GENERAL SYNOD

A NEW ENABLING MEASURE

This paper accompanies the motion to be moved on behalf of the Archbishops' Council inviting the Council to initiate the legislative process to bring an 'Enabling Measure' to the General Synod for first consideration at the July 2016 group of sessions.

The proposed Enabling Measure would facilitate removing or reducing burdens resulting from ecclesiastical legislation by making it possible to amend or repeal some Acts of Parliament and Church Measures by way of orders approved by the General Synod without going through the full legislative process that applies to Measures.

Summary of contents

- The paper first sets out the **background** to the proposal **(paragraphs 1-2)** then **the historic context (paragraphs 3-7)**, and identifies **the problem to be addressed (paragraph 8)**.
- The **proposed approach** to dealing with the problem is then described **(paragraphs 9-12)**, followed by some material on **legislative precedents (paragraphs 13-16)**.
- There then follows a more detailed description of the content of the proposed Enabling Measure as follows.
- The **purpose and general scope of orders** is described **(paragraphs 17-21)** followed by a description of **preconditions to initiating the process for making orders (paragraphs 22-23)** and **particular exclusions from the scope of the order making power (paragraphs 24-30)**.
- The proposed **procedure for making orders** – including the respective roles of the General Synod and the Archbishops' Council – is then described **(paragraphs 31-44)** followed by a **summary of the proposed procedure (paragraph 45)**.
- The final section of the paper (**paragraphs 46-59**) describes the **wider legislative context** within which the proposal for an Enabling Measure is being brought forward and concludes by **seeking the General Synod's support in principle** for the proposed Enabling Measure.

Background

1. GS Misc 1094, *Optimising the Role of the National Church Institutions (NCIs)*, was published in January 2015 among a number of other documents related to the emerging Renewal and Reform programme. It included a proposal for a new Enabling Measure to simplify the process for amending some of the Church of England's extensive corpus of statute law. The Archbishops' Council and House of Bishops had welcomed the proposal and asked for it to be developed further.

2. A consultation document (GS Misc 1103) agreed by the Council was published on 13 April 2015, with comments being sought on it by the end of July. The consultation document explained the complex legal framework within which the Church operates and the problems this creates, which the Enabling Measure is intended to address.

The historic context

3. The legal framework within which the Church operates is complex. It consists not only of the general statutory and common law of the land – for example in relation to charity and property law – but also of ecclesiastical law. The latter is itself a branch of English law and comprises: common law, which predates the Reformation; canon law, which has its roots in pre-Reformation canon law; and statute law passed during and since the Reformation by Parliament.

4. Since 1920 the Church of England has had its own legislative assembly (initially the Church Assembly, since 1970 the General Synod), which has power to pass Measures relating to any matter concerning the Church of England. These may include amendments to Acts of Parliament. Once Measures have received parliamentary approval and Royal Assent, they become part of the law of the land, having the same force and effect as an Act of Parliament. The constitutional convention since 1920 has been that Parliament does not initiate legislation affecting the internal running of the Church of England without the Church's consent.

5. Over the past 95 years the Church of England has used this right of initiative to bring forward a large number of Measures. Some of these have been about reforming the Church's liturgy. Most, however, have been about revising and modernising the framework of rights and duties within which the various office holders and bodies within the Church operate, about property and resource issues and about modifying structures that are no longer well adapted for today's world.

6. Despite all the reform that has been attempted the Church of England remains subject to an astonishingly large volume of statute law. Volume 14 of Halsbury's Statutes (4th edition), which includes only the primary legislation (Acts of Parliament and Measures passed since 1920) relating to the Church of England from 1533 to 2003, runs to nearly 1,400 pages.

7. This is just one part of the total framework of law that applies to the Church of England since the figure of 1,400 pages excludes general Parliamentary legislation relevant to the Church, the Church's Canons, its liturgy, provisions of the common law and all secondary legislation (orders, regulations etc.) whether made by Parliament or the Synod.

The problem

8. The Archbishops' Council issued the consultation document because it concluded that this situation was not merely unsatisfactory theoretically but also presented some practical difficulties:

    - In the past, far more detail was included on the face of primary legislation than would be the case today, where the practice would be to put much more of the detail in regulations or guidance. Since primary legislation can normally be amended or repealed only by fresh primary legislation the effect of that is that changes to this large corpus of legislation are time-consuming, costly and onerous.

