

Appendix 1

British General Election Results, 1945–2001

<i>Year</i>	<i>Parties</i>	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>MPs elected</i>	<i>Unopposed returns</i>	<i>Lost deposits</i>	<i>Total vote</i>	<i>Percentage vote</i>
1945	Conservative	624	213	2	6	9,972,010	39.6
	Labour	604	393	1	2	11,967,746	48.0
	Liberal	306	12	–	64	2,252,430	9.0
	Others	148	22	–	91	903,009	3.4
	Turnout: 72.7%	1,682	640	3	163	25,095,195	100.0
Swing*	11.3%						
1950	Conservative	619	298	2	5	12,502,567	43.5
	Labour	617	315	–	–	13,266,592	46.1
	Liberal	475	9	–	319	2,621,548	9.1
	Others	157	3	–	137	381,964	1.3
	Turnout: 84.0%	1,868	625	2	461	28,772,671	100.0
Swing*	–2.9%						
1951	Conservative	617	321	4	3	13,717,538	48.0
	Labour	617	295	–	1	13,948,605	48.8
	Liberal	109	6	–	66	730,556	2.6
	Others	33	3	–	26	198,969	0.7
	Turnout: 82.5%	1,376	625	4	96	28,595,668	100.0
Swing*	–0.9%						
1955	Conservative	623	344	–	3	13,311,936	49.7
	Labour	620	277	–	1	12,404,970	46.4
	Liberal	110	6	–	60	722,405	2.7
	Others	56	3	–	36	321,182	1.2
	Turnout: 76.7%	1,409	630	0	100	26,760,493	100.0
Swing*	–2.1%						
1959	Conservative	625	365	–	2	13,749,830	49.4
	Labour	621	258	–	1	12,215,538	43.8
	Liberal	216	6	–	55	1,638,571	5.9
	Others	74	1	–	58	255,302	0.9
	Turnout: 78.8%	1,536	630	0	116	27,859,241	100.0
Swing*	–1.1%						

<i>Year</i>	<i>Parties</i>	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>MPs elected</i>	<i>Unopposed returns</i>	<i>Lost deposits</i>	<i>Total vote</i>	<i>Percentage vote</i>
<i>1964</i>	Conservative	629	303	–	5	12,001,396	43.4
	Labour	628	317	–	8	12,205,814	44.1
	Liberal	365	9	–	53	3,092,878	11.2
	Others	134	1	–	121	348,914	1.3
Turnout:	77.0%	1,756	630	0	187	27,649,002	100.0
Swing*	3.1%						
<i>1966</i>	Conservative	629	253	–	9	11,418,433	41.9
	Labour	621	363	–	3	13,064,951	47.9
	Liberal	311	12	–	104	2,327,533	8.5
	Others	146	2	–	121	452,689	1.7
Turnout:	75.8%	1,707	630	0	237	27,263,606	100.0
Swing*	2.6%						
<i>1970</i>	Conservative	628	330	–	10	13,145,123	46.4
	Labour	624	287	–	6	12,179,341	43.0
	Liberal	332	6	–	184	2,117,035	7.5
	Others	253	7	–	208	903,299	3.2
Turnout:	72.0%	1,837	630	0	408	28,344,798	100.0
Swing*	–4.7%						
<i>Feb 1974</i>	Conservative	623	297	–	8	11,872,180	37.8
	Labour	623	301	–	25	11,646,391	37.1
	Liberal	517	14	–	23	6,058,744	19.3
	Others	372	23	–	265	1,795,590	5.7
Turnout:	78.7%	2,135	635	0	321	31,372,905	100.0
Swing*	1.3%						
<i>Oct 1974</i>	Conservative	623	277	–	28	10,464,817	35.9
	Labour	623	319	–	13	11,457,079	39.3
	Liberal	619	13	–	125	5,346,754	18.3
	Others	387	26	–	276	1,920,528	6.6
Turnout:	72.8%	2,252	635	0	442	29,189,178	100.0
Swing*	2.1%						
<i>1979</i>	Conservative	622	339	–	3	13,697,923	43.8
	Labour	622	268	–	22	11,532,218	36.9
	Liberal	576	11	–	303	4,313,804	13.8
	Others	756	17	–	673	1,697,503	5.4
Turnout:	76.0%	2,576	635	0	1,001	31,241,448	100.0
Swing*	–5.2%						
<i>1983</i>	Conservative	633	397	–	5	13,012,316	42.4
	Labour	633	209	–	119	8,456,934	27.6
	Liberal-SDP	633	23	–	10	7,780,949	25.4
	Others	679	21	–	605	1,420,938	4.6
Turnout:	72.7%	2,578	650	0	739	30,671,137	100.0
Swing*	–4.0%						

<i>Year</i>	<i>Parties</i>	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>MPs elected</i>	<i>Unopposed returns</i>	<i>Lost deposits</i>	<i>Total vote</i>	<i>Percentage vote</i>
1987	Conservative	633	376	–	0	13,760,935	42.3
	Labour	633	229	–	0	10,029,270	30.8
	Liberal-SDP	633	22	–	1	7,341,651	22.6
	Others	426	23	–	288	1,398,348	4.3
Turnout:	75.3%	2,325	650	0	289	32,530,204	100.0
Swing*	1.7%						
1992	Conservative	645	336	–	3	14,093,007	41.9
	Labour	634	271	–	1	11,560,484	34.4
	Liberal Democrat	632	20	–	11	5,999,606	17.8
	Others	1,038	24	–	888	1,960,977	5.8
Turnout:	77.7%	2,949	651	0	903	33,614,074	100.0
Swing*	2.0%						
1997	Conservative	648	165	–	8	9,600,943	30.7
	Labour	639	418	–	0	13,518,167	43.2
	Liberal Democrat	639	46	–	13	5,242,947	16.8
	Others	1,798	30	–	1,571	2,924,227	9.3
Turnout:	71.4%	3,724	659	0	1,592	31,286,284	100.0
Swing*	10.0%						
2001	Conservative	643	166	–	5	8,357,615	31.7
	Labour	640	412	–	0	10,724,953	40.7
	Liberal Democrat	639	52	–	1	4,814,321	18.3
	Others	1,397	29	–	1,171	2,470,494	9.4
Turnout:	59.4%	3,319	659	0	1,177	26,367,383	100.0
Swing*	–1.8%						

* Swing (between the Conservative and Labour Parties) shown here is calculated on the total national vote, *not* on the average of the swings in all constituencies contested. Positive figures represent a swing from Conservative to Labour, and negative from Labour to Conservative.

Note: 'Others' include the Speaker when standing for re-election as a non-party candidate.

Appendix 2

Other British Election and Referendum Results

British elections to the European Parliament

1979:

Great Britain (78 seats)	Turnout: 32.1%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	6,508,492	50.6	60
Labour	4,253,247	33.0	17
Liberal	1,690,638	13.1	0
Scottish National Party	247,836	1.9	1
Plaid Cymru	83,399	0.6	0
Others	90,318	0.8	0
Total	12,873,930	100.0	78

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR	Turnout: 55.6%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	170,688	29.8	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	140,622	24.6	1
Official Unionist Party	125,169	21.9	1
Others	135,760	23.7	0
Total	572,239	100.0	3

1984:

Great Britain (78 seats)	Turnout 32.1%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	5,426,866	40.8	45
Labour	4,865,224	36.5	32
Liberal/SDP Alliance	2,591,659	19.5	0
Scottish National Party	230,594	1.7	1
Plaid Cymru	103,031	0.8	0
Others	95,524	0.7	0
Total	13,312,898	100.0	78

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR	Turnout: 64.4%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	230,251	33.6	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	151,399	22.1	1
Official Unionist Party	147,169	21.5	1

Provisional Sinn Féin	91,476	13.3	0
Alliance Party of Northern Ireland	34,046	5.0	0
Others	30,976	4.6	0
Total	685,317	100.0	3

1989:

Great Britain (78 seats)	Turnout: 35.9%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	5,224,037	34.1	32
Labour	6,153,604	40.2	45
Liberal Democrat	986,292	6.4	0
SDP	75,886	0.5	0
Scottish National Party	406,686	2.6	1
Plaid Cymru	115,062	0.7	0
Green	2,292,705	15.0	0
Others	39,971	0.3	0
Total	15,353,154	100.0	78

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR	Turnout: 48.8%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	160,110	29.6	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	136,335	25.2	1
Official Unionist Party	118,785	22.0	1
Provisional Sinn Féin	48,914	9.1	0
Alliance Party of Northern Ireland	27,905	5.2	0
Others	42,762	7.9	0
Total	534,811	100.0	3

1994:

Great Britain (84 seats)	Turnout: 36.1%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	4,248,531	27.8	18
Labour	6,753,863	44.2	62
Liberal Democrat	2,552,730	16.7	2
Scottish National Party	487,239	3.2	2
Plaid Cymru	162,478	1.1	0
Green	494,561	3.2	0
Others	568,151	3.7	0
Total	15,267,550	100.0	84

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR	Turnout: 48.7%		
<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	163,246	29.2	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	161,992	28.9	1
Ulster Unionist Party	133,459	23.9	1
Sinn Féin	55,215	9.9	0
Alliance Party of Northern Ireland	23,157	4.1	0

Others	22,798	4.0	0
Total	559,867	100.0	3

1999:

Great Britain (84 seats)

D'Hondt regional list system of PR

Turnout: 23.1%

<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	3,578,217	35.8	36
Labour	2,803,821	28.0	29
Liberal Democrat	1,266,549	12.7	10
Scottish National Party	268,528	2.7	2
Plaid Cymru	185,235	1.9	2
Green	625,378	6.3	2
UK Independence Party	696,057	7.0	3
Pro-Euro Conservative Party	138,097	1.4	0
Others	440,388	4.2	0
Total	10,002,270	100.0	84

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR

Turnout: 57.0%

<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	192,762	28.4	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	190,731	28.1	1
Ulster Unionist Party	119,507	17.6	1
Sinn Féin	117,643	17.3	0
Alliance Party of Northern Ireland	14,391	2.1	0
Others	43,775	6.4	0
Total	678,809	100.0	3

2004:

Great Britain (75 seats)

D'Hondt regional list system of PR

Turnout: 37.2%*

<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Conservative	4,397,090	26.7	27
Labour	3,718,683	22.6	19
Liberal Democrat	2,452,327	14.9	12
Scottish National Party	231,505	1.4	2
Plaid Cymru	159,888	1.0	1
Green	1,028,283	6.3	2
UK Independence Party	2,650,768	16.1	12
British National Party	808,200	4.9	0
Others	996,656	6.1	0
Total	16,443,400	100.0	75

* Turnout 38.2% including spoilt and invalid papers

Northern Ireland (3 seats)

STV system of PR

Turnout: 51.2%*

<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	175,761	32.0	1
Sinn Féin	144,541	26.3	1
Ulster Unionist Party	91,164	16.6	1
Social Democratic & Labour Party	87,559	15.9	0
Others	50,252	9.1	0
Total	549,277	100.0	3

* Turnout 51.7% including spoilt and invalid papers

Elections to the Scottish Parliament, 6 May 1999

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 58%

	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Constituency seats</i>	<i>Regional votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	364,225	15.6	0	359,109	15.4	18	18
Labour	908,392	38.8	53	786,818	33.6	3	56
Liberal Democrat	331,279	14.2	12	290,760	12.4	5	17
Scottish National Party	672,757	28.7	7	638,644	27.3	28	35
Scottish Green Party	0	0.0	0	84,024	3.6	1	1
Scottish Socialist Party	23,654	1.0	0	46,635	2.0	1	1
Others	63,770	1.7	1	132,921	5.7	0	1
Total	2,342,462	100.0	73	2,338,911	100.0	56	129

Elections to the Scottish Parliament, 1 May 2003

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 49%

	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Constituency seats</i>	<i>Regional votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	318,279	16.6	3	296,929	15.7	15	18
Labour	663,585	34.6	46	561,879	29.8	4	50
Liberal Democrat	294,347	15.4	13	225,810	12.0	4	17
Scottish National Party	455,742	23.8	9	399,659	21.2	18	27
Scottish Green Party	0	0.0	0	132,138	7.0	7	7
Scottish Socialist Party	118,764	6.2	0	128,026	6.8	6	6
Others	65,877	3.4	2	143,908	7.6	2	4
Total	1,916,594	100.0	73	1,888,349	100.0	56	129

Elections to the National Assembly of Wales, 6 May 1999

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 46%

	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Constituency seats</i>	<i>Regional votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	162,133	15.8	1	168,206	16.5	8	9
Labour	384,671	37.6	27	361,657	35.5	1	28
Liberal Democrat	137,857	13.5	3	128,008	12.5	3	6
Plaid Cymru	290,572	28.4	9	312,048	30.6	8	17
Green	1,002	0.1	0	25,858	2.5	0	0
Others	46,990	4.6	0	24,210	2.4	0	0
Total	1,023,225	100.0	40	1,019,987	100.0	20	60

Elections to the National Assembly of Wales, 1 May 2003

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 38%

	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Constituency seats</i>	<i>Regional votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	169,832	19.9	1	162,725	19.2	10	11
Labour	340,515	40.0	30	310,658	36.6	0	30
Liberal Democrat	120,250	14.1	3	108,013	12.7	3	6
Plaid Cymru	180,185	21.2	5	167,653	19.7	7	12
Green	0	0.0	0	30,028	3.5	0	0
Others	40,575	4.8	1	70,475	8.3	0	1
Total	851,357	100.0	40	849,552	100.0	20	60

Elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly, 25 June 1998 and 26 November 2003

STV system of PR

<i>Party</i>	1998			2003		
	Turnout 68.8%			Turnout 64.0%		
	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Seats</i>
Democratic Unionist Party	146,989	18.1	20	177,944	25.7	30
Sinn Féin	143,647	17.7	18	162,758	23.5	24
Ulster Unionist Party	172,225	21.3	28	156,931	22.7	27
Social Democratic & Labour Party	177,963	22.0	24	117,547	17.0	18
Alliance Party	52,636	6.5	6	25,372	3.7	6
United Kingdom Unionist Party	36,541	4.5	5	5,700	0.8	1
Progressive Unionist Party	20,634	2.5	2	8,032	1.2	1
Northern Ireland Women's Coalition	13,019	1.6	2	5,785	0.8	0
Ulster Democratic Party	8,651	1.2	0	–	–	–
Others	38,012	4.7	3	31,959	4.6	1
Total	810,317	100.0	108	692,028	100.0	108

Election of Mayor of London, 4 May 2000

Supplementary Vote System

Turnout: 33.7%

<i>Name</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Transfers</i>	<i>Final</i>	<i>%</i>
Ken Livingstone	Independent	667,877	39.0	+108,550	776,427	57.9
Steven Norris	Conservative	464,434	27.1	+99,703	564,137	42.1
Frank Dobson	Labour	223,884	13.1			
Susan Kramer	Liberal Democrat	203,452	11.9			
Ram Gidoomal	Christian People's Alliance	42,060	2.5			
Darren Johnson	Green	38,121	2.2			
Michael Newland	British National Party	33,569	2.0			
Others		40,675	2.4			
Total		1,714,072				

Election of Mayor of London, 10 June 2004

Supplementary Vote System

Turnout: 35.9%*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>First preference votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Transfers</i>	<i>Final</i>	<i>%</i>
Ken Livingstone	Labour	685,541	36.8	+142,839	828,380	55.4
Steve Norris	Conservative	542,423	29.1	+124,765	667,188	44.6
Simon Hughes	Liberal Democrat	284,645	15.3			
Frank Maloney	UK Independence Party	115,665	6.2			
Lindsey German	Respect	61,731	3.3			
Julian Leppert	British National Party	58,405	3.1			
Darren Johnson	Green	57,331	3.1			
Ram Gidoomal	Christian People's Alliance	41,696	2.2			
Others		16,234	0.9			
Total		1,863,671	100.0			

* Turnout 37.0% including spoilt and invalid papers

Election of London Assembly, 4 May 2000

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 31.2% (constituency) / 32.6% (list)

<i>Party</i>	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>% Constituency</i>	<i>seats</i>	<i>List votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	526,707	33.2	8	481,053	29.0	1	9
Labour	501,296	31.6	6	502,874	30.3	3	9
Liberal Democrat	299,998	18.9	0	245,555	14.8	4	4
Green	162,457	10.2	0	183,910	11.1	3	3
Christian People's Alliance	0	0.0	0	55,192	3.3	0	0
Other	95,612	6.0	0	191,046	11.5	0	0
Total	1,586,070	100.0	14	1,659,630	100.0	11	25

Election of London Assembly, 10 June 2004

Additional Member System (AMS)

Turnout: 34.7% (constituency) / 36.0% (list)*

<i>Party</i>	<i>Constituency votes</i>	<i>% Constituency</i>	<i>seats</i>	<i>List votes</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Top-up seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
Conservative	562,047	31.2	9	533,696	27.8	0	9
Labour	444,808	24.7	5	468,247	24.4	2	7
Liberal Democrat	332,237	18.4	0	316,218	16.5	5	5
Green	138,242	7.7	0	160,445	8.4	2	2
UK Independence Party	181,146	10.0	0	156,780	8.2	2	2
British National Party	–	–	0	90,365	4.7	0	0
Respect	79,476	4.4	0	87,533	4.6	0	0
Other	65,211	3.6	0	59,882	3.1	0	0
Total	1,803,167	100.0	14	1,873,166	100.0	11	25

* Turnout 37.0% including blank, spoilt and invalid papers (not published separately for constituency and list)

Referendum on the status of Northern Ireland, 8 March 1973

Question: 'Do you want Northern Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom, or do you want Northern Ireland to be joined with the Republic of Ireland, outside the United Kingdom?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Remain part of United Kingdom	591,820	98.9
Joined with the Republic of Ireland, outside the United Kingdom	6,463	1.1
Total	598,283	Turnout 58.7%

Referendum on the Common Market, 5 June 1975

Question: 'Do you think that the United Kingdom should stay in the European Community (the Common Market)?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	17,378,581	67.2
No	8,470,073	32.8
Total	25,848,654	Turnout 64.5%

Referendum on Devolution for Scotland, 1 March 1979

Question: 'Do you want the provisions of the Scotland Act 1978 to be put into force?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	1,230,937	51.6
No	1,153,502	48.4
Total	2,384,439	Turnout 63.6%

Referendum on Devolution for Wales, 1 March 1979

Question: 'Do you want the provisions of the Wales Act 1978 to be put into force?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	243,048	20.3
No	956,330	79.7
Total	1,199,378	Turnout 58.8%

Referendums on a Scottish Parliament, 11 September 1997

Question: 'I agree that there should be a Scottish Parliament' or 'I do not agree that there should be a Scottish Parliament.'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
I agree that there should be a Scottish Parliament	1,775,045	74.3
I do not agree that there should be a Scottish Parliament	614,400	25.7
Total	2,389,445	Turnout 60.4%

Question: 'I agree that a Scottish Parliament should have tax-varying powers' or 'I do not agree that a Scottish Parliament should have tax-varying powers.'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
I agree that a Scottish Parliament should have tax-varying powers	1,512,889	63.5
I do not agree that a Scottish Parliament should have tax-varying powers	870,263	36.5
Total	2,383,152	

Referendum on a National Assembly for Wales, 18 September 1997

Question: 'Yr wyf yn cytuno y dylid cael Cynulliad Cymreig/I agree that there should be a Welsh Assembly' or 'Nid wyf yn cytuno y dylid cael Cynulliad Cymreig/I do not agree that there should be a Welsh Assembly.'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yr wyf yn cytuno y dylid cael Cynulliad Cymreig /I agree that there should be a Welsh Assembly	559,419	50.3
Nid wyf yn cytuno y dylid cael Cynulliad Cymreig /I do not agree that there should be a Welsh Assembly	552,698	49.7
Total	1,112,117	Turnout 50.1%

Referendum on a Greater London Authority, 7 May 1998

Question: 'Are you in favour of the government's proposals for a Greater London Authority, made up of an elected mayor and separately elected authority?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	1,230,715	72.0
No	478,413	28.0
Total	1,709,128	Turnout 34.1%

Referendum on the Good Friday Agreement (Northern Ireland), 22 May 1998

Question: 'Do you support the agreement reached in the multi-party talks on Northern Ireland and set out in Command Paper 3883?'

