

[Transcript] The News Agents / The Johnson Family Honours List

This is a global player original podcast.

The idea that Boris Johnson is nominating his dad for a knighthood for services to what?

That was Keir Starmer on LBC This Morning with Nick Ferrari talking about the fact, the apparent fact that Stanley Johnson is about to become Sir Stanley Johnson as the result of the resignation honours of Boris Johnson, keeping it all in the family.

And appearing on the newsagents podcast exclusively, Rachel Johnson, daughter of Stanley Johnson, sister of Boris Johnson, responds.

Look, I completely understand the sort of knee jerk reaction to it, but I think that's pretty ungenerous of Keir Starmer.

You'll be hearing a lot more from Rachel Johnson about the dilemmas of being the sister of the Prime Minister, of dealing with the Johnson family clan, of how far you can go in disagreeing with Boris Johnson.

It's a really fascinating lesson.

Welcome to the newsagents.

The newsagents.

It's John.

It's Emily.

She's back from the Atlas Mountains and has given around the office today oranges from Morocco.

So I am full of vitamin C and feeling a whole lot better than I did when I came in.

We did get served turnip at lunch.

No.

Yes, we got turnip.

Sort of raw, very finely sliced, lots of lovely herbs.

So now I sort of feel well equipped to deal with our English drought.

Maybe they knew that you were coming from England and they had been listening to...

That's what they need.

That's what she'll want.

She'll need turnips.

Exactly.

Anyway, while you were away, I don't know whether you noticed, mateless, but there were some WhatsApp messages that got out and it's kind of revealed all sorts of fascinating things.

And today we learned something new from The Times from Lara Spirit, who has been a guest on this podcast before.

Boris Johnson wants to give his dad, Stanley Johnson, a knighthood in a resignation honours list that is going to raise eyebrows and cause people to drop their spoon into their boiled eggs.

Yeah.

And a resignation honours list is something that I think increasingly a lot of people have quite a problem with because essentially it is a way of a prime minister, an ex-prime minister saying thank you.

You might understand if it was thank you to one or two, maybe even four or five.

But David Cameron gave 62 in his resignation honours list and he is now dwarfed by the number we understand Boris Johnson has on his, which is 100 and the only person who

can actually veto what's on that list is the Prime Minister, Rishi Sunak.

So this list has raised questions both in scale but also in quality, in those names that are appearing.

Because once you've got your dad on an honours list, and as you'll hear later, it's not the first time a family member has appeared on a resignation honours list, it does suggest a sense of impunity.

The other word that I would use is entitlement, that Boris feels entitled to give whoever he wants a gong, a little bauble to have that will adorn their name forevermore.

And you know, when you go to an honours ceremony and you see the awards being given out to people who have toiled for however many years in their communities, the idea that you're just deploying an OBE here, a CBE there, a knighthood somewhere else, just to pay off a few people who've scratched your back, I really think sits ill with the honours system.

Well we're joined in the studio now by Rachel Johnson and Rachel, it is a pleasure to have you here and it's worth saying for full transparency, normally I think we're really cautious about addressing a female journalist with questions about her brother's deployments.

But in this case we are going to talk a little bit more about family, we'll come to that later, but we can talk about you in relation to other members of your family because that seems relevant.

You've written about your mother during lockdown and the trouble she had and you have been a very vocal opponent to lockdown and I wonder if that was ever a conversation that you had with the Prime Minister, with your brother, did you ever say this is doing terrible things to our family?

That is a very good question, what I think happened during lockdown was I used the mic as my release valve every week on LBC on Sunday night, I really did feel he was too busy trying to run the country, run the pandemic response, get the vaccine rollout, you know, appoint the vaccines are, decide on tier systems, decide on whether we're going to go in and out of lockdowns, whether schools are going to be open or closed.

I did not think that me, as he would say, sniping from the sidelines would determine any of his decisions.

So I really did contain myself to what I said on my show as it were, in relation to the callers' questions and the callers' conversations.

So he could see you as a sniper, he'd see you as somebody who interferes.

I had this visceral instinct that lockdowns just could not work, they were a blunt instrument of last resort.

The WHO itself, obviously, didn't cover itself with glory with regard to China, said that they affected the poorest, the worst, that's what I felt happened during the pandemic when we saw the middle classes thoroughly enjoying themselves in their second homes, ordering acaudos to come to their houses and key workers basically waiting on them hand and foot. We had not just a tier system, we had a two-tier country.

