

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 13:55  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Complaint to the Speaker of the House of Commons - 02/12/15

Dear Mr Speaker

I'd like to make a complaint, that in my opinion, you did not fulfil the duties as Speaker on Wednesday, 2nd December 2015 during the House of Commons debate on Syria.

It explicitly states that your role is as the person who "keeps order and calls MPs to speak during Common debates".

Repeatedly during the speech by the Opposition Leader Jeremy Corbyn, he was continuously disrupted mid-sentence by members of the ruling party after it was indicated he would not give way. Although this happens on both sides to an extent, in this case it was to a significant level that requires some action.

In my opinion, you did not adequately keep order of the House. You took too long to remind the ruling party how to behave. Once you did remind them, they essentially ignored you.

I'm disappointed that myself and other listeners could barely make out the points made and order of the House was clearly lost. By the time it was restored the speech was over. I am concerned that listeners/viewers become disillusioned with politics and the House when this is allowed to happen.

Might I suggest that you use some of your powers that you have which include:

- suspending MPs who are deliberately disobedient.
- asking MPs to be quiet so Members can be heard.

Please use these powers swiftly and not towards the end of a speech. I believe as Speaker, you are the only person in the House than can maintain order and that you have an incredible responsibility on your shoulders to maintain the faith people have in Government, The House Of Commons and the debate process.

I look forward to your response.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 14:25  
**To:** Standards Commissioner; Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** David Cameron

Dear Sirs,

David Cameron's appalling and outrageous slur on those who are against bombing Syria is an insult. I, and many like-minded people are quite simply NOT terrorist sympathisers.

The PM must be made to apologise.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 14:27  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Offensive language by the Prime Minister

Dear Sir or Madam

I find deeply offensive David Cameron's comment that people opposed to bombing in Syria are a, "bunch of terrorist sympathizers". This is surely inappropriate language from any politician, but is completely unacceptable by a Prime Minister.

Is there please anything your Office can do about this offensive language by the Prime Minister?

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]  
Llandudno

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 15:10  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Prime Minister calling MP'S 'Terrorists sympathisers '!

Sir,

Once again, the Prime Minister denegrates the office he holds by calling fellow MP's (and members of the public), terrorist sympathisers, when all people are concerned about, is not repeating the debacle of Iraq!

It frankly disgusts me, that this man has once again, shamed the office he holds, by uttering such disgraceful comments, without a so much of a dressing down from you at his disgusting display of appalling language!

Seems to be a common trait by Mr Cameron!

Gutter remarks that has gone way beyond acceptable language from a so-called 'Honourable Gentleman!'"

Yours

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 15:57  
**To:** Standards Commissioner; Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** The Prime Minister's statement concerning "a bunch of terrorist sympathisers"

To: the Standards Commissioner, and Speakers Office of the UK Parliament,

I am writing to complain about the Prime Minister's reported branding of Jeremy Corbyn MP and other Members of Parliament as "a bunch of terrorist sympathizers" just because they do not agree with the arguments for sanctioning UK strikes in Syria. Mr Cameron's case has been found to be unconvincing not only by Mr Corbyn and colleagues but also by a large section of the British public, including myself (c.f. today's YouGov survey in the Times). If he indeed referred to those opposing his proposals in the way reported in the press, are we all to be branded "a bunch of terrorist sympathizers"?

I have to make it absolutely clear that I stand against any type of terrorism. I also oppose violence exerted by official institutions unless this is absolutely the last resort, but I think that this is not the case put forward by Mr Cameron's argument, which seems to be presented in a similar unsupported vein to the justification for the UK's intervention in Iraq in 2003 (e.g. the 'evidence' for weapons of mass destruction, 45 minute warnings, etc.). In order to avoid any misunderstandings I will explain why I believe that this is the case: I fully agree with Mr Cameron (and Mr Corbyn for that matter) that we cannot ignore the atrocities that ISIL has perpetrated, the future threats it poses to the people in the Middle East, and more recently the expansion of these actions to Europe and the rest of the world. Indeed, effective action must be taken. However, as many feared last year, the decision to initiate air strikes in Iraq has not only been ineffective but has also become a substitute for a coherent and comprehensive international strategy and, some argue, fuelled more terrorist acts: why commit the same mistake twice? Furthermore, it has also obscured fundamental matters that could actually lead to more effective ways of action, namely: 1) ISIL's strength as a result of revenue from oil extracted in captured fields, which points out to the existence of significant buyers for this oil (there are some indications that this includes countries such as Turkey): these should be stopped as a matter of urgency since cutting the supply of money to ISIL would be much more effective at weakening it than blind military offensives. 2) The sophistication of ISIS's weaponry, which indicates that there are suppliers with access to arsenals comparable to those of nation states who, again, must be stopped from selling to ISIL. Before we hurt more people in the region creating yet more fleeing refugees which Europe is reluctant to deal with, before we escalate to the inevitability of putting boots on the ground, real efforts should be devoted to the issues above. Cutting ISIL's income and supply lines would likely contribute to a quicker and less bloody resolution. These reasons, which provide a strong counter-argument to Mr Cameron's case, are as far from sympathy with terrorists as one can imagine. Why then should anyone arguing for such alternative strategy be branded a "terrorist sympathiser"? Personally, I am deeply offended, not only for myself but for the patronising way in which the British public is being treated.

