

**REGIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE 2010 Monday 24th – Wednesday 26th May 2010**

**REGIONAL RESPONSES AND GLOBAL SHIFTS: ACTORS, INSTITUTIONS
AND ORGANISATIONS**

Theme D: Regional policies: government and quasi-government initiatives
Gatekeeper: Tassilo Herrschel, University of Westminster and Iwona Sagan, Univ. of
Gdansk.

Section: Public Management vs. Democratic governance: direct or
representative democracy in the regions?

**Regional Government in England :
democratic governance and central government direction**

by

David M. Smith and Enid Wistrich.
Middlesex University

Introduction

Mainland Europeans are sometimes heard to joke that the English do not 'do' theory they only 'do' pragmatism. This pragmatism is exemplified in the UK's lack of a written Constitution. There has certainly been something pragmatic if not eccentric about the development of regional governance and government in the UK. We argue in this paper that there are huge disparities between England and the rest of the UK in the approach to its regions and the devolution of power to them. Since the late 1990s there has been considerable devolution of powers to Scotland, some to Wales and a new devolutionary settlement in Northern Ireland. Yet there has been no devolution of power to England which contains 80% of the population, and very little to the English regions. England is still ruled by the Parliament and central government of the whole of the UK. The one serious attempt to introduce a form of regional government in England failed at the first attempt in 2004 and was replaced by a more limited form of governance directed from the centre. So in place of a coherent federal system of government there are three regions which hold different degrees of self determination through devolved government powers, while the largest area of population and economic activity remains under central government control.

Furthermore, the general election on May 6 2010 is likely to add to the confusion rather than clarify it. Indeed it is an irony that whilst no national party is seriously running on the issue of regional government as a major part of its platform, the results of the election could have profound effects upon the future of English regional governance and government. Of course, by the time of the conference we will all know the election result.

The data we will refer to in this paper comes from some preliminary analyses of work done as part of our ongoing study of English Regional Political Elites.¹ This study involves in-depth interviews with key figures representing the political, Civil Service, business and third sector elites engaged in regional governance in three English regions. The work is ongoing so the findings reported here are indicative only.

The historical context

The ideology of Britain as a 'unified state' has been deeply embedded both in the "official mindset of the political elite" (O'Neill 2004) and in popular political culture (Gartside and Hibbert 1989). Nevertheless, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (its full title) is composed of four territorial 'nations': England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. By far the largest and politically dominant is England. The other three 'provincial areas' of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (originally the whole of Ireland) were joined to England at different times. Wales was annexed by England in 1536, the thrones and governments of Scotland and England were united in 1707 and the union of Irish parliaments implemented in 1801. Most of Ireland became independent as the state of Eire in the twentieth century after a bitter struggle, but the northern province chose to remain within the UK.

Cultural histories tell us that Wales, Scotland and Ireland contain predominantly peoples of Celtic origin while England initially drew its population from the early settlement of Anglo Saxons and of Norse and Danish peoples from northern Europe who settled in the provinces of Northumbria, Mercia (central England), East Anglia and Wessex. These joined together to form the kingdom of England, ruled, after the Norman conquest of 1066, by Norman kings and nobles who convened the first Parliament in the thirteenth century. However, this account is qualified in areas of England like Cornwall, which historically were predominantly of Celtic stock, and it has been argued that many of the distinctive 'Celtic' cultural identifiers are relatively modern inventions (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). Furthermore, all the populations of the constituent 'nations' are now, to various degrees, multicultural in their make-up. Nevertheless, there remains a sense of dominance by England, and especially by London, which has encouraged nationalist movements in Scotland, Wales and Ireland.

The movement towards degrees of devolution of government by the Westminster Parliament occurred in the late twentieth century and Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland now each have an elected parliament or assembly with varying powers. England, however, continues to be governed through laws for England which are passed in the Westminster Parliament by MPs from all parts of the UK. This is often referred to as 'the English Question' (Henig, 2006; Hazell, 2006). It really has two aspects. First, Westminster's responsibilities are for the whole of the UK, and so there is no central democratic body to represent England as opposed to the other 'nations'. Secondly, given that England as a whole

dominates the UK both economically and in population size, it seems to require disaggregation in the form of some kind of devolution to regions or sub-regions in order to effect a balance with the other three 'nations'. While there has been no move to establish a Parliament for England or for votes in the Westminster Parliament by English MPs only on English questions, attempts have recently been made to develop institutions of governance and government in the English regions to carry out central government policies.