	<i>Votes</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	676,966	71.1
No	274,879	28.9
Total	951,845	Turnout 81.0%

Appendix 3

Proxy and Postal Voters

Voters who wish to vote by post or proxy should obtain the appropriate form from their local council. (Most councils now have websites from which the forms can be downloaded directly.)

Postal votes were formerly subject to the same restrictions as proxy votes, set out below, but are now available to all electors registered in Great Britain; in Northern Ireland, however, the restrictions are still in force. Voters may apply either for a postal vote at a particular election, or to vote by post at all elections for a specified or indefinite period. Applications must be made at the latest by 5 p.m. on the sixth day before polling day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays).

The former regulation that postal votes could only be sent out to addresses in the United Kingdom no longer applies. However, voters should bear in mind the potential delays involved in overseas postage, and that ballot papers will not be sent out until ten working days before the election at the earliest; they may be better advised to apply for a proxy vote if there is any risk they might not be able to receive and return their ballot paper in time.

Once a postal ballot paper has been issued, the voter will not be able to vote at a polling station; anyone who has previously applied for a postal vote and wishes to cancel it must notify the council in writing at least eleven working days before the election to ensure they are not sent a postal ballot paper.

There are two broad categories of **proxy voters**: those who wish to be registered as such for an indefinite period, and those who are seeking a proxy vote for a particular election. Proxy votes may be claimed *for an indefinite period* by those unable, or unlikely to be able, to go to vote in person, because of:

1. The general nature of their employment, service or occupation (for example, long-distance lorry drivers and merchant seamen), or attendance away from home on a course. Such applications need to be countersigned by an employer or representative of the educational establishment or, in the case of the self-employed, some other responsible person.
2. Blindness or other physical incapacity. Except in the case of registered blind persons and people in receipt of the higher rate of the mobility component of the disability living allowance, a counter-signature is required from a doctor or other qualified person – such as first level nurses trained in general nursing, Christian Science practitioners, those in charge of residential care homes and local authority residential accommodation and resident wardens. (GPs are required by law to deal with applications for absent voting attestation free of charge.¹)
3. Having to make a journey by sea or air in order to be able to vote in person. (This applies mostly to Scottish electors who live on islands away from a polling station.)

4. Service voters and overseas voters can also vote by post or proxy. Service voters can obtain forms from their commanding officers, Crown servants from their own government departments and overseas electors from British embassies and consulates abroad, or, in each case, from the local authority where they are registered to vote.

In addition, a proxy vote may be claimed *for a particular election only*, if the elector cannot reasonably be expected to vote in person at that election. The reason must be stated on the form and the application may be rejected if it is inadequate.

Applications for proxy votes must be made, on an appropriate form, by 5 p.m. on the sixth day before polling day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays). Forms are obtainable from the electoral Registration Officer (that is, at the local council offices or, often, via its website). The applicant must name his or her proxy, who must be qualified to vote in the type of election(s) concerned. Nobody may act as proxy for more than two electors excluding family members.

A proxy records the vote at the same polling station at which the absent voter would otherwise be entitled to vote; a proxy voter may vote by post if he or she has made the appropriate application.

An elector, even having appointed a proxy, may vote at the polling station personally if a ballot paper has not already been issued to his or her proxy. However, an elector who has applied for a postal vote (or whose proxy has done so) may not vote in person at the polling station once a postal ballot paper has been issued.

Appendix 4

Election Timetable

The following chart lists the important days to remember during a general election campaign. It is important to remember to exclude Saturdays, Sundays and bank or public holidays in any part of the United Kingdom in the count of 17 days between the Proclamation and polling day.

Day

0	Dissolution Proclamation
1	Receipt of writ
3	Notice of election (by 4 p.m.)
4	First day for nomination
6	Last day for nomination (by 4 p.m.)
11	Last day for applications for postal or proxy votes
17	Polling day

Example (based on 2001)

Chart days Calendar dates

0	M	14 May	Dissolution Proclamation
1	Tu	15	Receipt of writ
2	W	16	
3	Th	17	Notice of election (by 4 p.m.) Last day for registration of political parties
4	F	18	First day for nomination
-	Sa	19	
-	Su	20	
5	M	21	
6	Tu	22	Last day for nomination (by 4 p.m.)
7	W	23	
8	Th	24	
9	F	25	
-	Sa	26	
-	Su	27	
-	M	28	Bank holiday
10	Tu	29	
11	W	30	Last day for applications for postal or proxy votes
12	Th	31	
13	F	1 June	
-	Sa	2	

–	Su	3	
14	M	4	
15	Tu	5	
16	W	6	
17	Th	7 June	Polling day

In a **by-election**, some discretion is allowed in the choice of polling day, which may be on the 17th, 18th or 19th working day (counting from the receipt of the writ on day 1). Nominations will open on day 4, regardless, but will close on day 6, 7 or 8 depending on polling day.

In elections to the **European Parliament**, notice of election must be given not later than the 25th day before polling day. Nominations open the day after publication of the notice of election, and close on the 19th day before polling.

Death of a candidate. If the Returning Officer is notified of the death of a nominated candidate at any time before the result is declared, the poll is abandoned, and the timetable starts afresh as if the writ had been received 28 days after the Returning Officer was notified of the candidate's death. This last occurred in a Parliamentary election at the 1951 general election, when the Labour candidate for Barnsley died shortly before polling day.

Appendix 5

Summary of Election Offences

(This table is only a summary and should not be taken as being an authoritative or exhaustive statement of the law.)

Corrupt practices

Offences

BRIBERY. No gift, loan, or promise of money or money's worth must be made to a voter to induce him or her either to vote or abstain from voting. The offer or promise of a situation or employment to a voter or anyone connected with him, if made with the same object, is also bribery.

The consequences are the same whether bribery is committed before, during, or after an election.

Giving or paying money for the purpose of bribery is equivalent to the offence itself.

A gift or promise to a third person to procure a vote is bribery. Payment for loss of time, wages, or travelling expenses may be judged to be bribery. Any person who receives a bribe, or bargains for employment or reward in consideration of his vote, is guilty of bribery.

TREATING. No meat, drinks, entertainment or provisions can be paid for or provided for any person at any time, in order to induce him, or any other person, to vote or abstain from voting. The gift of tickets to be exchanged for refreshment is regarded as treating.

Treating the wives or relatives of voters is also forbidden.

Penalties

On indictment, twelve months' imprisonment or an unlimited fine, or both. On summary conviction, six months' imprisonment, a fine not exceeding £2000, or both.

Deprivation of the right of voting at any election in the United Kingdom for five years.

Removal from, and disqualification for, any public office.

Payment of costs of an election inquiry in certain cases.

If committed by the candidate he or she also loses the seat, if elected, and is disqualified for ten years from representing the constituency and is disqualified for five years from sitting for any other constituency. If committed by any agent the election is void, and the candidate is disqualified for seven years.

NOTE: Any recognised active worker may be held to be 'an agent'.

The receiver of any meat, drink, etc., is equally guilty, and liable to the same consequences* (see note on p. 233)

UNDUE INFLUENCE. No force, threat, restraint, or fraud may be used to compel an elector to vote or abstain. Using or threatening any spiritual or temporal injury is undue influence. The withdrawal of custom, or a threat to do so, comes under this prohibition. A threat to evict a tenant will also be undue influence. Any fraudulent device or contrivance (e.g. publication of misleading election material resembling a rival's publications), or other interference with the proper course of the election (e.g. a scheme to prevent an elector receiving a candidate's election literature) may be undue influence if it can be shown to have impeded the free exercise of a voter's franchise.

UNAUTHORISED EXPENDITURE. Incurring expenditure on account of holding public meetings or issuing advertisements, circulars or publications, by any person, other than the election agent, for the purpose of promoting or procuring the election of any candidate at a Parliamentary election, unless authorised in writing by such election agent and returned as an expense by the person incurring it.

Making a false statement in nomination papers (including falsifying the signature of an elector in support of a nomination).
Fraudulently purporting to be authorised to issue a certificate on behalf of the registered nominating officer of a political party.

FALSE DECLARATION. Knowingly making a false declaration as to election expenses.

As for other corrupt practices, but in addition may be punishable under the Perjury Act (1911).

PERSONATION. Applying for a ballot paper in the name of another person, whether alive or dead, or a fictitious person.

Voting or attempting to vote at any election under the authority of a proxy paper when knowing or having reasonable grounds for supposing that the proxy paper has been cancelled, or that the elector on whose behalf it has been issued is dead or not entitled to vote at that election.

Aiding or abetting the commission of the offence of personation.

On indictment, two years' imprisonment, an unlimited fine, or both.

Five years' incapacity to vote, or hold any public office.

If committed by any agent, the candidate loses his or her seat.

Illegal practices

Offences

CONVEYANCE. Paying or receiving money for conveyance of voters to or from the poll. (Private conveyances lent gratuitously can alone be employed; hackney carriages – taxis – are prohibited except when hired by voters for their own exclusive use.)

ADVERTISING. Paying money to an elector for exhibiting bills, etc. The receiver is also guilty.

VOTING OFFENCES. Voting when prohibited or inducing a prohibited elector to vote (whether in person, by post or by appointing a proxy). Voting twice in the same constituency in the same election, or voting in more than one constituency in a general election.

Voting or attempting to vote in person knowing that one's proxy has already voted.

Voting or attempting to vote as proxy on behalf of more than two absent voters at an election in any constituency, unless voting as the husband or wife, or the parent, brother or sister of the absent voter.

Penalties

A fine not exceeding £5000. Incapacity to vote at any election in the constituency for five years.

If committed by a candidate, or with his knowledge and consent, the election may be rendered void and the candidate disqualified from representing the constituency for seven years. If by an agent, the election may be declared void and the candidate disqualified from representing the constituency until the next general election.

Making a statement one knows to be false in any declaration or form concerned with an application for a postal or proxy vote, or attesting such an application when one knows one is not qualified to do so.

FALSE STATEMENT. Publishing a false statement of the withdrawal of any candidate or as to his or her personal character or conduct.

POLL CARDS. Issuing at a Parliamentary election any poll card or document resembling an official poll card.

BROADCASTING. Broadcasting election propaganda from outside the United Kingdom (except by the BBC, S4C or one of the ITV companies).

DISTURBING AN ELECTION

MEETING. Acting or inciting others to act in a disorderly manner for the purpose of preventing the transaction of the business for which a (legal) election meeting was called.

ELECTION EXPENSES. Failure by a candidate or his election agent to comply with the provisions regarding returns and declarations of election expenses (including inadvertently making an inaccurate declaration or return).

Knowingly incurring an expense in excess of the statutory maximum.
Paying election expenses other than through the election agent.

EUROPEAN ELECTIONS. Standing for the European Parliament both in the United Kingdom and in another member state.
Standing in more than one region or for more than one party.

A fine not exceeding £2000. Incapacity to vote at any election in the constituency for five years.
If committed by a candidate, or with his knowledge and consent, the election may be rendered void and the candidate disqualified from representing the constituency for seven years. If by an agent, the election may be declared void and the candidate disqualified from representing the constituency until the next general election.

PUBLISHING BILLS, placards or posters, or any other printed document circulated for the purpose of promoting or procuring the election of a candidate, without the printer's and publisher's name and address. (The election agent alone, or sub-agents in counties, may issue any printed matter at the election.) Any process for multiplying copies of a document other than by copying it by hand is deemed to be printing.

If the offender be the candidate or his agent, the full penalty attaching to an illegal practice as above. If any other person, a fine not exceeding £5000.

Illegal payment, employment and hiring

ILLEGAL CONVEYANCE. Lending or using, for the conveyance of voters to or from the poll, horses or vehicles usually kept for hire (such as taxis). This does not prevent electors at their own cost from hiring such a vehicle for their own use.

A fine not exceeding £2000. If committed by a candidate or election agent, he/she is also guilty of an illegal practice and subject to the disqualifications outlined above.

EMPLOYMENT of any person as a canvasser.

USING OR HIRING A COMMITTEE ROOM in any maintained school.

ILLEGAL PAYMENTS. Payment to induce corrupt withdrawal of a candidate.
Providing money for illegal purposes.

FORGERY or counterfeiting a ballot paper is not a corrupt or illegal practice as such, but under the Forgery and Counterfeiting Act of 1981 is subject to a maximum penalty of ten years' imprisonment or an unlimited fine, or both. On summary conviction, the maximum penalty is six months' imprisonment or a maximum fine of £2000, or both.

OTHER ELECTIONS. The provisions for European, local and devolved assembly elections are generally similar, and the penalties the same, as for Parliamentary elections. At local elections, in circumstances where a Parliamentary candidate would be disqualified from representing the constituency in which the election concerned took place, the disqualification would apply to holding any corporate office in the relevant local government area.

REFRESHMENT FOR WORKERS. Whilst it is much better, and more prudent, to leave all workers, whether paid or unpaid, to find their own refreshments, the view has been expressed by some judges that 'the giving of refreshments to persons employed at the election, if *bona fide* and honestly done, is *not treating*, even though the workers be voters, if care be taken to confine it to persons actually engaged on the election'.

Appendix 6

Occupations of Candidates and MPs 2001

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Labour</i>		<i>Conservative</i>		<i>Liberal Democrat</i>	
	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>
<i>Professions:</i>						
Barrister	13	12	18	28	2	7
Solicitor	18	10	13	34	4	19
Doctor/dentist/optician	2	1	3	7	3	13
Architect/surveyor	1	2	4	9	1	3
Civil/chartered engineer	5	5	1	12	1	14
Accountant	2	3	3	22	1	30
Civil servant/local govt	30	21	2	13	3	23
Armed services	1	1	11	9	0	8
<i>Teachers:</i>						
University	18	6	1	1	2	15
Polytechnic/college	31	11	0	5	1	16
School	49	32	6	19	9	66
Other consultants	3	6	2	12	0	24
Scientific/research	6	4	0	1	0	5
<i>Total</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>243</i>
	<i>(43%)</i>	<i>(50%)</i>	<i>(39%)</i>	<i>(36%)</i>	<i>(52%)</i>	<i>(41%)</i>
<i>Business:</i>						
Company director	5	5	18	57	6	23
Company executive	10	9	31	66	7	42
Commerce/insurance	2	8	6	46	0	33
Management/clerical	12	2	2	12	1	21
General business	4	4	3	23	0	27
<i>Total</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>146</i>
	<i>(8%)</i>	<i>(12%)</i>	<i>(36%)</i>	<i>(43%)</i>	<i>(27%)</i>	<i>(25%)</i>
<i>Miscellaneous:</i>						
Miscellaneous white collar	73	35	2	29	1	90
Politician/pol. organiser	44	16	18	29	4	39
Publisher/journalist	32	19	14	18	4	20
Farmer	0	1	5	12	1	4
Housewife	0	0	2	2	0	4
Student	0	1	0	3	0	14
<i>Total</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>171</i>
	<i>(36%)</i>	<i>(32%)</i>	<i>(25%)</i>	<i>(20%)</i>	<i>(19%)</i>	<i>(29%)</i>

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Labour</i>		<i>Conservative</i>		<i>Liberal Democrat</i>	
	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>	<i>elected</i>	<i>defeated</i>
<i>Manual workers:</i>						
Miner	11	0	1	0	0	2
Skilled worker	37	13	0	4	1	16
Semi/unskilled worker	3	1	0	1	0	9
<i>Total</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>27</i>
	<i>(12%)</i>	<i>(6%)</i>	<i>(1%)</i>	<i>(1%)</i>	<i>(2%)</i>	<i>(5%)</i>
<i>Grand total</i>	<i>412</i>	<i>228</i>	<i>166</i>	<i>474</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>587</i>

Source: Reprinted by kind permission from Byron Criddle, 'MPs and Candidates', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 2001* (London: Palgrave, 2002), p. 204.