I am therefore writing to ask if there is any procedure for calling the Prime Minister to disciplinary action and, if so, that this such action is taken as a matter of urgency. Furthermore, if Mr Cameron indeed branded British politicians as "a bunch of terrorist sympathizers" he should apologise publically in the most unequivocal manner and admit that a true democratic system allows for disagreement with anyone's arguments; even the Prime Minister's.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

-----

[Redacted]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 15:58  
**To:** BERCOW, John  
**Subject:** The House Of Commons

Dear Sir

I am appalled as are numerous others at the lack of discipline in the house of commons. The Conservatives attitude of shouting and braying when people are discussing such an important issue of war..is un professional and childish. These people are discussing people lives !! Isn't it about time that after their first warning the second is to remove them from the house, also if they continue their rowdy and disgraceful response then fine them.

That way the British people might start to take them seriously. As it is now they come across as rude and bad mannered and seriously need to think how we the public see them !

Many Thanks  
[REDACTED]

(A normal Mother against war and killing people..not a terrorist sympathiser)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 16:00  
**To:** BERCOW, John  
**Subject:** Complaint about today's debate

Dear Mr Speaker,

I'd like to complain about the interruptions given by some MPs during todays debate about furthering airstrikes in Syria. I find the contrast between the immaturity of some MPs to the gravity of the debate disturbing.

Best wishes,  
[REDACTED]



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 16:21  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Protocol

Rt. Hon. John Bercow

I had hoped the new Members might have learnt by now to speak on their feet and not from notes. Today should have encouraged better effort in view of the subject which may well involve people in this country making supreme efforts involving more than merely thinking on feet, their feet will be on the line. I just watched Ms Solloway no doubt sincere, but coming over as a performance and not part of a debate. The shuffling of notes by so many is a disgrace at such a time.

A young girl crept in, took an aisle seat approx 3.30, and slung her Ruck/knap sack or satchel. Should never have been let in. See BBC rolling.

Best wishes and respectfully

[REDACTED]  
We have met.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 16:39  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Cc:** SOAMES, Nicholas; KAUFMAN, Gerald  
**Subject:** Syria Debate - Members Behaviour

Dear Mr Speaker

I am a constituent of Nicholas Soames who I have copied into this email along with Gerald Kaufman in his capacity as Father of the house.

It is a sad fact that people have become used to the childish behaviour of MP's in the house of commons. However, todays behaviour during the Syria debate was nothing short of appalling - I honestly cannot find the words to describe how depressed and embarrassed I felt when listening to the debate on radio 5. My colleagues and I were listening whilst travelling together in a car - we are all worldly wise middle aged businessmen and we were horrified.

Please find a mechanism for change. If members cannot debate war with decorum - it bodes ill for us all.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 16:53  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** CENSURE OF DAVID CAMERON

Mr Speaker

Do you intend to take any steps to censure or reprimand David Cameron for uttering insulting (and possibly defamatory) comments about Honourable Members, within the confines of the Palace of Westminster? You will, I am sure, have noted how many members from all sides of the House expressed their horror and dismay at the Prime Minister's description of all who opposed his motion to bomb Syria as "terrorist sympathisers", and noted too how many opportunities he was offered to express regret or apologise for his words – all of which he ignored (not just declined, but totally ignored).

