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Overview of the Committee System

On the performance of the Committee system, a Commission in UK, set up in July 1999 to investigate the role of Parliament, found that the scrutiny of government MPs and Peers was neither systematic nor rigorous.¹ Similar evaluations have been done in India too. Among other things, it was found that the information provided to the Committees was inadequate, and the quality varied. Committee investigations have a poor record of locating responsibility for the failures of executive, to ensure that the Government acts upon them by following up the recommendations for improvement. Members of Parliament were skeptical about the ability of the Committees to hold government to account; most MPs, particularly in India, thought that the functions of the Committees, to a great extent, were rituals.²

In addition to the above criticism of indifference, some commentators are weary of a plethora of Parliamentary Committees: setting up more and more Committees for the consideration of more and more complex matters. In a mood of resentment, Winston S. Churchill seems to have exclaimed, “We are overrun by them like the Australians were by rabbits”.³ It is also pointed out that the officials, fortified by the Committees upon which experts and interested parties have sat, are enabled to present to Parliament, through

² This was confirmed by Bhakta Charan Das, a Member of Standing Committee on Industry, Petroleum and Mining, in 1996-97, Lok Sabha, in an interviews with the author on 18.7.2003 in New Delhi.
³ Quoted in J.C.Johari, Major Political System (Delhi: Vishal Publication, 1990), p.228.
their ministers, proposals, so formidably supported by the Committees, that the lay Members of Parliament would find it hard to criticize. This is how the Committees may be misused.\(^4\)

The impact of the Committee system varies in both the countries. In Britain they have achieved considerable success. In UK, it is frequently suggested that the Committee system should be reformed by turning the existing Standing Committees into permanent specialist bodies. On the functioning of the Committees, it was observed that, “when PAC makes a sound like a suckling dove, the treasury, while communicating the conclusions of the Committee to the concerned authorities for action roars like a Libyan lion”.\(^5\)

In India it is a mixed bag. Critics lament that the system in India is neither extensive, nor effective. It lacks the seriousness found in UK. The bureaucracy has become impervious to the recommendations of the Committees, and have developed perfect immunity to the criticism and indictment in the reports. Officers are not worried because, so far, not many have been punished on the basis of Committee findings.\(^6\) It is due to lack of interest and bite by the Members, who need reorientation and empowering. The Committee structure in India should at least scrutinize all the bills after they are introduced, if not before; scrutinize at least the major items of

---

\(^4\) Ibid.
\(^6\) Ibid.
expenditure before they are voted; supervise and ensure that the rule of law is followed and there is no assault on human liberty and freedom.

The Committees have had to inject a fresh lease of life into the House, which was somewhat indifferent at different stages. They have made a modest but, nonetheless, significant contribution, in specific areas, to the Parliamentary scrutiny of the executive. There are mixed reactions to their success and achievements, sympathy for difficulties they face, both structural and in practicalities. One commentator said: “it is easy to criticize the role of Select Committees and hard to get convincing answers to questions about their effectiveness. But, the point is that a Parliament has through such Committees mobilised considerable expertise at virtually no expense to investigate and report on subjects which have been of concern.”

Herbert Morrisson, author and a prominent leader of Labour Party, commented: “The Committees do excellent work and it should certainly not be assumed that they are without influence on the power to frighten government departments.” The Minister, through the Committee, “is made to realize that he cannot run the risk of exceeding his statutory authority.”

Some others may also argue that the achievements cannot be said to have a major impact on the process of decision-making. However, the success of the Committees is that they have helped to create fear in the minds of the

---

9 Ibid.
executive: that they should observe codes of conduct in public services. Certainly, the Committees have helped to reinforce the basic democratic theory that the administration is accountable to Parliament. They may not have changed the working relationship between the Parliament and the executive, but they have at least improved it.

In brief, the success of the Committee system, and its effectiveness depend upon at least three factors: 1) including, in the Committees, adequate number of members from across parties who will take real interest in the issues being discussed; 2) maintaining continuity of membership; and 3) regular attendance in the meetings so that the Members gain considerable knowledge of the subjects and experience of the proceedings. As a result, the members would have greater hold over things and a bigger desire to improve the administration.

