)
- 9 Melville Jameson (HS 09)
- 10 Alexander Trotter (HS 10)
- 11 David Hill (HS 11)
- 12 Patrick Prenter (HS 12)
- 13 Monica Main (HS 13)
- 14 David Briggs (HS 14)
- 15 Dione Verulam (HS 15)
- 16 Lord Aberdeen (HS 16)
- 17 Martin Amlot (HS 17)
- 18 Helen Carty (HS 18)
- 19 Jean Evans (HS 19)
- 20 Alexander Matheson (HS 20)
- 21 Peter Beck (HS 21)
- 22 George Reid (HS 22)
- 23 Sir Bob Kerslake (HS 23)
- 24 Peter Stephen (HS 24)
- 25 Isobel Brydie (HS 25)
- 26 Mushtaq Ahmad (HS 26)
- 27 Sir James Cropper (HS 27)
- 28 Anne Dunnett (HS 28)
- 29 Duchess of Northumberland (HS 29)
- 30 Association of Lord-Lieutenants (HS 30)
- 31 Dame Janet Trotter (HS 31)
- 32 John Lidstone (HS 32)
- 33 SJ Warrilow (HS 33)
- 34 The Prime Minister (HS 34)
- 35 Correspondence between Mr Bernard Jenkin and Sir Bob Kerslake (HS 35)
- 36 Cabinet Office (HS 36)
- 37 Association of Lord-Lieutenants (HS 37)
- 38 Lord Spicer (HS 38)
- 39 Welsh Government (HS 39)
- 40 CP Johnston (HS40)
- 41 John Lidstone (HS 41)

Written evidence submitted by Sir Garth Morrison KT CBE, Lord-Lieutenant, East Lothian (HS 01)

Some reflections prepared in response to the request for the views of Lord-Lieutenants for the inquiry by the Public Administration Select Committee.

Summary

1. While the honours system is a positive force there is room for improvement
2. While the membership of the honours committees is impressive, the primary sifting process is carried out within government departments without independent oversight.
3. There remains a perception that too many recipients are being honoured solely for doing the job for which they are paid.
4. Civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces should have the same chance of getting an honour as other people
5. In the assessment of merit greater weight should be attached to the contribution of the individual to the well-being of society **additional** to the work for which they are remunerated, usually rather well.

- 1 I think that the existence of an honours system does act as a positive force in British society, but this depends upon public confidence that it is being operated properly. The fact that it is reviewed so regularly, with the conclusions being widely circulated, builds confidence in its operation. Part of the price that we pay for a democratic society is there will always be some in the media and elsewhere who make it their life's work to find fault.

- 2 There is a concern, which I share, that too many honours are bestowed on people who are perceived simply to be doing the job for which they are paid, perhaps rather better than their peers, but nonetheless they are basically earning their salaries or wages. There is a perverse element here – a highly talented, committed and hard-working individual who devotes him/herself entirely to the “day job”, to the exclusion of all else, and reaches the top is quite likely to receive a national honour, whereas an equally talented, committed and hard-working individual who devotes some of his/her time to an organisation like the Scouts, is much less likely to do so – yet it might be argued that the latter has brought more public benefit. The vast majority of those in the voluntary sector who are recommended for a national honour make their contribution to the well-being of society **in addition** to making their living – they give of their free time wholeheartedly to the wellbeing of others. I realise that within the voluntary sector there is a wide spectrum of circumstances, from wholly

unremunerated through various part-time employment to full-time executive direction, so it would not be right to devise hard and fast distinctions. It is a matter of the culture underlying the process whereby recommendations are sifted and I have concerns about that.

- 3 I think that the system is viewed as less susceptible to party politics, although that is taking some time. In Scotland the Ministers have expressly separated themselves from the process, and that is helping to build public trust. While this has diminished concern over party political involvement, there is still scope for the departmental heads to skew the system in accordance with their predilections. Ministerial statements, such as “there should be more recognition of the NHS (or teachers) in the honours list” does lead to distortion and unfairness. In my experience a number of Chief Executives of NHS Trusts were awarded the OBE at the behest of St Andrew’s House, when I was, and am, aware of many others in the voluntary sector who were, and are, more deserving. They were good Chief Executives doing a good job, for which they were well paid, but the bar was lower for them than for many.
- 4 I do not think that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces should have a better chance of getting an honour than other people. In my view the bar should be set at the same height for all who are honoured in this way. Achievements leading to the award of a national honour ought to extend beyond the activities defined in the job description of a civil servant, diplomat or member of the armed forces, and take into account the impact of those additional activities on the well-being of the communities in which they live or serve. In the case of the armed services, whose personnel I admire enormously, there is a range of military decorations that should be fully used to recognize their outstanding contribution to our security. Subject to the criteria used for assessment of recommendations for national honours being appropriate, it does not really matter if those for diplomats and the armed services are considered separately, so long as there is some independent oversight of the process. The purpose of that oversight would be to ensure that the chosen criteria are applied even-handedly.
- 5 The criticism that individuals are being honoured almost solely for being very successful at their day job is applicable to other fields of endeavour and not just the public sector. If the criteria for assessment were to include aspects demonstrating effective community involvement and a concern for the well-being of society the awards might command greater respect. By way of example, a very successful industrialist whose endeavours have generated much economic benefit is probably very well remunerated and is much esteemed in his/her peer group. It strikes me that the award of a national honour should depend upon **additional** factors, for example, involvement in organisations like Business in the Community or the Prince’s Youth Business Trust, where the individual’s skills would be greatly valued, or support for the arts and culture as well as an element of philanthropy. The same principle is applicable across all the fields covered by the honours committees.

- 6 The membership of the honours committees is impressive with majorities of members drawn from outside government departments, and who have achieved great distinction themselves. They have the difficult task to select 1,000 names from a list of about 1,800 short-listed nominations. I am not sure how many nominations are submitted every year, but it is well known that there is a substantial piece of work to select the 1,800 for further consideration, and that is carried out wholly within government departments. In my view the integrity of the procedure for national honours stands or falls by that stage of the process, and the role of the honours committees, which is much trumpeted by the senior civil servants driving the honours system, is regarded by some as adding little more than a veneer of independent assessment. I have no doubt that the officials in government departments carrying out this sifting process do it to the best of their ability and seek to be scrupulously fair, but the outcome over many years appears to me to be the continuing recognition of officials in the public sector, for whom the bar appears to be lower than that for those whose contribution to community well-being is made in the voluntary sector. As noted above, this may well be a cultural issue.
- 7 There is a sense in which Scotland is a village in which everybody knows nearly everybody else. One consequence is that undue weight appears to be placed on whether an individual is known within the relevant government departments, either directly or through involvement in well established organisations. This leads to the effective exclusion of a number of individuals whose sterling work for the well-being of the community does not fit within the auspices of any one department and who are not known to any one department. Perhaps there is also a tendency for those at the centre to think that they know all that they need to know about what is happening in every nook and cranny of the country – viewed from afar this is detrimental to community interest. It is part of the remit of a Lord-Lieutenant to be aware of these issues and he/she could be very helpful with advice and information, but our experience is that this element is generally ignored.
- 8 I welcome the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Office report of December 2011. It is perhaps too early to assess the impact of the weight given to philanthropy, and it will be important to avoid any sense of an honour being “bought”. The parable of the widow’s mite is not wholly irrelevant here.
- 9 The Honours List as gazetted allows space for the briefest of notes, which is a pity. It would be helpful to know what a recipient has actually done, in addition to occupying a certain position in a company or department. The vast majority simply state the person’s paid employment, eg “assistant solicitor, Justice Department” which conveys nothing, other than to reinforce the perception that civil servants are being honoured simply for doing their job. A good recent example in my experience noted that the award was for “services to(government department) and to the community of(his local town)”, where he is actively engaged in youth work. Naturally there was

widespread approval locally. That would help to overcome the perception that an honour is awarded simply for doing the day job.

March 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Captain David Younger, Lord-Lieutenant, Tweeddale
(HS 02)**

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes but it is highly dependent upon the integrity of the system and the quality of recipients.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

A quicker turn around would help to remove some criticism.

a. Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

The re-introduction of the BEM has done much to fill an obvious omission and in its turn will do much to raise the profile of the MBE in the course of time.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

Difficult to answer without detailed statistical evidence. The number of awards of the MBE needs closer scrutiny with a view to reduction. To a certain extent this will be assisted by the re-introduction of the BEM.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have been aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

The perception is that it is still not entirely transparent (cf Paul Ruddock and others).

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

By and large yes. There are still occasions where early recourse to Lord – Lieutenants could still avoid embarrassment.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

It is certainly reasonable to honour servants of the state provided they are doing an outstanding job and go the extra mile. It is not acceptable to award this category on the grounds of achieving senior rank or long service for anything below an outstanding contribution. This is an area where improvements can readily be made.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

In order that the assessment is made transparent it would be preferable that awards for these two areas are scrutinised by an independent committee possibly with some Diplomatic / military content.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? If no, how would you change them?

Yes, provided the skills of independent thought, consistency and integrity are predominant.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

Very much welcome the reintroduction. It will have a major impact both amongst the Services and in rural areas.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

Yes but it must not be allowed to become a passport to an award.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

Yes but this is an area where it continuously needs to be restated and it may well be necessary to build in further safeguards.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Financial links to a political party should not be a contributory factor to reward by an honour. Such action degrades philanthropy. Otherwise the level of explanation is probably acceptable. The temptation would be to make it too detailed which would have a detrimental effect.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

Yes. The membership of the Committee should be higher profile.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

The forfeiture must be in the public interest and not be vindictive. It is therefore preferable that it should be dependent upon a greater element of judgement.

15. Additional

There has been over recent years a situation in Scotland where a nominee is not known to the Departments of the Scottish Government and a number of very good candidates have been excluded in favour of those working closer to the Departmental world, regardless of the strength of the citation. There are plenty of potential nominees with strong credentials beavering away across a number of disciplines or at a level where they are below Departmental radar screens who are deserving of recognition but against whom the systems appear to mitigate.

March 2012

Written evidence submitted by David Lindsay, Lord-Lieutenant, County Down (HS 03)

Responses to Questions posed on pages 1 & 2 of Issues and Questions paper

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
 - a. Remove the separate allocation of Honours from the Civil Service & other Public bodies.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, however I believe there is still public distrust of the system. Too many honours are awarded to those working in public employment & the public are suspicious of this.
5. Yes, except the above comments still apply. Too many awards to those who have simply done their job in the civil service & too few to the rest of society.
6. No. Although awards for gallantry should remain separate. Automatic, or almost automatic awards for reaching a certain status in public office, should cease.
7. As above, except in the case of awards for gallantry, all awards should be subject to the same process. Gallantry awards should continue to be considered separately.
8. I don't have any knowledge of the make up & so cannot comment.
9. I welcome the re-introduction of the BEM although it should be restricted to non Civil Service candidates. If this is not done then it simply means that even more civil servants will receive awards.
10. If "Philanthropy" means "Charitable Works" then probably not. If the meaning is more about giving money to aid charitable works then I suspect that it is about right. It is important to also reward those who give large amounts for charitable purposes if only to support the flow of such funds.
11. Yes, although I suspect that the public are still very sceptical.
12. Yes, I think the descriptions of why a person has been awarded an honour are too short. More details would help to remove suspicion.
13. Yes. Almost by definition this will be an emotive subject. However it is right & proper that there is a mechanism for the removal of honours & the current system is probably as good as any.
14. I believe that it would be impossible to write absolute rules for the forfeiture of honours & is always going to be a matter of judgement & as long as the committee is genuinely independent the current system is likely to be as good as any.

General Comments

My working life until I retired, apart from 5 years serving in the army, was spent in the motor trade where honours are a rare occurrence. As a result, I had very little knowledge

of the process or indeed any particular interest or concern about the process. However I am dismayed when I now read the list of those getting an honour in County Down. For instance, in this New Year's list, there were 16 nominations. At a brief glance it appears that only 3 worked outside the public sector. It is simply not right that someone gets an honour for doing their job for which they were paid. An honour should only be awarded to someone who does something well beyond the normal call of duty. That "Something" could well be philanthropic or charitable, but this is not essential. What is essential is that what that person has done, probably over a long period, is seen by others as being absolutely exceptional. This could be as part of their job, or it could be totally unpaid, but it cannot be seen as in any way to be normal.

I do not want these comments to be seen as anti public service, indeed, all of those nominated from County Down in this year's list are probably most deserving. Of course most employees in public service do an excellent job & dedicate their working lives to the benefit of others. However they are paid to do this & essentially this is not that different from any other job except, that currently, the chances of gaining an award seem to be much greater.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Susan Cunliffe-Lister, Lord-Lieutenant, East Riding of
Yorkshire (HS 04)**

I give below answers to the questions:

1. Yes
2. I am sure it can be improved but I do not see one change.
3. We always seem to have very worthy nominees who do not get an honour – but I can see it has to be limited.
4. It might take a bit longer to establish trust.
5. I find this difficult to judge. We have worthy nominees who do not get recognised while people who are not known locally get honours through their work routes. I do feel that those who have been paid and done their public service job well for a number of years should be recognised in a different way from those who have done voluntary work for the community.
6. No.
7. Same as everybody else if it is the same honour.
8. Yes.
9. I welcome the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal.
10. I think philanthropy should not just be judged by the amount of money given to charity but the time and effort given by people otherwise the honours will just go to rich people which will again undermine public trust and look as if people are buying honours.
11. I am not sure it is to the general public. They would rely on the press to pick it up.
12. I think information is good.
13. It sounds like the right committee but I am not clear how it is composed.
14. Judgement should be entertained.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Sir Paul Ruddock (HS 05)

Thank you for inviting me to submit my views about making the honours system more transparent, and whether the reasons for awarding the most senior honours should be made public.

Background

I was awarded a Knighthood for Services to the Arts in the 2012 New Year's Honours List. I have been involved with philanthropic work in the UK for over 20 years. I believe that philanthropy is about four things: giving your time, giving your skills, using your contacts for the benefit of the charity, and giving money.

I have also been a regular donor to the Conservative Party over the last nine years. In my professional life, I am the co-founder and CEO of an alternative investment management firm, Lansdowne Partners Ltd.

The award of my knighthood received some media attention during the New Year period. In my opinion, increased transparency for the awarding of honours may facilitate a greater understanding and appreciation of why honours have been made.

Increasing published information

I would recommend that more information is included in the New Year Honours List to explain the reasons as to why individuals are being honoured. In my own case, specific details of my contribution to cultural institutions in the UK may have served to dispel the notion that the award was related to political donations. Fundamentally, the honours system serves a purpose – to recognise individuals for their significant contributions to the society of this country. The more open and transparent the system is as to why these honours are granted, the greater the system will be respected and valued.

Supplementary information

For the reference of the Committee, my wife and I have been contributors to over 20 cultural and artistic institutions and charities including the Victoria & Albert Museum, the British Museum, the Donmar Warehouse, the Courtauld Institute for Art, Mousetrap Theatre Projects, the National Trust, and a new Performing Arts Centre at King Edward's School, Birmingham.

I have been particularly involved with the following institutions:

- 1) Victoria and Albert Museum:

I have been closely involved with the V&A for nearly twenty years, both financially and through participation on various museum committees. I have been a Trustee of the Museum since 2002 and was appointed Chairman of the Board of Trustees by the Prime Minister in 2007. I was re-appointed for a second term in November 2011.

I have assisted with some of the most significant and successful fundraising projects the museum has undertaken in recent years. Over the last twelve years the Museum has raised £130 million for the renovation and redisplay of its galleries and collections.

I have served on many V&A committees including the British Galleries Committee and as Chair of the Trustees' Finance and Development Committees. In addition to chairing the Museum's Board I also currently Chair the Gilbert Trust for the Arts and donated significantly to the renovation of the museum's Medieval & Renaissance Galleries. In the ten years that I have been a trustee and Chair of the V&A, attendance at the Museum has increased to 2.9 million annual visitors, the highest in the museum's 155 year history (in 2000 the attendance was only 829,000). This makes it the 14th most visited art museum in the world. Within the UK it has consistently been ranked amongst the top 10 most visited tourist attractions. The Museum has been transformed from 'the nation's attic' to one of the most vibrant and successful museums in the world.

2) British Museum:

I have supported the British Museum by donating funds to restore the Later Medieval Gallery which includes the iconic Lewis Chess set. The renovated Gallery opened in 2009 to huge critical acclaim. I am also donating to the renovation of the early Medieval Galleries which include the Sutton Hoo treasure and which are due to open in late 2013.

3) Courtauld Institute for Art:

I have been a long term supporter and am funding research projects at the Institute, which is the leading Art History university in the world.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Mrs Clare Russell, Lord Lieutenant, Banffshire (HS 06)

1. Definitely - and the reintroduction of the BEM is extremely helpful for the " unsung heroes " in the community.
2. See later responses.
3. Not sure but there would be obvious difficulties in changing the number up or down by substantial amounts.
4. Not having been involved in the Committee system my impression is that the honours system has been depoliticised but that the level of public trust is not particularly high.
5. See number 6.
6. Strongly feel that the Armed Services should have a better chance of honours - but, given the change in public sector pay and pensions compared with the greater risk in the private sector there is a strong argument for less concentration on civil servants and diplomats.
7. Diplomatic service should go through the same process as other honours - Defence should remain being considered separately.
8. Not in a position to comment.
9. Welcome strongly.
10. I don't agree with Cameron - I tend to agree with the last sentence of your comment on philanthropy.
11. No - and Sir Paul Ruddock's suggestions would be an improvement.
12. See 11 above.
13. Yes, but Alastair Darling's comments are relevant
14. Probably difficult to anticipate all the possible scenarios which might warrant forfeiture.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Ingrid Roscoe, Lord-Lieutenant, West Yorkshire (HS 07)

- *Emphasis on the Big Society is key to the future success of the Honours system.
- *The re-introduction of BEMs is an excellent step forward.
- *The number of honours at MBE+ level feels right, but it might well be appropriate to increase the number of BEMs, to reflect the huge amount of high-calibre voluntary service given in this country.
- *Quotas. Expansion of BEM awards would help in fields where there are more worthy nominees than available honours, such as masters of music/organists.
- *Honours for successful civil servants, who are well paid anyway, should be eliminated, except in extraordinary cases. (e.g. too many chief executives). At a less remunerative level, there would be a good case for e.g. a head teacher whose extraordinary vision has brought round a failing school, to be recognised. This fits with the aims of the Big Society.
- *Honours for those in well paid jobs, however glamorous or patriotic, are no longer appropriate, though 2012 is an extraordinary case because of the Olympics and attendant patriotism.
- *Philanthropy. To give of your assets is a reward in itself, but if the giving is accompanied by a hands-on approach, an honour may well be appropriate.