The English Regions: Governance or Government?

The functions to be performed by the English regions have varied but their primary function has been one of governance from the centre rather than Government (Pearce and Ayres, 2009). However, there have been a number of attempts to introduce a more democratic element.

The boundaries of the nine English regions were originally defined at the beginning of the 1939-45 war for purely administrative reasons. They were set up to meet a perceived need for civil defence, each under the authority of a Regional Commissioner appointed by the central government. These administrative regional boundaries remained at the end of the war

In the late 1960s a Royal Commission recommended the creation of a regional tier of English Government. The Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England (1969) chaired by Lord Redcliffe-Maud proposed the creation of a series of provincial councils to be elected by local authorities with at least 20% of their members co-opted from industry and the professions. Their function would have been to produce strategic plans for economic growth, industrial development, housing, transport, further education and cultural facilities which would have to be approved by a central government Minister but would then have been binding on their constituent local authorities. However, these proposals were not included in the reforms carried out in 1972. Instead regional areas for central government services administration were established. A further democratic initiative was undertaken in 1973 when the minority report of the Royal Commission on the Constitution chaired by Lord Kilbrandon proposed a system of regional coordinating and advisory councils for England to be partly nominated and partly elected by local authorities. However, this proposal also was not realised.

The growing importance of EU Structural Funds in the 1990s required the creation of a regional tier of administration in order to access them. As a result the Government Offices for the Regions were set up in 1994. They were established to be the offices of central government operating in the regions and were initially mainly concerned with the administration of the EU Structural Funds. Subsequently their role has expanded to the co-ordination of government policy as applied to the regions and to the delivery of Public Service Agreements.

They have also played a role in the negotiation of Local Area Agreements with local authorities.

In 1996 the Millan Report of the Regional Policy Commission produced perhaps the most significant development in regional governance when it endorsed the creation of Regional Development Agencies. By 1999, there were eight of these in England with oversight from the Department of Trade and Industry, having Boards of Directors drawn from both local government and the private sector. One more for Greater London was created from 2000 accountable to London's elected Mayor. After some persuasion the EU agreed to their having a role in the distribution of Structural Funds (HMSO, March 2003). These regional quangos have been seen as important tools of central government in regional economic development and regeneration and work in parallel with the Government Offices for the Regions. In recent years, their remit has been extended to include rural affairs, tourism, transport, Business Link and the Small Business Service. There are separate regional authorities for the National Health Service and for water supply and drainage.

In 2002 an attempt was made to introduce a measure of regional government in the White Paper entitled "Your region your choice: revitalising the English Regions" (Cm 5511). Following the example of Scottish and Welsh devolution, elected assemblies for each of the English regions were proposed. The White Paper pointed out that the English regions were 'virtually the only regions within the EU which did not have some form of democratic governance'. It recommended elected assemblies for each English Region as well as a unitary structure of local authorities at local government level. These proposals were put to a referendum vote in 2004 in the North East Region which was believed to exhibit the strongest evidence of regional pride of any region. The intention was to hold a series of regional referenda. The result however was a resounding defeat – on a substantial turnout of 48%, 78% voted against and only 22% for the proposal. Subsequent reflection and analysis suggests that the negative vote arose as much from distrust of 'more politicians' than active rejection of the idea of regional government per se although the limited functions and powers proposed for the Assemblies and their likely cost may also have contributed (Harding et al., 2006). However, no further referenda were contemplated. Instead non-elected Regional Assemblies were created. These consisted of 70% local government councillors and 30% other 'stakeholders' from business, industry and the third sector. Members were not directly elected to the Assembly except in London where it became part of the government of Greater London. Their responsibilities were consultation with and scrutiny of the Regional Development Agencies.

