

Profile: Elizabeth Truss, who does not quite know how to talk to the judges, and vice-versa

It would be hard to exaggerate how angry the judges are with Elizabeth Truss. A few days ago, the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd, [condemned the Lord Chancellor](#) for failing to stand up for them in November, when the [Daily Mail](#) denounced them as “Enemies of the People”:

“I regret to have to criticise her as severely as I have, but to my mind she is completely and absolutely wrong about this, as I have said, and I am very disappointed. I understand what the pressures were in November, but she has taken a position that is constitutionally absolutely wrong.”

The Lord Chief Justice, who will soon retire, also complained that Truss’s officials had allowed her to make a serious error about the new arrangements to ease the ordeal of giving evidence in rape trials:

“Yesterday, I had to write to all the judges to explain that unfortunately what the ministry had said was wrong.”

Lord Thomas’s evidence on rape trials, delivered to the Lords Constitution Committee [and watchable here](#) (one of the most damning outbursts, quoted above, occurs at 10:57:38), reveals a history of acute dissatisfaction with the department which long predates Truss:

“To make clear what I am saying, we fought – there can be no other word for it – the ministry from 1999 right through to about 2015 to get the pre-recording of children’s evidence brought into effect. It had been recommended by Judge Pigot in 1989, but we were told, ‘No money, no this, no that’. Through the very hard work of three judges, Judge Collier at Leeds, Judge Goldstone at Liverpool and Judge Ader at Kingston, we have made the pilot work, and we want to roll it out carefully. It is quite difficult to change the culture. Instead of what we said was sensible, which was to move it to the adult victims of sexual crime and to start piloting that at the same courts, it was announced that this would be rolled out across the country. It was a complete failure to understand the impracticalities of any of this. That is the kind of thing that is very troubling.”

Truss and her civil servants between them managed first to misinform the

press about this, and then to take quite a long time to clear up the misinformation. Were it not for the wider Brexit story, the deterioration in relations between her and the judiciary would be attracting far more attention.

But Jacob Rees-Mogg MP this week told ConservativeHome that it is quite wrong of Lord Thomas to use “his authority as Lord Chief Justice to undermine and belittle the Lord Chancellor”, and continued:

“He can’t expect politicians to defend the independence of the judiciary if he behaves like a Labour Party activist.”

In Rees-Mogg’s view, “an independent judiciary is an apolitical judiciary”, and “it is unwise of judges to make statements other than from the bench”. The public trust them “because they don’t seem to have any preconceptions”.

It follows that “what the Lord Chief Justice did was deeply disgraceful and improper”, for it meant “getting involved in politics in a very sensitive way”, and this in a case in which “he was personally involved”, as one of the three judges who heard the Brexit case in the High Court and were attacked by the press.

In Lord Thomas’s defence, it should be repeated that he accurately reflects opinion among his colleagues. They feel Truss deserted them in their hour of need, when they could not defend themselves because the Brexit case had not yet ended.

Lord Judge, who preceded Lord Thomas as Lord Chief Justice, brushed aside the statement in support of judicial independence which the Lord Chancellor did at length issue as “too little, too late”, and told [The Times](#):

“The words she used were almost exactly the same as the Prime Minister used a couple of hours later. That’s my explanation why it took her so long.”

The judges see a Lord Chancellor who takes orders from Theresa May, who in turn is more anxious to keep on the right side of Paul Dacre, the editor of the *Daily Mail*, than to defend judicial independence.

A Lord Chancellor with a proper understanding of the grandeur and antiquity of the office, far more ancient than that of Prime Minister, would not have waited for clearance from Downing Street before upholding the rule of law. One need not be a judge to wonder whether Truss will ever have the intellectual self-confidence to speak her own mind.

But as Charles Moore [this week pointed out](#), it is Tony Blair’s fault, not hers, that the lord chancellorship is no longer held by a lawyer steeped in legal tradition, and presiding from the Woolsack over the House of Lords. Blair failed to abolish but

"succeeded in downgrading the post. He created a Justice Ministry (another continental idea) and tacked the Lord Chancellor's residual roles on to that. So being Justice Secretary and Lord Chancellor became just another political job rather than one requiring legal learning. There was no more reason for a lawyer to have to occupy the post than for a doctor to be Health Secretary.

