

HoL de jure representation

The UK's House of Lords (HoL) has long had members appointed by the Church of England. The principle of de jure representation seems good, though 26 is arguably somewhat excessive, and there are numerous other groups who could also be regarded as worthy of representation.

And many groups who are clearly important enough to include will be either too small to qualify as public interest groups or not appropriate for democratic appointment of delegates.

It is therefore proposed that a range of selected groups be granted de jure representation in HoL.

We might ask the Lords Appointments Commission to recommend who these groups should be, but probable subject to approval by Commons. To avoid the list being seen to be permanent, it is suggested that all allocations should be for 10 years, but renewable.

And who might they be?

Clearly, to avoid too harsh a break with tradition, the established Church of England should have at least one seat appointed by its leadership. Which would not preclude it also having representation as a public interest group, if it has enough members and if it cares to organise a democratic poll of them.

Numerous specific professions could perhaps contribute invaluable expertise: doctors, nurses, teachers, police, fire brigade, armed forces, architects, engineers, accountants, lawyers, etc.

A few influential umbrella organisation might be considered: CBI, FSB, TUC, LGA, etc.

In all cases the primary criterion is not whether inclusion will honour the prestige and (self-)importance of the group concerned but how valuable its inputs will be in moderating legislation in the best interests of the people of the nation. To which end it could be much more useful to hear from the CAB than from (say) the Countryside Alliance.