Those who could afford and enjoy lockdowns and those who worked through lockdowns.

I thought that the collateral harms, the long tail of having locked the country down, we have not seen the end of it and I think a reckoning is coming, is what I think.

I mean, we've seen the Matt Hancock WhatsApp messages in glorious technical although strangely, your brother doesn't seem to feature much, I don't know whether that's because-

He comes out of them actually well.

Well, I don't know whether that's because he hasn't, he didn't WhatsApp much with Matt Hancock or the Telegraph have chosen not to publish those bits of, because we obviously we're seeing the Telegraph's edited highlights of them.

But you didn't WhatsApp at all with your brother during that period.

No, but don't forget they didn't have his phone, they had Matt Hancock's phone.

So the Telegraph hasn't got every single cabinet member's phone.

What they've got is screenshots of Matt Hancock's WhatsApps with other members, right?

But presumably in a lot of them would be in discussion with your brother.

Can I just say to his credit, he questioned lockdowns, which is something that most media didn't do most of the time.

And we can see from those WhatsApps that he actually recognized right from the beginning as actually did the Health Secretary Matt Hancock, that the distribution of risk was completely weighted towards the elderly, the vulnerable, those who are obese and with those with comorbidities, yet the government messaging throughout was that risk is equal.

If you go to a park, you could die.

If you went out, your teenager could kill Granny.

So again, the messaging was extremely, I thought, freighted with fear quite unnecessarily and actually unethically.

And when you have that being equally distributed, that everybody's at equal risk and yet parties are still going on inside Downing Street, then they're actually proofs that they knew that the risk was not evenly distributed throughout the population because the young spads with their suitcases of wine were not remotely frightened about not socially distancing in Downing Street.

But then that makes it even more shameful of what went on in Downing Street, doesn't it?

To be fair, I genuinely don't know what went on in Downing Street.

So don't look at me.

I was not there.

I was sitting in my second home, which is why I think the whole thing was such a shower.

I just want to stay with that because if you're saying that it was absolutely disgraceful that the messaging was that everyone was affected the same, yet in Downing Street they behaved differently, doesn't that make it even more a source of anger for the British public?

I guess it does.

But I think that was noted at the time that clearly the 8,000 people who worked in the Cabinet Office or the hundreds of people who worked in Downing Street were not particularly alive to the risks that we were being told about from the lectern and podium of doom day after day.

So would you take that to your brother, to Boris Johnson, and say, what were you doing?

Like, there were so many people who felt absolutely locked into an environment and a place that they had never asked for, and he knew or we understand that he was at parties.

Yeah, no, I did have conversations.

I mean, I did between lockdowns when he got married, and I think you were allowed to have 30 people or something outside, and I remember having a very heated conversation with him actually on that wedding day about lockdown, and I said, why didn't you do focus protection?

And he said, he had actually looked into it because of multi-generational households. You couldn't have protected the old and the vulnerable.

If you'd had a Great Barrington-style declaration rather than a total lockdown, which is what we had, of course the Great Barrington, for those who've forgotten, basically said, you know, you can make it much more elective, the society, the bits of society that need to shield can shield the old and the vulnerable, can be protected by the state, but everyone else can get on, and we can protect the economy, and we can protect everyone as you have like that.

But he got very cross.

I think that, I think his mood did change after he got COVID and was extremely ill.

And then I thought he got the fear.

And I thought that he then got behind the full lockdown narrative that was being pumped out.

Well, he didn't take it seriously enough, we now understand, to assume that it was okay to party.

I mean, look.

Emily, I genuinely don't think that he thought those parties were what you would call a party. I can't speak for him, but I mean, my impression is that he thought he was going down to sort of work gathering in his own office.

Now look, please, I can't say any more than that about those events.

We now see reports in the newspapers that your father is going to be knighted in the Honour's List, and I would think that normally in any circumstance, if you hear your father is going to get a knighthood, you just have a feeling of immense pride.

I'm sure a lot of people will think that is pretty rum that the Prime Minister is giving his dad a knighthood.

I mean, you go to an Honour's ceremony at Buckingham Palace and you think how marvellous all these people who've done incredible, you know, how they're doing it.

I don't expect there's going to be a national outpouring of joy.

So he is going to get one.

If my father is, it is going to be a rise to Stanley.

I can't confirm that.

