

**Johnny Stocks**

**Supervisor: AA**

**Tutor: SPMA**

*Depoliticising the House of Lords: why and how  
should it be reformed?*

**Subject Area: Politics**

**Word Count: 3984**

## Depoliticising the House of Lords: why and how should it be reformed?

House of Lords reform has been a topic of fierce debate for over 130 years<sup>1</sup>. Our upper house was recently described<sup>2</sup> as ‘a ludicrous affront to democracy and accountability’ in *The Guardian*. With Brexit demonstrating the power of unelected peers in our legislative process, as well as various expenses scandals, public perception of the Lords is poor. Research<sup>3</sup> by YouGov revealed that 60% of Britons think there are too many Lords; its 803 members<sup>4</sup> make it the second largest parliamentary chamber in the world, exceeded only by China’s 3000-strong National People’s Congress, which Lord Russell (pers. comm.) describes<sup>5</sup> as “...not a great place to be second to.” Britain is one of only 3 countries globally<sup>6</sup> to have a second chamber larger than its lower chamber, and it will only continue to grow<sup>7</sup> as each new Prime Minister appoints more peers of their ‘political persuasion’. In a 2016 Commons debate<sup>8</sup> on Lords reform, Pete Wishart MP described it as “... an utter undemocratic disgrace. It is an antiquated, absurd Chamber stuffed full of cronies, donors, placemen, former MPs and failed MPs.” To improve efficiency and legitimacy, the House needs to be smaller, and the appointments system needs to be comprehensively reviewed. Recent reform efforts have called for a democratically elected house, without the hereditary peers and bishops, and I will consider the merits of such reform, ultimately concluding that it should remain unelected. I will briefly explore the history of the Lords and attempts at

---

<sup>1</sup> Parliament Website, House of Lords reform <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/lords-reform/> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>2</sup> The Guardian, *The Lords is a ludicrous affront to democracy and accountability* (2015) <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/oct/28/house-of-lords-democracy-accountability-reform> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>3</sup> YouGov, *Most people want fewer politicians in the House of Lords* (2015) <https://yougov.co.uk/news/2015/09/01/fewer-politicians-house-lords/> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>4</sup> Oscar-Research Datasheets, *MP and Lords Database* <http://www.oscar-research.co.uk/datasheets/mplord> (accessed 18/8/17)

<sup>5</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.8*

<sup>6</sup> UCL Political Science Publications, *Second Chambers Overseas* (1999) <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/political-science/publications/unit-publications/40.pdf> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>7</sup> The Conversation Journal, *Why making the House of Lords smaller is a bigger task than it seems* (2017) <http://theconversation.com/why-making-the-house-of-lords-smaller-is-a-bigger-task-than-it-seems-70875> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>8</sup> House of Commons Hansard, *Volume 615* (19<sup>th</sup> October 2016) <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-10-19/debates/CA0685E2-6A97-43EE-8524-94C27A53AB25/HouseOfLordsReformAndSizeOfTheHouseOfCommons> (accessed 27/6/17)

past reform, before considering its ultimate purpose, and how it should be reformed to best execute this role.

The chamber originates from an 11<sup>th</sup> century Anglo-Saxon assembly<sup>9</sup> of councils for Saxon Kings, before becoming a house of bishops ('Lords Spiritual') and noblemen ('Lords Temporal') in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. During the 16<sup>th</sup> century suppression of the monasteries, the Lords Temporal formed their first majority, and the number of bishops was limited to 26 in 1847. The 19<sup>th</sup> century saw the House of Commons grow in influence<sup>10</sup> and several reform bills limited the Lords' powers, although they retained unlimited veto rights. By the 20<sup>th</sup> century the House of around 450 was composed of bishops, Law Lords (added under The Appellate Jurisdiction Act in 1876<sup>11</sup>) and hereditary peers.

In 1906 a reforming Liberal government was elected<sup>12</sup> and the Lords blocked Chancellor Lloyd George's 'People's Budget'<sup>13</sup> of 1909, which aimed to tax rich landowners. This confrontation between Lords and Commons led the Liberals to pass a bill to weaken the powers of the upper chamber, threatening them with an inundation of Liberal appointees should they stand in their way. The bill became the Parliament Act 1911 which formally limited the Lords' powers to delay bills by only 2 years and 'money bills' by just a month. The revolution was that the Commons could now pass bills without the Lords' consent.

However, the real breakthrough came when Labour's 1945 landslide election victory saw the development of the 'Salisbury Convention'. Before the war there were just 15 Labour peers, and the Marquess of Salisbury, then Conservative leader of the Lords, led an initiative amongst Tories that they would not vote down legislation that was explicitly proposed in the Labour manifesto. This has become an informal convention of the House and one that gives it some democratic legitimacy. A revised Parliament Act<sup>14</sup> further

---

<sup>9</sup> Parliament Website, *History of the House of Lords* <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/history-of-the-lords/> (accessed 9/8/17)

<sup>10</sup> Wikipedia, *House of Commons of the United Kingdom* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House\\_of\\_Commons\\_of\\_the\\_United\\_Kingdom#Layout\\_and\\_design](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_of_Commons_of_the_United_Kingdom#Layout_and_design) (accessed 9/8/17)

<sup>11</sup> Parliament Website, *About Parliament (Judicial Role section)* <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseoflords/judicialrole/overview/professionalcourt/> (accessed 18/8/17)

<sup>12</sup> Meg Russell, p.12

<sup>13</sup> History Today, *The House of Lords rejects the 1909 People's Budget* (2009) <http://www.historytoday.com/richard-cavendish/house-lords-rejects-1909-people%E2%80%99s-budget> (accessed 9/8/17)

<sup>14</sup> The Telegraph, *How the Parliament Act works* (2004) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1476916/How-the-Parliament-Act-works.html> (accessed 18/7/17)

restricted their powers of delay to just one year in 1949 and The Life Peerages Act 1958<sup>15</sup> allowed women to sit and meant peers could be appointed through life peerages instead of hereditary peerages. This was part of the long held desire to remove hereditary peers, which had been debated since 1886<sup>16</sup>. The House of Lords Act 1999 finally removed the right of most hereditary peers to sit, but still left 92 'hereditaries' as a compromise. In Lord Russell's view<sup>17</sup>, they respected that the removal was a manifesto commitment and they would not stand in their way, but that Labour had not committed to any further package of reform, so they wanted a 'rearguard' of hereditary peers left in as a reminder that Lords reform was very much unfinished business. Russell says, "It was assumed that it would be a temporary stopgap on the way to full reform." Most people think it unfair that anyone should sit by birth right, and this contributes to poor perception, but a more comprehensive reform package must be thought of to reduce its size and regain legitimacy. The 1999 reform shrunk the House in the short term by removing one group of peers, but left a House that would quickly bloat back to the previous size. In 2011 Nick Clegg created a bill for an 80% elected and 20% appointed chamber of 300 peers, although this was dropped in 2012.

The House of Lords in its current 'edition' most certainly requires reform. First of all, it is simply too large. Lord Taverne QC (Liberal Democrat) (pers. comm.) asserted that, "The Lords is now so completely dysfunctional because it is so very very large. In major debates speeches are limited to about 5 minutes! On the debates on the European Union we had over 85 speakers."<sup>18</sup> Taverne thinks that a revising Chamber should be analysing legislation in great detail, and its current bloated size simply does not allow for that, and we are therefore increasingly seeing the 'Punch and Judy' style politics of the Commons replicated in the Lords. Russell adds, "We are too large, not least because when there is a big debate there literally is not enough room."<sup>19</sup> The House can never sit as one body because there are simply too many peers, and this means major academics and experts might miss out on taking part in a debate where they could have contributed vital information. This is a significant problem, and many call for fixed-terms or an age limit of 75 to cull the numbers

---

<sup>15</sup> Parliament Website, *The Parliament Acts and the role of the Lords (Life Peerages Act 1958 Section)*

<http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseoflords/parliamentacts/overview/lifepeeragesact/> (accessed 18/8/17)

<sup>16</sup> Parliament Website, House of Lords reform <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/lords-reform/> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>17</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.10-11*

<sup>18</sup> Interview with Lord Taverne QC (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.17*

<sup>19</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.8*

instantly to a manageable size. However, these are short term measures, as if the system allows parties to appoint peers, those parties can dole out unlimited peerages and the House will soon balloon again. Reform needs to provide a long term solution. Russell gave me his opinion: "I think the patronage powers are abused."<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the appointments system seems to be the most important area of reform, given that the size of the House is, in a sense, subsidiary to it. It seems that a system where party leaders can appoint whoever they want will ultimately get tied up with money and political donations. Lord Oakeshott (non-affiliated) told me, "I think it is just completely wrong for one individual to have power like that to create new members of Parliament."<sup>21</sup> Other problems include the large number of inactive peers who make little contribution to proceedings but still claim the full daily allowance. Oakeshott explained that many people will be appointed as a minister for one year, "... but then they're in there for the next 20 or 30 years making no contribution or just pissing about."<sup>22</sup> This results from the fact there is no mechanism to get rid of people from the House, and this is partly why it is so large.

However, before considering reform, it is first necessary to establish what the purpose of the House of Lords should be. Having established a purpose, I will later consider how the composition and appointments system should be reformed to equip the House to carry out this function.

I met with 3 Lords and an MP to get their views on reform, all of whom agreed that the purpose of the House was to scrutinize, revise and improve draft legislation. Lord Russell told me, "[O]ur primary purpose and skill is going through legislation in enormous detail, clause by clause and line by line, pulling it apart, trying to act as a devil's advocate and work often across party lines to try and persuade the front bench that there are different or better ways to achieve what the bill is trying to achieve." They are not the lawmakers and serve as a 'review stage' in the passage of a bill through the parliamentary legislative process, using their skill and knowledge to aid governments. Conservative MP Anne Milton explained<sup>23</sup> that they have powers to 'regret' legislation (which tells the government to think again), to 'annul' secondary legislation (which stops the granting of law-making

---

<sup>20</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.7*

<sup>21</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.25*

<sup>22</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.28*

<sup>23</sup> Interview with Anne Milton MP (31<sup>st</sup> March 2017), *Appendix p.3*

powers to different branches of government) and to delay a bill by one year, but not to veto. These limited powers determine the scope of the function they serve.

British bicameralism is distinct from the American system where 2 elected chambers compete and can block each other. Thus Russell explained that we are cosmetically bicameral but practically unicameral. He says, "Our secondary purpose is to act as a 'fig leaf' in the notional sense of there being a form of check and balance with a bicameral assembly. The reality is that we actually have very little authority."<sup>24</sup> He implies that the Lords are partly there to prevent perception of the Commons as an unrestrained Leviathan. This unique system allows Lords, who have more time available than MPs, to scrutinize bills and apply their diverse range of expertise while ultimately allowing elected representatives to have the final say.

Moreover, in JS Mill's *Considerations on Representative Government* he argues<sup>25</sup>, "It will not often happen that of two Houses similarly composed, one will be almost unanimous, and the other nearly equally divided," thus implying a second chamber has no real purpose as both chambers are likely to reach similar conclusions. However, Mill misses the point that they serve fundamentally different purposes. Brexit shows that elected representatives, despite the fact that 73% of MPs voted remain<sup>26</sup>, tend to obey the will of the people. Contrarily the Lords showed great resistance, perhaps due to their unelected nature, and Lord Taverne told me, "I think that the Lords would vote against Brexit if they had their way, but it has always been part of the Salisbury convention that if something is in a manifesto then they would put the referendum into effect." The Houses do disagree occasionally, but that is valuable as it forces rethinking, although Mill points out<sup>27</sup> that much consideration already goes into the creation of a bill: "... it must be a very ill-constituted representative assembly in which the established forms of business do not require many more than two deliberations." The problem of competing chambers is shown by the recent public outrage that unelected peers, "... had no right to thwart the will of ... the referendum result."<sup>28</sup> This is simply not the purpose of the House and the Salisbury convention prevents

---

<sup>24</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.7*

<sup>25</sup> JS Mill, p.232

<sup>26</sup> Business Insider, This is the size of the majority in House of Commons against Brexit (2016) <http://uk.businessinsider.com/majority-house-of-commons-against-brexit-2016-11> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>27</sup> JS Mill, p.232

<sup>28</sup> The Guardian, Don't abolish the Lords. History shows it really can be reformed (2017) <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/feb/23/dont-abolish-house-of-lords-history-reformed-second-chamber-change> (accessed 27/6/17)

them from stopping manifesto promises, although Lord Oakeshott told me, “The Lords will be playing their proper role of exposing all the difficulties and complications,” and he explained that because of Mrs May’s weak electoral mandate and lack of detail in her manifesto, the Lords will feel more able to flex their muscles. This would appal some, but this is due to the questionable current membership of the Lords, characterised predominantly by corrupt elderly cronies. With better composition, this is the purpose they should serve and I agree with Lord Taverne who fears that referendums are drawing us towards a plebiscite where the will of the people is seen as sacrosanct, instead of having a more considered parliamentary democracy.

Ultimately the Lords seek to amend and improve new laws, and 45% of ‘Lords amendments’ pass into law<sup>29</sup>, even when they directly disagree with what the Commons originally wanted. One can be happy with this as it means legislation is scrutinized by what is essentially an expert panel before being accepted as law, giving some form of ‘quality control’ on the Commons. Mill might say it is unnecessary, but it seems that this is directed towards bicameral assemblies where the two houses serve the same function, whereas in our unique case the Lords have authority in the sense of scrutinizing, but not creating or killing legislation. This purpose need not be reformed, as Lord Oakeshott told<sup>30</sup> me: “I think the powers are basically right. I think the balance of powers is about right. But I think the composition and the method of choosing the House of Lords is completely wrong.” Thus the House could be better composed and appointed to execute this important role.

Having established its rightful purpose of scrutinizing the work of the Commons, we must consider what composition and membership equips the House to execute this role. There are two groups of Lords that many believe should be removed on grounds of being undemocratic and archaic.

The first target is the 26 Bishops. Wishart<sup>31</sup> said, “This is the only legislature in the world that has a place reserved for clerics other than the Islamic Republic of Iran...” and he

---

<sup>29</sup> Interview with Lord Taverne QC (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.17*

<sup>30</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.24*

<sup>31</sup> House of Commons Hansard, *Volume 615* (19<sup>th</sup> October 2016)

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-10-19/debates/CA0685E2-6A97-43EE-8524-94C27A53AB25/HouseOfLordsReformAndSizeOfTheHouseOfCommons> (accessed 27/6/17)

has a point particularly given that a recent report<sup>32</sup> found that only 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the population identify as Anglican. Oakeshott adds<sup>33</sup>, “The Anglicans are not even the majority of the Christian Church in this country, never mind the Muslims or the Jews.” Milton says<sup>34</sup> they are there because we have an established Church, which Lord Russell explained makes it ‘very complicated constitutionally’ to unravel, which of course is no good reason for not trying. He thought the ideal situation would be if the Church of England recognised that the country had changed and gave up their seats voluntarily. Milton said that “... faith leaders have got an important role to play in our society ... because we talk a lot about the practical, and we don’t always necessarily consider the spiritual impact of laws we pass.” Religious faith leaders do bring different perspectives, but it seems an aberration that only one group is formally recognised. Milton claims many peers come from a wide range of religions, but surely they present their views without being recognised faith leaders. Believers of all religions have a right to be there and indeed are, but it seems archaic that clerics of one faction have a section reserved. Many, including the Bishop of London<sup>35</sup>, have called to see the 26 seats shared between representatives of different faiths to create a truly all-inclusive ‘Lords Spiritual’, although the Church of England website<sup>36</sup> says that, “[T]hey seek to be a voice for all people of faith, not just Christians.” Others think religious leaders should have nothing to do with legislative affairs, as they have done in England since well before the formation of the Church of England.

