

Procedure Committee

Call lists

Fourth Report of Session 2024–26

HC 536

Procedure Committee

The Procedure Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider the practice and procedure of the House in the conduct of public business, and to make recommendations.

Current membership

[Cat Smith](#) (Labour; Lancaster and Wyre) (Chair)

[James Asser](#) (Labour; West Ham and Beckton)

[Bambos Charalambous](#) (Labour; Southgate and Wood Green)

[Sir Christopher Chope](#) (Conservative; Christchurch)

[Mr Lee Dillon](#) (Liberal Democrat; Newbury)

[Mary Kelly Foy](#) (Labour; City of Durham)

[Gill Furniss](#) (Labour; Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough)

[Tracy Gilbert](#) (Labour; Edinburgh North and Leith)

[Gurinder Singh Josan](#) (Labour; Smethwick)

[John Lamont](#) (Conservative; Berwickshire, Roxburgh and Selkirk)

[Tom Morrison](#) (Liberal Democrat; Cheadle)

[Katrina Murray](#) (Labour; Cumbernauld and Kirkintilloch)

[Lee Pitcher](#) (Labour; Doncaster East and the Isle of Axholme)

[Kenneth Stevenson](#) (Labour; Airdrie and Shotts)

[Michael Wheeler](#) (Labour; Worsley and Eccles)

[Sir Gavin Williamson](#) (Conservative; Stone, Great Wyrley and Penkridge)

The following Members were members of the Committee during the inquiry:

[David Baines](#) (Labour; St Helens North)

[Graeme Downie](#) (Labour; Dunfermline and Dollar)

[Mr Richard Holden](#) (Conservative; Basildon and Billericay)

[Frank McNally](#) (Labour; Coatbridge and Bellshill)

[Joy Morrissey](#) (Conservative; Beaconsfield)

Powers

The powers of the Committee are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 147. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

This Report, together with formal minutes relating to the Report, was Ordered by the House of Commons, on 28 January 2026, to be printed. It was published on 3 February 2026 by authority of the House of Commons. © Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2026.

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright.

Committee Reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/proccom and in print by Order of the House.

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Procedure Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3351; the Committee's email address is proccom@parliament.uk. You can follow the Committee on X (formerly Twitter) using [@CommonsProcCom](https://twitter.com/CommonsProcCom), and on Bluesky using [@CommonsProcCom.parliament.uk](https://bsky.app/profile/CommonsProcCom.parliament.uk).

Contents

	Summary	1
1	The Committee's inquiry	5
2	The problem to be solved	7
	Accessibility	7
	Representation of smaller parties	9
	Certainty and work-life balance	10
	Are call lists the solution?	11
3	Practice in other legislatures	13
	House of Lords	13
	European Parliament	15
	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe	17
	Devolved legislatures in the United Kingdom	17
	Northern Ireland	18
	Scotland	19
	Wales	20
	Key differences to the House of Commons context	21
	Proportional allocation of speaking time to parties based on size	22
	Fixed nature of business	23
	Opportunities to raise emerging and emergent issues	23
4	The current practice	25
	The flexibility of the sitting day in the House of Commons	25
	Government Statements and Urgent Questions	26

The Moment of Interruption	28
Role of the Speaker and Deputy Speakers	29
Call list arrangements during the Covid-19 pandemic	31
Appendix 1: Responses from Members to the Committee's online form	35
Respondents in favour of introducing call lists	35
Respondents opposed to introducing call lists	36
Other matters to consider	37
Conclusions and recommendations	38
Formal Minutes	41
Witnesses	43
Published written evidence	44
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	45

Summary

We started this inquiry to examine potential merits and drawbacks of publishing call lists (also referred to as speakers lists) for debates in the House of Commons, and the impact this could have on business in the House. We heard a range of differing and distinct views from both external stakeholders, and from Members, who identified challenges relating to the current organisation of debate in the House of Commons, and ways in which published call lists could help to address some of those issues.

Amongst the Members who called for published call lists there were suggestions that this would make the working day more predictable as they would know roughly when (or indeed if) they could be expected to be called in a debate. Other Members stated that it would be helpful to know when they would need to be in the Chamber to give their speech, to allow them to plan for caring responsibilities, travel to their constituencies, or managing health conditions or disabilities. We also heard from smaller parties who argued that due to having fewer Members covering debates across the Chamber, Westminster Hall and participating in committee meetings, call lists could help them plan their time and ensure their parties were well represented. On the other hand, we heard from those opposed to the introduction of published call lists, who suggested it might have a negative effect on the quality of debates and attendance in the Chamber. Overall, the evidence we have heard has provided excellent context to our inquiry and alerted us to challenges like accessibility, representation and certainty. This has in turn helped guide us towards considering call lists in a wider context, rather than in isolation.

We took note of how things operate in the House of Lords, where speakers lists are used for some items of business, and how it necessitated earlier deadlines on registering interest to speak compared to in the Commons where no prior notice is required. We also noted the administrative resource required to manage and update the list. We recognise how the idea of a speakers list operates under the very different model of running business in the House of Lords, where business can proceed without fixed finish time provided for in their Standing Orders. We also corresponded with colleagues in the devolved legislatures and examined international legislatures and assemblies that use call lists in their proceedings (outlined in chapter 3 of this report), and identified similarities and differences in how our business operates.

We also reflect on the experience of call lists in the House of Commons during the Covid-19 pandemic, when call lists were used out of necessity due to the hybrid nature of our proceedings and the digital infrastructure which we relied on for virtual contributions. Although this system was designed to suit a very specific set of conditions, it provided a useful insight into how it changed the dynamics of our debates. From the experience and the accounts shared with us, we do not believe it was conducive to high quality debate. Instead, we suggest it is appropriately viewed as being of its time and conditions, rather than something that can be applied to House proceedings in a business-as-usual situation.

From our examination of international examples, and as was the case during our hybrid Covid-19 pandemic proceedings, the introduction of call lists often necessitates timed speaking slots to fit into the time allocated to the business in question. Pre-designated time limits are not desirable in all circumstances; rather time limits should be imposed reactively by the Chair to ensure that as many Members as possible can make comprehensive contributions on important matters.

The Speaker and the Deputy Speakers enjoy unfettered discretion over who to call and when, a power which is underpinned by several conventions regarding the order in which Members can be called to contribute to debates. They are, in practice, guided by a provisional list of speakers drawn up by the Speaker's Office, based on Members notifying the Speaker's Office ahead of a debate with a request to participate. In contrast to the practice in some other legislatures, this list is not shared publicly, though Members and party Whips can approach the Chair informally during debates to ask for indications of if/when they will be called.

The oversight and management of debate which the Chair exercises during a debate considers many factors and must remain flexible to their informed discretion. We believe this would be unduly restricted with a published call list, and directly limit the powers of stewardship vested in the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers by the House. We believe that the informal system currently in play, where Members can seek guidance from the Chair on if and when they might be called strikes the right balance, ensuring that the power of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker to exercise discretion during a debate is not eroded. We conclude that Members should continue to approach the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers and make use of the informal system in place.

In addition to this, we recognise and respect the discretionary power of the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers over who to call and when. In many of the assemblies that we examined, these speaking slots are allocated to parties based on their relative size in the legislature and are then distributed across the membership by the party whips. This is different to our procedure in the House of Commons, where the concept of proportionality is not widely

found; rather, our present system relies on dividing opportunities to speak between the Government and Opposition sides of the House, which has the potential advantage of giving greater speaking opportunities to individual opposition Members compared to a directly proportional system.

The flexibility of House of Commons business to take account of emerging and emergent issues makes it challenging to predict when a business item will start, or how long it may last for. Our system is by design flexible to respond to nationally significant events and announcements, with statements from the Government, or an Urgent Question chosen by the Speaker, being regular occurrences. These business items have a knock-on effect on both the starting time, and time available to, subsequent business, given the timing infrastructure provided for in our procedures. These business items reinforce the perspective of Parliament as the principal forum for national debate and assure constituents that they can rely on their representatives to perform Parliament's core scrutiny function by holding the Government to account in a timely and effective way.

If the House would like more certainty over the running of the parliamentary day, which was not something universally desired in the evidence we received, this must be looked at as part of larger piece of work, including considering the time allocation to different types of business as well as mechanisms for when debates conclude ahead of their allocated time, including the Moment of Interruption. The previously cited flexibility of the House of Commons sitting day, allowing Government statements and Urgent Questions to be added to a day's business at short notice, could be considered, including the timing at which such items are taken.

Ultimately, we believe that House of Commons procedure as it stands balances certainty and flexibility to meet the needs of Members and of the wider House. Any added elements or mechanisms to achieve greater certainty during the parliamentary day must be weighed against the possible negative effects or impacts on Members' ability to hold the Government to account, on the ability to hold dynamic debates on emerging and developing topics of national importance, and on the powers of the Chair in stewarding debates, a power which has been vested in them by the whole House through their election.

We do not believe that published call lists in isolation will have the effect which some have suggested. Published call lists would not work unless implemented alongside a broad package of major procedural changes, and would risk causing more problems than they have the potential to solve. Our key recommendation is that call lists should not be published.

We also recommend that our colleagues on the Modernisation Committee investigate the merits of introducing more certainty into the sitting day in more detail, as this was not seen as universally positive in the evidence we

received. We also recommend that the Modernisation Committee should be clear on whether it intends to consider the use of time in the Chamber, as announced in its 2024 memorandum, and if so, what it intends to cover.