Appendix 7

Opinion Poll Surveys Published during the 2001 Election

Campaign polls

<i>Fieldwork dates</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Client</i>	<i>Publ'n date</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Con (%)</i>	<i>Lab (%)</i>	<i>Dem (%)</i>	<i>Others (%)</i>	<i>Lab Lead (%)</i>
8 May	MORI	<i>Times</i>	10 May	1,046	30	54	13	3	24
10–11 May	NOP	<i>S. Times*</i>	13 May	1,003	32	49	13	6	17
10–11 May	ICM	<i>Observer*</i>	13 May	1,011	32	48	15	5	16
10–12 May	MORI	<i>S. Telegraph*</i>	13 May	1,021	31	51	13	5	20
11–13 May	ICM	<i>Eve. Standard*</i>	14 May	1,437	32	48	14	6	16
12–13 May	Rasmussen	<i>Independent**</i>	15 May	1,030	32	46	13	9	14
13–14 May	ICM	<i>Guardian*</i>	16 May	1,004	31	46	16	7	15
10–14 May	MORI	<i>Economist</i>	18 May	1,846	26	54	14	6	28
14–15 May	Gallup	<i>D. Telegraph*</i>	17 May	1,004	32	48	13	7	16
15 May	MORI	<i>Times</i>	17 May	1,019	28	54	12	6	26
17–18 May	NOP	<i>S. Times*</i>	20 May	1,107	30	49	14	7	19
19–21 May	ICM	<i>Guardian*</i>	23 May	1,000	32	45	17	7	13
19–22 May	Rasmussen	<i>Independent**</i>	25 May	3,162	32	44	16	8	12
21–23 May	Gallup	<i>D. Telegraph*</i>	24 May	1,439	32	48	15	5	16
22 May	MORI	<i>Times</i>	24 May	1,066	30	55	11	4	25
24–25 May	NOP	<i>S. Times*</i>	27 May	1,001	30	49	14	7	19
26–27 May	Rasmussen	<i>Independent**</i>	29 May	1,227	32	44	17	7	12
26–28 May	ICM	<i>Guardian*</i>	30 May	1,000	28	47	17	8	19
29 May	MORI	<i>Times</i>	31 May	1,013	30	48	16	6	18
28–29 May	Gallup	<i>D. Telegraph*</i>	31 May	1,462	31	47	16	6	16
30 May–1 Jun	ICM	<i>Channel 4*</i>	1 Jun	1,007	31	43	19	7	12
31 May–1 Jun	NOP	<i>S. Times*</i>	3 Jun	1,105	30	47	16	7	17
31 May–1 Jun	ICM	<i>Observer*</i>	3 Jun	1,005	34	46	15	5	12
31 May–2 Jun	MORI	<i>S. Telegraph*</i>	3 Jun	1,070	27	50	17	6	23
2–3 Jun	ICM	<i>Eve. Standard*</i>	4 Jun	1,332	30	47	18	5	17
2–3 Jun	Rasmussen	<i>Independent**</i>	5 Jun	1,266	33	44	16	7	11
2–4 Jun	ICM	<i>Guardian*</i>	6 Jun	1,009	32	43	19	6	11
4–5 Jun	MORI	<i>Economist*</i>	7 Jun	1,010	31	43	20	6	12
5–6 Jun	MORI	<i>Times</i>	7 Jun	1,967	30	45	18	7	15
6 Jun	Gallup	<i>D. Telegraph*</i>	7 Jun	2,399	30	47	18	5	17
7 Jun	<i>Result (GB)</i>				32.7	42.0	18.8	6.5	9.3

* Telephone poll.

** Telephone automated response poll.

Exit polls

<i>Company</i>	<i>Client</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Con seats</i>	<i>Lab seats</i>	<i>Lib Dem seats</i>	<i>Other seats</i>	<i>Lab majority seats</i>
MORI	ITV	13,667	154	417	58	30	175
NOP	BBC	17,638	177	408	44	30	157
<i>Result</i>			<i>166</i>	<i>413</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>167</i>

Source: Adapted with permission from tables in *British Public Opinion* Newsletter, Vol. 24 (June 2001), p. 32 (London: MORI, 2001).

Appendix 8

Other Electoral Systems¹

There are three broad categories of electoral systems: plurality, majoritarian and proportional representation (PR).

The Plurality System

This system awards seat(s) to the candidate(s) who get the most votes even if this is less than an absolute majority. This is often known, particularly in the United Kingdom, where it is used for Parliamentary and local elections, as the 'first past the post' system.

Most frequently it is used in single-member constituencies, but it may equally be applied to multi-member constituencies where the voter normally has as many votes as there are seats to be filled (for example, in some local government elections in the UK). A unique example of the use of multi-member constituencies, where the elector has only one vote, was the system formerly used in Japan, known as the *single non-transferable vote*.

Plurality systems are very widely used for Parliamentary elections, though they are nowadays mostly restricted to countries (including the USA) which were once under British rule. For presidential elections however, where by definition only one person is to be elected, the plurality system is more widely employed.

The Majoritarian System

This means that only candidates winning more than 50 per cent of the votes cast may be elected. The system has two main sub-categories: the *two-ballot* system and the *alternative vote*. A variant of the alternative vote called the *supplementary vote*, which is not strictly majoritarian, is also discussed here.

In the two-ballot system, which is normally restricted to single-member constituencies, a second round of voting is held if no candidate gains more than 50 per cent of the votes cast in the first ballot. The second ballot is often legally limited to the two leading candidates in the first round. Historically it has been the system used most frequently in France in Parliamentary elections, but it was temporarily replaced by a proportional system in 1986. It is widely used, however, in presidential elections.

The alternative vote is used for the election of the Australian House of Representatives. Voters number the candidates in the order of their choice, and if no candidate wins more than 50 per cent of the votes cast the bottom candidate is eliminated and his or her votes are redistributed to their second choices. Further candidates may be eliminated until one candidate achieves an absolute majority. The alternative vote is also used in the Republic of Ireland in the event of Parliamentary by-elections and for the election of the president.

The supplementary vote (SV) is similar to the alternative vote except that voters can only express their first and second choices; the two candidates with the highest number of first choice votes proceed to the second stage of the count, while all other candidates are eliminated, and the second choices of their voters redistributed if they are for one of the two candidates still remaining in the contest. Because a proportion of votes can be 'wasted' (voters whose first and second choice candidates are both eliminated at the first count get no chance to choose between the two candidates who remain), SV is not a fully majoritarian system. SV is used in the election of the Mayor of London.

Proportional Representation

This is the final broad category of election systems. As its name implies, it attempts to relate the allocation of seats as closely as possible to the distribution of votes. By definition, this requires more than one vacancy, so multi-member constituencies are necessary.

There are two distinct forms of proportional representation: party list systems, which explicitly recognise parties and assign them seats on the basis of the votes cast for them or their candidates, and the single transferable vote (STV), in which votes are cast only for individuals but the overall effect is to ensure that any group of candidates (including those belonging to any particular party) receive a total number of votes proportional to their collective support. Party list systems were mostly invented and adopted in continental Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth century; STV was invented by British (and Irish) political philosophers around the same period, and has until recently been the preferred form of PR of most electoral reformers in the British Isles, though it is little used elsewhere.

The *party list* system is divided between two main sub-categories and a number of sub-sub-categories. The sub-categories are: *largest remainder* and *highest average (or divisor systems)*. These refer to the mathematical formulae by which the seats are allocated, as there is no way of ensuring 100 per cent proportionality. In any given election, even the best PR system will be fractionally less fair to some parties than to others because parties cannot be awarded a fraction of a seat, and the number of votes each party receives are unlikely to correspond to exact whole number shares.

The largest remainder method is the simplest means of allocation. It involves setting a quota of votes which party lists of candidates must achieve in order to be guaranteed a seat. The most common quota is the *Hare quota*, named after Thomas Hare, a Victorian lawyer and associate of John Stuart Mill. This is derived by dividing the number of votes cast by the number of seats to fill. For example, in a four-member constituency where 20,000 votes have been cast the quota will be 5000.

In the example shown in Table A8.1 only two of the four parties achieve an electoral quota. So only two of the four seats can be directly allocated: one each to parties A and B. But under the *largest remainder* system the third seat also goes to party A and the fourth seat to party C. The *largest remainder* system is sometimes regarded as being favourable to smaller parties, and it is noteworthy in the above example that party C gets as many seats as party B while getting less than half the number of votes; but in fact it treats parties of all sizes equally, and examples can also be constructed where the larger parties are over-represented.

Table A8.1 Largest remainder, four-member constituency (20,000 votes cast. Hare quota 5000)

<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Quota</i>	<i>Seats</i>	<i>Remainder</i>	<i>Seats</i>	<i>Total seats</i>
A	8,200	5,000	1	3,200	1	2
B	6,100	5,000	1	1,100	0	1
C	3,000	–	0	3,000	1	1
D	2,700	–	0	2,700	0	0
Total	20,000		2		2	4

Two different quotas, whose practical effect is to allocate more seats by quota, leaving fewer to the remainders, are the *Hagenbach-Bischoff quota* and the *Imperiali quota*. The Hagenbach-Bischoff quota involves dividing the total votes cast by the number of seats plus one, and the Imperiali quota by the number of seats plus two. The *Droop quota*, which is equivalent to the Hagenbach-Bischoff quota plus one or the next whole number above it, is not normally used in list PR systems but is used to assign seats in the single transferable vote system.

The *highest average* system was devised by another nineteenth-century lawyer, the Belgian Victor D'Hondt, after whom it is named; this is the system which has been adopted for PR elections in Britain since 1997 (although only in the European Parliament elections is the pure D'Hondt system used – for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and London Assembly it is used only for calculating 'top-up seats' in the hybrid AMS system, explained below). Its central idea is to minimise the over-representation of the most over-represented party by successively awarding each seat to the party which given that extra seat would have the highest number of votes per seat. This is achieved by dividing each party's votes by successive divisors, and then allocating the seats to the parties in descending order of quotients. Table A8.2 shows the same results in votes as Table A8.1, but under the D'Hondt system the allocation of seats is different.

Table A8.2 Four-member constituency (20,000 votes cast. Division by D'Hondt divisors)

<i>Party</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Divisor 1</i>	<i>Divisor 2</i>	<i>Divisor 3</i>	<i>Seats</i>
A	8,200	8,200 (1)	4,100 (3)	2,733	2
B	6,100	6,100 (2)	3,050 (4)	2,033	2
C	3,000	3,000	1,500	1,000	0
D	2,700	2,700	1,350	900	0
Total	20,000				4

In the example in Table A8.2 the first seat will go to party A, the second to party B, the third to party A and the fourth to party B whose second quotient is 50 more than the first quotient of party C. Party C is left without a seat, which suggests that the D'Hondt system is less favourable to smaller parties than the Hare quota.

It is possible to produce a hybrid system, first assigning seats by quota or 'first past the post' and then allocating the remaining seats by D'Hondt divisors.

Different quotas and divisors have also been devised, with the objective of giving greater or lesser advantages to large, small or medium-sized parties.

Alternative divisors to those used in the D'Hondt system are the *Sainte-Laguë* and the *Sainte-Laguë modified divisors*. The first of these involves dividing each party's votes by 1, 3, 5, 7, and so on, instead of by 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on. The second, which has been adopted in several Scandinavian countries, involves setting the first divisor at 1.4 instead of 1 (1.4, 3, 5, 7, and so on). This has the effect of strengthening medium-sized parties in a multi-party system. The pure Sainte-Laguë divisors, which have rarely been chosen for national elections but are used to calculate the PR element of New Zealand's mixed-member electoral system, can be shown mathematically to be the most equitable in the sense that they do not systematically advantage or disadvantage any particular size of party.² It can be argued that in practical terms this results too often in small parties gaining an electoral foothold, to the detriment of the democratic process. On the other hand, those arguing this – and those with the legislative power to determine details of electoral systems – tend to belong to the larger parties.

Several countries practise a double allocation of seats, in so far as remainders are transferred to a regional or national pool before the remaining seats are allocated. The effect is usually to make the overall result more proportional.

Many countries apply a threshold, in any event, before parties can qualify for seats, either at a constituency or at national level. The size of the threshold varies from country to country, but the most common figure is 5 per cent. Other things being equal, the larger the number of seats in each constituency the more proportional a system will be. The extreme examples are Israel and the Netherlands, in each of which the entire country forms one constituency.

Party list systems can also be classified as 'open' or 'closed', depending on the way in which they decide which of a party's candidates are assigned the seats which the party has won. The simplest system is the closed list system (used in Britain for the 1999 European Parliament elections), where voters simply vote for a party, and candidates win seats in the order in which they appear on the party's list. At the other extreme, fully open lists, voters vote for individual candidates – the votes for each party's candidates are totalled to determine the party's entitlement, and these seats assigned to those individuals from that party who won the most votes. Many countries use an intermediate, 'semi-open' system, where voters can choose either to vote for an individual candidate or to accept the party's recommended ranking. (The best-known variant of this type is often called the 'Belgian system', since it is used there.)

A different form of proportional representation is the *Single Transferable Vote* (STV), which is used for Parliamentary elections in the Republic of Ireland and Malta, and for elections in Northern Ireland except those to the Westminster Parliament. Under this system the voter may list all the candidates on a ballot paper in his or her order of preference. The total number of votes cast is divided by the number of seats plus one, and one is added to the quotient. This is known as the *Droop* quota. Candidates achieving the Droop quota are allocated seats, and any excess votes are transferred to their second preferences. The process is repeated until all the seats have been filled, if necessary eliminating the bottom candidates and transferring their votes in the same way. The counting of votes under STV is a complicated procedure, often requiring a long series of separate

counts. An example from the Irish general election of February 1982 is shown in Appendix 9.

The STV system as used in the Republic of Ireland is less proportional than most party list systems, mainly because the constituencies are relatively small (three to five members), but it gives a much larger choice of individual candidates to the voter; with comparable constituency sizes it would operate almost as proportionately as a party list system (and where it did not, it would be because the voters themselves had declined to vote along party lines, not because of any capriciousness of the electoral system).

Table A8.3 Quotas and divisors: the formulae

1. Hare quota = $\frac{\text{Votes}}{\text{Seats}}$
2. Hagenbach-Bischoff quota = $\frac{\text{Votes}}{\text{Seats} + 1}$
3. Imperiali quota = $\frac{\text{Votes}}{\text{Seats} + 2}$
4. Droop quota = $\left(\frac{\text{Votes}}{\text{Seats} + 1} \right) + 1$
5. D'Hondt divisors: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.
6. Sainte-Laguë divisors: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, etc.
7. Sainte-Laguë modified divisors: 1.4, 3, 5, 7, 9, etc.

One other device, which also produces this effect, is *panachage*, as practised in Switzerland and Luxembourg. These countries employ party list systems, but the voter has as many votes as there are seats to be filled and may, if he or she chooses, distribute choices between candidates on several different lists.

The *Additional Member System* (AMS), also known as the Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP), is a hybrid containing elements of 'first past the post' and party list PR, and has been adopted in Britain for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and London Assembly. The system was originally devised by the occupying powers in West Germany after the Second World War, and imposed for the first Bundestag elections, with the intention of modifying the excesses of list PR which were seen as having contributed to the rise of Hitler. The system has been used in West Germany, and since reunification throughout Germany, ever since, and more recently was also adopted in New Zealand. The basic idea is that a certain number of seats are filled by 'first past the post', with members elected by and representing individual constituencies; but then 'additional members' are added on a regional basis to 'top up' each party's representation so that overall the number of seats is proportional to party support. Voters normally have two votes, one for a constituency member and one for a regional list, and candidates may nominate themselves both at constituency and regional level. (Those candidates

who have already won constituencies are ignored when the extra seats are allocated to the leading names on the lists.)

The exact effect of AMS on party representation depends on the ratio of constituency members to top-up members – if there are too few additional members, a party may win so many seats in the constituency section that the top-up is unable to compensate fully. This is what happens in the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly, where there are more constituency members than top-up members. (In both cases the D'Hondt divisors are used to allocate the top-up seats.) Table A8.4 shows how this worked in one region in Scotland, and Table A8.5 shows how the top-up seats are distributed in the same election.

Table A8.4 Scottish Parliament seats and votes in the West of Scotland region, 1999

<i>Party</i>	<i>Constituency voting</i>		<i>Regional voting</i>		<i>Total seats</i>
	<i>% votes</i>	<i>Seats</i>	<i>% votes</i>	<i>Seats</i>	
Conservative	16.4	0	15.7	2	2
Labour	43.5	9	38.5	0	9
Liberal Democrat	11.3	0	11.0	1	1
SNP	26.9	0	25.9	4	4
Other	0.0	0	8.9	0	0
Total	100.0	9	100.0	7	16

Table A8.5 Distribution of top-up seats, West of Scotland

	<i>Con</i>	<i>Lab</i>	<i>Lib Dem</i>	<i>SNP</i>
Votes	15.7	38.5	11	25.9
<i>Seats at start</i>	0	9	0	0
Votes/Seats + 1	15.7	3.85	11	25.9
<i>Seats after distribution 1</i>	0	9	0	1
Votes/Seats + 1	15.7	3.85	11	12.95
<i>Seats after distribution 2</i>	1	9	0	1
Votes/Seats + 1	7.85	3.85	11	12.95
<i>Seats after distribution 3</i>	1	9	0	2
Votes/Seats + 1	7.85	3.85	11	8.63
<i>Seats after distribution 4</i>	1	9	1	2
Votes/Seats + 1	7.85	3.85	5.5	8.63
<i>Seats after distribution 5</i>	1	9	1	3
Votes/Seats + 1	7.85	3.85	5.5	6.47
<i>Seats after distribution 6</i>	2	9	1	3
Votes/Seats + 1	5.23	3.85	5.5	6.47
<i>Seats after distribution 7</i>	2	9	1	4

The result in this case is that the largest party (Labour in both cases in 1999) gets more than its proportional share of seats, but much less of an advantage than would be the case under 'first past the post'. In Germany, by contrast, half the

seats are reserved for additional members, and it is much rarer for a party to win too many constituency seats in a region – but when this does happen (termed an ‘overhang’) extra top-up seats are added to restore proportionality, so that the Bundestag occasionally has more members than normal.³

AV-plus, a system devised and recommended by the Jenkins Commission for use in future British general elections, is a refinement of AMS. In each constituency it uses alternative vote (see above) rather than ‘first past the post’ to determine the constituency member. It also uses a far smaller proportion of top-up members than is usual with AMS, only around one in six of all members elected. This means that without increasing the size of Parliament it could use constituencies little bigger than those currently in place – so that most would continue to comprise small, recognisable communities of single towns, sections of cities or country areas – and with top-up regions also small, consisting of no more than a single county. For example, they suggested that Oxfordshire, instead of returning six constituency MPs would return five constituency MPs and one top-up MP representing the whole county (and belonging to the party which would otherwise be most under-represented).

AV-plus would not operate as a system of PR, but rather as a blunted version of ‘first past the post’. The biggest party, even with less than half the votes nationally, could still hope to win half the seats and thus command a majority in the Commons, but would need a more convincing lead in votes to achieve it than has hitherto been the case. Meanwhile, every voter would be represented by two or three MPs instead of one, and many more of them would find that at least one of their MPs belonged to the party they had voted for. Looking back at the history of British elections since 1945, hung Parliaments would have been more common, but around half of elections would still have produced a majority government, experts have estimated.

