

Questions of Procedure for Ministers

Research Paper 96/53

19 April 1996



Questions of Procedure for Ministers (QPM) is currently under examination by the Public Service Select Committee as part of its inquiry into ministerial and parliamentary accountability and responsibility which it announced following the debate on the Scott Report. The constitutional importance of the document appears to have grown since its publication in May 1992 and this paper gives a brief history of the text since that date, in particular following the recommendations of the Nolan Committee for a new 'ethical' section within *QPM*.

QPM is considered in "*The Individual Responsibility of Ministers : an outline of the Issues*" Research Paper 96/27 and in "*The Collective Responsibility of Ministers : an outline of the issues*" Research Paper forthcoming.

Oonagh Gay
Home Affairs Section

House of Commons Library

Summary

Questions of Procedure for Ministers (QPM), a Cabinet Office document circulated to Ministers, was first made public in 1992 following an Open Government initiative by the Prime Minister John Major. Since publication its constitutional importance seems to have grown as the paragraphs relating to ministerial accountability have been commented upon by Lord Nolan and by Sir Richard Scott in his Inquiry Report. This Paper summarises the recent history of the text of *QPM*, which is currently under consideration by the Public Service Committee as part of its enquiry into ministerial and parliamentary accountability and responsibility. In particular, it provides the text of the new paragraph 1 which sets out a seven point code of Ministerial Conduct following the recommendations of the Nolan Committee.

Contents

	Page
I Introduction	5
II The Nolan Amendments to <i>QPM</i>	7
III The Scott Report	13
IV The Public Service Committee Inquiry	14
Select Bibliography	15

I Introduction

Questions of Procedure for Ministers was first published in May 1992 although its existence was well known unofficially in the media, academic texts and in Parliament.¹ It was first issued to Ministers on a confidential basis by Clement Attlee in 1945 although elements within it are older. The initial versions were primarily concerned with procedure rather than conduct² but it now contains paragraphs on the secrecy of Cabinet proceedings, collective responsibility,³ relationship with civil servants, acceptance of gifts and Ministers' private interests as well as the duty of accountability to Parliament.⁴ The Nolan Committee summarised the status of *Questions of Procedure (QPM)* in its first report as follows:⁵

9. QPM has no particular constitutional status, but because it is issued by each Prime Minister to ministerial colleagues at the start of an administration or on their appointment to office, and any changes can only be authorised by the Prime Minister, it is in practice binding on all members of a Government. The records show that QPM has grown organically over the years, beginning as a document that was not much more than what Lord Trend described as 'tips on etiquette for beginners' but with fresh sections being added to deal with new circumstances. Over the years, the growth in QPM has largely been in the area of conduct and not procedure.

10. We do not believe that the explanation for this is a decline in ministerial standards of conduct. We think that the addition of ethical material to QPM has resulted from a combination of responses to specific incidents and a general trend, not confined to Government, towards codification of what might once have been assumed to be common ground.

Peter Madgwick and Diana Woodhouse state that *QPM* "may now be taken as the defining constitutional document on Prime Minister and Cabinet."⁶

Dr Peter Hennessy, Professor of Contemporary History at Queen Mary and Westfield College, has described in his evidence to the Nolan Committee his concern that Sir Robin Butler, the Cabinet Secretary, had denied the status of *QPM* as a constitutional convention with the exception of paragraph 27 on ministerial accountability to Parliament.⁷ However the acceptance by the Government of amendments to its wording by the Nolan Committee

¹ Tony Benn submitted his 1976 copy of *QPM* to the Treasury and Civil Service Sub-Committee enquiry on civil servants and Ministers [HC 92 1985-86] but declined to give evidence in private session on the document. The Committee would not hear the evidence in public.

² Earlier versions can be found in the Public Record Office subject to the 30 year rule

³ See a full discussion in "*The Collective Responsibility of Ministers: an outline of the issues*" Library Research Paper forthcoming

⁴ Hennessy notes in *Whitehall* [1989] that in 1945 it consisted of 35 paragraphs - by 1976 it had grown to 132 paragraphs. The 1992 version has 134 paragraphs.