1 The Committee's inquiry

1. The order in which Members are called during House of Commons business is at the discretion of the Chair, meaning that there is no predetermined and published order of speakers available to Members or the public. In other legislatures a “call list” is published ahead of the debate, which sets out an expectation (with a varying degree of precision) of if, and when, a member can expect to be called.
2. Our inquiry into call lists was launched on 16 December 2024, with the purpose of considering any potential merits and drawbacks to published call lists—or speakers lists as they are sometimes known—for debates in the House of Commons. We were especially interested in understanding the possible impact on business in the House, and whether there were lessons to be learnt from the use of call lists during the Covid-19 pandemic, or from assemblies and legislatures around the world.¹
3. The Committee received 16 written submissions (listed and linked at the end of this report), and 35 Members responded to the Committee’s anonymous online form (a summary of responses is available in Appendix 1).
4. We heard from four panels of witnesses in oral evidence:
 - On 23 April 2025 from former Deputy Speakers of the House of Commons: Rt Hon. Nigel Evans, the Rt Hon. the Baroness Laing of Elderslie DBE and the Rt Hon. the Baroness Winterton of Doncaster DBE;
 - On 15 October 2025 from MPs from smaller parties in the House of Commons: Dr Ellie Chowns MP (Green Party of England and Wales), Claire Hanna MP (SDLP) and Robin Swann MP (UUP); and
 - On 5 November 2025 from two panels, the first consisting of Kirsty Blackman MP (SNP), and the second of Dr Ruth Fox, Hansard Society,² and Dr Sarabajaya Kumar, Centenary Action.³

1 UK Parliament, [‘Inquiry launched into the use of call lists for debates’](#), 16 December 2024

2 Hansard Society is a charity focused on research and analysis of politics and democracy

3 Centenary Action is a cross-party coalition bringing together women’s organisations, academics, and politicians to campaign for a gender-equal Parliament

5. We also held private meetings with Clerks in the House Administration and with Members, and we benefited from the insights from the Modernisation Committee's 'call for views' exercise, where call lists was a frequently raised topic.⁴

6. **CONCLUSION**

We would like to express our gratitude to all those both inside and outside the House of Commons who have taken an interest in our inquiry and shared their views with us.

4 Modernisation Committee ([CLIO001](#))

2 The problem to be solved

7. We started this inquiry following representations from Members raising concerns about the lack of certainty in the parliamentary day. Some Members argued that it was challenging to plan their working day when they could not find out when, or even if, they might be called during a debate. Several Members told us that they felt that they often ‘wasted’ significant periods of time waiting in the Chamber to be called and then not being called at all before the end of the debate; time that could be better spent on other important parliamentary or constituency business.
8. Over the course of our inquiry, we also heard of other situations in which it was suggested that call lists could be a helpful tool in assisting Members with their parliamentary work, as well as evidence concerning how they could improve accessibility, assist Members managing health conditions, increase the ability of Members from smaller parties to contribute to debates, and improving the work/life balance.⁵ For some, call lists presented a neat solution to the current uncertainty that can exist during a parliamentary day.

Accessibility

9. During our inquiry, we were particularly concerned to explore the impact of current arrangements on accessibility. Dr Ekaterina Kolpinskaya from the University of Exeter told us that the current arrangements for debates in the Commons encourage lively and dynamic discourse and make Members very visible to their constituents. However, Dr Kolpinskaya also argued that the practices are “unpredictable and physically and mentally intense”, which she suggested is specifically challenging for disabled Members who may require more time to move around on the Estate, and may also require more frequent breaks.⁶ Centenary Action, an organisation focused on working towards a gender-equal Parliament, similarly suggested that call lists could make the sitting day more predictable, allowing Members to have more clarity of when they need to be in the Chamber. This, they argued, could enable more equitable participation for a wider range of Members.⁷

5 Modernisation Committee ([CLIO001](#))

6 Dr Ekaterina Kolpinskaya, University of Exeter ([CLIO010](#))

7 Centenary Action ([CLIO015](#))

10. Dr Marie Tidball MP told the Modernisation Committee:

I am of the view that having a sense, as they have in the Lords, of when you are going to be called on the list is a really good thing, because if you know that you are going to speak after a certain number of speakers or after an individual speaker, you could indicate just before. [...] I think having call lists is a good idea. I want to be required to listen to my parliamentary colleagues, but I want to do so for a reasonable amount of time so that I can go in and out, and with some predictability, so that it is not stressful.⁸

11. Sarah Bool MP similarly told the Modernisation Committee that although she was not in favour of full call lists, more certainty would be helpful:

[...] the difficulty with type 1 [diabetes] or any other condition [...] is how long you can wait for a debate. I am not calling for call lists, because I understand that it is a debating Chamber, and I like that side of it. My difficulty is this: I was sat waiting in a debate for five hours the other day. It was on a Monday night, so I was there until 9, and I could see that my blood sugars were dipping and dipping. I was taking sweets, but I did not want to leave the Chamber, because I had been told that, through an admin error, they had forgotten my name, so they said they would put me up the list. I did not dare leave, in case I then missed my slot, but by the time I got to occasionally bobbing, I felt quite ill. I did it anyway, because you put the smile on your face and you do it, don't you? I have talked to a few colleagues, and for us that is probably the hardest part. It is about knowing with a bit more certainty, if possible, when we could be called.⁹

12. We are grateful to our colleagues on the Modernisation Committee who undertook important work considering the accessibility of the House of Commons and its procedures in their recent report. They concluded that certainty over the parliamentary day may be particularly helpful for disabled Members, and Members with long-term health conditions, but stated that they were keen to “[...] strike the right balance between making the House more accessible while retaining important flexibility and the vitality of debate.”¹⁰

13. We are in complete agreement with our colleagues on that committee that the House must do all that it can to ensure that all Members can participate in House proceedings equally and equitably and we look forward to seeing how their important recommendations will be implemented. While we too

8 Oral evidence taken by the Modernisation Committee on 1 April, [Q5](#) [Dr Marie Tidball]

9 Oral evidence taken by the Modernisation Committee on 1 April, [Q5](#) [Sarah Bool MP]

10 Modernisation Committee, First Report of Session 2024–26, [Access to the House of Commons and its Procedures](#), HC 775

have kept considerations of accessibility in the forefront of our minds during the course of our inquiry, we are of the view that in this specific context the discretion of the Chair is a suitably flexible means by which Members can be reassured that all Members have access to the information and adjustments they require to participate in debates in the House of Commons Chamber.

Representation of smaller parties

- 14.** Claire Hanna MP told us about the challenge smaller parties face in covering multiple policy areas, a particular challenge in her case as she was her party's only representative in Westminster. The lack of certainty over if and when she would be called in a debate prevented her from participating in debates as often as she would wish:

If you go in to speak on a standard debate of maybe three or four hours, as a smaller party coming down the pecking order, you really need to commit those four hours. It is a disincentive to speak. Unless it is absolutely fundamental to you—or, in my case, is on legislation specifically about Northern Ireland or the island of Ireland—you unfortunately cannot commit the time, or you cannot put anything else into your diary for that day. That encourages you to just do interventions, which means a loss in the quality of debate—something we are all trying to uphold.¹¹

- 15.** Similarly, Dr Ellie Chowns MP told us that the Green Party were in favour of call lists, suggesting that it could be especially beneficial for smaller parties:

We have, as individuals, experienced the challenges, with each of us covering at least half a dozen portfolios and juggling very significant demands on our time to be in different places at different times. We are frequently called quite low down the list, particularly during long debates, so the current way of organising parliamentary business, in which there is not a huge amount of transparency and predictability, particularly impacts on small groups.¹²

- 16.** However, Robin Swann MP suggested that being called late in a debate was understandable seeing as he is his party's only representative, and expressed his opposition to call lists as a solution to smaller party representation:

I would be opposed to introducing a call list because it would manufacture an expectation of when people will speak, and it would move the Chamber away from being a debating chamber and towards being a public speaking chamber. It is common that, as smaller parties, we are always at the end of the debate. That is the place I see

¹¹ [Q2](#) [Claire Hanna MP]

¹² [Q1](#) [Dr Ellie Chowns MP]

my party as being in, because I am a single MP from a single party, so that is where I see our place in that. Speaking in the Chamber is a privilege; it is not a right. Introducing call lists would give Whips the ability to manage who speaks, when they speak, how long they speak and what they speak on.¹³

17. We note the real difficulty and uncertainty faced by representatives of smaller parties in knowing when they will be called. We also note that while they expect to be called late in a debate and that there is no certainty over when they will be called, there is a general expectation that they are nevertheless more likely than not to be called in a debate of reasonable length. We discuss the potential advantages and disadvantages of allocating speaking time proportionately in paragraphs 53 and 54 of this report, and the impact that this could have on the smaller parties.