The success of the Committee depends upon its relations with the government - its equation and its balancing role between the executive and the legislature. The basic function of the Committee has been to make the executive more responsive without derogating its powers. It enabled the Government and Parliament to perform the same functions as they do. But the important difference is that Parliament, with the help Committees, does its role with enhanced efficiency.

However, the equation could be constructive cooperation or unproductive conflict. In some cases, the work of Select Committees tends to be seen by
the Government as a threat rather than an opportunity. This could partly be
due to unfamiliarity of the Committee’s work. On the other hand, there have
been cases of cooperation and understanding. Secondly, the growth of
governmental activities and the complexities of governance have tilted the
balance of power in favour of the executive. It is through the Committee
system that proper scrutiny of the executive and the balance of power
between the government and the Parliament can be restored. This should
constitute one of the foundations of good governance.

Governments try to bypass the Committees. For instance, in India, the
system of promulgating ordinances during the inter-session period has also
served to belittle the Committee system. A Presidential Ordinance has to be
brought as Bill before the Parliament within six months, beyond which it
will lapse. Taking advantage of this, governments try to rush many
important legislations without subjecting them to scrutiny by the members in
Joint or Select Committees.\textsuperscript{10}

The Committees do intensive work. They gather a lot of material; collect
expert evidence and frame conclusions. Such conclusions coming in the
form of recommendations are meant to improve the quality of
administration, by avoiding wastes, improving efficiency and saving time.
Since the Committees gather a lot of details and technical material,
Parliaments often find it difficult to subject all of it to debates, concern

\textsuperscript{10} K.V.Ramesh, "The Slow Decline of Parliament", Deccan Herald (Bangalore), 25
themselves only with matters of policy and leave them to the Government and the Committees to sort things out. Committees keep the House informed of the progress and bring to the notice of the Parliament the unresolved differences between the Committee and the Government for the final decision of the House. Governments are aware of the importance of these Committees, derive benefit out of valuable material in their possession,\(^1\) and try to give adequate attention to the recommendations made by the Committees. They apprise the Committees if certain recommendations are not being carried out and give reasons for their non-implementation.

While judging the efficacy of the Committee system, one has to formulate certain criteria. As we posed in the beginning of the study (in the Introduction Chapter), the criterion for measuring the success of the Committees could be their contribution to increasing transparency, accountability, professionalism of Parliamentary performance, and so on. Although it was clear that the Committees were very much on these roles, their status needs to be enhanced so that they contribute in greater measure than what they are doing currently.

**Procedural Limitations**

The accountability of the executive seems to be more to the general elections than on day-to-day administration.\(^2\) Although Committees are carrying out scrutiny of finances, the financial scrutiny should be more closely linked to

---

policy outcomes. There should also be effective link between the Committees and the Speaker of the House who, in the first place, is responsible for appointing and monitoring the Committees. The secretariat provided by the Secretary to the Speaker provides that link, and there is full comprehension of the functions and responsibilities of the Secretariat to the Committees and the Speaker. But with regard to the Chairmen, the position is fluid. There is no system through which the Speaker can communicate the procedural and organisational aspect from time to time. Similarly, there is no system to standardize the procedures followed by various Chairmen. It is also noticed that the chairmen, appointed from time to time, follow their own line of procedure, although the Secretariat is there to guide them. It is, therefore, advisable that there is coordination at higher level too and the policies laid down by the Speaker are followed uniformly.

In a representative democracy, Parliament is the principal means of holding Government to account, on behalf of the public, between general elections. But, how to secure democratic control of the mass government actions is a major problem in the modern state. Parliament provides a permanent monitor of the work of the Government, regularly call ministers to explain their actions and, where necessary, seek remedial actions. The effective way of making the doctrine of ministerial responsibility would mean penalties for ministers who incur widespread Parliamentary displeasure.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Peter G. Richards, \textit{The Backbenchers} (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), p.141.
The Future of the Committee System
The nature of government from a single party majority to a multiparty coalition will influence the role and relations of the executive and the legislature; and the Parliament assuming greater influence on how the country is governed and what policies are implemented. This change could occur within the current frame of Parliamentary government, but it would require substantial change in its practice and operation and attitudes.