I mean, I don't know how you'd expect me to know any of that, John, but the resignation honours has got to be signed off by the current Prime Minister.

So I think this is a subject of speculation, and what I do think, and I know people won't love me for saying this, is if my brother hadn't been Prime Minister, I think my father could have been in line for some sort of recognition in his own right.

He's done much more for the Tory body in the environment than dozens of people who have been given gongs to this point.

And I might also say that it's not unprecedented that a Prime Minister puts a family member, whatever you may feel about it, on his resignation honours list, Theresa May knighted Philip, Maggie Thatcher gave Mark a baronet see, and John Major gave a damehood to Norma.

Now obviously, three wrongs don't make a night.

Get it?

Yeah, very good.

But you think he deserves one, is what you're saying?

I don't like the honours system at all.

And I think that if I had my druthers, there wouldn't be one.

And there wouldn't be a house.

So you wouldn't take one from your brother?

I wouldn't, no.

Nothing?

Nothing, no.

No MB, no CB, no.

Apart from you, Emily, I'm probably the last woman in England is going to be offered any sort of recognition for their work over the past few years.

Now, of course, you're going to get one for services to broadcasting, but...

Can we just play it?

Yeah.

I mean, as you've said, there will be a lot of people who don't share your belief that it is a feasible, legitimate thing to happen.

Let's listen to Keir Starmer, who is on LBC this morning.

The idea that Boris Johnson is nominating his dad for a knighthood.

You only need to say it to realise just how ridiculous it is.

It's classic of a man who liked Johnson.

I mean, I think the public would just think this is absolutely outrageous.

Nothing personal against Stanley, but the idea of an ex-prime minister bestowing on his dad for services to what?

I think that's quite, look, I completely understand the sort of knee-jerk reaction to it, but

I think that's pretty ungenerous of Keir Starmer.

If you...

I'm not saying to people, Google Stanley, but if you did, you would see that he actually started work for the Tory Party and Conservative Research Department with Chris Patton in 1975. He has man and boy served that party, given endless speeches to constituency associations, and piloted a lot of the legislation that Jacob Riesmog wants to bin off that protects our natural habitats, our bathing waters and our air when he worked for the European Commission in Brussels for 17 years.

Isn't there something about being the prime minister's dad?

Yeah, no, no.

Basically, I think my point is...

Even if you do deserve it, wouldn't you kind of go, no, it just looks and smells and feels wrong?

It may Emily look, and if you've been in my shoes for the past six years, nothing surprises you anymore.

So I understand where you're coming from, but I'm sort of inured to this now.

When you say nothing surprises you anymore, is that because of the way your brother behaves which is a pretty unconventional view of the rulebook or what is acceptable or what lines you mustn't cross?

Well, maybe he thought, my dad's 81, he has never been acknowledged, his service to the

party and to the environment has never been acknowledged.

This is the one thing I can do for him, and I'm jolly well going to go and do it and I don't care what people say.

Yeah, but that's interesting.

I can look at Emily's face in this, I can see the distaste.

No, I'm not making this about your dad, I'm not making this about your dad.

It's about your brother and how he behaves, that people say that party...

Listen, people control their own conclusions, please don't ask me to, as it were, sit in judgment on it, because it literally is too close.

You're talking about my brother and my father.

That is a decision that my brother has made with regards to my father or not.

And I have no further comment on it.

Can I ask you something more broadly, because you've been very publicly, politically, again...

I mean, you're an extraordinary family in many ways, and that you've gone against Brexit and you've changed UK and you...

I've got a brain.

Sorry.

No, no, I don't really.

Maybe a second class brain.

But take us inside, like are there massive family rows?

Do you have those discussions, or do you say he's Prime Minister, I'm not going to get involved with that, he was elected, I'm not...

How does it work?

Genuinely, Emily, when we get together, most of the time, when somebody's Prime Minister, their time is quite limited, their diary is like, not even in five minute slots, it's in two minute slots.

We try not to pick massive partisan fights, and it would be jolly easy to do that.

I'm not saying we haven't had our moments, but generally, those old rules used to apply at sort of upper middle class dinner parties, no sex, no politics.

No religion.

No religion.

I think it was religion, actually.

Well, we sort of apply those rules.

And I think politics, if we started talking about politics, I think there'd be so many flare-ups and flances that it's just not worth it, you just...

Don't let politics spoil a good family dinner.

Let me ask you another question.

