



HOUSE OF LORDS

Library Note

Bibliography on Lords Reform

This Library Note summarises a selection of the literature published on the subject of Lords reform. It begins with broader material covering the subject as a whole, before focusing on more specific themes, including powers, composition, remuneration, and the relationship between the two Houses. The summaries aim to provide a concise rather than comprehensive overview of the various arguments expressed by the authors, and in doing so present a range of opinions and perspectives. The Note only covers work published between 1999 and April 2012, with an emphasis on items published in academic articles and blogs, as well as books, but excluding the large volume of newspaper articles and correspondence on this subject. Further coverage of developments and government publications on the subject can be found in the House of Lords Library Note *House of Lords Reform 1997–2010: A Chronology* (July 2011, [LLN 2011/025](#)).

Russell Taylor
26 April 2012
LLN 2012/014

House of Lords Library Notes are compiled for the benefit of Members of Parliament and their personal staff. Authors are available to discuss the contents of the Notes with the Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public.

Any comments on Library Notes should be sent to the Head of Research Services, House of Lords Library, London SW1A 0PW or emailed to brocklehursta@parliament.uk.

Table of Contents

1. General Overviews and Edited Compilations on Lords Reform	1
2. Commentary on Lords Reform	3
3. Remuneration (Salaries and Allowances)	7
4. Legitimacy	8
5. Composition	10
6. Crossbenchers	14
7. Religious Representation	15
8. Methods of Selection	17
9. Expertise	20
10. Powers, Roles and Functions	22
11. Relationship Between the Houses	24
12. Transitional Arrangements	26

1. General Overviews and Edited Compilations on Lords Reform

[Our House: Reflections on Representation and Reform in the House of Lords](#) (ResPublica, 29 February 2012)

Published in February 2012, this paper compiled a number of articles that discussed the role of the House of Lords in providing broad representation. The authors covered subjects such as: religion, international comparisons, public engagement, society and commerce. The latter, written by John Longworth, argued that the House needed to better consider the interests of businesses, and sought to underline this with reference to the Pensions Act 2008 and the Localism Act 2011. He proposed a further strengthening of the appointments process, which he believed would be better suited to ensuring proper representation for all sectors.

House of Lords Reform Since 1911 (Peter Dorey and Alexandra Kelso, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

Dorey and Kelso's book provided commentary on the issues surrounding Lords reform over the last 100 years, with reference to some of the major developments within that time—such as the Life Peerages Act 1958 and the House of Lords Act 1999. In the final chapter, the authors considered the current prospects for reform of the House, debates over its legitimacy and the extent of its powers. In their conclusion, Dorey and Kelso suggested that many discussions over reform now have little to do with “institutional idealism” (i.e. achieving wholesale reform of the second chamber), and are more to do with the potential political and governmental effects of cumulative changes.

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

This briefing paper by Dr Alan Renwick provided analysis across a range of issues relating to the present government's proposals for Lords reform. These included: the future role and composition, the electoral system to be used, the transition to a reformed chamber and methods of remuneration. In his conclusion, the author believed that three big questions need to be further considered. First, what is to be the precise role of the second chamber? Second, how important is achieving democratic legitimacy? And finally, how would the best candidates be encouraged to stand for election?

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Compiling opinion pieces by a range of academics, politicians and Peers, this CentreForum report considered the proposals put forward in the House of Lords Reform Draft Bill and white paper, published on 17 May 2011. The report covered the background to reform—including views on bicameralism in other democracies—as well as a variety of detailed responses to the government's proposals.

[The House of Lords—Into the Future?](#) (Nicholas D. J. Baldwin, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, June 2007)

In this article, Nicholas Baldwin compiled presentations made by three Peers at a seminar about parliament. The first, by Lord Howe of Aberavon, is summarised below in the “Legitimacy” section of this bibliography. The second and third, by Lord McNally and Lord Carter, provided a broader view on reform proposals, as well as providing background to some of the steps in the reform process.

House of Lords (Donald Shell, Manchester University Press, 2007)

In his 2007 book, Donald Shell dedicated a chapter to reform of the House of Lords. He outlined a number of principles which he considered to be important when determining the shape of a reformed chamber, such as ensuring no party has an overall majority and how best to solidify its legitimacy. The author also discussed the arguments for and against elected members. Shell expressed his desire to see greater accountability of the executive to parliament, and increased negotiation in the legislative process.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Written in 2000, Meg Russell's book on Lords reform considered the history of the House of Lords, bicameral parliaments in other countries and people's perception of the House, asking how this knowledge could be best used to shape reform. Russell went on to list a number of features for reformed second chambers that appeared to garner support: they should represent the territorial nature of the state; the two chambers should have distinct functions; no powers to remove the government from office; less power on financial legislation and more on constitutional change; no party with overall control; an elected element to the membership; smaller membership than the lower chamber; and members to serve for longer terms.

2. Commentary on Lords Reform

[“A More Representative Chamber”](#): [Representation and the House of Lords](#) (Hugh Bochel and Andrew Defty, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 15 February 2012)

Presenting their findings following a series of interviews with 78 Peers in 2007 and 2008, this article considered the concept of “representation” and how it may feature within the House of Lords. The authors referred to a number of claims that the current composition of the House demonstrated broad representation of different ethnic groups, genders and regions. However, Bochel and Defty argued that there is little evidence to suggest that this representation extended to an appropriate range of ages, occupations or social classes. The authors also discussed questions over the accountability of Peers, and whether they may be more inclined to act in their own self-interests. In conclusion, they called for more consideration of the issue of representation before embarking upon further reform.

[Public Choice Theory and House of Lords Reform](#) (Stephen MacLean, *Economic Affairs*, October 2011)

Stephen MacLean’s article applied the principle of public choice theory to House of Lords reform. The author asserted that, when elected, representatives behave in a way that protects their best interests, simply responding to the many wants of the electorate. This arguably leads to more expensive government programmes, which require increased levels of taxation or government borrowing. MacLean praised the current House of Lords for its relative independence in the process of legislative scrutiny. Indeed, the author believed that having two elected chambers would see more policy compromises between the two Houses, adding to the risk of government failure.

