



Additional Written Evidence to the Procedure Committee Call Lists Inquiry

We welcome the opportunity to contribute to the Committee's work, both through our recent oral evidence session and this additional written submission.

[Centenary Action](#) is a cross-party coalition bringing together women's organisations, academics, and politicians to campaign for a gender-equal Parliament. We also work closely with MPs in our role as the Secretariat to the [All-Party Parliamentary Group on Women in Parliament](#).

The evidence we provide is informed by our [research](#), feedback from women MPs, consultation with our academic advisory group and research on published call lists internationally provided by our colleagues at [Westminster Foundation for Democracy](#) and pro bono advice from [Hogan Lovells](#) law firm.

This submission sets out the key principles that we believe should underpin any reform of parliamentary procedures grounded in global norms on gender-sensitive parliaments. In particular, we assess the potential introduction of published call lists in light of these principles, with the aim of supporting a system that is fair, transparent, inclusive, and fit for a modern Parliament.

Key principles:

1. Parliament must work for all MPs

Parliamentary procedures should enable the full diversity of Members to participate effectively. A central principle of the international norms on gender-sensitive parliaments is that systems must facilitate participation rather than create barriers. [The Inter-Parliamentary Union \(IPU\)](#) defines a gender-sensitive parliament as one that *"responds to the needs and interests of both men and women in its composition, structures, operations, methods and work."*

[The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association \(CPA\)](#) identifies parliamentary infrastructure as a core dimension of a gender-sensitive parliament and emphasises the importance of scrutinising whether current systems unintentionally favour particular groups. As the CPA notes, a gender-sensitive parliament *"takes a critical look at the way in which parliament facilitates the work of Members and whether this benefits a particular type of parliamentarian – explicitly or implicitly."* This approach is directly relevant to current considerations of procedural reform, including the role of published call lists, and highlights the need for systems that support all MPs equally.

A modern Parliament should be designed around the needs of every Member, including those with disabilities, long-term health conditions, caring responsibilities, or other time- and energy-related constraints. Published call lists have the potential to advance this objective by providing greater predictability and enabling equitable participation for a wider range of MPs.

The traditional [practice](#) of MPs having to ‘bob’ to catch the Speaker’s eye is time-consuming, fails to acknowledge (gendered) bodily functions, and only works for those who can remain in the same seat for hours without food, drink, or comfort breaks. Long periods in the Chamber without clarity on when a Member will be called to speak can take a significant physical toll. As a current female MP told us:

‘I once bobbed in a debate for 7 hours before I was called. During that time, I did not leave at all in case I missed my opportunity to speak. By the time I had to vote, I felt almost faint from hunger.’

As the experience of this female MP illustrates, current procedures can disproportionately disadvantage women, particularly those managing gynaecological or menopause-related conditions:

‘I was diagnosed with adenomyosis last year and prior to treatment, I experienced menstrual flooding. It would be impossible for me to take part in lengthy debates if I had to stay in the chamber until I was called. The procedures should not preclude parliamentarians with health conditions from taking part in parliamentary duties in the chamber.’

Introducing published call lists would address some of these issues and enable [MPs with health conditions](#), such as Type 1 diabetes, to manage their time more effectively, by providing clarity on when they need to attend the Chamber and removing the need for bobbing. This would reduce the need for individuals to seek case-by-case accommodations from the Speaker, which risks framing reasonable adjustments as personalised exceptions rather than standard practice and can feel infantilising.

Published call lists would also support MPs with caring responsibilities by providing greater predictability and enabling them to better organise their time. As one current female MP in favour of call lists noted:

‘It would also allow me to better plan my time so I could possibly spend more time with family. Family relations definitely suffer in this job because of the time spent away from family and children / parents if you are caring.’

2. Systems should be designed to be inclusive

Inclusivity should be built into parliamentary procedures, rather than relying on individual adjustments. Under the current system, it is often those with the least powerful voice who need to

request adjustments. Designing the system to be inclusive from the outset benefits all MPs, not just those with specific requirements.

At present, the system depends on the Speaker's discretion to grant allowances for individual needs, such as health conditions that prevent MPs from 'bobbing' during debates. This places the burden on the individual rather than creating processes that work for everyone.

The current approach is [informal, individualised, and opaque](#). MPs with caring responsibilities can be dependent on whether they have a supportive whip who provides guidance on when they will be called to speak.

