International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering and Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-9, Special Issue-9, September-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Availability of Parliamentary Sovereignty

Neha Saxena
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-nehasinha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT

A basic premise of constitutional law is parliamentary sovereignty, which denotes that a nations legislative body has the absolute power to enact or amend laws. The notion of parliamentary sovereignty is examined in this examination along with its historical evolution and current applicability. It looks at whether parliamentary sovereignty is available in various constitutional systems, what obstacles it encounters in the face of globalisation and supranational government, and what effects it has when it is used. This research intends to provide insight on the availability and constraints of parliamentary sovereignty in contemporary government by examining case studies and legislative frameworks.

KEYWORDS

Constitutional Law, Constitutional Systems, Globalization, Parliamentary Sovereignty, Supranational Governance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion of parliamentary sovereignty refers to Parliaments authority over all legislative matters. It implies that Parliament is free to enact whatever laws it sees fit, regardless of how absurd or unjust they may be. The legislation of a previous parliament may be repealed, and the legislative authority of this one may be transferred to other entities or people. The legislation passed by Parliament must be applied by the courts. If a law is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights, some courts may issue a declaration of incompatibility under the Human Rights Act of 1998 [1], [2]. A lengthy and intricate process is involved in turning a legislative proposal into an Act of Parliament.The developing Act is referred to as a Bill up until all of the phases in the procedure have been finished. Bills come in a variety of forms: Public bills 1 alter general law or have national ramifications. Unless there is an express provision to the contrary, it is presumed that the Bill applies to the whole United Kingdom. For instance, Scotland is not covered by the Supply of Goods and Services Act of 1982, but it does apply to England, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

Private Bills deal with issues that are pertinent to a specific location, a private firm, or even a person rather than changing the law for the whole society. Private Bills are often supported by local authorities looking for more authority than what is provided under general law. Government Bills are proposed by a minister with support from the government and have a high likelihood of becoming into law. Others may be submitted to address an emergency that has developed, alter or combine prior legislation, or deal with other issues. Some of the Bills are intended to carry out the political goals of the administration. Private peers or MPs may present a private members bill in the House of Lords without the support of the government. Instead of merely party political issues, they often address moral or legal issues. A private members bill is unlikely to pass without the assistance of the government. The Murder Abolition of the Death Penalty Act of 1965 and the Abortion Act of 1967 are two significant pieces of legislation that were first introduced as private members bills [3], [4].

Before a bill is submitted for the Royal Assent, it must go through a number of stages and get the Commons and Lords approval. The Lords lost its right to reject legislation under the Parliament Act of 1911, which was only passed by the Lords because the King threatened to create enough new peers to secure the passage of the Bill. Although a bill may generally begin life in either the Commons or the Lords and then pass to the other House, in practise most public bills begin in the Commons and then proceed to the Lords. The Lords reluctance to approve David Lloyd-Georges 1909 peoples budget had set off this crisis. The 1911 Act eliminated the Lords ability to veto

legislation, with the exception of measures that would extend the tenure of Parliament, and also added the ability to postpone a bill for up to two years. The Lords delaying authority was shortened to one year by the Parliament Act of 1949. Since 1949, four Acts have been passed into law without the Lords approval:

1. European Parliamentary Elections Act of 1999 and the War Crimes Act of 1991
2. Hunting Act of 2004 and Sexual Offences Amendment Act of 2000.
3. In the following case, the House of Lords considered the legality of the Hunting Act of 2004.

Delegated Legislation

The operations of contemporary government are so diverse, and the issues they address are so intricate and technical, that Parliament lacks the time to personally address all necessary laws. By introducing an enabling Act of Parliament that outlines the fundamental framework of the law, this challenge is solved. The operations of contemporary government are so diverse, and the issues they address are so intricate and technical, that Parliament lacks the time to personally address all necessary laws. An enabling Act of Parliament that lays out the fundamental framework of the law but permits other entities or individuals to create the required particular regulations is passed in order to solve this obstacle. Delegated legislation is the term for rules produced in this manner. The following are the major types of delegated legislation.