The party effect of different systems

The exact effect which different electoral systems would have on the party balance in Britain can only be estimated, because voters would naturally behave differently under different circumstances, and even the best survey evidence is limited in the depth of local detail it can collect. The following table is based on published estimates from two sources of what the result would have been under different systems in 1997, but should only be considered a rough guide. (In particular, the two estimates were based on very different survey evidence about voters’ second and subsequent preferences, and how likely the voters would be to express them, which led to very diverse results on the effects of introducing STV; and neither source made estimates for all the different systems.)

Table A8.6 Estimated outcome of the 1997 election (GB only) under different electoral systems

	<i>Con</i>	<i>Lab</i>	<i>Lib Dem</i>	<i>Others</i>
First past the post – votes (actual) %	31.4	44.4	17.2	7.0
<i>Seats</i>				
<i>First past the post (actual result)</i>	165	419	46	11
Alternative vote	103–110	436	84–91	11
Supplementary vote	110	436	84	11
AV-plus	167	367	92	15
D'Hondt (5 MPs per region)	205	345	72	19
AMS with 75% constituency seats	196	326	104	15
STV (4–8 MPs per region)	144–195	317–342	89–131	17–24
AMS with 50% constituency seats	203–207	303	111–115	20
National party lists with 5% threshold	208	300	113	20
Largest remainder (5 MPs per region)	205	295	121	20
<i>Pure proportionality</i>	202	285	110	34

Sources: Data from the British Election Study, reported by John Curtice and Michael Steed in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1997* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 319; and Patrick Dunleavy, Helen Margetts, Brendan O'Duffy and Stuart Weir, 'Remodelling the 1997 Election: How Britain Would Have Looked Under Alternative Electoral Systems', in *British Elections and Parties Review*, Volume 8 (London: Frank Cass, 1998), and, for AV-plus, Margetts and Dunleavy, 'Reforming the Westminster Electoral System: Evaluating the Jenkins Commission Proposals', in *British Elections and Parties Review*, Volume 9 (London: Frank Cass, 1999).

Appendix 9

The Single Transferable Vote

The Single Transferable Vote is a very simple system of voting, the voters merely numbering the candidates 1, 2, 3 and so on in their order of preference. The counting of the votes is more complicated, as the following not untypical result from Galway West, in the Republic of Ireland's general election of February 1982, illustrates. It took seven counts before the five seats were filled, only one candidate securing enough first preference votes to secure election on the first count.

Table A9.1 Galway West result, general election February 1982

Galway West (5 seats)

Total valid poll, 48,572; Quota 8,096

Turnout 67.5%

<i>Candidate and party</i>	<i>Count 1</i>	<i>Count 2</i>	<i>Count 3</i>	<i>Count 4</i>	<i>Count 5</i>	<i>Count 6</i>	<i>Count 7</i>
Molloy (FF)	9,545	-1,449 8,096					
Donnellan (FG)	6,105	+38 6,143	+51 6,194	+30 6,224	+2,181 8,405	-309 8,096	
Higgins (Lab)	5,718	+129 5,847	+715 6,562	+214 6,776	+554 7,330	+2,970 10,300	-2,204 8,096
Fahey (FF)	6,019	+352 6,371	+99 6,470	+294 6,764	+97 6,861	+379 7,240	+431 7,671 [†]
*Geoghegan-Quinn (FF)	4,139	+475 4,614	+47 4,661	+1,716 6,377	+87 6,464	+221 6,685	+196 6,881 [†]
*Killilea (FF)	5,624	+198 5,822	+35 5,857	+242 6,099	+29 6,128	+212 6,340	+145 6,485
McCormack (FG)	3,952	+24 3,976	+38 4,014	+41 4,055	+1,014 5,069**		
Coogan (FG)	3,746	+47 3,793	+145 3,938	+105 4,043**			
O'Connor (FF)	2,513	+171 2,684	+33 2,717**				
Brick (SFWP)	1,211	+15 1,226**					
Spoilt/non-transferable	391	0	63	75	81	1,287	1,432

General notes:

- (i) The quota = $\frac{48,572 + 1}{5 + 1} = 8,096$ (ignoring any fractions).
- (ii) The party abbreviations following each candidate's name are:
FF Fianna Fáil. (Literally translated this party name is 'soldiers of destiny'.)

FG Fine Gael. (Literally translated the party name is 'family group of the Gaels'.)

Lab Labour.

SFWP Sinn Féin the Workers' Party.

- (iii) An asterisk preceding a candidate's name, for example, *Molloy, indicates a member of the previous Dáil, that is, a sitting member.

A single asterisk following a number of votes indicates that the votes of that candidate have exceeded the quota and hence the candidate has been elected on that count.

A dagger following a number of votes indicates that the candidate has been elected at the final count without having exceeded the quota.

A double asterisk following a number of votes indicates that the candidate has been eliminated as a result of that particular count and the votes are to be transferred in the following count.

- (iv) The candidates are listed in descending order of the final vote obtained by the candidate. This vote will be obtained in the count which results in the candidate being elected or eliminated. An alternative presentation which could be used is to list the candidates in alphabetical order, as they are on the ballot paper.

Count 1: First preference votes counted: Molloy (FF) elected.

Count 2: Distribution of surplus votes of Molloy (FF): Brick (SFWP) eliminated.

Count 3: Transfer of votes of Brick (SFWP): O'Connor (FF) eliminated.

Count 4: Transfer of votes of O'Connor (FF): Coogan (FG) eliminated.

Count 5: Transfer of votes of Coogan (FG): Donnellan (FG) elected, McCormack (FG) eliminated

Count 6: Transfer of votes of McCormack (FG): Higgins (Lab) elected.

Count 7: Distribution of surplus votes of Higgins (Lab): Fahey (FF) and Geoghegan-Quinn (FF) elected without reaching quota.

Source: Adapted with kind permission from Paul McKee, 'The Republic of Ireland', in Vernon Bogdanor and David Butler (eds), *Democracy and Elections: Electoral Systems and their Political Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 170–1.

Table A9.2 First preference votes and seats won

Party	N votes	% votes	Seats won
FF	27,840	57.3	3
FG	13,803	28.4	1
Lab	5,718	11.8	1
SFWP	1,211	2.5	0

Source: Adapted with kind permission from Paul McKee, 'The Republic of Ireland', in Vernon Bogdanor and David Butler (eds), *Democracy and Elections: Electoral Systems and their Political Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 170–1.

Appendix 10

Miscellaneous Statistics, 2001 General Election

Number of registered electors (as reported by Returning Officers to the Electoral Commission)	44,403,238
Number of constituencies	659
Number of candidates	3,319
Number of polling stations	c. 46,500
Total valid votes cast	26,367,383
Turnout	59.4%
Number of postal voters on list	1,758,055
Number of postal ballot papers included at start of count	1,370,884
Total number of ballot papers rejected in the count	100,005
Ballot papers rejected as unmarked or void for uncertainty	69,910
Ballot papers rejected for want of official mark	2,548
Ballot papers rejected for voting for more than one candidate	22,590
Ballot papers rejected for writing or other mark that might identify the voter	3,760

Sources: Electoral Commission, *Election 2001: The Official Results* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2001); Electoral Commission, *Absent Voting in Great Britain* (London: Electoral Commission, 2003); *UK Election Statistics: 1918–2004* (House of Commons Library Research Paper 04/61).

Notes and References

Chapter 1

1. See C. Seymour, *Electoral Reform in England and Wales* (New Haven, 1915); H. L. Morris, *Parliamentary Franchise Reform in England from 1885 to 1918* (New York, 1921); D. E. Butler, *The Electoral System in Britain since 1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
2. See Bill Jones, Dennis Kavanagh, Michael Moran and Philip Norton, *Politics UK*, 5th edition (Harlow: Longman, 2004) or Gillian Peele, *Governing the UK*, 4th edition (Oxford: Blackwell's Publishing, 2004).
3. See Vernon Bogdanor and David Butler (eds), *Democracy and Elections: Electoral Systems and their Political Consequences* (Cambridge University Press, 1983); Dick Leonard and Richard Natkiel, *World Atlas of Elections* (London: Economist Publishing Company, 1986); Bernard Grofman and Arend Lijphart (eds), *Electoral Laws and their Political Consequences* (New York: Agathon Press, 1986).

Chapter 2

1. In 2001 the general election and local government elections were also held on the same day, but not the first Thursday in May: both were held on 6 June, having been postponed because of the Foot and Mouth Disease epidemic. Unlike the date of the general election, which (with the concurrence of the Queen) is in the Prime Minister's gift, the date of the local government elections is prescribed by law, and the postponement required legislation.
2. The last Parliamentary election not held on a Thursday was the Hamilton by-election in 1978, held on a Wednesday to avoid coinciding with the opening game in the football World Cup finals, which was the following day.

Chapter 3

1. The local government franchise also applies to elections for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and Greater London Authority.
2. In the special case of the City of London the business vote is still retained.
3. The qualifying date was 10 October in England, Wales and Scotland, but 15 September in Northern Ireland.
4. Indeed, until 1980, no changes could be made to the register after 16 December, and anybody mistakenly omitted was excluded until the next year's register was drawn up. In 1980, it became possible for late claims for inclusion to be considered up to the final date for the nomination of candidates, although the Registration Officer could only include the names of people who were duly qualified to be registered at a particular address on the qualifying date.

5. For similar reasons of cost, the annual register was adopted in 1949, to replace the twice-yearly register originally decreed under the 1948 Representation of the People Act, at an annual saving of £650,000 (£13m at current prices).
6. The annually updated register is published on 1 December; there are no monthly updates in September, October or November.
7. The Electoral Commission has suggested that a future reform should be to switch to registration on an individual rather than household basis; this is already the case in Northern Ireland since the Electoral Fraud (Northern Ireland) Act 2002.
8. In the past this has been interpreted in practice to prevent the registration of the homeless (who cannot provide a permanent address), and voluntary mental patients have also been excluded – even if otherwise fit to vote – because registration officers have not been allowed to accept mental hospitals as valid addresses. Changes in the regulations have now been brought into effect that allow both groups to vote. Voluntary mental patients can register in the ordinary way giving the hospital as their address; similarly, unconvicted prisoners who have been remanded in custody can register at the address where they are being held. (Convicted prisoners serving their sentence are at present not allowed to vote, but the European Court of Human Rights has recently ruled this to be a violation of their human rights, and the law may now be changed to allow them, too, to register and vote.) Homeless people who wish to be registered should contact the local council for the area where they are for the time being staying, and will be asked to sign a ‘declaration of local connection’ stating that they commonly spend a substantial part of the time (whether day or night) in the constituency; having signed such a declaration they may register. People making a declaration of local connection have the choice of providing an address to which correspondence from the registration officer or returning officer can be delivered, or of agreeing to collect such mail periodically from the registration officer’s office.
9. It used to be generally assumed that it was legal to vote in local government elections for two different local authorities if resident and registered in both areas, but a recent Parliamentary answer from the Lord Chancellor’s Department has stated the opposite. The state of the law is consequently not entirely clear unless it is tested in court.
10. The registration form normally includes an extra box for those aged over 70 to tick, so they can be marked as exempt on the copy of the register used for selecting names for jury service.
11. This is the form of words prescribed by statutory instrument to be included on the registration form.
12. The period was initially five years, increased to 20 years in 1989 and reduced to 15 years by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000.
13. The studies are reported in: P. G. Gray, T. Corlett and Pamela Frankland, *The Register of Electors as a Sampling Frame* (London: Central Office of Information, 1950); J. Todd and P. Dodd, *The Electoral Registration Process in the UK* (London: OPCS, 1982); S. Smith, *Electoral Registration in 1991* (London: OPCS, 1993). See also J. Todd and B. Butcher, *Electoral Registration in 1981* (London: OPCS, 1982), M. and S. Pinto-Duschinsky, *Voter Registration: Problems and Solutions* (London: Constitutional Reform Centre, 1987).

14. The extent and electoral effect of poll-tax deregistration are discussed in Jeremy Smith and Iain McLean, 'The Poll Tax and the Electoral Register', in Anthony Heath, Roger Jowell and John Curtice with Bridget Taylor (eds), *Labour's Last Chance?* (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1994).
15. A detailed breakdown of registration figures for all groups in 1991, calculated by testing the electoral register against the Census, is given in S. Smith, *Electoral Registration in 1991* (London: OPCS, 1993).
16. In Northern Ireland postal votes remain restricted to those who cannot be reasonably expected to vote in person at the polling station for the address where they are registered – see Appendix 3.

Chapter 4

1. Detailed and entertaining pen-portraits of every constituency, and their MPs, their histories and political and social characteristics, can be found in Robert Waller and Byron Criddle, *The Almanac of British Politics*, 7th edition (London: Routledge, 2002). Simon Henig and Lewis Baston, *The Political Map of Britain* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2002) has similar coverage with comprehensive historical statistics.
2. Before 1832, the biggest constituency was Yorkshire, with an estimated 16,000 voters, although from 1826 to 1832 it had four MPs rather than the two it had up to that point. At the other end of the scale, there were many 'rotten boroughs' where the electorate was in single figures, and on one occasion, at Bossiney in Cornwall in 1784, there was only one qualified elector, electing both the borough's two MPs. Among the most notorious of the rotten boroughs were Old Sarum, where there was not a single building left standing in the borough so that the Returning Officer had to operate from a tent, and Dunwich, which was mostly underwater having been swept away by the sea centuries before.
3. Borough constituencies are called burgh constituencies in Scotland.
4. The history of the Boundary Commissions is told, and the effects of each of their boundary reviews analysed, in D. J. Rossiter, R. J. Johnston and C. J. Pattie, *The Boundary Commissions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999). For a wider view of the principles involved see Iain McLean and David Butler (eds), *Fixing the Boundaries* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996) and Ron Johnston, Charles Pattie, Danny Dorling and David Rossiter, *From Votes to Seats* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).
5. *House of Commons Debates* (Hansard), Fifth Series, volume 535, columns 1839–41. Partially quoted by D. E. Butler in an article 'The Redistribution of Seats', *Public Administration*, Summer 1955. See also *The Electoral System in Britain since 1918* (Oxford University Press, 1963) by the same author.
6. By the time of the 2001 general election, the electorate of the Isle of Wight had grown further, to 104,431, while that of the Western Isles was only 21,706.
7. John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'An Analysis of the Voting', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1983* (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 361.
8. John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'The Results Analysed', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1992* (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 351.

9. Rossiter *et al.*, *Boundary Commissions* (p. 359), disagreed. Using a different method from the other analysts to estimate the effect of the boundary changes, they concluded that the Conservatives gained a net 24 seats over other parties. For details of the 1994 boundary changes and calculations of their electoral effect in individual constituencies by the more generally accepted method, see Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher, *Media Guide to the New Parliamentary Constituencies* (London: BBC Publications, 1994).
10. John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'The Results Analysed', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1997* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 315.
11. John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'The Results Analysed', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 2001* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 331–2.
12. John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'The Results Analysed', in Butler and Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1992*, pp. 352–4.
13. See John Curtice and Michael Steed, 'Electoral Choice and the Production of Government: The Changing Operation of the Electoral System in the United Kingdom since 1955', *British Journal of Political Science*, July 1982, and their appendices to Butler and Kavanagh's books on each election. For the cube law to operate, there need to be about 180 seats that would be marginal in a close election; if the number falls to 65, the electoral system will be broadly proportional. Between 1955 and 1970, the number averaged 159, but fell to a low of just 80 in 1983. After that it rose at each election until 1997, when it reached 114.
14. These figures refer to the situation immediately after the 2001 general election and make no allowance for the effect of likely boundary changes in Scotland.

Chapter 5

1. The best up-to-date study of British political parties is probably *The Modern British Party System* by Paul Webb (London: Sage, 2000). See also *The British Party System* by Stephen Ingle, 3rd edition (London: Pinter, 2000).
2. The precise law on nominating under a misleading name or description was rather unclear, and was interpreted by different Returning Officers in different ways. The courts could intervene if they were convinced that voters might be misled – for example, in 1997 the Attorney General Sir Nicholas Lyell secured an injunction against an independent who had changed his name by deed poll to 'Sir Nicholas Lyell', and the Labour Party was able to prevent three independents running as 'New Labour'. But short of court action, most Returning Officers felt compelled not to interfere.
3. The task is not necessarily straightforward. At the 1999 Scottish Parliament elections (before the Electoral Commission had been set up, when registration was being administered by Companies House), the Scottish Socialist Party and Scottish Green Party were both initially told that they could not use those names because they were too similar to other party names already registered. In the case of the Greens this was a particular nonsense, since the name was registered to the Green Party in England and Wales, technically separate but allied to the Scottish Greens, and of course not likely to run candidates in

competition to it. After the unanimous intervention in their favour of the four major parties, however, both the SSP and Scottish Greens were eventually allowed to stand under their chosen labels and, indeed, both won a seat in the Parliament.

4. K. Maguire, 'Blair pleads to disaffected as membership plummets', *Guardian*, 12 April 2004.
5. UNISON, uniquely, is only partly affiliated to the party, because it was founded as an amalgamation of unions some of which were affiliated and some of which were not. The union maintains two political funds, one contributing to Labour and one not, and members may choose which to support.
6. Martin Bell at Tatton, standing against a Conservative incumbent, in 1997; Richard Taylor at Wyre Forest, standing against a Labour incumbent, in 2001. Both were successful.
7. For more information about the history of the minor parties see David Butler and Gareth Butler, *Twentieth Century British Political Facts 1900–2000* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 135–84, or the even more exhaustive catalogue in David Boothroyd, *The History of British Political Parties* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2001).
8. His constituency, North Down, has established something of a tradition of rejecting the established Unionist parties – his predecessor, Sir James Kilfedder, was elected for the Ulster Popular Unionist Party, which organised only in North Down and was in effect a personal organisation of his supporters, and unlike the other Unionists Sir James continued to take the Conservative Party whip. However, McCartney was beaten by the official Ulster Unionist candidate in 2001.
9. S. O. Davies at Merthyr in 1970, deselected because the CLP thought he was too old, and Dick Taverne (Lincoln) and Eddie Milne (Blyth), both deselected ahead of the February 1974 election for political reasons. Taverne, indeed, resigned immediately to call a by-election, and won both that (see Chapter 11) and the general election a few months later.

Chapter 6

1. The figures are cited in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1997* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 217.
2. In recent years the parties have begun to use the term 'Parliamentary spokesman/spokesperson' as an alternative to PPC.
3. *The Funding of Political Parties in the United Kingdom*, Fifth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, Cm. 4057 (London: The Stationery Office, 1998), paragraphs 3.33–3.44.