"So the governmental system has lost its umbilical connection with the judiciary. The judges are right to regret this, but it is partly their fault. Most of them were in favour of the changes I have described above."

Truss is the third non-lawyer, after Chris Grayling and Michael Gove, to be Lord Chancellor, and the first woman. Grayling became immensely unpopular with the judges, and amazed me, when I [interviewed him for ConHome](#), by saying it was an advantage for him not to be a lawyer, because this meant he was not biased in favour of the legal profession.

Gove profited from not being Grayling, and from a natural eloquence which made him a ready defender of ancient liberties as well as modern prison reforms. But he spent only just over a year in office.

To Truss now falls the tricky task of trying to settle relations with a judiciary suffering from low morale and potentially very severe recruitment problems, and brought into unaccustomed prominence by the Brexit case. It cannot be said she has made a very promising start.

Her defenders say the judiciary condescend towards her because of her youth (she is only 41), her lack of legal experience, and because she is a woman. They add that although she consults with Number Ten, she does not take orders.

Her detractors say she rubs people up the wrong way, supposes she is more charming than is actually the case, and is an embarrassingly bad public speaker, who has inflicted some "toe-curling" performances on the Conservative Party Conference. They admit, however, that she is very bright.

Truss herself insists that she takes "very seriously" her duty under her oath of office to defend the independence of the judiciary. But in [a letter to The Times](#) she went on:

"However there is another principle at stake here: the freedom of the press. I believe in a free press, where newspapers are free to publish, within the law, their views. It is not the job of the government or lord chancellor to police headlines, and it would be a dark day for democracy if that changed."

It ought to be feasible to defend both the judiciary and the press. The two are not mutually exclusive. Nor does one need to get hung up on "headlines": general remarks about the indispensability of the rule of law, and how

fortunate we are to live under it, would be quite sufficient.

A Lord Chancellor who possessed a greater affinity with the Establishment would have no difficulty in producing that sort of thing on demand. But Truss is not that kind of person, which is one reason why she so disconcerts the judges.

They do not quite know how to talk to each other.

In the old days, by which I mean the era before 23 June 2016, if the Lord Chief Justice was worried about something, someone in his office would ring one of the private secretaries in Number Ten or the Treasury, with both of which they had direct lines of communication, and very likely the trouble would be sorted out.

The Lord Chancellor did not necessarily have to be involved. But the people at both ends who oiled the wheels have now moved on, or been moved on, and a different atmosphere prevails in Downing Street.

The Prime Minister and her joint chiefs of staff, Nick Timothy and Fiona Hill, want quite naturally to be in control. The avoidance of friction is not one of their instinctive preferences. For them, friction can be good.

An essential element in their style of government consists of showing that they will not be pushed around, and in particular that they will not yield a point just because a lot of high-minded liberals say how much easier and more pleasant life would be if a concession could just this once be made.

An obvious example is the proposal to remove students from the immigration figures. Almost all the friendly, civilised, liberal people say that doing so would make life easier and more pleasant, and May has refused to do it.

The judges are, for the most part, as friendly, civilised and liberal a group of people as you could hope to meet. They are delightful. Some years ago, when I used often to have lunch in the Terrace Cafeteria at the Palace of Westminster, I would usually see four or five of the Law Lords eating together in that long, modest, unassuming room, surrounded by researchers, police officers, cooks on their break and other Commons staff. How ready they were to be amused, and how completely without side.

A friend of mine who was a barrister used to lament that the abolition of the death penalty had removed much of the drama from criminal trials. It has certainly been accompanied by a change in the character of the judiciary. The majesty of the law, emphasised by occasional outbursts of eccentric savagery, is no more. Hangers and floggers are no longer required on the bench.

This may be a very good thing, but it makes the judiciary less frightening. Why should Truss, educated at a comprehensive school in Leeds, after which she read PPE at Oxford, defer to its opinions? Why should she not think instead that the judges need to loosen up a bit, become less worried about describing what their work entails?