Another target are the 92 hereditary peers. Many rightly believe, including hereditary peer Lord Russell, that it is unfair that anyone should be appointed just because their father was there before them, and instead people should be there on the merits of how good a job they will do. Wishart reminds us<sup>37</sup> that “... only land-locked Lesotho has elders as a feature of its democracy. This is the mother of all parliaments for goodness’ sake,

---

<sup>32</sup> The Telegraph, *Britain is no longer a Christian country and should stop acting as if it is, says judge* (2015) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/12036287/Britain-is-no-longer-a-Christian-country-and-should-stop-acting-as-if-it-is-says-judge.html> (accessed 3/8/17)

<sup>33</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.30*

<sup>34</sup> Interview with Anne Milton MP (31<sup>st</sup> March 2017), *Appendix p.4*

<sup>35</sup> Christian Today, *Bishop of London Defends Church’s Position in House of Lords* (2007) <https://www.christiantoday.com/article/bishop.of.london.defends.churchs.position.in.house.of.lords/9475.htm> (accessed 3/8/17)

<sup>36</sup> Church of England Website, *Bishops in the House of Lords* <https://www.churchofengland.org/our-views/the-church-in-parliament/bishops-in-the-house-of-lords.aspx> (accessed 3/8/17)

<sup>37</sup> House of Commons Hansard, *Volume 615* (19<sup>th</sup> October 2016) <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-10-19/debates/CA0685E2-6A97-43EE-8524-94C27A53AB25/HouseOfLordsReformAndSizeOfTheHouseOfCommons> (accessed 27/6/17)



and we still have people here because of birthright!” However, evidence collected during my research suggests that hereditary peers might actually scrutinize government action more comprehensively than life peers.

Indeed, analysing voting data from *The Public Whip*<sup>38</sup>, with help from the House of Commons library, has revealed that the average rebellion rate of hereditary peers in divisions since 2001 is 9.04%, whilst that of the House of Lords as a whole is a measly 0.07%. Thus hereditary peers vote against the majority vote of peers from their party (sometimes known as the ‘whipped vote’) more regularly than party appointed peers. I would suggest this is because hereditary peers know they will never reach high office within their parties so are more willing to vote on the merits and failings of a particular bill having assessed it with their own expertise, ignoring party whips. This is exactly how Lords should operate; it is a ‘review stage’ where ‘experts’ put their knowledge to good use. If peers are merely voting on orders of whips, then they are blindly following the lines of party officials, meaning they are not using their backgrounds to scrutinize legislation, and serve no distinct function from the lower house nor provide any meaningful advice to the government. It is right that the elected House follows the will of the people, but given that the Lords have no right to create or veto legislation, they should be genuinely analysing bills with their expertise to improve it rather than following a whip, and it is hereditary peers who would appear to be more willing to do this. Russell put it very neatly: “The moral contract between a hereditary peer and the party he or she decides to align with and between a life peer and their affiliated party is fundamentally different.” This willingness to disconnect from parties and depoliticize the House should be at the heart of future reform.

Moreover, the removal of hereditary peers and/or the bishops is likely to be part of the next stage of reform due to their poor public perception, but this alone would not improve the efficacy with which it carries out its role. A fuller package of reform to depoliticize the House and permanently reduce its size will be considered in the next section.

Finally, the appointments system and size of the House will be considered. The Lords do not reflect the number of votes cast in General Elections. Wishart says, “... the ultimate

---

<sup>38</sup> The Public Whip Website, *Data on rebellion rates of members of the House of Lords* [www.publicwhip.org.uk](http://www.publicwhip.org.uk) (accessed 31/7/17)

horror of the membership of the House of Lords ... is the fact that we still have 104 Liberal Democrat peers. Roundly rejected by the electorate, the Liberal Democrats are kept alive in that crypt on a political life support system.” Even Taverne and Oakeshott, current and former Lib-Dems respectively, described it as ‘crazy’<sup>39</sup> and ‘ridiculous’<sup>40</sup>. Sir Henry Bellingham MP has proposed<sup>41</sup> indirect elections are held based on votes cast in elections, with each party having an electoral college, and with a cap of 500 peers. This would be more representative but in reality it’s very hard to have a House with any tenure or longevity if members are removed and added with every electoral swing. Moreover, it doesn’t need to mimic the Commons as it serves a different purpose, and as explored earlier the House should be distancing itself from parties to encourage better scrutiny of government action.

Furthermore, Milton supports the crossbenchers, who are appointed by an independent commission, telling me that their ability to choose whether or not to follow whips allows them to better scrutinize government action: “... their freedom is derived from the fact that they’re not elected, because if you’re standing for election, you’re always mindful of what that is going to do to your voters, for want of a better word, in the way you behave.” Therefore, it seems obvious to me that the Lords should be purely composed of crossbenchers, as that allows the Lords real freedom to impart wisdom and knowledge, which is their ultimate purpose, free from party political interference. This same freedom and party disconnection was found with the ‘hereditaries’ but ultimately there is no room for the injustice of appointment by birthright in a modern legislature, and it is too damaging to the House’s perception and sense of legitimacy. Having a House of crossbenchers also prevents parties appointing people as a payback for a donation, and those appointed would feel less responsibility to toe the party line. Oakeshott told<sup>42</sup> me, “...that any appointments system whereby party leaders are making appointments is inherently undemocratic, and inherently has the seeds of corruption in it.”

To appoint this House, many call for democratic elections. However, democratically elected individuals would not be the best people to carry out the role of scrutinizing government. Milton<sup>43</sup> said, “... to do that effectively you need people from a wide range of

---

<sup>39</sup> Interview with Lord Taverne QC (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.17*

<sup>40</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.27*

<sup>41</sup> House of Commons Hansard, *Volume 615* (19<sup>th</sup> October 2016)  
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-10-19/debates/CA0685E2-6A97-43EE-8524-94C27A53AB25/HouseOfLordsReformAndSizeOfTheHouseOfCommons> (accessed 27/6/17)

<sup>42</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.25*

<sup>43</sup> Interview with Anne Milton MP (31<sup>st</sup> March 2017), *Appendix p.1*

backgrounds, so my problem with it being wholly elected ... is whether people from a wide range of backgrounds would stand for election? The answer is probably no.” She gave the example of her friend Professor Winston who was happily appointed but would not have stood for election otherwise, thus suggesting an elected house would lack the breadth of knowledge it currently has. Lord Russell added that the hereditary dominated pre-reform House actually had greater experience and diversity: “The randomness of the genetic lottery, which enabled somebody to become a peer, did create a genuine diversity. There were more people who were unlike each other in many ways in the pre-99 House than in the current House where an awful lot of people have had pretty similar careers, backgrounds, senses of self-importance and all the rest of it.”<sup>44</sup> Either way it seems that undemocratic appointments bring people in who are less afraid to tell the government what they think. A revising chamber requires handpicked ‘experts’ from across society, instead of politically motivated candidates who actually threaten democracy according to JS Mill who agrees with Plato<sup>45</sup> that those best equipped to govern are seldom those who wish to govern.

Moreover, our system is superior to more democratic ones like the Spanish Senate<sup>46</sup>, which is appointed by popular elections and regional Parliaments. Senators serve 4 year terms, which has been called for in Britain, but short terms and party swings leave the Senate lacking longevity and tenure<sup>47</sup> to develop into an effective instrument to add value to new legislation. Replicating the Commons with yet more ‘temporary’ elected officials fighting and squabbling is inferior to having a genuine ‘upper’ house of wisdom and knowledge, that serves a distinct purpose and is above party squabbles. Taverne supported the German Bundesrat<sup>48</sup> model where members represent the governments of the 16 federate states. However, to serve as a ‘review stage’ you don’t want government representatives but instead people who have had non-political careers who have practical real-world experience. Both these examples show that an elected House of Lords, as is much desired in Britain, would destroy a unique example of how bicameralism can work.

---

<sup>44</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.13*

<sup>45</sup> Wolff, p.96

<sup>46</sup> Senado de España Website, *Composition of the Senate*  
<http://www.senado.es/web/conocersenado/temasclave/composicionsenadoelecciones/index.html?lang=en>  
(accessed 9/8/17)

<sup>47</sup> Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.12*

<sup>48</sup> Bundesrat Website, *Organisation* [http://www.bundesrat.de/EN/organisation-en/organisation-en-node.html;jsessionid=7C1E5B3097C06ABBEEE5F8795D89FCEF.2\\_cid374](http://www.bundesrat.de/EN/organisation-en/organisation-en-node.html;jsessionid=7C1E5B3097C06ABBEEE5F8795D89FCEF.2_cid374) (accessed 9/8/17)

Ultimately the House of Lords is not as bad as the tabloids lead us to believe, with tales of peers leaving taxis running<sup>49</sup> outside while they claim their daily allowance, hiring prostitutes<sup>50</sup> and snorting cocaine. It is all too easy to see bishops and aristocrats as outdated, and critique the unelected nature of the House, but as explored in this essay, hereditary peers are actually well placed to revise legislation, although in the long run should be removed, and the unelected nature is where the House derives its freedom to scrutinize. To amend legislation well does not require parties, and a fully elected House would see people with less experience and more party discipline replacing distinguished Lords who will rebel against party whips. There is no place for parties in a revising chamber and they should lose the right to appoint peers. The House should be composed entirely of independently appointed crossbenchers, with a coherent vetting system to prevent ‘payback peerages’ or individuals with blatant conflicts of interest, to ensure the culture of cronyism is ended and that it is not stuffed with corrupt donors. A new Appointments Commission, having removed the hereditary peers and bishops, can also remove inactive peers and investigate those who have made donations. This cleansing process and appointment of handpicked crossbenchers will allow Lords to scrutinize legislation with real wisdom and expertise. The Salisbury Convention puts in sufficient protection against creating a runaway unelected ‘Leviathan’ and ensures they cannot block elected representatives, while still allowing a more legitimate counter voice to be heard in political debate which the public would finally be able to respect. Although, the disappointing conclusion is that in this political climate where Brexit dominates both the government’s and Parliament’s agenda, there is little chance of seeing any Lords reform in the coming years. Lord Taverne said, “[Brexit] pushes everything else aside.”<sup>51</sup> Lord Oakeshott said, “It’s complete paralysis.”<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> The Telegraph, *Peer ‘kept taxi running while claiming £300 House of Lords allowance’* (2017) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/21/peer-kept-taxi-running-claiming-300-house-lords-allowance/> (accessed 26/7/17)

<sup>50</sup> The Independent, *Watch the undercover footage that allegedly shows peer Lord Sewel snorting cocaine with two prostitutes* (2015) <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/watch-the-undercover-footage-that-allegedly-shows-labour-peer-lord-sewel-snorting-cocaine-with-two-10417927.html> (accessed 26/7/17)

<sup>51</sup> Interview with Lord Taverne QC (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.23*

<sup>52</sup> Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *Appendix p.29*

## Bibliography

1. Parliament Website, House of Lords reform <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/lords-reform/> (accessed 27/6/17)
2. The Guardian, *The Lords is a ludicrous affront to democracy and accountability* (2015) <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/oct/28/house-of-lords-democracy-accountability-reform> (accessed 27/6/17)
3. YouGov, *Most people want fewer politicians in the House of Lords* (2015) <https://yougov.co.uk/news/2015/09/01/fewer-politicians-house-lords/> (accessed 27/6/17)
4. Oscar-Research Datasheets, *MP and Lords Database* <http://www.oscar-research.co.uk/datasheets/mplord> (accessed 18/8/17)
5. Interview with Lord Russell (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *can be found in Appendix*
6. UCL Political Science Publications, *Second Chambers Overseas* (1999) <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/political-science/publications/unit-publications/40.pdf> (accessed 27/6/17)
7. The Conversation Journal, *Why making the House of Lords smaller is a bigger task than it seems* (2017) <http://theconversation.com/why-making-the-house-of-lords-smaller-is-a-bigger-task-than-it-seems-70875> (accessed 27/6/17)
8. House of Commons Hansard, *Volume 615* (19<sup>th</sup> October 2016) <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-10-19/debates/CA0685E2-6A97-43EE-8524-94C27A53AB25/HouseOfLordsReformAndSizeOfTheHouseOfCommons> (accessed 27/6/17)
9. Parliament Website, *History of the House of Lords* <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/history-of-the-lords/> (accessed 9/8/17)
10. Wikipedia, *House of Commons of the United Kingdom* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House\\_of\\_Commons\\_of\\_the\\_United\\_Kingdom#Layout\\_and\\_design](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_of_Commons_of_the_United_Kingdom#Layout_and_design) (accessed 9/8/17)
11. Parliament Website, *About Parliament (Judicial Role section)* <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseoflords/judicialrole/overview/professionalcourt/> (accessed 18/8/17)
12. *Reforming the House of Lords* by Meg Russell (2000), published by OUP Oxford
13. History Today, *The House of Lords rejects the 1909 People's Budget* (2009) <http://www.historytoday.com/richard-cavendish/house-lords-rejects-1909-people%E2%80%99s-budget> (accessed 9/8/17)
14. The Telegraph, *How the Parliament Act works* (2004) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1476916/How-the-Parliament-Act-works.html> (accessed 18/7/17)
15. Parliament Website, *The Parliament Acts and the role of the Lords (Life Peerages Act 1958 Section)* <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseoflords/parliamentacts/overview/lifepeeragesact/> (accessed 18/8/17)
16. Parliament Website, House of Lords reform <http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords/lords-history/lords-reform/> (accessed 27/6/17)
17. Interview with Lord Taverne QC (2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017), *can be found in Appendix*
18. Interview with Lord Oakeshott (23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017), *can be found in Appendix*
19. Interview with Anne Milton MP (31<sup>st</sup> March 2017), *can be found in Appendix*
20. *Considerations on Representative Government* by JS Mill (1861), published by Parker, Son and Bourn
21. The Guardian, *Don't abolish the Lords. History shows it really can be reformed* (2017) <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/feb/23/dont-abolish-house-of-lords-history-reformed-second-chamber-change> (accessed 27/6/17)
22. The Telegraph, *Britain is no longer a Christian country and should stop acting as if it is, says judge* (2015) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/12036287/Britain-is-no-longer-a-Christian-country-and-should-stop-acting-as-if-it-is-says-judge.html> (accessed 3/8/17)
23. Christian Today, *Bishop of London Defends Church's Position in House of Lords* (2007) <https://www.christiantoday.com/article/bishop.of.london.defends.churchs.position.in.house.of.lords/9475.htm> (accessed 3/8/17)
24. Church of England Website, *Bishops in the House of Lords* <https://www.churchofengland.org/our-views/the-church-in-parliament/bishops-in-the-house-of-lords.aspx> (accessed 3/8/17)
25. The Public Whip Website, *Data on rebellion rates of members of the House of Lords* [www.publicwhip.org.uk](http://www.publicwhip.org.uk) (accessed 31/7/17), *referenced data can be found in Appendix*
26. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy* by Jonathan Wolff (2006), published by OUP, U.S.A.