⁵ First Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life Cm 2850 May 1995, p.120

⁶ The Law and Politics of the Constitution, 1995

⁷ Cm2850 - II p364

inevitably increases its importance as a constitutional text, as Professor Hennessy notes in his 1995 book *The Hidden Wiring*.⁸ Since its publication the media and academics have from time to time made a connection between a resignation of a Minister that of David Mellor for example in the case of David Mellor in September 1992. Here, Diana Woodhouse⁹ noted that Bryan Gould, then Shadow Heritage Minister, wrote to the Prime Minister about the propriety of Mr Mellor's actions in the context of the *QPM* sections relating to the acceptance of gifts and in his reply to Mr Gould John Major indicated that in his view Mr Mellor had complied with the *QPM* guidelines. Gordon Brown, when Shadow Trade and Industry Secretary, cited paragraph 25 on Ministers' legal proceedings when Norman Lamont, then Chancellor of the Exchequer instructed lawyers concerning an unsatisfactory tenant.¹⁰ Attention has also focused on paragraph 55 concerning ministers duties towards civil servants: Vernon Bogdanor has criticised as tautologous the requirement that Ministers have a "duty to refrain from asking or instructing civil servants to do things which they should not do."¹¹ The FDA has also called attention to paragraph 27, arguing that Ministerial attempts to divide responsibility for policy from responsibility for administration were without constitutional authority.¹²

Sir Richard Scott in his report in February 1996 used paragraph 27 of *QPM* to interpret whether Ministers were meeting their obligation to account to Parliament, thereby elevating its importance further.¹³ Scott examined the changes to *QPM* made in the light of the Nolan recommendations and considered that the redraftings did not make any material difference to the substance of the obligation on Ministers not to mislead Parliament or the public.¹⁴

The wording of paragraph 27 is as follows:

Accountability

27. Each Minister is responsible to Parliament for the conduct of his or her Department, and for the actions carried out by the Department in pursuit of Government policies or in the discharge of responsibilities laid upon him or her as a Minister. Ministers are accountable to Parliament, in the sense that they have a duty to explain in Parliament the exercise of their powers and duties and to give an account to Parliament of what is done by them in their capacity as Ministers or by their Departments. This includes the duty to give Parliament, including its Select Committees, and the public as full information as possible about the policies, decisions and actions of the Government, and not to deceive or mislead Parliament and the public.

⁸ pp189-190

⁹ in *Ministers and Parliament 1994*, pp79-80, 85

¹⁰ *Independent* 2/12/92, 'Lamont broke further rules over legal fees'

¹¹ *Politics and the Constitution: Essays on British Government* [1996] p38

¹² *Times* 12/1/95 "Ministerial principles 'made up on the hoof'"

¹³ References to *QPM* are to be found in D2.112, D4.57, D4.63, D6.50, D6.53-4, K8.1, K8.4, K8.14

¹⁴ *Report of the Inquiry into the Export of Defence Related Equipment and Dual Use Goods to Iraq and Related Prosecutions*, HC 115 Session 1995/96, K8.5

The 1992 version of *QPM* was revised in 1994 to take account of new rules on Ministers' membership of Lloyds. The amendment was set out in a lengthy Parliamentary Answer¹⁵

II The Nolan amendments to *QPM*

The Treasury and Civil Service Select Committee considered *QPM* as part of its inquiry into the Role of the Civil Service. It considered that *QPM*, the Armstrong memorandum and the Civil Service Management Code were inadequate as a framework for maintaining the essential values of the Civil Service.¹⁶ It recommended the establishment of a civil service code of ethics (para 103-107) on independent appeals procedure based on a strengthened Civil Service Commissioner body (paras 108-112) and a Civil Service Act to provide statutory backing to maintain the essential values of the Civil Service (para 116). The Committee published a draft Code of Ethics as Annex 1.