Subsequently, there has been no indication that the people of England do want to see political powers devolved from the centre to elected English regional authorities. A survey of opinion in England between 1999 and 2008 found that only 14 – 26% of the people favoured elected Regional Assemblies, and over

50% were satisfied that the UK Parliament of MPs from all the regions governed England. Proposals for an English Parliament received the support of 16 – 26% (British Social Attitudes, 2010). The one English authority performing functions at a regional level with public support appears to be the Greater London Authority which was established in 1963 as a successor to the London County Council set up in 1888 (Rhodes and Ruck, 1970). However there has recently been some resentment about the share of all government expenditure agreed for Scotland compared with England which appears to have prompted some sentiments in favour of English regional government (Curtice, 2010).

Regional Government and Governance in 2010.

The relationship between central Parliamentary democracy and local and regional democracy continues to be a matter of interest. In 2007 the Government published a Constitutional Green Paper which claimed to continue its pursuit of greater devolution but turned its interest from the regional to the sub-regional level. The Review of Sub-National Economic Development and Regeneration (SNR) recommended that new powers and incentives be given to local authorities to enable them to pursue local prosperity, economic growth and regeneration, as well as to tackle social deprivation and inequality. The Regional Assemblies have been abolished and Parliamentary Select Committees established for each of the regions, and a movement towards greater authority for local authorities has taken place, especially in regard to economic development and regeneration.

The non-elected Regional Assemblies which were all abolished by 31st March 2010 were replaced by Regional Strategic Leaders' Boards drawn from local authorities. Although some of these new bodies have been meeting in shadow form for a short period, they only formally came into existence on April 1st 2010, so it is not yet possible to comment upon their effectiveness. They will be composed of representatives of the relevant local authorities but their size is likely to ensure that power in each will lie in a caucus group of key leaders who will inevitably be drawn from upper tier and Unitary authorities. In future there will be no statutory Regional Planning Body and the RDA and the Local Authority Strategic Leaders Board will have a joint responsibility for regional strategy. Quite how this will work in practice is unclear.

There has also been a movement towards the formation of voluntary partnerships between local authorities, known as Multi-Area Agreements (MAAs), to cooperate on issues and services crossing local boundaries like transport, housing and the environment. The first MAAs were established in 2007 and the number has grown considerably since. The intention is to draw together more than one city to create the best possible framework for improved economic performance. The MAAs are precursors of a move to establish 'city regions' as the best spatial level for local development. They are intended to coordinate economic development beyond the purely local government areas and are

informed by the example of France where city regions were created under legislation of 1966 permitting the joint working of communes (municipalities) in metropolitan areas (Loughlin, 2008). It has been argued that 'city regions' might provide a model of regional urban government which would match the Regional Development Agencies and be able to work effectively with them (Hazell and Leary 1999). So far only three have formally been recognised by the Government and these are all in large metropolitan areas, though it is clear that should Labour win the next election they will continue this trend and allow for elected mayors where desired.

In addition there is now a build up of more informal relationships at the regional level between local authorities, other public bodies, the private sector and voluntary organisations into 'Local Strategic Partnerships'. These Partnerships have very limited statutory authority and powers and are closely monitored by the Regional Offices of Central Government. More recently, some Local Strategic Partnerships have played a leading role in the 'Total Place' approach which is intended to examine how government funds can be spent more effectively in order to realise policy objectives at a local level through identifying and then avoiding overlaps and duplication between organisations and so effecting service improvement and efficiency at the local level, as well as in Whitehall (http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/psr_total_place.htm).

There have so far been thirteen Total Place pilot schemes. This is clearly an important measure in attempting to safeguard front-line public services in a time of serious cuts to expenditure, though little thinking seems to have gone into the very different service conditions of the staff who might be affected (Dudman, 2010). However, it also has important implications for future regional, sub-regional and local governance reform. As David Parsons says in his role of Chair of the Local Government Association Improvement Board: "Total Place presents significant opportunities for local government to set the direction for the next phase of public sector reform" (<http://www.localleadership.gov.uk/totalplace>). For local authorities to operate a whole area approach there would have to be some further devolution of powers from Whitehall and possibly some changes in the structure of local and regional bodies.