Other

I am aware, as a Lord-Lieutenant, that the extensive paperwork preparatory to making a nomination means that many excellent would-be submissions never reach the Honours Secretariat. One difficulty is the probe into ethnic background which many of us see as irrelevant. Simplification of the nomination paper would help. Later in the process, nominations coming to my office are thoroughly investigated and without favour. I feel that this use of the lieutenancies should be retained and that, on the whole, my own top commendations, which are sparingly made, are promoted.

As ever, there is under representation in the North-East, an issue I shall discuss with my deputy-lieutenants.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by G.W.N.H Clark, Lord-Lieutenant of Renfrewshire (HS 08)

There is widespread support for the Honours system in my Lieutenancy; this is particularly evident from the Press coverage of those successful recipients following each round. If it was not held in such high regard there would be no need for the public's concern following the occasional questionable Award. It is a very important and respected part of the fabric of the United Kingdom.

1. It is a positive force in British Society

2. Yes.

(a) More people should be recognised from the Voluntary Sector by a larger number of MBE's and BEM's allocated. Possibly at expense of those paid individuals merely doing their job!

3. As 2(a).

4. This is getting a good deal better.

5. More recognition to be given at the lower end of the scale AND a greater number of senior Awards to females.

6. Yes - they feature much more in the public eye and service to the Nation should be readily recognised.

7. Defence (in particular) should be considered separately given the totally different nature of their role in society. Not comparable to those in civilian life.

8. Membership of the Honours Committee seem fair and representation by a majority of non civil servants.

9. The reintroduction of The British Empire Medal is the best part of the Honours and Awards system in recent times. Should never have been abolished. Many highly deserving people who would not otherwise be entitled to an MBE can now be considered for recognition. Would like to see more than 300 Medals available at each round.

10. Yes - though must be wary that Awards cannot be bought! Emphasis should be given in citations of details which have been the reason for the Award being made. The rich giving donations to Charity should also have details given of the resulting benefits of their actions.

11. No.

12. Yes.

13. Yes.

14. On forfeiture. This thankfully very seldom happens. Why suddenly should the rules on forfeiture be aired in the public domain because of one high profile case of Fred Goodwin? Would suggest, no knee jerk reaction here, but leave things unchanged. Otherwise there will be an unfortunate risk of anyone in receipt of an Honour who mildly transgresses being subject to a hue and cry for him/her to be stripped of their honour. Therefore yes-judgement entertained here.

On the whole I believe the system works well. There will always be dissatisfaction from a small minority, but confidentiality must remain paramount on how final decisions are made. We live in a world of open architecture but the Honours and Awards system must NOT go down that road.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Brigadier Melville Jameson, Lord-Lieutenant, Perth and Kinross (HS 09)

Answers to General Questions

1. The Honours system acts as a very positive system in British Society.
2. I believe the System should give more weight to “Voluntary Service”. It is a widely held view that too many honours go to people who have just “done their job”. However, it is impossible to have a perfect system.
3. About right.
4. The present Honours System does now attract greater public trust and respect.
5. See 2 above.
6. I think that The Armed Services certainly deserve special consideration, as do Diplomats serving in challenging circumstances abroad.
7. Recommendations for the Diplomatic Service and Defence must be considered separately.
8. I am not equipped to answer that question, however my observation in Scotland is that we appear to have a further serious hurdle with the Scottish Government Committees, indeed a “Sieve”, before nominations are submitted to the Cabinet Office.
9. I warmly welcome the re-introduction of the BEM, I have had much experience of it in the Army and in both the Army and the civilian area, it has been greatly missed.
10. Yes
11. No
12. Yes
13. Yes probably but I think that this is a very difficult area; recent examples may be justified, but tend to smack of “Scapegoat”. There are many much worse examples where no proper action has been taken.
14. Clearer rules need to be made public.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Major Alexander R Trotter, Lord-Lieutenant, (HS 10)

1. Does the existence of all honours system act as a positive force in British society?
Yes.
2. Could the existing honours system be improved?
 - a) Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?
 - i. *"On retirement" awards should be extended to 18 months after retirement to allow time to put citations together.*
 - ii. *System does not give sufficient weight to those who have done outstanding service in more than one field.*
3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?
Too many MBE's are awarded to those who've done outstanding work in the voluntary sector at national level i.e. Scotland committees when they should have had OBE's.
4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?
Yes.
5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?
This is doubtful. There appears to be a bias towards academics where it is unclear that "they have gone the extra mile" beyond what they are paid to do.
6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?
No
7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?
They should be considered through committees.
8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?
I am not sure that it is clear to the public who they are.
9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?
Yes, I welcome it.
10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?
Yes, possibly too much.
11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

No.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes, an expanded citation could be made available on line.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

Yes.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

The rules need to be publically known.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by David Hill (HS 11)

Thank you for your communication.

I would like to respond to the questions as follows--

Q1 Many people who receive Honours are, by their very nature, unmotivated by the prospect of getting them, and as for being a 'positive force in British society', I think the question is misplaced and misguided.

Q2 Yes, by being monitored more locally by people with specific, local knowledge.

Q3 I believe the system of granting peerages etc. to those who have happened to have been in Parliament for some years, often without distinguishing themselves in any profound or nation enhancing way, is flawed.

Q4 I was not aware of what this level is set at. Perhaps this could be better publicised.

Q5 The system is still somewhat politicised, but progress is being made. Political awards should depend as much on merit as is the case for the public, perhaps a committee of lay and political members should debate it, ideally on a regional basis. According to my research, many of the public still distrust the concept of awards.

I hope this helps.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Patrick Prenter, Lord-Lieutenant, Midlothian (HS 12)

1. Yes .
2. Probably no – different categories might require differing improvements.
3. I think so and once the reborn BEM has settled down a slight narrowing of the MBE may occur.
4. Maybe - but I do feel that it may be better to reward political activity and achievement with Honours rather than in other ways!
5. That is the intention but many categories such as medicine, teaching, local government etc. seem to run on pre-ordered lines from within the professional hierarchies.
6. Reasonable but this raises a duty of restraint by those involved.
7. Considered separately.
8. Probably all right.
9. Welcome.
10. I do not know.
11. Probably not – but this is a grey area and the general public usually can make a realistic assessment.
12. Simple statements should be enough for all Honours.
13. Yes – but consistency is important.
14. I agree with the statement at the top of page 6 of the questionnaire: the implication is that the Honours system is brought into disrepute by the delinquent and/or the committee's failure to act – or both.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Dr Monica Main, Lord-Lieutenant for Sutherland (HS 13)

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of commenting on the above. I will follow the format as set out.

1. Yes the Honours system does act as a positive force in British society.
2. I feel the Honours system could be improved by awarding more Honours in the general community.
3. The number of Honours I feel are capped at the right level, otherwise the significance of the Honour is diminished.
4. I can see that there have been great strides to de-politicise the Honours system which will attract greater public trust as a result.
5. I do feel that many people in the community miss out on Honours, and in particular in this Olympic year, the Honours may well be skewed towards athletes and competitors.
6. I feel it unfair that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an Honour than other people. It should be reserved for those who excel at what they do, not just at the position they attain.
7. I feel that Honours for the diplomatic service and defence should be part of the same process as other Honours being filtered through committees with an independent majority.
8. No comment.
9. I welcome the re-introduction of the British Empire Medal as so few deserving candidates actually receive a higher Honour.
10. I feel there should be no weighting towards philanthropy as only the very rich can indulge in this pastime.
11. It is clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award Honours.
12. People should be awarded Honours on their own merit even if they have financial links to a political party; the two are not mutually exclusive.
13. The Honours forfeiture committee is an appropriate forum for taking decisions for removing Honours.
14. Clearer rules would be helpful to decide whether an Honour should be forfeited or not.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by David Briggs MBE KstJ, Lord-Lieutenant, Cheshire (HS 14)

This is provided by David Briggs, Lord-Lieutenant of Cheshire, after consultation with three of the Cheshire Honours Committees, which are groups of Deputy Lieutenants which he has to advise him on individual honours nominations.

Answers to the questions set out in your question paper using your numbering.

1. Yes but much of the public probably regards it as a 'closed shop'. The system as a whole needs more publicity as to the reasons for granting individual honours - the challenge is of course to get local media to print good news or 'worthy' stories.
2. The biggest negative is that some jobs appear to automatically bring with them an honour. An honour should not be awarded just for doing a job for which one is paid.
3. Yes, capped at the right level but the balance between civil and military is very distorted.
4. Sadly the system is not yet seen to be de-politicised. There is still a perception that people can 'buy' honours.
5. No. The public sector whether civil or military is still favoured and still gets honours for 'doing the day job'. To a lesser extent this is also true for senior people in the private sector.
6. No. Honours should only be awarded for service over and above the call of duty. You should not get an award for simply doing what you are paid to do. There may be a few special cases in the diplomatic service where for the 'Honour of Britain' the Ambassador in the most important countries is awarded a Knighthood.
7. They should be part of the same process in that it is visible that no preferential process is in place.
8. The only comment on this issue I have is from a very able lady DL who made the point that there appear to be very few women on the Committees.
9. I welcome the introduction of a medal below an MBE to recognise outstanding but very local good works. I do however think it was unfortunate that the sub-MBE medal was brought back as the BEM for two reasons – first it is associated with 'class' which we all want to get rid of and secondly it seems inappropriate in 2012 to bring back an award containing the word 'Empire'.

10. This is probably the most difficult area of all not least because The Big Society or as we used to say Charitable Causes needs cash and philanthropists are vital and need encouraging.

That said it has to be clear that no-one can simply 'buy' an honour.

The mere writing of a cheque by a wealthy person needs to be balanced against the charity volunteer who puts hours of unpaid time into benefitting the community.

My view is that if the philanthropy is associated with time and personal commitment then it has the qualification for an award. The mere payment of money does not.

11. No. This is a significant concern of the public and does lower the status of the Honours system.
12. The honour should represent the time and commitment of an individual to benefit society. Every effort should be given to get more publicity for the reasons why an award is made.
13. There is no reason why the Honour Forfeiture Committee should not be the appointed body but there is a feeling that Fred Goodwin was made a scapegoat which is bad for the system.
14. There should be rules but there will also need to be the ability to use discretion on occasions.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Dione Verulam, Lord-Lieutenant Hertfordshire (HS 15)

The Honours system works well as a provider of rewards for people who stand out for having done good works.

*The chief difficulty for a Lord-Lieutenant is consistency. There is often a grey area between "outstanding" and "highly deserving". And the bench mark probably varies county to county. The grading is an art and not a science.

*The most baffling aspect of the system is the way some nominees pass through the process quite quickly whereas others sink without trace. They reappear neither as successful recipients nor as unsuccessful candidates.

Following are answers to some of the questions, numbered as on the correspondence from PASC:

1. Yes, in the main recipients are delighted and flattered to receive an Honour. The communities they serve are also very well pleased. The charities they work for enjoy the publicity and the high profile.
2. In order to improve consistency in Lieutenancy recommendations some test cases might be useful for Lord-Lieutenants to refer to. Examples of "outstanding", "highly deserving", "deserving" etc could help as guidelines.
5. It is not possible to be completely fair because human judgement is sometimes flawed, however, the system clearly tries to be evenhanded. When it is criticised it is forgotten that everyone involved in the system is trying to be fair. The fact that making a nomination requires a considerable amount of time and trouble means that the nominees are more often than not deserving of some recognition.
6. It does seem odd that civil servants who have been paid to do their job should receive the same Honour as someone who has put themselves out in order to work on behalf of others for no pay.
9. I welcome the reintroduction of the BEM. There are many nominees who fall just below the MBE but who have contributed much to their local communities.
10. No, the Honours system does not yet give enough weight to philanthropy, it would be right to see more, this would recognise the generous and might encourage others to follow suit.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Lord Aberdeen, Lord-Lieutenant, Aberdeenshire (HS 16)

There is a sub-committee within the Lieutenancy of Aberdeenshire dealing with the nominations for honours comprising myself (Lord Aberdeen), the Lord Glenarthur, Marcus Humphrey Esq. CBE, and the Lord Lieutenant himself, James Ingleby Esq. The answers to the general questions have been agreed within this sub-committee and are as follows:-

Summary

- **There is no doubt that the honours system does act as a positive force in British society.**
- **The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal will allow greater recognition of voluntary community service.**
- **It must be made clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours.**
- **A greater element of judgement should be retained in relation to forfeiture of honours.**

General Questions

1. **Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?**

Yes. The honours system has been in existence for a long time and those who achieve honours feel a great sense of pride in the recognition they receive. This is particularly true in the lower levels of honours as people have so often been nominated by others within their peer group. It has been particularly galling of late to have seen the number of people who have declined honours when one sees so many deserving people who fail to achieve an honour despite having a very strong nomination.

2. **Could the existing honours system be improved?**

Yes, in a number of ways. One of the easiest ways of improving the system would be to speed up the process. A large number of nominations are either elderly or infirm and there can be occasion when someone nominated dies or becomes totally incapacitated before their application is approved. Another is to allow greater feedback as to why a

particular nomination has not succeeded, perhaps by asking the nominating body supplementary questions to flesh out what appears to be an otherwise valid nomination likely to succeed.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

Broadly speaking, yes. The overall total number of honours is probably at the right level and it must remain highly selective and competitive. However, a large number of nominations for honours is for people who have done outstanding voluntary work within their communities. At a recent meeting with the Honours Secretariat in Edinburgh, it was pointed out that there were very few honours awarded to such people and therefore this could be an area where the numbers are increased as every community feels that they have some person who has made an outstanding contribution. The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal may help to address this.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

It is difficult to say that the honours system has been depoliticised as so many honours still seem to be awarded through the political system to the exclusion of those who are very deserving amongst the general public. As to public trust in the system, it is probably neutral because of necessary opacity in the selection process.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

Probably not. There appear to be far too many honours awarded to people who are merely carrying out their normal day to day activities / jobs for which they have been well remunerated, or have achieved other forms of public recognition. This extends to the world of arts, sports (where, for example, Olympic medal winners are often additionally awarded honours subsequently) and most public services. Honours should generally be awarded to people who have made outstanding contributions to

their communities in an entirely voluntary fashion and not for merely carrying out their job to the best of their ability.

6. **Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?**

We struggle to see why this should be the case, if indeed it is. All three categories of people are merely doing their normal day to day job. In relation to the armed forces, acts of outstanding bravery or selfless duty are already rewarded with operational honours falling under a different system outside the twice yearly honours system. These are not generally open to the general public with the exception of areas of outstanding civilian bravery which can receive a George Cross or a George Medal. However, there are those within each category who have given such 'service', loyalty, expertise, sound judgement and wise advice to their respective organisations, which might in other fields have generated for them substantial reward, for whom recognition within the honours system is very appropriate.

7. **Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?**

Following on from 6. above, there seems to be a strong case that they should be considered separately, through a different quota system, although it is difficult to see why they should be prioritised. The Civil Service should also be included in this category.

8. **Do honours committees have the right membership? If no, how would you change them?**

It is difficult to say whether the committees have the right membership although it is interesting to note that at least 75% of the membership of most of the committees have already received an honour of some form or another.

Current Issues

9. **Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?**

We would welcome the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal and think it is unfair to say that this was viewed as a “lesser” medal as those in the past who have received it would have been immensely proud of doing so. We believe also in the past it was a medal that could be handed over by a local distinguished person as opposed to a member of the Royal Family and this may well help to increase the number of honours issued as it will not place such a burden on the time of the Royal Family.

10. **Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?**

It is difficult to see how one can give weight to philanthropy. As is rightly pointed out in the accompanying notes, those who are able to be philanthropic tend to be rich people but that is no bad thing. However, we wonder how philanthropic they would be if they merely receive an OBE as opposed to a Knighthood.

11. **Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?**

This is currently a very controversial issue and therefore it is probably best left alone for the major political parties to solve the problem.

12. **Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?**

Again, this is an area which has attracted considerable controversy. There is no need to explain why members of the general public have received an honour because they have been nominated by their peer group. However, having financial links to a political party should not be a consideration for receiving an honour.

13. **Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?**

Yes, very probably it is. We believe that this has only occurred on very few occasions, most recently with Sir Fred Goodwin, as pointed out in the notes. A better way would be for anyone charged and convicted of a very serious or major criminal offence, or thought to have been ‘guilty’ of other manifest failing, to have their case brought as a matter of course to the Honours Forfeiture Committee for assessment,

which must be objective, factual and not given to hyperbole. (If Sir Chris Hoy should fall off his bicycle in the three races at the 2012 Olympics for which he received his Knighthood after the last Olympics, should he have his honour forfeited?)

14. **Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?**

See 13. above. We feel that a great element of judgement should be entertained by the Honours Forfeiture Committee and that if an honour is being considered for forfeiture, one element to be taken into account, as well as that of a serious or major criminal offence, should be that the individual may have caused considerable harm to a great number of people, thus bringing the honour, as well as the judgement of the individual, into severe disrepute.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Colonel Martin Amlot OBE DL, Merseyside Honours
Nomination Panel (HS 17)**

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes it does. Honours at all levels give pleasure and satisfaction not only to those who receive them but also to the families, friends and acquaintances of those who receive them. The positive publicity that is given to individuals in their communities is evidence of the generally supportive reaction to the system.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

I have no specific proposals to improve the system except the following as an aid to transparency.

a. Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

When lists are published, prominence should be given to information explaining the criteria of each level of award. This could be done by drawing attention to a simplified web link to existing information at:
http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/Governmentcitizensandrights/UKgovernment/Honoursawardsandmedals/DG_176568

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

The current level means that someone whose contribution is outstanding is likely to be recognised. To increase or reduce the availability might degrade support for the system.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

Concerns regarding 'politicised' honours tend to arise from party political point scoring and are of less concern outside immediate political circles, unless there is blatant abuse of patronage. Although fuss has been made by politicians about other politicians and political benefactors, one has to search hard for evidence of real abuse. Only one person has ever been convicted under the Honours (Prevention of Abuses) Act 1925 – the individual whose actions cause the law to be enacted. Suggestions of political patronage, whether or not based on evidence always damage the party concerned (e.g. Harold Wilson's 'Lavender List'). The system could therefore be said to be self-correcting.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

The system appears to be as fair as an objectively judgemental system could be. The various committees are drawn from prominent and distinguished men and women in their field.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

Yes. To be successful in each of the three categories implies a limitation on personal freedom and a sustained and higher level of distinguished public service than is the case of those in other walks of life.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

They should continue to be considered separately. The system of screening by the peers of each group seems as robust as any alternative that could be devised. In all three cases, knowledge of the special circumstances of all three is essential when judging citations.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? If no, how would you change them?

