**Power of HoC and HoL**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The House of Commons is more powerful** | **The House of Lords is more powerful** |
| They’re elected – therefore have a mandate from the people and are more legitimate. Therefore they dominate policy – House of Lords cannot stop manifesto bills (Salisbury Convention) | Specialist knowledge – they know what they are talking about and therefore better at scrutiny and more likely to be listened to. Alan Sugar/Coe/Karen Brady |
| Prime Minister can appoint the Lords allowing him to dictate the party balance in the HoL. E.g. 117 Conservatives appointed very early on | Can delay/amend/reject bills. Therefore have power over government policy. E.g. 90 day detention/EU Referendum. Fox hunting DELAY – full public debates on fox hunting. 100 defeats of the Coalition. |
| House of Lords not allowed to reject money bills (1911 Parl Act) and can only delay one year (1949 Parl Act) – there are a number limitations on power of House of Lords. Budget comes from Commons (e.g. Osbourne) because they represent the taxpayers | No party whips as there are in Commons. In the HoC people can be forced to vote with them meaning the govt/exec dominates. In the Lords they can much more vote how they please (e.g. rejecting EU referendum). Evidenced by cross-benchers |
| Vote of no confidence belongs to HoC – i.e. Commons can kick out govt. Last exercised in 1979 | Appointed for life therefore cannot be kicked out therefore can vote as you like; do not have to worry about keeping the electorate happy. Therefore can be more critical. E.g. Terrorist 2006 |
| PMQs – actually get to hold the PM directly accountable (HoL does not) | No time limit on discussion of bills – can be properly considered and more widely scrutinised |
| Executive/government dominance – normally would have a “working” majority. Which means that govt can force through all legislation it wants e.g. Fox Hunting. Tuition Fees | House of Lords Reform Act 1999 – more assertive since they now feel they have more legitimacy (expertise link) – Appointed by someone who is elected – almost argue indirectly elected. |
| Strong party whips means you should always be able to guarantee a bill passes e.g. Tuition Fees – 35/56 LD voted for it | Lords reflects the Commons (party balance) – greater claim to legitimacy and ability to scrutinise |
| Domination of the press – Media much more interested in PM/Cabinet/MPs – gives them an importance in the public eye | Individually each member is more powerful – they all have the right to be heard in a debate (links unlimited time) |
| We live in a representative democracy and this is the only house that actually directly represents the people (party, **constituency**, self, PG, functional) | Spiritual Lords and minorities/women are more able to be appointed to achieve a balance. Spiritual Lords lend an air of moral centring e.g. 3 person DNA (Lords spiritual very concerned over designer babies) |
| Where the Commons is elected, Peers can be appointed for their donations – this is almost corruption. Lord Ashcroft? | The key body which prevents elective dictatorship (Lord Hailsham) |
| **Commons probably more powerful certainly the Lords has been growing in power since 1999**  *(HoL – like winning the ‘tallest dwarf’ competition?)*  Could argue that there a ‘time’ element – House of Lords is stronger when HoC has a smaller majority/Coalition. HoL very weak when HoC has a massive majority – IT DEPENDS | |