In May 2009, a report of a Select Committee of Parliament on 'the balance of power: central and local government' called for 'a substantial change in the balance of power between central and local government' and 'greater parliamentary oversight' of the relationship which could strengthen both local and national democracy. Regional Ministers are now appointed for each region to head the regional organisations and to guide their strategies. They are answerable to Parliament whose Regional Select Committees consider their reports. This was an attempt to introduce some democratic oversight over the regions albeit from the centre. However, the opposition parties have declined to provide representatives on these Regional Select Committees² which has somewhat undermined their credibility. There is in addition, since 2008, a Council

of Regional Ministers which reports to the Regional Economic Council and to the National Economic Council which is chaired by the Prime Minister. The representation of views within the regions also extends to a structure of Regional Economic Forums which include representatives of business, the trades unions and local authorities and have an advisory role.

Where next?

As we argued above it is an irony that whilst no party is seriously running with the issue of regional government as a major part of its platform in this year's election, the results of the election could have profound effects upon the future of English Regional Government whoever wins. The main parties have quite distinct positions on regional government.

Labour has indicated that it will continue its current policy direction. Thus, Parliamentary Select Committees and national government Ministers will work through Government Offices. At regional level Strategic Leaders Boards will be the 'democratic' focus of decision making at local authority level, but will be balanced by the continued existence of central government dominated Regional Development Agencies. There will be continued development of the sub-regional agenda - MAAs and City regions and the extension of the Total Place experiment. The Party has also made clear its intention to devolve new powers in a number of specific areas like social and affordable housing, climate change and in relation to the NHS (The Labour Party Manifesto, 2010). At the national level they have proposed a referendum on electoral changes but these will not necessarily impact directly upon regional governance or local government structures.

The Conservatives, on the other hand, have determined to dismantle the regional level altogether. A letter written by Ken Clarke and Caroline Spelman dated March 2010³ states that they would scrap all of England's Regional Development Agencies in their current form. In their place would be partnerships of local authorities working across 'real economic areas'. These 'local enterprise partnerships' (LEPs) would 'reflect natural economic areas' - largely sub-regions, although some councils could decide that the new economic area would mirror the borders of the present region. These local enterprise partnerships would in future be the appropriate body for EU Structural funds. At the same time central government would be re-establishing 'clear national leadership for key business policies'. One big difference between these local enterprise partnerships and the present government's arrangements would be that 'at least fifty per cent of the boards of the new partnerships will be representatives from local commerce and industry and a leading local business person will chair each new partnership'. The emphasis here, like that of Labour, is more on governance by many agencies and organisations rather than on government, although elected local councils would be involved and would gain some new powers over planning and housing and receive new financial incentives to promote new business and jobs.

In the Conservative Manifesto they also propose a new 'localism' which could see some services taken away from current public sector providers to be run by volunteer groups (Conservative Party Manifesto, 2010).

The Liberal-Democrats are the only national party to claim that they wish to directly address the position of England in a federal government of Great Britain, and they propose a Constitutional Convention to draft a written UK constitution (Liberal Democrat Manifesto, 2010). At the regional governance level they propose the abolition of Government Offices for the Regions (Liberal Democrat Party Manifesto, 2010) and the reform of Regional Development Agencies in order to devolve power to local authorities (Lib-Dem Policy Briefing, 2009). Unlike the Conservatives, their demands for greater localism are through a revision and bolstering of existing local authority structures. They would scrap central government inspection regimes on local councils and create locally elected Police Authorities and Health Boards (Liberal Democrat Party Manifesto, 2010).

Which policies will be pursued over the coming months and years will depend upon election results which we cannot know at the time of writing. Each of the three main parties has a distinctive policy on the future of English regions. Should there be a hung parliament, which at the time of writing seems a possibility, regional governance may find itself pushed aside while party political considerations predominate in the scramble for power.

In the next section we report on some preliminary findings from our on-going study of English regional political elites on issues relevant to the Political Party policies raised here.