They appear to be comprised of exactly the sort of people who would be chosen by any system of selection for such duties.

CURRENT ISSUES

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

I strongly welcome it. The withdrawal of the BEM was well intentioned but ill-advised. Withdrawal resulted in large numbers of members of the community being disenfranchised. There could never be enough MBEs to make up the difference, and many very worthy and distinguished persons whose contribution was local and specific to one small field lost the opportunity to be recognised. I unreservedly endorse the decision to reintroduce it.

10. Does the honours system currently give appropriate weight to philanthropy?

In order to respond properly I had to check the dictionary definition of 'philanthropy'¹. I was little the wiser! The honours system is already designed to recognise those who act in the common good in whatever way that they can. When a candidate for an honour has been identified as someone who makes a highly significant and wholly positive difference in their community, I suggest that it would be wrong to shade such a person out because the

¹ Concise Oxford Dictionary – Philanthropy – Love, practical benevolence to mankind. Philanthropist – Lover of mankind; one who exerts himself for the well-being of his fellow men.

candidate's contribution could not be described as 'philanthropy' in competition with another candidate. The 'Big Society' is a Conservative Party policy and rewarding people differently as part of this has the faintest overtones as political expediency!

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

Yes, but that will not stop political party point scoring. It would be very difficult to do this entirely given the amorality of some politicians.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes, see my answer to 2.a. above.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people who have previously been awarded?

The Goodwin affair has been in danger of causing this system to be questioned. The committee is allowed to consider 'compelling evidence that an individual has brought the honours system into disrepute...' It considered the FSA report which specifically found no evidence of lack of integrity. Consequently the committee's findings became a matter of judgement and although the committee is made up of distinguished persons, they are all career civil servants. If a judgement is to be made, why not include a distinguished senior retired member of the judiciary as well as other distinguished lay members?

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

Hard cases make bad law so there should be no rush to change, other than the proposal above to widen the experience and skills available to the committee.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Professor Helen Carty DL, Merseyside Honours
Nomination Panel
(HS 18)**

Comments for the Lord Lieutenant.

1. The Honours system is unequivocally a force for good in the UK and should be maintained. While there are some anomalies, by and large those that get them deserve the honours.
2. I have no idea whether the number awarded is correct, but when situations occur such as this Olympic Year, when it is likely that many honours will be awarded to the athletes and those concerned with the Olympics, this will mean that the numbers available for the general population will be reduced and this is a little unfair.
3. I suggest that in circumstances such as this, or in any situation where there is a high profile event, that the honours to these recipients should be above the capped quota.
4. Politicians who do more than politics should not be disbarred, but any suggestion of giving an award to politicians for being politicians is unacceptable. Elevation of politicians to peerages also is not widely approved of by the public. There will always be worthy exceptions, but in general peerages for politicians should be sparse in numbers. If you want a working House of Lords, since the abandonment of Hereditary seats, it should be a House open to all elected members with very few appointed on political grounds.
5. The Honours system depends on submissions. Unless one's name is submitted one cannot be a recipient. Somehow a message needs to be got out into the public domain that it is up to everyone to submit names if they consider someone worthy. There is very little appreciation in society in general that anyone can put someone forward. Most people do not know how to set about it, feel that they could not do this, honours are "not for the likes of us" and thus, there are myriads in the public arena who are hugely deserving but do not get nominated. The filling in of the form, is daunting and even when one offers help, there is still diffidence about proceeding. I say this based on my experience this year. Therefore, whether one gets one or not is virtually a lottery. It would be far better to have a local, non-political committee, probably managed through the Lord Lieutenant's office, which can raise the profile of the system and offer help and guidance and demystify the whole system. I believe that this would produce a much broader base and be more representative.
I have met many people this year whom I believe should be considered, and have made suggestions, but so far only one person has come back to me. When one looks at

the lists, there appears to be a disproportionate number of celebrities and civil servants in them. I also think there are too many people in quangos or working in the limelight on government executive boards who seem to get them for sitting in high profile public service boards or posts. People doing comparable work in industry or education or health are not thus favoured.

6. It is utterly unreasonable that civil servants should have a higher chance of getting an honour than the general public. They are paid to do their job, have security and do not contribute to those who create wealth. There will be exceptions, but in general they are in no different position to nurses, the police force etc. I know nothing about military awards. These I presume are given for administrative service or for unusual leadership roles. If they get them more easily than those carrying out similar duties outwith the armed forces, then patently this is not right, but I suspect that most are given for exceptional service. It is easier for this to be appreciated in military ranks because of the structure. The criteria for the award should be stringent, but military awards are easier to justify than civil service ones.
7. I believe it would be fairer to consider them in the same way as all others. The implication of this question is that they have a quota within the system but I do not know if this is so. Clearly, there is a considerably more professional and routine approach to submissions than obtains generally which does confer an advantage.
8. I do not know who sits on Honours committees centrally so I cannot comment. Are the names published? If so I have not seen them.
9. The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is very much welcomed, but I suggest that submissions should be filtered locally where it will be easier to obtain supplementary information if needed. An indication can be given as to how many should be forwarded. I realise that the decision as to the level of the award is made centrally, but it would seem logical that this one should be filtered. Otherwise the system will be overwhelmed. The prior scrutiny can be checked centrally and if necessary the level of the award can be altered. A list with reserves would enable all quotas to be fulfilled.
10. It depends on the Philanthropy! This must not become a way to “buy” an award. It would devalue the whole system. Genuine, quiet Philanthropy should be recognised and awarded appropriately. Most such people give without expecting public recognition. If you want to encourage major giving as in America, create a separate

category such as The Queen's Award for Philanthropy and keep the Honours system for those who really deserve it.

11 and 12.

It should never be part of the process. Party political donations are not there to purchase awards. If the person gets one for other good work, then it should be clear that this is why the award was given and it should be incapable of being challenged. The two are not mutually exclusive. If necessary the Honours Committee should issue a statement, or have one in reserve to be issued if the press starts making snide comments. Such a committee is completely independent of politics and must remain so and free of pressure.

13.and 14

The only recent case I am aware of is removal of the Knighthood from Fred Godwin. It certainly raised a lot of hot air. Like most people, I only know what was in the press and on TV. Such media issue their perspective and do feed public demands for heads to roll. If he lost his Knighthood for what he did, I doubt he was alone in RBS and bluntly he was supported by Government when all was apparently well. It was all very unseemly. I doubt though that most of the public care whether he was stripped of his honour or not. He lost his because of the profile he had. I doubt that rules can be made for such situations. All are different. Surely we can trust the judgement of a carefully constituted independent committee, who hopefully will not bow to baying for blood demands.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Mrs Jean Evans, Merseyside Honours Nomination Panel
(HS 19)**

General Questions

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

I believe it is a form of very positive and important recognition extended to individuals who have undertaken valuable work in their respective professions/community. It would be a retrograde step to remove the system and if removed it would be difficult to know what would replace it. Many people feel a need to seek recognition for outstanding contributions. Long may this continue.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

Yes I believe stronger communications are needed about the system itself.

a. Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

By finding a way of helping more people understand the criteria and the extent to which the honours system can apply to all walks of life.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

I think it probably is but if a change in the number offered was debated, I would favour a slight reduction to a slight increase to maintain the value of those granted.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

I believe much good work has taken place towards removing politics from the honours system but whether it has essentially been depoliticised is difficult to say. I do think it is a trusted system, however.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

I believe there isn't a system which will ever be considered fully fair by all and I think great attempts are made towards ensuring the British Honours system is fair and even-handed.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

Yes as it acknowledges the nature of what these people contribute. The reintroduction of the BEM should hopefully redress any perceived unfairness in the system.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

There are reasons why they are considered separately and these are just as valid today.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? If no, how would you change them?

I feel the committees largely comprise the right members and that the present selection procedures should continue but be reviewed from time to time to be sure they reflect any relevant changes in society.

Current Issues

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

I would welcome it as I feel there is a need for it. However, I would hope any reintroduction would be carefully managed so it does not have a negative impact i.e. by it being seen as an inferior honour or by it increasing the overall number of honours issued to the point of devaluing the system.

10. Does the honours system currently give appropriate weight to philanthropy?

I don't feel able to comment on this as I have insufficient information about it.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

I believe so although it is a good idea for committees to remain vigilant on this particular issue.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes. It is common for people to question why some honours have been granted and why a certain level has been selected. I feel sure this is due to a lack of understanding.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people who have previously been awarded?

Yes, I think so. Committees always experience difficulties in some cases/decisions as do Judges and Magistrates. The main thing is that the committee has clear guidelines and procedures and strives at all times for consistency.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

As above, I feel it is essential to have clear guidelines and decision-making structures. From that the committee is accountable for its judgements which should be open and transparent.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Alexander Matheson OBE, Lord-Lieutenant, Western Isles
(HS 20)**

INTRODUCTION

1 As Lord-Lieutenant of the Western Isles, I welcome the invitation from the Public Administration Select Committee to submit views on the honours system.

2 These views, based on comments made over the years by my fellow Deputy Lieutenants and occasionally members of our islands community, are submitted in the form of answers to the most relevant of the 14 questions posed by the Committee.

3 As a general point, there is a prevailing view within this particular community that the level of awards given to individuals from areas such as ours are very low and that the level of awards for community and voluntary services are much less successful than awards to paid public servants who are believed to be given honours on completion of long public service careers. This creates a belief that the system does not allow a level playing field, in terms of both geographical representation and community/voluntary service.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS

Question 1 – Despite recent publicity involving the forfeiture of honours, it is considered that the existence of an honours system does act as a positive force in British society and should, therefore, be retained.

Questions 2, 5 and 6 – The system could be improved by removing the practice of awarding honours to public officials, such as civil servants and diplomats for recognising long service in paid employment since this does not convey a fair and even-handed way of being selected for an honour. This is something which is not available for employees outwith the public services. There is a feeling that as long as the current practice continues, non-public servants are in competition for an award with public servants who have the advantage of being considered for an honour on the basis of length of paid service. If the current practice is to continue, it would be better to have a separate category for paid public service and armed forces awards. More detailed information on the allocation of awards broken down into regions, with comparable statistics indicating the *per capita* ratio for each region may also go some way towards a better understanding by the public of how awards are given.

Question 3 – It is considered that the cap for awards for community and voluntary service should be increased to provide for a more equitable distribution.

Question 4 – While changes over the past fifteen years have focused on removing politics from the system, it is still the case that the public view the system as still being very much under the control of the political system.

Question 7 – Diplomatic Service and Defence honours should remain as a separate category, for the reasons given in the answers to Questions 2, 5, and 6 above.

Question 8 - The current membership of the various Committees would seem to take inadequate account of geographical representation in respect of Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland interests.

Question 9 – The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is a welcome step since it provides more opportunities for deserving individuals involved in services to the community at local level, to be recognised.

Question 10 – No views.

Question 11 – It is not sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions in relation to honour awards. This is a matter which needs to be addressed by the introduction of a more robust system which provides transparent and detailed information on the reasons for an award.

Question 12 – As indicated above, more detailed information on the reasons for an award should be given, and particularly where an award is given for political donations, philanthropic reasons or other political services to enable the public to be fully aware of the basis for the award and to avoid the feeling of bias/favouritism for political or other purposes.

Questions 13 and 14 – It is clear from recent publicity that more defined guidance on the process and procedures for dealing with forfeiture of awards should be provided.

I hope that the Committee will find these views helpful in their further deliberations on the matter.

April 2012.

Written evidence submitted by Dr Peter Beck, Lord Lieutenant, South Glamorgan (HS 21)

I feel that the Honours system performs a very valuable service. The huge amount of work that is done on a voluntary basis should be acknowledged and this system is a well tried, cost effective and generally successful way of doing this.

- 1 I feel the Honours System exerts a positive role in British Society.
- 2 The total removal of political donations from any contribution to the award of honours would benefit the probity of the whole system.
- 3 I support the continuing separation of honours for the Armed Forces and diplomats from the general system.
- 4 I strongly support the reintroduction of the BEM for awarding local efforts; the scope of the MBE was far too wide.
- 5 I support the role of the Honours Forfeiture Committee but would welcome clarification of its operating criteria.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Rt Hon George Reid, Lord-Lieutenant of
Clackmannanshire (HS 22)**

INTRODUCTION

This submission responds to the letter of 16 March 2012 from the Public Administration Select Committee, requesting views from Lord-Lieutenants on the honours system.

My views are based on informal discussions about the honours system with Deputy Lieutenants and local people across the civic, voluntary and political sectors (a) since my appointment as Lord-Lieutenant of Clackmannanshire and (b) as a former MP and MSP for Clackmannanshire.

OVERVIEW

Value of Honours

In recognising exceptional service and achievement, honours are an important and valued part of British life.

Process and Perception

Management of the honours system in the past decade has become significantly more independent, transparent and accountable. However, there is a gap between process and public perception. A substantial number of citizens neither understand the system nor believe that it has anything to do with them.

Supporting Evidence

Nominations at OBE level and above are usually accompanied by reasonably clear documentation covering the nominee's contribution to society. Nominations for MBEs are generally more difficult to process, since evidence of achievement and impact is often lacking.

The British Empire Medal

The reintroduction of the BEM is welcome. It will provide public recognition of individuals who help build stronger and more integrated communities. However, more promotion of the honour, and what it is for, is required.

Honours for Women

Women are still under-represented in the award of honours, particularly at CBE level and above.

“Empire” Honours

There is unease about the use of the word “Empire” in the largest section of honours awards. This is seen to be anachronistic and inappropriate to a post-imperial UK. One

local resident of ethnic origin, whose family came from a former colony, said that he could never accept an honour “named after a system his family had fought to abolish”.

This is an issue on which the Committee may wish to revisit its predecessor’s Recommendations in 2004.

Devolution

The Honours secretariat should be sensitive to the position of the devolved nations. In some circles, scrutiny committees are perceived to be “Westminster-oriented” and “metropolitan minded”. Recent proposals to abolish devolved QAVS advisory panels (which contained real community and voluntary expertise) and to appoint a single individual – representing Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland on the Diamond Jubilee committee – run contrary to the spirit and practice of devolution.

Public Awareness

There is a real need for a sustained public awareness campaign on the honours system. This should have three objectives: to ensure greater public understanding of how the system works; to encourage more joined-up working across the system; and to promote the belief that honours are an integral part of British life, in which all citizens have a stake.

SPECIFIC COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Number of Honours

The current cap on honours is about the right level. The reintroduction of the BEM is welcome since it includes local activists who have made a real difference to their communities but who, in the past, may have narrowly missed an MBE.

Philanthropy

It is right to recognise and honour philanthropic giving. However, the creation of a separate philanthropy section has led to perceptions that millionaires have a fast track to honours. As with all awards at CBE Level and above, there should be an expanded citation which details the impact for the public good of the individual’s donations.

Party Political Donations

The key issue is whether the nominee has made an exceptional contribution to society, not whether he or she has contributed to a political party.

Despite careful checking of the Electoral Commission’s lists of donations and detailed examination by the Main Honours Committee, a substantial number of citizens believe there is a link between gifts to political parties and the award of an honour.

Any public awareness campaign should explain the process, and its safeguards, in detail. Citations should provide specific information on the outcomes of recipients’ activities for

the public good, and should also include the names of organisations and individuals proposing the award.

Fairness

- a. State Servants: When I was first elected to Parliament in the 1970s, around 40% of honours went to state servants (senior civil servants, diplomats and senior members of the armed forces). These awards were closely linked to grade and rank. This structural advantage has now been significantly reduced and ‘automaticity’, to use John Major’s phrase, no longer applies to awards.

However, local trade unionists in particular are clear that there should demonstrably be no link between employment status and level of honour.

The Committee may wish to consider recommending a future date when separate diplomatic and military lists would be subsumed within the general system, with a majority of independent members on their own scrutiny committees.

- b. Slipping through the Silos: Two local people have raised the issue of a local activist who spread his engagement across a range of activities, none of which necessarily merited an honour – but whose sustained commitment to his community over many years was substantial and justified an award. They claimed he had “slipped through the selection silos” and that this was unfair.

It would be helpful if the Committee could reiterate the need for the honours process to consider overall achievement and commitment, transcending the brief of specific subject panels.

Forfeiture

While the Forfeiture Committee should certainly take into account such issues as imprisonment or disqualification by a professional or regulatory body, the guiding principle in determining forfeiture should be whether the individual has brought the honours system into disrepute.

PUBLIC AWARENESS

The honours system has been adapted and redefined over the centuries. Reforms over the past decade have ensured that it is more independent, transparent, accountable and targeted towards people who make a significant contribution towards community life at a local level.

Discussions with local officials, media and community representatives indicate that there is still wide misunderstanding of how the system operates – and what its purpose is. A rather cynical response was that it is “a Westminster-based reward hierarchy for elites”. There was little sense that all citizens have a stake in the process and can contribute to it.

There is good information on the honours system on the Direct Government website, but only a small number of officials – and of people making nominations – seem to have studied it in any detail. While there are helpful videos containing case studies of recipients of honours on You Tube, these are difficult to access and somewhat dated.

The quality of nominations varies substantially. Some are as basic as: “X has done a good job as Y over Z years and should get an honour. Please support this recommendation.”

It would be helpful to have more information on the Direct Government website, indicating the information – particularly on the impact and outcomes of the nominee’s activities – which should accompany a nomination.

Information on the Direct Government website and (as happened after the PASC 2004 review) adverts in the local papers are not enough. There should be sustained follow-up by the honours secretariat at civil service and Lord-Lieutenant levels. The aim should be threefold – to encourage more joined-up working across the honours system; to increase public understanding of the system; and to encourage proactive engagement in identifying potential candidates.

The honours secretariat should be more actively engaged with Lord-Lieutenants on a sustained basis. This might cover:

- a) Consultation: More regular use of the provision to consult Lord-Lieutenants when the candidate is not known at departmental level.
- b) Guidance: The provision of clear written background distilled from the Direct Government website, including guidance and timelines.
- c) Monitoring: The monitoring and reporting on nominations/awards on a Lieutenancy/population basis.
- d) PowerPoint: The provision of a PowerPoint series of slides and text on the honours system for Lord-Lieutenants to use in local presentations.
- e) Presentation: A yearly presentation by Lord-Lieutenants on the honours system to umbrella organizations for civic and voluntary groups.
- f) Media: The provision of a draft article outlining the system for placement by Lord-Lieutenants in their local newspapers.
- g) Deputy Lieutenants: The encouragement of Deputy Lieutenants to engage on a planned and sustained basis with civic and voluntary organisations in the geographical areas for which they are responsible, with the aim of their bringing forward honours recommendations on a yearly basis.