The Government response published in *The Civil Service : Taking Forward Continuity and Change*¹⁷ accepted the proposal for a new Civil Service Code, and provided a revised version of the Committee's draft as an Annex. However it did not accept that *QPM* was inadequate:¹⁸

The Committee is not specific in its criticisms of the Armstrong Memorandum and *Questions of Procedure for Ministers*. The Government does not accept that they are unsound or inadequate in their account of constitutional relationships. The proposals which follow in the Committee's report address the need for a concise summary of the ethics and values of the Civil Service, in a way which addresses the position of all civil servants.

The Government congratulates the Committee on the draft Code published as Annex 1 to its Report which brings together clearly and concisely the key principles in *Questions of Procedure for Ministers* and the Civil Service Management Code.

As described in paragraphs 2.8 and 2.9 above, the Government accepts the Committee's proposal for a new Civil Service Code, to apply to all civil servants, summarising the constitutional framework within which they work and the values they are expected to uphold. A revised draft Code, suggesting a number of changes to the text proposed by the Committee with an associated commentary, is annexed, as a basis for further consultation.

The Government response provided a commentary on the amendments it proposed to the Committee's draft Civil Service Code. The commentary traced the antecedents of the Code

¹⁵ HC Deb vol 247 21/7/94 c551-553

¹⁶ HC 27 Session 1993/94 para 101

¹⁷ Cm 2748 January 1995

¹⁸ Response to Recommendation 11 Cm 2748 January 1995

Research Paper 96/53

(which was mainly drawn from *QPM*, the Armstrong Memorandum,¹⁹ and the Civil Service Management Code). Probably the most controversial amendment was the addition of 'knowingly' to the Committee's draft paragraph 3. This had rephrased paragraph 27 of *QPM* which governs the duty of Ministers to Parliament:²⁰

PARAGRAPH 3 "This Code should be seen in the context of the duties and responsibilities of Ministers set out in Questions of Procedure for Ministers which include:

- accountability to Parliament;
- the duty to give Parliament and the public as full information as possible about the policies, decisions and actions of the Government, and not to deceive or knowingly mislead Parliament and the public;
- the duty to give fair consideration and due weight to informed and impartial advice from civil servants, as well as to other considerations and advice, in reaching decisions: and
- the duty to comply with the law including international law and treaty obligations. and to uphold the administration of justice;

together with the duty to familiarise themselves with the contents of this Code and not to ask civil servants to act in breach of it."

'Knowingly' was also inserted into draft paragraph 5 governing the duty of civil servants, so that they "should not deceive or knowingly mislead Ministers, Parliament or the public." These additions were justified as consistent with the Government response to recommendation of 17 of the Committee's report:

17. We consider that any Minister who has been found to have knowingly misled Parliament should resign (paragraph 134).

As the Prime Minister made clear in his letter to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee of 5 April 1994:

"It is clearly of paramount importance that Ministers give accurate and truthful information to the House. If they knowingly fail to do this, then they should relinquish their positions except in the quite exceptional circumstances of which a devaluation or time of war or other danger to national security have been quoted as examples."

This letter was placed in the Library as part of the evidence to the Treasury and Civil Service Select Committee.²¹ The use of 'knowingly' is retained in the final version of the Code.

¹⁹ The Armstrong Memorandum "*The Duties and Responsibilities of Civil Servants in Relation to Ministers*" was first issued in May 1985 following the Ponting case. It was incorporated into the Civil Service Management Code, but it has been superseded by the new Civil Service Code which came into force on 1 January 1996

²⁰ proposed new Civil Service Code showing Government amendments to Select Committee draft Annex Cm 2748