As one current female MP explained: *'I can feel nervous about nipping out in case I'm about to be called. I don't like bothering the speaker, this is probably a feminine thing of not wanting to be a pest. It's nerve wracking not knowing if I'm going to be called or when.'*

3. Systems need to be equitable

Under the current system the Speaker curates the debate and precedence may be given to those who have been in the house for a long time or who have particular expertise. This prioritises the established MPs, who for historical reasons are less likely to be diverse and are more likely to be white men, whereas the more recently elected MPs are more likely to come from diverse backgrounds.

The use of published call lists during the pandemic [overturned the conventions of seniority](#) that tend to privilege long-sitting men MPs, giving more opportunities to younger, ethnically diverse, and female MPs. A more equitable system would make it clearer who is prioritised in debates and how these decisions are made.

The current system also has a greater impact on smaller parties as they are generally called lower down the list, which means they have to spend longer in the chamber and are more likely to have their speaking time reduced. As representatives of smaller parties, they are also often covering multiple portfolios, so face particular demands on their time.

Gender sensitive parliament audits can provide valuable data on levels of participation, including the amount of speaking time, orders of speakers, and interruptions. For example data collected as part of the [Scottish Parliament's Gender Sensitive Audit](#), revealed patterns of unequal participation in debates.

4. Published call lists should be seen as part of a broader package of reforms:

In order to ensure that parliament is sensitive to people from diverse backgrounds, processes and procedures need to be considered holistically. Published call lists should be seen as one element

within a broader suite of reforms aimed at making parliament more inclusive, drawing on international best practice as outlined by the [IPU](#) and [CPA](#).

There are already recommendations for the UK context, including those in [The Good Parliament](#) report and the [Open House](#) report. The *Open House* report reviewed all the recommendations that had been made since 2014, and found that of the 92 proposals only a handful had been implemented. This means that Parliament is not short of well-evidenced, practical suggestions for reform that are ready to be taken forward.

While published call lists could significantly enhance predictability and help MPs manage their time more effectively, the underlying challenge extends beyond this single procedure. One female MP's experience highlights the need to consider call lists as part of a wider effort to modernise parliamentary scheduling and make the institution more responsive to the realities of MPs' lives:

'It's so hard to plan childcare. Sometimes you don't know when votes will go on until. Usually Thursdays are a one-liner, but sometimes you find out really last minute that there will be a three-line vote, and everything goes up in the air. If you've got a sympathetic partner, family and an army of people who can babysit last minute it's fine. If you don't, that makes life incredibly stressful.'

Examples of reforms that would complement published call lists and address similar challenges include:

- Greater certainty and predictability in sitting hours. Currently, MPs may know when their day starts but not when it will end. Deciding sitting hours further in advance, and providing clearer schedules for debates and votes with fewer last-minute changes would help MPs plan their time more effectively.
- Building breaks into debates and providing spaces for MPs to step away from the Chamber when needed.
- Having shorter debates and setting clear time limits for speeches in advance.

5. Parliamentary processes need to maximise MPs effectiveness and efficiency

The role of an MP has evolved, with increasing demands on their time, including greater focus on constituency work and maintaining a social media presence. Parliamentary processes need to reflect this reality and enable MPs to use their time efficiently. Introducing published call lists would help MPs manage their time and diaries more effectively, allowing them to balance parliamentary and constituency duties and maximise their overall effectiveness.

While MPs value listening to other contributions during debates, published call lists would potentially give MPs greater certainty about when they will speak and for how long, enabling them to prepare their speeches properly, avoid last-minute cuts if timings change, and manage their diaries more efficiently.

As one current female MP who experienced published call lists during the pandemic explains:

'I believe that this was really helpful, knowing when the speaker would call you, so that time could be well used, listening to other contributions while also undertaking a few other tasks. When waiting to be called in the Chamber, I would normally listen to the debate, undertake a few other tasks and be constantly preparing to speak, as it could be imminent or not. I find this a far less productive use of time, when time is so precious.'

Another female MP who had previously been an MEP shared:

'In the European Parliament we had a call list system and there was a definite advantage – you knew you were going to speak, you knew roughly when, and you knew for how long. This meant you could prepare a speech properly, you didn't end up having to cut chunks of it out on the bench as the time available got shortened, and you could manage your diary much more efficiently.'

Another current female MP shared:

"This is one of the things that frustrates me most. I have a very full diary. This area is under-researched, but anecdotally I think women are busier. We take on causes we care about, invite in voices that are often unheard, and end up overfilling our schedules. Women often feel they have to work harder to prove themselves and respond to unconscious bias from others. I do everything intentionally; I don't just turn up. Yet I can sit for five hours and not get called."