SUMMARY

The honours system has gone through a significant programme of reform to make it more independent, transparent, accountable and representative of citizens working for the public good at local level. The system has always been adaptable and further reform, to make it fit for purpose in the contemporary UK, should follow in a gradual programme of change. The guiding principle should be to ensure that the honours system commands respect through its inherent fairness.

What is needed in the short term is more engagement at community level, to seek out candidates for honours and to assure citizens that they have a stake in the process.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Sir Bob Kerslake, Head of the Civil Service (HS 23)

Please find attached the Government's contribution to your call for written evidence to inform your Inquiry into the honours system. I look forward to expanding further during the oral session on 22 May.

GOVERNMENT SUBMISSION TO PASC'S INQUIRY INTO THE HONOURS SYSTEM

1. The Government welcomes the opportunity to provide written evidence to the Inquiry, and would like to do so under a number of headings linked to the questions raised in the Inquiry's Issues and Questions Paper. Its second three-year report, covering 2009-11, has already been submitted, but the Committee may like some updated statistics from the New Year 2012 list: the proportion of honours awarded to women remained at 43%; the proportion of honours awarded to those known to be of an ethnic minority background rose to 11%; and there were 17 refusals, slightly lower than the norm.

2. Some introductory remarks may also be helpful. The Government's policy remains that the honours system should be entirely based on merit. It is fundamental to the integrity of the system that its processes should be open (while retaining a necessary degree of confidentiality, to protect those under consideration) and fair. Those who are honoured should be people of real achievement, with no sense of entitlement arising simply from holding a particular office: Permanent Secretaries, for example, can no longer expect Knight- or Damehoods as a matter of course. We want to recognise both excellence and selfless voluntary service. The Government is especially keen to broaden the base of those who are honoured (and the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is helping with this, particularly in encouraging more nominations of those who contribute to the Big Society): it is focusing this year on outreach efforts to encourage more nominations of women, and a number of the honours selection committees are working with Departments to reach out to those sectors which have thus far not been properly represented in the honours lists. We are also looking at how best to use social media to reinforce the message that the honours system is open to everyone. The Committee's views on how to do even better would be particularly welcome.

Views of the honours system (Qs 1, 2)

3. Between 2007 and 2009, the Honours and Appointments Secretariat commissioned an independent market research company to conduct an awareness and attitudinal survey of public perceptions of the honours system. The results of the three annual surveys are summarised in Attachment 1. The main messages were:

- Awareness of the Honours system was high in 2009 at 81%.
- 71% of people were proud that the UK Honours system exists, an increase from 66% in 2007.
- The number of people agreeing that the Honours system is out-of-date showed a statistically significant reduction from 40% in 2007 to 34% in 2009.

- The majority of people (76%) agreed in 2009 that the UK Honours system is open to all.
- The number of people agreeing that the UK Honours system is a unique method of recognising the achievements of ordinary people rose from 71% in 2007 to 75% in 2009.
- The number of people agreeing that Honours are mainly awarded to people for the service they have given to the country or their community showed a statistically significant improvement from 69% in 2007 to 76% in 2009.

The surveys also highlighted some particular areas for improvement:

- Only 44% of people agreed in 2009 that the honours system is open and fair in the way it operates, although this represented a marked improvement from 39% in 2007.
- 38% of people still believed that celebrities were the most likely to receive an honour.

Depoliticisation of honours (Qs 4, 11, 12)

4. The Issues and Questions Paper rightly points out that many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. But it is less clear that this is also the public's perception, and it may be that the public's general view of politicians means that it will never be universally accepted that the honours system is free from political interference. This perception is not helped by the way the media presents the awarding of honours to those who are entirely meritorious in their own right, but who have also made donations to a political party. Such donations do not strengthen a case for an honour in any way, but neither do they preclude a candidate from receiving an award.

5. Sir Paul Ruddock has suggested that the problem could be alleviated by making public the details of the reasons for awarding the most senior honours. We agree that this has merit: **there have in fact been some occasions when the purely factual elements of an individual's citation have been released, with the individual's agreement. We therefore see some scope for releasing shortened citations for those who receive the highest honours.**

6. The creation of a new selection committee for parliamentary and political service further cements the independence of the system. Beginning with the Birthday 2012 honours round, this will consider honours recommendations for those who serve the Westminster Parliament, the Devolved Administrations and the political system more broadly, whether as politicians, officials or party workers (those involved in local government will continue to be considered by the Community, Local and Voluntary Service Honours Committee). The new committee is keen to receive as broad-based a range of nominations as possible, to cover the full range of political and parliamentary activity, including the smaller parties. As with all the other specialist selection committees, it has a majority of independent members.

Distribution of honours (Qs 5, 6)

7. We doubt whether there will ever be an honours system that satisfies everyone. One of the most frequent criticisms is that honours are given to people who are simply “doing their job”. In fact, by far the majority are given to those who are engaged in some form of voluntary work, and the re-introduction of the British Empire Medal is cementing this still further. The selection committees are particularly concerned to recognise those who have gone beyond their jobs and who put something back into society or their profession. This is particularly the case for candidates on the State Committee’s list, and a determination to reward only the truly deserving means that that Committee has not used its full allocation of honours in the Birthday 2012 round. The overall balance of honours between committees will be looked at again soon in the forthcoming Quinquennial Review. The views of PASC will be a useful input.

8. Nonetheless, we believe there are some individuals who are so pre-eminent in their profession that recognition through the honours system is merited, even if their job is all that they do. Nobel prize-winning scientists, Oscar-nominated actors, multi-medal winning Olympians, internationally-acclaimed musicians are just some examples that might fall into this category. But as a general rule, the selection committees are looking for something more.

9. In previous years, successful Olympic and Paralympic athletes have been treated as a special case (each nomination was judged on its merits, but all Olympic gold medallists at Beijing received at least an MBE). Given the move away from automaticity in other fields, this no longer seems right. The Sports Committee has therefore identified four factors that will need to be taken into account when considering the case for honours for those who do well at London 2012. A summary of its conclusions may be found at Attachment 2.

10. The only remaining area where honours are automatic is the conferring of Knighthoods or Damehoods on High Court Judges on appointment. The rationale for this arrangement is that the independence of the judiciary is critical and must be preserved. If automaticity were to end, so that honours were granted to some judges for the quality of their judicial work, and not others, that could lead to accusations of ‘honours from Government in return for the right judgements’, no matter how transparent the process. The reform of the honours system to the current independent, apolitical process has reduced the weight of this argument, but the issue remains sensitive, touching as it does on the relationship between Government and the judiciary. An independent view from PASC would therefore be very welcome. Possible options might include creating a new selection committee composed of judges (or judges and some non-judges) to determine honours for judicial service, with its own quota of honours to allocate; or to extend such a committee’s remit even further to cover all aspects of Law and Order currently handled by the Community, Voluntary and Local Service Committee, including police and prisons as well as judges.

British Empire Medal (Q9)

11. The Committee may like to know that in the current (Birthday 2012) honours round, the selection committees have considered over 400 nominations for the British Empire

Medal; about three-quarters of these were handled by the Community, Voluntary and Local Service Committee.

Philanthropy (Q10)

12. The Committee may find it useful to have the Terms of Reference for the Philanthropy Committee – see Attachment 3.

Forfeiture (Qs 13,14)

13. When PASC and Sir Hayden Phillips conducted their reviews of the honours system in 2004, they did not include forfeiture arrangements within the scope of their work. We have therefore conducted an internal review, in consultation with some of the independent chairs of the selection committees and with the current members of the Forfeiture Committee. Its conclusions may be found at Attachment 4.

14. There have been a number of forfeitures since the PASC last took evidence on the honours system. Fred Goodwin's case had the highest public profile. We cannot comment in detail on that, beyond what has been already been made public, for the usual important reasons of confidentiality. But it is worth stressing that the over-riding criterion – that of bringing the honours system into disrepute - used by the Forfeiture Committee in all these cases has not changed for many years (the history of this is given in Attachment 4) and was duly applied in Goodwin's case too.

Attachment 1: Public perceptions of the honours system 2007-2009 – key findings

Awareness of the Honours System					
Wave 1 (2007)	81%	Wave 3 (2008)	77%	Wave 4 (2009)	81%

Of those aware of the UK Honours System, the following percentages of people ‘agree strongly’ and ‘agree slightly’ with the statements:

The UK Honours system is out-of-date and should be replaced by a scheme more suited to the UK as it is today					
Wave 1 (2007)	40%	Wave 3 (2008)	37%	Wave 4 (2009)	34%

The UK Honours system is currently open to all. Everyone, from any background, can receive an award					
Wave 1 (2007)	75%	Wave 3 (2008)	73%	Wave 4 (2009)	76%

The UK Honours system is open and fair in the way that it is operated					
Wave 1 (2007)	39%	Wave 3 (2008)	47%	Wave 4 (2009)	44%

The UK Honours system is a unique method of recognising the achievements of ordinary people					
Wave 1 (2007)	71%	Wave 3 (2008)	71%	Wave 4 (2009)	75%

Honours are mainly awarded to people who deserve them for the service they have given to the country or their community					
Wave 1 (2007)	69%	Wave 3 (2008)	72%	Wave 4 (2009)	76%

I would feel very proud if I were to be nominated for a UK Honour					
Wave 1 (2007)	73%	Wave 3 (2008)	76%	Wave 4 (2009)	77%

I am proud that the UK Honours system exists					
Wave 1 (2007)	66%	Wave 3 (2008)	69%	Wave 4 (2009)	71%

Attachment 2: Sport Committee's conclusions on Olympic Honours

Honours Policy

Policy is that honours are awarded for:-

- Service
- Achievement

There should be no automatic honours, except those currently awarded to High Court Judges on appointment.

In most walks of life - businesses, the arts, local communities etc - policy has developed in recent years. Candidates must do more than their "day job".

Sporting Awards

Current practice has been for sports people to be honoured when:-

- they are about to/have retired after a long career. It has not always been thought necessary that they should be giving anything back;
- they have achieved a significant victory such as a Gold medal at the Olympics or become world champions (eg. motor racing). Achievement has often been the sole criterion;
- they have captained a winning team in major international contests/been an important player in the winning team.

Disadvantages

This gives rise to a number of anomalies and unsatisfactory outcomes, for example:-

- people have been honoured without 'giving back' either in the community, or in the development of their sport;
- people have got MBEs for an achievement which they then repeat;
- charges of automaticity;
- 'fast tracked' honours for people who have achieved an instant success/record.

Elements of a New Approach

In line with the policy applied across the other independent selection Committees, there should be no 'automatic' honours.

All selections should continue to be made entirely on merit taking into account the following four factors when assessing sporting nominations:

1. Sporting achievement/excellence.

- Taking into account the level of competition (be it within field, or when considered against historical achievement);
2. Length of Service.
- Taking into account career achievements and duration (this might lead to a silver medallist who has competed at the highest level over a long period getting an award, when an 18 year old winning gold at first competition might not);
3. Service to sport or the wider community.
- ‘Giving back’. In line with the Prime Minister’s strategic objectives, taking into account how the candidate has used their profile for the benefit of the wider community, and/or the development of sport.
 - Taking into account participation numbers.
4. Any Honours currently held.
- The first three factors should be applied especially rigorously to nominations for further awards, particularly where performance has been repeated eg a gold medallist in the same discipline in subsequent Olympic Games might merit an upgrade not four years later but later in their career.
 - This could also help to achieve parity between the Olympics and Paralympics, as single gold medallists at the Beijing Paralympics did not receive honours.

We would make it clear that these are not absolute criteria and the Sport Committee would continue to exercise its judgement when making final selections.

Benefits of this New Approach for the Olympics and Paralympics

Applying these four factors to all sporting awards would facilitate parity of approach to awards for Olympians and Paralympians that could deliver equitable proportions of awards for the Olympics and Paralympics without using an automatic formula that delivered an award for every gold medal.

It would also allow the Sport Committee to continue to honour Olympians and Paralympians as recognition is merited for career achievements and performance in other events etc. In particular, awards made at BD12 in advance of the Olympics and Paralympics could be used to demonstrate the new approach in practice.

- For example, recent awards have been made to Jessica ENNIS and Phillips IDOWU at BD11 and the Paralympians, Ann CUTCLIFFE at NY11 and Nyree LEWIS at BD09.

Attachment 3: Terms of Reference of the Philanthropy Committee

Background

The Prime Minister provides the key strategic direction to the UK honours system. He has particularly asked that the vast majority of honours go to individuals who have gone beyond excellence in playing their part to create a Big Society. He has also asked that greater prominence be given to philanthropists who are making a difference to the Big Society through a sustained personal engagement. He wants the Honours Committees to give more consideration to how our top sports stars, actors, business people etc are also using their prominence and profile for the greater good in giving back to society in any number of ways. The Philanthropy Committee has been established to ensure that such people are properly recognised and do not “slip through the net”.

Scope of the Committee

In the light of this strategic guidance, it is likely that the majority of candidates for honours will be engaged in some form of philanthropic activity. The Philanthropy Committee is not expected to review them all. It should focus instead on those who, in addition to sustained personal commitment to a charitable cause or voluntary endeavour, have also contributed a gift or gifts of significant monetary value. In each honours round, the Honours and Appointments Secretariat will provide a list of such candidates for the Philanthropy Committee to consider, comprising both those who have been recommended for honours by one or more of the specialist Honours Committees and those who have not.

Purpose of the Committee

The Philanthropy Committee’s functions will be:

- to review the levels of award proposed for philanthropists by the specialist Honours Committees;
- to consider whether any additional candidates should be recommended for honours;
- to propose to the Main Honours Committee any additions or changes in level of award.

The Philanthropy Committee will not itself have an allocation of honours for distribution, but it may want to recommend additional candidates to compete for any honours that might be available in the “pool”.

Criteria for making recommendations

Simply making a philanthropic gift does not qualify a candidate for an award: honours cannot be bought. Some or all of the following characteristics² also need to be evidenced in the citation:

² These are drawn from Annex 5 to the 2004 Review of the Honours System by Sir Hayden Phillips

- a sustained **commitment** to the body or bodies in receipt of the gift, and a thoughtful approach to such support, normally over a period of five years at least. Short term gifts which create financial problems for others are clearly unhelpful. A contribution of time, as well as money, is required for consideration for an honour.
- where a very large donation has been made, perhaps for a key project, no award should be made until there is evidence of **success** – eg a building has been completed or the project is running well.
- the activities supported should be **meritorious**, being well-selected and successfully meeting publicly recognised needs.
- there would normally be a **low-key** approach to giving – or at least giving which is not self-evidently designed to enhance the public prestige of the giver or to publicise his or her business interests.
- the source of the gift must be **legitimate** and not derived from activities which might bring the honours system into disrepute.

Governance and Membership

The Philanthropy Committee is a sub-committee of the Main Honours Committee. It is chaired by the Chair of State Committee. Its membership comprises the Chairs of those specialist Honours Committees (usually Arts and Media, Economy and CVLS) which have considered philanthropists for honours as defined above; a representative from Number 10 also attends. The Honours and Appointments Secretariat in the Cabinet Office provides administrative support and policy advice.

Attachment 4: Review of Forfeiture Policy and Processes

Summary of Recommendations

- I. The Forfeiture Committee should have a majority of independent members. It should comprise the Head of the Civil Service; the Treasury Solicitor; the chair of the specialist committee which recommended the honour to be forfeited; and two other specialist committee chairs who have no association with the case(s) under consideration. The Head of the Civil Service should remain Chair (paras 11-12).
- II. The Committee should use “bringing the honours system into disrepute” as its over-arching criterion and consider forfeitures on a case-by-case basis (para 16).
- III. The Committee should be prepared to accept written representations from the individual at risk of forfeiting an honour before it makes its final recommendation (para 17).
- IV. In all other respects, the Committee should continue with present policies and practice (para 10).

Background

1. The honours system was reformed in 2005, following a wide-ranging review led by Sir Hayden Phillips. That reform created the independent honours selection committees we have today. But the Phillips review omitted to cover the policy and processes for forfeiting honours, which were last considered by a working party chaired by Sir Charles Cunningham in 1963. This paper is intended to fill that gap.
2. Both the Phillips and Cunningham reviews were confined to honours which feature in the New Year and Birthday Honours lists: the Companion of Honour; the Order of the Bath; the Order of St Michael and St George; the Order of the British Empire; and Knights Bachelor. They did not review those Orders of Chivalry for which awards are in the personal gift of the Sovereign, nor gallantry awards or other military medals. This review covers the same ground.
3. Peerages, baronetcies and privy counsellorships are outside the honours system and similarly are not covered by this review. The Cunningham review concluded that any forfeiture cases in those categories should be handled on an *ad hoc* basis: the surrender of peerages and baronetcies requires an Act of Parliament; privy counsellors who are convicted of a criminal offence are removed from the Privy Council by an Order in Council, unless they choose to resign.

Current policy and processes

4. The proposals put forward by the Cunningham review were implemented in full and, with some minor tweaks, are still in place today (see Annex). The key elements of the current system are:

- All proposals for forfeiture of an honour are considered by the Forfeiture Committee. This is a standing sub-committee of the Main Honours Selection Committee. It is chaired by the Head of the Civil Service and its membership comprises the Cabinet Secretary; the Permanent Secretaries of the Home Office and Scottish Executive; and the Treasury Solicitor. The Head of the Honours and Appointments Secretariat acts as Secretary.
- Cases are generally brought to the attention of the Committee by the Department which made the original nomination. Such cases are usually dealt with by correspondence, though some may require a meeting of the Committee. The subject of the forfeiture proposal is not given the opportunity to make representations to the Committee.
- If the Committee agrees that forfeiture is justified, the Chair makes a recommendation to the Prime Minister, who in turn submits that recommendation to the Sovereign for approval.
- The forfeiture is then announced in the London Gazette, after the individual concerned has been given prior notice.