You are the last hope of many of the citizens of this country, who feel very strongly that the Prime Minister by his words and (lack of) actions has brought Parliament into disrepute. Despite the contempt which he and his Conservative colleagues have consistently demonstrated to you personally, the hope is that Mr Cameron will at least respect your office – and if ordered to apologise, will respond.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 17:02  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Syria Debate

Mr Bercow

I am in the middle of listening ( which is indeed hard with all the heckling ) to Mr Corbyn's contribution to the Syria debate, and am so incensed by so called MP's behaviour that I felt the need to contact you as speaker of the house. The treatment of Mr Corbyn is disgraceful and it is obvious that there is little respect for him. You yourself appeared to find Mr Hogg's intervention amusing, but I can assure you that to normal members of the public, he came across as pompous.

Each week at prime ministers questions there is no problem hearing Mr Cameron but it is extremely hard to focus with the noise in the chamber on Mr Corbyn's contribution. If a good number of MP's want to behave like animals and they can't be asked to leave the chamber, then it may be better that parliament wasn't televised.

To think that parliament is discussing such a grave topic today and some, instead of listening to maybe a different opinion to their,s choose to behave like rowdy youth on a street corner.

I know there is banter in the chamber but today is not the time or the place.

I am appalled by this behaviour, perhaps its not only young conservatives that are bullies.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 17:48  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Fw: Behaviour today in the House of Commons

Dear Mr Speaker

I am wondering if this should have been more properly address to you at the Speakersoffice as its is not really a constituency matter.

Yours [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** "john.bercow.mp@parliament.uk" <john.bercow.mp@parliament.uk>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 2 December 2015, 17:29  
**Subject:** Behaviour today in the House of Commons

Dear Mr Speaker

I watched part of today's debate on the potential bombing of Syria. Although you intervened on numerous occasions to try to bring order to the House I have to say that I was horrified by the behaviour of the MPs. The eyes of the world are potentially looking at our response to difficult times. The house is deciding whether to kill people in what some believe is national security. I think such momentous decisions should not be taken lightly and every member should be sitting quietly and **LISTENING** to all the arguments when another member is speaking so that they can reach a considered and thoughtful decision, whatever that may be. I think most of them today should be ashamed of the constant interruptions and noise they are making. I hope you will be able to install a bit more discipline in them in the days to come. Yours [REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 18:10  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** PM'S INSULTING REMARKS RE: TERRORIST SYMPATHISERS

To Rt Hon John Berkow MP  
Speaker of the House of Commons,

My friends and family are appalled at the Prime Minister David Cameron's refusal to apologise for his defamatory remarks to those who do not support his desire to bomb Syria in the House of Commons today.

To have made those remarks in the beginning, and then to defiantly ignore and repeatedly refuse to apologise, to act in such a dismissive way towards those he has defamed, beggars belief.

I have never witnessed such incredibly offensive behaviour by a Prime Minister, in front of a full house, on television, at a most important debate. His behaviour left us all angry and offended.

I am too very surprised that this behaviour was allowed to persist throughout the debate, that you Mr Berkow did not feel that this was an outrage, and point out to this bully that such behaviour will not be tolerated in the house of Commons.

The PM's recent softening of his bullying tone when speaking to the electorate, an attempt no doubt to emulate the Leader of the opposition Jeremy Corbyn more inclusive approach, has been thoroughly blown.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 18:40  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Today's Debate

Dear Mr Bercow,

I took most of the day to watch the important proceedings today.

We clearly need a change of process to help restore the dignity of the house.

The opening statements from the PM and Leader of the Opposition were frankly embarrassing with the schoolboy bullying attempts to intervene from all sides.

I am ashamed that my MPs behave like this, despite your best attempts. I am not the only voter that wanted to hear the opening statements.

As we went on, I really appreciated the way this very difficult topic was then debated.

If the members of the house can not be grown ups, perhaps the primary statements should be listened to in silence with questions at the end.

Any member making a noise or animal sound being immediately removed without warning.

Hopefully the remaining arguments tonight will be conducted with dignity.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from my Android device with K-9 Mail. Please excuse my brevity.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 13:45  
**To:** BERCOW, John  
**Subject:** Interruption of Jeremy Corbyn's speech

Dear John Bercow,

I have been listening to the debate about bombing Syria. I was dismayed that there was a campaign to prevent Jeremy Corbyn being heard properly on this serious subject. It was obvious that this was the case as Alan Duncan, who followed, was heard in silence.