In a profile of her [published three years ago on ConHome](#), I recorded the

toughness she showed in hanging on to the Conservative candidacy in South-West Norfolk in the face of opposition from “the TurnipTaliban”, as the press dubbed a group of local Tories displeased by the discovery of a scandal some years before in her private life.

A few days ago, [The Times](#) sided firmly with Lord Thomas, and with the rest of the legal Establishment, in a leading article. But its suggested remedy was a bit feeble:

“Ms Truss has not impressed so far in the job. She needs to take a good look at herself and ask whether she is up to it.”

Surely the person who will decide “whether she is up to it” is May. If anything, the attacks on Truss by the judiciary must make it less likely that in the near future she will be moved. The Prime Minister’s determination not to be pushed around will override other considerations, and will, one imagines, be shared by the *Daily Mail*.

Restoring order to the classroom

Ensuring that teachers have the authority to maintain order in the classroom has been one of the areas where the Government has been making progress since 2010. One of the [changes](#) Michael Gove brought in was to reduce the pages of guidance that teachers were expected to follow from 600 to 50. It was also clarified that a teacher could use “reasonable force” – for instance to remove a pupil who was disrupting a lesson. Teachers can now give detentions without notice.

There will certainly be some teachers who will never be up to what is a very difficult job – and it is much better for everyone that they should pursue alternative careers. But there are very many others who can or could maintain good order with the necessary support. Tom Bennett has already produced proposals to make teacher training more practical in this regard. (He offers his top ten tips for behaviour management [here](#).)

Bennett has now offered some more recommendations for the Government – in the form of an [independent review](#) of behaviour in schools. He says that even if individual teachers are capable and well trained they will still struggle to maintain order in a badly run school. The head needs to provide the right culture in the school.

Naturally the permanent exclusion of a pupil is regarded as rather drastic and only happens to a small number. Bennett proposes “internal inclusion units to offer targeted early specialist intervention with the primary aim of reintegrating students back into the mainstream school community” – in other

words the pupil is removed from the class and therefore the disruption ceases, but this is as a temporary measure.

More visits should be made to those schools that have succeeded with regards to school discipline – often despite challenging circumstances, says Bennett. He also suggests that Ofsted could do a better job at gathering the views of teachers and pupils on behaviour management. Research has confirmed that many teachers ignore “low level disruption” and just try to carry on as best they can.

Ebbsfleet Academy in a deprived area of north Kent is offered as a case study. It was previously the Swan Valley Community School and began in its present incarnation under new management in 2012:

“All staff had their classes monitored and performance management put in place. This resulted in many teachers resigning of their own accord and some being dismissed. The former leadership team was made redundant.”

The school has “a leadership team with a clear culture, standards and vision for the school”; there is “attention to detail – strict rules, weekly equipment checks, detentions for such things as rubber or pen missing, uniform infractions, colour of hair”. While “any child caught with a mobile phone has it confiscated until the next school holiday”.

Bennett quotes plenty of other heartening examples of schools doing well. He looks at the importance of assemblies and wall displays, of involving governors and catering staff as well as teachers in upholding the school ethos. There was recognition of the need for teachers to maintain punctuality.

In Passmores Academy in Harlow the school charter which pupils sign up to includes the behaviour expected of pupils on their way to or from school and when in uniform as well. There is a centralised detention system. This helps ensure the rules are consistent and that the teachers handing out the detention do not have to take up their own time to supervise it.

Bennett also argues that where exclusions are needed the school make the tough choice to proceed with them:

“When they are required, they should be used. Inspections must not unfairly deter schools from meaningfully using exclusions by treating their existence as an exclusively negative strategy. It is important to examine the patterns of exclusion carefully, and to consider the context of exclusions in order to understand how appropriate they are. In some schools, a temporary, high exclusion rate may be a sign of effective leadership, not weak or over punitive.”

In the past, the reluctance to exclude has come from a concern that sending a child to a Pupil Referral Unit will set them on to a downward spiral. But the answer to that is to drive up the standards at these Units.