The Queen, acting on the advice of the Privy Council an honorary body derived from the former Curia Regis, enacted these regulations according to an Act. In reality, the Cabinet all of whom are privy council members exercises the authority to issue orders. The Queens approval is purely ceremonial. These decisions are made by a minister about the area of government for which he is responsible, such as the Secretary of State for Social Securitys ability to create specific rules for the income assistance programme. Statutory instruments are the general term for all orders, rules, and regulations. These are created by local government entities as well as a few other public and nationalised agencies to control their respective fields of expertise. The competent minister must agree to this kind of delegated legislation.

Legislation and the Judiciary

An Act of Parliament is created when a Bill successfully clears both the House of Commons and the House of Lords and receives the Royal Assent. A statutes legality cannot be contested in court due to the sovereign legislative authority of the Queen in Parliament. Nevertheless, the courts have a great deal of control over how the passed legislation is put into practise. Every Act of Parliament will eventually be examined by the courts during matters that come before them. The judges job is to interpret and construe the language employed by Parliament in order to discover the legislatures meaning. According to their place of origin, the judges rules of interpretation might be categorised as either common law rules or statutory rules.

Common Law Rules

Aside from the minimal assistance offered by Parliament, the courts are left to devise their own statutory interpretation strategies. There are many methods for approaching the work of interpretation, and the judges are free to choose the method that best fits the particular case at hand. The following explanations of numerous presumptions and the most significant principles of interpretation. According to the literal rule, regardless of the outcome, the court must interpret a statutes terms in accordance with their usual, plain meaning if they are obvious and unambiguous. When a literal interpretation results in an illogical or perverse judgement, it is up to Parliament to correct the situation non-elected judges are not responsible for doing so.

For instance, it was determined in the case of Fisher v. Bell 1960 that a shopkeeper could not be found guilty of the crime of offering for sale a flick knife in violation of the Restriction of Offensive Weapons Act 1959 even though it was this type of behaviour that Parliament had intended to be prohibited. It is a well-known rule of contract law that putting items in a store window does not constitute a sales pitch but rather an invitation to treat. The defendant could not have committed the crime since he had not offered to sell the flick knives. In 1961, the legislature amended the law to narrow the gap. Golden rule no. 2. The court must follow the golden rule and choose the interpretation of a legislation that results in the least ludicrous situation where its terms might have two or more interpretations. Some judges even contend that where a phrase has just one meaning yet a literal reading would result in an absurdity, the golden rule might be used. For instance, it was decided in Re Sigsworth 1935 that although seeming to be entitled based on a strict reading of the Administration of Estates Act 1925, a man who killed his

mother could not inherit her property. A fundamental rule of law is that one shouldnt make money off of their own crime.

Rule of mischief in Heydons Case. This rule, which stems from Heydons Case 1584, establishes that the court must examine the Act to determine what mischief or flaw in the common law the Act was intended to correct, and then interpret the Acts language in the context of this understanding. For instance, in Gardiner v. Sevenoaks Rural District Council 1950, Gardiner argued that since he stored his film in a cave, he was exempt from an Act that established rules on the storage of films in premises. It was decided that the cave should be classified as a premises since the Acts goal was to ensure the safety of everyone who worked at the storage facility or lived nearby. The current purposive approach to interpretation, which states that a judge should adopt the construction that would advance the overall goals or objectives behind the legislation, is closely related to the mischief rule. Rule of ejusdem generis. When general terms appear after specific terms, the court should interpret the general terms to mean members of the same class or genus. For example, if the Act mentioned cats, dogs, or other animals, the general term other animals should be interpreted in the context of cats and dogs to mean different species of domesticated animals rather than wild animals.