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

Dr Alan Renwick considered the legislative impact of the House of Lords since the formation of the coalition government in May 2010, believing there to be two key developments. First, the author referred to discussions about the applicability of the Salisbury convention under a coalition government. And second, the author suggested that an influx of new members, many former MPs, led to a more partisan chamber which is less respectful of the government’s wishes. He used the proceedings on the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Bill in February 2011 as an example. The paper also explored recent attendance and voting statistics.

[An Independent Scrutiny Commission Could Take Over the Constitutionally Valuable Roles that the House of Lords Presently Performs, and at Lower Cost—Whether We Move to Create an Elected Second Chamber; or Reform the Unacceptable Features of the Current House of Lords; or Just Scrap a Second Chamber Altogether](#) (Dawn Oliver, London School of Economics blog, 6 July 2011)

Dawn Oliver considered the current proposals for Lords reform, and looked into the possible creation of an independent scrutiny commission in its place. She set out recommendations for the appointment of commission members, suggesting it should be done on an independent basis, with fixed-term membership, and that appointments be made to maximise areas of expertise. The author envisaged the commission taking on the burden of legislative scrutiny, and—therefore—believed it could be a cheaper and more efficient alternative to the House of Lords.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Covering many aspects of Lords reform, this paper contained an article by Meg Russell discussing bicameralism in other parliaments, and an article by Dawn Oliver advocating the creation of an independent “Scrutiny Commission” as an alternative to the House of Lords. Broad analysis of the 2011 white paper proposals were provided by Mark Harper MP (the Minister for Constitutional Reform), Hilary Benn MP, Baroness Royall of Blaisdon and Lord Harries of Pentregarth.

[A Stronger Second Chamber? Assessing the Impact of House of Lords Reform in 1999 and the Lessons for Bicameralism](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Studies*, 4 November 2010)

Discussing her belief that the 1999 reforms have led to a more politically balanced and “legitimate” House, Meg Russell considered the effect of this upon the parliamentary system as a whole. In Russell’s view, the strengthening of the House of Lords has created a forum for increased negotiation with the government, and allows Britain to pursue improved political consensus over policy making. Additionally, the author believed that the most likely outcome for reform would see a move to a proportionally elected second chamber, increasing the power of the House of Lords further still.

[Nick Clegg’s proposed reforms to the House of Lords is a solution seeking a problem](#) (Tim Bale, LSE blog, 6 June 2010)

Tim Bale questioned whether substantial reform of the House of Lords was actually a pertinent issue for the public, believing that many would consider other matters as more worthy of parliament’s time and energy. He suggested that the government may be better served trying to implement less fundamental changes that could improve the efficiency of the House, rather than trying to find a solution to a problem that has not actually been identified.

[House of Lords Reform: Are We Nearly There Yet?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2008)

Following the publication of the 2008 white paper on Lords reform, Meg Russell’s article considered some of the potential problems that may be faced getting the proposals agreed. In addition to disputes over the composition of the House and the extent of its powers, the author also believed that the choice of voting system will be a highly contentious issue, noting strong disagreement between parties on whether to use proportional representation or first-past-the-post. As a result, Russell suggested that any attempt at reform may face even fiercer opposition in the Commons than in the Lords.

[The House of Lords in 2006: Negotiating a Stronger Second Chamber](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, Constitution Unit, January 2007)

This Constitution Unit publication commented on recent changes in the House of Lords, such as the introduction of a Lord Speaker and apparent strengthening of the second chamber following the removal of the hereditary Peers. Citing increased debate in the House regarding its conventions, Sciara and Russell believed that the Lords had shown that an elected membership was not an essential element in strengthening the second chamber. They also asserted that further agreement on reform may prove difficult, alleging increased scepticism in the Commons over further bolstering of the Lords’ powers. However, the authors argued that the increased confidence in the Lords had been a boon to both chambers.

[Why Does the Government get Defeated in the House of Lords? The Lords, the Party System and British Politics](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, *British Politics*, 2007)

The authors assessed the impact of the 1999 reforms, insisting that the House of Lords now had an increased impact upon legislation and policy. They believed that this was attributable to two things: first, due to the changed composition of the House, there was often greater negotiation between political parties. And second, the reforms had led to a more confident second chamber. As a result, the authors argued that the House already had a growing influence within the political process.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Navigating Representation, Democracy and Legitimacy at Westminster](#) (Alexandra Kelso, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 3 June 2006)

Alexandra Kelso queried whether there was any true clarity on what the public would see as a justifiable new structure to the House of Lords. Kelso stated that people appeared to be happy with the work of the House, but were not content with the perceived undemocratic nature of its selection. However, the author then discussed the potential difficulties balancing the desire for an elected second chamber, with the continuing calls for the Lords to retain its level of individualism and expertise, and questioned whether a partially elected House would genuinely placate all parties.

[The House of Lords in 2005: A More Representative and Assertive Chamber?](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, Constitution Unit, February 2006)

Focusing on parliamentary activity in 2005, this report included discussions on the changes in the balance of power within the Lords and the lengthy proceedings on the Prevention of Terrorism Bill. The authors suggested that the impact of the Lords had increased, highlighting the importance of the Liberal Democrats and anticipating future challenges to the Salisbury convention. They predicted that this change could benefit both Houses, and may demonstrate that an elected element is not necessary to improve legitimacy.

Lords of Parliament (Emma Crewe, Manchester University Press, 2005)

Emma Crewe discussed the subject of Lords reform in one of the chapters of her 2005 book. She expressed her belief that it may now be time to separate the second chamber from titles entirely, believing it to be a necessary step in increasing public engagement. With reference to Commons procedure, Crewe noted the added difficulties facing members of the public wishing to make contact with a Peer. Discussing the question of Lords reform more generally, the author suggested that the House of Lords now offers a unique opportunity to improve the workings of democracy.

[Views from Peers, MPs and the Public on the Legitimacy and Powers of the House of Lords](#) (Meg Russell, Constitution Unit, 12 December 2005)

At a seminar on 12 December 2005, Meg Russell presented a paper analysing the results of a recent Constitution Unit survey of MPs, Peers and members of the public on the House of Lords. She presented three key parts of the survey. First, whether the removal of the hereditary Peers made the House more legitimate. Second, the extent to which the Lords should vote down legislation. And third, whether the Lords has enough power and policy impact. Discussing her findings, the author claimed that there was general satisfaction with the current work of the second chamber.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Breaking the Deadlock](#) (Paul Tyler MP et al, Constitution Unit, February 2005)

This paper set out a number of arguments and recommendations for Lords reform. Asserting their belief that the stalling progress on Lords reform related to fears over a reformed chamber challenging the supremacy of the Commons, the authors questioned that assumption, arguing that a reformed House need not be a replica of the Commons. The paper also looked into some of the other issues dominating the subject of Lords reform, including the relationship between the two chambers, improving legitimacy and maintaining levels of expertise.