I think you should consider your policy in permitting barracking. I think this behaviour will continue or perhaps increase unless you do something about it.

[REDACTED]



This email has been sent from a virus-free computer protected by Avast.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 19:13  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** David Cameron MP - Complaint

Dear Sir/madam,

I am writing to you to make a complaint about David Cameron MP, in reference to his characterisation of Jeremy Corbyn and other member of Parliament as 'terrorist sympathisers'. I find that this statement is unbecoming of a British Prime Minister and amounts to a slander on the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Moreover, it shows a lack of respect and regard for both this country's democratic culture and the opinion of many citizens of the UK, who might not be convinced of the Prime minister's case for military intervention in Syria. I would expect our Prime Minister to refrain from attempts to stigmatise our elected representatives when they express an opinion that is contrary to his.

If there is a procedure to reprimand a serving Prime Minister for this attack on the public and Parliamentary procedure I would ask for it to be implemented in this case. I would also like the Prime Minister to publicly apologise to both the public and his colleagues in Parliament at the first available opportunity.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 19:40  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Complaint re David Cameron

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to complain in the strongest terms about David Cameron's disgraceful and offensive slur against all those people who disagree with him on Syrian air strikes. His branding of Jeremy Corbyn and other MPs who will vote against his motion is, by implication, also slander against the millions of British people who support Jeremy Corbyn's stance on action against Daesh. As one of those millions, I am furious that the Prime Minister should have the audacity to call me a 'terrorist sympathiser'. I do not support terror perpetrated by anybody, whether by Daesh, other terror organisations, or indeed governments.

I demand that David Cameron withdraw his comment and apologise. I understand that he was called upon to apologise several times today during the Commons debate, but that he refused to do so. I am appalled that he has not the grace to accept that this was a serious misjudgement and unworthy of his position. Indeed his many attempts to avoid apologising made him look like a recalcitrant child and were deeply unstatesmanlike.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]  
Sent from [Outlook](#)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 20:26  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Complaint

Dear Mr. Speaker

I would like to complain/object re David Cameron's comment today re people being a terrorist Sympathiser if they disagree re bombing Syria. I do not agree with the proposal of Bombing Syria but I am certainly not a Terrorist Sympathiser, I find this extremely offensive.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 21:22  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Syria

Dear friend,

I am sending this email to all my great Labour-Family MP's.

In the issue of Syria you have a decision which will result in the life or death of thousands and will influence the safety of our world for many years to come.

I am in my 60's and believe in order to see real positive change we need spiritual progress. Politics is too often about trying to look clever and put other people down.

You can't do everything well. If you spread your energy thinly you can't succeed in anything - so I have concentrated my time on inner progress, knowing we need to raise the consciousness of the entire world if we are to establish lasting peace on earth - but I just joined the Labour Party - because this decision about Syria is so crucial.

There are many good and important reasons why we should or should not start bombing Syria. The following article sets out the arguments very well - setting them out alongside the other burning issue of our time - Climate Change.

On such incredibly important issues - on which so many lives hang - I beg you not to vote until you have read this in full.

Where you would expect to see caution and circumspection, instead there is a rush to action. Where you would expect to see determination and resolve, there is only vacillation and delay. The contrast between the government's handling of the Syrian crisis and its handling of the climate change crisis could not be greater. It responds to these issues with an equal and opposite recklessness.

"We have to hit these terrorists in their heartlands right now," David Cameron told parliament last week. While it is hard to contest the principle of fighting Isis, to do so without a clear strategic purpose and intelligible objectives is lunacy.

The 70,000 fighters Cameron believes he can call upon might exist, but most of them are fighting President Assad in other parts of the country. Does he really intend to draw them away from that fight, even if - and this seems unlikely - they are willing to be drawn? After all, he insists (correctly I believe) that "we will not beat ISIL if we waver in our view that ultimately Assad must go." Redeploy Assad's opponents against a different enemy and he will consolidate his hold on Syria. This flaw in the plan is so obvious that it should scarcely need stating.

Where are the targets, and how will our bombers hit them? Isis is buried among the remaining residents in the city of Raqqa. What ratio of dead civilians to dead fighters does Cameron consider acceptable? For there will be a ratio, and it is likely to be a large one: the terrorists will make sure of that.