Certainty and work-life balance

18. Elect Her and Compassion in Politics, two campaigning organisations, suggested that call lists could help support predictability and work-life balance for Members, encourage better public engagement and understanding of Parliament, promote accessibility and fairness, and enhance participation in debates.¹⁴ In his written evidence to us, Neil Duncan-Jordan MP suggested that the uncertainty of not knowing when or if Members would be called in a debate could limit the “efficient use of parliamentary time and lead to inconsistent opportunities to contribute”, and stated that call lists could provide clarity, enable better preparation and structuring for debates, and “enhance the overall function of the House”.¹⁵
19. Kirsty Blackman MP told us about the trade-off many Members must make between attempting to speak in a debate without guarantees that they will, and the other aspects of their professional and private life:

Especially because of the size of [the SNP] right now and the fact that we don’t always get called in all of the debates, I think it is the case that people think, “I’ve got the choice. Will I be home for my constituents and my kids, and to care for my mother on that Thursday, or will I put in for that debate? If I put in for the debate, I probably won’t get called anyway, so there is no point in my doing that—I’d better just go up the road and have that certainty.” Because of the nature of it, you do have to plan further in advance. The majority of

13 [Q2](#) [Robin Swann MP]

14 Elect Her and Compassion in Politics ([CLI0011](#))

15 Neil Duncan-Jordan MP ([CLI0003](#))

Scottish MPs will fly to Westminster. All the Northern Irish MPs have to fly, pretty much, in order to get here. Travel is much more difficult, so there is a time element for that.¹⁶

20. Drawing upon their report, entitled ‘The Remotely Representative House?’,¹⁷ Centenary Action argue that the current practice for finding out when a Member can expect to be called in a debate is “informal, individualised and opaque, leaving women MPs with caring responsibilities dependent on whether or not they have what is seen as a family-friendly Whip who will tell them when they will speak in a debate”.¹⁸ During our evidence session on 5 November 2025, Dr Sarabajaya Kumar, a representative of Centenary Action, argued that call lists could, in principle, enable some groups of Members to participate more effectively:

We are starting from the point of view of accountability to the public. If our disabled MPs, women MPs and perhaps those MPs who live very far from Westminster can participate much more in debate, that is, for us, an accountability issue. They may be less likely to be selected because they are from a smaller party, are further away or are disabled.¹⁹

Are call lists the solution?

21. Dr Ruth Fox, Director of the Hansard Society, summarised her view that the different arguments for the introduction of call lists seemed to suggest that they were a ‘silver bullet’ that could remedy many different issues, but that she was not clear if this was truly the case:

It is not clear to me at this stage exactly what problem this is trying to solve. It seems to me that there is not a consensus. Some Members want more certainty than others; some Members are suggesting that perhaps the Chair’s existing informal speakers’ list should be published, or at least made available privately to the parties and to Members; some want certainty about whether they are going to be called; some Members want more certainty about when they are likely to be called; some Members want additional certainty about how long they are going to have for their speeches, and so on. I think you need to define quite carefully the degree of specificity and certainty that you want.²⁰

22. Dr Fox suggested that should the House want to solve the issues of certainty and increase transparency over who was called to participate in any given debate, this might have to be resolved by much wider changes to House

16 [Q28](#) [Kirsty Blackman MP]

17 Centenary Action, [The Remotely Representative House?](#) February 2021

18 Centenary Action ([CLI0002](#))

19 [Q37](#) [Dr Sarabajaya Kumar]

20 [Q30](#) [Dr Ruth Fox]

procedures, including to the powers of the Speaker or Deputy Speaker chairing the debate and to the way in which business in the House is organised.²¹ Among the examples she gave of such possible changes were introducing breaks in business, as in the House of Lords, or reducing the time allowed for statements.

23. Similarly, Centenary Action recognised that published call lists could form part of a larger package of procedural changes which they suggested could include deciding sitting hours further in advance, a clear schedule for debates and votes with less room for last-minute changes, building breaks into debates, and holding shorter debates with time limits agreed in advance. Centenary Action also suggested that call lists could be introduced for some debates, but not necessarily for all debates, or could be introduced for parts of debates.²²

24. **CONCLUSION**

The witness statements made to our inquiry, and to the Modernisation Committee's inquiry into accessibility, have provided excellent context to this inquiry and alerted us to challenges regarding accessibility, representation and certainty in the parliamentary day. The consideration of these issues has helped to guide us towards undertaking a wider examination in the course of our inquiry, as we were repeatedly told by witnesses that call lists should not be considered in a vacuum.

21 [Q38](#) [Dr Ruth Fox]

22 Centenary Action ([CLI0015](#))

3 Practice in other legislatures

25. Call lists for debates exist in many legislatures around the world. Members who wish to speak in a debate are often required to apply by a certain deadline, after which a list is compiled and published a set period ahead of the debate. Other legislatures with technical facilities built into the design of their chambers allow members to press a button at their allocated seat to indicate that they wish to speak and rely on digital screens in the chamber to display who is added to the list of the speakers waiting to speak in the debate.
26. However, as we have considered the practice in other legislatures, it has also become clear to us that the specific context of our system, where flexibility in the sitting day is a key feature (see Chapter 4 for more details), makes it challenging to directly compare it to others. Some legislatures also rely on political input from a wider set of political groups to a larger extent, particularly in a proportionally elected legislature, and employ methods designed to ensure proportionality such as the D'Hondt method, a mathematical formula used in many places across the world in various proportionality-based electoral systems, to allocate speaking slots in a debate.
27. In this chapter, we will briefly examine how call lists—or speakers lists—work in other legislative chambers, both in the UK and internationally.

House of Lords

28. In the House of Lords, call lists are compiled and published for certain items of business, a practice which has been in place since the 1960s. The lists are compiled and published by the House of Lords' Chief Whips' office, rather than by the Lord Speaker's Office or any other part of the House of Lords Administration. In a letter to our Committee, Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Senior Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords, informed us that speakers lists are commonly used for the following types of debates:
 - General debates (Government- or other Peer-led), whether formally time-limited or not;
 - Questions for short debate; and

- Second Readings of Government and Private Members Bills.²³

29. Conversely, Lord Gardiner told us that speakers lists are specifically not used for the following types of business:

- Amending stages of legislation;
- Secondary legislation debates (even on “take note” motions in relation to a statutory instrument);
- Oral questions;
- Urgent business (either Private Notice Questions or repeated business from the Commons); or
- Normally, House-related business (Conduct, Commission, Procedure Committee report etc), though in exceptional circumstances some House motions may have lists by agreement of the Usual Channels.²⁴

30. A Peer who wishes to notify their intention to speak in a debate for which there is a speakers list signs up via the Chief Whip’s website using their own personalised login or by notifying the Chief Whip’s office by email, phone, or in person.²⁵ The speakers list closes two working days before the debate is due to take place, with the deadline set at 5pm Monday to Thursday and 4pm on Fridays. The final list is then published online on the Chief Whip’s website an hour before the debate is due to start, following discussions and agreement between the party Whips. Peers who withdraw from the debate once they have signed up to it are called “scratchers”, as their name is “scratched” off the list.²⁶

31. The House of Lords is a self-regulating chamber over which the Lord Speaker, or the Deputy Lord Speakers, have no authority to call Members to speak, and the debate proceeds by agreement in the order specified on the speakers list.²⁷ For debates where there is no speakers list, Peers will rise in their place to speak, and if two Peers do so at the same time. one of them will give way to the other.²⁸ The debate will continue until there are no more Peers indicating a wish to speak. Lord Kennedy of Southwark provided the following reflection, at the end of the Annex to Lord Gardiner’s letter, on how he thought the speakers list system works in practice:

23 Letter from Lord Gardiner of Kimble to the Chair on Lord’s Speakers’ lists, [20 June 2025](#)

24 Letter from Lord Gardiner of Kimble to the Chair on Lord’s Speakers’ lists, [20 June 2025](#)

25 Government Whips’ Office House of Lords, [Speakers’ lists for Debates](#), accessed 041225

26 Letter from Lord Gardiner of Kimble to the Chair on Lord’s Speakers’ lists, [20 June 2025](#)

27 Letter from Lord Gardiner of Kimble to the Chair on Lord’s Speakers’ lists, [20 June 2025](#)

28 Erskine May, [Precedence in speaking](#), 25th edition

Generally it works well, and is in keeping with the overall procedures of self-regulation in the House of Lords. We have well established conventions and precedents for how lists are ordered. We have been asked previously whether lists could be published earlier, but we have advised against this given the extensive changes we find from scratchers up until just before the House sits, which would lead to reissuing of the list and potential confusion about the correct version.²⁹

European Parliament

- 32.** The European Parliament, the directly elected legislative body of the European Union, meets twelve times per year, on a rotating basis between its two chambers in Strasbourg and Brussels.³⁰ The 720 Members of European Parliament (MEPs) are elected in their home countries and sent to represent their party and country in the European Parliament. MEPs are seated in allocated seats from which they vote using electronic voting buttons, and they sit grouped alongside their political groups rather than other MEPs from their home country.³¹ Business in the plenary sessions focuses primarily on debates and votes on legislative reports, reports under the budgetary procedure, and non-legislative reports and resolutions. Speaking time is allocated in two parts of the debate: the first part is divided equally to the political groups; and the second part is divided amongst the political groups in proportion to each of the groups' total number of MEPs.
- 33.** The political groups decide internally who from their group will speak and for how long, and the order of speakers is published in a speakers list. There are also certain MEPs who will be expected to speak on specific items, such as the committee spokespersons.³² In debates where there is sufficient time, there is also a portion of the debates dedicated to 'catching the eye' of the President of the European Parliament for those MEPs who have not put their name down for the official list.³³ Members who have not spoken in a debate may also, once per part-session, submit a written statement (of no more than 200 words) to be appended to the report of the debate in lieu of making a spoken contribution to a debate.³⁴
- 34.** During our evidence session on 15 October 2025, Dr Ellie Chowns MP told us about what she considered was a positive experience of speakers lists in the European Parliament from her time as an MEP:

29 Letter from Lord Gardiner of Kimble to the Chair on Lord's Speakers' lists, [20 June 2025](#)

30 European Parliament, [How plenary works](#), accessed 041225

31 European Parliament, [Plenary](#), accessed 041225

32 European Parliament, [The Plenary: a User's Guide](#), table 1, 2024

33 European Parliament, [The Plenary: a User's Guide](#), section 4.3, 2024

34 European Parliament, [The Plenary: a User's Guide](#), 2024

There is a system of allocation of time, partly divided between groups and partly in accordance with group size. There is also a portion of debate that is more open and freer. I only served for seven months, but there was a mechanism whereby you could be in a debate and go down and give a piece of paper to the Speaker saying that you wanted to speak—you could get into a debate right then and there. There were opportunities to prioritise speaking on issues that were particularly important to you. Even if you were not your party's or political group's main speaker—it would be them who had the first go-round slot—there were opportunities to put yourself on the list. You would not always get on to the list in the ballot, effectively, but if you were attending the debate and able to get on to the list at the last minute, there was also that opportunity to contribute. To me it seems like a really good balance between pre-programmed clarity about timings—the order in which people would speak was on our intranet—and allowing for a bit more of a flow of debate. There was still an opportunity for the equivalent of requests to give way.³⁵

35. However, due to concerns that published speakers lists are having a negative impact on the quality of debate in the European Parliament, trials began in January 2025 of a pilot programme where, for some debates, the speakers lists were not published. Media reports noted that one of the reasons for trialling this was that it would “increase the attractiveness of the plenary debates”.³⁶ During these trials, the structure of debates remained broadly the same as before, with the first round of speeches still being made up of speakers from the political groups, and the second round of those MEPs who has requested to speak, but MEPs present in the chamber were only able to see the next two speakers to be called on display screens in the chamber, rather than having access to the full speaking list.³⁷
36. A spokesperson for the European Parliament reportedly stated that the trials will be evaluated by the President of the European Parliament and the leaders of the political groups in due course.³⁸ At time of publication, these trials are ongoing. We look forward to hearing the reflections from members of the European Parliament once the evaluation has concluded, given the experience of some of our own Members as former MEPs, and the close links between our two parliaments.

35 [Q18](#) [Dr Ellie Chowns MP]

36 EU News, [EU Parliament will test new rules to combat absenteeism in the chamber](#), 17 January 2025

37 EU News, [EU Parliament will test new rules to combat absenteeism in the chamber](#), 17 January 2025

38 Politico, [European Parliament finally devises plan to force lawmakers to actually turn up](#), 16 January 2025

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

- 37.** The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) consists of 306 members of national parliaments across the 46 member States, including the United Kingdom.³⁹ PACE conducts its work both in committees and in plenary sessions four times per year. Like the European Parliament, members sit in allocated seats with their political groups rather than with parliamentarians from their own country, and vote using an electronic voting system.⁴⁰
- 38.** Members of PACE are called to speak by the President of the Assembly and do so from their allocated seat in the chamber. Unless making a point of order or moving a procedural motion, members wishing to speak in a debate must enter their names in the speaker's register.⁴¹ The list of speakers for a debate is closed one hour before the end of the previous sitting and is published as soon as possible thereafter. The list for the first sitting of a part-session is closed one and a half hours before the opening of that sitting.⁴²
- 39.** PACE table office staff are responsible for managing and ordering the speakers list following quite complex criteria set out in the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly. These include taking account of the number of speakers in each debate from each party group (using the D'Hondt formula), allowing members who have participated in the highest number of votes taken in a plenary session to be moved up three positions in the list, and ensuring that the first half of a speakers list does not include more than 50% of the members of a national delegation.⁴³

Devolved legislatures in the United Kingdom

- 40.** We wrote to the Presiding Officers of the Northern Ireland Assembly, the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Parliament/Senedd Cymru to learn about the arrangements in each of the devolved legislatures in the United Kingdom. Their responses were published as written evidence to our inquiry, and we reiterate our thanks for their helpful contributions. We also heard from current Members of the UK Parliament who were previously members of devolved legislatures.

39 The Council of Europe in Brief, [Structure](#), accessed 041225

40 The Council of Europe, [Assembly Procedure](#), accessed 041225

41 The Council of Europe, [Rules of Procedure of the Assembly](#), October 2025

42 The Council of Europe, [Rules of Procedure of the Assembly](#), October 2025

43 The Council of Europe, [Rules of Procedure of the Assembly](#), Appendix 1, October 2025

Northern Ireland

41. The Standing Orders of the Northern Ireland Assembly stipulate that the Speaker of the Assembly is responsible for the arrangement of the debate, including the order of speakers, in conjunction with the Assembly's Business Committee.⁴⁴ After each election, the Business Committee agrees the general arrangements for debates. At present, it can be summarised as a first round where spokespersons are called from those parties with five or more members, with the largest party generally being called first, followed by subsequent rounds of speeches where speakers are called in an order calculated on the basis of the D'Hondt formula, worked out on the proportionate size of each party in the Assembly.⁴⁵
42. In his letter to the Committee, the Speaker of the Northern Ireland Assembly, Edwin Poots MLA, stated that in practice each party sends a party speaking list to the Assembly Business Office, which is then used by officials to populate a speaking list template. This list is then used by the Speaker in the Chamber but remains subject to change. Members of the Assembly can add their name to the speaking list by rising in their place or otherwise notifying the Speaker or the Business Office, and can remove their name from the list by notifying the Speaker. Only the party Whips can adjust the order of the speakers.⁴⁶
43. We were especially interested to read about the Speaker's discretion to offer a so-called 'grace period' when the number of speakers remaining on a list might justify extending the debate beyond its allocated time:

In the 2017/22 mandate, in light of the frequency of debates in which the number of Members seeking to speak exceeded the time allocated by the Business Committee, the then Speaker, Alex Maskey, sought the consent of the Business Committee for flexibility for the Chair to go beyond the agreed length of a debate. One such flexibility was that the Speaker could utilise a grace period of up to 15 minutes to extend a debate to accommodate remaining Members who wish to speak, in particular where there were parties or independent Members who have not had an adequate or proportionate opportunity to speak. This process was well received and the current Business Committee agreed that it should continue. In deciding whether to apply a grace period to a debate, the Speaker (or Deputy Speakers) will take into account the significance of the topic being debated, the number of Members yet to speak, whether time has already been extended for amendments; and other pressures on Assembly business on that day. When used, the

44 Northern Ireland Assembly, [Business Committee](#), accessed 081225 ; Northern Ireland Assembly, [Standing Orders](#), 17 (4)-(5), July 2025

45 Edwin Poots MLA ([CLI0014](#))

46 Edwin Poots MLA ([CLI0014](#))

Speaker may shorten speaking times for remaining Members in order to accommodate more Members. The Speaker will also announce the use of the grace period.⁴⁷

44. During our evidence session on 15 October 2025, Claire Hanna MP and Robin Swann MP both provided their reflections on their experiences as former MLAs. Claire Hanna MP suggested that there is predictability as a result of the arrangements in the Northern Ireland Assembly,⁴⁸ while Robin Swann MP told us:

[...] it is done by D'Hondt. It depends on party size: it is biggest party, then second party, and you could get a number of speakers from those two parties before you move to the smaller parties at the end. The difference with the Northern Ireland Assembly is that there are two types of debate. The no day named list is a 90-minute debate, and I can tell you from having been Chief Whip, party leader and a Minister that, in a 90-minute debate, the mover has 10 minutes to move and 10 minutes to wind up, and all other Members will have five minutes. That is how structured that becomes, and it worries me that the Commons Chamber could move there. The Assembly Speaker, Edwin Poots, recently challenged the Members of the Assembly to move away from a public speaking chamber back to being a debating chamber. That is my worry about moving to that style.⁴⁹

Scotland

45. In her letter to us, the Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP, Presiding Officer of the Scottish Parliament, set out that during a regular parliamentary sitting week (the Scottish Parliament sits three afternoons per week during its sitting time), the business includes time allocated each afternoon for a debate lasting between two and three hours, which is sometimes split into two separate debates. The official opposition can schedule business during 16 half sitting days per year, following discussion and agreement between the opposition political leaders at the Parliamentary Bureau. The remainder of debate slots are for Government-led business, such as legislation.⁵⁰
46. Under the Scottish Parliament's Standing Order 7.2.1, the Presiding Officer has the power to decide who should be called in the debate. In her letter to us, Ms Johnstone set out:

47 Edwin Poots MLA ([CLI0014](#))

48 [Q10](#) [Claire Hanna MP]

49 [Q14](#) [Robin Swann MP]

50 Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP ([CLI0012](#))

At the beginning of the parliamentary session, the Presiding Officer agrees and provides Business Managers with debate management lines for debates of different types (e.g. Government debates, committee debates, opposition debates, Stage 1 or Stage 3 debates on bills) and lengths. The time is allocated to the parties represented on the Bureau on a proportionate basis but a degree of flexibility (approximately 10 per cent of the time for each debate) is retained to allow the Presiding Officer in the chair latitude where speakers have taken interventions and for additional speakers should there be requests. MSPs not put forward by their party, independent MSPs or parties not represented on the Bureau may request to speak in a debate and are invited to participate at the discretion of the Presiding Officer.⁵¹

47. The party Whips usually nominate speakers for the debates. Following the opening speeches, the Presiding Officer or Deputy Presiding Officer in the chair invites all members who wish to speak to press their ‘request to speak’ buttons on their desks. Their names then appear on the screen in the chamber, allowing the Presiding Officer to confirm the list and take account of any additional requests subsequently received. Depending on the time available, the Presiding Officer or the Deputy Presiding Officer may use their discretion to allow additional speakers to be called.⁵²