Chapter 7

1. A comprehensive survey of the candidates in each recent election, and of how they came to be selected, can be found in Byron Criddle's chapter of the Butler and Kavanagh Nuffield studies. The recent overhaul in selection procedures awaits an updated and comprehensive treatment. Three earlier books which cover the process as it used to be are *Pathways to Parliament* by Austin Ranney

- (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, and London: Macmillan, 1965); *The Selectorate* by Peter Paterson (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1967) and *The Selection of Parliamentary Candidates* by Michael Rush (London: Nelson, 1969). On Members of Parliament see *The Commons in Perspective* by Philip Norton (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1981) and *The Backbenchers* by P. G. Richards (London: Faber, 1972).
2. *Age of Electoral Majority: Report and Recommendations* (London, Electoral Commission, 2004).
 3. Indeed, one hereditary peer who no longer has a seat in the Lords, 3rd Viscount Thurso, has already been elected to the Commons, as a Liberal Democrat MP in 2001.
 4. The passage of the bill solved the problem posed by the selection of David Cairns, a former Catholic priest, as Labour candidate in Greenock and Inverclyde; he was subsequently elected and, as a result of the new Act, was able to take his seat.
 5. As a result of the Disqualifications Act 2000, which also removed the bar on members of the Dáil sitting in the Northern Ireland Assembly.
 6. Although it should be noted that the Conservative candidate who was elected in this way immediately resigned the seat to allow a new by-election once the law had been changed so that Benn was once more qualified to sit.
 7. Nigel Nicolson, *People and Parliament* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1958), p. 40.
 8. R. L. Leonard, *Guide to the General Election* (London: Pan Books, 1964), pp. 93–4.
 9. In 2003, a Commission on Candidate Selection sponsored by the Electoral Reform Society and the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust reported on the efforts of the parties to select more women and more candidates from ethnic minorities, and suggested new guidelines to aid their success – see Peter Riddell, *Candidate Selection: The Report of the Commission on Candidate Selection* (London: Electoral Reform Society, 2003).
 10. Trade unions may still financially assist their local Labour parties through Constituency Plan Agreements if the money is not linked to candidacies.
 11. Margaret Thatcher, then still Margaret Roberts, was the defeated Conservative candidate for Dartford in 1950 and 1951; Tony Blair lost at Beaconsfield in a 1982 by-election.
 12. Edmund Burke, Speech to the Electors of Bristol, 3 November 1774.
 13. Byron Criddle, 'Candidates', in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1983* (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 241 (n. 5).

Chapter 8

1. For a more detailed survey of the campaign in the constituencies, see David Denver and Gordon Hands, *Modern Constituency Electioneering* (London: Frank Cass, 1997). For a readable and up-to-date account of the campaign from the candidate's point of view, see Paul Richards, *How To Win An Election*, 2nd edition (London: Politico's Books, 2004).
2. David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1997* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 216.

3. But accidents do happen. In 2002, almost the entire Liberal Democrat slate for Harrow London Borough Council, including six sitting councillors, had their nominations deemed invalid and were therefore excluded as candidates, because of a clerical error by which the party description they gave on the nomination form did not match the description authorised by the party's national nominating officer.
4. An earlier edition of this book described the above programme as 'a cracking pace'. This provoked an astonished reaction from a leading political scientist, who wrote 'American visitors are always amazed by the soft lives that British politicians lead. This, by American standards, would be an easy day.' On the other hand, the author was light-heartedly rebuked by a well-known Labour MP, later a senior Cabinet minister. 'Before your book appeared,' he said, 'I had always succeeded in persuading my agent that candidates could not be expected to do any electioneering before lunchtime. Now he has me out canvassing after breakfast!'
5. In European elections, the Post Office is similarly obliged to make one delivery to each elector for each party list. At the election of the Mayor of London, a single manifesto booklet containing material from all the candidates is delivered.
6. However, the delivery was not achieved to everybody's satisfaction. The Electoral Commission reported that it had been made aware of 'a number of situations in which political parties were unhappy about the timeliness of the delivery, failures to deliver leaflets to properties with no other mail, the omission of some households owing to problems in matching postcodes to constituency boundaries, leaflets being delivered to the wrong constituency and, most seriously, instances where it is alleged that large numbers of election addresses from one particular party were not delivered at all'. It added that 'the Commission will pursue with the Royal Mail the various issues that emerged from the general election' (Electoral Commission, *Election 2001: The Official Results*. London: Politico's Publishing, 2001, pp. 54–5).
7. Although it is helpful if voters bring their poll cards to the polling station with them when they vote it is not necessary, and any elector who has lost or indeed for some reason not received a poll card may still vote at the polling station for the appropriate polling district (assuming his or her name is duly included in the electoral register).
8. It may be worth noting that in Northern Ireland, where personation was considered to be a problem in the past, the 1985 Representation of the People Act made specific provision to allow the Secretary of State to suspend postal voting (except for those on the permanent list of postal voters) if he was satisfied that it was necessary to do so to prevent serious abuse.
9. According to a Populus poll reported in *The Times* (8 June 2004), one in seven electors in the pilot areas had not received a ballot paper by the weekend before the election. In Bolton the council had to open polling stations after it was discovered that whole streets had had no ballot papers until it was too late to return them by post (*Financial Times*, 8 June 2004).
10. Nevertheless, it also agreed that the all-postal method should be retained for the referendum in the North-East on regional devolution, the arrangements being too far advanced to be easily changed.

Chapter 9

1. The government launched a consultation on the future of party political broadcasts in 2004 after receiving a report on the subject from the Electoral Commission, and it is possible that this will lead to a formalisation of the rules, and perhaps significant change to the practice, in the near future.
2. Martin Harrison's chapter on broadcasting, and Martin Harrop's and Margaret Scammell's on the press, in David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh *The British General Election of 1983* (London: Macmillan, 1984), *The British General Election of 1987* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987), *The British General Election of 1992* (London: Macmillan, 1992), *The British General Election of 1997* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997) and *The British General Election of 2001* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), have been important sources in compiling this chapter.
3. See, for example, Martin Harrop's comments in Butler and Kavanagh, *The British General Election 1983*, chapter 9, and especially pp. 214–15, and in Butler and Kavanagh, *The British General Election 2001*, pp. 181–2, and David Deacon and Dominic Wring, 'Partisan Dealignment and the British Press', in John Bartle, Simon Atkinson and Roger Mortimore (eds), *Political Communications: The General Election Campaign of 2001* (London: Frank Cass, 2002).
4. The evidence was examined by Martin Linton, then a *Guardian* journalist and now a Labour MP, in 'Maybe the *Sun* won it after all', *British Journalism Review*, November 1996.

Chapter 10

1. Acceptable forms of identification for this purpose are a passport issued by the United Kingdom or any other Member State of the European Community, a Northern Ireland or Great Britain driving licence (which must bear the photograph of the holder), a Senior SmartPass issued under the Northern Ireland Concessionary Fares Scheme, or an Electoral Identity Card (which can be obtained by application to the Chief Electoral Officer).
2. In recent elections, between 2000 and 3000 ballot papers have not been counted for this reason on each occasion. It is possible for such errors to affect an election result. At Winchester in 1997, the Conservative candidate lost by two votes and successfully petitioned to have the election result overturned by the courts because several votes in his favour had been ruled invalid – see p. 141.
3. Or for too many candidates in some local elections where voters are entitled to cast multiple votes.
4. David Butler and Richard Rose, *The British General Election of 1959* (London: Macmillan, 1960), p. 280, quote a senior party organiser on this point: 'If we lost a seat by one vote and I could clearly prove illegal practices by the other side I wouldn't try. It would cost perhaps £5000 and they might be able to show that our man had slipped up in some way. But worse than that, it might start tit-for-tat petitions and no party could afford a lot of them. On the whole, we are both law-abiding and it's as well to leave each other alone.'

5. Technically, neither the Glasgow Govan nor Newark cases were election petitions, since they proceeded by prosecution through the criminal courts. However, if the court had convicted, the MP would have forfeited his or her seat and a by-election would have been held.
6. The previous record, of 59 minutes, had stood since 1959, and had been particularly notable because it was set in the Essex constituency of Billericay, despite being at the time the constituency with the highest electorate in the country.

Chapter 11

1. See Pippa Norris, *British By Elections: The Volatile Electorate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), and Chris Cook and John Ramsden (eds), *By-elections in British Politics* (London: University College London Press, 1997), which both include accounts of many of the most significant by-elections of the twentieth century.
2. Though in the latter case the public opinion poll trends, which fully confirmed the adverse by-election results, were probably equally responsible.
3. The standard work on local elections in Britain, by the accepted experts on the subject, Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher, is *Local Elections in Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997). Results in detail for England and Wales are collected in the annual *Local Elections Handbook*, compiled by the same authors and published by Local Government Chronicle Communications; summary results are published in the annual *British Elections and Parties Review* (London: Frank Cass). For local elections in Scotland, results are collected by H. M. Bochel and D. T. Denver and published annually as *The Scottish Council Elections: Results and Statistics* (Newport on Tay: Election Studies). The House of Commons library now usually produces a research paper summarising each year's results which is available on the Internet. For a more general study of the structure and functions of local government, see J. A. Chandler, *Local Government Today*, 3rd edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).
4. Exceptionally, in 2001 they were postponed to June because of the Foot and Mouth Disease outbreak, and in 2004 they were also moved to June so they would coincide with the European Parliament elections.
5. The government originally planned also to hold referendums at the same time in the North-West and Yorkshire and the Humber regions, but announced in July 2004 that these would be postponed.
6. Detailed accounts of the first two Euro-election campaigns in Britain are given in David Butler and David Marquand, *European Elections and British Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1981) and David Butler and Paul Jowett, *Party Strategies in Britain: A Study of the 1984 European Elections* (London: Macmillan, 1985). More recent Euro-elections are described and analysed in David Butler and Martin Westlake, *British Politics and European Elections 1994* (London: Macmillan, 1995) and David Butler and Martin Westlake, *British Politics and European Elections 1999* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000). A volume on the 2004 elections by Butler and Westlake is forthcoming. Each election since 1984 has also been the subject of a special issue of the journal *Electoral Studies*.

7. The official figure given for turnout was 38.2 per cent, but this included spoilt, blank and invalid ballot papers, in defiance of previous practice.
8. On the history, principles and structure of devolved government in Britain, see Vernon Bogdanor, *Devolution in the United Kingdom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
9. Except that in the Scottish Parliament the Westminster constituency of Orkney and Shetland is split into two, so that there are 73 rather than 72 constituencies. When the number of Westminster constituencies in Scotland is reduced from 72 to 59 (probably at the next general election), the constituencies in the Scottish Parliament will remain unchanged and the link will be broken.
10. Until 1965, the outer areas which are now in London came under the county councils of Essex, Surrey, Kent and Hertfordshire, all of which lost territory to the GLC, and of Middlesex, abolished entirely.
11. On referendums in general, see Austin Ranney (ed.), *The Referendum Device* (Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1981) and David Butler and Austin Ranney (eds), *Referendums around the World: The Growing Use of Direct Democracy* (Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1994). For the constitutional context, see Vernon Bogdanor, *Politics and the Constitution* (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1996), chapter 12. The *Report of the Committee on the Conduct of Referendums* (London: Constitution Unit, 1996) discusses the principles in a modern context. For studies of specific referendums: on the EEC referendum, see David Butler and Uwe Kitzinger, *The 1975 Referendum* (London: Macmillan, 1976), Anthony King, *Britain Says Yes* (Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1977) and Philip Goodhart, *Full-Hearted Consent* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1976); on the 1979 Scottish referendum, see *The Referendum Experience, Scotland 1979*, edited by Jean Bochel, David Denver and Alan MacCartney (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1981).

Chapter 12

1. The history of opinion polls in Britain is told in detail in Nick Moon, *Opinion Polls: History, Theory and Practice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999) and (up to 1987) in Robert M. Worcester, *British Public Opinion: A Guide to the History and Methodology of Political Opinion Polling* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991). Both discuss methodology and the issues that opinion polling raises. See also Robert M. Worcester and Roger Mortimore, *Explaining Labour's Landslide* (London: Politico's Books, 1999), and David Broughton, *Public Opinion Polls and Politics in Britain* (London: Prentice Hall, 1995). David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh in their *British General Election* series invariably include a chapter assessing the impact of the public and private polls on each individual general election.
2. The websites of the principal companies are: www.mori.com; www.icmresearch.co.uk; www.nopworld.com; www.populuslimited.com; www.yougov.com.
3. See *The Opinion Polls and the 1992 British General Election: A Report to the Market Research Society* (London: Market Research Society, 1994).
4. YouGov's methodology is explained, and its strengths and weaknesses debated, in the *International Journal of Market Research* Volume 46 (2004) by

- Peter Kellner (chairman of YouGov) on one side and Nick Sparrow (head of ICM) and the psephologist John Curtice on the other.
5. Post-election analysis showed that the reason for the failure on that occasion was probably a combination of the constituency having an unusually high percentage of second-home absentee homeowners, and not allowing for the different voting patterns of farm owners and farm labourers.
 6. See Philip Gould, *The Unfinished Revolution* (London: Little, Brown, 1998).
 7. Figures from David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1987* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987), pp. 140, 144.
 8. See David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1992* (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 151.
 9. Conservative spending on opinion research in 1997 is reported in *The Funding of Political Parties in the United Kingdom*, Fifth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, Cm. 4057 (London: The Stationery Office, 1998), but the figure was not broken out for either Labour or the Liberal Democrats.
 10. See Robert Worcester (ed.), *Political Opinion Polling: An International Review* (London: Macmillan, 1983) pp. 109–10 for the full text of the 1974 Code of Practice. Details of the BPC's rules and membership can be found at its website, www.britishpollingcouncil.org.
 11. A cross-national review of evidence on the impact of opinion polls was conducted in 2001 by Professor Wolfgang Donsbach of the University of Dresden, who concluded that 'any effects are difficult to prove and in any case are minimal' (Wolfgang Donsbach, *Who's Afraid of Opinion Polls?: Normative and Empirical Arguments for the Freedom of Pre-Election Surveys*. Amsterdam: Foundation for Information, 2001). For discussions by two leading pollsters on the influence that polls have on voters, see Worcester and Mortimore, *Explaining Labour's Landslide*, pp. 179–81 and Moon, *Opinion Polls: History, Theory and Practice*, pp. 207–12.
 12. See Butler and Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1992*, p. 146.
 13. Dick Leonard, 'Belgian Leaders should read "Areopagitica"', *Wall Street Journal (Europe)*, 18 October 1985. See also Dick Leonard, 'Opinion Polls can't be Banned', *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 6 December 1985. Polling bans in France have been circumvented by publication of poll results in foreign media and, more recently, in Canada and Hungary by publication on the Internet. Donsbach (*Who's Afraid of Opinion Polls?*, see Note 11 above) also marshals the arguments in principle against banning polls in the light of recent experience.
 14. Frits Spangenberg, *The Freedom to Publish Opinion Poll Results: Report on a Worldwide Update* (Amsterdam: Foundation for Information, 2003) reviews the state of the law on the publication of polls in 66 countries worldwide.

Chapter 13

1. David Butler and Donald Stokes, *Political Change in Britain*, 2nd edition (London: Macmillan, 1974); Bo Särilvik and Ivor Crewe, *Decade of Dealignment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Anthony Heath, Roger Jowell and John Curtice, *How Britain Votes* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985); Anthony Heath, Roger Jowell, John Curtice, Geoffrey Evans, Julia Field and Sharon Witherspoon, *Understanding Political Change* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1991); Anthony Heath, Roger Jowell and John Curtice with Bridget Taylor (eds),

- Labour's Last Chance?* (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1994); Harold D. Clarke, David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart and Paul Whiteley, *Political Choice in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
2. See the detailed bibliographies in the books listed above.
 3. For a description of the methodology of these surveys see Clarke *et al.*, *Political Choice in Britain*, pp 329–39.
 4. A 2003 MORI survey for Nestlé UK, which interviewed secondary school children rather than their parents, found that the same effect still seems to be present; but it also found a new development, that children of parents who do not vote have no intention of voting themselves. See Roger Mortimore and Claire Tyrrell, 'Children's Acquisition of Political Opinions', *Journal of Public Affairs* Volume 4 (2004), 279–98.
 5. A strikingly similar 'generational effect' among US voters, which may largely have accounted for a long-term swing from Republican to Democrat, had earlier been detected by Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren Miller and Donald Stokes, *The American Voter* (New York: Wiley, 1960), especially pp. 45–6.
 6. Särilvik and Crewe, *Decade of Dealignment*. See also Ivor Crewe, Bo Särilvik and James Alt, 'Partisan Dealignment in Britain 1964–74', *British Journal of Political Science* Volume 7 (1977), 129–90.
 7. Heath, Jowell and Curtice, *How Britain Votes*. See also Heath *et al.*, *Understanding Political Change*.
 8. Heath, Jowell and Curtice, *How Britain Votes*, pp. 35–9.
 9. Anthony Heath, 'Comment on Dennis Kavanagh's "How We Vote Now"', *Electoral Studies* Volume 5 (April 1986), 30.
 10. See Crewe, Särilvik and Alt, 'Partisan Dealignment in Britain 1964–74'.
 11. Heath, Jowell and Curtice, *How Britain Votes*, p. 62. See also 'How did Labour lose in 1992?' by the same authors, *Independent on Sunday*, 29 May 1994.
 12. Clarke *et al.*, *Political Choice in Britain*, especially chapters 2 and 10.
 13. Anthony Downs, *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (New York: Harper, 1957), and see, more recently, David Robertson, *Class and the British Electorate* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).
 14. See, in particular, chapter 7 of Heath, Jowell and Curtice, *How Britain Votes*.
 15. Notably J. Lees-Marshment, *Political Marketing and British Political Parties* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).
 16. See Mark Abrams, 'Opinion Polls and Party Propaganda', *Public Opinion Quarterly* Volume 28 (Spring 1964), 13–19.
 17. See David Denver, Gordon Hands and Iain MacAllister, 'The Electoral Impact of Constituency Campaigning, 1992–2001', *Political Studies* Volume 52 (June 2004), 289–306.
 18. P. M. Williams, 'Two Notes on the British Electoral System', *Parliamentary Affairs*, Winter 1966–7, pp. 13–30.
 19. See Heath, Jowell and Curtice, *How Britain Votes*, chapter 11, pp. 157–69.
 20. See much of the research on the Electoral Commission's website, www.electoralcommission.org.uk. Most of the books on the 2001 election cited in the bibliography also address the question.
 21. See in particular Robert Worcester and Roger Mortimore, 'The Most Boring Election Ever?' in John Bartle, Simon Atkinson and Roger Mortimore (eds),

Political Communications: The General Election Campaign of 2001 (London: Frank Cass, 2002), pp. 143–58.