Views of some Regional Political Elites

The data we use derives from some recent work by us on a study of regional political elites in England.¹ Three regions have been selected for study and in each region in-depth interviews are being conducted with key figures drawn from political, Civil Service, business and third sector elites engaged in regional and local governance. The findings reported here are preliminary and indicative only as we are still in the process of completing some remaining interviews.

We report on three issues of regional governance and government: attitudes towards the value of a regional tier of government/ governance; the impact, if any, of closing the Regional Assemblies; and the role and effectiveness of Regional Development Agencies as an economic driver.

a) Are there necessary regional functions which need to be fulfilled?

Although all major national political parties are moving away from the idea of a regional level of government and governance in varying degrees, wide concern was expressed by elites about the present dominance of central government

over regional issues. One regional political leader put it like this: “England lacks a sort of balance to Whitehall, whereas Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland definitely have that balance.... There is a huge defect in the Government of England.” Another politician asked: “who will take on the responsibility of arguing with Government about the amount of funding that should come from the Exchequer to the region?” Someone involved in the business community was less diplomatic: “Central Government is scared of the regional, and the more local the emphasis, the bigger the centre could get!” Many more expressed concerns about how adequately local authorities and sub-regional bodies could reflect broader needs without any regional perspective. Who would negotiate between the local and the national when it comes to major developments like wind farms, coastal erosion, or major roads? It was not clear.

Our respondents were very clear that there was a level of regional functions which need to be carried out whatever institutional framework was devised. There were some differences in detail by region and by sector as to what all of these were, but there was a high level of agreement that certain functions were necessary. These were spatial planning, including housing strategy, transport strategy, economic development and regeneration, and the environment, especially sustainable development, flood control and waste management. Serious doubts were raised about the appropriateness of the current regional boundaries in pursuing some these functions; economic and social hinterlands often cross official regional boundaries. Nevertheless regional planning in these areas was seen to be essential. Other regional functions raised as important were appropriate skills, reflecting a concern that educational planning be included, and agriculture as a specific aspect of economic planning. Specific minority issues like those concerning black and ethnic minority people and gypsies were mentioned by third sector organisations, as was culture and sport.

Of course, it is an empirical question how well these functions could be performed at the sub-regional level and Strategic Leaders Boards and Economic Prosperity Boards of local authorities have yet to be given the opportunity to try their hand. Only in one local authority area of one Region which we studied was there serious rejection of the regional and sub-regional levels. Some of its key figures believed that their Unitary County Authority could effectively operate as a region, perhaps from time to time co-operating with others through wider partnerships but only on specific issues.

What has been the impact of abolishing Regional Assemblies?

The Regional Assemblies are no more. They were all abolished by the last day of March, 2010. We interviewed in the last few months of their operation so respondents were actively considering the consequences of their imminent disappearance and the implications of the new arrangements that would replace them. Given their apparent unpopularity with both the core of the Labour and Conservative parties in Westminster circles we were somewhat surprised at the

range of views we received. In all regions our respondents were fairly evenly split on whether or not the abolition would have an impact. In two of our three regions most respondents felt that the closure would have an impact, while in the third region the opposite view was expressed. Some, especially in one region, felt that the Assembly had done a useful job and were happy to enumerate its successes, but others were more critical. Those who wouldn't miss the Assembly were very negative about it. One business person said he "couldn't point to a single thing that had happened because of its existence." Another local civil servant suggested that the quality of its constituent members sometimes left something to be desired. "It wasn't always the A team. It was often the C, D and E teams!"

Others commented upon the potential importance of the Assemblies' scrutiny functions over the Regional Development Agencies though still others questioned their effectiveness in this regard. A few complained that the impact of its closure was to place additional burdens upon themselves and their institutions, though it was acknowledged that this could also mean additional opportunities.

Those most concerned about the closure of the Regional Assemblies were the 3rd sector stakeholders who feared that they might lose a location where their voices could be heard. In some cases they were already lobbying as shadow stakeholder groups but the key issue will be whether they gain any voice in new arrangements and whether, if they do, it can be influential. The most obvious location for such a voice would be the Local Strategic Partnerships but, as we said earlier, these have very limited statutory authority. It is even less clear in the Conservative Party's model of 'local enterprise partnerships' which would be much more heavily dominated by business representatives.

b) Have the Regional Development Agencies proved valuable as an economic driver?