The rule of one expression excluding all others. According to this principle, the direct mention of one or more items entails the exclusion of other things. For instance, if the Act only said dogs and cats, other domesticated animals are excluded. The sociis rule arises. This principle states that a word should get its meaning from the context in which it is used. In Muir v. Keay 1875, it was decided that a café that was open late should have had a licence under the Refreshment Houses Act of 1860. The Act mandated the licencing of buildings used for public refreshment, resort, and entertainment. The Acts context was used to determine the meaning of the word entertainment, which was determined to apply to public refreshment areas rather than musical or theatrical entertainment. the suppositions. The court will assume a variety of things unless there are express remarks to the contrary. The Act is not retroactive, meaning it does not retroactively apply the legal change, and the Act does not obligate the Crown. use of other resources. Extrinsic materials are informational resources concerning a law other than the Act itself. A Law Commission report, a Royal Commission report, or report from another governmental body might have served as inspiration for the Act. The government often lays forth legislative recommendations in the form of a White Paper hard legislative proposals or a Green Paper a discussion document. In certain instances, the law is founded on a global agreement. The remarks made during the discussion on the Bill will be included in Hansard, which is the official record of parliamentary events. The issue is whether a judge is permitted to consult these sources in order to clarify the intent behind a legislative provision. Extrinsic assistance use has always been strictly controlled. However, the rule has recently been loosened, especially when the court wants to apply the mischief rule and is looking for the mischief that the Act was meant to address. The current laws are as follows:

1. When a law is unclear, it may be helpful to refer to the international conventions and treaties that served as its foundation. The court may also take into account any draughts of such conventions or treaties travaux préparatoires.
2. The Law Commission, royal commissions, and other comparable bodies reports may be consulted, but solely to determine the mischief the Act was intended to address.
3. A formerly severe restriction against the use of Hansard as a tool for legislative interpretation has been modified. In Pepper v. Hart 1993, the House of Lords ruled that the norm excluding courts from using legislative documents as an aid to statutory interpretation should be changed, subject to any parliamentary privilege.

Reference to parliamentary materials, such as Hansard, should be allowed in the following situations the legislation is unclear or imprecise, or a literal interpretation would result in an absurdity ii the material referred to consists of statements made by a minister or other bill promoter, along with any other parliamentary material required to understand the statements and their implications and the statements relied on are clear and unambiguous The House of Lords ruling in Pepper v. Hart signalled a change in the way English courts read statutes. There is more work to be done before the exact boundaries of the courts increased independence are determined. For instance, it wasnt immediately obvious if a court may only use Hansard in cases where the law was unclear, ambiguous, or would result in an absurdity. R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport, and the Regions, ex parte Spath Holme Ltd 2001 confirms that the first threshold requirement outlined in Pepper v.

Hart must be met before a reference is made to Hansard. The House of Lords has used Hansard in a number of instances to support independent interpretations. There is considerable question as to whether the courts are limited to the parliamentary information found in Hansard. Can the courts also take into account government news releases, ministerial briefing notes, etc.? In Pepper v. Hart, Lord Browne-Wilkinson examined a press statement sent by the Inland Revenue. According to the terms of the Human Rights Act of 1998, the House of Lords has affirmed that courts may take into account background information stated in Parliament when determining whether a statutory provision is compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights Wilson v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, 2003. However, their Lordships believed that such situations would be uncommon and that the courts should keep in mind that the wording employed in Parliaments enactments expresses that bodys intentions [5]–[7].

II. DISCUSSION

Precedent in Action

Every time a judge renders a decision, the speech that follows might be brief in a straightforward case but could take up several pages of the Law Reports in a complex case before the House of Lords. The following components are included in every judgement:

1. Based on the evidence that was provided in court, the judge makes a note of the pertinent facts of the case.
2. The judge considers the legislation that pertains to the facts as discovered this may include a review of a parliamentary acts contents or an analysis of earlier court rulings.
3. He provides justification for his choice, including the legal principles upon which it is founded. This is referred to as a cases ratio decidendi. This section of the ruling serves as a model for similar situations in the future. Obiter dicta, or things said by the way, refers to additional remarks made by the judge that are not required to the decision-making process and are not legally binding.
4. The judge then declares the outcome of the case, such as I give judgement for the claimant for the amount claimed or I would dismiss this appeal.

Precedents may be persuasive or enforceable. A persuasive precedent is one that is paid respect to but is not binding, while a binding precedent is one that a court must abide by. The position of a court in relation to the court that set a precedent determines whether or not it is bound by that precedent. The basic norm is that subordinate courts must abide by the rulings of higher courts. Before evaluating the position of the primary courts in the next section, the reader should turn to Chapter 3 for a summary of the civil and criminal courts organisational structure.

