

# Candidate 11 evidence

QUESTION	MARGIN
3.b)	
political Party	sending troops to Syria rejected PM member of
vets with mm	but didn't have to ask house UK has vote (can influence outcome :-)
	cannot be overturned by supreme court.
legis Needs to be approved by Supreme Court	3/4 of amendment 2/3 of state approval US
committees can block	not member of house veto prohibit veto
	Bush stem cell research

The UK Prime Minister has much less limits on his powers than the US President. However, it can still be argued that the US President is still more powerful due to his status on the world stage. One reason that the Conservative Prime Minister's power is less limited is due to the fact that he is a member of a house, unlike US President, Barack Obama.

As David Cameron is a member of Parliament this allows him to vote on any new legislation and influence his majority Government to vote with him so that the legislation is passed. This allows the UK Executive to pass legislation freely without the approval

of any other house. For example, David Cameron was influential in a gay marriage law being passed as he had the ability to vote on it.

However, embarrassingly for Cameron, in his previous term he asked for the approval of the House of Commons MP's to send troops to Syria as he wanted to do this. This MP's rejected this idea and David Cameron did not send troops even though he did not need the Parliament's approval.

However, the US President is not a member of any house in the political system and therefore does not have a vote in passing legislation - he can only convince the senate to vote in his favour.

For example, in Obama's new legislation of healthcare, he could not vote to approve this but only convince others to pass it for him. Therefore, the president needs 2/3 of Senates approval for the legislation to pass through the house whereas the Prime Minister only needs a majority vote from a Government that he is a part of. Therefore the executive in the UK is somewhat less limited in passing legislation than the US.

Furthermore, the UK Executive is less limited by committees than the US Executive when passing legislation.

This is because UK committees can only scrutinise decisions made by the Government such as The Bedroom Tax but they do not have

the ability to actually overturn the legislation. Whereas, Committees in the US, due to their size, have the ability to both scrutinise and block new legislation by voting it down.

Therefore, this makes the US Executive more limited in its powers than the UK.

Moreover, the US Executive is also more limited in making legislation than the UK Executive due to the influence of the Supreme Court. The US Supreme Court must pass any new legislation before it is allowed, unlike the UK Supreme Court who only deals with secondary legislation. This would also be the case when amending the constitution. President Obama would need  $\frac{2}{3}$  of Senates approval,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of States approval and the

Supreme courts approval to modify their written constitution. For example, Obama was not allowed to intervene in new gun laws as it violated the written constitution where US civilians have the right to bear arms. Therefore, the US Executive is more limited than the UK Executive when exercising powers.

However, the US President has his ability to veto any legislation he ~~dis~~ disagrees on. Although this veto can be overturned by a 2/3 senate vote, the President can also use a limited pocket veto which blocks any legislation they strongly disagree on. This is beneficial to a lame duck President. For example, George W. Bush used his pocket veto to

that block legislation on stem cell research as his Christian values completely disagreed with it. However, a UK Executive does not have the power of a veto but can still vote on legislation. Therefore, this gives the US President some advantage of power but does not make him less limited than the UK Executive.

In conclusion, although the US Executive is still powerful in his role as the commander in chief and his ability to appoint members to roles, he is still more limited in his powers than the UK Executive. The main factor of this is due to the President not being a member of a house where he cannot substantially influence the outcome of the vote. Furthermore, the

UK Executive n. also allowed more powers equal to the President such as appointing cabinet. For example, David Cameron's appointment of Theresa May to Home Secretary.