[None of the Above: The UK House of Commons Votes on Reforming the House of Lords, February 2003](#) (Iain McLean, Arthur Spirling and Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

This article provided in-depth analysis of the Commons votes in 2003 on Lords reform. Studying the voting patterns, the authors considered six possible reasons why all the options were defeated, including strategic voting and member error. They also discussed voting bloc statistics and whether there would have been a clearer result if the alternative vote system had been used. The authors claimed that many of their findings indicated overall support for a largely or wholly elected House.

Second Chambers (Nicholas D. J. Baldwin and Donald Shell eds, Frank Cass, 2001)

A collection of works considering the operation and importance of second chambers in general, this book discussed their powers, structures and relationships with other bodies. Nicholas Baldwin concluded the book by discussing the Royal Commission's view on the important components of a second chamber, and also the importance they attached to the work of the European Union Committee. He finished his piece by asserting the need to fully appreciate their autonomy and standing within the parliamentary system.

3. Remuneration (Salaries and Allowances)

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

In the section entitled “A Full-Time, Salaried Chamber”, Dr Alan Renwick considered the cost implications of a salaried chamber, and addressed some of the potential difficulties enlisting “full-time Parliamentarians”. Stating that the proposals in the Draft Bill would lead to a more costly House of Lords, the author estimated that this would still amount to less than the Commons, and believed that many would find this situation to be acceptable in the pursuit for a more democratic second chamber. Renwick also discussed the possibility of salaries being linked to attendance.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Breaking the Deadlock](#) (Paul Tyler MP et al, Constitution Unit, February 2005)

Endorsed by a number of MPs, this Constitution Unit publication made firm recommendations regarding the level of resources allocated to members in a reformed House of Lords. They proposed that members receive additional support staff to assist with research or secretarial tasks, and are salaried in accordance with the decisions of the Senior Salary Review Board. However, in recognition of the absence of any constituency duties, the paper anticipated that these allowances would be lower than those for MPs.

[Commentary on the White Paper: The House of Lords – Completing the Reform](#) (Robert Hazell, Constitution Unit, January 2002)

Under the heading “Payment, Allowances and Office Support”, Robert Hazell made a number of recommendations for the remuneration of members in a reformed House. The author suggested that all members, whether elected or appointed, should be paid daily allowances of around £250 to £300, and receive increased levels of office support to allow them to perform proper legislative scrutiny. His vision of the allowances system was broadly similar to the new system introduced on 1 October 2010.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Recognising that the reformed membership would be expected to attend the House “full-time” and that it would be inappropriate to encourage members to support themselves through outside employment, Meg Russell argued for the introduction of yearly salaries. Estimating costs, including the allocation of support staff, Meg Russell still believed these would be lower than for the Commons.

4. Legitimacy

[Lords reform: A century in the making Part 2](#) (Rafel Heydel-Mankoo, ResPublica blog, 9 December 2010)

In this blog piece, Rafel Heydel-Mankoo argued that the concept of linking elections to democratic legitimacy is too simplistic. The author asserted that true liberal democracy relies upon the balancing and consideration of a number of factors, such as: human rights; a respect for a variety of beliefs; majority opinion; a platform for political dissent and the application of equal rights. This principle, Heydel-Mankoo claimed, is already embodied by the current composition of the House of Lords, making it essential to the UK democratic system. The author then set out a number of ways in which he believes that the introduction of elected members will negatively impact upon the work of the two Houses.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Considering the background to the Lords reform proposals contained in the Draft Bill, Lord Maclennan of Rogart highlighted two arguments in favour of an elected chamber and increased legitimacy. First, he suggested that some people viewed the House of Commons as too obedient to the wishes of government. Therefore, he believed it was important to have a second chamber with a greater authority to challenge them. Second, he considered the House of Commons to be over-burdened, and that—if the second chamber was also democratically elected—it could alleviate this by taking on more of the workload.

Constitutional Law, Administrative Law and Human Rights (Ian Loveland, Oxford University Press, 2009)

In his chapter on the House of Lords, Ian Loveland questioned the proposals put forward by the 2001 white paper and the Wakeham Commission. Referencing calls for the second chamber to maintain a pronounced level of expertise and impartiality, he suggested that the key division within the legislative process was now between party interest and national interest, a subject he argued was not met by those proposals. Addressing the calls for a more democratic second chamber, Loveland asked whether even the House of Commons could be said to truly represent the wishes of the public.

[“If It Isn’t Broke...”](#) (Lord Howe of Aberavon, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, June 2007)

Presenting at a seminar about parliament in the 21st Century, Lord Howe argued against the perception that the House of Lords lacks legitimacy due to its unelected status. First, he challenged the assumption that democratically elected parliamentarians are best for society, referring to quotes from Walter Bagehot and Robin Cook. And second, Lord Howe drew attention to developments brought about by the 1999 reforms, and recent surveys regarding public perception of the House, as evidence that the House already carries enough legitimacy to challenge the government.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Navigating Representation, Democracy and Legitimacy at Westminster](#) (Alexandra Kelso, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 3 June 2006)

With reference to manifesto commitments, white papers and committee reports on Lords reform, Alexandra Kelso sought to analyse some of the fundamental discussions. Considering the quest for greater legitimacy, the author drew a distinction between the principles of better representation and improved democracy, claiming that they are not intrinsically linked. Kelso also distinguished between legitimacy of input, and that of

output, asserting that further consideration of this issue was needed to truly enhance the work of the second chamber.

[Is the House of Lords Already Reformed?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

Meg Russell began her article by looking at bicameral democracies around the world, concentrating on the relationship between the two chambers and their composition. In order to be effective in their role, she asserted that second chambers need to possess three characteristics; adequate powers, a distinct composition from the lower house, and perceived legitimacy. Russell believed that the main argument for reforming the House centred on that of improving legitimacy. However, the author claimed that this aim had already been accomplished, to an extent, through the 1999 Act, which had removed the previous imbalance in favour of Conservative Peers and led to a more active second chamber.