6. Historic practices reflect past dominance

Many long-standing procedures were designed around those who [traditionally held power](#). They aren't necessarily the best practice for a more diverse cohort of MPs. In considering reforms, the value of tradition must be weighed against the need to accommodate the diverse needs of current MPs and to encourage broader participation. Parliament must work both for the current cohort of MPs and those who might in future seek to become members of Parliament. Well designed reforms can also help shift public perceptions of Parliament, making it easier for a broader and more diverse range of people to view it as a place where they can belong and contribute.

7. Different MPs contribute in different ways

The current system tends to favour a particular style of participation, often centred on long sittings and traditional forms of speech-making. Yet many MPs could contribute more frequently if the style and structure of debate were more accommodating. MPs can also be effective in different ways and the "great orator" model is not the only measure of effectiveness.

Concerns about introducing call lists often reference spontaneity, reflecting a preference for an idealised version of an MP rather than the realities of modern parliamentary work. In practice,

despite claims of spontaneity, MPs tend to deliver pre-prepared speeches, and the whipping system further limits the scope for debate to change minds. The institution should also consider whether maintaining an ideal of spontaneity should outweigh reforms that prioritise equity and inclusivity.

Parliament has long held that [MPs are free to choose how to carry out their role](#), with no formal job description. Published call lists could give MPs greater control over how they fulfil their role. Some may choose to speak more often if the format becomes less time-intensive and more predictable; others may contribute selectively, or focus on alternative parliamentary or constituency work. MPs can be trusted to decide how best to allocate their time.

Published call lists and other procedural reforms can support this diversity of contribution without imposing a single standard of parliamentary effectiveness, enabling all MPs to participate fully and effectively.

8. Procedures shape public confidence

Parliamentary procedures contribute to how citizens view the workings of parliament. For example, Diane Abbot having to 'bob' 40 times without being called to speak generated negative [headlines](#) and made the institution look out of touch.

Procedures that enable equal participation are important for confidence in democratic processes. [Evidence](#) shows the public are more content with decisions when they are made by diverse groups.

Introducing call lists on a permanent basis would demonstrate that the norms and traditions of parliament can be amended to increase accessibility and inclusivity.

9. Transparency builds trust

Principles of openness and accountability should guide reform. Transparency is a key principle and central to [IPU](#) recommendations for what makes an effective parliament, and it is essential for identifying problems and designing solutions. At present, there is in effect already a call list, but it operates informally and without transparency. Making these processes open and accessible would strengthen accountability and support a fairer, more understandable system.

10. Parliament can change

The experience of the pandemic demonstrated that Parliament is capable of introducing flexible and inclusive procedural reforms at pace. It also made clear that Parliament already has the internal expertise needed to design and implement effective changes. Those who understand parliamentary procedure such as clerks working with MPs, are best placed to develop, test, and refine practical improvements that support a more modern, accessible, and inclusive system. Any reforms could be

introduced on a trial basis, such that impacts, both negative and positive could be assessed, and any further revisions made (see more below).

11. Learn from international best practice

Research into practice in other European countries reveals that call lists are common practice in other comparable democracies. Procedures in other European countries are outlined in research from [Westminster Foundation for Democracy](#) and [Hogan Lovells](#), which you can read in the Appendices.

Some countries, such as Finland, have an electronic system for requesting to speak - rather than the bobbing system. In Finland, MPs are queued electronically in order of the requests being made, but the Speaker has full discretion to ensure fairness and balance.

Some systems use call lists but have an element of flexibility. For example, in Sweden the official speaking list is released prior to the debate, but during the debate the Speaker has the discretion to grant short interventions and additional speakers.

12. Take a flexible approach

Some of the concerns raised about the introduction of call lists could be mitigated by taking a flexible approach. For example, published call lists could be introduced for some debates but not all. There could also be published call lists for part of a debate, perhaps at the beginning, which is then followed by a more free flowing debate.

If published call lists were adopted, there could be recommendations in relation to how long MPs are expected to stay in the chamber when they are allocated to speak. For example, the Lords system has published lists so they have the benefit of knowing when they will speak and how long for, but they are still expected to remain in the chamber for the whole debate. Concerns about the chamber looking empty could also be mitigated by encouraging MPs to sit more closely during debates. Published call lists could be introduced in a way that ensures that the Speaker retains control of the debate and allows some flexibility to insert speakers into the order on the day.