²¹ Unprinted Paper 6, The Chairman of the SubCommittee was Giles Radice MP

The Nolan Committee in its first report²² also examined the text of the draft code and made some recommendations concerning *QPM*.²³ Firstly the Nolan Committee commented that the first paragraph of *QPM* should be amended to say "it will be for individual Ministers to judge how best to act in order to uphold the highest standards. **It will be for the Prime Minister to determine whether or not they have done so in any particular circumstance.**" The Committee argued that Ministers did not make ethical judgements in isolation, and to remain in office they needed to retain the confidence of the Prime Minister. In a question of conduct, that would involve the Prime Minister's own judgement of the case, and this should be reflected in *QPM*.²⁴ The Nolan Committee had heard evidence from Peter Hennessy, that the phrase 'it will be for individual Ministers to judge...' was very recent since it had not appeared in the 1983 version which was in Professor Hennessy's possession.²⁵

The Government response to Nolan published in 1995 did not fully accept the Nolan recommendation: noting "the amendment proposed would, in the Government's view, go too far towards suggesting that the Prime Minister's relationship with his Ministerial colleagues is that of invigilator and judge."²⁶ Its proposal was: "It will be for individual Ministers to judge how best to act in order to uphold the highest standards. They are responsible for justifying their conduct to Parliament. And they can only remain in office for as long as they retain the Prime Minister's confidence." This proposal has been incorporated into the final text. Professor Hennessy has criticised the wording as too feeble.²⁷

Probably the most important recommendation from the Nolan Committee was as follows:

We recommend that the Prime Minister puts in hand the production of a document drawing out from QPM the ethical principles and rules which it contains to form a free-standing code of conduct or a separate section within a new QPM. If QPM is to remain the home for this guidance, we recommend that it is retitled 'Conduct and Procedure for Ministers' to reflect its scope.

16. The precise wording of the new guidance will be a matter for the Prime Minister. We believe, however, that the following essential principles should be spelt out, supported where necessary by detailed rules, some of which already exist in *QPM*:

Ministers of the Crown are expected to behave according to the highest standards of constitutional and personal conduct. In particular they must observe the following principles of ministerial conduct:

- i) *Ministers must ensure that no conflict arises, or appears between their public duties and their private interests;*

²² *Standards of Conduct in Public Life* Cm2850 May 1995

²³ Recommendation 16 Chapter 3

²⁴ Chapter 3, para 13

²⁵ Further detail is given in pp39-40 of *The Hidden Wiring* [1995] by Peter Hennessy

²⁶ Response to Recommendation 12 Cmnd 2931 July 1995

²⁷ *The Hidden Wiring*, p196

Research Paper 96/53

- ii) *Ministers must not mislead Parliament. They must be as open as possible with Parliament and the public;*
- iii) *Ministers are accountable to Parliament for the policies and operations of their departments and agencies;*
- iv) *Ministers should avoid accepting any gift or hospitality or which might, or might appear to, compromise their judgement or place them under an improper obligation;*
- v) *Ministers in the House Of Commons must keep separate their roles as Minister and constituency Member;*
- vi) *Ministers must keep their party and ministerial roles separate. They must not ask civil servants to carry out party political duties or to act in any other way that would conflict with the Civil Service Code.*

Adam Tomkins has described this wording as bland and disappointing, lacking important matters for detail.²⁸

The Government response to Nolan published in July 1995²⁹ accepted this recommendation noting "The Prime Minister intends to implement it in the next revision of Questions of Procedure for Ministers by amending the first paragraph on the lines of the draft at Annex A." This Annex amended the Nolan wording given above in recommendation 16:

ANNEX A. CONDUCT AND PROCEDURE FOR MINISTERS

Key to amendments: xxx = additions; and ~~strikeout~~ = deletions. Shaded passages are additions by the Government and passages which are struck out are deletions.

