**26 October 2015**

**House of Lords defeats the government over tax credit cuts**

Peers vote to block cuts unless the Tories offer full compensation to the low-paid for at least three years.

In a dramatic assertion of its authority, the House of Lords has defeated the Conservatives over the planned tax credit cuts. Peers voted in favour of a Labour motion, which demanded full compensation for the low-paid for at least three years, by 289 to 272.

The failure of the Tories to include the cuts in their manifesto, and their refusal to offer any compensation to the low-paid, led peers to conclude that it was both legitimate and necessary to defeat the government.

The result is the greatest political reversal that Osborne, the favourite to become his party's next leader, has suffered. But if he avoids staining the Tories' reputation by inflicting unprecedented cuts on the working poor, he may yet have cause to thank the Lords.

**26 April 2016**

**Government defeated again in Lords over child refugees**

The government has been defeated again in the House of Lords over calls to take in child refugees from Europe.

A new amendment to the Immigration Bill from Labour's Lord Dubs was backed by 279 votes to 172.

It would force ministers to arrange the relocation of children who have made it to Europe into the UK, with the total number to be decided by the government.

The government has warned against encouraging people to place children in the hands of traffickers.

It announced last week it would take in as many as 3,000 refugees, mostly vulnerable children, from the war-torn Syria region by 2020.

But campaigners, including charity Save the Children, are calling for unaccompanied children who have already made it into Europe to be allowed into the UK.

On Monday night, MPs rejected Lord Dubs' attempt to force the government to admit 3,000 children from Europe.

His revised amendment - which was backed by the Lords - did not include the 3,000 target, instead requiring the government to consult with local authorities to come up with a total.

Speaking before the vote, the prime minister's spokeswoman said the government wanted to protect vulnerable people but not "fuel a system that is incentivising people to be exploited by trafficking gangs and make perilous journeys".

The government suffered further defeats on the Immigration Bill over the detention of pregnant women in immigration custody and holding people in detention for more than 28 days.

It will now decide whether to try to overturn the latest defeats when the bill returns to the Commons.

**29 February 2016**

**Peers inflict second government defeat on disability benefit cuts**

The government has been defeated in the House of Lords for a second time over plans to cut some disabled people's benefits by £30 a week.

Peers voted by 286 to 219 to delay the cuts, pending an assessment of the impact on claimants.

In January the Lords voted to remove the cuts from the Welfare Reform Bill altogether, but they were later reinstated by MPs in a Commons vote.

Ministers may try to overturn the fresh defeat at a later date.

A Department for Work and Pensions spokesman said: "The vote in the House of Lords is a routine part of the legislative process and next steps will be announced in due course."

This stage in a bill's journey is known as "parliamentary ping pong", when legislation is batted between the two Houses until agreement is reached on its contents.

The government wants to cut Employment Support Allowance by £30 a week to encourage some new claimants to return to work.

In a bid to stave off another defeat over the plans, Work and Pensions Minister Lord Freud offered several concessions and warned peers against supporting the "wrecking amendment" which he said "undermines conventional parliamentary process".

The decision by peers to inflict defeat on the government sets up another showdown between the Commons and the Lords, coming not long after last year's clash over tax credits, which led to moves by ministers to limit the powers of the Lords.

**Tuesday 1 March 2016**

**Conservatives defeated by House of Lords on plans to cut ESA – for a second time**

Defiant peers voted 289 and 219 to delay the cuts – which could see benefits reduced by over £1,500 a year

The House of Lords has, for a second time, rebuffed the government’s welfare reform bill proposals to slash £30 a week from the benefits of ill and disabled people who have been found unfit for work.

On Monday evening defiant peers in the Lords voted 289 and 219 to delay the cuts – which could see benefits reduced by over £1,500 a year – pending a parliamentary report on the impact on claimants.

However, the Commons last week overturned an earlier Lords vote rejecting ministers’ plans to cut employment and support allowance (ESA), despite concerns raised by some Conservative backbenchers.

**25 January 2016**

**Peers defeat government over child poverty reports**

**The government has lost a vote in the House of Lords on child poverty.**

Peers voted by a majority of 92 to amend the [**Welfare Reform and Work Bill**](http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2015-16/welfarereformandwork.html) to make ministers report annually on income levels in the poorest families.

The move was spearheaded by the Bishop of Durham, Rt Rev Paul Butler, who argued income-related statistics must be recorded so they could be assessed with other measurements of deprivation.

Ministers say life chances are a better measure of economic outcomes.

The defeat could be overturned when the bill returns to the Commons later this year.

If it is not, ministers will be obliged to present a report to Parliament each year setting out the percentage of children in households whose net income is 60% to 70% below the median average.