Technological solutions could also play a role. For example, an electronic request-to-speak system could help address many of the challenges associated with bobbing. Such a system could be trialled and adopted in the short term, while more substantial reforms are considered as part of the restoration and renewal process.

13. Pilot and evaluate

In order to find the best approach, different options such as published call lists and or technological solutions rather than physical bobbing and other connected procedural factors, (e.g.

order and length of speaking and length of sessions) should be piloted and evaluated for their impact on equal participation and effectiveness.

Conclusion

The current system is ineffective, inequitable, and long overdue for reform. If we were designing parliamentary procedures from scratch, they would look very different from those shaped by historical convention. Any modern system should be built on the principles of equity, fairness, and effective representation, ensuring that all MPs are able to participate fully and that Parliament reflects the needs and expectations of today's diverse democracy.

Appendices

1. Call Lists Briefing from [Westminster Foundation for Democracy](#)

Call lists are the lists of Members who are due to be called to speak on a particular item of business.¹ They are compiled by the Speaker's office and cover: oral question sessions (PMQs, departmental sessions), Ministerial sessions, urgent questions, and general debates.

This briefing is an outline of the process of call lists in several parliaments, with particular attention to how they differ from Westminster parliament.

Sweden

In the Swedish Parliament, the order of speakers (talarlista) during a debate is generally managed by the Speaker or Deputy Speaker. General principles:

- Each party group notifies the Speaker's Office in advance of which of their members will speak and in what order.
- The Speaker then compiles and announces the official speaking list before the debate begins.
- The speaking time for each party is allocated proportionally to its representation in the Parliament.

While the list is prepared in advance, the Speaker has the discretion to grant short interventions or additional speaking turns. The system aims to ensure that all parties have the opportunity to participate. The order of speakers is managed collectively through party-based speaker lists agreed in advance and coordinated by the Riksdag Secretariat, with the Speaker (talman) calling Members

¹ House of Commons Procedure Committee, "*Procedure under coronavirus restrictions: the use of call lists and the Speaker's lists*" (HC 300, 2020)

according to this prearranged, balanced order. The Swedish approach emphasizes party coordination and procedural predictability.

See Annex 1 for a translation of the relevant sections from the Rules of Procedure of the Riksdag.

Finland

The Speaker grants actual speeches in the order in which they are reserved. The Speaker of the Parliament grants replies in the order he or she deems appropriate. In the debate on the Prime Minister's announcement, during oral question time and in the topical debate, the Speaker may grant speeches at his or her discretion. A representative may reserve a speech no earlier than 3 hours before the start of the session.

During a debate, MPs signal a request to speak using an electronic request system at their seat in the plenary. Their names are queued electronically in the order the requests are made, but the Speaker has full discretion to manage speakers to alternate between parties for balance and allow shorter intervention speeches.

In the Eduskunta, MPs request the floor electronically, and the Speaker calls them in order, or by discretion, to ensure fairness and balance. There is no formal or public call list - the system relies on procedural neutrality and real-time management by the Chair.

See Annex 2 for a translation from their parliamentary Rules of Procedures.

Croatia

The Parliament of Croatia organizes a draw to determine the order of oral questions. A draw is used so that the opposition and ruling parties take turns to ask questions; the opposition asks the first, third, fifth, etc., questions, while the ruling parties ask the second and fourth, etc. The names of parliamentary groups (or an independent MP) are drawn from two different pots — one for the opposition, the other for the ruling parties.²

Senedd

There are different processes for different proceedings.

Questions during Plenary

The calling of speakers is at the discretion of the chair. Members wishing to contribute to proceedings inform the Presiding Officer in advance (either by email or through the Siambr instant messaging system during a session).

² Parliamentary Oversight of the Executive in the OSCE Region, (2025) OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/9/590063_0.pdf

The Presiding Officers will: "ensure that business is handled on the basis of equality and fairness to all political groups and Members" and will call 'Members "at their discretion whilst ensuring that the interests of all Members are treated equally" "When calling Members to speak, the chair will give regard to the balance of party representation in the Senedd." ³

Informally staff of the Senedd noted that "In practice, the list order is generally based on the order in which they come in - they will get added to the bottom of the list, unless the Llywydd (Presiding Officer) indicates that they should be listed higher. This might be based on info the Llywydd has, or consideration of earlier/later business, etc."