48. Ms Johnstone concluded in her letter:

The Scottish Parliament’s Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee is responsible for proposing any changes to the Parliament’s procedures or practices. While the Committee has considered the format of debates and how best a range of speakers can participate in debates, there have not been any specific inquiries into the current approach during this 2021–2026 session.⁵³

Wales

49. The Welsh Parliament/Senedd Cymru has 60 elected members who meet in plenary sessions on Tuesdays and Wednesdays during sitting time. Members can choose to participate virtually or in person, and, with the exception of consideration of legislation, each item of business is generally scheduled for one hour of consideration.⁵⁴

51 Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP ([CLI0012](#))

52 Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP ([CLI0012](#))

53 Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP ([CLI0012](#))

54 Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS ([CLI0013](#))

50. The power to call Members to speak lies with the Presiding Officer/the Llywydd.⁵⁵ As set out in the ‘Guidance on the proper conduct of Senedd business’, there are conventions relating to the order of speakers depending on the business in question, and the Llywydd has the power to impose speaking limits for oversubscribed debates.⁵⁶ Members who make their contribution virtually should, according to the Senedd’s ‘Guidance on Virtual and Hybrid Proceedings’, be “treated equitably in every regard, whether they are participating virtually or in person” and should expect to have the same opportunity to speak as those participating in person.⁵⁷
51. Members wishing to speak in a debate notify the Llywydd, either via their political group leaders or directly. According to the letter we received from the Llywydd, the Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS, submitted requests are “generally accommodated”.⁵⁸ There is no published version of this speakers list and there is no final definitive order of who is to be called, but instead the list is a “live document” for the use of the Llywydd, clerks and a limited number of other staff teams supporting the proceedings.⁵⁹ Ms Jones also told us that there had not been any calls to reform the speaker list system, which she suggested might be due to the fact that there are only 60 Members and that they are usually able to be accommodated in the debates they want to speak in. However, she did note that with the Senedd’s membership rising from 60 to 96 members at the next election in May 2026, this might be something the Senedd wishes to consider as part of other procedural changes to accommodate this increase in the size of the legislature.⁶⁰

Key differences to the House of Commons context

52. As we have contemplated these domestic and international examples, we have considered to what extent they can be equated with the House of Commons context, and we have concluded that there are four key differences which would make it challenging to directly read across their procedures in relation to call lists to fit our circumstances.

55 Senedd Cymru, [Guidance on the proper conduct of Senedd business](#), paragraph 194, February 2025

56 Senedd Cymru, [Guidance on the proper conduct of Senedd business](#), paragraphs 28–32, 195, February 2025

57 Senedd Cymru, [Guidance on Virtual and Hybrid Proceedings](#), November 2025

58 Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS ([CLI0013](#))

59 Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS ([CLI0013](#))

60 Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS ([CLI0013](#))

Proportional allocation of speaking time to parties based on size

- 53.** In the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Northern Ireland Assembly and the Scottish Parliament, speaking slots are pre-agreed and allocated to parties or political groupings proportionally based on the size of the parties in the respective assembly. It therefore places more of the decision making on who gets to speak in any given debate to political parties, rather than to individual members themselves.
- 54.** The House of Commons is predicated on a fundamentally different basis from many of these examples, with our procedures starting from the position of recognising only two sides of the House—the Government and the Opposition—both of which can be composed of more than one party. Allocating speaking slots according to a mathematical formula based on the proportional size of each party in the Commons would be a significant departure from the current way in which the Speakers and Deputy Speakers use their discretion to call speakers alternately from both sides of the House. This gives greater speaking opportunities to Members from opposition parties of all sizes than would a proportional system, whereby their size is taken into account in allocating speaking opportunities, and more accurately reflects the way in which the House of Commons Chamber is, in part, a forum for scrutinising the Government. It would also require advance notice from parties of who was interested to speak in a debate, and changes to our procedures regarding the powers of the Chair to choose speakers. If notice was to be given by party whips, rather than individual Members themselves, it would increase the influence of whips over the business still further than is arguably the case today, and disadvantage those smaller parties who cannot hope to mirror the whipping operation of larger parties. Taken together, this, in turn, could have a particular impact on the ability of smaller parties to participate in debates, potentially leading to fewer rather than more opportunities for participation than is currently the case.
- 55.** In its written evidence to our inquiry, the Government set out its support for an indicative form of call list which could give Members a broad indication of when (and if) they can be expected to be called but not provide exact timings, but stated that:

In all circumstances, the Government would expect that the existing conventions and courtesies about participation in the Chamber continue to be observed and the Chair should continue to have the discretion to change the list where Members have not adhered to these.⁶¹

61 HM Government ([CLI0006](#))

Fixed nature of business

56. Some of the legislatures we have considered in this chapter have fixed timings for business, or for contributions from members, which means that there is more certainty over how many people can be called to speak and when a subsequent business item will start. We discuss the timings infrastructure in House of Commons procedures in more detail in the next chapter.
57. These assemblies also have a form of business organisational body—a committee or something similar—which is charged with compiling and organising the speakers lists,⁶² staffed by officials but often with political input. This is not something that the House of Commons currently has in place, despite calls in the past for a House Business Committee.⁶³

Opportunities to raise emerging and emergent issues

58. By contrast, the House of Commons is an outlier. The United Kingdom does not directly elect a Government, rather the Government retains its position because it can command the confidence of a majority in the House of Commons. This has led to a procedural emphasis on the Government's accountability to the House, and, in turn, an expectation that the House can expect to discuss urgent matters of national importance or public interest as they happen rather than waiting for a Departmental question time to be scheduled or for the Government to make a report to Parliament at a time of its own choosing. If the Government does not make a statement on a matter of importance in a timely manner, which it can do on any sitting day with notice to the Speaker, the Speaker may grant an Urgent Question. This means the business on House of Commons sitting days is inherently flexible and often depends on decisions relating to business being made on the day itself. We believe this is a strength and a privilege, and something which allows Parliament to undertake timely scrutiny in the national interest.
59. The interplay between Government statements and Urgent Questions and the potential introduction of call lists is discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Resource allocation

60. Based on our examination of other systems, we note that the management of published call lists comes with significant administrative and resource implications. In our context, the Speaker's Office (for debates in the

62 See, for example, the Northern Ireland Assembly, [Understanding the D'Hondt Method: Its Use in the Northern Ireland Assembly](#), accessed 081225

63 See, for example, House of Commons Reform Committee, First Report of Session 2008–09, [Rebuilding the House](#), HC 1117. To note: this is different from the Business Committee envisaged under SO No.82, which relates solely to scheduling of certain legislative stages and which is more often dealt with by way of Programme Orders.

Chamber) or the Chairman of Ways and Means' Office (for Westminster Hall)—and likely other parts of the House Administration, such as the Vote Office—would need to be involved in organising, updating and reissuing a call list based on Member requests (including withdrawing from a debate or actioning requests to be called earlier or later in a debate), and to ensure Members and staff are aware of and are accessing the most up to date version of a list. The need to ensure a timely collation, publication and reorganisation of published call lists would also require deadlines to be imposed for when Members could request to be added to a list, or removed from it, which may be quite far in advance of the business actually taking place to allow for the required administration of the list. Taken together, this indicates that the introduction of published call lists could represent increased administrative resourcing compared to the operation of the current arrangements; an increase which it has not been possible for us to accurately quantify based on the evidence received, but which we judge would be substantial in nature.

61. CONCLUSION

It has been immensely helpful to look at the practice in other legislatures and the House of Lords in considering whether, and if so how, call lists might be used in the House of Commons. It is clear to us that each legislature is unique. While some legislatures publish a pre-agreed list of who is speaking in debates, there is no single way in which this is done, as each legislature has its own procedural norms and constraints. Call lists can only be considered as part of a wider procedural, and even constitutional, system.

4 The current practice

62. In this chapter, we explore the procedural framework underpinning the current arrangements by which Members can speak in debates in the House of Commons. We will consider the arrangements for scheduling, and the mechanisms for timetabling, business in the House of Commons (including Government statements and Urgent Questions), the role of the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers, and lessons to be learnt from the experience of call lists in the House of Commons during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The flexibility of the sitting day in the House of Commons

63. The Government announces the business to take place in the House of Commons Chamber, and has almost full control of House business under Standing Order No. 14. The announcement of forthcoming business is announced to the House by the Leader of the House at Business Questions, usually on Thursday, but Business Statements can take place at different points if changes to business are deemed necessary to react to emerging situations.⁶⁴ It is customary for the Leader to announce the business for the forthcoming week.⁶⁵ Once announced, this business, which can include legislation and debates on various topics, is added to the Order Paper which is published online and printed in hard copy.⁶⁶ There are procedural rules preventing substantive business being brought forward unexpectedly.⁶⁷ Most substantive business is now timetabled either through Standing Orders (for example, 90 minutes is allocated to debates on proceedings under an Act of Parliament), Programme Motions (for legislation, usually taken after Second Reading of a Bill and supplemented for later stages by additional Programme Motions) or Business of the House motions.