27. Senado de España Website, *Composition of the Senate*  
<http://www.senado.es/web/conocersenado/temasclave/composicionsenadoelecciones/index.html?lang=en> (accessed 9/8/17)
28. Bundesrat Website, *Organisation* [http://www.bundesrat.de/EN/organisation-en/organisation-en-node.html;jsessionid=7C1E5B3097C06ABBEEE5F8795D89FCEF.2\\_cid374](http://www.bundesrat.de/EN/organisation-en/organisation-en-node.html;jsessionid=7C1E5B3097C06ABBEEE5F8795D89FCEF.2_cid374) (accessed 9/8/17)
29. The Telegraph, *Peer 'kept taxi running while claiming £300 House of Lords allowance'* (2017)  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/21/peer-kept-taxi-running-claiming-300-house-lords-allowance/> (accessed 26/7/17)
30. The Independent, *Watch the undercover footage that allegedly shows peer Lord Sewel snorting cocaine with two prostitutes* (2015) <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/watch-the-undercover-footage-that-allegedly-shows-labour-peer-lord-sewel-snorting-cocaine-with-two-10417927.html> (accessed 26/7/17)

*(NB. please also see attached Appendix for full interview transcripts and referenced data)*

**APPENDIX**

**Johnny Stocks**

**Supervisor: AA**

**Tutor: SPMA**

*Depoliticising the House of Lords: why and how  
should it be reformed?*

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Contains transcripts of private interviews with members of Parliament  
which must not be shared, reproduced or referenced.

**APPENDIX****CONFIDENTIAL**

Contains transcripts of private interviews with members of Parliament which must not be shared, reproduced or referenced.

**1. Transcript of interview with Anne Milton MP (Conservative)**

**Johnny:** What right do unelected peers in the House of Lords have to make laws that affect us all?

**Anne Milton:** They've got an important role in scrutinizing and improving draft legislation. There is a wide range of expertise in the House, which I think adds value. I think there has been a cross party consensus for well over a hundred years that the House of Lords needs reform, and there is no doubt it does. The problem is nobody one can agree what it should look like, so this is a very personal point of view. If you think about its role in scrutinizing and improving draft legislation, that is very important, and to do that effectively you need people from a wide range of backgrounds, so my problem with it being wholly elected, and there is a proper and good case for that, is that would people from a wide range of backgrounds stand for election? And the answer is probably no. So there are some people, Lord Winston, I can think of, would be one, but there are a number of other people, who are happy to be appointed, but wouldn't necessarily stand for election. So the danger of it being all elected is you miss out on some important skills and backgrounds, by making it all elected.

**Johnny:** Absolutely, and do you think it's good there are many who are free from party political interference?

**Anne Milton:** I think it's very valuable that we have cross bench peers, yes I do think it is, and although they can take the whip of one of the political parties, that is much looser so they won't necessarily go along with their whip all the time. But to some extent, some of their freedom is derived from the fact that they're not elected, because if you're standing for election, you're always mindful of what that is going to do to your voters, for want of a



better word, in the way you behave. So the fact they're not elected, is also a strength in terms of their ability to scrutinize what parliament does. The fact that you are there by appointment, or you are there because your father was there before you, is of course in itself slightly undemocratic, which is why it's not been reformed.

**Johnny:** Do you think they still have authority though?

**Anne Milton:** Oh I think the House of Lords does hold authority, you know, there's no doubt that the fact the number of hereditary peers is down is a good thing. David Cameron got into some trouble for appointing people to the House of Lords who people generally felt he shouldn't have done, so that discredits it a bit. But I think they probably have had a more high profile role since the 'hereditaries' were knocked down than they ever have done before actually.

**Johnny:** Should all the hereditary peers be removed?

**Anne Milton:** Well maybe, but I don't think that you can pick off one particular group; you have got to come up with a complete package, which again is a problem. Some of those hereditary peers work extremely hard and do a very good job, I can think of one in particular. So whether there should be some election, so one option would be, and I've not thought it through, you've probably thought it through, would be if you look at the House of Lords and its current size, maybe the Peers amongst themselves, if you're going to reduce the size, should vote on who should stay and who should go, irrespective of the reasons they got there in the first place. So you could maybe cut it down to say three hundred for starters with existing peers, because the existing peers, and it would be a cross party thing, so there would be labour peers who might well vote for some of the hereditary peers, not necessarily being something that would stick with their general philosophy, because they might have done a very good job and worked very hard.

**Johnny:** I read that some hereditary peers are perhaps more likely to be more productive in the House of Lords because they are unlikely to reach high office within parties, and therefore they're more willing to vote on the merits of an individual bill instead of in accord with party whips.

**Anne Milton:** That might be the case; you could do quite a limited bit of research to find that out, and I'm happy to help with that. We have got access to the House of Commons library so we could seek an enquiry to the House of Commons library which could pull this data out very easily, and we could have a look at that. So we'd be looking at how many times hereditary peers vote against their party whips, yes. I'm happy to do that.

**Johnny:** Thank you very much, that would be very interesting.

**Guest of Anne Milton:** Just a quick statistic on that, just from memory, because of the 92 hereditary peers 90 of them are elected amongst the 800 or so hereditary peers, so when the Lords was reformed in 99 I think it was, they voted for the 90 most active people, so the lazy ones were actually kicked out at that stage.

**Johnny:** For you on a personal level, I was wondering has the House of Lords ever affected you directly with a bit of legislation perhaps you wanted to pass, or with your work in the House of Commons?

**Anne Milton:** Not me personally. I mean obviously as a party of government, the House of Lords for any party that's in government can be pesky. You know, I mean you're the government, you want to get your legislation through, and the House of Lords says 'no we don't want you do that'. But I think that generally they pick their moments to be strong at about the right moment and about the right legislation.

**Johnny:** And they can't absolutely stop something, they can only amend or delay?

**Anne Milton:** Well actually they can stop somethings. So they can annul secondary legislation – they can kill a piece of secondary legislation, and if you look at secondary legislation, a quick google search, there was a piece of secondary legislation last week, and there were two motions, one was to annul it, and one was to regret it. They didn't annul it; the vote was to regret it. The regret motion is saying to the government that they should 'think again about this'. The annul motion kills it dead.

**Johnny:** Do you think it is a good filter on the House of Commons?

**Anne Milton:** I think secondary chambers have an important role to play, but the concern would be, is that derived from the fact that they're not elected? I'd put a question mark there, but I could see that it might be true.

**Johnny:** Also, concerning the Bishops in the House of Lords, I read online that the Bishop of London has advocated for the inclusion of religious leaders from different faith communities into the House of Lords as well as the Bishops, and I was wondering if you would think that this would make it more representative, or if indeed there is no need for religious representation?

**Anne Milton:** I think that faith leaders have got an important role to play in our society, yeah actually, and quite an important role to play there.

**Johnny:** But should a legislative house be associating itself with a religious body?

**Anne Milton:** Well it's not associating itself, it's saying that those are a group of people, they're leaders in their communities, they're leaders of different faiths, so they add a perspective that you might not otherwise get in the House of Lords.

**Johnny:** And do you think, as perhaps the Bishop of London has suggested, that there should be more officially recognised faith leaders? So like the Bishops have their own section, so should there also be leaders from other faiths?

**Anne Milton:** Probably. Probably. I mean, I see no particular down side to it. We have an established Church so that's the origin of the Bishops, but I think that's not an unreasonable thing to do.

**Johnny:** And on that matter, because obviously there are members who come from a wide range of different backgrounds and faiths, do they necessarily need to be officially recognised, or would you then perhaps not have that perspective at all?

**Anne Milton:** Ah well, so you are right that you could appoint or elect people because they're scientists, doctors or worked in environmental industries and that would be the main reason for electing them or appointing them, where that group of people might also be of different faiths. But I think that there is a case to say that people should be elected or appointed because they are a leader of a particular faith. I think that there is quite a strong case, because we talk a lot about the practical, and we don't always necessarily consider the spiritual impact of laws we pass. I use the term 'spiritual' broadly to cover all the faiths. So a spiritual dimension into the legislative process I don't think is any bad thing.

**Johnny:** Yes, I understand that and I think that is one of the things that the House of Lords achieves.

**Anne Milton:** There is almost inevitably a secular dimension to non-faith based dimensions of the House of Lords because if you look at the country as a whole, I'm not sure what the figures are on faith, but I should think that under 50% of the population adhere to a particular faith or certainly practice it.

**Johnny:** Finishing off, do you have any final ideas of how perhaps the House could be reformed? You suggested earlier perhaps an election process within the Lords for chucking people out, but I don't know if there was anything else you might suggest?

**Anne Milton:** Yes, I think that might be, and as I say it's just a personal view, it's a way to start, and that would maybe be the place to start. I think one of the problems is, and I have said to you, that actually any change you make needs to be part of an overall plan, and that's when it gets difficult because then everybody disagrees about various bits of the plan about getting to where we want to get to. So starting by an election of existing members of the House of Lords for a seat in the House of Lords irrespective of your origin into the House of Lords would be a place to start, and then you need to decide how you do the rest of it. Appointments are always tricky. Can you have a truly independent appointment panel? It's quite difficult because they always generally, well not always, they tend to come into disrepute, because who appoints the appointments panel? You run into problems. So one way of doing it would be you take people from certain roles rather than individuals. So you could take, say, whoever is (i.e. not the person but the post) Chief Executive of NHS England

maybe, or a former permanent secretary of the Department for Communities and Local Government, so the person who sits in that post automatically, when they retire, becomes a peer, maybe. You could take the former Head of the Police Force? But anyway, I don't know, that would be a slightly purer way of doing it than the appointments panel, because the appointments panel is appointed.

**Johnny:** And people are perhaps chosen more for their genuine skills rather than for any part interest?

**Anne Milton:** Well yes absolutely. I mean it's tricky, it really is, it's tricky. I think there is a case for a elected element of the House of Lords probably, but I'm not utterly convinced.

**Johnny:** Yes, it does seem to be somewhat a good thing the unelected element.

**Anne Milton:** Well as I say you would cut out a whole group of people who just wouldn't want to put their names forward for election.

*Anne was interviewed on Friday 31<sup>st</sup> March during her weekly Constituents' surgery at the offices of Guildford Borough Council*

## 2. Transcript of interview with Lord Russell of Liverpool (Cross-Bench)

**Johnny:** What do you think is the primary purpose of the House of Lords?

**Lord Russell:** Well the primary purpose is scrutinizing and revising legislation that is not to do with matters fiscal, because that power was removed in the 1911 Parliament Act. So our primary purpose and skill is going through legislation in enormous detail, clause by clause and line by line, pulling it apart, trying to act as a devil's advocate and work often across party lines to try and persuade the front bench that there are different or better ways to achieve what the bill is trying to achieve. Our secondary purpose is to act as a 'fig leaf' in the notional sense of there being a form of check and balance with a bicameral assembly. The reality is that we actually have very little authority. We can make life more difficult, we can slow things down and we can make a nuisance of ourselves, but ultimately when push comes to shove the elected chamber takes priority. The third useful purpose for some is that for a Prime Minister it is an irresistible lure in terms of doling out patronage. For all of the political parties it is a very useful way of occasionally gently edging some of your MPs out who are getting past their 'sell-by' date or where you have a safe seat and you want to put someone in who you might think is a rising star. And, of course, for some of the parties it is a way of repaying favours to donors.

**Johnny:** And do you think the appointment system works well?

**Lord Russell:** No I don't think it works well. I think the patronage powers are abused. I think there seems to be quite a consensus amongst many peers that the system that exists for nominating people who go through a vetting system and end up on the crossbenches seems to work quite well and that is a feeling on many sides of the House as we discuss how to reduce our size. We are looking at the appointments system and want to be putting in some sort of proper vetting system to ensure people who actually don't have any skeletons in their closet would be willing and able to make a contribution of some kind, and don't bring too much baggage with them.

**Johnny:** And in terms of reducing size, how are the Lords looking to do this?

**Lord Russell:** Well we have a group at the moment of peers from across the House led by Lord Terry Burns, most of them quite well tenured. There is an almost total consensus in the House of over 800, which makes us the second largest parliamentary chamber in the world behind the Chinese National People's Congress, which is not a great place to be second to, that the House of Lords should be no larger than the House of Commons and indeed many believe it should be smaller. So there seems to be broad agreement that it should either be reduced to about ½ its current size which would be around 400 to 450, or to between 600 and 650 like in the Commons. We are too large, not least because when there is a big debate there literally is not enough room, and I have to sit there rather like back in Pageites on the lunch benches. How it will be achieved is being discussed at the moment and some people are saying 'Should there be an age limit?', 'Should there be a fixed term?', 'Should people who virtually never turn up of whom there are over 200 have the right to stay?', so there are a variety of different methods, and they are trying to come up with a recommendation which has as much consensus as is possible behind it, so it is sort of an attempt by the Physician to heal itself. This is coming from the House; it is a cross-party initiative.

**Johnny:** And do you think these reforms will actually come to fruition?

**Lord Russell:** If the House of Lords can come up with a consensual way of reforming itself which would primarily at this stage involve reducing its size, which the House of Commons broadly seems to agree with, I think the Commons would not have a problem with that. It is entirely possible. How quickly it will happen I don't know.

**Johnny:** Is the unelected nature of the House a good thing?

**Lord Russell:** That is very complicated because you then start getting into constitutional arguments about the rights and wrongs of having a bicameral assembly. To a large extent, other than being a revising chamber, what we really have today is a unicameral assembly. Virtually all of the cards are with the House of Commons. The 1911 Act specifically disarmed the House of Lords. The problem with any reform which results in all or part of its membership being elected is the very fact that being elected gives one a democratic mandate, which gives one a degree of equivalence with MPs, and you have the scene set for

some quite major stand-offs. Elected Lords would say that they have a representative right and their voice has equal weight to the Commons, which is one of the reasons why virtually any attempt at reform has failed. The Commons cannot deny that in many ways the Lords is an historic anachronism, however every time it looks at the practicalities of any reform which in any way makes the second chamber more accountable, democratic and representative, it also removes authority from the Commons, and every time they look over the edge of the cliff of such reform it steps back.

**Johnny:** And is that what happened in 2011 with Nick Clegg's Reform Act? Why exactly was withdrawn?

**Lord Russell:** Yes. Again I just feel there wasn't enough support in the end or consensus that it would be an improvement.

**Johnny:** Could I ask what it was like leaving the House in 1999?

**Lord Russell:** I never imagined that I would ever be in the House of Lords full stop. In the late 1960s the idea that the House of Lords would even still exist in any shape or form if and when I did inherit a title seemed like cloud cuckoo land. I just assumed naturally, like most of us did, that it wouldn't be there and we would've reformed it. It seemed impossible to believe that it would still be there, but it was! When the first Blair government was elected, one of its manifesto commitments was getting rid of the hereditary element of the House of Lords. Frankly I couldn't disagree with it. When the legislation came through I did not vote against it and when this last strange rearguard position was negotiated of 90 hereditaries I didn't put my name forward. I thought the House of Lords as it was was no longer going to exist and I left perfectly happily. Fast-forward to about five years ago and I was at a lunch with one of my first cousins once removed, Edward Baldwin, who had stayed in on the crossbenches, and I was sounding off at lunch and saying how I thought it was disgraceful that the House still hadn't been reformed, all these political appointments had been made and it was even more dysfunctional than it was beforehand. At which point he said, "Well why don't you go back in?" And I literally said, "What on earth are you talking about?" He explained the process of election and I went back in December 2014.