On what grounds does he believe that a military campaign in one part of the world will discourage terrorism in others? One of the astonishing features of counter-terrorism is the dearth of empirical assessment. A paper in the journal *Psicothema* found "an almost complete absence of evaluation research on counter-terrorism strategies ...[we] conclude that counter-terrorism policy is not evidence-based." Of the 11 military adventures the researchers analysed, they found that five had no discernible impacts on subsequent terrorism. Six were followed by more terrorism than there had been before.

By contrast, we need no further research to tell us that climate change requires a fast and decisive response. Yet, on every front, Cameron's government dithers – or worse.

The UK is now the only G7 nation substantially to increase its subsidies for fossil fuels: this year, George Osborne granted a further £1.7 billion of tax breaks for extracting oil and gas from the North Sea. Cameron has imposed, through the Infrastructure Act 2015, a legal obligation on the government to "maximise economic recovery" of the UK's oil and gas. As it also has a legal obligation (through the Climate Change Act 2008) to minimise the burning of oil and gas, this creates something of a quandary. But no one in the government appears to care.

He has, in effect, shut down the development of onshore windfarms and large-scale solar power, and now wants businesses to invest in gas instead. The only way in which more gas burning could be reconciled to our climate change commitments is to capture and bury the carbon dioxide it produces. But seven days after the government announced its dash for gas, it dumped its carbon capture and storage competition, ensuring that its contradictions are now impossible to resolve.

It has cut the funding for energy efficiency in homes by 80%. It is selling its green investment bank. It has cut the incentives to buy less polluting cars. It wants to build new roads and runways. Only with a reversal of these policies, and the vastly expensive closure of the plants Mr Cameron now seeks to commission, could the United Kingdom meet its climate targets.

So, while one Cameron claims to protect us from global threats, another Cameron contributes to a catastrophe likely to dwarf anything Isis could unleash. Even if they are honoured, the pledges that nations have brought to the climate change conference in Paris commit the world to dangerous global warming. But bad faith is contagious, and if governments undermine their own commitments, as Cameron is doing, the outcome will be even worse.

A study published in Nature Climate Change last month found that, if climate breakdown is not curtailed, by the end of this century temperatures in parts of Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Kuwait, Iraq and Iran "are likely to approach and exceed" the levels that human beings can survive. That doesn't sound to me like a formula for peace on Earth.

During his statement on Syria, Mr Cameron told the House of Commons that "my first responsibility as Prime Minister ... is to keep the British people safe". So why does he expose us to such threats? Why, when the outcomes are so unlikely and uncertain, does he pursue his bombing campaign with such passionate intensity, while his statements on climate change – where the need for action is so clear – lack all conviction?

No politician does anything with enthusiasm unless they wanted to do it all along: look at the glee with which George Osborne pursues austerity, even as its initial justifications are forgotten. Cameron, like other prime ministers, appears to suffer from Churchill Syndrome: the belief that, to be a great leader, you need a great conflict. Unlike Tony Blair, he has not invented the war he wishes to join, though his involvement risks its escalation.

There is nothing thrilling, nothing that conjures a mental image of sitting codpieced and cockaded on a rearing steed, gazing into the middle distance, about decarbonising the economy. The measures required are mundane and unglamorous. To make your mark, to take your place on the political panelling, you need a few explosions.

If the political effort and expense devoted to the bombing of foreigners over the past 25 years had instead been addressed to the world's environmental issues, we might not now be facing a multitude of crises. But the threshold for bombing has always been low, and the threshold for protecting the living world has always been high. It's as if governments were indifferent to life and in love with death.

I just joined the Labour Party - last Saturday. I so impressed by Jeremy's wisdom and courage. At last we have a leader who inspires. Do give him all the support you can.

Sincerely

[Redacted signature]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 21:23  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** Offensive comments from the PM

FAO: speakersoffice@parliament.uk and standardscommissioner@parliament.uk

Yesterday it was reported on the BBC website, in the Daily Telegraph and elsewhere that, in the course of a speech to the 1922 committee, the Prime Minister asked MPs to vote in favour of the government motion to extend bombing to Daesh targets in Syria instead of siding with "Jeremy Corbyn and a bunch of terrorist sympathisers." If this has been accurately quoted, it is the most disgraceful thing for any Prime Minister to say. He has characterised not only Members of Parliament who happen to believe he has not made a sufficient case for bombing raids as "terrorist sympathisers", but by extension has slandered all those members of the public who disagree with the government's proposals. This would include the members of the armed forces of this country who have stated that his plans have no hope of success, many of those who have served in combat, as well as many actual survivors of terrorism. How dare he call us "terrorist sympathisers".