Was it a relief when he stopped being Prime Minister, and what do you think about all the reports that he would like to come back for a second go at it?

I don't want to get into that particularly.

I will admit that during that October moment when Liz Truss was being dismounted by her own party, she actually elegantly dismounted herself, and there was that, you know, flight tracker when he was...

He was coming back from...

I did say that moment.

I didn't think this was the right time.

You said that to him?

Yeah.

Yeah, I did.

And I don't think I was alone in saying that.

I mean, I think even his biggest fans were saying that.

No, he doesn't listen to me.

No, I'm like a sort of...

I'm the opposite of a canary in the coal mine because he just...

I mean...

Who does he listen to, then?

If he gave me services to anything, it was because I campaigned against Brexit, and lots of people decided Brexit must be a good idea if I was campaigning against it.

So anyway...

Who does he listen to?

Is he someone...

Because it doesn't look like there is a lot of counsel taken there.

He's quite instinctive.

I think you're probably right, yeah.

Who does he listen to, Stanley Johnson?

Possibly.

You see, I'm now clamming up.

Yeah.

No, look, do you know what?

I mean, I said at the beginning, normally we would talk to you, Rachel Johnson, as a commentator and as a...

I really don't like being asked as a...

Just to come on, you know, things, to talk about male family members.

You can understand that.

Completely.

But you understand in this situation...

I quite completely do.

I guess what we're trying to do is work out...

No, of course.

Especially when two of them in question are on the front page of today's Times.

Exactly.

Yeah.

Fair do's.

Yeah.

Well, thank you for being so genuine.

Yeah.

And as honest as you can be and answer as much as you can, given the constraints of family bonds and all the rest of it.

It's always been a tricky line the last few years.

Do you have any sympathy for Matt Hancock and the texts?

I do, actually, because, I mean, look, which one of us would want to see our WhatsApp chats on the front page of the Telegraph, honestly?

I mean, but what an idiot to have handed his phone to Isabel Oakeshop, who's doing my podcast tomorrow.

Oh, fascinating.

Well, look, we're going to pick up on that in the next half of this podcast.

Rachel's podcast, Difficult Women, is available on Global Player, so do listen to that.

We're going to be back talking WhatsApp messages.

But we're also going to be talking about Kirstama attempting to appoint Sue Gray, the senior civil servant who conducted the party gate investigation, as his chief of staff, and the questions that Kirstama seems really reluctant to answer, which I think he has to at some point.

This is The Newsagents.

Welcome back.

I have no doubt about it.

The gobsmacker of last week, aside from Matt Hancock's WhatsApp messages, was the announcement

that Sue Gray, a senior civil servant who wrote the party gate report, was going to become chief of staff, Sir Keir Starmer, the leader of the opposition.

And of course, over the weekend, people have started saying, well, hang on, when was this discussion happening?

And were you writing the party gate report supposedly in judgment of Boris Johnson and what happened in Downing Street at the same time that you were about to become chief of staff to the Labour leader?

Surely that can't be right.

So not surprisingly, when Keir Starmer came into the studios here at Leicester Square, Newsagents HQ, which we allow LBC to use from time to time, it wasn't surprising that Nick Ferrari had a few questions for Sakir.

When did you first approach Sue Gray to be your chief of staff?

On the, I know her personally, I met her when I was direct to public prosecution.

She was off to a senior civil servant.

I met a number of them.

I was really, really impressed with her.

So I've known her personally since then.

She's not a friend.

I don't mix with her.

I'm not in the same social circles or anything like that.

She's, I know her personally in the sense that if I saw her as a reception or something, I would go over and have a discussion with her.

But as I say, I actually haven't had a discussion with her during the entire time she was doing her report.

Might I ask when you first approached her to be your chief of staff?

