## Monitor

The Freedom of Information Act 2000 came into force on 1 January this year. After four years of lead-in time, all central government departments, local authorities and other bodies subject to the law shifted overnight from preparation to response mode. However, response mode has required different levels of activity from each authority. Whilst most of the estimated 100,000 public bodies legally bound to respond to requests have received few to no inquiries, some Whitehall departments have been inundated. It is those that have received many – and difficult – requests that are making the news. But that is not the whole picture.

Central government reported receiving some 4,400 requests in the first month. Surprisingly large numbers of requests came from the media and from politicians (130 requests were filed in the first week by members of the shadow Cabinet), but relatively few so far from business. Some departments had to increase their FOI teams to deal with the high volume of requests. The burden is felt heavily at senior levels, and by government lawyers, but initial performance

figures suggest most requests are responded to within 20 days.

Some of the most complex requests have dealt with the Attorney-General's advice about the Iraq war, the Hutton Report and Black Wednesday as well as inquiries about ministerial diaries and ministers' financial interests. There was almost full disclosure of the Treasury papers about Black Wednesday, after consultation with John Major and Norman Lamont. Sensitive policy papers about more recent issues are much less likely to be disclosed, leading to some of these cases inevitably going in appeal to the Information Commissioner.

FOI officers at organisations off the media's 'radar' are facing varying workloads. The results of a dipstick survey of small to medium-sized local and central authorities after the first month of FOI implementation reveal that each authority received an average of 36 requests in January. Jim Amos, the Constitution Unit researcher who carried out telephone interviews with FOI officers, found that, in general, the organisations surveyed have had

the English quota, following the precedent of Northern Ireland representation being reduced by a third during the 1922-1972 Stormont Parliament. In the Lords, the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats are likely to propose a reformed house consisting of 80 per cent elected members. Labour may want to define more tightly the powers of the Lords in relation to primary and secondary legislation, to remove the remaining hereditary peers, and to put the House of Lords Appointments Commission on a statutory basis.

The royal marriage announced on 10 February 2005 raised two questions about its possible validity. The first was whether the marriage had the consent of the Sovereign, under the Royal Marriages Act 1772, and whether the Sovereign's consent had been given on advice. It quickly became apparent from the congratulations which came, first from Buckingham Palace and then from 10 Downing Street, that the marriage had the consent of the Sovereign and the support of the Government. Such consent is not necessarily automatic: in 1953 the Churchill Government indicated that it would not be able to advise in favour of a marriage between Princess Margaret (then third in line of succession) and a divorced man, Gp Capt Peter Townsend. The marriage did not take place.

The second question was whether members of the Royal Family could validly get married in a civil ceremony. The 1836 Marriage Act permitted civil marriages for the first time, but under section 45 the Act did not 'extend to the marriage of any of the Royal Family'. A similar saving was included in the Marriage Act 1949, which provided in section 79: 'nothing in this Act shall affect any law or custom relating to the marriage of members of the Royal Family'. In 1953 it was understood this meant that Princess Margaret could only contract a valid marriage in church. In the Lords on 23 February the Lord Chancellor Lord Falconer explained that the Government now took a different view, not least because of the Human Rights Act 1998. This requires legislation to be interpreted in a way that is compatible with the right to marry (ECHR Article 12), and to enjoy that right without discrimination (Article 14). If members of the Royal Family cannot get married in church (e.g. because they are divorced), and cannot validly marry in a civil ceremté

the Sovereign. It proposed a retiring age of 75 (but not affecting the present Queen); and for Parliament to choose the most suitable successor from among the Sovereign's heirs (but not affecting the succession of the Prince of Wales). The Monarchy has been off limits for constitutional reformers; that may no longer be the case.

The law lords ruled in December that the indefinite detention without trial of suspected foreign terrorists under Part 4 of the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 was unlawful (A v Home Secretary [2004] UKHL 56). The law lords quashed the derogation order from ECHR Article 5, and declared that indefinite detention was a disproportionate response to the threat of terrorism, and discriminatory if applied only to foreign nationals.

If the Government were to continue to detain terrorist suspects, immediate legislation was necessary, because in any event N inr < MM

taéi

representative and democratic' chamber. Government sources had indicated to the press that Labour might commit to anything from an 80 per cent elected House (*Independent*, 11 March) to no further reform at all (interview with Baroness Amos, *Daily Telegraph*, 24 January). Whatever the manifesto does say, it seems clear that there remain divided opinions within government about the appropriate way forward.

In February a cross-party group of parliamentarians launched an initiative, including a draft bill, aimed at 'Breaking the Deadlock'. Coordinated by Paul Tyler MP, Liberal Democrat Shadow Leader of the House of Commons,

the Earl of Glasgow was elected by Liberal Democrat hereditary peers, to replace Earl Russell. Similarly Lords Burnham and Aberdare (both Conservative) died in January and were replaced by Lord De Mauley and Viscount Eccles respectively.