Oral questions to the First Minister are determined by a ballot. Staff of the Senedd noted "the reality of this is a spreadsheet with a randomise button". The specific details of this are in paragraph 210 in the [Senedd Guide](#).

The Member selected must table their oral question at least five working days before the question is due to be answered for Ministers, the Counsel General, and Senedd Commission. A shorter deadline of three working days applies for questions to the First Minister. The order in which the questions are to be asked in Plenary are selected by random means and they are published on the [Senedd website](#).⁴

Ireland

In the Oireachtas, the order of speaking is managed through pre-submitted speaking lists, agreed between party whips and the Business Committee, rather than an officially published call list. For major debates or statements, the Government Chief Whip's Office circulates a speaking rota showing how much time each party or group has and in what order they'll speak. MPs must notify their whips or the Speaker (Ceann Comhairle) if they wish to speak; they are then allocated a slot based on their party's time allocation. The Speaker calls Members in line with this rota but can adjust it.

You can read the Annex to this briefing [here](#).

³ *Guide to Plenary*, Welsh Parliament Chamber Secretariat (2025) [Guide to Plenary](#)

⁴ I checked the website on 3/11/2025 and the call list was listed for debates on 4/11/2025 and 5/11/2025.

2. Call Lists Briefing From [Hogan Lovells](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This briefing paper examines how Germany, France, Sweden, Norway and the Netherlands structure parliamentary questioning, with a particular focus on how speakers are selected. These international comparisons reveal that the UK's current approach of 'bobbing' stands in contrast to more transparent, equitable, and modern systems elsewhere.

2. GERMANY⁵

- 2.1 In the Bundestag, there are separate mechanisms by which written and oral questions can be asked of the government. They are distinguished by 'minor' and 'major' interpellations, and debates on matters of topical interest.
- 2.2 A 'minor' interpellation is submitted to the government in writing if at least 5% of the Members of Parliament agree to ask about the issue, and the response is exclusively in written form. A 'major' interpellation is one which raises important political issues, and is used by opposition parties to put critical questions to the government. These can be answered in written form, but are also debated in the Bundestag.
- 2.3 In debates on matters of topical interest, it is not always the case that there will have been written communications owing to the pressing nature of the debate. Speakers are chosen by party and may not speak for longer than five minutes – in the 16th electoral term, it has been agreed that there should be four speakers for the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, four for the SPD parliamentary group, one for the FDP parliamentary group, one for The Left Party parliamentary group and one for the Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary group. The parliamentary group that has tabled the motion for a debate on matters of topical interest may put forward an additional speaker.⁶
- 2.4 There is no formal rule that MPs can signal their intent to speak only by standing up. MPs must register their intent to speak with the Clerk of the Chair that administers the speakers list. There are no formal requirements on how this is done. For interposed questions, MPs can press a button at the microphone to signal their intent.

⁵ [Rules of Procedure of the German Bundestag and Rules of Procedure of the Mediation Committee](#)
⁶ [Instruments of Scrutiny - Deutscher Bundestag](#)

2.5 The Chair has discretion on who is given the floor but is bound by some principles to ensure an appropriate exchange between different factions. There is no explicit rule on Gender balanced speaking lists.

3. **FRANCE**

3.1 France offers multiple mechanisms for parliamentary questioning, divided into oral and written formats. Each week, there is a designated sitting where parties may table oral questions in proportion to their parliamentary strength, as determined by the chief whip. These are delivered as two-minute speeches by MPs and are not followed by debate.

3.2 Since 2008, a separate weekly session allows both majority and opposition parties equal time to pose questions. These are not tabled, notified, or published in advance. Party groups submit the names of questioners and indicate the ministers to whom questions will be directed, but the topics remain undisclosed. The question and response lasts five minutes, with approximately 15 questions addressed per sitting.⁷

3.3 Written questions must be answered within one month, and if not, the MP may request that the question be converted into an oral one. Since 1995, a 'signalling' procedure allows party whips to prioritise certain questions for response, proportionally to party size. However, this system has lost influence, as ministers tend to respond only to those questions signalled by party leadership.⁸

3.4 In a notable reform effort, the National Assembly trialled a session where the Prime Minister answered questions alone, which mirrored the UK's PMQs. Each party, regardless of size, was allowed one question, with a total of 10 questions over a 45 minute session. This shift led to a broader range of backbench MPs participating, reducing the dominance of party leaders and democratizing access to the Prime Minister.