5. Composition

[Elected Second Chambers and Their Powers](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 6 February 2012)

Meg Russell compared the compositions of other second chambers throughout the world, using the information available on the Inter-Parliamentary Union's database. At the time of writing, she identified 76 second chambers where it was possible to ascertain the composition arrangements, and found that only 17 of these contained no elected members. However, drawing a distinction between the concept of direct and indirect elections, the author stated that only 21 of the 76 were wholly and directly elected. Russell's findings also indicated that 19 second chambers contained a mix of elected and unelected members.

[Expertise in the House of Lords is vital and supplied by the cross benchers: there is no democratic deficit and so elections are not needed](#) (Baroness D'Souza, LSE blog, 13 July 2011)

Addressing the proposals in the Draft Bill, Baroness D'Souza—then Convenor of the Crossbenchers—asserted that the main function of the legislation would be to achieve a wholly or partly-elected House, and questioned how this will actually lead to a more effective second chamber. She believed that making such a change would cause the House to become too similar to the House of Commons, risking a loss of individual expertise and stronger party political bias.

[The Draft Bill and the Report of the Royal Commission on the reform of the House of Lords](#) (Lord Harries of Pentregarth, LSE blog, 11 July 2011)

Lord Harries of Pentregarth compared the current Draft Bill on Lords reform with the proposals put forward by the Royal Commission report in 2000, and largely favoured the latter. In particular, he argued that the planned size limit for the House to 312 members was too small and would not enable proper representation of a breadth of professions. Additionally, Lord Harries stated that he saw benefit in having an elected element within the House, believing that it would allow better regional representation, although he did not see this as an important measure in the quest to improve democratic accountability.

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

Whilst considering the possible composition of a reformed second chamber, Dr Alan Renwick looked at all membership options individually. Referring to evidence from abroad, Renwick did not believe that an elected House would necessarily affect the primacy of the Commons, especially if the Commons retain their majority of Cabinet seats. Renwick further debated the issue of Lords ministers in the chapter "Ministers in the Chamber". Addressing concerns of possible tensions arising between elected and appointed members, the author asserted that there is simply no evidence—domestic or international—available to predict whether this would be the case.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

John Baker drew attention to the disagreements over the future composition of the House, believing that no reasoned case has been put forward for an elected second chamber. Referring to the conflicting results of the 2007 votes in the Commons on composition, the author argued that the government may be seen to be forcing through constitutional reform without adequate awareness of the views of the electorate. Baker also questioned whether the House of Commons should have such a strong and independent say over the “only effective control on their power”.

[The Salisbury convention that avoided complete Lords reforms for the last century is dead, but achieving any mandate for change that Peers must accept remains very difficult](#) (Iain McLean, LSE blog, 4 July 2011)

Iain McLean considered the response to the 2011 white paper on Lords reform, questioning the belief that an elected House of Lords would cease to be a forum of expertise. The author also looked into the changing views of the major political parties over the last decade regarding the composition of a reformed second chamber.

[House Full: Time to Get a Grip on Lords Appointments](#) (Meg Russell, Constitution Unit, April 2011)

Reporting on the difficulties caused by the growing membership of the Lords, the Constitution Unit discussed a number of interim proposals to limit the growth of the House, including fixed-term appointments, provisions for retirement and transferring more powers to the Appointments Commission. In light of potentially long delays to the process of wholesale reform, the report expressed concern that if some of these proposals were not implemented soon then the House would become increasingly expensive and inefficient.

[Debate: Shifting Sovereignities: Should the United Kingdom have an elected upper house and elected head of state?](#) (Iain McLean and Vernon Bogdanor, *Political Insight*, April 2010)

In this piece, Vernon Bogdanor put forward the argument against an elected House of Lords, with the opposing stance presented by Iain McLean. Bogdanor briefly considered the problems encountered by elected second chambers in other countries, and believed that current proposals would make it too similar to the Commons, risking its important role in the scrutiny process. In contrast, McLean maintained that the current proposals for an elected element would avoid such difficulties, and argued that the Commons would retain their supremacy through their embodiment of most recent public opinion.

[Against the grain](#) (Bishop of Bradford, Nick Baines' blog, 14 March 2010)

The Bishop of Bradford—then Bishop of Croydon—discussed the potential disadvantages of having a 100 percent elected second chamber, as well as the benefits brought about by the presence of the Bishops. Suggesting the quest for a fully elected House to be a naive attempt at improving democracy, he stressed his belief in the importance of drawing upon the expertise of people from beyond the political sphere.

[Women Peers and Political Appointment: Has the House of Lords Been Feminised Since 1999?](#) (Christina Eason, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 27 January 2009)

Analysing the changes in the proportion of female Peers before and after the House of Lords Act 1999, Christina Eason opined that their increased representation has been a

by-product of the reforms thus far, and not a key aim. Eason called for the issue of gender inequality in the chamber to be discussed further when considering proposals for future reform of the House.

[Lords of our Manor? How a reformed House of Lords can better represent the UK](#) (James Hulme and Nick Hope, New Local Government Network, September 2008)

Published soon after the 2008 white paper on Lords reform, this report put forward an argument for elected members as a method to improve regional representation. Looking at data compiled from the addresses of Peers' main residences, the authors asserted that representation in the House was biased towards London and the South East.

[House of Lords Reform: Are We Nearly There Yet?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2008)

Addressing the debate over whether the House should be wholly elected or retain a 20 percent appointed element, Meg Russell referred to the Commons votes of 2007 and a survey by the Constitution Unit. Highlighting results suggesting that 83 percent of respondents considered independence an important function of the House of Lords, the author also stressed her belief that the popularity of a wholly elected chamber during the 2007 Commons votes did not reflect the true wishes of MPs.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Breaking the Deadlock](#) (Paul Tyler MP et al, Constitution Unit, February 2005)

This paper made several recommendations for the composition of a reformed second chamber. These included: a partially elected element of 70 percent, a smaller membership, no party making up an overall majority, the majority of Cabinet ministers remaining in the Commons, and a reduction in the number of Bishops to 16.