    - In a fast-changing world institutions need, without compromising their core values, to be adaptable and fleet of foot. That is much harder if the surrounding framework of law is burdensome and the processes for changing any of it are very elaborate. As regards the latter, the legislative processes for Measures typically take three groups of sessions to complete, with the result that that part of the process usually takes 12 to 18 months. The parliamentary stages then normally take several months to complete. So the legislative

process itself typically takes around two years – and can take longer – in addition to the time needed to develop policy proposals in the first place.

- Law is essential for safeguarding key rights and duties but over-regulation through primary legislation can stifle creativity and give insufficient weight to trust and relationship. Legislating for everything can also reduce the focus on those areas where the law does have a key role to play.

Proposed approach

9. The Archbishops' Council considered whether it might be possible to simplify the processes by which Measures are considered by the Synod and then, after final approval, are scrutinised by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament before being approved by the House of Commons and House of Lords and receiving the Royal Assent. It concluded, however, that there was no scope for any significant shortening. Where Measures are needed, as they will continue to be in many cases, the present stages each add value and need to be retained.

10. Instead, the Archbishop's Council identified a different solution, which was the subject of the consultation. This was to enact a new Enabling Measure, making it possible to amend or repeal some primary legislation by secondary legislation, in other words by an order approved by the Synod rather than by a Measure. Such a power for the Synod would be similar in some respects to that which Parliament created for itself in the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 in relation to amending Acts of Parliament (see further below).

11. Before the Enabling Measure itself became law it would first need to have gone through all the normal legislative stages in the General Synod, and then, if given final approval there, have been submitted to the Ecclesiastical Committee and approved by both Houses of Parliament in the usual way.

12. The consultation document envisaged that the Measure would contain a number of safeguards. These included:

    - Certain tests and preconditions that would have to be met before the power could be exercised – for example that it was directed to the removal and reduction of burdens and that it did not involve the removal or rights or freedoms.

    - Certain pieces of Church legislation would be outside its scope and would therefore continue to be amendable only by means of a fresh Measure. These would include legislation dealing with constitutional or doctrinal matters.

    - A prescribed procedure would be put in place involving, among other things a new Scrutiny Committee of the Synod which would examine proposals from the Archbishops' Council before they came to the Synod for approval.

Legislative precedents

13. It has long been recognised that it is possible, in principle, for primary legislation to contain a provision allowing the making of secondary legislation which amends or repeals primary legislation, subject to further Parliamentary scrutiny. There have been examples of Parliament conferring wide-ranging enabling powers for primary legislation to be repealed or amended by secondary legislation[1]. Of most potential relevance to the challenge facing the Church of England is **Part 1 of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006** ('the 2006 Act'), which replaced the Regulatory Reform Act 2001.

[1] Such as the European Communities Act 1972 and the Health Act 1999.

14. This is directed at deregulation. Section 1 of the 2006 Act permits a government minister to make an order for the purpose of *"removing or reducing any burden, or the overall burdens, resulting directly or indirectly for any person from any legislation"*.[2]

15. Because it enables Acts of Parliament to be amended by order rather than a fresh Act of Parliament the 2006 Act contains a number of safeguards. For example:

- Before making an order under s.1 of the 2006 Act (a 'legislative reform order'), the relevant minister must be satisfied that the provision to be made by the order meets certain **specified conditions**.
- In particular, an order may not be made unless the relevant minister has **consulted extensively** and, following that consultation, has laid a draft order and **explanatory document** before Parliament, explaining the power under which the order is to be made, the reasons for the provision to be made by it and why the minister considers that the relevant conditions for making it are satisfied.
- Committees of both Houses consider the draft order and the explanatory document, and whether the order meets all the criteria laid down by the 2006 Act. Once a Committee is satisfied that it has all the information it requires, it makes a substantive **report to the House** concerned, assessing the proposal against all the relevant criteria.