House of Lords

The House of Lords is the highest court of appeal for domestic law, and its rulings are enforceable in all other English courts. In the past, the House of Lords was constrained by precedents set by itself London Street Tramways v. London County Council, 1898. But in 1966, the Lord Chancellor said in a Practise Statement that the House would no longer consider its own precedents to be an absolute obligation. In Miliangos v. George Frank Textiles Ltd. 1976, the House overturned its own ruling in Re United Railways of Havana & Regla Warehouses Ltd. 1960, stating that an English court may award damages in a foreign currency. This case serves as an illustration of how this flexibility was used. It should be emphasised that the option to deviate from established norms hasnt been used very often.

Court of Appeal

The Court of Appeals Civil Division is bound by the rulings of the House of Lords as well as its own earlier rulings Young v. Bristol Aeroplane Co 1944. Three situations fall outside of this basic rule. The court is not required to follow one of its own decisions that was made per incuriam, i.e. when the court has overlooked a pertinent statute or case. The Court of Appeal must decide which of two conflicting decisions of its own it will follow. The court must not follow one of its own decisions that is inconsistent with a later decision of the House of Lords. Decisions made by the Court of Appeal are enforceable in lower civil courts like the High Court and county court. Although the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal is bound by House of Lords rulings and often by its own rulings, there seems to be more latitude to deviate from its own precedents given that it deals with issues pertaining to individual liberty.

In a recent criminal case involving provocation R v James 2006, the Court of Appeal had to choose whether to adopt an earlier ruling by the Privy Council Attorney-General or one by the House of Lords R v Smith Morgan James 2000. It often only has persuasive power except in Jersey v. Holley, 2005. The Privy Councils decision in Holley was upheld by the Court of Appeal. Nine Law Lords made up the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which was specifically called together to hear Holley. By a large margin, it was determined that the decision in Smith Morgan James was incorrect. In light of the circumstances, the Court of Appeal was justified in deferring to the Privy Councils judgement rather than the House of Lords. Lower criminal courts, such as the Crown Court and magistrates court, must follow the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeals rulings [8], [9].

III. CONCLUSION

Although its availability and exercise are impacted by the constitutional systems and the difficulties created by globalisation and supranational governance, parliamentary sovereignty continues to be a fundamental premise in constitutional law. Maintaining parliamentary sovereignty while upholding international duties must be balanced. In order to maintain the notion of parliamentary sovereigntys relevance and efficacy in contemporary legal systems, the changing nature of governance need constant review and change. The rulings of the European Court of Justice in aspects of European law have been binding on all English courts since the country joined the EC in 1973. The European Court often adheres to its own judgements, although this is not a requirement.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Ewing, Brexit and Parliamentary Sovereignty, Mod. Law Rev., 2017, doi: 10.1111/1468-2230.12281.
[2] V. Bogdanor, Imprisoned by a doctrine: The modern defence of parliamentary sovereignty, Oxf. J. Leg. Stud., 2012, doi: 10.1093/ojls/gqr027.
[3] H. Hardman, In the name of parliamentary sovereignty: conflict between the UK Government and the courts over judicial deference in the case of prisoner voting rights, Br. Polit., 2020, doi: 10.1057/s41293-019-00110-x.
[4] M. Elliott, United Kingdom: Parliamentary sovereignty under pressure, Int. J. Const. Law, 2004, doi: 10.1093/icon/2.3.545.
[5] I. Steytler, Striking Back and Clamping Down in South Africa: Responding to Adverse Judicial Decisions Under Systems of Parliamentary Sovereignty and Constitutional Supremacy, Hague J. Rule Law, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40803-020-00142-2.
[6] A. Greene, Parliamentary sovereignty and the locus of constituent power in the United Kingdom, Int. J. Const. Law, 2020, doi: 10.1093/icon/moaa100.
[7] J. Jowell, Parliamentary sovereignty under the new constitutional hypothesis, Public Law, 2006.
[8] S. Bandžović, The Phenomenon Of Fragile States: Bosnia And Herzegovina, Hist. Pogl., 2021, doi: 10.52259/historijskipogledi.2021.4.6.338.
[9] G. Marshall, The Referendum: What, When and How?, Parliam. Aff., 1997, doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.pa.a028728.