Keir Starmer sacked Louise Haigh as Transport Secretary yesterday.

He knew she had a spent and incredibly insignificant criminal conviction. He really has no excuse for not understanding the importance of spent convictions.

He appointed her knowing that.

Then she criticised P&O for their appalling labour relations, and he wanted to suck up to them despite that fact, and the almost total failure of the corporate governance of that company as represented by its incredibly late filing of accounts.

The difference with Haigh on this issue was serious. It revealed the rottenness in Starmer’s version of Labour and that alternatives were available. And so,I have little doubt, someone in Labour’s corporate team planted the story in the press that Haigh had a trivial spent conviction on a matter where she secured no gain. It was just too easy.

And then Labour advised her she should resign, even though they admit all the facts were known to them, all along. It would do less damage to the Party, they thought.

Starmer’s acknowledgement of Haigh’s resignation was terse, rude, utterly uncaring and straightforwardly nasty.

What does this say about Louise Haigh? She made a mistake once, relying on poor professional advice. There but for the grace of God go most people. And she believes in what many might call Labour values. She actually knows what they are.

What does it say about Starmer? I think the kindest description is that he’s a duplicitous, callous, two-faced, untrustworthy, coward. He is also clueless. If he couldn’t have foreseen the risks in this, the belief that he has absolutely no political antennae is reinforced.

Starmer wanted Haigh to go away. The fact that she has resolves nothing for him. It just proves what a really unsuitable candidate to be prime minister he was, and how unfit to hold office he is.