5. The criteria for forfeiture have evolved slightly over time. In a discussion of the Order of the British Empire in 1936, Sir Warren Fisher (the first Head of the Home Civil Service) said:

“The view we have taken is that appointments [to the Order] should usually be cancelled on conviction by a competent Court of an offence for which there had been a sentence to a term of imprisonment of something more than a nominal period, or a substantial fine has been imposed, and the offence has involved moral turpitude. Most of the cancellations have been for embezzlement, theft or some such other offence.”

6. The Cunningham review tightened this to imprisonment for three months or more, and proposed that forfeiture should follow only if one of the following criteria was also satisfied:

- “(a) the offence involves disloyalty to the State; or
- (b) the offence was committed by a civil servant and involves a serious dereliction of duty; or

(c) the offence involves such disgraceful conduct that public opinion would be likely to consider it wrong for the offender to hold a public symbol of Royal favour.”

However Cunningham also noted that:

“Forfeiture may sometimes be justified by special considerations. One instance of what we have in mind is the case of an employee of a Government department whose offence, though it may be treated leniently by the criminal Court, is nevertheless a grave one, having regard to departmental standards – for example, the theft of postal packets or the taking of a bribe. We accordingly think it right that departments should be free to submit for consideration on their merits cases in which there seem to be special reasons justifying forfeiture, even though they do not fall within the criteria set out [above].”

7. In 1994 John Major gave a wider definition in a written answer to the House of Commons:

“Cancellation is considered in cases where retention of the appointment or award would bring the honours system into disrepute. There are no set guidelines for cancellations, which are considered on a case-by-case basis.”

This was confirmed in a parliamentary answer given by Gordon Brown in early 2009.

8. The criterion of “bringing the honours system into disrepute” has been used both before and since. This was elaborated at a meeting of the Forfeiture Committee in late 2009. That meeting concluded that forfeiture was appropriate if an individual had brought the honours system into disrepute, as evidenced by having been:

- found guilty by the Courts of a criminal offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment of three months or more; or
- censured/struck off etc by the relevant professional or other Regulatory Authority for action or inaction which was directly relevant to the granting of the honour.

9. In early 2012, the Committee noted that forfeiture was not restricted to these two criteria: if there was other compelling evidence that an individual had brought the honours system into disrepute, then it was open to the Committee to consider such cases as well.

Proposals for reform

10. Where no proposals are made, I recommend that the Committee continues with its present practice.

Membership

11. The current membership of the Committee is out of line with the principles established by the Phillips review, which concluded (and the Government accepted) that the specialist selection committees should contain a majority of non-Civil Service experts in order to guarantee the committees' independence from political interference. If the same principles were to apply to the Forfeiture Committee, then a possible membership would be: the Head of the Civil Service; the Treasury Solicitor; the chair of the specialist committee which recommended the honour to be forfeited; and two other specialist committee chairs who have no association with the case(s) under consideration. If the Cabinet Secretary were also to attend, we would need to include one more specialist committee chair. I recommend that there should be a majority of independent members.

12. Given the gravity of the issues discussed by the Committee, and given that the Committee's recommendations are submitted directly to the Prime Minister, it is appropriate for the Chair of the Main Honours Committee also to be Chair of the Forfeiture Committee. I therefore recommend that the Head of the Civil Service remains Chair. An alternative option would be for the chair to be taken by one of the chairs of the specialist honours committees, who would then submit the Forfeiture Committee's recommendations to the Prime Minister via the Main Honours Committee, but this seems unnecessarily bureaucratic and could cause significant delay.

Criteria for forfeiture

13. The evolution of the criteria for forfeiture as described in paras 5-9 above suggests a tension between the wide over-arching criterion of "bringing the honours system into disrepute", which gives the Committee the maximum leeway in considering individuals on a case-by-case basis; and the narrower, specific criteria such as those recorded in para 8, which present only a very small legal risk in the event of a challenge to a Committee decision. The courts are likely to be wary of straying into the territory of the Committee's deliberations, but might be tempted in the face of a hard case based on an unfair process. If the Committee were to adopt more or wider criteria for assessing the question of disrepute, the more likely it would be that its processes would eventually come under the scrutiny of the courts. In particular, if it were to move to more subjective criteria, it would need to have some method of establishing the relevant facts. In certain circumstances, fairness might mean it had to invite the views of the person against whom forfeiture was proposed.

14. Perhaps greater than the risk of legal challenge would be the precedent created by moving from objective criteria to a more subjective test. Simply "bringing the honours system into disrepute" might capture many who have been honoured but who have since (or indeed previously) behaved disgracefully but not criminally.

15. A further issue is that the criterion of considering forfeiture if an individual has been censured or struck off by their professional body fails to capture those who might be judged guilty of misconduct but who are not members of any such body – many civil servants, for example.

16. It therefore seems right to continue to have a combination of:
- an over-arching criterion of bringing the honours system into disrepute as a result of the individual's actions;
 - the more specific under-pinning criteria described in para 8, which provide examples of how the system may have been brought into disrepute. It would be open to the Committee to add to these, on the basis of cases successfully brought before it (for example, a civil servant might not be a member of a professional body, but might nevertheless have brought the honours system into disrepute as a result of an action which led to disciplinary proceedings), to ensure equality of treatment for others who might fall into a similar category. If any of these more specific criteria are met, that would then automatically trigger consideration of forfeiture; and
 - the freedom to consider any other case where it might reasonably be argued that an individual has brought the honours system into disrepute.

I recommend that the Committee should continue to use “bringing the honours system into disrepute” as its over-arching criterion and to consider forfeitures on a case-by-case basis.

Processes

17. The appointment of a majority of independent members should help to allay concerns about the fairness of the process, particularly in cases where the more specific criteria have not been met. However, in cases where the specific criteria do not apply or where the issues are open to interpretation, an additional safeguard would be to allow written representation before a final decision is made. This is the practice adopted by the Order of St John, which allows individuals up to 28 days to make representations before a forfeiture decision is taken. I recommend that the Committee should in future be prepared to accept written representations before it makes its final recommendation.

**Head of the Honours and Appointments Secretariat
February 2012**

ANNEX TO ATTACHMENT 4

THE CUNNINGHAM REVIEW: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Our main recommendations relate to Knighthoods and lower honours granted in respect of services in civil life. There should be no distinction of practice as between Knighthoods and lower honours.

2. We think that forfeiture should be considered in all cases where conviction of an offence is followed by a substantial sentence of imprisonment – we suggest three months or more. In such cases we think that forfeiture should, as a general rule, be recommended if and only if one or other of the following criteria is also satisfied:

- (a) the offence involves disloyalty to the State; or
- (b) the offence was committed by a civil servant and involves a serious dereliction of duty; or
- (c) the offence involves such disgraceful conduct that public opinion would be likely to consider it wrong for the offender to hold a public symbol of Royal favour.

Departments should bring to notice other cases where there seem to be special reasons justifying forfeiture or about which they would like advice.

3. The honours to which the above recommendations apply without qualification are the Companion of Honour; the Order of the Bath; the Order of St Michael and St George; the Order of the British Empire; Knights Bachelor; the Imperial Service Medal; and the Civil Defence Long Service Medal.

4. The Home Office and the Scottish Home and Health Department should consult chief officers of police with a view to obtaining reports of relevant convictions. A standing sub-committee of the Main Honours Selection Committee should consider all names brought to its notice and should consult sponsoring departments.

5. Exceptions to the above recommendations are given in respect of:

- (a) honours awarded by The Queen otherwise than on the recommendation of a Minister;
- (b) civil gallantry awards;
- (c) police and fire service awards;
- (d) other civil medals.

6. Our recommendations, if adopted, should be communicated to the Service departments so that they may consider modifying their practice.

7. Our recommendations only relate to honours held by citizens of the United Kingdom. Our recommendations have been brought to the notice of the Foreign Office, the Commonwealth Relations Office and the Colonial Office.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Peter J Stephen, OStJ, MCIBS, Lord-Lieutenant City of Aberdeen (HS 24)

Further to your letter dated 16 March 2012, my response to your questions is as follows:

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British Society
Yes
2. Could the existing honours system be improved - **Yes**
- 2a Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?
Any suggestion of influencing or purchasing an honour should be wholly removed
3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level? **Could be more**
4. Many of the changes to the honours systems in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially de-politicised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?
Not wholly de-politicised – and not certain it attracts public trust
5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them? **No**
6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people? **No**
7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately? – **Be part of same process**
- 8 Do honours committees have the right membership? If no, how would you change them?
No aware of membership detail
9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?
On balance, welcome
10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?
No – but this is a minefield – so not only to wealthy people!!
11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours? **No**
12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party? **Yes**
13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?
Not sufficiently active, so No
- 14 Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeited? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained? **Clearer Rules**

In addition to the above, I would like to put forward the following observations from my Lieutenancy.

The honours system is vague and imprecise. Yes, guidance is given on what makes a good submission. However, practical experience leaves you with the conclusion that it is not clear what merits an award and what does not. The time it takes for an honour to be considered and any award to be made is far too long. What is the reasoning for this? It only adds to the mystery and lack of clear process. An honours system is always going to be subjective to some extent but the current system is so vague it can appear random and ad hoc. We have no idea why some submissions are successful and some are not. We have no idea why the process takes such a long time. This lack of transparency and absence of feedback leads to mistrust.

A lack of clarity, guidance or any real process was evident as part of the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal. It appeared rushed and badly thought out. We were asked to put forward existing current honours submissions as potential recipients. However, this is not a reasonable request as we are never given any information after submission regarding the status of a nomination. In addition, it is not clear enough what qualifies for what type of award.

I hope the foregoing is helpful.

April 2012

**Written evidence submitted by Isobel Brydie MBE, Lord-Lieutenant West Lothian (HS
25)**

Thank you for your letter of 16 March 2012 in relation to the above.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you. I have considered the terms of the consultation document and can respond to each of the questions as noted below.

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
- a. There should be more emphasis on nominations from the general public and less recognition of nominations from 'employers'.
3. Probably.
4. It is less political, but I believe there are still too many awards for doing a paid job, rather than for the volunteers.
5. No. There is too much emphasis on how a nomination form is completed, rather than what the nominee has actually done.
6. It is not reasonable that Civil Service or Diplomats have a better chance at receiving an Honour than other people, however, it is reasonable in a time of 'war' that members of the Armed Forces receive Honours.
7. It is my view that Honours for the Armed Forces should be done by separate committee.
8. N/A
9. I welcome this.
10. N/A
11. Could be made clearer.
12. Yes.
13. Yes.
14. Yes.

I hope that you find my comments useful. Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Mushtaq Ahmad OBE, Lord-Lieutenant, Lanarkshire (HS 26)

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes – Public acknowledgement and gratitude for public service is a positive force.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

a) Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

Yes – More recognition of unsung heroes and higher honours available to all members of society.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

Yes.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

The honours system is viewed as being depoliticised and there is greater trust as a result, however it is important to keep the system under review to continually build up even greater trust in the future.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

Yes – more action however could be taken to publicise the basis on which awards are made.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

Through action to more widely publicise the nomination process, this should over time ensure an appropriate balance of honours are allocated to those where there is more merit.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

Yes they should continue to be considered separately.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?

There could be less representation by senior civil servants with more members of the general public being brought into the panel.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is welcomed.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

No – Philanthropy should not be limited to financial standing only and consider other altruistic aspects, for example where people give of their time and talents for the benefit of others.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

No – and there is scope for this message to be reinforced at every opportunity.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes – the reasons for the honour should be publicly available.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

Forfeiture Committee should comprise 50% membership from non-civil servants.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

Existing guidance appears adequate.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Sir James Cropper KCVO, Lord-Lieutenant, Cumbria (HS 27)

1. Does the existence of all honours system act as a positive force in British society?

The existence of an Honours system does act as a positive tonic in British Society. The recipients, their families and the local community are all delighted when they receive Honours to recognise they are most deserving.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

- a) Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

The existing Honours system can be improved in particular the present nominations for an Honour form which is too complicated and off-putting for those filling it in. A member of my Honours Panel submitted a suggested revised form via the Lord-Lieutenants Association to the Honours Appointment Secretariat. I received a letter from the Head, Richard Tilbrook, that his and other suggestions were being incorporated into a revised form but which I am not aware as yet being produced.

The other improvement would be to change the title of the Order of the British Empire to say 'The Queen's Order for Service' or 'The Queen's Commonwealth Order'.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

No comment.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Does the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

I am not aware of any political awards being made to recipients in Cumbria and I am sure there is greater public trust now.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

On the whole, with one or two exceptions, those that deserve Honours the most in Cumbria have received them. The exceptions have been those that I have recommended as outstanding on being consulted but receiving nothing. Hopefully in the future they will get at least a BEM.

I do not know whether we get an adequate number of awards for the population of my county roughly 16 to 20 a year for a population of half a million but it has remained constant in my 17 and a half years as Lord Lieutenant.

I am not also sure whether there is as wide a knowledge of the system yet as there should be.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

No – they are all being paid for the work they do as in other professions. The Armed Forces have their separate gallantry awards to recognise their bravery.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

They should be filtered through Committees with an independent majority.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?

No comment.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

I welcome the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal but with the following changes a member of my Honours Panel has suggested to the next meeting of the Lord-Lieutenants Association to consider:

- a. A title more meaningful for the present times such as the ‘Queen’s Commonwealth Medal’ or ‘Queens Medal for Service’.
- b. A shorter and simpler nomination form than generally used for Honours nominations to enable the administration of the system to take up less civil service and local government staff time and speed up the process.

The reintroduction will hopefully enable more people on whom I have been consulted and ranked as Highly Deserving to receive awards.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

Caution needs to be exercised in giving too much weight to philanthropy where an Honour is awarded for gifts of money only to charity. The use of philanthropists’ time and talent should be a contributory factor. However philanthropists I know in Cumbria have deserved their Honours.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

Yes, Cumbria. Elsewhere, no comment.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes, this might be a good idea if it does not take too long to draft all the reasons. Maybe they should only be on a website.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

No comment.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

No comment.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Anne (M.A.G.) Dunnett, Lord-Lieutenant, Caithness (HS 28)

1. Yes.
2. Yes. (a) That the ordinary people who give so generously of their time and effort have a larger “slice of the cake” when the categories are divided out
3. Probably. Any increase would possibly dilute the value of honours
4. I am not certain that the system has been totally depoliticised.
5. It does not always seem so
6. No. They are all paid for doing the job they are employed to do. However, there will be those who perhaps deserve awards for exceptional achievement or bravery. Again the slice of the cake is too large for this category.
7. I am not familiar with the set up of these committees to enable me to comment
8. As No. 7
9. I welcome it’s reintroduction as a “special” award for the Jubilee year but am not sure whether it should continue thereafter. It seems this award is somewhat “second rate” since there is no investiture for the recipient
10. I am not in a position to comment on this as in Caithness there are not many people who are hugely wealthy and in the category of philanthropist. I would not like to think it put the wealthy in a position to contribute to charity to achieve an award.
11. If it is not clear then it ought to be
12. I have not encountered this situation but political links should not be a consideration for an award
13. I am not familiar with the nature of the Forfeiture Committee but I agree there should be one with powers to impose forfeiture.
14. Yes, and two examples in very recent times were welcomed by most people.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by the Duchess of Northumberland (HS 29)

1. Does the existence of all honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

Yes.

a) Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

There is a lack of transparency about how the system works.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

Yes.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

No. There is a need for more transparency.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

There is still a perception that it isn't fair.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

There is a separate system for armed forces and diplomats (Q7 below refers) however more transparency is needed and comprehension of the process required.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

See answer to question 6 above.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?

Honours committee members look suitable but there could be more regional representation in each section.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

Welcome the reintroduction, however consideration to be given about the name of the award e.g. 'British Citizen Medal' or introduce another award.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

On the one hand philanthropy needs to be recognised, be seen to be appreciated and awarded when appropriate but equally philanthropy shouldn't be seen as an immediate door-opener to receiving an honour.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

Whatever the policy states I don't think anyone believes this to be the case as we have all read about donors to political parties receiving honours. Politics, philanthropy and honours don't mix.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

No.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

Yes – however more transparency and understanding required.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

Yes.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Association of Lord Lieutenants (HS 30)

I am replying to your letters to a number of Lord-Lieutenants inviting them to submit evidence to your inquiry into the honours system. I hope you will understand when I say that Lord-Lieutenants are much occupied with the Queen's Diamond Jubilee at present and so some have not been able to give your request as much consideration at this time as they should have liked. This response comes to you from us corporately and follows full discussion at our recent meeting of regional Chairmen.

Lord Lieutenants are involved in the honours system in several ways. First, we each have a panel to promote nominations for honour – not to make nominations but to promote public awareness in our Lieutenancies of the facility to make a nomination for an honour. Next, we help the Honours and Appointments Secretariat in the Cabinet Office assess at a local level every nomination which cannot otherwise be allocated to a Government department, principally those for community, voluntary and local service. Last, we present awards on behalf of The Queen to those who choose not to (or cannot) travel to a Royal investiture and we will present all awards of the British Empire Medal.

We each have direct personal experience of the value of the honours system and commend it to you. We see the surprise and pleasure that appointment MBE can bring to a dedicated volunteer, their family and colleagues. It is right that the state can recognise valued contributions to our society. We also see the outstandingly high level of service which an individual needs to give to be successful. We also commend the Queen's Award for Voluntary Service which was created in 2002 as something of an MBE for local groups. We do not however see the full picture: many nominations are made by government departments rather than members of the public; and nominations which fall under a departmental remit are assessed within the relevant department without consulting us.

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes it does. It is right that The Queen should honour those who have achieved and given service to the nation; and at every level.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved? Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

The greatest single achievable change might be to make the system more agile and responsive to public nominations. For understandable reasons, it can take up to three years for a nominee to be honoured: that is too slow. It is also the case that those experienced in drafting citations have a greater chance of success than the novice: the system should be sufficiently agile to look behind an initial disparity.

There are further adjustments we could suggest. In particular, we value that the honours system is a United Kingdom system. To be fair, it needs consistent administration in each

part of the UK and central oversight: the system currently works differently in each part of the UK, which we regret.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

At MBE level, yes. Indeed, with the reintroduction of the BEM without a concurrent reduction in the number of appointments MBE, there will soon be a significant increase in the number of awards.

Although contrary to a previous report from your predecessor Committee, we value the gradation in awards and hope that knighthoods will continue. We would encourage a slightly more liberal conferral of knighthoods and, in particular, appointments to the higher levels of the various historic orders. The orders (e.g. Bath, British Empire, St Michael and St George) will die a slow death if regular appointments are not made; and that would be an undesirable loss to the tapestry of our history. Appointments could perhaps be diversified a little, i.e. for a broader range of relevant service.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

A Lord-Lieutenant is invited to observe each meeting of the Community, Voluntary and Local Service Committee. We are impressed with the administration of the system, the members of the Committee and the level of service or achievement required to be successful.