Well, I've been on a lookout for a chief of staff for a little while now.
Very clear what I wanted in that.
And obviously, you know, Sue will set out that, but nothing improper at all.
I've been on the lookout for a chief of staff.
I'm really pleased that people of her calibre are interested in that, but, you know.
So when did you approach?
Can I ask when you approach Sue?
Look, I've been looking for a chief of staff for a number of weeks now.
I think October 2022, Sam White left you.
Have I got that?
Well, that's when I lost, when Sam White moved on at that stage.
The first task I had for myself was being clear of my own mind what I wanted from a chief of staff, because I was beginning to think about how to deliver a chief of staff.
So I will try again.
And obviously, you don't have to answer.
But when did you first contact Sue Gray about the possibility of becoming your chief of staff?
Well, Nick, that's going to be laid out by Sue.
She's got to do that as part of a leaving procedure, but there's nothing improper at all.
But you can't tell me that.
Nick, nothing improper at all.
No, no, no.
But you can't tell me when you first approached her.
I've been looking for a chief of staff for a little while now, but Sue will lay that out.
Why won't you tell me?
But there's nothing improper at all.
No, no, no.
But just answer why you won't tell me when you first made contact with her.
I'm not going to go through lock, stock and barrel, but there's nothing improper.
It's not unusual.
But if it's not improper, I'm sorry to interrupt.
If it's not improper, why won't you say it was a month ago, Nick?
Or it was six weeks ago, Nick?
Or it was on New Year's Day?
Awkward.
Exchange that, isn't it?
I mean, there was nothing improper, as he explained to us five times.
I think you cannot not hear the denial in that conversation that he first told us about when he met her.
He then told us she wasn't a friend.
He then insisted there was nothing improper.
And then he said it was up to Sue Gray to explain the timing.

Now, why is this such a difficult question for Keir Starmer to answer?

Because he is trying to protect her from looking as if her whole inquiry counts for nothing because she was always about to jump from, if you like, a conservative bollocking to working for the leader of the opposition.

We know that Keir Starmer is a seasoned and practised lawyer.

He sounds in that interview like a seasoned and practised lawyer, able to evade a very direct question.

I think that it's catastrophic.

I think you need to sound like a human being.

Do you remember when we discussed on the podcast when Rishi Sunak gave an interview about whether

he had private medical insurance, and we were saying, he's just got to answer the question.

And sure enough, about a week later, he answers the question.

And I think that this is one of those questions where you just think, just answer the bloody question, you're making it more complicated, and you're given the impression that there is wrongdoing and suspiciousness.

The first rule of an excuse is only provided one.

So don't say it wasn't improper, and I met her a long time ago, and she's going to give out the timing herself.

Just choose one and go with your line there.

We don't know.

It might be that there is nothing at all in this, as he says, and it might be that he's just allowing her to set out the timing herself, but it doesn't paint a good picture at a time when many people, legitimate fans of both Keir Starmer and Sue Gray, still think that there is something very uncomfortable about the timing of this.

But perhaps we can understand more when we look at Sue Gray's apparent motivation.

Because we understand that Sue Gray had hoped to be promoted into a permanent secretary position,

and she had twice been overlooked for a more senior role, despite being, as we've heard, incredibly capable and a woman of supreme integrity.

And the person who had blocked that appointment, it's alleged, was Simon Case, who is the cabinet secretary.

And the cabinet secretary.

It sounds such an anonymous post, and it sounds so bloody boring.

But the cabinet secretary is, if you like, the head of the government running the government.

You've got the prime minister who is in charge of making the political decisions, and you've got the cabinet secretary who makes the wheels turn, who is the engine oil that lubricates all the moving parts of government.

And he is a critical figure.

Now, his appointment itself was fascinating because it was considered when he got the job that he was far too inexperienced to take on this humongous role by Boris Johnson.

Because he was brought in originally by David Cameron as a personal private secretary, somebody who basically learns the ropes under the prime minister.

Yeah.

[Transcript] The News Agents / The Johnson Family Honours List

And if you look at previous cabinet secretaries that have been around, the sort of Gus O'Donnells, the Robin Butler's, these are pretty big figures who are not afraid to say to the prime minister, I'm sorry, prime minister, I don't think you can do that.

Don't go there.

Don't go there.

This is very dangerous.

Yeah.

Boris Johnson deliberately chose somebody who didn't have that heft, who would answer back to him.

And arguably, a lot of the problems that Simon Case has found himself in, and he's found himself in quite a few, stem from the fact that he was inexperienced and he didn't feel he could stand up to Boris Johnson.

And remember, the reason that Sue Gray wrote the report on the parties that took place in Downing Street, it should have been written by Simon Case.

But he had to recuse himself because he attended one of the parties.

So Simon Case, and this is quite often the way politics works, is that you don't notice somebody's actions until they're thrust into the spotlight with something that you can't miss.

At the moment, Simon Case is in these WhatsApp messages with Matt Hancock.

He's the one who said it was hilarious that holiday makers were going into hotel quarantines on their return to the UK.

He was the one who joked about pop stars having to stay in Premiere Inn.