[Is the House of Lords Already Reformed?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

Suggesting that one of the important elements that contributes to the effectiveness of a second chamber is that it has a "distinct composition", Meg Russell also discussed the need to ensure that no party obtains overall control. Drawing on examples in other bicameral parliaments, the author reasoned that this tends to lead to better legislative scrutiny and less partisan decision-making. Thus, if this principle were borne in mind, Russell asserts that it would be possible to introduce an elected element to the House of Lords without losing its distinctiveness and deliberative ethos.

Commentary on the White Paper: The House of Lords—Completing the Reform

(Robert Hazell, Constitution Unit, January 2002)

Looking into the potential composition of the House of Lords in relation to the 2001 white paper, Robert Hazell made the following recommendations: that the second chamber be made attractive to non-career politicians and—therefore—distinct from the House of Commons, that it retains an appointed element which could be said to be non-partisan, and that it should contain broader representation of faith groups and genders. The author then considered the possible role the Appointments Commission could take.

Response to “Cm 5291: The House of Lords— Completing the Reform” (Iain McLean, Oxford University, 2001)

Iain McLean considered some of the difficulties that could be encountered ensuring that the composition of the House provided a balance of gender, religions and ethnic groups. Addressing elected members, McLean asserted that such a balance would require particularly intrusive primary legislation. Recognising that the Appointments Commission could not redress the balance simply through its limited remit to appoint members, the author claimed that the only viable solution may be to ask each political party to voluntarily produce a balanced list of candidates for each election.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Writing about the potential for a mixed chamber of appointed and elected members, Meg Russell outlined one of her concerns. The author claimed that “limited experience” from other parliaments suggested that controversy can arise when appointed members decide the outcome of votes. As such, Russell believed that one possible solution would be to limit their involvement to decisions only affecting their devolved nations or regions. Russell considered the idea of territorial representation in further depth throughout the chapter on composition.

6. Crossbenchers

[Expertise in the House of Lords is Vital and Supplied by the Crossbenchers: There is No Democratic Deficit and So Elections Are Not Needed](#) (Baroness D'Souza, LSE blog, 13 July 2011)

Writing at the time as Convenor of the Crossbenchers, Baroness D'Souza considered the potential difficulties that may be caused by having a partially elected House, focusing on the possible future role of the crossbenchers. Believing that independent appointed members would often distinguish themselves by challenging the government's policies, based on their individual backgrounds and knowledge, Baroness D'Souza suggested that their opposition may quickly lead to them being dispensed with altogether.

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

Dr Alan Renwick looked at evidence suggesting that the crossbenchers have a positive influence on the work of the House, and considered the possible effects of the reform on their impact. With reference to voting statistics from the 2009–10 session, Renwick suggested that, although their representation within the chamber would be decreased under current proposals, the imposition of full-time membership could see an increase in their participation.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Asserting her belief that the crossbenchers provide a wealth of expertise and a vital check on party politics, Baroness D'Souza—then Convenor of the Crossbenchers—argued that an elected chamber would not adequately represent or protect the wishes of the public. Listing recent issues such as the NHS, education, the Public Bodies Bill, and legislation supported by community organisations, Baroness D'Souza suggested that the House already regularly voiced the concerns of the electorate.

[Independent Parliamentarians En Masse: The Changing Nature and Role of the 'Crossbenchers' in the House of Lords](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 15 October 2008)

Providing a detailed study of the crossbenchers, this paper looked into members' backgrounds, beliefs, influence and voting patterns, as well as considering their future within the House. The authors asserted that their participation is seen as a valued feature of the Lords, claiming that it is representative of a society demonstrating decreased political affiliation. However, they did question whether the group can realistically be said to be independent, due to the involvement of members with apparent political ties, and others with past connections. In conclusion, the article—with reference to statistics suggesting a low voting record—determined the crossbenchers' influence as a subtle, yet persuasive, element within the Lords.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Whilst considering the composition of the House, Meg Russell turned her attention to the desire for an independent element. Analysing the potential impact of no party retaining overall control of the chamber, the author believed that this opened up the possibility of the independent members often holding the balance of power. Drawing comparisons to the Australian Senator, Brian Harradine, Russell argued that this could lead to them becoming controversial figures, prompting questions about their appointment and how they are resourced.

7. Religious Representation

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

Dr Alan Renwick presented three solutions to the argument over whether the Bishops should be retained in a reformed House of Lords. First, he discussed the possibility of ending their representation entirely. He believed that this position has many advocates, but also acknowledges that there are people who would regret the loss of a faith-based perspective entirely. Second, Renwick considered calls to extend the range of automatic places to other faith groups. And finally, the author queried whether the Appointments Commission could have been given the responsibility of ensuring the representation of a range of religious groups.

[Against the Grain](#) (Bishop of Bradford, Nick Baines' blog, 14 March 2010)

The Bishop of Bradford—then Bishop of Croydon—argued that Bishops are often better informed and experienced in the realities of society than many other members of the Lords, principally due to their close relationship with the work of regional parishes. As such, he believed that their removal would be a potential loss to the second chamber, although he did acknowledge that there was no fundamental reason for retaining them.

[Religious Representatives in the House of Lords](#) (British Humanist Association, March 2010)

The British Humanist Association (BHA) argued that no member of the House should be elected or appointed on religious grounds alone. With reference to the current composition of the Lords, the BHA asserted that providing automatic places to one religious group is undemocratic, but believed that it would be too difficult to enforce rules broadening coverage within the Lords. The report then outlined its opposition to automatic religious representation entirely, questioning its relevance to modern society and asking whether religious groups should be required to assert their influence upon parliament in an alternative manner.

Coming Off the Bench: The Past, Present and Future of Religious Representation in the House of Lords (Andrew Partington and Paul Bickley, Theos, 2007)

This Theos publication considered the role of the Bishops in the House, and discussed their recent attendance and voting records. Looking to the future, Partington and Bickley asserted that the Bishops could still make an important contribution to the House, despite the time restraints imposed upon them by their other responsibilities. As such, the authors suggested the possibility of 5 or 6 “working” Bishops serving in the chamber, with extra thought given to the extent of their diocesan duties and selection.