The increasing workload of Parliament has forced it to make more extensive use of the Committees, and it is evident that this process is going to continue in future. The increasingly technical character of the legislation makes the Committee system necessary. On the other hand, there are forces of tradition which are in favour of the House retaining all its main powers in its own hands. In case of Britain, the British have not been favourably impressed with the working of Committees in many countries. The British Cabinet prefers to defend its programme on the floor of the House where the cabinet ministers can be present and the Government can summon up its majority to defeat any undesirable amendment. Nor the Commons themselves do have any wish to surrender part of their all-embracing responsibilities to any subsidiary organ.\(^{14}\)

The strengthened Committee system, in both India and, can will contribute to the policy at the preliminary stage of formulation and at the final stage of

implementation. Although the government’s responsibility for actual decisions should remain, the range of information and arguments for the improvement of policies would come from the Committees. Moreover, as a result, detailed scrutiny the policies can be better made.

The efficacy of Committees also depends upon how seriously their work is taken. In any Parliamentary system, respect for democratic values, both by leadership and by masses, is essential for success. The structures, however strong they are, unless they are run by people with convictions, alone would not deliver. This assumption is more relevant for India, as democratic values have not taken stronger roots. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, on the basis of Ad hoc Committee report, moved a resolution for the expulsion of a corrupt member of the provisional Parliament in 1951. He could have chosen to ignore the recommendation of the Committee, but he did not. Such attitudes are in decline, a veteran Member of Indian Parliament lamented. “Standing Committees for different ministries and their work has become just a ritual,” he said.15 It is a matter of opinion by experts that the Committees’ recommendations should not be binding. The Committees and the Governments work in their different ways. It is good that the Committees bring discussion, on to the floor, on important issues; the government, most of the time comes under pressure to respect those discussions. This point was stressed by Peter Laugarne of Guildhall

University, UK, in an interview to the author.\textsuperscript{16} He underlined the fact that Parliamentary Committees have a scrutinizing role not an executive role. They bring out the failure of the government's work and try to keep the government alert about what it is doing.

However, Lord Norton suggests that there should be some procedural mechanism requiring the government to accept the important recommendations of the Committee.\textsuperscript{17} He cited the current practice of scrutiny of European Union legislations, which is known as the 'scrutiny reserve'. In other words, what it means is that the government should not agree to any thing in the Council until the Parliamentary scrutiny of that proposal, is completed. So it gives the Committee some leverage. For instance if an EU Committee is not satisfied with the proposal it can seek further information while keeping it under scrutiny. The government cannot simply agree to it until the Parliament scrutiny is over. This way, Committees get some procedural support.

The structure of the government and the context in which it operates have changed enormously in recent years. Many external factors influence the performance and accountability of the Government and the Parliament. How relevant are the internal mechanisms like the Committees in the current context? For instance, in Britain, the devolution of Scotland and Wales and the extension of EU involvement in a wide range of policy making and the

\textsuperscript{16} Peter Laugherne in an interview with the author on 26.10.2002 in London.
\textsuperscript{17} The author's interview with Lord Philip Norton on 24.10.2002 in London.
growing power of the media have had some impact on the influence of Westminster. Both in India and Britain the growing influence of the courts also impacts on the accountability of the government. These external factors may dilute the role of the Committees, may make them complacent, but the Committees have specific roles in scrutinizing the governments as participant observers, which other agencies may not be able to do.

The arguments about the role of Committees are likely to continue. It was noticed that there are at least four schools of thought on the role of the Committees. One, they give powers and opportunities to the backbenchers. Second perspective, bordering on cynicism, suggests that their power to send for ‘persons, papers and records’ backed by a right to offer recommendations to the House and government does not give them any real powers; in fact, it pushes them to peripheral role in the political system. Third, a traditionalist viewpoint, argues that the existence of Committees has reduced the importance of the Chamber as the Grand Forum for political debate. Fourth, the modernist perspective, suggests that the Committees supplement the critical role of Parliament in securing accountability of executive and maintaining the balance between the executive and the legislature.

Overall, the Committee system has a major impact on the style of government functioning, and on the responsiveness of the executive. Various recommendations of the Committees have led to the observance of code of conduct and ethics in public service, as well as in political life. The
premise in democratic system that the administration is accountable and is in subordination to the Parliament is reinforced by the Committees.