**Johnny:** How are the hereditary peers divided between parties?

**Lord Russell:** So the Conservative party has a certain amount of peers, around 40, and the crossbenchers are the second largest group and we have around 30, and then Labour has a small group and the Lib Dems have 3. Hereditary peers stand for election through the party system where the remaining hereditary peers of your party are the electorate, which leads to the farcical situation with the 3 Lib Dem seats where a peer ran for election and got 100% of the vote. I mean it's a shoe-in!

**Johnny:** How were those numbers per party decided?

**Lord Russell:** As I understand it they looked at the then percentages of hereditary peers who were affiliated with all the parties and simply said the Conservative peers are X% and so they will get X% of 90 and so on.

**Johnny:** And why did they keep the 90?

**Lord Russell:** There are several reasons. One was a desire from the Conservatives to tweak Tony Blair's nose and put it out of joint which I think they did fairly effectively. Secondly they knew that they had some bargaining positioning in their favour because Blair had publically said and was committed by the clock striking midnight at the end of December 31<sup>st</sup> 1999 so that he and Alistair Campbell could hold their hands up and say 'we have carried out our manifesto commitment and we have wiped out the hereditary Lords and we are ready for the next century', and they were very focused on that messaging, so they didn't want to let it drag on. Robert Cranbourne and some others knew this and came up with a solution which said that they accepted that this was a Labour manifesto commitment and they weren't going to stand in their way, however they said that Labour had not committed or given any proper content regarding the next stage of reform. Getting rid of the hereditaries is one thing, but what are you going to do next? You're talking about the need for reform and you've actually come up with nothing concrete at all.

**Johnny:** So was it a stopgap on the way to a more complete package of reform?

**Lord Russell:** It was assumed that it would be a temporary stopgap on the way to full reform. I doubt that anybody thought that 90 would still be there in 5 years' time, and here we are in 2017.

**Johnny:** How were the remaining hereditary peers chosen?

**Lord Russell:** I think it was a bit of a popularity contest to be honest, and it was a shock to some of the hereditary peers who had never before stood for election so it was a rather novel experience for them! The reform opened the gates for a deluge of new life peers, particularly from the Labour party, due to the huge historic imbalance of Conservative dominance, and they wanted to end that to bring it into a better reflection of what happens in the General Elections of that time. Blair created huge numbers of life peers to burgeon up the ranks of the Labour side. Of course once Blair had done that rather enthusiastically, along comes Cameron and Clegg who decide that Labour has gone too far and decides to appoint a whole load more life peers. Once the Lib Dems were in government they wanted stronger representation and so a vast number of Liberal peers were appointed, so you now have this extraordinary anomaly where there are over 100 peers and what 6 or 7 MPs? Many Tory Privy-Counsellors find it irresistible bating Lib Dem peers who stand up and talk about the importance of democracy and proportional representation by pointing out that it's rather difficult for them when they are so deeply unrepresentative. The problem for parties is that it's easy to become obsessed and do what seems right at the time without looking forward. The Lib Dems didn't consider what would happen having appointed so many peers what would happen if they went into meltdown at the next election. And there is currently no mechanism to exit the Lords other than being kicked out or resigning.

**Johnny:** Do you think party numbers should reflect the Commons more closely?

**Lord Russell:** I don't really think so. It comes back to constitutional questions. Do you want two identical twin chambers? Or do you want an upper chamber with more longevity and greater tenure which can ride out the swings of the way the people vote. What happened with the Lib Dems shows that it's not very wise to try and mimic the Commons. The minute our debates start mimicking and parroting the rather febrile atmosphere of the Commons is when we will lose all credibility and the quality of decision making goes down. It becomes a

worse and rather more senile and decrepit version of the Commons and that doesn't really get you anywhere.

**Johnny:** What do you make of the Bishops? Is it right and proper that apart from Iran we are the only legislature in the world with spaces reserved for clerics?

**Lord Russell:** Not really no but it's all very complicated constitutionally, with the Church of England as the established Church, but it is a slight aberration not least because the C of E is probably one of smallest religious denominations in the country for them to have all of those seats. However, to start unpicking that you really have to start unpicking bits of the constitution which is where it becomes complicated. In an ideal situation the Church would decide itself to voluntarily dismiss themselves, as I suggested the Lib Dems should perhaps do. It's complicated and messy to disentangle, which I suppose isn't a good reason for not trying. At some point in the future it will be tackled but is not a priority.

**Johnny:** As a crossbencher, do you think parties are less important in the Lords?

**Lord Russell:** The parties do have whips and they have a degree of importance and relevance, and the patronage system of creating peerages tries to reinforce that with the idea of the 'working peer' who turns up and votes in line with their party, and I think in some cases that is made pretty overt with what are nakedly political appointments. However, all the parties accept that voting against the whip is acceptable in moderation.

**Johnny:** I have actually found that hereditary peers have a much higher rebellion rate than all other peers. Why do you think that is?

**Lord Russell:** That doesn't surprise me. It's to do with the ethos of the place; the fact that as a hereditary peer one decided to align oneself with a party, and therefore were not there as a result of any kind of political patronage, is different from if a party approached an individual and asked them to become a life peer which places on them an obligation to toe the party line. The point of the view of a hereditary peer having inherited a title is that they have a choice of whether to align with a party or join the crossbenches. If you do then join, say, the Conservative Party then because that is a decision that you've taken by yourself,

when you could have gone in any other direction, the dynamics of it being your initiative leaves open the fact that if you ever wanted to, you might not want to align with the Conservative Party anymore, and that is accepted. The moral contract between a hereditary peer and the party he or she decides to align with and between a life peer and their affiliated party is fundamentally different.

**Johnny:** That to me seems like a good thing?

**Lord Russell:** Well I think I would have to plead the fifth. The bizarre thing about the Lords pre-99, and it was bizarre because you had some very bizarre characters indeed, is in a way that defies logic more representative of the real world out there than the current House, because the hereditary thing is literally rather serendipity, and it was certainly more interesting, but it was not democratic and was difficult to defend. It is a very interesting example of how over the centuries the randomness of the genetic lottery, which enabled somebody to become a peer, did create a genuine diversity. There were more people who were unlike each other in many ways in the pre-99 House than in the current House where an awful lot of people have had pretty similar careers, backgrounds, senses of self-importance and all the rest of it.

**Johnny:** The House of Lords seems to me like a sort of focus group or an expert panel that reviews legislation with expertise. Do you share this view?

**Lord Russell:** There is some virtue in that view but I am sure that if you mapped out the areas of expertise there would be some where there a disproportionate focus and others where we showed a great ignorance. There is much greater genuine knowledge and experience of our Healthcare system, for example, in the Lords than there is in the House of Commons.

**Johnny:** And it seems that hereditary peers tend more often to rebel, which might suggest that they are voting on experience and knowledge rather than toeing the party line?

**Lord Russell:** I think hereditaries rebel often to show their independence to their party. Some have a similar attitude to us on the crossbenches where what drives your vote is

ultimately your conscience, which is not necessarily the way that politics usually works, where you vote for what you think is right.

**Johnny:** If you thought the hereditary peers were so ridiculous when you left then why did you return? Did you want to make a difference to the system?

**Lord Russell:** Well having happily left because I thought there would be a proper and fundamental reform, not just of the Lords but more constitutionally in general, whether we wanted to be unicameral or bicameral, and how to make an assembly fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, when still nothing had really started to happen I was actually so pissed off that I thought I should come back in and by the time I would leave we would have finally sorted this damn place out and I would have worked myself out my seat again.

**Johnny:** So you would like to see the hereditary peers go completely?

**Lord Russell:** I would like to see the House of Lords reformed completely and its current form fundamentally rethought and restructured, and I am assuming that the hereditaries will go, but they are not really the issue. They are an attractive and slightly eccentric irrelevance. We accept the world has changed and logically we should not have the right to sit, but before we turn the lights out we want to make sure that we have arrived at a full and complete reform.

**Johnny:** And what do you want that to involve?

**Lord Russell:** Well a real change in the constitution has to go back to basics. In effect we are a unicameral assembly and the House of Lords is like a revising arm of the Commons because ultimately if they say this is what is going to happen then this is what happens. We don't genuinely have a bicameral assembly today, because the gravity is all on one side. The ultimate conundrum is whether the House of Commons should give powers to the upper chamber to override them and that is where virtually all reform has got stuck. You have to work out what it is really there for.

*Simon Russell was interviewed at the London offices of Spencer Stuart on Connaught Place on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> August*

### 3. Interview with Lord Taverne QC (Liberal Democrat)

**Johnny:** I hear that you're currently trying to get an effective movement started to stop Brexit. I was wondering how much influence the Lords will be able to have in the Brexit?

**Lord Taverne:** Not a lot. If the Commons is divided and it is very close, then it is possible that the Lords will stick to their vote. I think that the Lords would vote against Brexit if they had their way, but it has always been part of the Salisbury convention that if something is in a manifesto then they would put the referendum into effect and implement it so that they would leave. The Lords will probably not press it and will obey the Commons vote. If they did press it they would cause all sorts of trouble, because the Parliament Act would have to be invoked, and there would have to be a year's delay, and that is just impossible and the whole thing would fall off a cliff. I think the Lords will have their say and they make some very important points and speeches, because there is an awful lot of expertise in the Lords including former Members of the European Parliament, current representatives for the European Commission, former Commissioners, a lot of academics. But in the end I do think that they would be very reluctant to overrule the Commons.

**Johnny:** Can I ask about the Salisbury convention? Is that an informal acknowledgement that if the government has power over the Lords?

**Lord Taverne:** I think it is regarded as one of the constitutional conventions, after all our constitution is riddle with conventions. The Queen, on the face of it, has a veto because if she doesn't sign then there's no law. But she will sign, and no Monarch, even mad, well he wasn't mad just a very sick George III, has refused to sign. The Salisbury convention is genuinely observed, and I have argued on Brexit that we weren't obliged to obey the convention because the House of Commons had already overthrown a central principle of our constitution which makes us a parliamentary democracy and not a plebiscite. I argued in the Lords that the return to the plebiscite which says that the will of the people shall always prevail was a complete rejection of the vital constitutional principle that we are a parliamentary democracy.

**Johnny:** And moving into your career in the Lords, you're a Liberal Democrat but do you think that parties are less important in the House of Lords than in the Commons?

**Lord Taverne:** Somewhat less important, yes. A lot of peers have been appointed by the parties and it's a very strange system because there is an independent commission nowadays which does vet the appointments and makes sure they haven't just been appointed because they'd given a lot of money, although even so I think quite a lot of people do get appointed because they've given a lot of money! A quarter of MPs are automatically appointed by this commission as crossbenchers, so the very fact that you have crossbenchers makes parties less important, and you can look at the numbers. Liberal Democrats, because they were strong at one stage, have got something like 104 peers. Conservatives have got the most, just, but the Liberal Democrats have got a huge influence and Conservatives even with the crossbenchers will still be outnumbered by Labour and the Liberal Democrats, so the Conservatives don't have a majority.

**Johnny:** Do you think it's right that the Liberal Democrats have such a large number of peers?

**Lord Taverne:** No it's crazy! Crazy. I think the whole House of Lords election, well non-election, system is crazy. A lot of people defend the House of Lords on the grounds that it's got expertise and time to consider laws, and after all something like 45% of the amendments made by the Lords are finally accepted by the Commons, even when most of them go against what the Commons originally said. And it is true that the Lords do have more time to consider new laws, but when it comes to party issues, I think the government's view generally should prevail, because that is the elected body, and the Lords is now so completely dysfunctional because it is so very very large. In major debates speeches are limited to about 5 minutes! On the debates on the European Union we had over 85 speakers! The active participation of the House is about 350 even though there are over 800 members. But it is ridiculous that on major issues you have just 5 minutes to speak; you can say quite a lot in 5 minutes but you may want to examine it in much greater detail. For the question time you have to queue up to get your question down and it's ridiculous. We ought to cull the numbers by one way or another and it's all part of how the House should be reformed. I think that there is a lot to be said for the expertise but there's



also a lot to be said for being more democratically responsible. First of all, if nothing else is done, I would cull the numbers with, say, an age limit of 75 or a service limit of 15 years. That would be perfectly reasonable and immediately the numbers would decline to what is a manageable House of Lords, but it's not ideal as a lot of people over 75 have an awful lot to contribute!

*NB. Lord Taverne QC is 88 years-old*

I remember there was a hundred-year-old peer called Lord Longford who was a Labour peer who used to make very good speeches even at the age of 100, within the time, without notes and very balanced, and at one time when 'New Labour' was all the rage he made a speech saying, "I suppose my speech could be considered rather old Labour, but if I'm not entitled to be old Labour then who is?" So the age limit is unsatisfactory but it would cull the numbers, and similarly if done by term served. I think the last proposal from 2011 was very deficient. The idea was that they would make people more responsible, but not duplicate the House of Commons. They would have been no more accountable than before, so that was a silly proposal.

**Johnny:** You might disagree but it seems that if you were running for election, you might not be the sort of person who has the necessary expertise or experience?

**Lord Taverne:** Well absolutely, I am very interested in Science, and we had a meeting of all the Scientists in the Lords, and at the end one of the journalists asked, "Which of you would stand for election if it was an elected Lords?" None. So for God's sake don't make yourselves elected Lords! After all our Special Reports are read all around the world.

**Johnny:** So you think the unelected nature is actually a good thing?

**Lord Taverne:** Well I think it is still difficult. In my view there is another reason for major reform, so this is my recipe for reform. We are now more devolved, with the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly for example, but there is now much more talk of the need to devolve more powers to the regions and big urban centres. You can see the UK become a devolved country with regional assemblies, including Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, the

North-East, the North-West, the South-East, the South-West and London. But how are they going to be represented in an overall Parliament? I think the answer is the German model. The Germans have been extremely well governed since the War.

**Johnny:** In Spain they have a split model. Some are appointed by regional Parliaments and the rest by popular elections. Is that a good model?

**Lord Taverne:** I think that also is very sensible, but if we were becoming more devolved and federal, as we are, then we should copy the German model. Why has Scotland got its own devolved powers and Parliament, and not London, when London is bigger than Scotland? I like this idea and it's being talked about at the moment, but no one has yet formally proposed it. I think logic will drive us that way, to devolve from London, which is far too dominant. We do want Manchester and the Northern towns and the North-East and the South-West and Northern Ireland to have a say. The Lords would become the Bundesrat of the United Kingdom of different regions and countries. The Bundesrat is composed of 69, I think, member all elected by the different länders.

**Johnny:** If we had that in the Lords, do you think we'd lose people of expertise who wouldn't stand?

**Lord Taverne:** That, I think, would have to be sacrificed. It's important, yes, but not that important. The committees of the House of Lords call experts from all over the world to testify and a lot of the Commons' committees do also produce very good reports, because of the witnesses that appear before them. Their trouble is time, which the House of Lords has, provided that it is kept to a relatively small size. I think 200 or 300 would be about the ideal size.