Ministers of the Crown are expected to behave according to the highest standards of constitutional and personal conduct ~~in the performance of their duties~~. In particular they must observe the following principles of Ministerial conduct:

- i. **Ministers must uphold the principle of collective responsibility;**
- ii. Ministers are accountable to Parliament for the ~~policies, decisions and actions~~ **policies—and operations—**of their departments and agencies;
- iii. Ministers must not ~~knowingly~~ mislead Parliament ~~and the public and should correct any inadvertent errors at the earliest opportunity~~. They must be as open as possible with Parliament and the public, ~~withholding information only when disclosure would not be in the public interest;~~
- iv. Ministers must ensure that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their public duties and their private interests;
- v. Ministers should avoid accepting any gift or hospitality which

²⁸ Legal Studies March 1996 "A Right to mislead Parliament?" by Adam Tomkins

²⁹ Cm2931

might, or might reasonably appear to, compromise their judgment or place them under an improper obligation;

- vi. Ministers in the House of Commons must keep separate their roles as Minister and constituency Member;
- vii. Ministers must use public resources for party political purposes. They must uphold the political impartiality of the Civil Service. ~~Ministers must keep their party and Ministerial roles separate. They must not ask civil servants to carry out party political duties or and not ask civil servants~~ to act in any other way which would conflict with the Civil Service Code.

In the notes to Annex A the Government response noted that "the proposed addition of 'knowingly' reflects the restatement of this principle in the draft Civil Service Code, as set out in Taking Forward Continuity and Change"³⁰ and in the Prime Minister's letter to Giles Radice of 5 April 1994. The addition of "and the public" is also consistent with paragraph 27 of *QPM* and the draft Civil Service Code.³¹ Paragraph 27 governs the accountability of Ministers and Parliament. Following the statement by Roger Freeman on the government response to Nolan on 18th July 1995 there was criticism that the phrase 'in the public interest' in the Annex at sub-paragraph (iii) was not defined and that it would therefore be Ministers who would determine the public interest.³² When the statement was repeated in the Lords Baroness Blatch for the Government defined "knowingly" as follows:³³

The noble Lord, Lord Rodgers of Quarry Bank, was concerned about the term "knowingly mislead". We shall, of course, debate the matter in much more detail when the time comes, but the use of the word "knowingly" here refers to wilfully or wantonly knowingly misleading the House. We in this House have a proud record. Those of us who sit on the Front Benches in this House may have gone through the pain of unwittingly misleading the House, but we have a tradition in this House of Ministers coming to the Dispatch Box to make amends for any statement in which they may have misled the House unwittingly. That is a very different matter from knowingly misleading either House. If we knowingly mislead the House, the culpability is ours personally. There is a real distinction to be made. We recognise that distinction in our suggestion that we alter the *Questions of Procedure for Ministers* in both Houses.

³⁰ pages 29,47 and 48

³¹ Annex A p33

³² HC Deb 18/7/95 vol 263 1473-1484

³³ HC Deb 18/7/95 vol 566 c163

Research Paper 96/53

In the debate on the Government response to Nolan on 2nd November 1995 Roger Freeman gave an amended version of sub-paragraph (iii) of the new paragraph 1:³⁴

"Ministers must not knowingly mislead Parliament and the public and should correct any inadvertent errors at the earliest opportunity, They must be as open as possible with Parliament and the public, withholding information only when disclosure would not be in the public interest, which should be decided in accordance with established Parliamentary convention, the law, and any relevant Government Code of Practice."

I have provided three references: first, established parliamentary convention - I have given the reference in "Erskine May" - secondly, the law; and, thirdly, any relevant Government code of practice. My hon. Friend has also drawn attention to the document on open government that we have published already. I hope that the amendment provides greater clarity. Right hon. and hon. Members will no doubt wish to study the record and perhaps reflect further upon the debate.