16. While the 2006 Act provides a helpful precedent, it is not proposed that its provisions should simply be duplicated in the Church context. Instead the provisions of the proposed Enabling Measure should be specifically tailored to the particular context of the Church of England and the respective roles of the General Synod and the Archbishops' Council. Those provisions would include:

- the purpose of orders that could be made under the Enabling Measure;
- the preconditions that would have to be met before any order could be made;
- the range of matters that would be excluded from the scope of the power to make orders; and
- the legislative procedure by which orders would be made.

The next part of this paper addresses each of those areas in turn.

Purpose and general scope of orders under the proposed Enabling Measure

17. It is proposed that the power to make orders that would be conferred by the Enabling Measure should be directed to **the removal or reduction of burdens resulting directly or indirectly from ecclesiastical legislation**. For this purpose, 'burden' should be defined as:

- a financial cost;
- an administrative inconvenience; or
- an obstacle to efficiency.

18. For this purpose a 'financial cost' or 'administrative inconvenience' would include cost and inconvenience deriving from the form of legislation (e.g. because it was hard to understand).

[2] The power conferred by section 1 of the 2006 Act is significantly narrower than it was in the Bill as originally introduced into Parliament; a Minister was originally intended to have power to make an order merely for the purpose of "reforming legislation". In the light of concerns about the breadth of such a power, the Government accepted that the Bill should be amended to narrow the scope of the power so that its purpose was confined to that set out above.

Examples of burdens involving financial cost or administrative inconvenience would also include those resulting from Church legislation which:

- established bodies that were unnecessarily large for their purpose;
- prescribed unnecessarily complex administrative processes;
- put in place safeguards (e.g. consent or consultation requirements) of a kind that were disproportionate; or
- were expressed in a form which was hard to understand or unclear.

19. The provision that could be made by order under the Measure would include:

- provision abolishing, conferring or transferring, or providing for the delegation of, functions of any description, and
- provision creating or abolishing a body or office.

In the light of responses to the consultation it is proposed that an order could provide for the abolition of an office only where that was *consequential upon* the removal of some other burden. For example, if the structure of the ecclesiastical courts were to be streamlined by an order, the office of judge in a court whose jurisdiction had been transferred to another court could be abolished by the order as a consequence of the transfer.

20. Additionally, an order could contain provision which was consequential on or supplementary to its main provisions.

21. It is further proposed that the Measure should enable the making of pre-consolidation changes to legislation which it was intended to consolidate, given that such changes are very largely of a technical and uncontroversial nature. (See further paragraphs [46]-[49] below as to the consolidation of legislation.)

Preconditions to initiating the process for making orders

22. Before initiating the process for making an order under the Enabling Measure the Archbishops' Council would have to be satisfied that any provision to be made by the order (other than that which simply restated an existing enactment) met **each of the following conditions – that:**

- **the policy objective intended to be secured by the provision could not be satisfactorily secured by non-legislative means;**
- **the effect of the provision was proportionate to the policy objective;**
- **the provision, taken as a whole, struck a fair balance between the public interest, the interest of the Church of England as a whole, and the interests of any person adversely affected by the provision;**
- **the provision did not remove any necessary protection;**
- **the provision did not prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right or freedom which that person might reasonably expect to continue to exercise;**
- **the provision was not of constitutional significance.**

23. The effect of imposing those preconditions would in practice be to circumscribe the uses to which the order making power might be put. In particular, the requirement relating to the continuing exercise of rights or freedoms – while it would not prevent the imposition of *reasonable* restrictions on the exercise of rights such as the right to be consulted – would

prevent the power being used in such a way as to remove the rights of office holders, parishioners, patrons and others. The requirement relating to constitutional significance would prevent the power being exercised in such a way as to alter the relationship between the Church and the State.

Particular exclusions from the scope of the order making power

24. Imposing preconditions on the exercise of the proposed power would already have the effect in practice of narrowing its scope by preventing it being used in certain ways. But **certain specified pieces of Church legislation would also be expressly excluded** from the scope of the new power, on account of their significance or sensitivity within the life of the Church.

25. Providing for exclusions involves striking a balance between, on the one hand, keeping the range of exclusions reasonably restricted so that the new Enabling Measure can make a real difference and, on the other, not drawing it so tightly that changes could be made by order that potentially upset some of the delicate historic checks and balances that make up the complex economy of the Church of England. One obvious category for exclusion is legislation which is foundational to the life of the Church, including because it addresses its relationship with the State. Any amendment to such legislation should be made by Measure in the usual way.