**Johnny:** I see it becoming too similar to the House of Commons if it went this way. Wouldn't people be voted according to party whips?

**Lord Taverne:** Yes, but they would be regional representatives, and they would be appointed by the governments of the regions, and they would probably appoint those who would be best equipped to provide specialist knowledge in the upper House.

**Johnny:** Can I ask what you think about the hereditary peers?

**Lord Taverne:** Well I think it's ridiculous to have them, and the strange compromise that was arrived at where 90 peers were allowed to continue results in these mad elections. When a Lib Dem peer dies there is an electorate of 3! It's an absurd position. Although, some of the elected ones have been quite good. In fact, before the removal of most of them in 1999, some of the best contributions were from the hereditary peers. Yes, they had their traditions behind them but they had a lot to say. More broadly on the whole, the general quality of peers is quite good, and as a lawyer my God am I impressed by some of the Barristers in there. They're very impressive. And, of course, there are lots of Scientists.

**Johnny:** As a lawyer, could you tell me about your thoughts on the removal of the Law Lords to form the Supreme Court?

**Lord Taverne:** Well they were already separate in a sense. I think the Supreme Court was a good move and, of course, their powers have been increased, because of the questions about what is European and what is domestic jurisdiction.

**Johnny:** So in this current moment, what do you see as the primary purpose of the Lords?

**Lord Taverne:** It is primarily a revising Chamber and there is no doubt about that. That's where it does its job well and where its expertise, time and prestige comes in. Its second role is as a chamber which has extremely good committees. I am particularly interested in Science and served on the select committee for a very long time, and we produced reports on allergy for instance which were very very revealing and exposed how backwards we are at the treatment of allergy in the UK. We produce some reports which are really very weighty.

**Johnny:** And this purpose of being a revising chamber – do you think that's the right purpose for our second chamber?

**Lord Taverne:** I think so. An upper chamber is usually a revising chamber, excluding perhaps America for example. Functions of the upper House vary from country to country.

**Johnny:** And you think that the function of ours does not need to be reformed?

**Lord Taverne:** No. If it became like the German Bundesrat it would also remain as a revising chamber.

**Johnny:** And is the current composition equipping it to perform this role?

**Lord Taverne:** Well the problem at the moment is the House of Lords is just too big. There are a lot people there who are passengers. I think if it were smaller, it would probably be of a higher general quality, but it wouldn't have that special expertise which comes now from members of the Royal Society for example. If we had the German system, then elected people wouldn't necessarily come from those backgrounds. Ultimately this would make it more democratic as they would be elected by elected regional representatives.

**Johnny:** And the Bishops –

**Lord Taverne:** Oh that's a ridiculous anomaly. Have we separated Church and State? No we haven't. For many purposes we have, and generally speaking we have a separation but this is an absolutely ridiculous anomaly. The Church of England is now a minority religion. I have no doubt that any reform in the future should abolish the Bishops and certainly the hereditary peers. If somebody produced a bill tomorrow to cull the numbers by saying nobody over 75 should be able to serve, and nobody should serve more than 15 years, I would support that straightaway because that would make a big difference.

**Johnny:** Are there any other ways of doing it?

**Lord Taverne:** I can't see any other viable way.

**Johnny:** Could there be bi-elections or would they be too divisive? For example, if you took the 104 Lib Dem peers and imposed a maximum of 40, and then left you to elect the ones who would stay, would that work?

**Lord Taverne:** Well if they were Lib Dems I don't know how it would work. Perhaps those with the fewest number of exclusion votes would survive? I don't like the idea of the appointments system, except the independent Appointments Commission which appoints the independent crossbenchers, who are very good, although some do pretend to be crossbenchers when in reality they always vote Tory.

**Johnny:** So there are parties and whipped votes in the House – how do people tend to vote?

**Lord Taverne:** Most of the time they tend to vote with the party.

**Johnny:** But that seems like a bad thing. If you have these peers who have, as you have said, a vast array of expertise and experience, then surely they should be voting on their experience instead of blindly following a whip?

**Lord Taverne:** That's true, yes. But that's because they are appointed by the party and therefore feel an obligation to the party.

**Johnny:** But then it seems no different to the Commons?

**Lord Taverne:** Well it's not as there are no sanctions. If you disobey the whips they might protest, but on the whole people are not as party minded as there are no sanctions. Undoubtedly if we didn't have the crossbenchers then the place would be more party minded. But I tend to keep my rebellions to subjects that I really care about, and if I want them to carry weight, then I restrict them to things I care about.

**Johnny:** Should there be whips in the Lords at all?

**Lord Taverne:** Well whips are useful in the sense that the crossbenchers don't have whips but they do have people who organise and tell them what the thing is about.

**Johnny:** Should the Lords be paid?

**Lord Taverne:** Well if we're going to be fully elected, as I think in the end we have to be, then of course we should be paid. I receive an allowance of about 30 thousand a year tax free, and I don't need it so I give it away to the Refugee Council. This attendance allowance is ludicrous – it's a salary! People say, gosh he got paid an attendance allowance for turning up for half an hour. Well yes maybe he only attended for half an hour for a vote but then he spent a lot of time elsewhere for an important meeting, so the allowances are an absurdity, and they're a myth, and you can't have myths as then you get malpractices.

**Johnny:** Looking forward with the current climate where the government is consumed by Brexit, what will happen in terms of Lords Reform in the coming years?

**Lord Taverne:** Oh nothing in the near future. Brexit is going to dominate everything. It pushes everything else aside.

*Dick Taverne was interviewed at his flat in Westminster on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> August*

#### 4. Interview with Lord Oakeshott of Seagrove Bay (Non-affiliated)

**Johnny:** I thought I would start by asking what you thought was the primary purpose of the House of Lords?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well it's to be a revising chamber to revise and improve legislation, but it's also an important constitutional safeguard against all power being in one House of Parliament. Most democratic countries do have a bicameral system. It is a safeguard and I think it is particularly important in this country where we have no written constitution or separation of powers, as you have particularly in America and to some extent in France, and you have a first-past-the-post voting system where if the Prime Minister's party has a good majority in the House of Commons it can almost be an elective dictatorship, so a properly reformed and properly elected House of Lords is an important part of that. The one power that the House of Lords has, and is quite important I think, is the long-stop power that means an election to the House of Commons cannot be delayed by five years without the permission of the Lords. It was exercised during the War, and otherwise you could have the situation where the Commons could just pass something with a majority to say they are carrying on. That's an important safeguard and if you only have one Chamber in Parliament that's quite hard to do.

**Johnny:** With that purpose in mind, are you content with this being the role that the House of Lords plays?

**Lord Oakeshott:** I think the powers are basically right. I think the balance of powers is about right. But I think the composition and the method of choosing the House of Lords is completely wrong, and I am in favour of reform but I don't think the powers need changing significantly.

**Johnny:** In terms of reforming the composition and election system, is the size one of the biggest problems?

**Lord Oakeshott:** The size is indeed, and is in a sense subsidiary to the other two. The reason the size is so big is because on one side Tony Blair came in and made hundreds and

hundreds of appointments, far more than had been done previously, and then on the other side Cameron made loads of appointments. I believe that any appointments system whereby party leaders are making appointments is inherently undemocratic, and inherently has the seeds of corruption in it. Inevitably it gets mixed up with money and people making donations, and I have done a lot of campaigning on that, particularly in the Blair years. I think it is just completely wrong for one individual to have power like that to create new members of Parliament. How else could do it – well there is an Appointments Commission but then again that isn't easy because how does that get appointed and again what are the criteria and why do they know better than the public who or how they should choose? So while I'm not against the principle of having an Appointments Commission I think it's difficult. I supported the bill which got to second reading which called for something like an 80% elected and 20% appointed House, and I think that a substantial majority of the House of Lords should be elected in just the same way as it is in other countries, and we can talk about the methods of ensuring that is not exactly like the Commons. There is no way of having a fair and straightforward appointments system.

**Johnny:** So you think there is an argument for a split elected and appointed House?

**Lord Oakeshott:** There could be. I definitely think that either the whole of the Lords or a substantial majority should be elected by the people. If you look at opinion polls on the issue most people in the country also believe that. It has been the position of both the main parties for many years, it's just they don't actually ever get round to doing anything.

**Johnny:** But do you think that's just a manifesto commitment that's quite appealing to the public, when actually the undemocratic element of the House almost gives it an edge, because if you have people who have to run for election then the sort of people who are in the Lords now would not necessarily run for election.

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well that's the argument. I think you don't want the situation where you just have 2 MPs for the same constituency with one in each House, and that's why all the proposals that have been made have all got a second reading in the Commons and that was approved in principle, but wasn't forced through, whereby you have people elected on a regional basis through proportional representation, so you have a better balance of



different parties and all those other arguments for PR, who serve long periods and are not constantly going back to the electorate, with renewable terms of 10 or 15 years. I certainly think that you would still have independents and people not beholden to party whips, and you would have the best of both worlds.

**Johnny:** Do you think there is actually a role for parties in the Lords?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well no. People would of course run as party candidates but if you have PR then the electorate would no doubt choose people from different parties, and they may decide to vote for a woman or a black person or a young person. You don't want first-past-the-post where you have the problem of the straight-jacket in the Commons and just have one candidate to vote for. You would have it a bit like the elections for the European Parliament where there would be 10 candidates for the South-East for example, and people would have a reasonable choice.

**Johnny:** But I still don't really see why there are whips in the House of Lords?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well if parties are there then they will whip, but they don't have nearly as much strength as in the Commons, and people are not frightened of them and they're not controlling people's meal ticket. It's fairly relaxed, as I expect will continue to be the case.

**Johnny:** Have you ever voted against what you actually believed in because of a whip?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Not really no. I resigned from the Lib Dems 2 or 3 years ago but I've never really felt uncomfortable. I'm quite independent minded. Once or twice there were issues where I was unhappy and I just didn't turn up. There were 4 things I just abstained on, but that it because on the whole I fell very in tune with my party.

**Johnny:** With the Lords as a revising chamber, is that independently minded spirit not important?

**Lord Oakeshott:** It is important, yes. It can be overdone, but you get a lot of people at the moment for instance who are in favour of remaining in the EU, but there has been a lot of

pressure on them not to rebel, so it's not perhaps as independently minded a place at the moment.

**Johnny:** Do you think it should be more?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well I just think that we should all have more of a say to be honest, because it's fundamentally undemocratic. Any appointments system with party leaders doing it is corrupt and bound to lead to all sorts of problems. When you go in there there's a lot of people who are only there because they've given money. There are an awful lot of characters in there who ought not to be sitting in Parliament under any circumstance.

**Johnny:** So should the Lords better reflect the results of General Elections?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well that's what they're trying to do at the moment but that's part of the reason it's so big, because the trouble is no one goes, but you get all those in when Labour when, and then all those when you get a vast swing to the other side, so it's got the seeds of its own destruction there. At the appointment stage there ought to be some sort of reflection, but until you have a retirement mechanism or fixed terms, then the House of Lords is just going to balloon to a ridiculous size as we have seen. But that is just trying to patch up a broken system really, and we should really be moving over to an election system to a reasonably sized House of 300 elected peers.

**Johnny:** So what are your thoughts on the fact that the Lib Dems have 104 peers?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well it's obviously too many! It's obviously ridiculous, and that's what I mean. At the time we were underrepresented, with 20% of the vote, but now with only 7% of the vote it's far too many, but those are the rule; you don't kick people out! It clearly shows you the nonsense of trying to keep it in line with General Election results, because when someone loses an election there is no way of getting rid of them.

**Johnny:** So are fixed terms the way forward?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well if it's elected you would have fixed terms, yes. If you're not having it elected, it would still be better with fixed terms. You find now people like Alan Sugar of all people, who when Gordon Brown wanted a headline was appointed, and he's never had anything to do with Labour in his life, and he takes that whip. Then he resigned and was fed up, but he's still there! These people come in maybe as a minister for a year, but then they're in there for the next 20 or 30 years making no contribution or just pissing about.

**Johnny:** Is there a short-term measure now to reduce the size?

**Lord Oakeshott:** There has been talk of retirement ages but it's very difficult to see how that's going to get through. There are an awful lot of Lords who are 80 or 90 and think they have a lot still to contribute, and some of them have and some of them haven't and that's the problem!

**Johnny:** Would you like to see the 'hereditaries' go in the next package of reform?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Oh yes. That was just a typical British cock-up. It's just completely wrong that you get to sit in Parliament because your father used to go drinking with Henry VIII or because your mother used to go to bed with King Charles - it's completely wrong! These people could quite easily stand for election though, and I think the public would be quite interested in voting for them! Some are real characters actually.

**Johnny:** Well it seems that the 90 left in were chosen because they were distinguished individuals?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well they've certainly got a lot more go in them than some of the other lot and the original 'hereditaries'. With the Lib Dems though you probably know that one was elected by the 2 or 3 Lib Deem hereditary peers – it's just horrific!

**Johnny:** And why were the 90 left in?

**Lord Oakeshott:** It was just a deal after a great argument between Blair and the Tories.

**Johnny:** Was it just a temporary measure?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Oh yes it was all meant to be an interim measure until there was proper reform, but look that was almost 20 years ago now.

**Johnny:** And in the current climate is there any chance of reform?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Nothing is going to happen now. With the current 'no-government' Lords Reform is completely off the agenda, and will be for years. There is no legislation of any sort going through, and no government as they try to do Brexit. It's complete paralysis.

**Johnny:** And moving onto Brexit, what role will the Lords play if any?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well they will play a detailed role. The key thing with the Lords is how able they feel to flex their muscles tends to be very much based on the state of the Commons and what was agreed in the manifesto. There was no majority in the election for anything really and no mandate. She was asking the country for a mandate to back her on Europe and the country said no, so I think the Lords will feel well empowered given all the detailed legislation that is going to go through. It's very hard for the Lords to send back legislation that had passed through with a majority in the Commons, but if there are big splits in the Commons and close votes, then I think there will be quite an effort to certainly block a hard Brexit and maybe block it all together. We can point out the genuine problems, as they're trying to get an awful lot of constitutional changes through in a very short space of time. The Lords will be playing their proper role of exposing all the difficulties and complications.

**Johnny:** Is that because of her weak mandate?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Exactly. I mean we were all in despair before the election as if she had come back from the election with a strong mandate then that would have been it. The Lords could not have resisted that.

**Johnny:** And is that also because of the Salisbury convention?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well the Salisbury convention has no legal status and has fallen into disuse really, certainly with the Liberal Democrats in the Lords who have said that they don't regard it as having any standing. The government in this case has not got any majority or mandate.

**Johnny:** Moving onto the Bishops now, is there still a place for recognised faith leaders in our legislature?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well not just the Bishops. There is something to be said for them, and if you are appointing people then appointing some faith leaders would be a good idea, but what you can't have is just one faction of the Christian Church. The Anglicans are not even the majority of the Christian Church in this country, never mind the Muslims or the Jews.

**Johnny:** So with the 80-20 split House, if there wasn't enough appetite back in 2011 when it was dropped, then why would there be now or in the future?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well there was appetite, just not quite enough appetite. It got through to a point where the Commons voted in favour with the principle of the bill.