In general Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) were reasonably well thought of, as in the Price Waterhouse Cooper report (2009) on them. In two of our three regions the RDAs were felt to have done some useful work. One telling criticism was that whilst the RDA had effectively distributed funds within the region it had not been sufficiently pro-active in its approach and it had also been found to be administratively very expensive to operate. This could be an important issue in the context of the Total Place approach.

Two important considerations here in regard to the future are: if, as Labour intend, the RDAs stay in place, will effective scrutiny be possible by the Strategic Leaders Boards in the absence of the Assembly, especially since the RDAs and the SLBs will have joint responsibility for the regional strategy? Secondly, if the RDAs are not to continue (Conservatives), or at least not in their present form (Liberal Democrats), then how will elements of the regional role be fulfilled, over and above local authorities and their local enterprise partnerships? As one of our respondents said, "one must be careful not to think that if the RDAs go

everything will then work on a County or local authority level. Any Government will be looking for a degree of joining up probably at the sub-regional level.”

At the other end of the regional spectrum, a possible institution to play a greater co-ordinating and planning role could be the Government Offices for the Regions (Mawson, Pearce and Ayres 2008). However, this would be moving that role back towards Whitehall and central government, which is likely to prove unpopular with most of the regional political elite. Whilst the Directors of Government Offices to whom we spoke were anxious to stress that they saw their role as two-way communication, many on the receiving end were cynical about information satisfactorily passing up the chain. As one respondent colourfully expressed it, “the Government Offices are the Assistant Commissioners of Governance.” This is an organisation that Liberal-Democrats wish to abolish.

Conclusions

Overall, future policies and developments are not clear. While devolution in Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland appears to be working effectively and is popular with the people, there is uncertainty and confusion over England. Only the Liberal-Democrats, the smallest of the three main parties in the 2005-10 Parliament, have a proposal to address the status of England within a federal UK.

As far as English Regions are concerned, a Conservative victory could wipe away the regional institutions which currently exist leaving only Regional Government Offices as a conduit for central government policy on those many regional functions which have been identified. In the case of the Liberal-Democrats the Government Offices would disappear but some form of reformed Regional Development Agency would continue. Labour would keep the Regional Development Agencies, which potentially could be more powerful when their scrutiny falls to the Strategic Leaders Boards and also more a creature of central Government policy via Government Offices and Regional Ministers.

The idea of democratically elected regional bodies to mirror those of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland proved unpopular with the electorate on the one occasion that it was tested in a referendum and opinion polls suggest that it remains so. Their replacement, the non-elected Regional Assembly, has been abolished. A constitutional settlement proposed by the Select Committee report of 2009 on “The balance of power: central and local government” which aimed to secure greater decentralisation of power has not yet been pursued. All parties now make some reference to the rhetoric of ‘localism’ but it is unclear how the necessary regional functions identified by our respondents would be addressed in each case.

While the English regions continue to exist as vehicles for central government action, they will have no democratic mandate except as constituencies for elections to the European Parliament. Whichever political party is successful the regions are likely to become further creatures of governance not government. There will be no democratic base between the local and the national except through various second order partnerships. The UK is often criticised for its over-centralised system of government. Future arrangements carry the danger of extending that tendency.

We have argued in this paper that there are huge disparities between England and the rest of the UK in the approach to its regions and the devolution of power. It seemed when the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly were established with their very different legal powers that the UK might be heading for the kind of 'asymmetric federation' which is to be seen in Spain (Swendon 2002). In this system Spanish regions have varied patterns of power over policy, with the historic regions of Catalonia, the Basque country, Galicia and Andalusia all having greater autonomy than other regions. This devolutionary asymmetry already exists in three of the constituent 'nations' within the UK and seems likely to increase if the 'nationalist' parties improve their electoral standing, but it seems that no major political party wants to consider extending devolution to the English regions.⁴

Bibliography

British Social Attitudes (2010) *the 26th Report*

Clarke, K. and Spelman, C., letter, dated March 2010. For summary see *Regeneration and Renewal*, 13/04/2010 (<http://www.regen.net>)

Communities and Local Government Select Committee Report (May 2009), *The Balance of Power: Central and Local Government*, (<http://www.parliament.uk>)

Conservative Party Manifesto, 2010
(<http://www.conservatives.com/Manifesto.aspx>)

Constitutional Green Paper, July 2007, Houses of Parliament.