Chapter 14

1. This chapter deals solely with the cost of general elections; statistics are not readily available of total expenses incurred in local elections, though the sums involved are undoubtedly lower. Expenditure on Parliamentary by-elections is substantially greater than that in individual constituencies at a general election, as the spending limits are now much higher.
2. *The Funding of Political Parties in the United Kingdom*, Fifth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, Cm. 4057 (London: The Stationery Office, 1998). A comprehensive historical account is contained in *British Political Finance 1830–1980* by Michael Pinto-Duschinsky (Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1981). On the case for public subsidies see the Houghton Report, *Report of the Committee on Financial Aid to Political Parties* (London: HMSO, Cmnd. 6601, 1976) and *Paying for Party Politics: The Case for Public Subsidies* by Dick Leonard (London: Political and Economic Planning, 1975). The Electoral Commission also launched an investigation into party funding in 2003, and its report when published (no likely date is known at the time of writing) will probably provide the most up-to-date discussion of all the relevant issues.
3. *Election 2001: Campaign Spending* (London: Electoral Commission, 2002), available at www.electoralcommission.gov.uk.
4. These were three trade unions (Unison, MSF and USDAW), four groups campaigning principally on the issue of relations with the European Union (the Democracy Movement, the Yes campaign, the Campaign for an Independent Britain and the South Molton Declaration), Charter88, the Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child and Tacticalvoter.net.
5. David Butler and Richard Rose, *The British General Election of 1959* (London: Macmillan, 1960), pp. 144–5.
6. *Observer*, 11 April 1999.
7. Dick Leonard, *Paying for Party Politics* (London: Political and Economic Planning, 1975). See also Dick Leonard, 'Contrasts in Selected Western Democracies: Germany, Sweden, Britain', in Herbert E. Alexander (ed.), *Political Finance* (Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications, 1979), pp. 41–73.
8. See, for example, the MORI research published by the Electoral Commission in September 2003.
9. For a thorough discussion of the issue, by an opponent of public funding, see Pinto-Duschinsky, *British Political Finance 1830–1980*. A less ambitious proposal for public funding was put forward by a committee set up by the Hansard Society, under the chairmanship of Edmund Dell – see *Paying for Politics* (London: Hansard Society for Parliamentary Government, 1981). A later Hansard Society inquiry, chaired by Christopher Chataway, split three ways on the issue – see *Agenda for Change* (London: Hansard Society for Parliamentary Government, 1991).
10. Although there has never been direct public subsidy of general election campaigning in Britain, at one point money was made available by the European Parliament to help towards parties' election expenses in European

elections, though it was distributed on a capricious basis. This peaked in 1984. Some 69 per cent of the money was supposed to be paid out in advance, but this was only available to parties already represented in the Parliament. The remaining 31 per cent was paid out afterwards on the basis of percentage votes cast. The result was that, apart from three Northern Irish parties, only the Tories (£2.4 million), the Labour Party (£600,000) and the Scottish National Party (£100,000) received any money in advance, though the Liberals were given £150,000 by other European Liberal parties who were shocked by their exclusion. (The SDP also collected £8000 on account of a Labour MEP who had defected to them.) After the election, the Conservatives collected a further £390,000 and the Labour Party £350,000, while the Liberals got £98,000, the SDP £89,000 and the SNP a further £16,000. In the subsequent Euro-election, in 1989, the parties were again heavily subsidised by the European Parliament, though the grants were distributed on a rather different basis. From 1994, however, following a court action brought by the French Green Party, no money was provided by the European Parliament for election expenses, though the parties' activities between elections still receive funding, which is no longer entirely confined to parties represented in the Parliament.

11. The forfeiture of deposits is the one small if regular source of income to the Treasury which an election provides to offset the other costs. This peaked at almost £800,000 in 1997, and brought in £588,500 in 2001. (The number of deposits lost at each general election is recorded in Appendix 1.)
12. Pinto-Duschinsky, *British Political Finance 1830–1980*, p. 267.
13. Electoral Commission, *Funding Democracy* (Consultation Paper, September 2002).

Chapter 15

1. With recent changes in departmental responsibilities, the Constitutional Affairs Committee rather than the Home Affairs Committee would probably now be the relevant one.
2. Electoral Commission, *Voting for Change: An Electoral Law Modernisation Programme* (London, 2003), available at www.electoralcommission.gov.uk.

Appendix 3

1. Legal advice from the Home Office to this effect was quoted in the Fourth Report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee 1997–8, paragraph 71.

Appendix 8

1. This appendix is largely an updating, by kind permission of the Economist Publishing Company, of the introduction one of the authors wrote to Dick Leonard and Richard Natkiel, *World Atlas of Elections* (London: Economist Publishing Co., 1986).
2. Readers interested in exploring the arcane mathematics of the benefits of the various systems to different sizes of party should consult M. Balinski

and H. P. Young, *Fair Representation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982) and Iain McLean and Roger Mortimore, 'Apportionment and the Boundary Commission for England', *Electoral Studies* Volume 11 (1992).

3. Although AMS systems normally use two votes, allowing voters to distinguish between their preferred local candidate and preferred regional party, it is possible to adapt the system so that it requires only a single vote (the vote for the constituency candidate being also counted as a vote for his or her party). A report by the Hansard Society, *Commission on Electoral Reform* (London: Hansard Society, 1976), recommended such a system for Britain, but found little sympathy.

Bibliography

For further reading on the topics covered in each chapter, see the notes to the chapter, especially the first note in each case. [The publisher Macmillan (Basingstoke) changed its name to Palgrave Macmillan in 2000.]

Election results

Summary statistics of all elections in Britain (Parliamentary, European, and local) have been published since 1993 in the annual *British Elections and Parties Review* (London: Frank Cass).

Full results of general elections, together with biographical details of members and of defeated candidates are published shortly after each election in *The Times Guide to the House of Commons* (London: Times Books). The series goes back to 1929, and also appeared after the elections of January 1910, December 1910 and 1918. Less detailed results are given also in *Dod's Parliamentary Companion* (London: Vacher-Dod Publishing), published annually, *Vacher's Parliamentary Guide* (London: Vacher-Dod Publishing), quarterly and *Whitaker's Almanack*, annually (London: The Stationery Office).

Tabulated results for all constituencies from 1832 to 1983 inclusive are included in five volumes compiled by the late F. W. S. Craig: *British Parliamentary Election Results 1832–85*, 2nd edition (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1989); *British Parliamentary Election Results 1885–1918*, 2nd edition (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1989); *British Parliamentary Election Results 1918–49*, 3rd edition (Chichester: Parliamentary Research Services, 1983); *British Parliamentary Election Results 1950–1973*, 2nd edition (Chichester: Parliamentary Research Services, 1983) and *British Parliamentary Election Results 1974–1983* (Chichester: Parliamentary Research Services, 1984). The series has now been taken up by Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher, *British Parliamentary Election Results 1983–1997* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999). In 2001 for the first time official results were published by the Electoral Commission, again collated by Rallings and Thrasher and accompanied by the Commission's initial report on the election: *Election 2001: The Official Results* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2001). Summaries are included in *Twentieth Century British Political Facts 1900–2000* by David Butler and Gareth Butler (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), and in Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher, *British Electoral Facts 1832–1999*, 6th edition (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

Results of elections to the European Parliament are given in *The Times Guide to the European Parliament* (Times Books, 1979, 1984, 1989 and 1994) and in *Europe Votes 2: European Parliamentary Election Results 1979–84*, Thomas T. Mackie and F. W. S. Craig (eds) (Chichester: Parliamentary Research Services, 1985) and *Europe Votes 3* by Thomas Mackie (Aldershot: Dartmouth Press, 1990). Local election results in detail are collected in the annual *Local Elections Handbook*, compiled by Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher and published by the *Local Government Chronicle*.

Results of the elections to the Scottish and Welsh Parliaments are reported in *Whitaker's Almanack* (London: The Stationery Office) for the following year.

General elections

A general overview of all the elections from 1945 to 1987 is given in *British General Elections since 1945* by David Butler (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989). More detailed accounts of individual elections are provided in a series of books sponsored by Nuffield College, Oxford: *The British General Election of 1945* by R. B. McCallum and Alison Readman (London: Macmillan, 1947); *The British General Election of 1950* by H. G. Nicholas (London: Macmillan, 1951); *The British General Election of 1951* by D. E. Butler (London: Macmillan, 1952); *The British General Election of 1955* by D. E. Butler (London: Macmillan, 1955); *The British General Election of 1959* by D. E. Butler and Richard Rose (London: Macmillan, 1960); *The British General Election of 1964* by D. E. Butler and Anthony King (London: Macmillan, 1965); *The British General Election of 1966* by D. E. Butler and Anthony King (London: Macmillan, 1966); *The British General Election of 1970* by David Butler and Michael Pinto-Duschinsky (London: Macmillan, 1971); *The British General Election of February 1974* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1974); *The British General Election of October 1974* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1975); *The British General Election of 1979* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1980); *The British General Election of 1983* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1984); *The British General Election of 1987* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1988); *The British General Election of 1992* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (London: Macmillan, 1992); *The British General Election of 1997* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997) and *The British General Election of 2001* by David Butler and Dennis Kavanagh (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

A rival series, published by the American Enterprise Institute in Washington DC, first appeared in 1974. The titles were *Britain at the Polls: The Parliamentary Elections of 1974*, edited by Howard R. Penniman; *Britain at the Polls 1979*, edited by Howard R. Penniman; *Britain at the Polls 1983*, edited by Austin Ranney. A new series with the same title has covered the last three elections, all edited by Anthony King: *Britain at the Polls 1992* (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1993), *New Labour Triumphs: Britain at the Polls* (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1998), and *Britain at the Polls 2001* (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 2002).

A third series, focusing on the specific topic of political communications, has covered every election since 1979, usually including articles by the parties' own campaign chiefs. The titles are: *Political Communications: The British General Election of 1979*, edited by Robert Worcester and Martin Harrop (London: Macmillan, 1982); *Political Communications: The 1983 Election Campaign*, edited by Ivor Crewe and Martin Harrop (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); *Political Communications: The General Election Campaign of 1987*, edited by Ivor Crewe and Martin Harrop (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); *Political Communications: The General Election Campaign of 1992*, edited by Ivor Crewe and Brian Gosschalk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); *Political Communications: Why Labour Won the General Election of 1997*, edited by Ivor Crewe, Brian Gosschalk and John Bartle (London: Frank Cass, 1998) and *Political*

Communications: The General Election Campaign of 2001, edited by John Bartle, Simon Atkinson and Roger Mortimore (London: Frank Cass, 2002).

The last two elections are examined from the different dimension of public opinion of the issues and participants, as revealed by the opinion polls, by Robert Worcester and Roger Mortimore in *Explaining Labour's Landslide* (London: Politico's Publishing, 1999) and *Explaining Labour's Second Landslide* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2001).

Most recent elections have also produced a crop of more detailed studies of various aspects of the campaign and edited collections of articles. Books on the 1997 election include Andrew Geddes and Jonathan Tonge (eds), *Labour's Landslide: The British General Election of 1997* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997); Pippa Norris and Neil Gavin (eds), *Britain Votes 1997* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) and *British Elections and Parties Review Volume 8: The 1997 British General Election* (London: Frank Cass, 1997). On 2001: Andrew Geddes and Jonathan Tonge (eds), *Labour's Second Landslide: The British General Election of 2001* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), Pippa Norris (ed.) *Britain Votes 2001* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) and *British Elections and Parties Review Volume 12* (London: Frank Cass, 2002).

An interesting interpretation of recent election campaigns is provided by *Designer Politics: How Elections are Won*, by Margaret Scammell (London: Macmillan, 1995). Dennis Kavanagh assesses recent tactical and technological developments in *Election Campaigning* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995).

Voting studies

The major works are the successive volumes reporting the findings of the British Election Surveys, listed in the notes to Chapter 13. See also *The British Electorate, 1963–87: A Compendium of Data from the British Election Studies*, by Ivor Crewe, Neil Day and Anthony Fox (Cambridge University Press, 1991). A separate volume on Scotland is *The End of British Politics?* by W. L. Miller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981). An offshoot of this series is *Class and the British Electorate* by David Robertson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984). For other analyses, see also *How Voters Decide* by Hilde T. Himmelweit, Patrick Humphreys and Marianne Jaeger (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985, 2nd edition), *Electoral Change in Britain since 1945* by Pippa Norris (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1997), *Elections and Voting Behaviour in Britain* by David Denver (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), *The Loyalties of Voters* by Richard Rose and Ian McAllister (London: Sage Publications, 1990), and Geoffrey Evans and Pippa Norris (eds), *Critical Elections* (London: Sage Publications, 1999).

The electoral system

The fullest and most up-to-date account is *The Electoral System in Britain* by Robert Blackburn (London: Macmillan, 1995). An authoritative historical survey is *The Electoral System in Britain since 1918* by D. E. Butler, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963). Critical assessments are made in *Political Representation and Elections in Britain* by P. J. Pulzer (London: Allen and Unwin, 1968) and *British Elections* by Geoffrey Alderman (London: Batsford, 1978).

On the relationship between seats and votes in the electoral system, and reasons for the bias currently being shown towards Labour, see Ron Johnston, Charles Pattie, Danny Dorling and David Rossiter, *From Votes to Seats* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001). An alternative electoral system for Britain is proposed in *The Report of the Independent Commission on the Voting System* (London: The Stationery Office, 1998), although this does not attempt to assess the case for replacing 'first past the post'.

The effects of different electoral systems on party systems and political culture are comprehensively examined in *Electoral Systems and Party Systems* by Arend Lijphart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); see also David Farrell, *Comparing Electoral Systems* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998) and *Electoral Systems: A Comparative and Theoretical Introduction* by Andrew Reeve and Alan Ware (London: Routledge, 1992). Slightly older surveys containing information on other electoral systems and on elections in other democratic countries include Vernon Bogdanor and David Butler (eds), *Democracy and Elections: Electoral Systems and their Political Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), and *World Atlas of Elections: Voting Patterns in 39 Democracies* by Dick Leonard and Richard Natkiel (London: Economist Publishing Company, 1986).

Election law

The standard reference book is *Schofield's Election Law* (2nd edition) edited by Andrew Scallon and Rory Mates (Crayford: Shaw and Sons, 1996), loose-leaf with regular update supplements now accompanied by a CD-ROM of the entire text. See also *Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*, edited by William McKay, Frank Cranmer, *et al.*, 23rd edition (London: LexisNexis UK, 2004) and *Law and the Electoral Process* by H. F. Rawlings (London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1988). The Electoral Commission also issues regular detailed notes of guidance for candidates, agents, administrators and voters, which are available on its website (www.electoralcommission.gov.uk).

Internet sources

In recent years the Internet has emerged as a useful resource for statistics and reference, on politics as on other subjects, and can naturally be more up to date than the published texts, but often at the price of losing authoritative reliability. Among the relevant sites which can certainly be relied upon are the Research Papers in the House of Commons Library (www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_publications_and_archives/research_papers.htm), and the Electoral Commission's website, mentioned above.

Index

- 1922 Committee, 48–9, 52, 53, 54, 58
abortion as election issue, 70, 125, 204
Abrams, Mark, 190–1, 260
absent voting *see* postal voting, proxy voting
abstention *see* turnout
Acting Returning Officer, 11, 15
Additional Member System (AMS) *see* electoral systems
adoption meetings, 107–8
advertising, political, 42, 69, 121–2
 cost of, 198–9
 in the press, 132
 on posters, 114, 193
age
 minimum for candidature, 83
 of candidates, 96
agents, 49, 77, 79, 108–17, 136, 202
 borrowed from other constituencies
 in by-elections, 147
 cost of employing, 77, 80, 100
 election agent, law regarding,
 105–6, 201, 228–33
 liaison with party HQ, 44
 number falling in recent years, 77
Alderman, Geoffrey, 266
Alexander, Herbert E., 261
aliens, 12, 83
all-postal voting experiments, 8,
 119–20, 157, 196, 255
Alliance Party (APNI) *see* Northern
 Ireland political parties
Alliance, Liberal-SDP, 62–3 *and passim*
Alt, James, 260
Alternative Vote (AV) *see* electoral
 systems
Ancram, Michael, 54
apathy and turnout, 195
Archer, Jeffrey (Lord Archer of
 Weston-super-Mare), 94
armed forces
 barred from candidature, 85–6
 voting by servicemen *see* service
 voters
Ashdown, Paddy, 63
Asian candidates, 98
Asian voters, 19
Asquith, Herbert, 61, 62
Assheton, Sir Ralph, 24
Atkinson, Simon, 256, 260, 266
attainers, 13, 15, 17
Attlee, Clement, 5, 56

Balfour, Arthur, 45
Balinski, M., 263
Ballard, Jackie, 63
Ballot Act (1872), 209
ballot boxes, 118, 135, 136
 collection and transport to count,
 138, 139
ballot paper, 135–6, 142
 counterfoils, 135, 138, 141
 interpretation of during count, 140
 mixing of papers from different
 ballot boxes, 139
 party names and symbols on, 43–4,
 89, 107, 136, 210, 252
 retained after election, 141
 sent out to postal voters, 117–18,
 120, 255
 spoilt and blank papers, 248, 258
 validation of, 135, 136, 140, 141,
 248, 256
 See also counting of votes
ballot paper account, 138, 139, 141
bandwagon effect, 8, 175
bankruptcy as bar to candidature, 84,
 145
Bartle, John, 256, 260, 265, 266
Baston, Lewis, 251
Beaufort Research, 166
Beckett, Margaret, 57
Beith, Alan, 63
Bell, Martin, 72, 253