The future of the Committee system is best explained by the Norton Report\textsuperscript{18} which has examined the cause of decline in the effectiveness of Parliament in holding the executive to account, and to make proposals for strengthening democratic control over the government. It mentioned, in this context, citizens' need for an effective Parliament. The Report said, citizens need a body that can call the government to account, that can ensure that government answers for its actions and the actions of civil servants. They need a body that can scrutinize and if necessary, change the legislative proposals brought towards by government-proposals that, once approved by Parliament, have the force of law. They need a body that can ensure that their voice is heard by the government when they have grievance, be it about the impact of a policy or the absence of a policy. They need security of knowing that, if there is a problem, there is a body to which they can turn for help, a body that can force public officials to listen.

\textbf{Suggestions}

In addition to the foregoing conclusions, this study would like to make the following suggestions for improving the Committee system. An American Sociologist, Robert Merton, developed a series of interrelationships between the goals and the means, and propounded that in the working of a system,

there may be occasions where the goals are lost and the means are adhered to, resulting in mere ritualism.\textsuperscript{19} It has been argued by the critics that the Committee system is gradually becoming a ritual. This can be overcome by giving continuous training to the members of the Committees and of the Parliament Secretariat. The training would equip the MPs with the knowledge of what they should do in the Committees and with what skills they should do it.\textsuperscript{20}

Change of attitude and a new orientation vis-à-vis the Committee system are necessary for making the Committees effective. Both in UK and in India, MPs are unclear about their duties and, in particular, about how they can and should hold the executive to account. Vigorous scrutiny of the government depends upon how effectively the MPs use the tools, especially the Parliamentary Committees. A Commission Report in UK was based on the belief that changes in attitudes and behaviour of MPs themselves were as important as changes in the working of Parliament.\textsuperscript{21} Parliament will be as serious and watchful as the Members are.

In order to do so, training for members should be provided at the beginning of each Parliament, explaining the operation of the Committee system. A training infrastructure should be developed within the Parliament. In India, institutions like the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training are there.

\textsuperscript{19} Robert King Merton, \textit{Social Theory and Social Structure} (New York: Collier Miller, 1965), p.49.

\textsuperscript{20} Liam Laurence Smyth, Clerk of the Education and Skill Committee, UK House of Commons, in an interview with the author on 18-10-2002 in London.

\textsuperscript{21} UK, Conservative Party, n.18.
to provide such training. But this needs to be activated in relation to the Committee system.

Parliamentary institutions, including the Committees, have to evolve in response to changing times and demands on Parliament. It is such innovations in Parliamentary practice and structures, more so in India, which may breathe a new life into the country's democracy; many rue that it is going through a process of slow death. A few small steps in creating accountability structures will make a greater difference in the quality of India's democratic institutions.

On the face of it, the Parliament seems to have little impact, indeed, almost none, on the content of the bills paced before it. But, some caveats must be entered to show that the Parliament is not inconsequential. First, it is misleading to measure it on the basis of the number of amendments accepted or rejected by the Parliament. Some amendments are purely probing in nature, or are meant to elicit information. Second, the number of amendments carried in the Commons against the Government increase significantly on special occasions. Thirdly, the impact of the House of Lords on amendments has not been given sufficient emphasis. The importance of the House of Lords has been in making qualitative change in the amendments. The Lords also has sought to keep pace with the growth in the volume of public legislation, by increasing the time it gives to legislative scrutiny. By one calculation, at the end of 1980s, it had spent 65 per cent of
time on legislation. It shows the activism of the Parliament with regard to its legislative scrutiny role.

There are misgivings about the efficacy of the Committee system. In particular, it is argued that recommendations made by the Committees are either ignored or rejected. The Rules suggest that, "the reports of the Committees have persuasive value and shall be treated as considered advice given by Committees". In order to avoid Committees being ignored; one could suggest a Committee on Committees, with the Speaker as Head and all Chairmen as members, to act as a watchdog to see the status of the recommendations of the Committees and submit periodic report to the Parliament.

The party politics intruding into the Committee proceedings does reduce its effectiveness. The Opposition members sometimes are more concerned with obstructing the government legislative programme, than with the rational discussion of the Bills. On the other hand, members from the ruling party seem to be stampeding others into rushing the Bills through the Committee stage for Government's convenience. In order to partly avoid this problem the membership of the Committee should be delinked from party affiliation and be based on expertise and experience.