As to the Prime Minister's involvement, we would in fact prefer direct Ministerial accountability for the honours system to the covert influence which may have been evident in the recent meeting of the Honours Forfeiture Committee. We have no objection to honours for political service, so long as the awards are up-front and subject to the same levels of scrutiny and achievement as all others.

Public trust depends more on perception than on fact. Work may need to be done to produce better understanding of the process for determining who is honoured and the role and membership of the honours committees. All of this information is already in the public domain, but not well understood. We already do our part to promote in our Lieutenancies understanding of the system and, in particular, the facility for the public to nominate.

We would note that the award of a peerage is still perceived by many of the public as an honour when in fact the current and previous administrations have in practice discontinued that aspect of elevation to the peerage to focus exclusively on membership of the House of Lords as a chamber of Parliament. That was not done with clarity and work should be done to explain the purpose and different appointments processes for political, appointments commission and Prime Ministerial appointments.

We regret any knee-jerk award or removal of honour, especially in response to media clamour. In the past, it has been disappointing to see an entire sports team appointed MBE for transient success when those who have, unremunerated, given years of service have much higher hurdles to leap before they can hope of an award. We hope that any honours which follow the Olympics will be based on the same objective consideration given to other awards.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

In terms of the honours which we (in England) scrutinise for the Community, Voluntary and Local Service Committee, yes the system works fairly and well.

Nominations for honour come from two sources: members of the public and government departments. Each public nomination is sifted to the relevant department; we are only involved if the nomination does not fit under any department's umbrella. It is our sense that a departmental nomination of a nurse is more likely to succeed than a public nomination. At the higher levels (e.g. a Chief Constable) it is also our sense that those valued greatly in their own locality (and nominated for honour) might not be successful if they are either unknown to Whitehall or have had difficulty with Whitehall.

It is also our sense that a sizeable number of deserving people are never nominated. Each of us has a panel in our Lieutenancy to encourage nominations: not to make nominations direct, but to raise awareness of the ability of the public to nominate.

We readily commend the Honours and Appointments Secretariat who are refreshingly ready to leave Whitehall to come and explain the honours system across the country in our Lieutenancies. They regularly produce excellent statistics on the demographic and social nature of awards and invite us to encourage nominations in under-represented sectors (this applies to England only). We do so, but we urge that awards only ever be made to an absolute standards and not homogenised and made bland by rigid representative criteria. We regret that, on occasion, balance has been held to be more important than the quality of a nomination.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

No. This is however a regular tension in any debate about the honours system and there are arguments both ways. In recent years we have presented many awards to members of the armed services, from campaign medals, through MBEs to gallantry awards. Each was deserved. Successive Lord Chancellors have argued that the quality of the candidates for the judiciary will reduce if new High Court Judges cease to be appointed Knights and Dames without an increase in salary; the same argument can be extended to the civil and diplomatic services. To this debate should be added the appointment of drama, music and sporting celebrities for their professional success as opposed to other service or achievement. Individuals should not be honoured for doing their job, but for service and excellence.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, we suggest that much of the tension could be reduced if awards to members of the public were to be separated from awards for state service, both in terms of the order of appointment (e.g. British Empire/St Michael and St George) and indeed the days of the announcements. The knighting of judges attracts little public criticism because it happens ad hoc throughout the year and not as part of the Birthday or New Year honours. Perhaps state awards, at least at senior level, might be made ad hoc and in different orders from awards for non-state service.

Public understanding of the honours system is an ingredient in this question. To the list of civil servants, diplomats and soldiers needs to be added the large organisations and charities who are experienced at making nominations and skilled at honing citations. The Community, Voluntary and Local Service Committee copes with variations in the quality of submission as best it can, but can only react to the volume of nominations received.

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

We have no comment to offer.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?

Yes they do, but public awareness of the membership is slight.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

We greatly welcome the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal (or a comparable award) so that those who have given sustained, hand-on service to the community but fall below the outstanding level of service required for appointment MBE might once again be honoured. When the award of the BEM was discontinued, the number of former BEM awards was added to the total number of MBE awards. Initially, candidates for the MBE who might previously have been awarded their BEM were marked MBE(X) and considered separately. The standard of achievement/service required for appointment MBE has however steadily crept up so that, in our minds, it is almost inconceivable that a candidate who would have been a strong BEM candidate would today succeed with an MBE nomination. The result is that, until this year's Diamond Jubilee revival of the BEM, an important swathe of service was going unrecognised.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

Philanthropy is to be welcomed and encouraged: the UK remains far behind the USA in terms of the scale and spread of philanthropy. The OED defines philanthropy as "the disposition or active effort to promote the happiness and well-being of others; practical benevolence": it applies to both service and to money. In terms of honouring philanthropists, we would observe that i) the existing system can already honour philanthropists and

exceptional candidates can already be brought to the attention of the Honours and Appointments Secretariat; ii) many philanthropists are unostentatious and do not seek recognition beyond the success of their philanthropy; iii) it is the contribution which should be honoured, not just the ability to give; and iv) it would be helpful if policy in this area were consistent: to seek to honour philanthropists while at the same time changing gift aid rules (of great benefit to charities) could be read as contradictory.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

We have no comment to offer.

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

It would be benefit of the system if the short citations were a little longer and more specific.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

The honours system should operate apolitically and consistently. The removal of an award should only be done in an objective and consistent manner and certainly not in response to media clamour. The Honours Forfeiture Committee might benefit from an independent member, free from political influence, such as a serving Lord Justice of Appeal.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

The rules are already clear: it appears to us that they may of late have been misapplied. We regret that different rules apply to honours than to the peerage and membership of the House of Lords.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Dame Janet Trotter (HS 31)

Thank you for your invitation to respond to the inquiry into the operation of the Honours System in the UK.

An issue which you have not raised is the matter of the naming of the awards which is worthy of reconsideration. Officer/Member of the British Empire can be ridiculed: variations on “Queen’s medal for service” would probably sit more comfortably.

Please accept my general response as attached.

1. Does the existence of an honours system act as a positive force in British society?

Yes publication of the criteria and the process would enhance public understanding. I awarded an MBE to an 82 year old last week who was too ill to travel to London/Windsor. 130 members of the local community were present and there was a real sense of individual celebration and community support. This is when the system seems to be recognised as exceptionally worthwhile.

2. Could the existing honours system be improved?

a) Is there one change that would make the greatest positive difference?

More public information.

3. Is the number of honours awarded capped at the right level?

Yes – but I would like the BEM to be widely available for community contribution.

4. Many of the changes to the honours system in the last fifteen years have aimed to remove politics from it. Is the honours system now essentially depoliticised, and does it attract greater public trust as a result?

Yes – but, as noted above, more should be done to help people understand the system.

5. Are honours awarded in a fair and even-handed way to those who most deserve them?

Generally, yes. The seeking of additional information when panels are in doubt is very valuable.

I have just investigated the case of an 88 year old nominated by her sister. Unfortunately many of the claims in the citation are inaccurate which reinforces the current approach.

The ‘silo’ concept of sub-committees, however, does not help some worthy individuals e.g. health worker being nominated for educational work in schools.

6. Is it reasonable that civil servants, diplomats and those in the armed forces have a better chance of getting an honour than other people?

No, not unless they are outstanding. My own bias would be to those who have contributed fully to their communities.

Will armed forces awards decrease in line with personnel reductions?

7. Should recommendations for honours for the Diplomatic Service and Defence form part of the same process as other honours, being filtered through committees with an independent majority, or should they continue to be considered separately?

The process should be the same for all to ensure comparability. There needs to be a sense of 'going the extra mile' rather than being honoured for the job a person is paid to do.

8. Do honours committees have the right membership? if no, how would you change them?

Yes. Transparency and independence are essential but if more can be done to incorporate Nolan principles further they should be adopted.

9. Do you welcome or regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal?

I greatly welcome the re introduction of the BEM for two reasons:

i) it widens the net to more individuals who contribute to their local communities.

ii) the award of BEMs locally will encourage more nominations and more ownership of the Honours system as a whole.

10. Does the honours system currently give an appropriate weight to philanthropy?

Significant donors of money should be honoured in the same way as significant donors of time and energy. More emphasis should not be placed on philanthropy than other aspects: this would bring the system into disrepute and be available only to a particular elite.

11. Is it sufficiently clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours?

No (see below).

12. Is there more that should be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour, especially where they have financial links to a political party?

Yes. I was interested in the case noted in 1 above that the citation was full and detailed. The citation is not necessarily in the public domain for most people and if it was published this could give a clearer idea of what is being honoured.

Certainly those with financial links to a political party should have the reasons for the award published – also celebrities. Too many awards to the latter has the capacity to devalue awards.

13. Is the Honours Forfeiture Committee an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have been previously awarded?

I would agree that the HFC should comprise similar sorts of people as for the original Honours Panel and not just Civil Servants. It should be a Standing Committee and have some continuity of life and membership over time. This would give it greater credibility which is necessary. At the moment it seems that it is formed in a rush when an emergency/public pressure arises.

14. Are clearer rules needed on when honours should be forfeit? Or should a greater element of judgement be entertained?

I am in favour of letting the system take the strain and for consistent judgement to be exercised over time. Rules and processes which are open to scrutiny should be adopted.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by John Lidstone (HS 32)

It is eight years since the PASC's Report '*A Matter of Honour: Reforming the Honours System*' was published in 2004. In view of this I thought that you may like to know whether my views have changed, softened or hardened since I gave my expert evidence in February 2004.

I still believe that we should have an honours system to recognise and award just two categories of men and women: those who have done signal acts beyond their job and duty and those who have shown outstanding heroism in military or civilian life, no one else. It follows from this assumption, that the number of such people honoured would probably be less than the number now listed twice a year.

The 'update' I added to the Churchill 1998 Lecture 'Reforming The Honours System' in March 2007 has been circulated to you. This summarises my assessment of the PASC's first Report. But I should like to add a number of comments that have arisen since in talks, articles and broadcast interviews I have undertaken since that time.

The Report was never debated in the House of Commons so that MPs could express their views on the recommendations made in it. Just two seem to have been approved, changes in the composition of the eight sub-committees who review recommendations for honours. And the other, put forward by John Major for some sort of pin or badge that people who have been honoured could wear. But he said in his evidence: 'this Companion of Honour would not wear it'.

He added that he was content to have the CH for his work in the Northern Ireland peace process and would not be taking a former prime Minister's ration of honours, the Garter and a peerage. In 2005 a year on he had a Pauline conversion from saying he did not believe in automaticity and took the first half being dubbed a Knight of the Most Order of the Garter! The second half of his ration, a hereditary earldom will probably be accepted in due course. No wonder we do not believe anything a politician says.

Why was the Report never debated? In the absence of any explanation, I can only assume that Tony Blair kicked it into the long grass so that he could continue to sell honours for secret loans and donations to fund the 2005 Labour Party Election Fund. Accepting the recommendation that knighthoods should be phased out would have prevented him from continuing to milk the system.

In my original evidence I said that a Royal Commission should replace the eight sub-committees so that it was free from political influence of politicians and the Prime Minister. Instead we have eight sub-committees composed of the multi-honoured and a liberal sprinkling of Senior Civil Servants.

Here are the numbers of honours held by these sub-committee members so that you can compare the original committees with the present ones. In the first tranche of appointments to the eight sub-committees, 84 members between them had 84 honours many going with their jobs and not for any outstanding or meritorious reasons.

Taking my figures from the lists of present sub-committee members, the total number of is 84; between them they share 102 honours again many appearing to go with the jobs they do. There is an exception; the large number of honours shared by the members of the Sports sub-committee.

Whilst on this particular subject, the award of honours to those who compete in the Olympic Games is ridiculous. In a recent broadcast I was asked what honour Chris Hoy would get if he wins one or more Gold Medals at the London Olympics? Since he already has been knighted presumably a life peerage! For anyone competing in the Games the award of a Gold medal is a sufficient honour. It needs no national top up.

I have found throughout the country widespread ridicule for the honours heaped on sports men and women, journalists, actors and television performers and people in the professions and business. These groups of people earn huge sums of money can be honoured by their own particular profession or body. Actors and television presenters have the British Academy of Film and Television Arts (BAFTA), the Olivier Award, Emmies, Oscars etc. The law makes provision for people to be elected benchers, business people can become fellows of their specialisms, others be elected to City of London Livery Companies.

The Report's proposed that members of the public could apply to selected to sit on one of the sub-committees. In view of the time and study I have given to our dishonourable system, I decided to test this proposal by sending in an application in line with my comments that those who have no honours could bring a more objective view to those recommended for one. I was given no explanation why I was not considered. I imagine the sub-committee did not want any grit in their particular oysters! Or the fact that I had told the PASC Inquiry that I had refused an honour and was disgusted at having one dangled before me to try and persuade me to take the chair of a regional hospital authority.

Concerning my contention about who should be given honours; when those in the armed forces or in civilian life are awarded say the Military Cross or the George Cross, published citations run to at least 150 words and sometimes more. We can read about their deeds of valour, courage, or acts beyond their job or duty. And say 'yes', 'yes'

Those who get knighthoods like Fred Goodwin who has now been stripped of his, the citation read: '*For services to banking*'. All the honours are followed by equally brief citations in the bi-annual honours lists. Is it any wonder that the general public has become so cynical about why people are given them!

Recommendations were made that there should in future be no automatic honours given to men and women in the Armed Forces, the Diplomatic Service, the judiciary or in the Civil Service. Yet knighthoods continue to be awarded to Army Generals, Permanent Secretaries, ambassadors, life peerages and knighthoods to judges. Why?

Another puzzling refinement to the operation of the honours system has been the guidance to sub-committees to include more women and at least 7 per cent from ethnic minorities. Why stop there? The human beings considered could be made up like a bag of liquorice all sorts; agnostics, humanists, gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, atheists, muslims, members of the peoples revolutionary party et al. The permutations are endless.

Finally there is the issue of how political parties are to be funded and whether the general public through taxation should bear the cost. Press reports reveal that the Conservative Party continues to give life peerages in exchange for large financial contributions and payment for access to a minister. No doubt the other political parties are doing the same.

One person in an audience I addressed earlier this year made this cynical comment: 'You have argued well the case for cleansing the honours system. Why don't we just accept that it is corrupt and adopt the American way of doing things in preference to everyone having to pay for it. Publish a tariff like Lloyd George and every British Prime has used ever since and the Americans do quite openly. In addition to the cost of a life peerage, baronetcy, knighthood, et al, there are plenty of other opportunities to exploit. Afternoon tea has become very popular and people now pay a lot of money to take it at places like the Ritz in London. Having it at Buckingham Palace Garden parties could prove a big money spinner'.

To my surprise there was great applause for this suggestion from the 260 men and women at this meeting in one of the most conservative of towns, Wallingford in Oxfordshire.

It underlines nationwide contempt for our parliament, its members in every party political party and the operation of the honours system. The exposure of MP expenses scandals by The Daily Telegraph has strengthened this disgust.

May 2012

Written evidence submitted by SJ Warrilow MBE (Military) (HS 33)

To correct the honours system is a mammoth task due to the class divisions in British Society. We are a class ridden society. More so in the Armed Forces and the Civil Service. Automatic honours for top people in the Forces and the Civil Service are a disgrace. Fairness does not exist. The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is a reintroduction of a class division by the elite “septic circle”. Public trust in the honours system is low-low. Fairness does not exist. The Committees are “stacked with the elite septic circle”. Honours Committees do not have the right membership. Will this be allowed to change? Prime Ministers should not provide “strategic direction” to the Honours Committee. It is not clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours. The honours system currently gives an appropriate weight to philanthropy. The BEM is known as the peasants award, British Empire Medal.

Answers:

1. The existence of a honours system acts as a positive force in British Society. Although the “old guard” the elite or “septic circle” claim it for their own.
2. The existing honours system would be improved if the present Committee Members were not admitted to the Committees. The “elite” is in control.
3. The number of honours is capped at the right level.
4. The honours system is not essentially depoliticised and does not attract greater public interest. It is still elitist and socially divided by class.
5. Honours are not awarded fairly. The class divider operates. Knights and Peasants as the special forces say.
6. It is not reasonable or fair that civil servants, diplomats have a better chance of getting honours than others. Armed Forces need to be treated fairly. A general need not be automatically awarded an award.
7. Recommendations for the diplomatic services and Defence should not be considered separately.
8. Honours Committees do not have the right membership. Members should be from a cross section of the British population not from the controlling “elite” that gets more powerful with the public schools “power elite”.
9. I regret the reintroduction of the British Empire Medal “The Peasants medal”. Probably the PM D. Cameron’s idea.
10. The honours system currently gives more weight to philanthropy than it should. No individual should be allowed to hold a place in Government by purchase. This is allowed at present.
11. It is not clear that political donations play a part in decisions to award honours. We have “purchases” in our Governments.
12. More can be done to explain why a person has been awarded an honour especially where financial links to a political party exist. This should be made public.

13. At present the honours Forfeiture Committee is not an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people. The present Committee is suspect by “elitist” some active action. The Committee is suspect and not trusted by the public. The British way of life and expected standards should be paramount.
14. To examine the operation of the honours system, the British obsession with class must be acknowledged. The status points of power and authority are in the hands of an “elite” that depends on support from the “elite” capable or otherwise. This circle will defend the present procedures against all corners. Progress is ignored. John Major in 1992 said the British Empire Medal symbolised social division within the honours system, now Cameron the PM supports the class division. A rich donor need not or should be awarded a knighthood in fact he could be excluded from a knighthood but honoured by other awards. No individual should join a government by payment in donation. We have members of the House of Lords because of payment. If the honours system had been fair, Goodwin would not have been knighted. A good example of the “elite” protecting the elite is the Institute of Directors warning the politicians of creating “anti business hysteria” and turning round the action the Goodwin of “none approval of someone” withholds criminal conduct politicises the honours system. The action helped the honours system.
15. I have studied the honours system since 1968 and I fully expect my letter to the Public Administration Select Committee will be read if decided by what is seen as the “power elite” but I feel sure some value may be used.

