10 DOWNING STREET

LONDON SW1A 2AA

THE PRIME MINISTER

21st November 2025

Dear Bidon,

After recent events relating to the drama surrounding the Liaison Committee, I have written this statement to clarify the many confusing aspects of the situation.

The now former Chairman of the Liaison Committee made several claims as to why the committee became dysfunctional. Some of these claims had merit, but some were misleading. To start off, the Chairman misunderstood what his duties were as Chair of the committee. The Standing Orders of the House of Commons places most of the responsibilities he complained about others not showing, on him to have. The standing orders place scheduling, attendance, internal communication, agendas and member coordination on the Chairman, not other people. Not the government, not the Leader of the House, and not other party leaders. The government is responsible for appearing when summoned, providing documentation, and not obstructing committee business. Since being made Chairman of the committee on the 18th October, in the span of he had only invited two members of the government to appear before the committee; the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Transport Secretary. Due to scheduling conflicts, and the Transport Secretary's work in real life, I stepped in to take questions from the committee to continue the committee's function. **As a result of this, the Chairman's claims that the government delayed the work of the committee because of my Transport Secretary's unavailability is not true.**

The Chairman admitted in his resignation letter that he was “caught up with other stuff” which directly contradicts his narrative of systemic obstacles. His role requires constant coordination, communication, active scheduling, and managing member attendance. He did not meet these obligations by his own words. What I will say on that matter is he failed to reach out for help. If he wanted help from the government, to prop up his position, we would have done so. It was why **we consulted with him days prior to his resignation** about moving committee sittings to a discord channel, so there would be no excuse for members not to show up to a meeting unless legitimate.

Another claim the chairman made was the Leader of the House not communicating with him after the government reshuffle. The new LOTH was appointed on the night of the 4th November, and communication between the Chairman and the LOTH began on the 7th. Roughly 2 days of this absence does not constitute at all the contribution of the committee becoming dysfunctional. A short 2-3 day administrative delay is normal, especially with briefings having to take place within government. Additionally, there were a lot of conversations between the Chairman and the LOTH regarding the issues the committee was facing, and the trial of a discord sitting for the committee. **His claim of lack of government communication is false.**

Another claim the Chairman made was that the government and parliamentary party whips failed to provide committee member lists. The fact is the standing orders say party leaders provide member names, not party whips, and not the government. The chairman took one internal problem and tried to blame the government, whips from political parties, and the entire system. I was not once contacted by the Chairman for an updated list. **The claim that we failed to provide committee member lists is misleading** as the standing orders place the responsibility on the chairman to get members lists from party leaders, not from whips.

Another claim made was that the Transport Secretary caused delays by not attending committee meetings. The meeting in which the Transport Secretary was going to come was on the 9th November, and he had to cancel for legitimate reasons. I then went to the meeting as Prime Minister to face scrutiny to ensure there were no delays in committee business. The meeting proceeded on that same day. **There was no delay for the committee.**

Another claim, which partly was addressed earlier, was the lack of government communication made his role impossible. Once again, the standing orders place responsibilities on the chairman to communicate, to schedule, manage attendance, the agenda, and internal coordination. The standing orders place none of this on the government. **The claim the government is the reason why his position became untenable is false.**

The claim that he was left out of decisions and therefore his position becoming ineffective is false. The Leader of the House briefed him directly in his DMs regarding changing the way committee meetings are done. He proposed it to him three days before his resignation. The Chairman left before any reforms could even begin.

Another claim made was the committee lacked resources. Which is true. The committee lacked HIM. That was the only resource the committee lacked, it was his own time. I am sympathetic towards that, because most people in politics are severely time constrained. And I am sure that most of the claims he made came from a position of stress from his own time constraints, which I completely understand.

To address CallumCathcarts letter, once again full of misleading statements. Not surprising that this is coming from somebody that, as speaker of the house, tried to influence members of parliament to vote along with the political party he had come from, prior to becoming speaker of the house.

Firstly, the Leader of the House didn’t lie to anyone. He had plentiful discussions with the Chairman about the Liaison Committee, and discussions with the current Speaker of the House of Commons. And it is not the Leader of the House of Commons job to do the Liaison Chairman's job for him. You'd think a former speaker of the house would know the standing orders, except that the former speaker was corrupt and didn't care for the rules that governed parliament. I'm not entirely sure why this member is attacking the Leader of the House for writing weekly reports to the general public, ITS PART OF HIS JOB.

To conclude, it is quite obvious that the Liaison Committee has been dysfunctional over the past several months, and it is time to try a new avenue. If we have MPs like CallumCathcart in the committee, who don't even know the standing orders, and the responsibility the committee has, we will keep having these idiots cry and whine about how it's always the governments fault, and thus we will never have a functioning liaison committee.

After in depth discussions with the Speaker of the House of Commons, and the Chairman of the Lothian-Heathcote Commission, the government agrees with the scrapping of the Liaison Committee. Even after my own scrutiny session by the committee, in which I was mostly asked about one Transport policy that was perhaps never discussed anywhere or with anyone, being non-existent, I find myself agreeing with the Lothian-Heathcote findings, in which the Liaison Committee cannot function anymore. Our political community just isn't ready for it yet. The Speaker of the House, and the leader of the Unionist Party, have been working on an amendment to the standing orders together, to create dedicated question time for ministers, as a replacement for the Liaison Committee. If the Social Democrats, and the Nationals, actually support all the findings of the commission, they would support scrapping this, rather than play politics, which I am sure they would rather do the latter.

The Rt Hon. Sir MichaelMRothschild KG KCMG OBE MP
Prime Minister

Please let me resign.The

MM Rothschild