There is separation of powers between the legislature, executive and judiciary. This becomes a limitation if harmonious (integrated) approach is not adopted. The Committees can use this approach by a supporting role in
policy formulation, execution and legal iteration, which help to promote responsive governance. Committees can amend Bills, and improvements can come into the system from the opposition through the Committee process and that the Committees should be able to initiate legislation.\footnote{John McKay, Member of Parliament, Canada, “Responsibility, Accountability, and Transparency: Enhancing Good Governance by Improving Democratic Standards in International and Domestic Decision-making”, \textit{The Parliamentarian} (London), January 2000, xxxi, no.1.}

The Committees are also isolated in their works. At times, it is advisable that Committees get into the jurisdiction of other Committees. As such, the Members have the right to initiate discussion in any issue under Article 122(1), which extend to the Committee also.\footnote{M.P. Jain, \textit{Indian Constitutional Law} (Bombay: N.M. Tripathi, 1987), p.60.} However, it will be useful to take a holistic view of a particular issue, which may provide a road map to the resolution of other issues. In the present times, when convergence is being regarded as a key to efficient functioning of the system, the Committees, by adopting a partnership approach, can provide greater synergetic benefit and make governance more effective. It is advisable that for the sake of efficiency of the Committees an integrated system of Committees of Parliament, with adequate powers to scrutinize the working of the Government, is necessary.\footnote{V. Muttemwar, “Role of Parliamentary Committees in Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms”, \textit{Fifty Years of Indian Parliament}, n.15, p.402.}

Furthermore, the Committee system, instead of confining itself to more deliberative and legislative process, should enlarge itself to forging a
partnership between the law and policy makers, represented by the Parliamentarians, and their executors, as represented by the executive.\textsuperscript{25}

Increasingly, government policies transcend Departmental boundaries, and the Government is looking at ways of developing ‘joined up government’. In the light of this, the Committees should be encouraged to hold joint inquiries on issues that cut across departmental boundaries.

Matters of policy do not always fall neatly into single compartment of the Government Department. If there is an overlap of interest and areas between two Committees, the work is sorted out and divided by an informal agreement. But when policy involves several Departments and a whole range of Government activity, the Committees are at a disadvantage to handle it. Of course, crosscutting Committees like Environmental Committees or Public Administration Committee can overcome departmental barriers, but not all the Committees. Therefore, a case of ‘joined up’ Committees becomes increasingly relevant. Innovative initiatives like quadripartite inquiry into arms and exports, conducted by the defence, foreign affairs, international development, trade, and industry, have shown the way.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{26}Philip Norton, Lord and Professor of Government, the University of Hull, UK in an interview with the author on 24 October 2002, in London.
The role of the Committees needs to be more sharply defined, so that each has a set of core responsibilities and a set of certain pre-agreed public goals. The Committee structure should use new methods of work through Sub-Committees, rapporteurs and researchers. Political and financial incentives should be provided for MPs to be involved in Committee activities of pursuing accountability. For instance, Chairing a Select Committee should be recognized as a political position comparable to being a minister (a Deputy Minister or a Minister of State in India), and be paid accordingly.

The Committees should also be engaged in more regular and systematic scrutiny of Departments and their agencies, quangos and the like. The investigative power of MPs should be expanded. Barry Gardiner, a British MP, suggested that this would make the work of Parliament easy. He cited the role of a Select Committee on Arms to Iraq as an example of such powers.27 What should be the priorities of the Committees in scrutinizing the main activities of the government departments - policy, administration, finance, agencies and regulators? Should Committees have broader roles, that is, in the legislative process or in public appointments?

The Second Chambers - Rajya Sabha in India and House of Lords in UK - should complement the roles of Lok Sabha and the Commons. Although there are Committees in Rajya Sabha and the Lords, they are not equally powerful. The financial matters are in the domain of the Lok Sabha and the

---

27 Barry Gardiner, British MP, and member of the Public Accounts Committee in an interview with the author on 15.10.2002, in London.
Commons. Be those as they may, the second chambers have an important role to play in holding the government to account; they must play a complementary role in the scrutiny work of the Commons and the Lok Sabha.