Reforming the Lords: The Role of the Bishops (Janet Lewis-Jones, Constitution Unit, June 1999)

This report considered the arguments for and against the automatic representation of religious groups in the House of Lords, and stated that the UK is the only Western democracy that still retains the practice. In relation to the widening of religious representation to other groups, Lewis-Jones predicted there may be difficulties actively identifying suitable figures. Additionally, the author queried whether the Bishops are genuinely representative of the Church of England as a whole, and believed that, if the idea of religious representation is to be pursued, then it may be more useful to consider alternative proposals that are more reflective of our multi-faith society.

8. Methods of Selection

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

This briefing paper provided analysis of five of the principal voting systems under consideration for the elected element of the second chamber, and discussed how best to encourage a wide range of candidates. The author also considered issues such as: methods to fill vacancies, the order of names on the ballot paper, the structure of constituencies and recall procedures to allow voters the opportunity to replace members who are seen to perform unsatisfactorily.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Patrick Dunleavy put forward his suggestions for improving the government's proposals for Lords reform. One such recommendation was to use the open list proportional representation voting system rather than the single transferrable vote system. He provided three reasons for this preference. First, he believed it is simpler to administer and easier for voters to follow. Second, he suggested that, if the Lords votes were held alongside the general election, having two radically different systems would create confusion. He claimed that this problem was evident in the 2008 Scottish parliament elections. Finally, he pointed to the alternative vote referendum as an indication of the public recently rejecting a numerical preference system.

The Athenian Option (Anthony Barnett and Peter Carty, Imprint Academic, 2008)

Originally a paper published by Demos in 1998, the authors of this book recommended experimenting with an entirely different approach to the second chamber, based on the Athenian model. They suggested that members could be chosen by lot from the list of registered voters, whilst ensuring they incorporated a balance of regional representation and genders. Amongst their recommendations, they argued for a yearly intake, close guidance by elected politicians, a maximum of four years' service and changes to the scrutiny process of Bills. The authors also considered their proposals alongside those in the 2008 white paper.

[Lords of Our Manor? How a Reformed House of Lords Can Better Represent the UK](#) (James Hulme and Nick Hope, New Local Government Network, September 2008)

In Section Four of their report, James Hulme and Nick Hope discussed the potential voting systems that could be used for the election of members. They detailed their preference for the open list system over the closed party list system, arguing that the latter does not allow voters a say over who the candidates are. The authors also believed that consideration should be applied to the possibility of running regional primaries to nominate potential candidates, or whether they could be indirectly nominated by local authorities and devolved legislatures. Finally, another method mentioned in the report was that of the d'Hondt voting system for the European parliament, with seats awarded on a proportional basis.

[House of Lords Reform: Are We Nearly There Yet?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2008)

Meg Russell noted the apparent lack of government consensus in the 2008 white paper on its preferred voting system for an elected element of the Lords. Suggesting that those being discussed were first past the post, the alternative vote system, or two forms of

proportional representation, Russell questioned whether this would lead to fundamental disagreements between the parties in their pursuit of reform.

[Power: An Independent Inquiry into Britain's Democracy](#) (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, March 2006)

This report aimed to tackle the issue of improving public engagement with politics, and made a number of suggestions relating to reform of the House of Lords. One of its principal recommendations was that the House be 70 percent elected; with candidates being over 40 years old, sitting for three parliamentary terms and not chosen on a closed party list system. The aim of these caveats was to ensure the reformed chamber was not overly politicised.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Breaking the Deadlock](#) (Paul Tyler MP et al, Constitution Unit, February 2005)

This Constitution Unit publication made a number of recommendations for method of election to a revised second chamber. These included: boundaries established in line with those for European elections, use of the single transferable vote system, elections to be held alongside the general election, and no hereditary by-elections. Considering the appointed element, the paper proposed that they be chosen by a statutory Appointments Commission, with members of the commission chosen by a joint committee within parliament. Further to this, they called for these members to be non-political appointments, with the commission making appointments to fill potential gaps in expertise. Finally, the publication advocated that the Prime Minister be allowed four appointments per parliament, reliant on the condition that they would immediately serve as ministers.

[Commentary on the White Paper: The House of Lords—Completing the Reform](#) (Robert Hazell, Constitution Unit, January 2002)

Robert Hazell's report on the 2001 white paper contained a study of the possible voting systems that could be used to determine the elected element of the Lords. The author recommended that the elections be held alongside those for the European parliament; due to the use of the same constituency boundaries and to prevent candidates for the Lords being overshadowed by those for the Commons. The report also contained an appendix advocating the use of an open list system, and potential provisions to encourage gender balance and the selection of independent candidates.

[Response to "Cm 5291: The House of Lords - Completing the Reform"](#) (Iain McLean, Oxford University, 2001)

Amongst his recommendations for methods of selection, Iain McLean advocated the use of an open list or single transferable vote system, with members appointed for two terms totalling ten years. The author also considered the discussions over the timing of the elections, stating his preference that these occur alongside the general election. When examining the possibility of combining them with European parliament elections instead, McLean stated that there was a firm principle that confidence in the government drops during mid term, therefore slanting the result of the voting for the second chamber. In contrast, he claimed that votes held alongside the general election tend to represent the government's popularity, yet would still be highly unlikely to result in an overall majority for one party.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Meg Russell's chapter on the possible composition of the new chamber considered the possible methods of selection. These included: direct and indirect election, appointment, and other forms of membership—such as vocational. Additionally, the author discussed the view that appointed members should be independent of political party ties.

9. Expertise

[Expertise in the House of Lords is Vital and Supplied by the Cross Benchers: There is No Democratic Deficit and So Elections Are Not Needed](#) (Baroness D'Souza, LSE blog, 13 July 2011)

Baroness D'Souza, writing as Convenor of the Crossbenchers, believed that the proposals for Lords reform would make the House too similar to the House of Commons, risking a loss of individual expertise and a stronger party political bias. Quoting from the [Report of the Leaders Group on Working Practices](#) about the benefits provided by the range of interests and backgrounds prevalent in the Lords, Baroness D'Souza also suggested that this provided closer links to specialist groups, allowing better cooperation with non-political lobbyists.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

In addition to considering previous attempts at reform, Iain McLean's piece contained many references to the issue of expertise within the House. The author believed that, if the House retains an appointed element, the role of the Appointments Commission would ensure that members were introduced that provided a breadth of backgrounds and interests. Also, McLean argued that the time periods associated with future membership, and the rules barring immediate candidacy to the Commons, would ward off those simply intending to pursue a high-profile political career.