The [Government's response](#) to Bennett's report says:

"It is our ambition to give schools control of Alternative Provision budgets to enable them to commission AP for pupils who require it (including those who have been permanently excluded) as well as accountability for pupils' educational outcomes whilst they are in AP. Giving schools responsibility for commissioning AP and accountability for pupils' educational outcomes will incentivise them to take preventative approaches and to achieve value for money when identifying the best and most suitable alternative provision for any child that needs it."

There is plenty of good progress being made. On the other hand, attempts to evaluate the scale of disorder in classrooms have probably resulted in underestimates – due to many teachers and their heads being reluctant to acknowledge such difficulties. Bennett's report is positive and constructive but also honest about the scale of the challenge – and robust in identifying how it can be met.

Press release: Guidelines on reducing sugar in food published for industry

[unable to retrieve full-text content]Reduction programme could see 200,000 tonnes of sugar removed from the UK market per year by 2020.

Press release: Raytheon UK invests in North Wales

[unable to retrieve full-text content]Alun Cairns: Defence market place is a major driving force for Wales' economy

'The Daily Mile' officially launched in Wales

Team GB weightlifter Michaela Breeze and sprinter Christian Malcolm, adventurer Tori James, Public Health Minister Rebecca Evans, founder of The

Daily Mile Elaine Wyllie, and head of physical activity at Public Health Wales Robert Sage, will officially launch the initiative at Pontllanfraith Primary School in Blackwood .

The Caerphilly primary school is the latest school in Wales to sign up to The Daily Mile – an easy, fun way to improve children's health and wellbeing. The initiative is the brain-child of Elaine Wyllie, former headteacher of a large Scottish primary school in Stirling. The initiative sees primary-aged children run, walk or jog for 15 minutes every day in school. It is inclusive, simple and free, with no equipment or set up required.

Minister Rebecca Evans said:

"The Daily Mile is an easy and fun way for children to improve their health and wellbeing. It is a fantastic way to support young people to get the recommended amount of physical activity each day, and will help them grow up healthier and happier. Well done to everyone at Pontllanfraith Primary for getting involved! I encourage schools across Wales to follow hot on their heels and sign up to The Daily Mile."

Elaine Wyllie, former headteacher and founder of The Daily Mile, commented:

"I'm delighted to see The Daily Mile being launched today in Wales and congratulate the Welsh Government and Public Health Wales in recognising the long lasting benefits that this simple, effective and free initiative will bring to the children of Wales – better physical, emotional, social and mental health now and into their future lives."

Christian Malcolm, World and European 200m Medallist, said:

"I'm thrilled to be joining the staff and students of Pontllanfraith Primary School for the national launch of The Daily Mile Cymru. It's such a simple yet effective initiative – within a month the children are much fitter, and feel happier and more confident in themselves. By instilling these healthy habits at a young age, we're helping our children to live full and healthy lives."

Michaela Breeze, Commonwealth Games weightlifting gold Medallist, said:

"Getting children active at a young age is key to setting them up for a healthy lifestyle. The Daily Mile is so simple. There's no set up, tidy up, or equipment required. Children simply run outside in the fresh air. It's fully inclusive; every child, whatever their

circumstances, age or ability, succeeds at The Daily Mile.”

Angela Talor, Headteacher of Pontllanfraith Primary, said:

“Some of our year 6 pupils took part in Young Ambassador training with the local Sports Development team, and came back really enthusiastic about The Daily Mile. We discussed it with staff and they were keen to do it too. The Young Ambassadors have really got involved in organising and planning for our Daily Mile – we’ve had a few practices to work out how to make it work. We’ve decided that we’re going to be out running or walking every day during afternoon play.”

Robert Sage, Physical Activity lead for Public Health Wales, said:

“We are delighted to have helped bring The Daily Mile to Wales and look forward to encouraging all schools in Wales to adopt The Daily Mile as one of their Healthy School actions. The best way to establish and maintain an active life is to make it part of your day to day routine. The Daily Mile is an excellent way for children to develop good habits that can last throughout life.”