In the second chambers, no political party has an over all majority. Because of this composition, the second chamber provides a different perspective on accountability. It is possible, in the second chambers, to have less adversarial approach and take a long-term view of policy and administration. In UK the Lords is in a better position to scrutinize issues which transcend departmental boundaries, where as the House of Commons Committees are tied to individual ministries. Moreover, the upper chambers should be given the specific responsibility for ethical, constitutional and social issues for which the Lok Sabha and the Commons have less time, although this will require closer coordination and cooperation between both the chambers.

The Committees are dependent on the government for information and cooperation, particularly in matters of appearance of civil servants. This is problem is due to current rules and conventions regulating the relationship between the Parliament and the Government. It may also be possible to change these regulations by, let us say, increasing the right of Committees to demand information and summoning the named civil servants. This right is denied in the name of ministerial responsibility, as the doctrine is currently understood by the government, which means, there is no room for Committees summoning the civil servants. Also, a Freedom of Information
Act would contribute significantly to increasing Parliamentary insight into administration.

Although the Committees have the power to send for persons, papers, and reports from time to time, concerns have been raised about their lack of specific powers. Committees do not seem to have sufficient powers to secure accountability from departments. There should be clear guidelines on the kind of evidence they should take, from where they should take these evidences. Lord Norton agreed that there were problems of collection of evidence when the Maxwell brother did not say anything to the Committee on security or when they did not turn up, the Committee could not punish them. He suggested that something should be done for gathering evidence bit strictly.28

Reducing party dominance is an essential reform for the effective functioning of Committees. Party dominance prevents Committees from building up a sense of collective identity and loyalty. Party Whips, in the name of party loyalty, have accentuated this problem. Moreover, the doctrine of ministerial responsibility can be moderated in the line of the system of accountability adapting the structure of modern state. Party loyalty causes another problem. When the Government gets uneasy of the Committee’s activity, most members owing loyalty toe the line of the party.

---

From the above, it follows that Parliament lacks a corporate ethos which promotes collective functions such as accountability. Members of the Parliament (Lok Sabha and Commons) have to balance a number of competing roles of varying significance - representing the interest of their constituencies and parties as well as performing their Parliamentary duties. Parliaments in India and UK should provide the means and opportunity for MPs to reconcile these diverse and conflicting roles. Party loyalties and demands need to be seen in balance with scrutinizing the executive and holding the government to account. In fact, scrutiny should be central to all the work of an MP.

Limited resources available to Committees are a major problem. Inadequate resource has been a source of complaint from Committee chairs. Resources that are lacking include staff for collecting and assessing evidence, in view of the increasing complexity of government business, making it difficult for MPs to be fully informed. Most Committees function with 4 to 5 staff. Given the pressure on the time of MPs, they meet for a few hours each week. Obviously, they will not be able to get through any substantial amount of work. It is, therefore, necessary that Committees have sufficient resources in terms of adequate staff, at least by secondment from other parts of government; for example, from the civil services. They should also get specialist advice from experts. Lord Norton was of the view that more resource should be provided to facilitate the work to the Committees. In particular, he suggested research budget for the Committees.
The strongest role of the Parliament is perhaps its articulation of, and mobilization of, public opinion. Therefore, Parliament should improve its communication with, and responsiveness to, the public. Whereas Government, the political parties and individual MPs in both UK and India are attuned to media requirements, Parliaments are not. Parliaments need to adapt their procedures and logistics to improve its media coverage and make their business more intelligible to voters. In any case, the Parliaments must improve their ability to respond. The new technology may be used to enhance the effectiveness and transparency of the Committees. There should be mechanisms for the Committees like telecasting of important Committee proceedings. This will make them more responsive to individuals and organizations outside Parliament. Committees themselves could improve their public profile and the range of their consultations by making greater use of the Internet.

Finally, a Commission set up to assess the role of Parliament in UK set out a vision of how a reformed Parliament might work.\(^{29}\) Its central theme was that Parliament should be the apex of system of accountability – enhancing, among other things, the status of Select Committees and clarifying the role of Parliament and its politicians. Parliament must make the Government accountable with a view to enhancing the quality of governance; this is a task Parliament undertakes on behalf of the electorate. Hence the Parliament must articulate issues of public concern. Various activities of MPs in the

\(^{29}\) UK, Hansard Society, n.1.
House of Commons and the Peers in Lords should be coordinated, so that they complement each other in the pursuit of accountability. Parliamentary Committees are essential instruments of it.