- Benn, Tony, 56, 86, 254
 Bevin, Ernest, 1
 bias in electoral system, 30–1
 black candidates, 98
 black voters, 19
 Blackburn, Robert, 266
 Blair, Tony, 5, 10, 34, 41, 46, 57, 60, 67, 126, 129, 143, 174, 194, 254
 Blakenham, Lord, 50
 blind voters, 136, 224
 block vote (of unions at Labour conference), 45, 57
 Bochel, H. M., 257
 Bochel, Jean, 258
 Bogdanor, Vernon, 247, 249, 258, 267
 Boothroyd, David, 253
 borough and county constituencies, differences, 11, 22–3, 25, 200
 borough councils *see* local government
 Bossiney, 251
 Boundary Commissions, 22–31, 201, 251
 Bowman, Phyllis, 204
 British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 72, 125, 129
 election night exit poll, 143, 165
 election website, 125
See also television, radio
 British Election Panel Study (BEPS), 191
 British Election Studies (BES), 179–90
British Journalism Review, 256
 British National Party, 67, 68, 125
 British Polling Council, 175, 259
 broadcasting *see* television, radio
 broadcasts, party political, 42, 114, 124–7, 199, 207
 Broughton, David, 258
 Bruce, Malcolm, 63
 burgh *see* borough
 Burke, Edmund, 101
 business links with Conservative Party, 122, 204, 205
 business vote, 13, 249
 Butcher, B., 250
 Butler swing, 37
 Butler, David, ix–x, 36, 99, 107, 179, 184, 202, 235, 245, 247, 249, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 264, 265, 266, 267
 Butler, Gareth, 253, 264
 by-elections, local, 6, 67, 155
 by-elections, Parliamentary, 36, 86, 87, 127, 134, 142, 144–53, 180, 193, 253, 254
 and minor parties/independents, 67, 69, 70, 71, 147
 and rise of the SDP, 62–3
 causes, 145
 effect of poor results on government, 7, 62, 148–51
 effect on election timing, 6, 7
 exit polls at, 143
 frequency of, 145
 imposition of candidates by Labour Party NEC, 93
 limit on expenses, 147, 200, 203
 nationalist gains at, 64, 65, 150, 151
 opinion polls in, 164, 165, 171
 timetable for, 227
 timing of, 8, 145
 Cairns, David, 254
 Callaghan, James, 5, 7, 26, 62, 129, 148, 174
 campaign
 effect on voting behaviour, 191–4
 in the constituencies, 104–20
 length of, 10
 nationally, 121–33
 Campbell, Angus, 260
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 61
 Canavan, Dennis, 72
 candidate selection
 criteria, 95–101
 deselection and mandatory
 reselection of sitting MPs, 102–3
 influence of party headquarters, 90, 92–3
 procedures, 87–95
 selection conferences, 90–2
 shortlists, 88–90, 93, 94–5
 shortlists, all-women, 93, 97
 candidates, 83–103 *and passim*
 effect on voting behaviour, 78, 95, 148, 193–4

- eligibility, 83–7
- number of, 35
- occupations and professions of, 98–100, 234–5
- training and vetting of, 43, 87
- canvassing, 79–80, 81, 111–13, 114, 116, 193, 199
- ‘carpet baggers’, 96
- cars
 - conveying voters to the poll, 115, 117, 138, 230, 232
 - for campaigning (by loudspeaker), 137
- casting vote in event of a tie, 140
- Central Office *see* Conservative Party
- Centre for Research into Elections and Social Trends (CREST), 179
- Chandler, J. A., 257
- Channel 4, 125, 236
- Chiltern Hundreds, 145
- city councils *see* local government
- City of London, 249
- civil servants, disqualified from sitting in Commons, 85
- Clarke, Harold, 190, 260
- Clarke, Kenneth, 53, 54
- class and voting behaviour, 180–4
- Clause Four of Labour Party
 - constitution, 56, 60
- clergy, eligibility as candidates, 84, 87
- Commission on Candidate Selection, 254
- Committee on Standards in Public Life (Neill Committee), 81, 197, 198, 206, 253, 259, 261
- committee rooms, 80, 106, 137
- Common Market *see* European Economic Community
- Commonwealth citizens
 - eligibility as candidates, 83
 - voting rights, 12
- Communicate Research, 166
- Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), 65, 127
- Community Charge (‘poll tax’), 19, 251
- community councils *see* local government
- compulsory voting, 196
- computers, 43, 79, 112, 113, 142, 155, *see also* e-mail, Internet
- conferences, party, 44–7, *see also under party names*
 - local parties represented at, 76
- Conservative Future, 49, 75, 77, 81
- Conservative Party
 - candidate selection and training, 87–95
 - Central Office, 41–2, 44, 48, 77, 87, 93, 94, 98
 - conference, 44–5
 - election of leader, 49–54
 - Ethics and Integrity Committee, 93
 - history and organisation, 47–55 and *passim*
- constituencies, 22–31 and *passim*
 - number of electors, 27–9
- constituency campaigns, effect on votes, 193
- constituency parties *see* local parties
- Constituency Plan Agreements, 254
- Constitutional Affairs Select Committee, 262
- Converse, Philip, 260
- Cook, Chris, 257
- Co-operative Party, 59, 60, 61
- Co-operative Societies, affiliated to Labour Party, 58, 76, 95, 106
- Corlett, T., 250
- corrupt and illegal practices, 115–16, 119, 142, 228–33
 - Corrupt Practices Act (1883), 209
 - penalties for, 12, 84, 228–33
- cost of elections, 197–207, *see also* finances of parties
- councillors *see* local government elections
- counting agents, 138
- counting of votes, 117, 138–40, 207
- county and borough constituencies, differences, 23, 25, 200
- county councils *see* local government
- Cowley Street *see* Liberal Democrats
- Craig, F. W. S., 264
- Crewe, Ivor, 180, 189, 259, 260, 265, 266
- Criddle, Byron, 235, 251, 253, 254
- cube law, 32–3, 252

- Curtice, John, 180, 245, 251, 252, 259, 260
- D'Hondt divisors *see* electoral systems
- D'Hondt, Victor, 240
- Dáil *see* Ireland, Republic of
- Daily Express*, 131, 132
- Daily Mail*, 131
- Daily Mirror*, 130–1, 132
- Daily Star*, 130–1
- Daily Telegraph*, 131, 165, 166, 236
- dates of general elections, 8
- Davies, S. O., 253
- Davis, David, 54
- Day, Neil, 266
- Deacon, David, 256
- death of a candidate, 227
- debates
 - between constituency candidates, 111
 - between party leaders, 129–30
- declaration of election expenses *see* expenditure, limitations on
- declaration of local connection, 250
- deed poll to adopt misleading name for election, 252
- Dell, Edmund, 261
- Democratic Unionist Party *see* Northern Ireland political parties
- Denver, David, 254, 257, 258, 260, 266
- deposit, 86, 105, 108, 206, 262
 - at non-Parliamentary elections, 105
 - increased in 1980s, 35, 67, 147, 208
 - number lost, table, 212–14
 - recounts over lost deposits, 140
- deselection of sitting MPs, 102–3
- Dewey, Thomas E., 168
- disabled voters, 117, 134, 211
- disqualifications from membership of Commons, 83–7, 145
- Disraeli, Benjamin (Earl of Beaconsfield), 6, 47, 130
- dissolution of Parliament, 9, 10, 108, 122, 199, 226
- district councils *see* local government
- Dodd, P., 250
- Donsbach, Wolfgang, 259
- Dorling, Danny, 251, 267
- Douglas-Home, Sir Alec (Lord Home of the Hirsell), 50, 127, 141, 149, 150
- Downs, Anthony, 190, 260
- Droop quota, 240, 241–2
- Duncan Smith, Iain, 53, 54, 152
- Dunleavy, Patrick, 245
- Dunwich, 251
- Durant, Henry, 165
- Ecology Party *see* Green Party
- Economic and Social Research Council, 179
- economic confidence as factor in voting behaviour, 192
- Economist, The*, 236, 249, 262
- Eden, Sir Anthony, 6
- education and voting behaviour, 187
- Edward I, 208
- election address, 113–14, 123
- election expenses *see* expenditure
- election petitions *see* petitions
- electoral college
 - Conservative (Mayor of London), 94
 - Labour Party, 56, 95, 102
- Electoral Commission, 201, 208
 - and all-postal voting, 119
 - and party accounts, 174, 198–9, 201
 - and party political broadcasts, 124, 125
 - establishment of, 2, 201, 208, 211
 - registration of parties, 44, 65, 252–3
 - registration of 'third-party' campaigners, 199
 - reports and recommendations, 83, 135, 163, 186, 198, 203, 207, 248, 250, 254, 255, 256, 261, 262, 264
 - research commissioned by, 193, 260, 261
 - to absorb Boundary Commissions, 25, 201
 - website, 267
- Electoral Fraud (Northern Ireland) Act (2002), 250
- Electoral Reform Society, 34, 254

- Electoral Registration Officer *see*
Registration Officer
- electoral systems, 34–5, 238–45
- Additional Member System (AMS), 34, 158, 161, 242–4
 - Alternative Vote, 34, 63, 238, 244
 - AV-plus, 34–5, 244
 - Belgian system, 241
 - D'Hondt divisors, 157, 240, 241, 243
 - 'first past the post' (present system), 31–4, 156, 238
 - party effects of, 33–4, 68, 70, 244
 - party lists, 239–41
 - proposed referendum on, 162
 - Sainte-Laguë divisors, 241
 - Single Transferable Vote (STV), 34, 154, 157, 239, 241–2, 244, 246–7
 - Supplementary Vote, 160, 238, 239
- eligibility to vote, 83–7, *see also*
Register of Electors
- historic growth of franchise, 12–13
- Elizabeth II, 10
- e-mail, 78, 109, 114, 122
- envelopes, addressing of, 113
- Erskine May*, 267
- ethnic minority candidates, 90, 98
- European Court of Human Rights, 204, 250
- European Economic Community (EEC), referendum on (1975), 162, 221
- European Parliament elections, 134, 156–8
- candidate stands as Literal Democrat, 43–4
 - counting of votes, 138
 - deposit, 105
 - electoral system, 34, 157, 240, 241
 - eligibility of candidates, 83, 84
 - eligibility to vote, 12, 16, 17, 18
 - experimental voting method (2004), 119
 - free delivery of election addresses, 255
 - Green Party in, 67, 68
 - offences at, 231, 232
 - public subsidies for campaigning, 261
 - results, 215–18
 - spending limits, 201
 - timetable for, 227
 - turnout, 195, 215–18
 - UK Independence Party in, 69
- European Union
- single currency, 48, 162
 - voting rights of EU citizens in Britain, 12, 17
- Evans, Geoffrey, 259, 260, 266
- Evening Standard* (London), 192, 236
- Excalibur, 43
- exit polls, 142–3, 165, 176, 237
- expenditure, limitations on
- by-elections, 147, 200, 203
 - in constituencies, 105, 127, 142, 200, 201–2, 229, 231
 - national, 198
 - non-Parliamentary elections, 200
 - third-party spending, 199, 204
- Fabian Society, 55, 59, 60, 76
- false names, standing for election under, 252
- Farrell, David, 267
- Field, Julia, 259, 260
- finances of parties
- business contributions, 81, 205
 - foreign funding, 205
 - local, 81, 100–1, 106, 122
 - membership subscriptions, 55, 59–60, 74, 81, 204
 - national, 42, 204–6, 261
 - trade union contributions to Labour, 44, 59–60, 74, 81, 100–1, 204, 254
- Financial Times*, 130–1, 165, 255
- 'first past the post' *see* electoral systems
- Fisher, Justin, 81
- floating voters, 178, 188–94
- focus groups, 173, 174
- Foot and Mouth Disease (outbreak in 2001), 5, 10, 249, 257
- Foot, Michael, 7, 10, 56, 129, 174, 206
- football, 169, 249

- foreign funding of political parties, 205
- foreign residents, 12, 83
- Fox, Anthony, 266
- franchise *see* eligibility to vote
- Frankland, Pamela, 250
- Fraser, Hugh, 51
- free delivery of election addresses, 113, 206, 207
- free hire of meeting halls, 207
- Freud, Clement, 176
- fundraising *see* finances of parties
- Gaitskell, Hugh, 40, 56
- Galloway, George, 66
- Gallup polls, 143, 170, 236
- Gallup, George, 171
- Gardiner, Sir George, 69, 71
- Gavin, Neil, 266
- Gavron, Nicky, 161
- Geddes, Andrew, 266
- gender and voting behaviour, 187
- generational effect on voting behaviour, 180
- gerrymandering, 25, 31
- Gladstone, William, 61, 130
- Goldsmith, Sir James, 69, 125
- Goodhart, Philip, 258
- Gordon Walker, Patrick, 150
- Gosschalk, Brian, 265
- Gould, Brian, 57
- Gould, Philip (Lord), 174, 259
- Government Social Survey, 19
- Gow, Ian, 151
- Granada TV, 127
- Gray, P. G., 250
- Greater London Authority (GLA), 160–1
 referendum to establish, 162
 result of referendum on, 223
- Greater London Council (GLC), 95, 122, 160, 161, 258
- Green Party, 65, 67, 68, 69, 161, 252
- Grofman, Bernard, 249
- Guardian*, The, 130–1, 165, 236, 256
- Hagenbach-Bischoff quota, 240
- Hague, William, 47, 48, 53, 102
- Halliwell, Geri, 127
- Hamilton, Neil, 93
- Hands, Gordon, 254, 260
- Hansard Society, 13, 261, 263
- Hardie, J. Keir, 55
- Hare, Thomas, 239
- Harris Research, 143, 166, 174
- Harrison, Martin, 126, 256
- Harrop, Martin, 256, 265
- Hastings Agreement, 100
- Hattersley, Roy, 56, 57
- Healey, Denis, 56
- Heath, Anthony, 180, 183, 187, 188, 189, 190, 251, 259, 260
- Heath, Edward, 7, 45, 47, 50, 51
- Heffer, Eric, 56, 57
- Henig, Simon, 251
- Heseltine, Michael, 51, 52
- Himmelweit, Hilde, 266
- Home Affairs Select Committee, 210–11
- Home of the Hirsels, Lord (formerly 14th Earl of Home) *see* Douglas-Home, Sir Alec
- homeless people, voting rights, 250
- Houghton Report on party finance (1975), 206, 261
- hours of polling, 134, 138, 210
- House of Commons Disqualification Acts (1957 and 1975), 85, 145
- House of Lords
 elevation to peerage as cause of by-elections, 145
 members' ineligibility to sit in Commons, 83, 86
 use of peers in election campaigns, 122
 voting rights of members, 12, 17, 162
- housing and voting behaviour, 185
- Howard, Michael, 49, 53, 54, 152
- Howe, Sir Geoffrey, 51
- Hudson, Hugh, 126
- Hughes, Simon, 63
- Hume, John, 70
- Humphreys, Patrick, 266
- Hurd, Douglas, 52
- ICM Research, 165, 170, 172, 236, 259

- identification, acceptable forms of, 256
- ideology and voting behaviour, 188–90
- illegal practices *see* corrupt and illegal practices
- Imperiali quota, 240
- incapacitated voters, 117, 134, 211
- independent candidates, 44, 70, 86, 105, 106, 202
at local elections, 72, 95, 155, 161
in by-elections, 147
- Independent Commission on the Voting System *see* Jenkins Commission
- Independent Labour Party, 55
- Independent Television (ITV), 125, 129, *see also* television
- Independent*, The, 130, 166
- Ingle, Stephen, 252
- Inglehart, Ronald, 189
- Internet, 209
as reference source, 155, 267
BBC election website, 125
conducting opinion polls through, 171, 258–9
influence on voters, 193
provision of forms on, 20, 224, 225
publication of opinion polls on, 165, 259
use by MPs, 78
use by voters as information source, 114
- IRA (Irish Republican Army), 71, 84, 151
- Ireland, Republic of
electoral system (STV), 34, 242
eligibility of citizens as candidates, 83
members of Dáil and Seanad as candidates, 85
voting rights of citizens, 12, 15
- ITN, 143, 165, *see also* television
- Jaeger, Marianne, 266
- James II, 47, 61
- Jenkins Commission (Independent Commission on the Voting System), 35, 244
- Jenkins, Roy (Lord Jenkins of Hillhead), 35, 62, 151
- Jennifer's Ear, 126
- Jewish voters, 136
- Johnston, Ron, 251, 267
- Jones, Bill, 249
- Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, 254
- Jowell, Roger, 180, 251, 259, 260
- Jowett, Paul, 257
- Junz, Alfred J., 13
- Kaufman, Gerald, 123
- Kavanagh, Dennis, 99, 107, 235, 245, 249, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 258, 259, 260, 265, 266
- Kellner, Peter, 259
- Kennedy, Charles, 63
- Kennedy, John F., 129
- Kidderminster Hospital and Health Concern Party, 72
- Kilfedder, Sir James, 253
- King, Anthony, 258, 265
- Kinnock, Neil, 41, 56, 57, 60, 93, 102, 126, 129, 133, 194
- Kitzinger, Uwe, 258
knocking up, 137, 138
- Labour Party
candidate selection, 87–95
conference, 40, 41, 45, 46, 56, 59, 60, 93, 96
election of leader, 56–7
history and organisation, 55–60
National Executive Committee (NEC), 40, 42, 58, 93, 123
National Policy Forum, 46
party headquarters ('Old Queen Street'), 41–4, 59, 76, 88, 90, 159
and passim
- Labour Party Young Socialists *see* Young Labour
- Labour Representation Committee, 55
- Labour Students, 59, 82
- Labour Youth *see* Young Labour
- leadership elections
Conservative, 49–54
Labour Party, 56–7
Liberal Democrats, 63
- leaflets, 112, 114, 123, 125, 193, 204

- Lees-Marshment, Jennifer, 260
length of campaign, 10
Leonard, Dick, ix, x, 249, 254, 259,
261, 262, 267
Liberal Democrats
election of leader, 63
federal headquarters ('Cowley
Street'), 41
federal party conference, 46, 64
history and party structure, 60–4
and passim
Liberal Party (modern), 63, 68
Liberal Party (to 1988) *see* Liberal
Democrats
Liberal Unionists, 47, 61
Lib-Lab pact, 62, 148
Lijphart, Arend, 249, 267
Lilley, Peter, 53
Linton, Martin, 256
Literal Democrat, 44
Literary Digest poll, 171
Livingstone, Ken, 72, 95, 161
Lloyd George, David, 5, 62
local government elections, 80, 105,
107, 153–6, 257, 264
date of, 8, 10
effect on general election timing, 7,
8
electoral system, 155, 238
eligibility of candidates, 83, 84, 85
eligibility to vote, 12, 16, 17
expenditure, 201
experimental voting methods, 8,
119, 157, 196
far-right parties in, 67
hours of polling, 134
independent candidates in, 71–2
offences at, 232
proportional representation, 34
spending limits, 200–1
turnout, 195
local government reorganisation, 26,
154, 156
local parties, 73–82, 88, 113, 123
finances, 81, 100–1, 106, 122
officers and committees of, 75, 76
representation at national level, 45,
47–8, 56, 58, 64
selection of candidates, 90–103
See also campaign in the
constituencies
London *see also* Greater London
London Assembly, 68, 160–1
election results, 220–1
electoral system, 34, 240, 242–3
eligibility of candidates, 84
franchise, 249
selection of candidates, 94
London Mayor, 72, 160–1
candidate selection, 94–5
election results, 220
eligibility of candidates, 84
franchise, 249
lots drawn in event of a tie, 140
lunacy, 84, 145
Lyell, Sir Nicholas, 252