**Johnny:** But what's different now that would make it get through?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well to be honest it's just not on the agenda. It's years and years and years away.

**Johnny:** On Brexit, many leave voters voted because they felt that people that they were not electing were having influence over the creation of their laws. This could however be said of the Lords, and therefore why are they not as angry with the Lords?

**Lord Oakeshott:** Well we'll get plenty of it when people think the Lords are blocking Brexit, and all sorts of constitutional aggro. The Lords is just not really on most people's agenda.

**Johnny:** And the public perception of the Lords?

**Lord Oakeshott:** I think they have a mixed perception, and most people respect it. On the other hand, there have been quite a few expenses scandals and things, but I just don't think it's on most people's radar.

*Matthew Oakeshott was interviewed at the London offices of OLIM Property Limited on Dartmouth Street on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> August*

## 5. Data from 'The Public Whip' (<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/>)

NB. The Public Whip is an 'open source' website which provides data on the 'attendance rates' and 'rebellion rates' of MPs and Lords. A 'rebellion' refers to a vote in a division which goes against the majority vote of that member's fellow MPs or Lords in their party, sometimes referred to as the 'whipped vote'.

### a) Parties and Rebellion Rates of Hereditary Peers

Name of Hereditary Peer	Party	Rebellion Rate
Aberdare, L.	Crossbench	28.20%
Addington, L.	LDem	0.70%
Arran, E.	Con	1.40%
Ashton of Hyde, L.	Con	0.50%
Astor, V.	Con	2.00%
Astor of Hever, L.	Con	0.60%
Attlee, E.	Con	1.40%
Baldwin of Bewdley, E.	Crossbench	36.40%
Borwick, L.	Con	1.00%
Brabazon of Tara, L.	Con	0.50%
Bridgeman, V.	Con	0.30%
Brookeborough, V.	Crossbench	30.60%
Brougham and Vaux, L.	Con	0.80%
Caithness, E.	Con	1.20%
Cathcart, E.	Con	0.80%
Cholmondeley, M.	Non-affiliated	N/A
Clancarty, E.	Crossbench	32.50%
Colgrain, L.	Con	0.00%
Colville of Culross, V	Crossbench	21.80%
Colwyn, L.	Con	1.20%
Cork and Orrery, E.	Con	15.40%
Courtown, E.	Con	0.90%
Craigavon, V.	Crossbench	28.40%
Crathorne, L.	Con	0.50%
Cromwell, L.	Crossbench	15.90%
De Mauley, L.	Con	0.70%
Denham, L.	Con	1.90%
Dundee, E.	Con	1.80%
Eccles, V.	Con	0.90%
Elton, L.	Con	1.60%
Erroll, E.	Crossbench	26.40%
Fairfax of Cameron, L.	Con	1.40%
Falkland, V.	Crossbench	30.20%
Freyberg, L.	Crossbench	26.20%
Geddes, L.	Con	0.70%
Glasgow, E.	LDem	2.70%
Glenarthur, L.	Con	3.10%
Glentoran, L.	Con	0.70%
Goschen, V.	Con	1.00%
Grantchester, L.	Lab	1.30%
Greenway, L.	Crossbench	31.80%
Hanworth, V.	Lab	0.70%
Henley, L.	Con	1.40%
Home, E.	Con	0.00%
Howe, E.	Con	0.90%
Hylton, L.	Crossbench	22.80%

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Inglewood, L.	Con	2.70%
Kinnoull, E.	Crossbench	26.70%
Lindsay, E.	Con	0.50%
Listowel, E.	Crossbench	16.90%
Liverpool, E.	Con	2.30%
Lucas, L.	Con	4.00%
Lytton, E.	Crossbench	20.20%
Mancroft, L.	Con	1.60%
Mar, C.	Crossbench	19.40%
Montrose, D.	Con	0.80%
Mountevans, L.	Crossbench	0.00%
Moynihan, L.	Con	2.50%
Norfolk, D.	Non-affiliated	N/A
Northbourne, L.	Crossbench	23.80%
Northbrook, L.	Con	1.80%
Oxford and Asquith, E. M	LDem	2.50%
Palmer, L.	Crossbench	21.40%
Peel, E.	Crossbench	N/A
Rea, L.	Lab	4.10%
Ridley, V.	Con	0.40%
Rosslyn, E.	Crossbench	0.00%
Rotherwick, L.	Con	0.90%
Russell of Liverpool, L.	Crossbench	3.00%
St John of Bletso, L.	Crossbench	24.70%
Sandwich, E.	Crossbench	20.10%
Selborne, E.	Con	1.80%
Selsdon, L.	Con	1.10%
Shrewsbury, E.	Con	0.60%
Simon, V.	Lab	2.20%
Skelmersdale, L.	Con	1.30%
Slim, V.	Crossbench	23.60%
Somerset, D.	Crossbench	24.30%
Stair, E.	Crossbench	24.20%
Strathclyde, L.	Con	1.50%
Swinfen, L.	Con	3.00%
Thurlow, L.	Crossbench	41.20%
Thurso, V.	LDem	0.00%
Trefgarne, L.	Con	1.70%
Trenchard, V.	Con	2.80%
Trevethin and Oaksey, L.	Crossbench	26.70%
Ullswater, V.	Con	1.40%
Walpole, L.	Crossbench	19.90%
Waverley, V.	Crossbench	36.60%
Wellington, D.	Con	8.10%
Willoughby de Broke, L.	UKIP	0.00%
Younger of Leckie, V.	Con	0.80%
<b>Average</b>		<b>9.04%</b>

### b) Parties and Rebellion Rates of all Peers

Name of Peer	Party	Rebellion Rate
Lord Aberdare	Crossbench	0.282
Baroness Adams of Craigielea	Lab	0.005
Lord Addington	LDem	0.007
Lord Adebowale	Crossbench	0.333
Lord Adonis	Lab	0.007
Baroness Afshar	Crossbench	0.463
Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon	Con	0.007
Lord Ahmed	Non-affiliated	0.014
Lord Alderdice	LDem	0.007
Lord Allan of Hallam	LDem	0.017
Lord Allen of Kensington	Lab	0
Lord Alli	Lab	0.01
Lord Alliance	LDem	0.039
Baroness Altmann	Con	0.019
Lord Alton of Liverpool	Crossbench	0.321



# Johnny Stocks (S)

# Extended Essay

Baroness Amos	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Anderson of Swansea	Lab		0.014
Baroness Andrews	Lab		0.004
Baroness Anelay of St Johns	Con		0.005
Lord Arbuthnot of Edrom	Con		0
Lord Archer of Weston-Super-Mare	Non-affiliated		1
Baroness Armstrong of Hill Top	Lab		0
Lord Armstrong of Ilminster	Crossbench		0.3
The Earl of Arran	Con		0.014
Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon	LDem		0.01
Lord Ashton of Hyde	Con		0.005
Baroness Ashton of Upholland	Non-affiliated		0
Viscount Astor	Con		0.02
Lord Astor of Hever	Con		0.006
Earl Attlee	Con		0.014
Lord Bach	Lab		0.004
Lord Baker of Dorking	Con		0.03
Baroness Bakewell	Lab		0.006
Baroness Bakewell of Hardington Mandeville	LDem		0.007
Earl Baldwin of Bewdley	Crossbench		0.364
Lord Balfe	Con		0.041
Lord Bamford	Con		0
Lord Barber of Tewkesbury	Crossbench		0.125
Baroness Barker	LDem		0.007
Lord Barker of Battle	Con		0
Lord Bassam of Brighton	Lab		0.004
Lord Bates	Con		0.007
Lord Beecham	Lab		0.006
Lord Beith	LDem		0
Lord Bell	Con		0.006
Baroness Benjamin	LDem		0.025
Lord Berkeley	Lab		0.036
Lord Berkeley of Knighton	Crossbench		0.145
Baroness Berridge	Con		0.017
Baroness Bertin	Con		0
Lord Best	Crossbench		0.124
Lord Bew	Crossbench		0.41
Lord Bhatia	Non-affiliated		0.04
Lord Bhattacharyya	Lab		0.003
Lord Bichard	Crossbench		0.149
Lord Bilimoria	Crossbench		0.254
Baroness Billingham	Lab		0.007
Lord Bird	Crossbench		0
The Bishop of Birmingham	Bishop		0
Lord Birt	Crossbench		0.393
Lord Black of Brentwood	Con		0.004
Lord Black of Crossharbour	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Baroness Blackstone	Lab		0.01
Lord Blackwell	Con		0.033
Lord Blair of Boughton	Crossbench		0.222
Lord Blencathra	Con		0.008
Baroness Blood	Lab		0.035
Baroness Bloomfield of Hinton Waldrist	Con		0
Lord Blunkett	Lab		0
Lord Blyth of Rowington	Con		0
Lord Boateng	Lab		0.01
Baroness Bonham-Carter of Yarnbury	LDem		0
Baroness Boothroyd	Crossbench		0.313
Lord Borwick	Con		0.01
Lord Boswell of Aynho	Non-affiliated		0
Baroness Bottomley of Nettlestone	Con		0.011
Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth	Con		0.003
Baroness Bowles of Berkhamsted	LDem		0
Lord Bowness	Con		0.035
Lord Boyce	Crossbench		0.143
Lord Boyd of Duncansby	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Brabazon of Tara	Con		0.005
Lord Bradley	Lab		0
Lord Bradshaw	LDem		0.021
Baroness Brady	Con		0
Lord Bragg	Lab		0.033
Lord Brennan	Lab		0.05
Viscount Bridgeman	Con		0.003
Lord Bridges	Crossbench		0.164
Lord Bridges of Headley	Con		0
Baroness Brinton	LDem		0.024
The Bishop of Bristol	Bishop		0
Lord Broers	Crossbench		0.27
Lord Brooke of Alverthorpe	Lab		0.012

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Viscount Brookeborough	Crossbench		0.306
Lord Brookman	Lab		0.016
Lord Brougham and Vaux	Con		0.008
Baroness Brown of Cambridge	Crossbench		0.286
Lord Brown of Eaton-under-Heywood	Judge		0.03
Lord Browne of Belmont	DUP		0.002
Lord Browne of Ladyton	Lab		0.003
Lord Browne of Madingley	Crossbench		0.182
Baroness Browning	Con		0.008
Lord Bruce of Bennachie	LDem		0
Lord Burnett	LDem		0.044
Lord Burns	Crossbench		0.37
Baroness Burt of Solihull	LDem		0
Baroness Buscombe	Con		0.012
Baroness Butler-Sloss	Crossbench		0.206
Lord Butler of Brockwell	Crossbench		0.267
Baroness Byford	Con		0.008
Lord Caine	Con		0
The Earl of Caithness	Con		0.012
Lord Callanan	Con		0.006
Lord Cameron of Dillington	Crossbench		0.256
Lord Cameron of Lochbroom	Crossbench		0.243
Lord Campbell-Savours	Lab		0.02
Baroness Campbell of Loughborough	Crossbench		0.5
Lord Campbell of Pittenweem	LDem		0.018
Baroness Campbell of Surbiton	Crossbench		0.234
The Archbishop of Canterbury	Bishop		0
Lord Carey of Clifton	Crossbench		0.234
Lord Carlile of Berriew	LDem		0.104
The Bishop of Carlisle	Bishop		0
Lord Carrington	Con		0.03
Lord Carrington of Fulham	Con		0.003
Lord Carswell	Crossbench		0.161
Lord Carter of Barnes	Lab		0.038
Lord Carter of Coles	Lab		0.004
Lord Cashman	Lab		0.02
Earl Cathcart	Con		0.008
Lord Cavendish of Furness	Con		0.006
Baroness Cavendish of Little Venice	Con		0
Lord Chadlington	Con		0.003
Baroness Chakrabarti	Lab		0
Baroness Chalker of Wallasey	Con		0.01
Viscount Chandos	Lab		0.014
The Bishop of Chelmsford	Bishop		0
The Bishop of Chester	Bishop		0.054
Lord Chidgey	LDem		0.013
Baroness Chisholm of Owlpen	Con		0
The Marquess of Cholmondeley	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Christopher	Lab		0.003
The Earl of Clancarty	Crossbench		0.325
Baroness Clark of Calton	Judge		0
Lord Clarke of Hampstead	Lab		0.027
Lord Clarke of Stone-cum-Ebony	Judge	n/a	
Lord Clark of Windermere	Lab		0.008
Lord Clement-Jones	LDem		0.02
Lord Clinton-Davis	Lab		0.018
Lord Coe	Con		0
Baroness Cohen of Pimlico	Lab		0.025
Lord Colgrain	Con		0
Lord Collins of Highbury	Lab		0.004
Lord Collins of Mapesbury	Judge		0
Viscount Colville of Culross	Crossbench		0.218
Lord Colwyn	Con		0.012
Lord Condon	Crossbench		0.23
Lord Cooper of Windrush	Con		0.014
Lord Cope of Berkeley	Con		0.011
The Earl of Cork and Orrery	Con		0.154
Lord Cormack	Con		0.073
Baroness Corston	Lab		0.005
Lord Cotter	LDem		0.04
The Earl of Courtown	Con		0.009
Baroness Coussins	Crossbench		0.161
Baroness Coultie	Con		0
The Bishop of Coventry	Bishop		0
Baroness Cox	Crossbench		0.304
Viscount Craigavon	Crossbench		0.284
Lord Craig of Radley	Crossbench		0.257
Lord Crathorne	Con		0.005
The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres	Con		0.026

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Baroness Crawley	Lab	0.003
Lord Crickhowell	Con	0.014
Lord Crisp	Crossbench	0.206
Lord Cromwell	Crossbench	0.159
Lord Cullen of Whitekirk	Crossbench	0
Baroness Cumberlege	Con	0.021
Lord Cunningham of Felling	Lab	0.002
Lord Currie of Marylebone	Crossbench	0.483
Lord Curry of Kirkharle	Crossbench	0.367
Baroness D'Souza	Non-affiliated	0.077
Lord Dannatt	Crossbench	0.483
Lord Darling of Roulanish	Lab	0
Lord Darzi of Denham	Lab	0.008
Lord Davidson of Glen Clova	Lab	0.003
Lord Davies of Abersoch	Lab	0
Lord Davies of Coity	Lab	0.025
Lord Davies of Oldham	Lab	0.008
Lord Davies of Stamford	Lab	0.011
Lord de Mauley	Con	0.007
Baroness Dean of Thornton-le-Fylde	Lab	0.006
Lord Dear	Crossbench	0.316
Lord Deben	Con	0.055
Baroness Deech	Crossbench	0.312
Lord Deighton	Con	0.004
Lord Denham	Con	0.019
The Bishop of Derby	Bishop	0
Lord Desai	Lab	0.025
Lord Dholakia	LDem	0.012
Lord Dixon-Smith	Con	0.009
Lord Dobbs	Con	0.006
Baroness Donaghy	Lab	0.002
Lord Donoughue	Lab	0.057
Baroness Doocey	LDem	0.07
Baroness Drake	Lab	0.002
Lord Drayson	Lab	0.004
Lord Dubs	Lab	0.011
The Earl of Dundee	Con	0.018
Lord Dunlop	Con	0
The Bishop of Durham	Bishop	0
Lord Dykes	LDem	0.058
Lord Eames	Crossbench	0.261
Baroness Eaton	Con	0.02
Lord Eatwell	Non-affiliated	0
Viscount Eccles	Con	0.009
Baroness Eccles of Moulton	Con	0.003
Lord Elder	Lab	0.005
Lord Elis-Thomas	PC	0
Lord Elton	Con	0.016
The Bishop of Ely	Bishop	0
Lord Elystan-Morgan	Crossbench	0.373
Baroness Emerton	Crossbench	0.152
Lord Empey	UUP	0
The Earl of Erroll	Crossbench	0.264
Baroness Evans of Bowes Park	Con	0.009
Lord Evans of Temple Guiting	Lab	0.011
Lord Evans of Watford	Lab	0.002
Lord Evans of Weardale	Crossbench	0.091
Lord Fairfax of Cameron	Con	0.014
Lord Falconer of Thoroton	Lab	0.004
Baroness Falkender	Lab	0.035
Viscount Falkland	Crossbench	0.302
Baroness Falkner of Margravine	LDem	0.022
Baroness Fall	Con	0
Lord Farmer	Con	0.011
Baroness Farrington of Ribbleton	Lab	0.006
Lord Faulkner of Worcester	Lab	0.016
Lord Faulks	Con	0.003
Lord Fearn	LDem	0.037
Baroness Featherstone	LDem	0.009
Lord Feldman	Con	0.004
Lord Feldman of Elstree	Con	0
Lord Fellowes	Crossbench	0.27
Lord Fellowes of West Stafford	Con	0
Lord Filkin	Non-affiliated	0
Lord Fink	Con	0.002
Lord Finkelstein	Con	0.01
Baroness Finlay of Llandaff	Crossbench	0.22
Baroness Finn	Con	0
Baroness Flather	Crossbench	0.714