Mr Freeman said the new paragraph became effective immediately.³⁵ The new paragraph 1 reads therefore as follows:

"Ministers of the Crown are expected to behave according to the highest standards of constitutional and personal conduct in the performance of their duties. In particular they must observe the following principles of Ministerial conduct:

- (i) Ministers must uphold the principle of collective responsibility;
- (ii) Ministers are accountable to Parliament for the politics, decisions and actions of their departments and agencies;
- (iii) Ministers must not knowingly mislead Parliament and the public and should correct any inadvertent errors at the earliest opportunity. They must be as open as possible with Parliament and the public withholding information only when disclosure would not be in the public interest, which should be decided in accordance with established Parliamentary Convention, the law, and any relevant Government Code of Practice;
- (iv) Ministers must ensure that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their public duties and their private interests;
- (v) Ministers should avoid accepting any gift or hospitality which might, or might reasonably appear to, compromise their judgment or place them under an improper obligation;

³⁴ c456

³⁵ c457

- (vi) Ministers in the House of Commons must keep separate their rules as Ministers and constituency Member;
- (vii) Ministers must not use public resources for party political purposes. They must uphold the political impartiality of the Civil Service, and not ask Civil Servants to act in any other way which would conflict with the Civil Service Code.

These notes detail the arrangements for the conduct of affairs by Ministers. They are intended to give guidance by listing the principles and the precedents which may apply. They apply to all Members of the Government (the position of Parliamentary Private Secretaries is described separately in Section 3)."

"The notes should be read against the background of the general obligations listed above, and in the context of protecting the integrity of public life. It will be for individual Ministers to judge how best to act in order to uphold the highest standards. They are responsible for justifying the conduct to Parliament. And they can only remain in office for so long as they retain the Prime Minister's confidence."

Paragraph 27 (Accountability of Ministers to Parliament) remains in the text of *QPM*, but it is understood that the new paragraph 1 is to be read in preference to it.³⁶

The new version of *QPM* is not likely to be published until after the next General Election.

III The Scott Report³⁷

Sir Richard Scott noted in his report that the reformulation of *QPM* did not make any material difference to the substance of the obligation resting on Ministers not to mislead Parliament or the public:

K8.5 The qualification of "mislead" by the addition of the adverb "knowingly" does not, to my mind, make any material difference to the substance of the obligation resting on Ministers not to mislead Parliament or the public. It must, I believe, always have been the case that misleading statements made in ignorance of the true facts were not regarded as a breach of a Minister's obligation to be honest with Parliament and the public. Questions might, of course, arise as to why the Minister

³⁶ *Report of the Inquiry into the Export of Defence Related Equipment and Dual Use Goods to Iraq and Related Prosecutions* HC 115 Session 1995/96 K.8.5

³⁷ *"Report of the Inquiry into the Export of Defence Related Equipment and Dual Use Goods to Iraq and Related Prosecutions"* HC 115 Session 1995/96

was ignorant of the true facts and thus unable to have rendered to Parliament an accurate account of his stewardship. Similarly, the replacement of an obligation to give "as full information as possible about the policies, decisions and actions of the Government" by an obligation to be "as open as possible with Parliament and the public, withholding information only where disclosure would not be in the public interest" ought not to bring about any difference of substance. In effect, the qualifying phrase, "withholding information..." etc, is clarifying the circumstances in which it would not be possible for information to be made public. It is generally accepted, and rightly so, that there always have been and always will be some subjects in respect of which full information, or sometimes any information, cannot be given. Sir Robin Butler, in evidence to the Inquiry and also to the 1994 Select Committee, instanced information about imminent changes in interest rates or in exchange rates. The public interest may require information about such matters to be withheld from Parliament. This necessity should not, however, be allowed to obscure the fact that the withholding in the public interest of information from Parliament and the public involves a dilution, *pro tanto*, of the obligations imposed by Ministerial accountability. It follows that the withholding of information by an accountable Minister should never be based on reasons of convenience or for the avoidance of political embarrassment, but should always require special and carefully considered justification. The interpretation of "in the public interest" in the new formulation should, in my opinion, adopt that approach.