On 26 January MPs voted for a partial reversal of the Commons' reformed sitting hours, to take effect from the start of the new parliament. In 2002 the reforms brought forward by Robin Cook had ended sittings on Tuesdays and Wednesdays after 7pm, and started them earlier in the mornings. These changes were agreed only by the narrowest of margins. Ever since there have been campaigns amongst MPs to revert to the previous arrangements, with complaints including the difficulty of scheduling select committee meetings, and the loss of atmosphere in Parliament in the evenings. Under the new compromise, agreed on a free vote by 292 to 225, the Commons will sit from 2.30 to 10pm on Tuesdays (as it does on Mondays) but will continue to meet from 11.30am to 7pm on Wednesdays. This decision was described by Commons leader Peter Hain as 'a significant step backwards'. Cook's changes had sought to encourage media reporting of parliamentary proceedings, by coinciding with newspaper deadlines and ironically the vote to revert to the old hours, taken at 4.30pm, attracted significant attention. Although the reversion was welcomed by many MPs one member (Helen Jackson of Sheffield Hillsborough) announced that it was the last straw in driving her to announce her retirement.

The Bill completed its Commons passage in February. The government has accepted that the office of Lord Chancellor should be retained, but persuaded the Commons to overturn requirements inserted by the Lords that the Lord Chancellor should be a senior lawyer and a member of the House of Lords. The Lords considered the Commons amendments in March. The Conservatives continued to insist on the Lord Chancellor being a peer and a lawyer, but without Liberal Democrat support

Politics in the Scottish Parliament has reflected the imminence of the UK general election. First Minister's Question Time, theatrical politics in Scotland at its best or worst depending on taste, has witnessed some robust exchanges with election campaign themes well rehearsed. Health issues have been a source of significant clashes though whether significant substantial differences exist is unclear.

Another matter to have come to the fore in the last quarter has been the Executive's use of Sewel Motions in the Parliament. An enquiry into the use of these motions – designed to allow the Executive to allow Westminster to determine public policy in areas that have been devolved – has been provoked by the extent to which the device has been used. Lord Sewel, former Scottish Office Me

politicians as well as sections of the media. In December, a further use of a Sewel Motion to allow Westminster to legislate to permit 'Super Casinos' also met with criticism.

In December 2004, the Procedures Committee agreed to conduct an inquiry into the use of Sewel Motions. A number of issues arise. First, the issue of whether Sewel Motions should be used at all. Secondly, if these Motions are deemed appropriate when should they be used? Thirdly, ought there to be some means of either maintaining closer scrutiny of legislation as it is passed through Westminster and/or ought the Scottish Parliament have the

Government's dealings in a pay dispute with NHS consultants.

```
A recommendation of the Electoral Commission
                                                                ThMod
           that the Government has agreed to is the
                                                                in ocal overnm
                                                                                                      , by
           reduction of the minimum age at which someone
                                                                Corry and Ian Parker, N
           may stand for election to public office from 21
                                                                Ν
                                                             lead
Buil
           to 18. England and Wales will foll
           of p co
                                                                part
                                    al elections. R change Foundation for Democracyww " wfd " or R
           such a move for I
                    andidacy requiremen
                                                 Dar Mor Democracy
           cen
                                                                           , by N
           in
                                                 Compas
           1695.
           The Unit has been successful in
                                                      h
           funding from
                                                                                 for
           Affairs and Ä
                                                                            Kennet á M
                              J- epqR
                                             on-
           Trust for a project on Cq OrlankandR6bianteCoToke Paul TyŁ
                                                                            r, T
                                                                                    ny Wri7
           first pq ase (funded by
                                       1nd G rg-Youn7
                                                                £10, ISBN: 1
                                                                                         90
                                                                                                   39
           exercise, to chart the basis of, relations be
                Cq \mathbf{UE} \mathbf{chg} \mathbf{lam} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d}
           nill give a de
                                       handbook
                                                                , ohn oulds
   rrelandiamante uodava plus
                                       G
                                                            tton, £10, Cons
                                             ah1m
           co parative accoun
                                       190
                                                          6 3p
                                              90
                                                    2
           ina Sco
                                       Devolusion
                                                     L
                                                                 Makin R
 accoaum
           ni
                                                           W
           arrangemen
                                                                Conssiousionedin
                                                                                       d by Robert H
                Act ofSe
                                                                R1win7
                                                                            £3(
                                                                                    1rdb1ck)
                                                                                                    ISBN: 1 85540
           bisb of Lopsds;inab
                                nt Hontus nill extend
                                                                2
           also
                                NHS, r
           support ina
                                           armedaselvic-
                                                                outcomes, Mark Sandford, £8 (
                                                   re on cb
                  sons, and bnritage expendit
                                                                ISBN: 1 90
                                                                               90
           brnililotiongsluftiffst pisto
              report giving anaccoun
                                                                All o the outputs o the E
                                                                             ix reports) are now availab Ł e 6or a
           of
                                                                project (
                                                                special disc
                                                                                unt price o3-
          omnotiven
                     affund (
                             econd pb
           Ro
           looking at b
                               Cb
                                      rch/State relations migb
                                                                    be
           expected o evolve inar
                                        upure.
                                                                Bui 0
                                                                          ing New L
                                                                                            our: The politi
                                                                              , Meg R , PaŁârav
                                                                                        SBN: 10
                                                                                                       9 394 2
                                                                     aperb1ck)
           Ph
                                                                Must Politi
           Servic , Independent Commisson on G
                                                          od
                                                                F
           G
                 venanc
                                                                71
           С
                              cipf org
                                                               'The House o*
                                                                                    Lords'. Me Russe
                                                                                                                   in
           GHousreoftboentnbrysInqury
                                                                                                   , edited by
dminis
                                                                                                                ISBN:
                                                                Nicholas Ba Ł dwin £2 (
                                                                                               1rdb1ck)
(Evidenc
                                                                18
                                                                       27
```

## BulletinBoard