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Lord Flight	Con	0.028
Baroness Fookes	Con	0.022
Baroness Ford	Non-affiliated	0.036
Lord Forsyth of Drumlean	Con	0.036
Lord Foster of Bath	LDem	0
Lord Foster of Bishop Auckland	Lab	0.008
Lord Foulkes of Cumnock	Lab	0.005
Lord Fowler	Con	0.018
Lord Fox	LDem	0
Lord Framlingham	Con	0.027
Lord Fraser of Corriearth	Con	0
Lord Freeman	Con	0.005
Lord Freud	Con	0.008
Lord Freyberg	Crossbench	0.262
Baroness Fritchie	Crossbench	0.141
Lord Gadhia	Con	0
Baroness Gale	Lab	0.011
Baroness Garden of Frognal	LDem	0.014
Lord Gardiner of Kimble	Con	0.008
Baroness Gardner of Parkes	Con	0.018
Lord Garel-Jones	Con	0.034
Lord Geddes	Con	0.007
Lord German	LDem	0.008
Baroness Gibson of Market Rasen	Lab	0.01
Lord Giddens	Lab	0.006
Lord Gilbert of Panteg	Con	0
The Earl of Glasgow	LDem	0.027
Lord Glasman	Lab	0.004
Lord Glenarthur	Con	0.031
Lord Glendonbrook	Con	0
Lord Glentoran	Con	0.007
The Bishop of Gloucester	Bishop	0
Lord Goddard of Stockport	LDem	0.012
Lord Goff of Chieveley	Crossbench	0
Lord Gold	Con	0.003
Baroness Goldie	Con	0.008
Baroness Golding	Lab	0.014
Lord Goldsmith	Lab	0.002
Lord Goodlad	Con	0.004
Lord Gordon of Strathblane	Lab	0.031
Viscount Goschen	Con	0.01
Baroness Goudie	Lab	0.002
Baroness Gould of Potternewton	Lab	0.006
Lord Grabiner	Lab	0.031
Lord Grade of Yarmouth	Con	0.013
Lord Graham of Edmonton	Lab	0.017
Lord Grantchester	Lab	0.013
Lord Greaves	LDem	0.053
Lord Green of Deddington	Crossbench	0.543
Baroness Greenfield	Crossbench	0.357
Baroness Greengross	Crossbench	0.34
Lord Green of Hurstpierpoint	Con	0.009
Lord Greenway	Crossbench	0.318
Baroness Grender	LDem	0.004
Baroness Grey-Thompson	Crossbench	0.221
Lord Griffiths of Burry Port	Lab	0.011
Lord Griffiths of Fforestfach	Con	0.016
Lord Grocott	Lab	0.003
Lord Guthrie of Craigiebank	Crossbench	0.387
Lord Hague of Richmond	Con	0
Viscount Hailsham	Con	0.028
Lord Hain	Lab	0.013
Baroness Hale of Richmond	Judge	0
Lord Hall of Birkenhead	Crossbench	0.278
Lord Hameed	Crossbench	0.336
Lord Hamilton of Epsom	Con	0.025
Baroness Hamwee	LDem	0.019
Baroness Hanham	Con	0.01
Lord Hannay of Chiswick	Crossbench	0.226
Lord Hanningfield	Non-affiliated	1
Viscount Hanworth	Lab	0.007
Lord Hardie	Judge	0.08
Baroness Harding of Winscombe	Con	0
Lord Harries of Pentregarth	Crossbench	0.223
Lord Harris of Haringey	Lab	0.004
Lord Harrison	Lab	0.006
Lord Harris of Peckham	Con	0.006
Baroness Harris of Richmond	LDem	0.026
Lord Hart of Chilton	Lab	0.001

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Lord Haskel	Lab	0.007
Lord Haskins	Crossbench	0.354
Lord Hastings of Scarisbrick	Crossbench	0.322
Lord Hattersley	Lab	0.063
Lord Haughey	Lab	0.019
Lord Haworth	Lab	0.009
Lord Hay of Ballyore	DUP	0
Baroness Hayman	Crossbench	0.222
Baroness Hayter of Kentish Town	Lab	0.002
Lord Hayward	Con	0.007
Baroness Healy of Primrose Hill	Lab	0.003
Baroness Helic	Con	0
Baroness Henig	Lab	0.005
Lord Henley	Con	0.014
Lord Hennessy of Nympsfield	Crossbench	0.15
Lord Heseltine	Con	0.077
Baroness Heyhoe Flint	Con	0.006
Lord Higgins	Con	0.02
Lord Hill of Oareford	Con	0.009
Baroness Hilton of Eggardon	Lab	0.011
Baroness Hodgson of Abinger	Con	0.008
Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbotts	Con	0.024
Lord Hoffmann	Crossbench	0
Baroness Hogg	Crossbench	0.353
Lord Hollick	Lab	0.024
Baroness Hollins	Crossbench	0.213
Baroness Hollis of Heigham	Lab	0.003
Lord Holmes of Richmond	Con	0.011
The Earl of Home	Con	0
Baroness Hooper	Con	0.019
Lord Hope of Craighead	Judge	0.011
Lord Horam	Con	0.003
Lord Howard of Lympne	Con	0.004
Lord Howard of Rising	Con	0.032
Baroness Howarth of Breckland	Crossbench	0.316
Lord Howarth of Newport	Lab	0.012
Earl Howe	Con	0.009
Baroness Howe of Idlicote	Crossbench	0.153
Lord Howell of Guildford	Con	0.007
Baroness Howells of St Davids	Lab	0.009
Lord Howie of Troon	Lab	0.042
Lord Hoyle	Lab	0.014
Baroness Hughes of Stretford	Lab	0.003
Lord Hughes of Woodside	Lab	0.007
Baroness Humphreys	LDem	0.008
Lord Hunt of Chesterton	Lab	0.013
Lord Hunt of Kings Heath	Lab	0.008
Lord Hunt of Wirral	Con	0.011
Lord Hurd of Westwell	Con	0.05
Lord Hussain	Non-affiliated	0.077
Baroness Hussein-Ece	LDem	0.025
Lord Hutton	Crossbench	0.083
Lord Hutton of Furness	Lab	0
Lord Hylton	Crossbench	0.228
Lord Imbert	Crossbench	0.372
Lord Inge	Crossbench	0.267
Lord Inglewood	Con	0.027
Lord Irvine of Lairg	Lab	0.013
Lord James of Blackheath	Con	0.009
Baroness Janke	LDem	0.013
Lord Janvrin	Crossbench	0.235
Lord Jay of Ewelme	Crossbench	0.322
Baroness Jay of Paddington	Lab	0.008
Baroness Jenkin of Kennington	Con	0.009
Baroness Jolly	LDem	0.005
Lord Jones	Lab	0.008
Lord Jones of Birmingham	Crossbench	0.425
Lord Jones of Cheltenham	LDem	0.007
Baroness Jones of Moulsecoomb	Green	0
Baroness Jones of Whitchurch	Lab	0.009
Lord Jopling	Con	0.013
Lord Jordan	Lab	0.01
Baroness Jowell	Lab	0
Lord Judd	Lab	0.04
Lord Judge	Judge	0.02
Lord Kakkar	Crossbench	0.394
Lord Kalms	Non-affiliated	0.679
Lord Keen of Elie	Con	0
Baroness Kennedy of Cradley	Lab	0

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Lord Kennedy of Southwark	Lab		0.007
Baroness Kennedy of The Shaws	Lab		0.189
Lord Kerr of Kinlochard	Crossbench		0.299
Lord Kerr of Tonaghmore	Judge	n/a	
Lord Kerslake	Crossbench		0.317
Lord Kestenbaum	Lab		0
Baroness Kidron	Crossbench		0.265
Lord Kilclooney	Crossbench		0.401
Baroness King of Bow	Lab		0.003
Lord King of Bridgwater	Con		0.013
Lord King of Lothbury	Crossbench	n/a	
Baroness Kingsmill	Lab		0
Lord Kinnock	Lab		0.008
Baroness Kinnock of Holyhead	Lab		0
The Earl of Kinnoull	Crossbench		0.267
Lord Kirkham	Con		0.002
Lord Kirkhill	Lab		0.023
Lord Kirkhope of Harrogate	Con		0
Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope	LDem		0.027
Baroness Knight of Collingtree	Con		0.013
Lord Knight of Weymouth	Lab		0.007
Baroness Kramer	LDem		0.009
Lord Krebs	Crossbench		0.232
Lord Laird	Non-affiliated		0.2
Lord Laming	Crossbench		0.3
Lord Lamont of Lerwick	Con		0.018
Baroness Lane-Fox of Soho	Crossbench		0.19
Lord Lang of Monkton	Con		0.005
Lord Lansley	Con		0.007
Baroness Lawrence of Clarendon	Lab		0
Lord Lawson of Blaby	Con		0.033
Lord Layard	Lab		0.01
Lord Leach of Fairford	Con		0.012
Lord Lea of Crondall	Lab		0.004
The Bishop of Leeds	Bishop		0.056
Lord Lee of Trafford	LDem		0.016
Lord Leigh of Hurley	Con		0.004
Lord Leitch	Lab		0.01
Lord Lennie	Lab		0
Lord Lester of Herne Hill	LDem		0.024
Lord Levene of Portsoken	Crossbench		0.238
Lord Levy	Lab		0.003
Lord Lexden	Con		0.009
Baroness Liddell of Coatdyke	Lab		0.003
Lord Liddle	Lab		0.011
The Earl of Lindsay	Con		0.005
Lord Lingfield	Con		0.002
Lord Lipsey	Lab		0.014
Baroness Lister of Burtersett	Lab		0.005
The Earl of Listowel	Crossbench		0.169
Lord Lisvane	Crossbench		0
Lord Livermore	Lab		0.029
The Earl of Liverpool	Con		0.023
Lord Livingston of Parkhead	Con		0.012
Lord Llewellyn of Steep	Con	n/a	
Lord Lloyd-Webber	Con		0.19
Baroness Lockwood	Lab		0.008
The Bishop of London	Bishop		0
Lord Loomba	LDem		0.031
The Marquess of Lothian	Con		0.021
Lord Low of Dalston	Crossbench		0.281
Lord Lucas	Con		0.04
Lord Luce	Crossbench		0.323
Baroness Ludford	LDem		0.012
Lord Lupton	Con		0
Lord Lyell	Con		0.014
The Earl of Lytton	Crossbench		0.202
Lord Macdonald of River Glaven	LDem		0.079
Lord Macdonald of Tradeston	Lab		0.005
Lord MacGregor of Pulham Market	Con		0.015
Lord Mackay of Clashfern	Con		0.033
Lord Mackay of Drumadoon	Judge		0
Lord MacKenzie of Culkein	Lab		0.007
Lord Mackenzie of Framwellgate	Non-affiliated		0.015
Lord MacLaurin of Knebworth	Con		0.009
Lord MacLennan of Rogart	LDem		0.047
Lord Macpherson of Earl's Court	Crossbench		0.333
Baroness Maddock	LDem		0.008
Lord Magan of Castletown	Con		0.006

# Johnny Stocks (S)

# Extended Essay

Lord Maginnis of Drumglass	Independent Ulster Unionist	n/a	
Lord Mair	Crossbench		0.353
Baroness Mallalieu	Lab		0.101
Lord Malloch-Brown	Crossbench		0
Lord Mance	Judge	n/a	
Lord Mancroft	Con		0.016
Lord Mandelson	Lab		0.006
Baroness Manningham-Buller	Crossbench		0.31
Baroness Manzoor	Con		0
The Countess of Mar	Crossbench		0.194
The Earl of Mar and Kellie	LDem		0.011
Lord Marks of Henley-on-Thames	LDem		0.034
Lord Marland	Con		0.009
Lord Marlesford	Con		0.024
Lord Martin of Springburn	Crossbench		0.302
Baroness Masham of Ilton	Crossbench		0.212
Baroness Massey of Darwen	Lab		0.007
Lord Maude of Horsham	Con		0
Lord Mawhinney	Con		0.019
Lord Mawson	Crossbench		0.318
Lord Maxton	Lab		0.011
Lord May of Oxford	Crossbench		0.331
Lord McAvoy	Lab		0.008
Lord McCluskey	Crossbench		0.333
Lord McColl of Dulwich	Con		0.011
Lord McConnell of Glenscorrodale	Lab		0.004
Baroness McDonagh	Lab		0.007
Lord McFall of Alcluith	Lab		0
Baroness McGregor-Smith	Con		0
Lord McInnes of Kilwinning	Con		0
Baroness McIntosh of Hudnall	Lab		0.009
Baroness McIntosh of Pickering	Con		0.016
Lord McKenzie of Luton	Lab		0.006
Lord McNally	LDem		0.016
Baroness Meacher	Crossbench		0.282
Lord Mendelsohn	Lab		0
Baroness Miller of Chilthorne Domer	LDem		0.028
Lord Millett	Crossbench	n/a	
Lord Mitchell	Lab		0.013
Baroness Mobarik	Con		0.009
Lord Mogg	Crossbench		0.077
Baroness Mone	Con		0
Lord Monks	Lab		0.003
The Duke of Montrose	Con		0.008
Lord Moonie	Lab		0.021
Lord Moore of Lower Marsh	Con		0.011
Lord Morgan	Lab		0.041
Baroness Morgan of Drefelin	Crossbench		0.227
Baroness Morgan of Ely	Lab		0.004
Baroness Morgan of Huyton	Lab		0.004
Lord Morris of Aberavon	Lab		0.019
Baroness Morris of Bolton	Con		0.005
Lord Morris of Handsworth	Lab		0.008
Baroness Morris of Yardley	Lab		0.008
Lord Morrow	DUP		0.005
Lord Mountevans	Crossbench		0
Lord Moynihan	Con		0.025
Baroness Murphy	Crossbench		0.302
Lord Murphy of Torfaen	Lab		0.011
Lord Myners	Non-affiliated		0
Lord Naseby	Con		0.012
Lord Nash	Con		0.003
Lord Neill of Bladen	Crossbench		0.138
Baroness Neuberger	Crossbench		0.217
Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury	Judge		0
Baroness Neville-Jones	Con		0.01
Baroness Neville-Rolfe	Con		0
Lord Newby	LDem		0.01
The Bishop of Newcastle	Bishop		1
Baroness Newlove	Con		0.008
Lord Nicholls of Birkenhead	Crossbench		0
Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne	LDem		0.195
Baroness Nicol	Lab		0.006
Baroness Noakes	Con		0.015
The Duke of Norfolk	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Northbourne	Crossbench		0.238
Lord Northbrook	Con		0.018
Baroness Northover	LDem		0.012
Lord Norton of Louth	Con		0.046

## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

The Bishop of Norwich	Bishop		0.061
Baroness Nye	Lab		0.002
Baroness O'Cathain	Con		0.019
Lord O'Donnell	Crossbench		0.15
Baroness O'Loan	Crossbench		0.221
Baroness O'Neill of Bengarve	Crossbench		0.186
Lord O'Neill of Clackmannan	Lab		0.004
Lord O'Neill of Gatley	Con		0
Lord O'Shaughnessy	Con		0
Lord Oakeshott of Seagrove Bay	Non-affiliated		0.111
Lord Oates	LDem		0
Baroness Oppenheim-Barnes	Con		0.013
Lord Ouseley	Crossbench		0.401
Lord Owen	Independent Social Democrat	n/a	
Lord Oxburgh	Crossbench		0.2
The Bishop of Oxford	Bishop		0.143
The Earl of Oxford and Asquith	LDem		0.025
Lord Paddick	LDem		0.007
Baroness Paisley of St George's	DUP		0
Lord Palmer	Crossbench		0.214
Lord Palmer of Childs Hill	LDem		0.011
Lord Palumbo	Con		0.013
Lord Palumbo of Southwark	LDem		0.091
Lord Pannick	Crossbench		0.225
Lord Parekh	Lab		0.029
Baroness Parminter	LDem		0.004
Lord Patel	Crossbench		0.3
Lord Patel of Blackburn	Lab		0.019
Lord Patel of Bradford	Lab		0
Lord Patten	Con		0.009
Lord Patten of Barnes	Con		0.05
Lord Paul	Non-affiliated		0
Lord Pearson of Rannoch	UKIP		0
Earl Peel	Crossbench	n/a	
Lord Pendry	Lab		0.032
Baroness Perry of Southwark	Con		0.015
Lord Peston	Lab		0.031
The Bishop of Peterborough	Bishop		0
Lord Phillips of Worth Matravers	Judge		0.021
Baroness Pidding	Con		0
Baroness Pinnock	LDem		0
Baroness Pitkeathley	Lab		0.005
Lord Plant of Highfield	Lab		0.028
Lord Plumb	Con		0.01
Lord Polak	Con		0
Lord Ponsonby of Shulbrede	Lab		0.014
Lord Popat	Con		0.007
Lord Porter of Spalding	Con		0
The Bishop of Portsmouth	Bishop		0.1
Lord Powell of Bayswater	Crossbench		0.41
Baroness Prashar	Crossbench		0.213
Lord Prescott	Lab		0.003
Lord Price	Con		0
Baroness Primarolo	Lab		0
Lord Prior	Con		0.09
Lord Prior of Brampton	Con		0
Baroness Prosser	Lab		0.004
Lord Purvis of Tweed	LDem		0.009
Lord Puttnam	Lab		0.022
Baroness Quin	Lab		0.013
Lord Quirk	Crossbench		0.168
Lord Radice	Lab		0.006
Baroness Ramsay of Cartvale	Lab		0.003
Lord Ramsbotham	Crossbench		0.139
Lord Rana	Crossbench		0.592
Baroness Randerson	LDem		0.023
Baroness Rawlings	Con		0.007
Lord Razzall	LDem		0.004
Lord Rea	Lab		0.041
Baroness Rebuck	Lab		0
Lord Redesdale	LDem		0.015
Baroness Redfern	Con		0
Lord Rees of Ludlow	Crossbench		0.332
Lord Reid of Cardowan	Lab		0.02
Lord Renfrew of Kaimsthorn	Con		0.015
Lord Rennard	LDem		0.015
Lord Renton of Mount Harry	Con		0.052
Lord Renwick of Clifton	Crossbench		0.333
Lord Ribeiro	Con		0.008



## Johnny Stocks (S)

## Extended Essay

Lord Richard	Lab		0.016
Lord Richards of Herstmonceux	Crossbench		0.5
Baroness Richardson of Calow	Crossbench		0.402
Lord Ricketts	Crossbench		0
Viscount Ridley	Con		0.004
Lord Risby	Con		0.004
Lord Rix	Crossbench		0.164
Lord Robathan	Con		0
Lord Roberts of Llandudno	LDem		0.025
Lord Robertson of Port Ellen	Lab		0.024
The Bishop of Rochester	Bishop		0
Baroness Rock	Con		0
Lord Rodgers of Quarry Bank	LDem		0.021
Lord Rogan	UUP		0
Lord Rogers of Riverside	Lab		0.026
Lord Rooker	Lab		0.015
Lord Rose of Monewden	Con		0
Lord Rosser	Lab		0.003
The Earl of Rosslyn	Crossbench		0
Lord Rotherwick	Con		0.009
Lord Rowe-Beddoe	Crossbench		0.248
Lord Rowlands	Lab		0.005
Baroness Royall of Blaisdon	Lab		0.005
Lord Russell of Liverpool	Crossbench		0.03
Lord Ryder of Wensum	Con		0.009
Lord Saatchi	Con		0.01
Lord Sacks	Crossbench	n/a	
Lord Sainsbury of Preston Candover	Con		0.03
Lord Sainsbury of Turville	Lab		0
The Bishop of Salisbury	Bishop		0
The Marquess of Salisbury	Con	n/a	
Lord Sanderson of Bowden	Con		0.006
The Earl of Sandwich	Crossbench		0.201
Lord Sassoon	Con		0.007
Lord Saville of Newdigate	Crossbench		0
Lord Sawyer	Lab		0.008
Baroness Scotland of Asthal	Lab		0.004
Baroness Scott of Bybrook	Con		0
Lord Scott of Foscote	Crossbench		0.219
Baroness Scott of Needham Market	LDem		0.004
Lord Scriven	LDem		0.008
Baroness Seccombe	Con		0.008
The Earl of Selborne	Con		0.018
Lord Selkirk of Douglas	Con		0.008
Lord Selsdon	Con		0.011
Baroness Shackleton of Belgravia	Con		0.009
Lord Sharkey	LDem		0.028
Baroness Sharp of Guildford	LDem		0.01
Baroness Sharples	Con		0.013
Baroness Sheehan	LDem		0
Lord Sheikh	Con		0.006
Baroness Shephard of Northwold	Con		0.003
Lord Sherbourne of Didsbury	Con		0.01
Baroness Sherlock	Lab		0.006
Baroness Shields	Con		0
Lord Shinkwin	Con		0.019
Lord Shipley	LDem		0.034
The Earl of Shrewsbury	Con		0.006
Lord Shutt of Greetland	LDem		0.009
Viscount Simon	Lab		0.022
Lord Simon of Highbury	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Singh of Wimbledon	Crossbench		0.25
Lord Skelmersdale	Con		0.013
Lord Skidelsky	Crossbench		0.312
Viscount Slim	Crossbench		0.236
Baroness Smith of Basildon	Lab		0.007
Lord Smith of Clifton	LDem		0.019
Lord Smith of Finsbury	Non-affiliated		0.077
Baroness Smith of Gilmorehill	Lab		0.004
Lord Smith of Hindhead	Con		0
Lord Smith of Kelvin	Crossbench		0.4
Lord Smith of Leigh	Lab		0.013
Baroness Smith of Newnham	LDem		0.005
Lord Snape	Lab		0.004
The Earl of Snowdon	Crossbench	n/a	
Lord Soley	Lab		0.007
The Duke of Somerset	Crossbench		0.243
The Bishop of Southwark	Bishop		0
Lord Spicer	Con		0

# Johnny Stocks (S)

# Extended Essay

The Bishop of St Albans	Bishop		0
Lord St John of Bletso	Crossbench		0.247
The Earl of Stair	Crossbench		0.242
Baroness Stedman-Scott	Con		0.002
Lord Steel of Aikwood	LDem		0.039
Lord Stephen	LDem		0.009
Lord Sterling of Plaistow	Con		0.009
Baroness Stern	Crossbench		0.234
Lord Stern of Brentford	Crossbench		0.45
Lord Stevens of Kirkwhelpington	Crossbench		0.341
Lord Stevens of Ludgate	UKIP		0
Lord Stevenson of Balmacara	Lab		0.002
Lord Stevenson of Coddenham	Crossbench		0.059
Lord Steyn	Crossbench		0.2
Lord Stirrup	Crossbench		0.43
Lord Stoddart of Swindon	Independent Labour	n/a	
Lord Stone of Blackheath	Lab		0.009
Lord Stoneham of Droxford	LDem		0.018
Lord Storey	LDem		0.022
Baroness Stowell of Beeston	Con		0.008
Lord Strasburger	LDem		0
Lord Strathclyde	Con		0.015
Baroness Stroud	Con		0
Lord Stunell	LDem		0
Lord Sugar	Non-affiliated		1
Baroness Sugg	Con		0
Lord Suri	Con		0
Lord Sutherland of Houndwood	Crossbench		0.311
Baroness Suttie	LDem		0.004
Lord Swinfen	Con		0.03
Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean	Lab		0.006
Lord Tanlaw	Crossbench		0.283
Lord Taverne	LDem		0.034
Lord Taylor of Blackburn	Lab		0.008
Baroness Taylor of Bolton	Lab		0.004
Lord Taylor of Goss Moor	LDem		0.044
Lord Taylor of Holbeach	Con		0.011
Lord Taylor of Warwick	Non-affiliated		0.286
Lord Tebbit	Con		0.019
Lord Temple-Morris	Lab		0.013
Lord Teverson	LDem		0.012
Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd	Judge	n/a	
Lord Thomas of Gresford	LDem		0.021
Lord Thomas of Macclesfield	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Lord Thomas of Swynnerton	Crossbench		0.329
Baroness Thomas of Walliswood	LDem		0.015
Baroness Thomas of Winchester	LDem		0.019
Baroness Thornhill	LDem		0
Baroness Thornton	Lab		0.004
Lord Thurlow	Crossbench		0.412
Viscount Thurso	LDem		0
Lord Tomlinson	Lab		0.007
Baroness Tonge	Independent Liberal Democrat	n/a	
Lord Tope	LDem		0.02
Lord Tordoff	LDem		0.021
Lord Touhig	Lab		0.006
Lord Trees	Crossbench		0.211
Lord Trefgarne	Con		0.017
Viscount Trenchard	Con		0.028
Lord Trevethin and Oaksey	Crossbench		0.267
Lord Triesman	Lab		0.005
Lord Trimble	Con		0.011
Lord True	Con		0.015
Baroness Trumpington	Con		0.015
The Bishop of Truro	Bishop		0
Lord Truscott	Non-affiliated		0.093
Lord Tugendhat	Con		0.039
Lord Tunnicliffe	Lab		0.005
Lord Turnberg	Lab		0.013
Lord Turnbull	Crossbench		0.34
Baroness Turner of Camden	Lab		0.031
Lord Turner of Ecchinswell	Crossbench		0.25
Lord Tyler	LDem		0.021
Baroness Tyler of Enfield	LDem		0.012
Baroness Uddin	Non-affiliated		0.011
Viscount Ullswater	Con		0.014
Baroness Vadera	Non-affiliated	n/a	
Baroness Valentine	Crossbench		0.25
Lord Vallance of Tummel	LDem		0.014

# Johnny Stocks (S)

# Extended Essay

Baroness Vere of Norbiton	Con	0
Lord Verjee	LDem	0
Baroness Verma	Con	0.007
Lord Vinson	Con	0.058
Lord Wade of Chorlton	Con	0.012
Lord Wakeham	Con	0.01
Lord Waldegrave of North Hill	Con	0.024
Lord Walker of Aldringham	Crossbench	0.22
Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe	Judge	0.138
Lord Wallace of Saltaire	LDem	0.013
Lord Wallace of Tankerness	LDem	0.022
Baroness Wall of New Barnet	Lab	0.004
Baroness Walmsley	LDem	0.01
Lord Walpole	Crossbench	0.199
Lord Walton of Detchant	Crossbench	0.141
Lord Warner	Lab	0.013
Baroness Warsi	Con	0.004
Baroness Warwick of Undercliffe	Lab	0.01
Lord Wasserman	Con	0.002
Baroness Watkins of Tavistock	Crossbench	0.25
Lord Watson of Invergowrie	Lab	0.005
Lord Watson of Richmond	LDem	0.017
Lord Watts	Lab	0
Viscount Waverley	Crossbench	0.366
Lord Wei	Con	0.002
The Duke of Wellington	Con	0.081
Lord West of Spithead	Lab	0.008
Baroness Wheatcroft	Con	0.02
Baroness Wheeler	Lab	0
Baroness Whitaker	Lab	0.011
Lord Whitby	Con	0.005
Lord Whitty	Lab	0.008
Lord Wigley	PC	0
Baroness Wilcox	Con	0.01
Lord Willetts	Con	0.009
Lord Williams of Baglan	Crossbench	0.553
Lord Williams of Elvel	Lab	0.025
Lord Williams of Oystermouth	Crossbench	0
Baroness Williams of Trafford	Con	0.007
Lord Willis of Knaresborough	LDem	0.033
Lord Willoughby de Broke	UKIP	0
Lord Wills	Lab	0.003
Lord Wilson of Dinton	Crossbench	0.182
Lord Wilson of Tillyorn	Crossbench	0.267
The Bishop of Winchester	Bishop	0
Lord Winston	Lab	0.034
Baroness Wolf of Dulwich	Crossbench	0.2
Lord Wolfson of Aspley Guise	Con	0
Lord Wolfson of Sunningdale	Con	0
Lord Wood of Anfield	Lab	0.009
Lord Woolf	Crossbench	0.131
Lord Woolmer of Leeds	Lab	0.005
The Bishop of Worcester	Bishop	0
Baroness Worthington	Lab	0
Lord Wrigglesworth	LDem	0.006
Lord Wright of Richmond	Crossbench	0.198
Baroness Wylid	Con	n/a
The Archbishop of York	Bishop	0
Lord Young of Cookham	Con	0
Viscount Younger of Leckie	Con	0.008
Lord Young of Graffham	Con	0
Baroness Young of Hornsey	Crossbench	0.264
Lord Young of Norwood Green	Lab	0.007
Baroness Young of Old Scone	Lab	0.011
<b>Average</b>		<b>0.071346746</b>