64 For example, on [Monday 28 February 2022](#), the Leader of the House provided a Business Statement

65 Erskine May, [Business question](#), 25th edition

66 Erskine May, [Order Paper](#), 25th edition

67 A motion is substantive if it calls for action or expresses an opinion

Government Statements and Urgent Questions

64. The announced business mentioned in the preceding paragraphs forms the core of the expected running order of any given day. However, later additions to the House’s proceedings can introduce uncertainty into a parliamentary day as they have the effect of delaying and curtailing—potentially significantly—subsequent scheduled business. This includes, but is not limited to, Government statements and Urgent Questions (as mentioned in the preceding chapter).⁶⁸ Such business does not engage the decision-making role of the House; rather it gives Members the opportunity to question the Government in reaction to important events or changes in policy.
65. Ministers have the “presumptive right” to make statements in the House on topics within their policy remit.⁶⁹ The Ministerial Code sets out the general principle that all major Government statements should be made in the House of Commons Chamber in the first instance whenever the House is sitting.⁷⁰ The Speaker must be notified of Ministerial statements before the daily conference,⁷¹ unless in exceptional circumstances. Following a recommendation by the then Modernisation Committee in 2002, time limits on frontbench contributions during statements were introduced to try to limit the length of these statements and minimise the impact on subsequent business,⁷² but there is no overall restriction on how long Government statements can last.⁷³ It is largely within the gift of the Chair to decide how long to let the statement run for, depending on the interest from Members. This flexibility is useful when there is a statement of great interest, but it does make it challenging to estimate any delay to subsequent business ahead of time, as the popularity among Members may not be clear to the Chair until the Statement has commenced.
66. The Speaker also has the power to grant Urgent Questions. These are, if approved, taken after Departmental Questions and before any Government statements. These allow a Member to ask the Government a question about an urgent matter. As they are not scheduled before the day on which they are taken, they can also push the start of subsequent business to a later starting point. Members seeking to ask an Urgent Question must make an application to the Speaker’s Office before 11.30am on a Monday (or on a day

68 The Government has the power to schedule additional business provided that they adhere to the notice periods as set out in the House of Commons Standing Orders

69 Erskine May, [Ministerial statements](#), 25th edition

70 [HMG Ministerial Code](#) para 9.1; Erskine May, [Ministerial statements](#), 25th edition

71 The daily conference refers to a meeting between the Speaker and the Senior Clerks usually held a couple of hours before the House meets that day to discuss that day’s business

72 HC Deb (18 May 2016) 611, [c 2](#)

73 Erskine May, [Ministerial statements](#), 25th edition

after which the House has been adjourned for over two days), before 10am on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, before 8.15am on Thursdays, and before 8.30am on a sitting Friday.⁷⁴

67. Government statements and Urgent Questions are not by any means rare occurrences either. From the start of the current Parliament in July 2024, up to the end of December 2025, there were 159 Urgent Questions and 153 Ministerial statements across 238 sitting days. Statements and Urgent Questions are popular amongst Members, with the average Urgent Question lasting 39 minutes and the average statement lasting 1 hour and 3 minutes during this same period. They are viewed by Members as being effective in enabling scrutiny of the Government on important issues.
68. If Members wanted greater certainty in the timetabling of business, these types of business would need to be considered in detail and revisited, including the timing at which Urgent Questions or Government statements are taken. Having these at the end of the day for example could allow planned business to go ahead at scheduled timings before such items are taken but could impact on Members' ability to participate as these would then be taken after the expected finish time for that day. On days when the planned business finished ahead of the expected time, Members would have to be flexible to an earlier starting time, or the House would have to suspend between items. In short, if the House wants to continue to be able to debate emerging matters of national interest in the form of Government statements and Urgent Questions, then it is difficult to ensure complete certainty about when certain business will take place during a sitting day, and the introduction of call lists would not contribute to increasing certainty.
69. Moreover, as Government statements and Urgent Questions are announced to the House with short notice,⁷⁵ a call list system for these business items would either have to be done with a tight deadline, or the deadline for Members and the Government to give notice for them, and for the Speaker to grant them in the case of Urgent Questions, would have to be fixed further in advance of their taking place to allow Members time to register their interest. We suggest that this could risk preventing Members from participating in such proceedings and undermine the scrutiny aims of these proceedings. It would also leave the Speaker's Office with a very tight deadline to notify and receive feedback from the relevant Government department of the request for an Urgent Question, which is important information for the Speaker in informing a decision on whether to grant the Urgent Question.

74 Erskine May, [Urgent questions](#), 25th edition

75 These are usually announced to Members via a notice on the TV screens across the Estate (called the Annunciator) just 30 minutes before the sitting, other than on Mondays when it may be announced slightly earlier

- 70.** Dr Ruth Fox, Director of the Hansard Society, commented on the uncertainty that Government statements and Urgent Questions can create:

I don't think anybody would want to lose those, but the degree to which they can expand—they can be quite lengthy at times—is often a feature. That is, to some extent, at the discretion of the Speaker. The number of Members who want to participate in those goes to how long they will go on for. I do not think that anybody wants to lose that topicality, but perhaps you might want to think about whether there should be constraints on how long they can go for and whether there should be absolute certainty about a slot for those things, with legislative business starting at particular times.⁷⁶

The Moment of Interruption

- 71.** Each sitting day in the Commons has a set finishing time for main business, as set out in Standing Order No. 9(3), which is known as the 'Moment of Interruption'.⁷⁷ This is fixed in Standing Orders at 10pm on Mondays, 7pm on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, 5pm on Thursdays, and 2.30pm on sitting Fridays.⁷⁸ Certain motions or types of business can, however, be taken or continue past this point. These include (but are not limited to) exempted business or any other business that is programmed.
- 72.** When considering call lists, it was not clear to us how they should interact with the timing-related infrastructure of House of Commons procedures which are, in fact, designed to provide some form of certainty and predictability in and of themselves. For instance, if call lists were to be introduced, the House would have to agree, in addition to deciding whether call lists would apply to all business items or only to certain items, whether the proceedings on a given item of business would continue until the end of the call list (therefore rendering the Moment of Interruption, or the previously-agreed end point of a debate obsolete) or whether call lists would be cut short when the designated finish point is arrived at.
- 73.** In both circumstances, absolute certainty would not be a guaranteed outcome. If debates were to be allowed to continue until a call list had been exhausted, then the slots for subsequent business would be pushed later, particularly if it was an extensive list. Conversely, if few Members wished to speak, it could become necessary to suspend the sitting once the list was exhausted to await the allotted start time for the next item of business, in order to maintain the certainty of timing for subsequent debates. If, however, the way in which time was allotted remained unaltered, this would

⁷⁶ [Q37](#) [Dr Ruth Fox]

⁷⁷ House of Commons Standing Orders, paragraph 9(3), [HC 829](#), May 2024

⁷⁸ Erskine May, [Normal days and hours of sitting and rising](#), 25th edition

mean that a lengthy call list could be cut short when the designated finish is reached, with the result that Members expecting to be called could continue to be left disappointed, as adding their name to the call list would not act as a guarantee of being called.

Role of the Speaker and Deputy Speakers

- 74.** The chief characteristics attaching to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality.⁷⁹ The first of those is particularly relevant here: the authority of the Speaker over proceedings in the Chamber. It is ultimately for the Speaker, or the Chair of a debate exercising the delegated powers of the Speaker, to decide who to call to speak and when to do so, though they will often attempt to alternate between both sides of the House either until all Members who wish to speak have had the opportunity to do so, or until the time allotted for the debate is exhausted.⁸⁰ As a sign of courtesy, and often as a prerequisite to being called in a debate, Members wanting to speak are expected to be in the Chamber for the opening speeches, and once someone has spoken, they should remain for at least the next two speeches and return for the final speeches from the front benches.⁸¹ They should ‘bob’ or in another way try to ‘catch the Speaker’s eye’ in order to make the Chair aware of their desire to contribute to the debate.
- 75.** Although there is no published call list in the House of Commons, the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers can draw upon an informal call list. The Speaker’s Office draws this list together on the basis of those Members who have notified the office in advance that they wish to speak. There is a similar arrangement for debates in Westminster Hall, managed by the Chairman of Ways and Means’ Office.⁸² Not having given prior notice does not prevent a Member from attending a debate and seeking to contribute in the usual manner.
- 76.** The Government submission to our inquiry suggested that the informal call lists which are put together by the Speaker’s Office could form the basis of “greater advice” to Members on the likelihood of them being called in debates, and that there could be greater transparency as to how these lists are put together. The Government also suggested that we should consider whether there could be specific allowances made for Members with disabilities or other requirements preventing them from being in

79 Erskine May, [The Speaker as presiding Officer of the House of Commons](#), 25th edition

80 House of Commons, [Rules of behaviour and courtesies in the House of Commons](#), November 2023

81 House of Commons, [Rules of behaviour and courtesies in the House of Commons](#), November 2023

82 House of Commons, [Rules of behaviour and courtesies in the House of Commons](#), November 2023

the Chamber for a long period of time, as well as whether Members from smaller parties should be given greater consideration when such lists are produced to ensure the party's view is reflected.⁸³