[Analysis of existing data on the breadth of expertise and experience in the House of Lords](#) (Meg Russell and Meghan Benton, Constitution Unit, March 2010)

This report, commissioned by the House of Lords Appointments Commission, analysed the professional backgrounds of members of the House, and the available data on regional representation. Noting the large groups of Peers coming from political or legal backgrounds, the paper identified a number of areas of expertise that appeared to be less well represented. These included: architecture, engineering, environmental protection, public health, and non-higher education. The paper also looked into the background of former MPs, and considered how the data varies between political parties.

[A Question of Expertise: the House of Lords and Welfare Policy](#) (Hugh Bochel and Andrew Defty, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 27 August 2009)

This article concentrated on the notion of expertise in the House of Lords, and whether this has been demonstrated within discussions on welfare policy. The authors acknowledged that discussion of expertise occupied a large part of Lords reform debates, referencing the role of the crossbenchers and the differing backgrounds of members. However, the report also suggested that the level of expertise in the House is, at times, "patchy", and may sometimes demonstrate a lack of up to date public policy knowledge.

[Power: An Independent Inquiry into Britain's Democracy](#) (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, March 2006)

Recommending a reformed House of Lords, this paper proposed that the Upper House be given the power to co-opt outside individuals onto Select Committees when a particular area of expertise is needed. They believed that this would mitigate the potential loss of specialist knowledge if the House were partially or wholly elected.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

Meg Russell discussed the difficulties that may be encountered recruiting members with expertise, especially those who are still active in their field, due to the time commitments that would be expected in a reformed House of Lords. Further considering the inclusion of experts, Russell noted that it was not a theme commonly identified in other bicameral parliaments.

10. Powers, Roles and Functions

[Elected Second Chambers and Their Powers](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 6 February 2012)

Focusing on wholly or largely elected second chambers across the world, Meg Russell's article analysed the differing extents of their powers to veto or delay legislation. She suggested that these appeared to vary to a wider degree than some would claim; with some—such as the US Senate—enjoying a clear opportunity to block legislation, and others having comparatively weaker powers. As such, Russell believed that the assertions that Lords reform will not have any effect on the relationship between the two Houses, or will not affect the primacy of the Commons, may be “misleading”. In her conclusion, the author emphasised the experiences of Australia, Germany, Italy, India, Japan, Switzerland and Thailand as potential case studies for further comparative research.

[The Parliament Acts, the Constitution, the Rule of Law, and the Second Chamber](#) (Dawn Oliver, *Statute Law Review*, 23 December 2011)

Discussing some of the merits of the legislative scrutiny functions of the House of Lords, Dawn Oliver expressed her belief that a change to a wholly or largely elected House will have a negative effect upon its role. The author asserted that the process will suffer from reduced expertise, increased reliance on party whips, and members who may be less interested in the proper scrutiny of bills. Therefore, if the House is to be substantially elected, Oliver argued for the importance of establishing an independently appointed Scrutiny Commission. Setting out the potential terms of reference of the commission, the author then suggested that this step could negate the need for the House of Lords entirely.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

David Howarth addressed Clause 2(1) of the Draft Bill on Lords reform, asserting that it avoids discussions about whether the powers of the House should be reformed. The author analysed the current role of the House in the scrutiny process, and debated whether the Lords should be given the option of a full veto over certain legislation. He suggested that such a proposal would call for the second chamber to consist of—at most—a small minority of appointed members, as it would need greater “democratic endorsement”.

The New British Constitution (Vernon Bogdanor, Hart Publishing, 2009)

Providing general consideration of many of the proposals in the 2008 white paper on Lords reform—and arguments about the powers of the House—the author also looked to the experiences of other second chambers; notably Australia, Spain and the USA. Analysing these, Bogdanor argued that a reformed second chamber is unlikely to achieve better representation, with members most likely to vote in line with party whips rather than represent the interests of individual regions. He then discussed the demerits of basing the UK system on countries that have stronger territorial divisions and layers of governance, noting that the devolved legislatures only account for 15 percent of the UK.

[The Policy Impact of Defeats in the House of Lords](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 13 October 2008)

Through its analysis of the statistics on government defeats in the Lords, this piece looked to determine the House's impact on policy. Noting that a generous proportion of

these defeats appeared to lead to a government rethink, the authors then discussed whether these actually related to major areas of policy, concluding that the role of the Lords could be said to be important, yet unpredictable. The article also considered other potential factors attached to the government defeats; such as the origins of the Bill, the composition of the vote and timing within the parliamentary session.

[Why Does the Government get Defeated in the House of Lords?: The Lords, the Party System and British Politics](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, *British Politics*, 2007)

This article examined the powers of the different groups within the House to contribute to a government defeat, and looked into how these have developed since the 1999 reforms. Concentrating on the six parliamentary sessions following the House of Lords Act, the authors suggested that the decisive vote moved from the Conservatives—previously the best represented party—to the Liberal Democrats, with most defeats relying on consensus between two of the parties. The authors concluded that the shift in composition has led to a less partisan chamber, and a more pluralistic parliamentary system.

[The Powers and Conventions of the House of Lords](#) (Lord Carter, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

With reference to the Standing Orders and conventions of the House, Lord Carter's article looked into the powers held by the Lords in the legislative process. He believed the House had a significant impact on the legislative programme, outlining government concessions on Acts such as the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 and the Cabinet Office's insistence on a Lords handling strategy before the introduction of a government Bill. Lord Carter asserted that any proposals for reform should first codify how the powers of the second chamber would operate in the revised structure.

[Is the House of Lords Already Reformed?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

Believing that one of the three characteristics essential to the performance of an effective second chamber is that of "adequate powers", Meg Russell considered those currently held by the House of Lords. Although acknowledging that some may consider the Lords' powers to be fairly moderate—in comparison to those held by some other second chambers—the author asserted that the opportunity to delay legislation granted to the Lords appeared to be enough to allow the House to challenge the government on their proposals. Russell also noted that most reports on Lords reform appeared to advocate that these powers should remain largely unchanged.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

In her book on Lords reform, Meg Russell devoted a chapter to the potential powers of the new House. The author believed that the House should maintain its substantial scrutiny role, detailing the important work the Lords does scrutinising European and secondary legislation, as well as its comprehensive coverage of primary legislation. Russell also gave consideration to the House being given extra responsibility to exercise safeguards over possible constitutional changes.