IV The Public Service Committee Inquiry

Sir Richard Scott concluded that the term 'in the public interest' needed further Government clarification in relation to the obligation on Ministers to supply information to Parliament.³⁸ Following the debate on the Scott Report on 26 February 1996³⁹ the Public Service Committee decided to widen the inquiry it had begun into Next Steps Agencies into a review of ministerial and parliamentary accountability including an examination of *QPM* amongst other documents and consideration as to whether it would need amendment in the light of the Scott Report.⁴⁰ Ian Lang, for the Government had welcomed a widening of the inquiry in the Commons debate and said that the Government proposed to submit evidence.⁴¹

On 29th March 1996 Roger Freeman, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, submitted evidence to the Public Service Committee on Ministerial accountability and the provision of information by Government to Parliament. He noted, amongst other topics, the expansion of the first paragraph of *QPM* and underlined its importance.⁴²

³⁸ K8.14

³⁹ HC Deb vol 272 c589-693

⁴⁰ Public Service Committee Information for the Press 7/3/96

⁴¹ c593

⁴² Ministerial accountability and the provision of information by Government to Parliament. Memorandum by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster 19.3.96

10. The Government last year expanded the first paragraph of "Questions of Procedure for Ministers" into a seven point code of Ministerial conduct. The second and third points constitute the current summary formulation by the Government of the principal obligations which Ministers, as members of the Executive, owe to Parliament.

The memorandum examined how the text of paragraph 1 (iii) had been created from the time of the Armstrong memorandum through to the changes following Nolan. It discussed the terms "established Parliamentary convention" and "the law" and "relevant Government Codes of Practice" referring to *Erskine May*, some 200 Acts on the statute book which contain provisions designed to protect certain types of information and the current Open Government Initiative. Briefly, the memorandum set out the Government understanding of the established requirements of Ministerial accountability and the requirements and the longstanding conventions governing the provision of information to Parliament. The Public Service Committee is hearing evidence at present and it is likely to report around the time of the summer recess.

Select Bibliography

1. Questions of Procedure for Ministers May 1992 Cabinet Office.
2. The Role of the Civil Service Treasury and Civil Service Select Committee HC27 Session 1993/94.
3. The Civil Service: Taking Forward Continuity and Change Cm 2748 January 1995.
4. First Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life Cm 2850 May 1995.
5. Report of the Inquiry into the Export of Defence Related Equipment and Dual Use Goods to Iraq and Related Prosecutions HC 115 Session 1995/96 February 1996.
6. Whitehall (1989) Peter Hennessy.
7. The Hidden Wiring (1995) Peter Hennessy.
8. Ministers and Parliament (1994) by Diana Woodhouse.
9. Law and Politics of the Constitution (1995) by Peter Madgwick and Diana Woodhouse.
10. Politics and the Constitution: Essays on British Government (1996) Vernon Bogdanor.
11. Legal Studies March 1996 "A Right to Mislead Parliament? Adam Tomkins.

Research Paper 96/53

Section Code: HAS

Title: *Questions of Procedure for Ministers*

It would greatly help to ensure that Research Papers fulfil their purpose if Members (or their staff) would fill in and return this brief pre-addressed questionnaire. Negative responses can be as useful as positive.

For your purposes, did you find this paper:

Very useful Quite useful Not much use

1.

Too long The right length Too short

2.

Clear Not always clear Rather unclear

3.

Any comments? _____

Name MP/Assistant to
(Please print)

Please fold

INTERNAL

**Miss Nicola Harland
House of Commons
Department of the Library
1 Derby Gate
London SW1A 2DG**

Please fold

Recent Research Papers include:

96/27	The Individual Responsibility of Ministers: An Outline of the Issues	21.02.96
96/26	Public Interest Disclosure Bill [Bill 20 of 1995/96]	19.02.96
96/25	Public Interest Immunity	22.02.96
96/22	Forms of Investigatory Inquiry & the Scott Inquiry	09.02.96
96/16	The Scott Inquiry: Approaching Publication	25.01.96
96/14	Special Standing Committees in both Houses	23.01.96

Government & Parliament