- 77.** During our evidence session on 23 April 2025 with three former Deputy Speakers, Baroness Laing argued that there is an informal system in place where Members ask the Chair in the Chamber when they can be expected to be called, and that this delivered the right balance between letting Members know what to expect and letting the Chair retain the discretion of who to call next.⁸⁴ Baroness Laing suggested that accommodations were made for Members with a long-term disability on an individual basis, which she suggested ensured it suited the individual rather than making “sweeping changes that affect everybody without having thought them through”.⁸⁵
- 78.** Mr Evans, Baroness Laing and Baroness Winterton all agreed that Members now wanted to speak in as many debates as possible, much more so than in the past. Mr Evans stated that when he had entered the House of Commons in 1992, he had rarely been called to speak. The panel agreed that Members now had a different expectation, and that some people wanted to—and indeed expected to—speak regularly in the House on a wide range of topics.⁸⁶
- 79.** In her evidence to us on 15 October 2025, Dr Ellie Chowns MP said that the informal system worked well, but that it was not perfect:
- Currently, it is possible to come out of your space on the Benches, go around to the Speaker's Chair and ask where you are. As generally happens to me in long debates—I am talking about four or sometimes five-hour debates—you might be sitting there desperate for the bathroom, or maybe desperate for a banana or something to keep you going, and there is an opportunity to go and ask the Speaker. Sometimes you can get assured more than once in a debate that you are on the list and that they will get to you eventually, but there is no clarity on speaking time plus interventions. I have been in debates where I have been assured that I am on the list and will be reached, but then the debate has run out of time.⁸⁷
- 80.** Kirsty Blackman MP suggested that the Speaker's informal call lists could be shared with the Chief Whips of parties, to help them advise their Members ahead of debates. In her view, the current informal system where Members could go up to the Speakers' chair to ask did not work perfectly or equally for all Members or all parties:

83 HM Government ([CL10006](#))

84 Oral evidence taken 23 April 2025 [Q30](#) [Baroness Laing of Elderslie]

85 Oral evidence taken 23 April 2025 [Q39](#) [Baroness Laing of Elderslie]

86 Oral evidence taken 23 April 2025 [Q30](#) [Rt Hon. Nigel Evans, Baroness Laing of Elderslie, Baroness Winterton of Doncaster]

87 [Q7](#) [Dr Ellie Chowns MP]

It is much easier for MPs who can walk easily to go and ask the Speaker that question than it is for ones that struggle with mobility, for example. So there is a built-in advantage to some individuals as a result of having that system. The disadvantage is that it is mostly the Whips that do that. The SNP has nine MPs and one Whip. If I am not around, the Speaker and Deputy Speaker can sometimes be slightly awkward about giving the information to somebody who is not me, and I cannot be in the Chamber for every single debate. I just do not have time to do that. If there were more flexibility from the Speakers and they were clear that they would be flexible, or if we could delegate other people to ask those questions, that would make that easier. But it is a bit of an issue if you are the only MP from your party, for example, because then you are having to leave your space empty to go and ask those questions of the Speaker. If there were something published, it would be easier than having to go and ask.⁸⁸

81. We know that the Speaker and Deputy Speakers feel very strongly on this matter, and are all very open to doing what they can to ensure that Members are offered the necessary adjustments that they require. We are also conscious that Members may have concerns about confidentiality when disclosing bespoke accessibility needs, and the difficulties they may face in repeatedly having to set out their needs. We also understand that Members may not always be aware that such adjustments exist, and agree with the Modernisation Committee's conclusion that the Speaker, Deputy Speakers and party Whips should continue to work to ensure that the informal processes and mechanisms available to them are familiar to any Member who may benefit from them. Like the Modernisation Committee, we are keen to hear more about the Workplace Adjustment Passports initiated by the Members and Members' Staff Services Team, and we welcome the new Members Accessibility Group who will be instrumental in continuing to monitor these practices. We also look forward to seeing the House Administration's response to the Modernisation Committee's report in due course.

Call list arrangements during the Covid-19 pandemic

82. In a report published in November 2020, our predecessors set out the arrangements for debate in the Chamber during the Covid-19 pandemic.⁸⁹ One of the key tools in facilitating hybrid debates was the call lists, effectively providing Members with a speaking slot in the running order of speakers for a debate. This enabled the House Administration and

88 [Q25](#) [Kirsty Blackman MP]

89 Procedure Committee, Sixth Report of Session 2019–21, [Procedure under coronavirus restrictions: participation in debate](#), HC 905

the Member in question to ensure they were present, that there were no technical issues, and that they were in the virtual waiting room ready to make their contribution in good time. The report noted that this arrangement meant that Members had to give earlier notice that they wished to participate in debates, to enable the list to be generated.⁹⁰

83. The practical process of Members notifying that they wished to speak in the debate was done via the Speaker's Office who compiled the list and issued any updates to it as Members withdrew from debates.⁹¹ The list was then published by the Vote Office, with a clear timestamp for the purposes of version control.
84. Acknowledging the specific complicated context of the Covid-19 pandemic, the need to restrict how many people could physically be in the Chamber at any one time, and the hybrid element of Chamber which enabled virtual participation, it is nevertheless worth highlighting the then Clerk of the House's statement in regard to the complicated management of call lists:

Yesterday—and I counted them—we had 25 emails from the Speaker's Office indicating changes in participation, whether virtual switching to physical, physical to virtual, withdrawing or wanting to be included, and so on. During the course of yesterday, 14 Members withdrew from call lists. All those things are quite messy.⁹²

85. Reflecting on her experience of call lists during the Covid-19 pandemic, Claire Hanna MP concluded that she “probably spoke on more topics, in more debates during that time because I could invest the time”, but that it was not same as in a regular debate as it was not possible to take interventions. She did, however, suggest that the arrangement had meant that there was a level of assurance of whether she could expect to be called in a debate.⁹³

90 Procedure Committee, Sixth Report of Session 2019–21, [Procedure under coronavirus restrictions: participation in debate](#), HC 905

91 Procedure Committee, Fifth Special Report of Session 2019–21, [Back to the Future? Procedure under coronavirus restrictions](#), HC 1282

92 Oral evidence taken on 27 January 2021, [Q423](#) [Dr John Benger]

93 [Q9](#) [Claire Hanna MP]

86.

CONCLUSION

Published call lists would not operate in isolation, but within a complex procedural ecosystem. The business in the House of Commons Chamber, and the rules and procedures which govern it, makes predicting the duration of individual business items challenging. The timing infrastructure is designed to give certainty and predictability to the duration of certain business items, and particularly to the day itself via the Moment of Interruption. If the House is of the considered opinion that it would like to make wholesale changes to how parliamentary business works to deliver more certainty, that would require a much larger inquiry encompassing more areas of procedure and a deeper level of consultation and consideration.

87.

CONCLUSION

House of Commons procedure balances certainty with flexibility to change business at short notice to meet the needs of Members and of the wider House. This structure is, we believe, an important feature of our system and allows Members to scrutinise the Government in a responsive manner as and when situations develop. Not everyone will agree that more certainty is required; many will consider that the flexibility of the House of Commons business is a necessary feature of our parliamentary system. However, for those who desire an increased level of certainty on a day-to-day basis, we conclude that published call lists will be a flawed and blunt tool to respond to a challenge which requires a wider solution.

88.

CONCLUSION

We have heard, and we understand, some of the challenges which have been conveyed to us. We conclude that overcoming these challenges cannot be achieved by the introduction of published call lists alone. Furthermore, we are concerned about the negative effect that call lists could have on the quality of, and attendance during, debates. The power of the Chair to call Members to speak is an important feature of their authority in debates in the Commons, and they are trusted by the House to do so in the interests of the whole House. We believe a published call list system would unduly restrict the powers of oversight and stewardship of debate invested in the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers by the House, which we consider to be vitally important.

89.

CONCLUSION

The Speaker and the Deputy Speakers remain in contact with the party Whips and Members who approach them during a debate to provide guidance on when someone might be called, and to offer assurances if a Member needs to leave the Chamber at any point for a break. We encourage Members to rely on these informal arrangements, as the independence of the Chair is important. Any erosion of this independence must be avoided, and call lists would be an example of an undue erosion of this power. We commend the Speaker and Deputy Speakers for the substantive effort they make to accommodate Members' needs, including Members who have accessibility needs, are managing long-term health conditions, and any other requests, whilst balancing speakers from different parties and sides of the debate. We encourage the Speaker and Deputy Speakers to continue their excellent work in this space, and encourage Members to continue to rely on these informal arrangements, which underpin the current informal call list system.

90.

RECOMMENDATION

We do not recommend the introduction of call lists in the House of Commons.

91.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the Modernisation Committee should be clear about what it intends to cover on its work into the use of time in the Chamber, as set out in its 2024 Memorandum, and when it will do so. This work could lend itself well to considering whether there are levers which could be used to achieve greater certainty and to address the issues raised with us in this inquiry.

Appendix 1: Responses from Members to the Committee's online form

The Committee's online form welcomed responses from Members between 17 June and 31 July 2025. The form received 35 responses, and a majority (74%) of those who responded were in favour of introducing call lists. The below summary sets out the arguments made by those in favour of, and those opposed to, introducing call lists.

Respondents in favour of introducing call lists

Reasons for introducing call lists:

- The most cited reason for introducing call list was to prevent MPs from spending hours in the Chamber seeking to speak when there was no guarantee that they would be. Some called this a “waste of time”.
- Others said that a call list would enable them to plan in other meetings or constituency business, as well as giving them an opportunity to take regular breaks during their working day.
- One respondent said that MPs waiting in the Chamber to be called often use that time to do work on their phones or tablets, only to receive complaints from the public that “MPs are always on their phones”.
- Respondents acknowledged that the occupants of the Chair had discretion to let MPs know when they might be called or to take a break but argued that this discretion was exercised inconsistently.
- Some also acknowledged that call list might interrupt the flow of debate or lower attendance but remained in favour.
- Others argued that the quality of debate was already poor, suggesting that many MPs go into the Chamber to get clips for their social media channels rather than going in to debate and being open to change their mind on an issue.