11. Relationship Between the Houses

[Complementary Reform in the House of Lords?](#) (Beatrice Ferguson, ResPublica blog, 8 March 2012)

Beatrice Ferguson outlined her concerns that reforming the House of Lords will change the relationship between the two Houses, from “complementation” to “competition”. The author believed that the current make-up and legislative framework for the two Houses grants the House of Commons its primacy, yet allows the Lords to carry out “unbiased” pre-legislative scrutiny. In her conclusion, Ferguson argued that discussion on reform should centre on increasing the democratic authority of the Lords, whilst also safeguarding the way in which the constitutional process operates.

[The Salisbury convention that avoided complete Lords reforms for the last century is dead, but achieving any mandate for change that Peers must accept remains very difficult](#) (Iain McLean, LSE blog, 4 July 2011)

Iain McLean provided a brief history of the Salisbury-Addison convention and previous attempts at House of Lords reform. Analysing these, the author suggested that the imposition of reform would rely on a manifesto commitment to it, an electoral victory and the introduction of the necessary legislation early in the parliamentary term.

[End of the Peer Show](#) (CentreForum, July 2011)

Believing that, regardless of government intention, the current proposals for Lords reform will have an impact on the relationship between the two Houses, Graham Allen MP argued that such developments should be welcomed. The author believed that a reformed second chamber could see greater negotiation and cooperation in the legislative process. As such, he suggested that Lords reform could be the first step towards wider constitutional reform, including the possible introduction of a formal written constitution.

[A Stronger Second Chamber? Assessing the Impact of House of Lords Reform in 1999 and the Lessons for Bicameralism](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Studies*, 4 November 2010)

In this essay, Meg Russell first attempted to analyse whether the 1999 reforms have led to a stronger House of Lords. She considered statistics on government defeats and Lords insistence on amendments, and questioned whether long-standing conventions were now being challenged within the House. The author also looked at the changing nature of the government’s relationship with the Lords, suggesting there was evidence of increased negotiation between the two Houses.

[The Policy Impact of Defeats in the House of Lords](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciarra, *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 13 October 2008)

This article provided analysis of government defeats in the Lords, and considered the possible factors that may influence the government’s reaction to them. It presented varied hypotheses on how the relationship between the two Houses could be said to impact upon legislation and policy decisions.

[The House of Lords in 2006: Negotiating a Stronger Second Chamber](#) (Meg Russell and Maria Sciara, Constitution Unit, January 2007)

Analysing data on government defeats in the Lords, the authors of this paper asserted that, rather than demonstrating that the two chambers were in competition, there were actually indications of an increased willingness for the two Houses to work together. Russell and Sciara further discussed this idea through their consideration of the proceedings on the Terrorism Bill, the Racial and Religious Hatred Bill and the Identity Cards Bill.

[Reforming the House of Lords: A View from the Parapets](#) (Lord Norton of Louth, *Representation*, 2004)

Lord Norton considered the background to the House of Lords Act 1999, the 2000 Wakeham Commission report and the free votes held by both Houses in 2003 on Lords reform. In his analysis of the 2003 votes, Lord Norton drew particular attention to groups of MPs and Peers that appeared to switch their views from those expressed previously. He claimed that MPs raised concerns about competition between the two Houses if there were to be an elected element of the Lords; both within parliament, and between individuals in the local election process.

[Is the House of Lords Already Reformed?](#) (Meg Russell, *Political Quarterly*, 14 July 2003)

Meg Russell began her article by looking at bicameral democracies around the world, concentrating on the relationship between the two chambers and their composition. Highlighting the fact that the current structure of the chamber gives members immunity to confidence votes, the author suggested that this grants the Lords greater freedom and results in a less partisan chamber. Russell also considered the concerns regarding the maintenance of Commons supremacy, believing that this is often a key principle in the minds of those arguing for an appointed element of the Lords.

Reforming the House of Lords (Meg Russell, Oxford University Press, 2000)

In her chapter considering the possible role and functions of a new chamber, Meg Russell suggested that a joint mediation committee could be set up to resolve disputes between the two Houses, as currently operates in France and Germany. Setting out a number of possible features of such a committee, the author believed it may allow for the faster resolution of disputes and encourage better compromise.

12. Transitional Arrangements

[House of Lords Reform: A Briefing Paper](#) (Dr Alan Renwick, Political Studies Association, 4 July 2011)

Examining the transitional proposals in the 2011 white paper on Lords reform, Dr Alan Renwick identified the question over whether the “transitional members” should receive a salary as a potential problem. Noting that paying two-thirds of the current membership would incur costs of over £30 million, Renwick then queried whether you could ensure these members attended “full-time”, in line with the new membership. The author offered the solution of introducing a mechanism for the current membership to opt-in if they were willing to attend “full-time”.

[Reforming the House of Lords: Breaking the Deadlock](#) (Paul Tyler MP et al, Constitution Unit, February 2005)

Believing it was important to encourage a smooth transition to a reformed House, this paper made a number of suggestions to better facilitate this. The authors proposed that only a third of the House gets replaced at a time, meaning that it would take three terms—envisaged to last five years each—until all the current members were vacated. Additionally, they saw no value in the immediate removal of hereditary Peers, instead preferring they be treated in the same way as life Peers, with decisions on retirements made by the in-House parties. The report also recommended retirement packages for outgoing members, and that they should not be barred from standing for election to the new chamber.

[Response to “Cm 5291: The House of Lords—Completing the Reform”](#) (Iain McLean, Oxford University, 2001)

Under the heading “The Transitional House”, Iain McLean criticised the 2001 white paper for its analysis of the possible problems faced in the transitional phase. Addressing concerns over the number of members in the House during the reform process, McLean asserted that the removal of the hereditary Peers and the Bishops would help alleviate this issue, in conjunction with the offer of a retirement scheme. The author also believed that this would ensure that the House remained politically balanced.