But as people have been reading those messages, and as the Sue Gray appointment has also come to light, people have gone back a step and they've said, wait a sec, wasn't Simon Case in charge when Nadim Zahawi was appointed to the cabinet despite having those tax problems pursuing him?

Wasn't Dominic Raab reappointed to the cabinet despite those allegations of bullying?

How are these not being vetoed?

How are these slipping through the net?

And I guess a lot of it is then traced back to this figure of Simon Case.

And so if he was anonymous beforehand, I don't think he's anonymous now, you left out one of the WhatsApp messages where he said to Matt Hancock about the Prime Minister that he is a nationally distrusted figure.

I mean, the cabinet secretary writing that down about the serving Prime Minister is quite the quote.

And that was Boris Johnson, just to clarify, not Rishi Sunak.

Simon Case was working for Boris Johnson.

Yes, Simon Case was then working for Boris Johnson.

So you now have Sue Gray going to Kierstahmer and ultimately Rishi Sunak has got some really tricky decisions to make because he could block the appointment of Sue Gray, but that would be a nuclear option because it's not unprecedented for people to go from one job to another.

He's also got Boris Johnson's honours list, what's he going to do about that?

Does he want to get into a fistfight with Boris Johnson over that when Boris Johnson

is looking like he is eyeing his return to Downing Street?

And so all of these things revolve around the cabinet secretary, Simon Case, and the new Prime Minister, Rishi Sunak.

Who's actually not having a bad week.

He comes out of the text messages quite well at the moment because he's seen to be more anti-lockdown in terms of conservative ideology than many thought he was.

He's had a very good week so far over the Windsor Accord Agreement.

You've worked here in Morocco, we call it a framework now, the Windsor Framework.

Oh, I missed the protocol, it's the protocol dead now.

But also, I think when you hear allies of Boris Johnson in brackets, possibly Boris Johnson himself, claiming that Sue Gray's departure has undermined her inquiry into whether he misled Parliament over those Downing Street parties, it's worth looking at where the public is.

And the times today is running a live poll, so obviously everything could change.

But with about 23,500 votes in, 86% of the public are saying they would still trust Sue Gray's findings, versus 14% who say it's discredited.

So I wonder if this is quite a lot of flailing around, me thinks he doth protest a little bit too much.

It's very easy now for Boris Johnson to say, how can you possibly trust anything she's said?

Well, as it happens, most people kind of do.

So what should Keir Starmer do about Sue Gray?

We'll be back in just a moment.

This is The News Agents.

Welcome back.

And I guess the thing that you can never know when you're in the middle of an uncomfortable exchange is how long that question will follow you around for.

I think it follows Keir Starmer around until such time as he answers it.

I mean, the question is, when did he start the discussions about Sue Gray coming over to be his chief of staff?

It's not that complicated, but he's making it sound complicated.

And all the time he's making it sound complicated.

If I was a conservative press person, I'd be thinking, attack, attack, attack.

There is something to see here.

The more he protests that there's nothing, the more you think there is something.

And so if I was advising Keir Starmer, which I'm not, I would say, you just got to get this out there.

And as fast as possible.

And just as we said about Rishi Sunak, when he wouldn't answer questions about private health insurance, just be transparent.

It's going to be dragged out of you sooner or later.

Sooner is better than later.

Weirdly, I am just off to be interviewed by Keir Starmer, not for a job I isn't to add, for a charity lunch, where we've turned the tables and he gets to ask me questions on

[Transcript] The News Agents / The Johnson Family Honours List

a day when I'd really like to be asking him the questions.

Yeah.

Well, that's going to be a fascinating exchange.

I hope he does a quick fire round.

I was just thinking, I might say, there was nothing improper about it.

Whatever he asked me, I'll just say, there was nothing proper.

There was nothing proper.

I mean, if you remember when we had Keir, you know, who would you rather go to Arsenal with?

Piers Morgan or Jeremy Corbyn.

So if he says, who would you rather be at lunch with, John Soaple or Lewis Goodall?

Your answer is?

Deena Sophos.

Sorry.

That's a cop out.

And that's so creepy that we let it go.

Honestly.

Shameful.

Shameful.

I know which side my bread is buttered.

Right.

Well, we will play your answers tomorrow, hopefully, on the news agents and we'll see you then.

Bye-bye.

Bye for now.

This has been a global player, original podcast and a Persephoneka production.