4 April 2012

16. The existence of an honours system is a positive force in British society but the public in general believe a “septic circle” exists who decide the honoured are individuals who are deemed to be acceptable to the “septic circle” members. Eg. Products of public schools, have influential friends of an expected layer of society, chums of the people who have taken over the honours list, greedy developers etc.
17. The existing honours system could be improved by more workers, less shirkers. Class divisions banned. A change that would make the greatest positive difference would be to remove the power from the existing entrenched political manipulation, quite a battle.
18. I believe the numbers of honours awarded would be at the right level if the newly revised MBEs removed again. The MBE was looked upon as divisive act of the “great and the good” to insert more class dividers into the system. To revive it was Cameron’s idea to water down John Major’s improvement of a more fair honours list. John Major did a great service to the nation in general and the armed services in particular. Crosses for officers, medals for rankers except for the machinations of the officer corps. To keep certain decorations for the officers, eg. the DSO plus others.
19. The aim to remove politics from the honours system was obstructed by the “septic circle”, the power elite. The honours system is not essentially depoliticised and does not attract

greater public trust. We allow individuals in the Lords to take part in government without being elected. English law needs to be just and fair. These inserts are not just or fair.

20. Honours are not awarded in a fair and even handed way to those who most deserve them, eg. A general is dubbed with a sword because he is a general. A real officer by ability, a warrant officer is awarded a MBE (Military). Fairness does not exist or even handled operation. I doubt if any warrant officers have been awarded OBE? CBE? KBE?
21. It is not reasonable that anyone is awarded an honour automatically. It is not reasonable or fair that civil servants, diplomats should be in a better position to be awarded an honour than others. In the case of the armed forces, where the members sign on to do on die, a better chance of an honour should exist. How many civil servants, diplomats put their lives at risk? In the society/media of today we hear of people in the front line. The only individuals in the front line are the armed forces. The defence of the realm is paramount.
22. Recommendations for honours for the diplomatic service and MOD should form part of the same process as other honours being filtered through Committees with an Independent majority, not to be considered separately, not using the present Committees who are suspect, act independent. A clean “sweep” of the Committee Members is needed. Contamination exists at present.
23. Honours Committees cannot have the right membership because of the lack of fairness or just procedures in British Society. I would change it by stopping the elite(s) of British Society hogging the power centres and ensuring the “chums” and public school types do not recruit their own.
24. The reintroduction of the British Empire Medal is an idea to reintroduction of the class system within the honours “grades” possibly by the present Prime Minister Cameron.
25. The honours system gives more than an appropriate weight to philanthropy , an obscene weight, a purchase of a “badge of honour”.
26. It is not clear that party political donations play no part in decisions to award honours. Realistic monitor action has not been carried out by governments since world war 2 regarding decisions.
27. The electorate at large has been kept out of the decision making by the “septic circle”, the elite”. We have purchasers sitting in the House of Lords and so in Govt.
28. Where a person has been awarded an honour and they have a link with the financial aspects of a political party. Full publication should be carried out to explain to the public the whole procedures and reasons for the action taken.
29. At present the honours forfeiture committee is not an appropriate forum for taking decisions on removing honours from people to whom they have previously been awarded. The committee is weak and does not represent the electorate.
30. Clearer rules are needed on when honours should be forfeit. Fred Goodwin was not alone regards the forfeit position. Others should have been deprived of their honours too. We

have people with honours who act greedy self seeking and a danger to the security at the realm, e.g. not paying taxes due to devices dreamed up by the elite not paying taxes due endangers the realm by depriving the Treasury of rightful income. A kind of sabotage.

31. I find the whole honours system a shambles operated by and for a selected elite, selected by the elite.
32. I hope my papers are of value.
33. To revise the honours list to a list of honours, honesty, trust selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness and leadership. We need a cross section of the community, not a cabal of “chums”. The action will be difficult due to the fall in principles, culture and honesty in our present society.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by The Prime Minister (HS 34)

I am writing to let you know about the improvements we are making to the process for considering honours for MPs Parliamentary staff.

You will recall that the previous Government had a policy of not recommending honours for political service, although some individuals were honoured for services to Parliament. The Government believes that this policy was wrong. There are many people in politics who demonstrate selfless commitment for the good of the nation. It is right to recognise the best of them.

A new honours committee – the Parliamentary Honours Committee – is therefore being established. As well as considering candidates for honours from the Westminster Parliament, it will also consider recommendations for members of the Devolved Legislatures. And it will consider recommendations for honours for the staffs of the Westminster and other Assemblies, the staffs of bodies which report to them, such as the National Audit Office and the Ombudsmen, and Party workers.

I am glad to say that Lord Spicer of Cropthorne has agreed to Chair the new Committee. Other members will be the three Commons Chief Whips of the major parties and four independents: Baroness Hayman, Lord Butler, Dame Mary Keegan and Peter Riddell. The membership has been chosen to include a balance of party members and those who do not have known party allegiances but have a good awareness of Parliament and Parliamentary processes. Because there has been insufficient time, it has not been possible to select these independent members by the normal process of open advertising and written application in line with Nolan procedures. But the intention is that when further appointments are to be made, they will be carried out using the normal processes for selecting honours committee members. The full list of names will be published on the Government Portal (www.direct.gov.uk/honours).

The new Committee is being established for the Birthday 2012 Honours round. As with all the specialist Honours Committees, its recommendations will be subject to the agreement of the Main Honours Committee, chaired by the Head of the Home Civil Service.

March 2012

Correspondence between Mr Bernard Jenkin and Sir Bob Kerslake (HS 35)

Letter from Mr Bernard Jenkin to the Prime Minister dated 26 March 2012

Thank you for your letter of 19 March to inform me about the new Parliamentary Honours Committee. I have shared your letter with fellow Members of the Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) and we have had some initial discussion about the matter.

Without having previously considered the system by which honours for Parliament might operate, we broadly welcome the principle of establishing of a new Honours Committee specifically for parliamentary and related service.

As you may know, PASC is currently investigating the operation of the honours system and we will include consideration of this new arrangement in our inquiry. I do not expect us to consider a draft report until after the Birthday Honours List has been announced, so we will be able to comment in the light of its initial period of operation. I imagine that you may have set this up at speed, so that it can be operational in time for the current honours round. In the meantime, noting your comments about the membership of the committee, we hope we can regard this as an interim measure, pending broader consultation.

To assist us with our inquiry, I wonder if you could explain a little more about the origins of this idea, inter alia:

- What representations you received, and from whom, suggesting that the process for considering honours for MPs and parliamentary staff should be changed?
- Whether there will be annual quotas for the new parliamentary honours committee at each level from Dame/Knight to BEM, and how will this affect the quotas available to the other specialist honours committees?

It would be most helpful if we could have your response by Wednesday 18 April.

Letter from Sir Bob Kerslake to Mr Bernard Jenkin

Thank you for your letter of 26 March asking for further details about this new Committee. The Prime Minister has seen your letter and has asked me to respond on his behalf as Chair of the Main Honours Committee.

In response to your first question, the Committee was not established as a result of any particular representations. It was more to bring the consideration of nominations for those who have given outstanding parliamentary or political service into line with the rest of the honours system, using a dedicated committee with a majority of independent members. In the last honours round, these cases were considered by the Philanthropy and State Committees, in the absence of a committee set up for the purpose (you may recall that 3

Knight/Damehoods were awarded to MPs, alongside a number of lower level honours). We now have a much better process.

The annual quota for the new Committee will be set by the Quinquennial Review of honours, which is due to begin later this year. In the meantime, it has been given an allocation of 4 Kt/DBEs, 4 CBEs, 6 OBEs, 9 MBEs and 2 BEMs for distribution in each honours round. This does not affect the quotas available to the other committees: in previous rounds, committees have been allowed to “overbid”, in anticipation of the fact that there are always a number of refusals or deaths before the list is published. From the current round, we have stopped overbidding in order to create the allocation for the new committee.

April 2012

Written evidence submitted by Richard Tilbrook (HS 36)

I will be attending the Select Committee on 22 May to give oral evidence to the inquiry into the Honours System, and I wanted, in advance, to provide a clarification regarding the proportion of honours awarded to people from a black and minority ethnic (BME) background in the New Year's Honours List 2012 (NY 12).

The Government's written submission of 13 April included a figure of 11% BME recipients at NY 12. This figure correctly reports the proportion of BME recipients as identified by the nominator, either a member of the public or government department. However, the proportion of BME recipients as determined by the recipients themselves, now looks to be less. Having now had the opportunity to collate the results of our ethnicity questionnaires sent out to the recipients of honours at NY12, the proportion of recipients from a BME background calculated in this way comes out closer to 7% which is more in line with the representation seen in previous recent honours lists. This may in part be due to the fact that not all recipients are prepared to declare their ethnicity, so a lower figure might be expected: I suspect the true figure is something between the two. But given the disparity between the two figures, I thought it best to advise you at the earliest opportunity.

May 2012

Written evidence submitted by Association of Lord Lieutenants (HS 37)

In the course of your recent evidence session with the Lord Lieutenants of Cheshire and East Lothian, questions arose about the process for appointing Lord-Lieutenants. While outside the scope of your current inquiry into honours, I thought I would write to attempt to dispel some of the uncertainty arising from the session.

Lord lieutenants are appointed by the Queen on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, traditionally acting apolitically. The Prime Minister is in turn advised by his Secretary for Appointments, who is also the Head of the Honours and Appointments Secretariat in the Cabinet Office.

While it is not for me or any of the incumbent Lord-Lieutenants to defend the process (because it is a matter for Government alone), there is perhaps not as much mystery as was suggested during the evidence session. The Government published a protocol on the appointment of Lord-Lieutenants in July 2009. I enclose a copy and it is available online. The Government published the protocol in response to a report from the House of Commons Justice Select Committee.

Lord-Lieutenants themselves are careful to be apolitical in their counties and do not take part there in political activities. The national stage has always been considered differently. For example, those few Lord-Lieutenants who remain members of the House of Lords (which excludes me) may take a party whip. Similarly, several of my current and former colleagues have moved successfully from high national office to that of Lord-Lieutenant. I would say that the character of each individual has always been one which commands wide respect in the county, which I suspect any Prime Minister would consider an important attribute for appointment.

Your session also touched on our role. Last year, the Association and Secretary for Appointments agreed a short note on the role of a Lord-Lieutenant to assist those consulted in a county on the appointment and to give potential candidates some indication of the commitment involved. I enclose a copy for the information of the Committee.

In my original written evidence to you, I welcomed on behalf of the Association the revival of the award of the British Empire Medal; I am pleased here to be able to confirm the Association's strong support for that decision. Any question of the name of the Order is a matter for the Government and the Queen, not for us. As set out in my original letter, we are delighted that the state now again has a mechanism to recognise service which in recent years has gone unrecognised.

May 2012

Written Evidence submitted by Lord Spicer (HS38)

Background

Democracy is a defining characteristic of our country. Those who play a part in it, as elected representatives and volunteers or as officials, are to be applauded and encouraged. The bestowing of honours is one way of doing so. In recent years, and following the reforms to the UK honours system in 2005, candidates for political honours have been considered for honours through the independent Committee process, most recently via a sub-group of the Main Honours Committee.

The establishment of the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee now further cements the independence of the process, and offers an opportunity to increase transparency and public trust in the system, by putting arrangements on a more formal footing. Its creation ensures that nominations of individuals within this category will receive full and objective scrutiny.

In keeping with all other awards on the Prime Minister's List, the Committee will make recommendations to the Main Honours Committee, chaired by Sir Bob Kerslake, where the final Honours List is agreed for submission by the Prime Minister to The Queen for Her Majesty's approval.

We expect that the Committee will consider a broad range of candidates for honours from the Westminster Parliament and the devolved legislatures, the staffs of those bodies which report directly to them, and voluntary workers and staff of the political parties. I hope that MEPs will shortly be added to this list.

The Prime Minister laid a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) before Parliament on 17 May 2012 regarding the formation of the Committee and I attach this as Annex One by way of further background. The WMS also sets out in full the membership of the Committee.

Terms of Reference

At the first meeting of the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee, to consider candidates for The Birthday Honours List 2012, members of the Committee agreed a formal Terms of Reference, a copy of which I attach as Annex Two.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the criteria that have been agreed for recommending awards. These are entirely consistent with the criteria applied by each of the other eight independent Honours Selection Committees that make recommendations to the Main Honours Committee. There are no longer automatic awards in the UK Honours System, with the current exception of High Court Judges, and the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee will consider all citations received on merit. The Committee is not under an obligation to achieve political, or regional, balance and the full allocation of awards may not be used if there are insufficient meritorious candidates for a particular honours round. The content of citations will therefore be important in the future.

Nominations

The Committee would like to draw in a wide range of candidates for honours.

In an open system, members of the general public can, and do, make nominations for people in politics. These recommendations will be considered by the Committee on merit alongside all other nominations.

Nominations will therefore reach the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee via a number of routes. In each honours round, the Committee will consider candidates who have been recommended for honours by one of the political parties, the Westminster and other Assemblies, or through the public nominations route.

The Queen's Birthday 2012

The Committee assessed each candidate on merit against the agreed criteria.

All the recommendations made by the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee were made unanimously.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background - Process for Honours selection

The process for Honours selection is transparent and robust; all nominations are considered by one of nine expert Honours Committees, each chaired by a non-civil service chair and comprising a majority of non-civil service members.

Once the selections have been made by each Committee, the Chairs take their recommendations to the Main Honours Committee and agree the final List for submission by the Prime Minister to The Queen for Her Majesty's approval.

The composition of each Honours List reflects the strategic guidance given by the Prime Minister. He has asked that the system should prioritise people who are making a real contribution, particularly in their local community, to build the Big Society, and that particular attention is paid to candidates who are philanthropists, and who are making a sustained and personal contribution.

Scope of the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee

The Prime Minister would also like the UK Honours system to recognise the best of the many people in politics who demonstrate selfless commitment for the good of the nation. Until the mid-1990s, it was customary for there to be four or five Knights or Dames (normally Conservative) in each honours round. This practice was not continued by the Labour Party, although one or two Members, such as Gerald Kaufman, were knighted for Services to Parliament.

The Parliamentary and Political Service Honours Committee has therefore been established to consider candidates for honours from the Westminster Parliament, members of the Devolved Legislatures, the staffs of the Westminster and other Assemblies, the staffs of bodies which report to them (currently the National Audit Office; the Ombudsmen; the Electoral Commission; and the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority), and Party workers.

Councillors and others working for local government are considered by the CVLS Committee, though Party workers who are also local councillors will be seen by both Committees

In each honours round, the Honours and Appointments Secretariat will provide a list of such candidates for the Parliamentary Committee to consider, comprising both those who have been recommended for honours by one of the political parties, the Westminster and other Assemblies, and those candidates within the scope of the Committee put forward through the public nominations route.

It may be the case that a particular candidate has made a donation to a political party. This will be in the public domain on the Electoral Commission website. To ensure transparency, all the honours committees are made aware of any candidates for honours who have made a political donation. It is important to note that donating to a political party will not strengthen a case for an honour in any way, but neither will it preclude a candidate from receiving an award.

Purpose of the Committee

The Parliamentary and Political Service Committee's functions will be:

- to review the citations submitted to the Committee for the New Year and The Queen's Birthday and to review the proposed levels of award;
- to recommend awards to the Main Honours Selection Committee within the allocations set out below;
- to consider whether any additional candidates should be recommended for honours; citations would then be prepared for consideration on merit, and in the usual way, for a future honours round.

The Clerks of Parliament and the Devolved Administrations will be encouraged to obtain citations for the staff of those bodies. The three Commons Whips will put forward citations for members of their own Parties, the smaller Parties and Party workers.

Allocation

Each specialist honours Committee has an allocation which is set by the Quinquennial Review of honours (the next one is due in 2013). These allocations are decided according to the size of the relevant workforce: so the Education Committee, for example, has an allocation of honours proportionate to the overall size of the workforce employed in that field.

If we were to have adopted a similar approach for the Parliamentary and Political Service Honours Committee, the allocation would have been tiny. We have therefore agreed the allocation for the Parliamentary and Political Service Committee based on precedent as a more sensible alternative.

The Parliamentary Committee will therefore have the following allocation of honours for distribution in each honours round:

Kt/DBE: 4 awards

CBE: 4 awards

OBE: 6 awards

MBE: 9 awards

BEM: 2 awards

The Committee will also be able to recommend additional candidates to compete for honours available in the flexible “pool” allocation at K/D and CBE level at the Main Honours Committee. At the present time there are 4.5 K/D (9 each calendar year) and 5 CBE “pool” spaces available at Main Committee each round.

Criteria for recommending awards

All the citations received by the Committee will be considered entirely on merit. This might mean that some political parties, or Assemblies, will receive no honours at all in some rounds. The Committee should not feel under an obligation to achieve a political or regional balance, though it may wish to do so once it has decided which candidates merit an award (the three Commons Whips will decide on priorities within their Parties). If there are insufficient meritorious candidates for a particular honours round, it is possible that the full allocation may not be used.

In broad terms, the Committee will recommend awarding Honours to people who:-

- have changed things, with an emphasis on achievement, or
- have delivered in a way which has brought distinction, or
- exemplify the best in sustained and selfless voluntary service, or
- have demonstrated innovation and entrepreneurship, or
- carry the respect of their peers, or
- have shown sustained achievement against the odds requiring moral courage.

For meritorious candidates, the Committee will make decisions as to the appropriate level of award based on the following criteria:

- **Knight/Dame**

A pre-eminent contribution in any field of activity (usually, but not exclusively, at national level), or in a capacity which will be recognised by peer groups as inspirational and significant nationally and demonstrates sustained commitment.

Key factors:

- Pre-eminent and sustained contribution.
- Recognised by peer groups as inspirational.
- Impact of contribution felt at a national level.

- **CBE**

A prominent national role of a lesser degree, a conspicuous leading role in regional affairs through achievement or service to the community, or a highly distinguished, innovative contribution in his or her area of activity. Key factors:

- Achievement or service in a leading role at a regional level.
- Highly distinguished and innovative contribution of wide impact.

- **OBE**

Distinguished regional or county-wide role in any field, through achievement or service to the community including notable practitioners known nationally.

Key factors:

- Regional or county-wide role.
- Impact of contribution felt by a significant number of people or across a broad geographical area.

- **MBE**

Achievement or service in and to the community which is outstanding in its field and has delivered sustained and real impact which stands out as an example to others. Key factors:

- Outstanding achievement or service
- Sustained contribution
- Real impact
- Local role model.

- **BEM**

Achievement or contribution of a very “hands-on” service to the community in a local geographical area. This might take the form of sustained commitment in support of very local charitable and/or voluntary activity; or innovative work that has delivered real impact but that is relatively short (three to four years) in duration. Key factors:

- Sustained, local contribution, or
- Innovative, high impact work of a relatively short duration.