- Disabled respondents stated that an indicative call list would be helpful to help plan their day and movements around the Parliamentary Estate and could mean they wouldn't be required to "bob" up and down to indicate that they wanted to speak as they would be on the list to speak.
- Some suggested that MPs from smaller parties need to cover more areas and may therefore benefit especially from knowing when they are expected to be called.
- One respondent argued that call lists worked well in the House of Lords, and another that they had positive experience of it from the Council of Europe.

Matters to consider ahead of introduction:

- Some suggested full call lists, whilst others suggested that the call list could provide indicative "blocks" of time where a MP could be expected to be called. Many respondents also stated that MPs should be required to be present for opening and closing speeches, and that there should be rules stipulating a minimum attendance before and after making a speech.
- Some respondents agreed there should be business items which should not have a call lists, such as statements, urgent questions and adjournment debates, or debates which take less than an hour. Others argued that all types of business should be subject to call lists.
- Some respondents acknowledged that the Chamber might be emptier should call lists be introduced, and suggested that this would have to be adequately explained to the public.
- One respondent suggested that interventions should still be possible under a call list system, and another that there should be a portion of each debate set aside for "bobbing" to come in to allow spontaneity.

Respondents opposed to introducing call lists

Reasons for not introducing call lists:

- Many respondents in this group acknowledged the convenience to MPs should call lists be introduced, but expressed their concern that this would be at the expense of the "vitality" or "essence" of debates.
- The main reason cited by respondents in this group was that the quality of debate would decrease, and that the Chamber and Westminster Hall would turn into a "speaking chamber" rather than a debating chamber.

- Many respondents were also concerned that the Chamber would be empty, and one respondent suggested that fewer people in the Chamber waiting to speak would lead to less interventions and spontaneous exchange of views.
- One respondent who had first become an MP in 2024 said that spending time in the Chamber over the last year had made them understand the current system, and the benefits of it, including hearing and learning from other colleagues during a debate whilst waiting to speak.
- Another respondent argued that introducing call lists would diminish the constitutional role of Parliament to hold the Executive to account in “real time” and remove the Speaker’s discretion in deciding who to call as a debate or political event unfolds.
- One respondent also suggested that if there was a speaking list the Whips would be notified that you would speak and would work to influence what the speech should contain.

Other matters to consider

- One respondent suggested that instead of introducing call lists, there should be earlier introduction of time limits during a debate.
- Another respondent argued that the requests for call lists were made by new MPs at the start of the Parliament but that now those MPs had now gotten used to the informal system of asking the occupant of the chair.

Conclusions and recommendations

The Committee's inquiry

1. We would like to express our gratitude to all those both inside and outside the House of Commons who have taken an interest in our inquiry and shared their views with us. (Conclusion, Paragraph 6)

The problem to be solved

2. The witness statements made to our inquiry, and to the Modernisation Committee's inquiry into accessibility, have provided excellent context to this inquiry and alerted us to challenges regarding accessibility, representation and certainty in the parliamentary day. The consideration of these issues has helped to guide us towards undertaking a wider examination in the course of our inquiry, as we were repeatedly told by witnesses that call lists should not be considered in a vacuum. (Conclusion, Paragraph 24)

Practice in other legislatures

3. It has been immensely helpful to look at the practice in other legislatures and the House of Lords in considering whether, and if so how, call lists might be used in the House of Commons. It is clear to us that each legislature is unique. While some legislatures publish a pre-agreed list of who is speaking in debates, there is no single way in which this is done, as each legislature has its own procedural norms and constraints. Call lists can only be considered as part of a wider procedural, and even constitutional, system. (Conclusion, Paragraph 61)

The current practice

4. Published call lists would not operate in isolation, but within a complex procedural ecosystem. The business in the House of Commons Chamber, and the rules and procedures which govern it, makes predicting the duration of individual business items challenging. The timing infrastructure

is designed to give certainty and predictability to the duration of certain business items, and particularly to the day itself via the Moment of Interruption. If the House is of the considered opinion that it would like to make wholesale changes to how parliamentary business works to deliver more certainty, that would require a much larger inquiry encompassing more areas of procedure and a deeper level of consultation and consideration. (Conclusion, Paragraph 86)

5. House of Commons procedure balances certainty with flexibility to change business at short notice to meet the needs of Members and of the wider House. This structure is, we believe, an important feature of our system and allows Members to scrutinise the Government in a responsive manner as and when situations develop. Not everyone will agree that more certainty is required; many will consider that the flexibility of the House of Commons business is a necessary feature of our parliamentary system. However, for those who desire an increased level of certainty on a day-to-day basis, we conclude that published call lists will be a flawed and blunt tool to respond to a challenge which requires a wider solution. (Conclusion, Paragraph 87)
6. We have heard, and we understand, some of the challenges which have been conveyed to us. We conclude that overcoming these challenges cannot be achieved by the introduction of published call lists alone. Furthermore, we are concerned about the negative effect that call lists could have on the quality of, and attendance during, debates. The power of the Chair to call Members to speak is an important feature of their authority in debates in the Commons, and they are trusted by the House to do so in the interests of the whole House. We believe a published call list system would unduly restrict the powers of oversight and stewardship of debate invested in the Speaker and the Deputy Speakers by the House, which we consider to be vitally important. (Conclusion, Paragraph 88)
7. The Speaker and the Deputy Speakers remain in contact with the party Whips and Members who approach them during a debate to provide guidance on when someone might be called, and to offer assurances if a Member needs to leave the Chamber at any point for a break. We encourage Members to rely on these informal arrangements, as the independence of the Chair is important. Any erosion of this independence must be avoided, and call lists would be an example of an undue erosion of this power. We commend the Speaker and Deputy Speakers for the substantive effort they make to accommodate Members' needs, including Members who have accessibility needs, are managing long-term health conditions, and any other requests, whilst balancing speakers from different parties and sides of the debate. We encourage the Speaker and Deputy Speakers to continue their excellent work in this space, and encourage Members to continue to rely on these informal arrangements, which underpin the current informal call list system. (Conclusion, Paragraph 89)

8. We do not recommend the introduction of call lists in the House of Commons. (Recommendation, Paragraph 90)
9. We recommend that the Modernisation Committee should be clear about what it intends to cover on its work into the use of time in the Chamber, as set out in its 2024 Memorandum, and when it will do so. This work could lend itself well to considering whether there are levers which could be used to achieve greater certainty and to address the issues raised with us in this inquiry. (Recommendation, Paragraph 91)

Formal Minutes

Wednesday 28 January 2026

Members present

Cat Smith, in the Chair

James Asser

Bambos Charalambous

Mr Lee Dillon

Mary Kelly Foy

Tracy Gilbert

Gurinder Singh Josan

John Lamont

Tom Morrison

Lee Pitcher

Michael Wheeler

Sir Gavin Williamson

Call lists

Draft Report (*Call lists*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 91 read and agreed to.

Appendix agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134).

Adjournment

Adjourned till Wednesday 4 February at 2.30 pm.

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 15 October 2025

Claire Hanna MP; Robin Swann MP; Dr Ellie Chowns MP

[Q1-19](#)

Wednesday 5 November 2025

Kirsty Blackman MP, Chief Whip, Scottish National Party

[Q20-29](#)

Dr Ruth Fox, Director, Hansard Society; **Dr Sarabajaya Kumar**,
Steering group member, Centenary Action

[Q30-41](#)

The following witnesses gave evidence to our inquiry on Elections within the House of Commons, but also contributed views on this inquiry in the same evidence session. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 23 April 2025

Rt Hon. Nigel Evans; The Rt Hon. the Baroness Laing of Elderslie DBE;
The Rt Hon. the Baroness Winterton of Doncaster DBE

[Q29-33](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

CLI numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1	Centenary Action	CLI0002
2	Centenary Action (Supplementary)	CLI0015
3	Neil Duncan-Jordan MP	CLI0003
4	Elect Her and Compassion in Politics	CLI0011
5	Green MPs	CLI0008
6	HM Government	CLI0006
7	Rt Hon. Alison Johnstone MSP (Presiding Officer, Scottish Parliament)	CLI0012
8	Rt Hon. Elin Jones MS/AS (Speaker/Llywydd, Welsh Parliament/Senedd Cymru)	CLI0013
9	Kolpinskaya, Dr Ekaterina (Senior Lecturer in British Politics, University of Exeter)	CLI0010
10	Lee, Mr J	CLI0005
11	Modernisation Committee	CLI0001
12	Edwin Poots MLA (Speaker, Northern Ireland Assembly)	CLI0014
13	SNP Westminster Group	CLI0009
14	Robin Swann MP	CLI0007
15	Wilson, Mr Eliot (Former clerk, House of Commons)	CLI0004

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Session 2024–26

Number	Title	Reference
3rd	Status of independent Members of Parliament	HC 534
2nd	Proxy voting: Review of arrangements introduced in Session 2024–25	HC 489
1st	Written parliamentary questions: Departmental performance in Session 2023–24	HC 461
4th Special	Status of independent Members of Parliament: Government and House Administration Responses	HC 1314
3rd Special	Proxy Voting: Review of arrangements introduced in the 2024–25 Session: Government Response	HC 1353
2nd Special	Written Parliamentary Questions – Departmental performance in Session 2023–24: Government Response	HC 793
1st Special	Written Parliamentary Questions: Departmental performance in Session 2022–23: Government responses	HC 325