I can assure the Prime Minister that I have no sympathy for the perpetrators of terrorist acts. But that does not mean I am obliged to agree with everything the government proposes. Like many people in the UK - possibly an actual majority of the population - I would support the government in any legal actions that I thought would really put an end to Daesh and bring peace to Syria. I just do not believe that the government's proposals have a hope of doing that. And I am entitled to my belief, and to have it represented in the vote, without being stigmatised as a "terrorist sympathiser" by anyone, let alone by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister's comments are not only highly offensive and divisive. They are also dangerously anti-democratic. What is the role of our elected representatives if they cannot vote as they see fit in Parliament without being regarded as terrorist sympathisers - potentially as traitors? Why does this country have a loyal opposition at all if they are to be regarded this way? It seems that the Prime Minister would prefer no parliamentary scrutiny of his actions - and if that is the case, he should not be in Parliament at all.

I do not know what the procedure is for a reprimand to a serving Prime Minister, but he should certainly face one for this attack on the public and on Parliamentary procedure. He should apologise to the elected Members of Parliament and to the voters that he has insulted so casually - and he should be reminded that it is, actually, still legal to disagree with him.

[REDACTED]  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 21:23  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Terrorist sympathisers

Mr Bercow

Mr Cameron was given several opportunities in The House today to apologise for his remarks about those opposing the bombing in Syria being 'a bunch of terrorist sympathisers'. As someone who opposes the motion as put forward I will wear that description with pride until Mr Cameron apologises.

I understand that as the remarks were made at a meeting of the 1922 committee rather than in The House you may feel you are unable to pressure Mr Cameron, however given that he was given ample opportunity to apologise for his remarks today and didn't even take the time to deny them I think he can be found in contempt of the country if not The House.

You seem to be the only person who can order MPs to behave appropriately. Please use your influence

Thank you



Sent from Samsung Mobile on O2

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 21:29  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Attention issues in the Syrian airstrike debate.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I can't help but be frustrated by the lack of attention paid to those speaking during today's important debate on Syrian airstrikes. I believe it is disrespectful to the speakers and nearly insulting to the citizens of the United Kingdom who are expecting their representatives to have a meaningful and productive conversation. We rely on them to debate, in the case of Syria, life or death matters on our behalf, and I think MP's should **listen**.

I believe creating a respectful environment and enforcing decorum is part of your role as Speaker, which you try to do, but it occurs to be ignored. I think we would all be better off if you could communicate this to them.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 21:41  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** Complaint against David Cameron

To whom it may concern,

Today it has been reported on the BBC, in the Daily Telegraph and elsewhere that, in the course of a speech to the 1922 committee, the Prime Minister asked MPs to vote in favour of the government motion to extend bombing to ISIL targets in Syria instead of siding with "Jeremy Corbyn and a bunch of terrorist sympathisers."

If this has been accurately quoted, it is absolutely outrageous and defamatory statement about not only to PMs who disagree with him, but also a large proportion of the general public. He has characterised not only MPs who believe he has not made a sufficient case for bombing raids as "terrorist sympathisers", but by extension has slandered all members of the public who disagree with the government's proposals.

This would include members of the armed forces of this country who have stated that his plans have no hope of success, many of those who have served in combat, as well as many actual survivors of terrorism. How dare he call us "terrorist sympathisers". Terrorism is not fought by bombing others.

Just because we believe we need to learn from our mistakes from actions taken already rather than doing the same acts of killing over and over again- Cameron brands us 'terrorist sympathisers'.

The Prime Minister's comments are not only highly offensive, but divisive. They are also dangerously anti-democratic. What is the role of our elected representatives if they cannot vote as they see fit in Parliament without being regarded as terrorist sympathisers - potentially as traitors? It seems that the Prime Minister would prefer no parliamentary scrutiny of his actions - and if that is the case, he should not be in Parliament at all.

He should apologise for this attack on the public and MPs.

With best wishes

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 22:58  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Conduct of the House during the Syria debate

Dear sir,

Firstly, thank you for conducting the debate fairly and impartially.