26. Accordingly, the following **Acts of Parliament and Measures would be expressly excluded** from the scope of the power:

- the Submission of the Clergy Act 1533
- the Appointment of Bishops Act 1533
- the Suffragan Bishops Acts 1534 to 1898
- the Act of Uniformity 1662
- the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act 1919
- the Synodical Government Measure 1969 so far as it relates to the General Synod and the Convocations
- the Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure 1974
- the new Enabling Measure itself.

27. The repeal or amendment of at least some of these Acts and Measures would arguably already be outside the scope of the power anyway if (as proposed above) one of the conditions for its exercise is that the provision made by the order should not be 'of constitutional significance'. But it nonetheless seems desirable specifically to exclude certain Acts or Measures, if only to avoid the need to form a view as to whether what was proposed was indeed 'of constitutional significance'.

28. Although the power would not be capable of being used to repeal or amend the specified pieces of legislation as an end in itself, it would be possible to do that where doing so was merely *consequential upon* the removal of a burden resulting from other legislation and did not involve a change of constitutional significance.

29. In addition to these exclusions there would also be exclusions which cannot be framed in relation to specific statutes and therefore need to be expressed **in <u>generic</u> terms**. The generic exclusions would be in relation to:

- provision of a kind falling within Article 7 or Article 8 of the Synod's Constitution (since it should not be possible to use the procedure to remove or weaken the safeguards that those provisions provide); and
- provision altering the purposes for which the income of the Church Commissioners' general fund is applicable (since the State as well as the Church has an interest in how the Commissioners' funds are used).

30. Again, it would be possible to use the power to repeal or amend any Acts or Measures which fell into these generic categories if that was merely consequential upon the removal of a burden resulting from other legislation.

Procedure for making orders

31. It would be for the Archbishops' Council formally to initiate the process intended to lead to the making of an order. However, a request to initiate that process might come from the General Synod, from the Council itself, or from one of the other National Church Institutions.

32. Before it proceeded to embody any proposals in a draft Order, the Archbishops' Council would be required to carry out a consultation which afforded an opportunity to respond to (i) all members of the General Synod and (ii) other persons and bodies who might reasonably be considered to have an interest in the proposals. Having considered the responses to the consultation, the Council would decide whether to proceed with the proposals and, if so, whether they should be modified in the light of any responses.

33. If the Council decided to proceed, the legislative process would formally begin with the Council laying a draft of the proposed order before the General Synod accompanied by an explanatory memorandum. In practice that would involve the draft order and the memorandum being circulated to members of the Synod. It would also be published on the website.

34. The draft order would then be referred automatically to a committee of the General Synod which could be known as the Legislative Reform Scrutiny Committee. It is proposed that the Committee should be chaired by the Dean of the Arches and Auditor or one of the Provincial Vicars General. Its other members would be drawn from the membership of the General Synod and the Archbishops' Council. More detailed provision as to the Committee's membership would be contained in the standing orders of the General Synod.

35. Following the referral of the order to the Committee, a period of time (which would be specified in the General Synod's standing orders – possibly a month) would then be provided during which members of the Synod and others could send written representations to the Committee.

36. On the expiry of that period, the Committee would be required to **consider the draft order and prepare a report on it** within a further period specified in standing orders (possibly 3 months). The standing orders would also specify any matters which the Committee was required in particular to consider and report on (e.g. the adequacy of consultation carried out prior to the laying of the order; the purpose and general scope of the order; whether the preconditions for making an order were met; whether any exclusions applied). But that would not preclude the Committee from drawing the Synod's attention to any other aspect of the draft order in its report.

37. In the light of responses to the consultation, it is proposed that the Committee would additionally have the **power to make amendments to the draft order** – either as a result of

any representations received by it or on its own initiative. Any amendments would be subject to the same considerations as to purpose, and to the same preconditions and exclusions, as the original draft order. The Committee would explain any amendments it had made to the draft order in its report.

38. The Committee would then lay its report and – if it had made any amendments – the amended draft order before the Synod not less than a specified number of days before the beginning of the group of sessions at which the draft order was to be considered.