4. Unfortunately, this process was not adopted permanently. The dissolution announced by President Macron on 9 June 2024 did not allow the evaluation of this new procedure to take place as planned, and the newly elected Bureau of the National Assembly concluded that the party leaders had 'no attachment' to the process.⁹

5. **THE NETHERLANDS**

5.1 In The Netherlands, the Parliament is made up of a House of Representatives and a Senate, with the House of Representatives being the location of the majority of debate and calling of Ministers to account.

5.2 Every Tuesday, there is a 'question hour' in the Dutch House of Representatives, and MPs have from the end of the sitting week on Thursday afternoon until midday on Tuesday to submit questions. It is then up to the President of the House to decide which questions

⁷ [862-2019-01-21-Questioning-Routledge-Book.pdf](#)

⁸ [Microsoft Word - Getting to know the French National Assembly 2024.docx](#)

⁹ [Not interested in a second fiddle – why the French parliament's Prime Minister's Questions experiment failed | The Constitution Unit Blog](#)

should be asked, with counsel from the Secretary-General and clerks of the House of Representatives. The questions must be topical, urgent and novel.¹⁰

- 5.3 During debates, with ministers and state secretaries and other MPs, speakers may interrupt and pose questions, which are called ‘interruptions’. In the Plenary Hall, MPs use specific interruption microphones in order to intervene.

6. **SWEDEN**

- 6.1 The Swedish Riksdag is the unicameral parliament and main place where public political debate takes place. One of the principal tasks of the Riksdag is to scrutinise the work of the Government and public agencies, which involves asking questions and debating.
- 6.2 Each Thursday, Question Time is held at the Riksdag, where either the Prime Minister or four Ministers are in attendance to answer questions from members. If a member of Parliament wants to ask a question, they must register no later than one hour before Question Time.¹¹ If a Party wishes to prioritise a certain question, they must notify the Speaker either ahead of time or within the Chamber.
- 6.3 It is then the role of the Speaker to determine the order of speakers during Question Time, with the opposition usually given the opportunity to ask more questions than members from the governing party (or parties). Question Time is a speedy process, with both questions and answers being allotted a time of one minute – there can then be a supplementary question and answer, which cannot last more than half a minute.
- 6.4 Question Time is often used as an occasion to discuss highly topical issues, and while the Ministers are not given advance notice of the questions, members are informed which Ministers are attending. The purpose of this advanced notice is to ensure that the questions can be well prepared and specific.
- 6.5 As with other parliamentary systems, written interpellations are also widely used in Sweden, with several thousand questions being addressed to the Government each year. These questions can be on a range of topics, and are mainly asked by members of the opposition.
- 6.6 A member is required to submit the interpellation in writing to the Minister, but receives the answer both in writing and orally when the Minister visits the Chamber. The Minister is required to answer the question within 14 days, and must provide an explanation if there is a delay.¹²

7. **NORWAY**

- 7.1 The Norwegian system of scrutiny is similar to that of Sweden, in that every week a Question Time is held in the Norwegian Parliament (the Storting) to allow members to ask

¹⁰ [How Parliament Works - House of Representatives](#)

¹¹ [Debattregler - Sveriges Riksdag](#)

¹² [Examines the work of the Government - Sveriges Riksdag](#)

questions of the Government. Question Time is split into two sessions – first Oral Question Time, which is followed by Ordinary Question Time.

- 7.2 Each Monday, the Prime Minister informs the President of the Storting which members of the Government will be attending the Wednesday Question Time, with the President then notifying the members of Parliament. Usually three members of Government take part every week, with the Prime Minister attending around once a month.¹³
- 7.3 Questions are not submitted ahead of time of Oral Question Time, but members who wish to ask questions are required to notify the President in advance. The President then decides which members are to be permitted to ask questions, and in which order.
- 7.4 Ordinary Question Time is scheduled to take part immediately after Oral Question Time, with questions having been submitted ahead of time in writing by Members to the President of the Storting. The questions to be asked are sent to the Government ahead of the session, and also distributed to all Members ahead of time.

8. **CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The evidence from Germany, France, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands demonstrates that structured, codified, and equitable systems for selecting questioners are not only feasible but already in place across comparable parliamentary democracies. In particular, the use of specific microphones is a simple change that could result in more equity. The UK's reliance on physical visibility and informal discretion disadvantages certain MPs and particularly women, newer members, and those with disabilities.