Secondly, I have been closely following parliament most of my adult life, and this is the first time in 15 years that I can say that the debate was useful. It enlightened, was professional and a productive use of time for the country.

Thank you for your work on improving the conduct of the house since you took the position of Speaker.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 December 2015 08:54  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Debates in the Chamber

Dear Mr Speaker

Can you please explain why clapping in the chamber after the vote on bombing was permissible and those clapping were not chastised. The SNP MP's who were at least clapping good speeches were chastised but those voting to bomb a country were not. This smacks of double standards.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 07:48  
**To:** Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Prime Minister complaint

Dear Speaker

I am writing to complain about David Cameron apparently calling those who oppose air strikes to Syria as 'a bunch of terrorist sympathisers'.

I oppose the air strikes as I don't believe it is a considered approach that will bring peace but is likely to be inflammatory, will kill innocent people, and likely to make matters worse. I believe bombing Syria will decrease national security not increase it. This does not make me a 'terrorist sympathiser'. I am just someone who wants as much killing and maiming of innocent people to be avoided as possible. I believe a political, intelligent and measured approach is necessary instead, such as that proposed by Jeremy Corbyn. I condone the actions of Isis. I just don't think bombing Syria is what is needed to defeat them. There's enough bombing in Syria going on anyway. This surely does not make me a 'terrorist sympathiser'?

I am offended by the Prime Minister's highly offensive insult to those who disagree with his view that air strikes in Syria are the way forward in defeating Isis.

I would like him to apologise and retract his comment.

Thank you  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 07:52  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** David Cameron's statement about "terrorist sympathisers"

Dear Sirs,

I object strongly to the implication that because I do not support the proposed airstrikes on Syria I am a terrorist sympathiser.

I do not believe that it is appropriate for the Prime Minister of this country to label people like me who have a deep-rooted belief that violence solves nothing as sympathisers of the appalling acts and convictions of those who follow ISIS, AL Qaeda or any other group that bombs and maims people.

Mr Cameron should recognise that there are principled people, some of them in his own party, who disagree with him and should moderate his language when trying to convince people that his proposed course of action is correct.

I do not know exactly what powers you have to censure him, but at the very least he should be made aware that his language is inappropriate.

Thank you for taking the time to read this

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 08:12  
**To:** Standards Commissioner; Speaker's Office  
**Subject:** Mr David Cameron's reported comments

It is widely reported by the BBC and many newspapers this morning that Mr David Cameron, the Prime Minister, has said that those voting against the proposed escalation of air strikes to Syria, including Mr Jeremy Corbyn the Leader of the Opposition, are 'terrorist sympathisers'. By extension, he must mean not only our elected MPs but also the rest of the electorate in this country who, whilst not necessarily supporters of the Labour Party or Mr Corbyn, are against further violence. I can assure you that in no way am I a 'terrorist sympathiser'. But neither do I personally believe that air strikes on Syria are a safe or sensible way to solve the problems currently before us as a nation. This is hugely offensive statement and in my view it is quite improper for a serving Prime Minister (and I emphasise the *serving*) to say such a thing. This is supposed to be a democracy. In a democracy opposing views are heard, respectfully listened to and debated before a decision is reached - or they should be. This is especially important in such a serious matter as the one which will be debated today in Parliament.

I wish formally to complain. I would ask that Mr Cameron makes a full and public apology for his ill-chosen words, in Parliament, before the debate begins today. Mr Speaker should then ensure that the debate is thorough and that people with differing views are allowed a full and respectful hearing.

Yours sincerely  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 08:37  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** Complaint

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to formally complain about the conduct of David Cameron MP and Prime Minister in stating that if you are against bombing Syria you are a terrorist sympathiser.

This sort of comment is more fit for the play ground and feels like the bully boy not getting his own way and resorting to shouting nasty names.

His conduct in relation to a domestic animal made Britain the laughing stock of the world and now this act childishness surely has no place in a modern democracy.

Yours Sincerely [REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 December 2015 08:45  
**To:** Speaker's Office; Standards Commissioner  
**Subject:** David Cameron's comments

Last evening, David Cameron, the Prime Minister, called opponents of the Syria bombing "terrorist sympathisers". This is completely unacceptable. Not only is it untrue but it is not the sort of language I would expect to hear from the Prime Minister of the country.

I would be grateful if you would bring this to his attention and ask him to apologise.

Yours

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]