At all levels, awards illuminate areas of dedicated service which merit public recognition.

A list of Honours awarded to MPs since New Year 1990 is attached as Annex One. Members of the Committee may find this information helpful in terms of the precedent when assessing levels of awards.

Governance and Membership

The Parliamentary and Political Service Committee is chaired by Lord Spicer. Its membership consists of the three Commons Chief Whips and at least four independent members; a representative from Number 10 also attends. Members are appointed for an initial term of four years.

The Committee is one of the nine independent Honours Committees that report to the Main Honours Committee chaired by Sir Bob Kerslake, the Head of the Home Civil Service.

The Honours and Appointments Secretariat in the Cabinet Office provides administrative support and policy advice.

Honours and Appointments Secretariat, March 2012

**HONOURS TO MPs IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S LIST
BREAKDOWN OF AWARDS SINCE 1990**

	Con	L/D	Lab	Other	Total
NY2005 to NY2012	3	3	3	0	9
NY2000 to BD2004	3	3	2	0	8
NY1995 to BD1999	16	0	2	1	19
NY1990 to BD1994	33	1	1	1	36
Total	54	5	6	2	67

List	Award	Name	Citation	Party
NY12	Kt	Roger James Gale	For public and political services.	Con
NY12	Kt	Robert Russell	For public service.	L/D
NY12	DBE	The Right Honourable Joan Mary Ruddock	For public and political services.	Lab
BD11	Kt	Joseph Alan Meale	For public and political services.	Lab
BD11	Kt	Graham Robert Watson	For public and political services.	L/D
NY11	Kt	Peter James Bottomley	For public service.	Con
NY11	DBE	Ms Anne Begg	For services to Disabled People and to Equal Opportunities.	Lab
BD08	Kt	The Rt Hon Alan James Beith MP	Member of Parliament for Berwick-upon-Tweed. For services to Parliament.	L/D
BD08	Kt	Peter John Viggers MP	Member of Parliament for Gosport. For services to Parliament.	Con
BD04	Kt	The Rt Hon Gerald	Member of Parliament for	Lab

		Bernard Kaufman MP	Manchester Gorton. For services to Parliament.	
BD04	DBE	Marion Audrey, Mrs. Roe MP	Member of Parliament for Broxbourne. For services to Parliament.	Con
NY04	Kt	Stuart Bell MP	Member of Parliament for Middlesbrough. For services to Parliament.	Lab
NY04	Kt	John Valentine Butterfill MP	Member of Parliament for Bournemouth West. For services to Parliament.	Con
NY04	Kt	The Rt Hon Walter Menzies Campbell CBE QC MP	Member of Parliament for North East Fife. For services to Parliament.	L/D
NY03	Kt	Archibald Johnstone Kirkwood MP	Member of Parliament for Roxburgh and Berwickshire. For services to Parliament.	L/D
BD02	Kt	Nicholas Raymond Winterton MP	Member of Parliament for Macclesfield. For services to Parliament.	Con
BD00	KBE	The Rt Hon Jeremy John Durham (Paddy) Ashdown MP	For political and public service.	L/D
NY97	Kt	Nicholas Brian Baker MP	Member of Parliament for Dorset North. For political service.	Con
NY97	Kt	Cyril David Townsend MP	Member of Parliament for Bexleyheath. For political service.	Con
NY97	Kt	Raymond William Whitney OBE MP	Member of Parliament for Wycombe. For political service.	Con
BD96	Kt	Robert Hicks MP	Member of Parliament for Cornwall South East. For political service.	Con
BD96	Kt	Stanley James Allen Hill MP	Member of Parliament for Southampton Test. For political service.	Con
BD96	Kt	Raymond Powell MP	For services to the House of Commons.	Lab

BD96	Kt	Roger Edward Sims MP	Member of Parliament for Chislehurst. For political service.	Con
NY96	Kt	James Theodore Lester MP	Member of Parliament for Broxtowe. For political service.	Con
NY96	Kt	Colin Ryley Shepherd MP	Member of Parliament for Hereford. For political service.	Con
NY96	Kt	William Michael Hardy Spicer MP	Member of Parliament for South Worcestershire. For political service.	Con
NY96	KBE	The Rt Hon James Henry Molyneux MP	Member of Parliament for Lagan Valley and Leader of the Ulster Unionist Party 1979 - 95. For political service.	UUP
BD95	Kt	Julian Michael Gordon Critchley MP	Member of Parliament for Aldershot. For political service.	Con
BD95	Kt	Alan Gordon Barraclough Haselhurst MP	Member of Parliament for Saffron Walden. For political service.	Con
BD95	Kt	Geoffrey Lofthouse MP	First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means, House of Commons.	Lab
BD95	Kt	Julian Michael Shersby MP	Member of Parliament for Uxbridge. For political service.	Con
NY95	Kt	Patrick Thomas Cormack MP	Member of Parliament for Staffordshire South. For political service.	Con
NY95	Kt	The Rt Hon Peter Robert Cable Lloyd MP	Member of Parliament for Fareham. For political service.	Con
NY95	Kt	The Rt Hon Timothy Alan	Member of Parliament for Hove. For political, public and charitable	Con

		Davan Sainsbury MP	services.	
NY95	KBE	The Rt Hon Nicholas Paul Scott MBE MP	Member of Parliament for Chelsea. For political service	Con
BD94	Kt	Andrew Bowden MBE MP	Member of Parliament for Brighton Kemptown. For political service.	Con
BD94	Kt	Kenneth Melville Carlisle MP	Member of Parliament for Lincoln. For political service.	Con
BD94	Kt	John Michael Gorst MP	Member of Parliament for Hendon North. For political service.	Con
NY94	Kt	Peter Derek Fry MP	Member of Parliament for Wellingborough. For political service.	Con
NY94	Kt	The Rt Hon Archibald Gavin Hamilton MP	Member of Parliament for Epsom and Ewell. For political service.	Con
NY94	Kt	William David Madel MP	Member of Parliament for Bedfordshire South West. For political service.	Con
BD93	Kt	Ralph Frederic Howell MP	Member of Parliament for Norfolk North. For political service.	Con
BD93	Kt	David Laidlaw Knox MP	Member of Parliament for Staffordshire Moorlands. For political service.	Con
NY93	Kt	Michael Anthony Latham	Formerly Member of Parliament for Rutland and Melton. For political service.	Con
NY93	Kt	Roger Denis Moate MP	Member of Parliament for Faversham. For political service.	Con
NY93	Kt	Alfred William	Member of Parliament for Weston-	Con

		(Jerry) Wiggin TD MP	super-Mare. For political service.	
BD92	Kt	James Alexander Kilfedder MP	For political service	UUP
BD92	Kt	Ivan John Lawrence QC MP	For political service	Con
BD92	Kt	Herbert Keith Speed RD MP	For political Service	Con
BD92	Kt	Malcolm George Thornton MP	For political service	Con
NY92	Kt	William Michael John Grylls MP	For political service	Con
NY92	Kt	John Gordon Hannam MP	For political service	Con
NY92	Kt	Robert John (Robin) Maxwell-Hyslop MP	For political service	Con
NY92	Kt	Donald Thompson MP	For political service	Con
BD91	Kt	The Rt Hon John (Ambrose) Cope MP	For political service	Con
BD91	Kt	(Albert) (Edward) Patrick Duffy MP	For services to the North Atlantic Assembly	Lab
BD91	Kt	Robert Vidal Rhodes-James MP	For political service	Con
BD91	Kt	The Rt Hon Bernard Harold Ian Halley Stewart MP RD	For political service	Con
BD91	Kt	Edward Macmillan (Teddy) Taylor MP	For political service	Con
NY91	Kt	Robert Anthony Bevis (Tony) Durant MP	For political service	Con
NY91	Kt	The Rt Hon Richard	For political service	Con

		(Napier) Luce MP		
NY91	Kt	The Rt Hon Timothy (Hugh Francis) Raison MP	For political service	Con
BD90	Kt	Thomas Richard Arnold MP	For political service	Con
BD90	Kt	Robert Michael Marshall MP	For political service	Con
BD90	Kt	Robert Arthur McCrinkle MP	For political service	Con
BD90	Kt	Ieuan Wyn Pritchard Roberts MP	For political service	Con
NY90	Kt	Alan Glyn MP	For political service.	Con
NY90	Kt	Charles Graham Irving MP	For political service	Con
NY90	Kt	Christopher James Prout QC MEP	For political service	Con
NY90	Kt	John Daniel Wheeler MP	For political service	Con
NY90	KBE	Rt Hon David Martin Scott Steel MP	For political and public service	L/D

MPS APPOINTED COMPANIONS OF HONOUR

BREAKDOWN OF APPOINTMENTS IN THE LAST TWENTY YEARS

June 2011	The Right Honourable Michael, Baron Howard of Lympne	Con
Dec 1998	The Right Honourable John Roy Major	Con
Dec 1997	The Right Honourable Christopher Francis Patten, CBE	Con
Aug 1997	Michael Ray Dibdin Heseltine, The Right Honourable the Lord Heseltine	Con
June 1996	Richard Edward Geoffrey Howe, The Right Honourable the Lord Howe of Aberavon, QC	Con
Dec 1995	Douglas Richard Hurd, The Right Honourable the Lord Hurd of Westwell, CBE	Con
June 1994	David Anthony Llewellyn Owen, The Right Honourable the Lord Owen	SDP
April 1992	Kenneth Wilfred Baker, The Right Honourable the Lord Baker of Dorking	Con
April 1992	Peter Leonard Brooke, The Right Honourable the Lord Brooke of Sutton Mandeville	Con
April 1992	Thomas Jeremy King, The Right Honourable the Lord King of Bridgwater	Con

HONOURS TO MPS IN THE LAST 20 YEARS

RESIGNATION and DISSOLUTION HONOURS (not including Peerages)

1990 PRIME MINISTER'S RESIGNATION HONOURS

(All Conservative)

Award	Name	Citation
Kt	George Arthur Gardiner MP	Member of Parliament for Reigate
Kt	Rt Hon Peter Hugh Morrison MP	Member of Parliament for City of Chester and lately Parliamentary Private Secretary, 10 Downing Street
Kt	Gerrard Anthony Neale MP	Member of Parliament for North Cornwall
Kt	Michael Jon Neubert MP	Member of Parliament for Romford

1997 PRIME MINISTER'S RESIGNATION HONOURS

(All Conservative)

Award	Name	Citation
Kt	Robert Atkins	Former Minister of State for Northern Ireland, Environment, Sport, Transport, Trade and Industry
Kt	Rt Hon Michael Forsyth	Former Scottish Secretary
Kt	Rt Hon Brian Mawhinney	Former Transport Secretary, Chairman of the Conservative Party and Shadow Home Secretary
Kt	Richard Needham	Former Minister for Northern Ireland and Trade
Kt	Neville Trotter	Former Conservative MP for Tynemouth
Kt	John Ward	Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Prime Minister 1994-97
KCMG	Rt Hon Alistair Goodlad	Former Conservative Chief Whip and Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury
KCMG	Jeremy Hanley	Former Chairman of the Conservative Party and Defence and Foreign Officer Minister
KCMG	Rt Hon Malcolm Rifkind	Former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Scotland, Transport and Defence

2010 PRIME MINISTER'S DISSOLUTION LIST

(Both Labour)

Award	Name	Citation
Kt	Bill O'Brien	Former Member of Parliament for Normanton
Kt	Rt Hon Ian McCartney	Former Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and Trade and Industry

Written Evidence submitted by Bernard Galton, Director General, People, Place and Corporate Services, with responsibility for Honours within the Welsh Government (HS 39)

Summary:

- For more senior honours, the determination of what constitutes ‘national impact’ should be reviewed.
- The target levels (quotas) for gender, race etc used by the Cabinet Office need to be more flexible to account for local variation.
- Rewards for philanthropy should be focused on generosity and benevolence rather than self-publicity.
- The wider public needs to be more actively engaged in the Honours process.
- There is sensitivity around the use of the term ‘Empire’ but a rich history attached to it also.

National Impact:

1. For the most senior honours, there is a requirement to demonstrate that the impact of the contribution is felt at a national level. This definition is generally used to acknowledge the impact of individuals across the whole of the UK, rather than a single country within the UK.
2. Devolution has brought many changes to the lives of the people of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Each Government has made significant changes to the way that services are provided for the people for whom they have responsibility.
3. In developing and introducing these unique and distinctive approaches, these Governments have called upon many individuals with expertise and experience at a national level within the countries in which they reside. Many of these individuals have worked tirelessly for the benefit of the whole of the population of their respective countries, and the impact of their endeavours has been felt country-wide. However, in using the current definition of ‘national impact’, these individuals will never be considered for the most senior honours.
4. At present, our honours system overly relies on the use of the terms ‘local’, ‘regional’ and ‘national’ to determine which honour, if any, is bestowed upon an individual. The impact of the individual is, largely, a secondary consideration. The terms ‘local’ and ‘regional’ offer an element of flexibility in interpretation, but this is not the case in respect of ‘national’. Individuals whose dedication, sacrifice and hard work have positively affected the lives of millions of people are being overlooked for the highest honours because their impact is ‘limited’ to an individual country. However, others who have sat on Committees and Boards at a UK-level, often with far less of an impact, are being rewarded with the highest honours available. If devolution had not taken place, many of the individuals concerned may have been called upon to advise

in a UK-wide capacity. Effectively, these individuals are paying the price for devolution; this is clearly unfair.

Targets:

5. Whilst it is commendable that the Cabinet Office is attempting to increase nominations from under-represented groups, the arbitrary use of targets, in respect of state awards, for each Department is misguided. This is particularly evident in the case of gender.
6. The honours system is based around rewarding those that have made an exceptional contribution to society, over and above what would normally be expected of them. However, all Departments have been informed that the ratio of male to female nominations for state honours must match the gender ratio within the Department. This means that the best candidates are not necessarily being chosen; if the ratio of male to female nominations exceeds the given target, some male nominations may not be pursued, in favour of less suitable female nominations.

Philanthropy:

7. The general public are often distrustful of the motives behind nominations for the leaders of industry and other wealthy individuals, unless the individual is a household name well known for their generosity. When considering honours in relation to philanthropy, we should not be rewarding individuals where there is a clear self-interest on the part of the individual. This could be implicit, in attempting to attract indirect financial gain from an act of benevolence, or explicit through self-adulation, such as naming a charitable foundation or building after themselves.
8. The perception that some members of society have bought their honours will persist unless we can demonstrate clearly that philanthropy is rewarded for the right reasons.

Engagement:

9. If we aspire to make honours more representative of all members of society, we need to encourage more people, from all backgrounds and communities, to engage with the process. The majority of the general public have little or no idea about how to nominate someone for an honour and, in reality, they probably give little thought to it.
10. We need to find more effective ways of connecting with these individuals. Whilst there is a useful internet presence, you have to proactively search for the website. What we need to consider is how we might initially plant the seeds of the idea in the heads of those individuals. Libraries, community centres and other public local meeting places could be targeted with posters, flyers and leaflets, but we might also consider whether the private sector might become involved. Supermarkets, high street

stores, cafes and other such establishments have a far higher number of daily visitors than any public buildings, and people are generally in a more positive frame of mind when shopping or eating. Targeting these types of establishments might prove more effective.

11. If sufficient funding was available, it would be useful also to advertise across a range of media, such as newspapers, magazines, television and radio. This might be provided freely by those who support the honours process but we would need to be careful not to be seen to be rewarding those that waived advertising fees. Other typical outreach activities, such as talks to local community groups, could be considered alongside these activities.

Empire:

12. For some years, there has been considerable debate around the term 'Empire' being attached to the honours. There will always be some individuals for whom this term will conjure up visions of conquest and repression. However, there will be others who view the term as simply part of an honours system with a rich and colourful history. There is currently no evidence to suggest that any significant numbers of people find the term offensive or off-putting when it comes to considering nominations.
13. There would be little point, therefore, in attempting to discontinue the use of the term. Since the name of the honour is embedded in statute, this would require a cessation of the current honours and the creation of new honours under a new name. Not only would this potentially devalue the honours previously awarded, it could also devalue future honours.

June 2012

Written Evidence submitted by CP Johnston (HS40)

The English/British Empire/Order of etc.

I have heard witnesses criticising continuation of this style – apparently associating it solely with the former Maritime British Empire.

I submit enclosed extract from G R Elton’s “England Under the Tudors” which may help to explain the historical and legal background. Esp quoting the celebrated preamble to Henry VIII 1533 Statute of Appeals – (i.e. against appeals to the Pope, claiming Benefit of Clergy, Canon Law exemptions. This being also basis of later style Supreme Governor of the English Church. ie, from the word Government, ie, that the clergy were subject to the laws of England, embodied by the monarch.)

May 2012

Supplementary written evidence submitted by John Lidstone (HS 41)

In my evidence to you on Tuesday May 15th 2012 in response to question **Q158 Chair**: I replied 'If you take Gus O'Donnell who has just retired as Chief Secretary to the Cabinet and head of the Civil Service, he has four gongs'. My comments were picked up by the BBC and broadcast over the air.

I used the word 'gong' deliberately to mean "an honour, a medal or a decoration" to quote an Oxford Dictionary definition. The record books, 'Who's Who' and Debretts record Gus O'Donnell as having the following 'gongs'; GCB; KCB; CB; and a life peerage - four 'gongs'. This appears to follow a quite illogical tradition in respect of all heads of the Civil Service. To pluck two other names who have held these two offices, their 'gongs' are almost identical:

Robert Armstrong, formerly secretary to the Cabinet and Head of the Civil Service. His 'gongs': GCB; KCB; CVO; Life peerage;

Robin Butler, also a former secretary to the Cabinet and Head of the Civil Service: GCB; KCB; CVO; PC; Life peerage. I have excluded his KG, this being in the personal gift of the Monarch.

This brings me to the question put to the meeting of your Select Committee on Tuesday May 22nd 2012 when you took evidence from Sir Bob Kerslake. **Q292 Paul Flynn**: 'Sir Gus O'Donnell I think has four knighthoods'. Sir Bob Kerslake: "he has not; he has two'. Paul Flynn: 'I have seen it in the papers he has four'. Sir Bob Kerslake: 'No, of course, he is a lord as well, which is quite a separate process'.

When these types of exchanges take place and can be heard and read by the general public, they do not inspire any confidence in those who are supposed to be professionally involved in the process of sorting who gets what and whether they balance the honours quotas book.

June 2012