Curtice, J. (2010) "Is an English backlash occurring? Reactions to devolution 10 years on", *Institute of Public Policy Research*, London.

Dudman, J. (2010) "Placed on Hold", *SocietyGuardian*, 24th March page 6.

Gartside, P. and Hibbert, M. (eds) (1989) *British Regionalism 1900-2000*. Mansell, London.

Harding, A, Coombes M., Jeffrey C and Tomaney, J. (2006) *English Regional Governance in 2004*, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, House of Commons, London

Hazell, R. (ed.) (2006), *The English Question*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Hazell, R and O'Leary, B. (1999) "A rolling programme of devolution : slippery slope or safeguard of the Union": in R.Hazell (ed.) *Constitutional futures : a history of the next 10 years*, Open University Press, Harmondsworth.

Henig, S. (2006) *Modernising British Government: constitutional challenges and federal solutions*, The Federal Trust, London.

A modern regional policy for the United Kingdom, (March 2003), HMSO, London

Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. (1983) (eds) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

The Labour Party Manifesto (2010) (<http://www.labour.org.uk/manifesto>)

Lib-Dem Policy Briefing, (2009)
(<http://www.libdems.org.uk/siteFiles/resources/PDF/Policy%20Briefing%20-%20Business%20Oct%2009.pdf>)

Liberal Democrat Party Manifesto (2010)
(<http://network.libdems.org.uk/manifesto2010>)

Loughlin, J. (2008) "The slow emergence of the French regions", *Policy & Politics*, vol 3, no 4

Mawson, J. and Pearce, G. and Ayres, S. (2008) 'Regional governance in England : a changing role for the government's regional offices ?', *Public Administration*, 86 (2).

O'Neill, M. (ed) (2004) *Devolution and British Politics*, Pearson/Longman, Harlow.

Pearce, G. and Ayres, S. (2009) "Governance in the English Regions: The Role of the Regional Development Agencies", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 3.

Price Waterhouse Cooper Report, (2009) *Impact of RDA spending*, Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform, March.

Report of the Regional Policy Commission, (1996) *Renewing the Regions*, (B. Millan)

Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England (Lord Redcliffe-Maud) (1969), Cmnd. 4040

Report of the Royal Commission on the Constitution 1969-1973, (Lord Kilbrandon), Cmnd 5460

Review of Sub-National Economic Development and Regeneration (SNR), 17 July 2007, OPSI.

Rhodes G. and Ruck S.K. (1970), *The Government of Greater London*, Allen and Unwin

White Paper (2002) *Your Region, Your Choice: revitalising the English Regions*, HMSO, May, Cm 5511

Web pages on Total Place

http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/psr_total_place.htm).

<http://www.localleadership.gov.uk/totalplace>).

Notes

- ¹ "Regions in England: Government and Governance", David M. Smith and Enid Wistrich, Middlesex University, London. Funded by the James Madison Trust.
- ² Their reasons for refusing differ by political party. The Conservatives refused because they do not support Regional Government. The Liberal-Democrats, on the other hand, supported the principle but objected to the constitution of the Committees. They believed that membership should reflect political representation in each region rather than being dominated by the party which happens to be in power in Westminster.
- ³ See *Regeneration and Renewal*, 13/04/2010 for a summary of the contents.
- ⁴ There is a tiny political party called the *English Democrats* which advocates an English Parliament with devolved powers similar to those of Scotland. It is also anti-European Union (<http://www.voteenglish.org/what-we-stand-for/>)

David M. Smith and Enid Wistrich,
Middlesex University, London.

April 2010

Contact: davidsmithhbo@hotmail.com
enid.wistrich@blueyonder.co.uk