**April 2016**

**ESA benefit cuts forced through by Tories on ‘black day for disabled people’**

Lords ran out of options after the Speaker of the Commons attached a 'financial privilege' to the Welfare Bill

Conservative ministers argue cutting ESA would incentivise people back into work

Peers in the House of Lords have reluctantly backed down in their battle with MPs over a cut to disabled people’s benefits after being accused of “overstepping their mark”.

The Government [was twice defeated by defiant Lords over reducing Employment and Support Allowance](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/conservatives-defeated-by-house-of-lords-on-plans-to-cut-esa-for-a-second-time-a6904581.html) (ESA) for people in the work-related activity group (Wrag) from £103 to £73 a week. Peers were arguing to delay the cuts pending a parliamentary report on the impact on claimants.

But Lords in the upper chamber ran out of options after the Speaker of the Commons attached a “financial privilege” to the Bill. The privilege can be used by the Commons as grounds for overruling any Lords proposal that has a cost implication.

"This is a black day for disabled people,” warned the independent crossbencher Lord Low of Dalston, during the debate on Monday evening.

He added: “The Commons have spoken decisively and we must now bow to their wishes, but we do so under protest.”.

 “As a Chamber appointed because of our expertise in areas such as this, we know and understand the impact this Bill will have, even if no formal impact assessment was carried out. I apologise to the people affected by this Bill that, at this point, we could not do any more. This may be the end of the legislative process, but it is the start of the negative impact the Bill will have on thousands of people’s lives.

"By this action, the Government have betrayed the trust of disabled people and they should not be surprised if they forfeit it for the rest of their time in office."

* **1/16**

"One case where the claimant’s wife went into premature labour and had to go to hospital. This caused the claimant to miss an appointment. No leeway given"

* **2/16**

"It’s Christmas Day and you don’t fill in your job search evidence form to show that you’ve looked for all the new jobs that are advertised on Christmas Day. You are sanctioned. Merry Christmas"

* **3/16**

"You apply for three jobs one week and three jobs the following Sunday and Monday. Because the job centre week starts on a Tuesday it treats this as applying for six jobs in one week and none the following week. You are sanctioned for 13 weeks for failing to apply for three jobs each week"

* **4/16**

"A London man missed his Jobcentre appointments for two weeks because he was in hospital after being hit by a car. He was sanctioned"

2011 Getty Images

* **5/16**

"You’ve been unemployed for seven months and are forced onto a workfare scheme in a shop miles away, but can’t afford to travel. You offer to work in a nearer branch but are refused and get sanctioned for not attending your placement"

2013 Getty Images

* **6/16**

"You are a mum of two, and are five minutes late for your job centre appointment. You show the advisor the clock on your phone, which is running late. You are sanctioned for a month"

* **7/16**

"A man with heart problems who was on Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) had a heart attack during a work capability assessment. He was then sanctioned for failing to complete the assessment"

Copyright (c) 2015 Rex Features. No use without permission.

* **8/16**

"A man who had gotten a job that was scheduled to begin in two weeks’ time was sanctioned for not looking for work as he waited for the role to start"

* **9/16**

"Army veteran Stephen Taylor, 60, whose Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) was stopped after he sold poppies in memory of fallen soldiers"

2014 Getty Images

* **10/16**

"A man had to miss his regular appointment at the job centre to attend his father’s funeral. He was sanctioned even though he told DWP staff in advance"

2014 Getty Images

* **11/16**

"Ceri Padley, 26, had her benefits sanctioned after she missed an appointment at the jobcentre - because she was at a job interview"

Jason Doiy Photography

* **12/16**

"A man got sanctioned for missing his slot to sign on - as he was attending a work programme interview. He was then sanctioned as he could not afford to travel for his job search"

2012 Getty Images

* **13/16**

"Mother-of-three Angie Godwin, 27, said her benefits were sanctioned after she applied for a role job centre staff said was beyond her"

* **14/16**

"Sofya Harrison was sanctioned for attending a job interview and moving her signing-on to another day"

* **15/16**

"Michael, 54, had his benefits sanctioned for four months for failing to undertake a week’s work experience at a charity shop. The charity shop had told him they didn’t want him there"

* **16/16**

"Terry Eaton, 58, was sanctioned because he didn’t have the bus fare he needed to attend an appointment with the job centre"

Conservative ministers are arguing that cutting the ESA entitlement from April 2017 for new claimants in the work-related activity group (Wrag) would provide and incentive for them to return to work. Peers, however, claim there is no evidence of this while campaigners insist it will push benefit claimants into further poverty.

**Provide examples of the impact of the House of Lords on Government policy.**