39. At the group of sessions at which the draft order was to be considered by the General Synod a member of the Archbishops' Council would move the motion that the draft order be approved. It would not be possible for such a motion to be designated as 'deemed business' by the Business Committee: the motion would have to be moved on the floor of the Synod and it would be subject to the usual rules of debate.

40. If, following any debate, the approval motion were carried, the Archbishops' Council could proceed formally to make the order.

41. If the approval motion was lost the draft order could not proceed further.

42. It is further proposed – again in the light of responses to the consultation – that any member of the Synod should be able to give notice of a **motion that a draft order be referred back to the Legislative Reform Scrutiny Committee for further consideration**. Such a motion would identify the aspects of the order in respect of which it was to be reconsidered. Were the motion for reference back to be carried, the process described above at paragraphs [35] to [38] – including the possibility of the Committee making further amendments – would be repeated **but only in relation to the aspects of the draft order that were specified in the motion for reference back**. The draft order would then return to the General Synod and the approval motion would be moved again. The Synod would then decide whether to approve or reject the draft order – as further amended where that was the case.

43. Where a draft order had been approved by the General Synod and formally made by the Archbishops' Council, the Council would then be required to lay the order before both Houses of Parliament as a Statutory Instrument. The order would then be subject to annulment by either House within 40 days of its being laid.[3] (For this purpose, only days on which Parliament was sitting would count towards the 40 day period.)

44. Assuming that an order were not annulled by either House of Parliament, it would take effect as law, subject to any provisions it might contain concerning the date on which it was to come into force.

45. **In summary, the proposed procedure would be as follows:**

    i. **The Archbishops' Council, following consultation, lays a draft order before the Synod.**

[3] This is the Parliamentary procedure which applies to orders made under section 2(3) of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure 2009. That section empowers the Archbishops' Council, subject to approval by the General Synod, to make Regulations which apply, amend or adapt any Act of Parliament, Measure or other legislation. In that case, the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament accepted that the 'negative procedure' (as described above) was adequate, especially as the amending regulations would have been reviewed and, if necessary, amended by the General Synod. In terms of its effect, the power in section 2(3) of the 2009 Measure is similar to the power that would be conferred by the proposed Enabling Measure and there is a good case for proposing that the same Parliamentary procedure should apply. Steps will be taken to inform the Ecclesiastical Committee of what is proposed and to give them the opportunity of an expressing a view on this aspect of the proposals in particular at an early stage.

ii. **The draft order is referred to the Synod's Legislative Reform Scrutiny Committee.**

iii. **Following a short period for making representations, the Committee considers the draft order, makes any amendments, and issues its report.**

iv. **The draft order [as amended] is considered by the General Synod which decides whether to–**

a. **approve the draft order;**

b. **reject the draft order; or**

c. **refer the draft order back to the Scrutiny Committee (in which case steps iii and iv are repeated).**

v. **If the draft order is approved by the Synod, the Archbishops' Council may proceed to make the order.**

vi. **The order is then laid before both Houses of Parliament and is subject to annulment by either House within 40 days.**

Wider context

Consolidation of existing legislation

46. Consolidation Measures – which restate the statutory provisions contained in several Measures in a single Measure (with 'corrections and minor improvements') – are one way in which the current body of statutory ecclesiastical law can be improved. As well as drawing all the relevant statute law in a particular area into a single Measure, they also provide an opportunity to present it in a more helpful way.

47. It is often necessary, as a preparatory step, to make some pre-consolidation changes to put the law into a fit state to enable it to be consolidated.[4] But as consolidation Measures do not change the law, the standing orders provide that once introduced, a consolidation Measure can pass through the Synod quickly, normally by-passing the Revision Committee and Revision Stages.

48. The Legal Office has undertaken the consolidation of two significant pieces of legislation in recent years: the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 consolidated three Measures along with some other minor enactments. The Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 consolidated eighteen enactments of varying lengths and was a major undertaking.

49. The Legal Office is now embarking on a further programme of consolidation. This includes:

- the **Church Representation Rules**, which derive from a schedule to the Synodical Government Measure 1969 but which have been amended many times
- the legislation relating to **Church of England pensions**, which includes eleven Measures as well as various Regulations
- **ecclesiastical jurisdiction**, including the faculty jurisdiction/care of churches, which encompasses several Measures and
- **church property**, which includes over a dozen Acts and Measures.