McAllister, Ian, 266
MacAllister, Iain, 260
McCallum, R. B., 265
MacCartney, Alan, 258
MacCartney, Robert, 70
MacDonald, James Ramsay, 62
McKee, Paul, 247
Mackie, Thomas, 264
McLean, Iain, 251, 263
McLoughlin, Patrick, 98
MacManaway, Revd J. G., 87
Macmillan, Harold, 149, 150
Mail on Sunday, 130, 166
Major, John, 7, 10, 52, 53, 126, 129,
133, 174, 194
majoritarian systems *see* electoral
systems
manifestos, 122–4, 157
drafting of, 46, 123
launch obscured by other events
(2001), 129
Marek, John, 72
Margetts, Helen, 245
marginal seats, 34, 75, 82, 122, 143,
148, 202, 252
by-elections in, 147
campaign in, 112–13, 116, 118, 121
candidates, 95–6
definition, 36
exit polls in, 143
number, 33, 36
spending higher, 77
visits by party leaders, 129

- Market Research Society, 168, 169, 258
- Marplan, 165
- Marquand, David, 257
- Maslow, Abraham, 189
- Maudling, Reginald, 50
- Maxwell, Robert, 132
- media *see* television, radio, newspapers
- meetings, public, 77, 111, 114, 115, 128, 148, 231
- membership of political parties, 54, 55, 59, 205
- affiliated members (Labour), 59, 74, 76, 87, 204
- subscription fees, 55, 59–60, 74, 81, 204
- mental illness
- effect on voting rights, 12, 250
- lunacy a disqualification from membership of Commons, 84, 145
- Meyer, Sir Anthony, 51
- Militant Tendency, 93
- Mill, John Stuart, 239
- Miller, Warren, 260
- Miller, William, 266
- Milne, Eddie, 253
- minor parties, 65–70, 93, 104, 201
- in by-elections, 147
- party political broadcasts by, 125
- treatment by electoral system, 34, 70
- minority ethnic candidates, 90, 98
- Molotov, Vyacheslav, 1
- Montfort, Simon de, 208
- Moon, Nick, 258, 259
- Moran, Michael, 249
- MORI (Market & Opinion Research International), 114, 143, 165, 170, 172, 174, 236, 237, 261
- poll findings on voting behaviour, 179, 183–8, 260
- Morris, H. L., 249
- Mortimore, Roger, x, 168, 237, 256, 258, 259, 260, 263, 266
- Murdoch, Rupert, 132
- National Executive Committee (NEC) *see* Labour Party
- National Front, 67, 68
- Natkiel, Richard, 249, 262, 267
- neighbourhood effect, 185
- Neil, Andrew, 92
- Neill, Patrick (Lord) *see* Committee on Standards in Public Life
- Nestlé UK, 260
- News Chronicle*, 164, 165
- news management, 42–3, 128–9
- News of the World*, 130, 132
- newspapers
- advertisements in *see* advertising
- commissioning opinion polls, 165–6
- election coverage, 130–2
- influence on voting, 132–3, 193
- local newspapers, 79
- regional press, 132
- See also* under titles of newspapers, news management
- Nicholas, H. G., 265
- Nicolson, Nigel, 91, 254
- Nixon, Richard M., 129
- Nolan, Lord, 197
- nominating officer, 43, 44, 229, 255
- nomination of candidates, 86, 108–9
- invalidation of (Harrow, 2002), 255
- NOP (National Opinion Polls), 143, 236, 237
- Norris, Pippa, 257, 266
- Norris, Steven, 95, 161
- Northern Ireland
- differences in procedure at general elections, 11, 15, 116, 135, 224, 249, 250, 251, 255
- political parties, 2, 33, 36, 47, 65, 70–1, 86
- referendum (1973), 162, 221
- referendum (1998), 162, 223
- representation in Commons, 27
- Single Transferable Vote, 34, 157, 241
- Northern Ireland Assembly, 71, 160, 254
- election results, 219
- eligibility of candidates, 83, 84
- Northstead, Manor of, 145
- National Assembly of Wales *see* Welsh Assembly

- Norton, Philip (Lord Norton of Louth), 249, 254
 notice of poll, 109
 Nuffield College, Oxford, 265
- O'Duffy, Brendan, 245
Observer, The, 130, 203, 236, 261
 observers banned at polling stations, 135
 occupation and voting behaviour, 180–4
 occupations of candidates, 98–100, 234–5
 Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS), 19
 offices of profit under the Crown, 85, 145
 official mark *see* ballot paper, validation of
 Official Monster Raving Loony Party, 69
 Official Unionist Party *see* Northern Ireland political parties
 Old Queen Street *see* Labour Party
 Old Sarum, 251
 'one member, one vote' (OMOV), 57, 95, 102
 Onslow, Cranley, 52
 opinion polls, 164–77
 banning, 176, 259
 British Polling Council, 175
 constituency polls, 171–2
 during the 2001 election, 236
 effect in by-elections, 148
 exit polls, 142, 165, 176
 findings on voting behaviour, 178–96
 focus groups, 173, 174
 influence on election timing, 6–7, 150
 influence on voters, 176, 193
 Internet polls, 171
 phone-in polls ('voodoo polls'), 172
 private polls, 173–5, 199
 sampling methods, 170–3
 Opinion Research Centre (ORC), 166, 169
 Orkney and Shetland Movement, 64
 overseas voters, 17, 21, 44, 208
 Owen, Dr David, 62, 63
 pagers, 109
 Paisley, Ian, 70
 Palmerston, 3rd Viscount, 61
 panachage, 242
 parental influence on voting behaviour, 179
 parish councils *see* local government
 Parkinson, Cecil, 9
 Parliament Act (1911), 4
 Parliamentary Constituencies Act (1986), 25
 Parliaments, length of, 4
 parties
 funding *see* finances of parties
 number registered, 65
 organisation at constituency and ward level, 73–82
 organisation at national level, 39–72
 staff levels and cost, 42, 204, 205
 party lists *see* electoral systems
 party names
 registration of, 44, 252–3
 use of misleading labels on ballot paper, 43–4, 252–3
 party political broadcasts, 42, 124–7, 193, 207
 cost of, 199
 Paterson, Peter, 254
 Patten, Chris, 122
 Pattie, Charles, 251, 267
 Peart, Fred, 148
 Peele, Gillian, 249
 peers *see* House of Lords
 Penniman, Howard R., 265
People, The (*Sunday*), 130
 personal vote of popular candidates, 78, 95, 148, 194
 personation, 116, 119, 230
 petition against election result, 127, 141–2
 Peyton, John, 51
 Pinto-Duschinsky, Michael, 198, 207, 250, 261, 262, 265
 Pinto-Duschinsky, S., 250
 Pitt, William, 151
 Plaid Cymru, 36, 65, 125, 159
 at by-elections, 65, 150

- plurality system ('first past the post')
 - see* electoral systems
- Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act (2000), 25, 163, 250
- poll cards, 117, 207, 231, 255
- poll tax *see* Community Charge
- polling clerks, 117, 134–7, 207
- polling districts, 16, 139
- polling stations, 117, 134–7, 248
- Poole, Lord, 6
- Populus, 166, 255
- Portillo, Michael, 52, 53, 54
- positive discrimination in candidate selection, 96–7
- Post Office, delivery of election addresses, 113, 206–7, 255
- postal voting, 20–1, 79–80, 117–20, 135
 - and party campaigns, 79–80, 112, 118–19
 - ballot box for, 118, 139
 - experimental all-postal voting, 8, 119–20, 157, 196, 255
 - extent at 2001 election, 117, 248
 - how to apply, 20, 224
 - timetable for applications, 20, 224, 226
- posters *see* advertising
- Powell, J. Enoch, 50
- Prescott, John, 56, 57, 129
- Presiding Officer, 134–6, 138
- press conferences, 122, 128, 133
- Press, The *see* newspapers
- priests, eligibility as candidates, 84, 87
- Prior, James, 51
- prisoners
 - eligibility as candidates, 84
 - voting rights, 12, 250
- private polls, 173–5, 199
- Pro-Life Alliance, 70, 125
- Prolongation of Parliament Acts, 4
- proportional representation *see* electoral systems
- proposers of candidates, 108
- prospective Parliamentary candidate, 49, 77, 107, 200, 253
- protest votes, 68, 153
- proxy voting, 21, 135, 226, 230
 - election offences connected with, 230
 - eligibility and making applications, 224–5
- public funding of political parties, proposals for, 206
- Pulzer, P. J., 266
- qualifying date for inclusion on electoral register, 249
- Queen, The, theoretical powers of, 4
- quota, constituency (Conservative Party), 55
- quota, electoral, 28, 29
- quota sample *see* opinion polls
- radio, 42, 73, 121, 122, 123, 127, 128, 130, 133, 142, 172, 193, 207, 209, 231
- Rallings, Colin, 252, 257, 264
- Ramsden, John, 257
- Ranney, Austin, 253, 258, 265
- Rawlings, H. F., 267
- Readman, Alison, 265
- recounts, 140, 142
- Redgrave, Vanessa, 66
- redistribution of seats *see* Boundary Commissions
- Redwood, John, 52, 53
- Reeve, Andrew, 267
- Referendum Party, 69, 71, 125, 198
- referendums, 161–3
 - on Scottish devolution (1979), 64
 - results of, 221–3
- Reform Acts (1832, 1867), 22, 47, 208
- region and voting behaviour, 185
- regional devolution, 156
- Register of Electors, 13–21, 108, 113, 135
 - accuracy, 19–20, 194, 210, 250, 251
 - cost of compiling, 206–7, 250
 - double registration, 15
 - 'ex-directory' registration, 16
 - illustration, 18
 - late claims for inclusion, 249
 - marked, by Presiding Officer on issue of ballot paper, 136, 138, 141

- marked-up registers for
 - campaigning, 79–80, 111, 112, 137
- objections to errors and omissions, 15
- open to public inspection, 16
- qualifying date, 19, 249
- rolling register, 13, 19, 211
- sale of, 16
- use as a sampling frame for opinion polls, 170
- use for crime prevention and credit checks, 16
- used for selecting juries, 16, 250
- Registration Officer (ERO), 13, 15, 16, 249
- religion, 70
- religious objections to voting, 8, 136
- remand prisoners, voting rights of, 250
- Rendel, David, 63
- Representation of the People Acts, 12, 17, 22, 25, 107, 127, 139, 209, 210
- reselection of candidates, 102–3
- residency requirements for
 - candidates, 84
- Respect, 66
- Returning Officer, 11 *and passim*
- Returning Officers' expenses, 207
- Richards, P. G., 254
- Richards, Paul, 254
- Riddell, Peter, 254
- Robertson, David, 266
- Rodgers, William, 62
- Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 171
- Rose, Richard, 202, 256, 261, 265, 266
- Rossiter, David, 251, 252, 267
- rotten boroughs, 22, 251
- Royal Mail *see* Post Office
- Royal Proclamation of dissolution, 9, 11, 145
- Rush, Michael, 254

- safe seats, 24, 36–8, 110, 122, 133, 148
- sampling methods of opinion polls, 170–3
- Sanders, David, 190, 260
- Sands, Bobby, 84
- Särilvik, Bo, 180, 189, 259, 260
- Scammell, Margaret, 256, 266
- Scargill, Arthur, 67
- Schofield's Election Law*, 267
- Scotland, over-representation in
 - Commons, 27, 29
- Scottish National Party (SNP), 36, 64–5, 125, 158–9, 189
 - at by-elections, 64, 150, 151
- Scottish Opinion Limited, 166
- Scottish Parliament, 27, 64, 66, 68, 72, 158–60, 252–3, 258
 - candidate selection, 94, 98, 103
 - deposit, 105
 - election results, 218
 - electoral system, 34, 240, 242–4
 - eligibility of candidates, 83, 84
 - franchise, 249
 - result of referendums on, 222
 - spending limits, 200
- Scottish Socialist Party, 66, 252
- scrutineers, 138
- Seanad *see* Ireland, Republic of
- secrecy of the ballot, 119, 136, 139
- service voters, 15
- sex and voting behaviour, 187
- sex of candidates, 96–8
- Seymour, C., 249
- Shandwick, 133
- Sheridan, Tommy, 66
- Shore, Peter, 57
- 'Short money', 204
- single european currency, 48, 162
- Single Transferable Vote *see* electoral systems
- Sinn Féin *see* Northern Ireland political parties
- Smith Square, 41
- Smith, Jeremy, 251
- Smith, John, 41, 56, 57, 60, 102, 194
- Smith, S., 250, 251
- Social and Liberal Democratic Party (SLD) *see* Liberal Democrats
- Social Democratic and Labour Party *see* Northern Ireland political parties
- Social Democratic Federation, 55
- Social Democratic Party (SDP), 2, 40, 41, 60, 150, *see also* Alliance

- Social Science Research Council, 179
 Socialist Alliance, 67
 Socialist Labour Party, 67
 Socialist Workers' Party (SWP), 66
 Soskice, Sir Frank, 24
 Spangenberg, Frits, 259
 Sparrow, Nick, 259
 Speaker of the House of Commons,
 23, 55, 64, 72, 104, 141, 145, 209
 Speaker's Conference, 209–10
 of 1944, 23, 25
 of 1965–8, 13, 176, 209
 Spicer, Sir Michael, 54
 'spin doctors', 42
 sponsored candidates (Labour Party),
 60, 100
 Stansgate, 2nd Viscount *see* Benn,
 Tony
 state funding of political parties,
 proposals for, 206–7
 Steed swing, 37
 Steed, Michael, 37, 245, 251, 252
 Steel, David, 10, 62
 Stewart, Marianne, 190, 260
 Stokes, Donald, 179, 184, 259, 260
 'stopwatch timing', 128
 student political organisations, 81–2
 subscription fees *see* membership of
 political parties
Sun, The, 130, 132, 133, 256
Sunday Express, 130
Sunday Mirror, 130
Sunday Telegraph, 130, 165, 236
Sunday Times, 130, 132, 166, 236
 Supplementary Vote *see* electoral
 systems
 surgeries, constituency, 78
 Sutch, David ('Screaming Lord'), 69
 swing, 36–8
 in by-elections, 149–53
 System Three, 166
- tactical voting, 172, 176
 target seats, 116
 Taverne, Dick, 150, 253
 Taylor, Bridget, 251, 260
 Taylor, Dr Richard, 72, 253
 Taylor, Humphrey, 174
 telephone canvassing, 112–13, 114,
 116, 199
- telephone polls *see* opinion polls
 television
 effect of coverage on voting
 behaviour, 193
 effect of popular programmes on
 turnout, 138
 election night programmes, 142–3
 legal restrictions on coverage,
 127–8, 231
 news coverage of campaigns,
 127–30
See also news management, party
 political broadcasts
 tellers, 136, 137
 Test Research, 133
 Thatcher, Margaret, 7, 9, 10, 34, 51,
 52, 63, 123, 129, 151, 206, 254
 'third parties', regulation of spending
 by, 199, 204, 261
 Thompson, Sir Kenneth, 24
 Thompson, Malcolm, 86
 Thrasher, Michael, 252, 257, 264
 Thurso, John (3rd Viscount Thurso),
 254
- tie in number of votes, 140
 in Conservative leadership election,
 53
- time of day
 opening hours of polling stations,
 134, 138
 when votes are cast, 138
Times, The, 9, 131, 132, 166, 176, 255
 timetable of election campaign, 10,
 226–7
 timing of elections, 4–8
 TNS System Three, 166
 Todd, J., 250
 Tonge, Jonathan, 266
 Tories *see* Conservative Party
 trade union links with Labour Party,
 44, 45–6, 55, 56–60, 74, 76, 81,
 87–8, 95, 100–1, 102, 204–5, 253
 trade union membership and voting
 behaviour, 185
 Trimble, David, 70
 Truman, Harry S., 169
 turnout, 20, 194–6
 calculation of statistics, 258
 effect of postal voting, 118

- Tyrrell, Claire, 260
- UK Independence Party, 69
- Ulster Unionist Party *see* Northern Ireland political parties
- uncontested seats, 35, 212–14
- underdog effect, 175
- unilateral nuclear disarmament, 40, 56
- unitary authorities *see* local government
- unopposed elections, 109
- urban/rural differences in voting behaviour, 186
- voting age, reduction of (1969), 83
- voting behaviour, 178–96
- voting procedure on election day, 134–7
- Wales
 - over-representation in Commons, 27, 29
 - referendums on devolution, 162, 222–3
 - See also* Welsh Assembly
- Wall, Pat, 93
- Waller, Robert, 251
- War of Jennifer's Ear, 126
- ward party *see* local parties
- wards (local government electoral districts), 16, 24, 73, 82
- Ware, Alan, 267
- Webb, Paul, 252
- weekend voting, 8
- Weir, Stuart, 245
- Welland, Colin, 126
- Welsh Assembly, 65, 72, 158–60
 - candidate selection, 94, 98, 103
 - deposit, 105
 - election results, 219
 - electoral system, 34, 240, 242–4
 - eligibility of candidates, 83, 84
 - franchise, 249
 - spending limits, 200
- Westlake, Martin, 257
- Whitelaw, William, 51
- Whiteley, Paul, 190, 260
- Williams, P. M., 260
- Williams, Shirley, 62, 151
- Wilson, Harold, 6, 7, 150, 174
- Winchester by-election (1997), 142, 152
- window bills, 105, 107, 112, 113
- Winter of Discontent, 7
- Witherspoon, Sharon, 259, 260
- women as candidates, 96–8
 - special provisions relating to, 90, 93
- Worcester, Robert, 165, 168, 174, 237, 258, 259, 260, 265, 266
- Workers' Revolutionary Party, 66
- Wring, Dominic, 256
- writs to hold election, 141
 - effect of, 11, 145, 200
 - election timetable, 226, 227
 - issue in by-elections, 145
 - issue of, 11
 - return to Clerk of Crown, 141
- YouGov, 166, 171, 258
- Young Conservatives *see* Conservative Future
- Young Labour, 58, 75, 81, 82
- Young Liberal Democrats, 75, 82
- Young, H. P., 263
- youth organisations, 81–2
- zipping, 98