It is intended to introduce the relevant legislation over the next year.

[4] See paragraph 21 above.

Repeal of redundant legislation

50. Alongside this substantial programme of consolidation, the Legal Office has also identified an amount of redundant legislation, with a view to its repeal in a Statute Law (Repeals) Measure. A period of consultation ends on 29 January and depending on progress, the aim is to introduce the repeals Measure in July 2016.

Implications for the Enabling Measure

51. The purpose of the proposed Enabling Measure is different from the two legislative exercises described above: it would simplify legislation that is currently over-prescriptive. The proposed new powers would make it much easier both to repeal and amend primary legislation. There may also be cases where legislation is not needed at all, though each instance will need to be judged on its merits. Provision for the removal of existing burdens and obstacles would operate alongside the wider process of consolidation and repeal.

52. More generally, as a matter of principle, measures ought – like Acts of Parliament – properly to contain only provisions that reflect important matters of principle and policy and any ancillary provision that goes hand in hand with those provisions. Detailed matters – such as the size of committees, rules of procedure and technical details – should properly be left to **secondary legislation** (regulations, rules, orders etc.), which can be amended by further secondary legislation in a single stage.

53. The difficulty is that while this has been the approach in recent years, the historical legacy has left us with a large amount of legislation that is much too detailed. The Enabling Measure would enable us to address the legacy of too much past prescription without having to have lots of new amending Measures.

54. At the same time, it is proposed that any new Measures would be framed in a way that avoided unnecessary prescription and would leave it to secondary legislation to make any detailed, technical provision considered necessary.

55. The following examples illustrate this approach:

- **The Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure was a good recent instance of how to do things economically**. It contains just 6 substantive sections. These establish the legal framework for holding office under common tenure including basic provision as to the duration of appointments, and for the provision, acquisition and disposal of housing for office holders. Most of the detail is in the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations, hence the recent ability to amend regulation 29 on short-term appointments in a single vote at the July group of sessions.

- **The recent process of faculty reform illustrated the time and expense incurred as a result of the present inflexibilities**. An initial phase of reform was introduced in 2013, following the endorsement by the Council of the faculty simplification group's proposals in September 2012. This had to be limited to amendment of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, a piece of secondary legislation, since the more major aspects of the reforms were dependent on amending the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991, which we could not conclude until 2015. A further set of faculty Jurisdiction Rules then had to be made, replacing the 2013 Rules. Had the proposed Enabling Measure been available in 2013 the entire set of reforms could have been achieved in one go (this point was picked up in the response from the Salisbury diocesan secretary).

- We could similarly have delivered the changes secured by the **Ecclesiastical Property Measure and by the Diocesan Stipends Funds Measure** much more rapidly by way of order. The first will simplify life for parishes and the second will enable dioceses to apply their resources more flexibly.

56. It may also be helpful to illustrate some of the proposed safeguards by identifying examples of cases that would have fallen outside the scope of the proposed Enabling Measure or been in one of the excluded categories. Thus the Vacancies in Suffragan Sees and Other Ecclesiastical Offices Measure 2010 and the Clergy Discipline (Amendment) Measure 2013 would still have needed to be Measures.

57. This is because, in the first case, the legislation touched on rights of the Crown in relation to the Church and would therefore have been within one of the proposed exclusions. In the second, the new power to discipline clergy would not have amounted to removing or reducing any burden, or the overall burdens, resulting directly or indirectly for any person from any legislation and would therefore not have been within the scope of the power at all.

Conclusion

58. **The General Synod is invited to indicate its support in principle for an Enabling Measure** on the lines proposed in this paper by inviting the Archbishops' Council to introduce the necessary draft Measure for First Consideration in July.

59. The draft Measure would be subject to the full Synodical legislative process, including a Revision Committee Stage – which enables all members to make proposals to the Revision Committee – and a Revision Stage in full Synod – which affords members a further opportunity to propose amendments to the draft Measure. That means that **provided that the Synod supports the general principle of an Enabling Measure, there would be ample opportunity during the legislative process for the Synod to change, or refine the detail of, the proposed draft Enabling Measure**.

William Nye
Secretary General

January 2016