

GENERAL SYNOD

APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE AND MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Standing Orders Committee ('the Committee') presents its 46th Report to the Synod.

Our membership for the current quinquennium is as follows:

Appointed members:

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester) (Chair)
The Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)
The Ven Penny Driver (Exeter) (to 26th October 2011)
The Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester)
Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield)
Mr Clive Scowen (London)

Ex-officio members:

Dr Philip Giddings (Chair of the House of Laity)
Mr Tim Hind (Vice-Chair of the House of Laity)
The Ven Christine Hardman (Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury)
The Revd Canon Glyn Webster (Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of York)

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1. Unusually this Report deals with two different kinds of business.
2. In Part II the Committee presents its reports on an issue specifically referred to it by the Archbishops' Council ('the Council'), namely the appointment of the Chair of the Business Committee. As a consequence of the controversy which has arisen concerning that appointment, the Council requested the Committee to make proposals to the Synod for the amendment of SO 115 which currently determines the procedure for appointing the Chair. The Committee has agreed to that request and accordingly brings proposals to the Synod for debate and decision.
3. In Part III the Committee presents, as it does from time to time during each Synodical quinquennium, proposals for improving the Standing Orders, for the better conduct of the Synod's business. SO 117(c) requires the Committee to *"keep under review the procedure and Standing Orders of the Synod and submit to the Synod such proposals for amendment of the Standing Orders as they may think fit, and shall report to the Synod on all such proposals ... before any final decision thereon is taken by the Synod"*. Part III of this report therefore sets out the Committee's

proposals for a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Standing Orders arising out of procedural issues that have emerged in the course of the Synod's business or, in one case, from the need to make provision for a new type of business. (If members have proposals for other ways in which they consider the procedures of the Synod can be improved they are invited to send them to the Committee for its future consideration.)

The procedure for the amendment of the Standing Orders

4. For the convenience of Synod members we set out here the arrangements for the amendment of the Standing Orders, which are governed by SO 39.
5. The motions for the amendment of the Standing Orders to be proposed on behalf of the Committee are set out in the First Notice Paper.
6. Items 1 and 2 in the First Notice Paper, which involve amendments to Standing Order 115 relating to the Chair of the Business Committee, will both be moved on behalf of the Committee and debated in the normal way.
7. In accordance with SO 39(c), the Business Committee has determined that items 3 to 14 in that Notice Paper do not need to be debated. Accordingly, unless not less than 5 members give notice by **5.30pm on Monday 6th February** that they wish any of such items to be debated, or any member gives notice in the way described below of a proposed amendment to any such item, they will not be debated and will be deemed to have been approved by the Synod.
8. Members can propose amendments to any of the amendments to Standing Orders proposed by the Committee set out in the First Notice Paper, provided that they give due notice in accordance with the requirements of the Standing Orders. As explained in the Agenda, notice of amendments must be given no later than **5.30pm on Monday 6th February**. However, if members wish to propose amendments they are encouraged to make early contact with the Legal Office, the staff of which stand ready to assist with their drafting.

PART II: ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Items 20 and 21

SO 115 - Chair of the Business Committee

9. In September 2011 the Committee was invited by the Council to bring forward, at the February 2012 group of sessions, proposals for the amendment of the provisions contained in SO 115 for the appointment of the Chair of the Business Committee. Currently SO 115 (a)(i) provides that its Chair is to be

appointed by the Archbishops' Council after consultation with the Appointments Committee from among the six members of the Council directly elected by the General Synod; such appointment and the term of office to be subject to confirmation by resolution of the General Synod.

10. The background to the request made to the Committee was that:

- (a) in advance of the February 2011 group of sessions the Council agreed to appoint the Bishop of Dover as Chair of the Business Committee, but the Synod resolved to adjourn the debate on the motion put before it to confirm that appointment;
 - (b) the Council subsequently agreed that SO 115 should be reviewed with a view to widening the field of potential candidates for appointment as Chair but, because that review would take some time, proposed that the Bishop of Dover should be appointed as Chair until 31st July 2013 so that the position could be reconsidered in the light of whatever changes to the Standing Order emerged from that review;
 - (c) before the motion confirming the Bishop of Dover's appointment as Chair was moved at the July 2011 group of sessions he withdrew from the process, as a result of which the motion was not moved; and
 - (d) as explained in GS Misc 998, circulated by the Secretary General on 18th July 2011, it accordingly fell to the Council to decide how to proceed.
11. The Committee was informed that the Council had considered the issue further at its meeting in September 2011 and that the Council:
- (a) stood by its earlier view that SO 115 needed to be amended, and wished the Synod to have the opportunity in February to consider whether and, if so, how that should be done;
 - (b) was inclined to favour the route of direct election by and from the Synod as a whole;
 - (c) was also inclined not to exclude in the Standing Order the members of any House from eligibility to be Chair;
 - (d) recognized, however, that the effect of s.11 National Institutions Measure 1998 would be that, whilst anyone who was already a member of the Council, the Church Commissioners, the Pensions Board, or the Appointments Committee could stand for election as Chair of the Business Committee, they would cease to be a member of the former body if elected as Chair; and
 - (e) noted that if SO 115 were amended in relation to the Business Committee that would raise a question about whether the arrangements for the appointment of the Chair of the Appointments Committee (contained in SO 116(a)) should be left as they are, but saw the two issues as distinct and therefore offered no view on that question.
12. Against that background the Committee firstly considered whether it wished to commend a change to the current position. Its unanimous view was that it wished to do so: the implications of the very small size of the pool of possible candidates had shown the current arrangement to be potentially problematic.
13. In the light of that the Committee recognised that it needed to go on to consider a number of questions, as follows:
- (a) How should the Chair be appointed – by nomination or by election?
 - (b) If the Chair was to be nominated, who should make the nomination, what process of consultation should be required before the nomination was made and would Synodical confirmation still be required?
 - (c) If the Chair was to be elected, who should be the electorate?
 - (d) Should there be any restrictions on the class of members of the Synod who might be chosen (and in particular, should members of the Council or of the House of Bishops be excluded)?
 - (e) What should be the Chair's term of office?

- (f) Should the Standing Orders confer on the Chair a right to attend and speak at meetings of the Council if he or she was not a member of it?
- (g) From when should any change take effect?
14. The Committee firstly considered whether the Chair should be appointed by nomination or by election. The Committee noted that the role of the Chair of the Business Committee was a demanding one, involving not only the chairing of the Business Committee but also ensuring that the business of the Synod was dealt with in an even-handed way and handling any procedural issues that arose. This unusual mix of responsibilities called for a mix of qualities, and the Committee therefore acknowledged the possibility that an elective process might deliver a candidate who did not possess them all. (The Committee noted that it was probably on account of considerations of this kind that there had been a long standing practice of appointing, rather than electing, the Chairs of boards, councils etc.) It was also possible that the use of an elective process could politicise the Chair's role, which would be undesirable.
15. On the other hand, the Committee noted that elections were used to fill other Synodical roles that also called for a mixed range of skills. Furthermore, in the Committee's view it was essential that the Chair should enjoy the confidence of the Synod; and that requirement was in the Committee's view more likely to be achieved if the Chair were elected.
16. Whilst its individual members might take different views on the relative weight to be attached to the factors referred to in the preceding two paragraphs, the Committee as a whole shared a common perception that the balance of opinion amongst the membership of the Synod was in favour of a process of election. To facilitate the Synod's decision on the matter it therefore unanimously agreed to put forward amendments to SO 115 under which the Chair would be elected rather than appointed.
17. The Committee therefore went on to consider who should be able to stand for election. Its view was that, since the process was an elective one, the Synod should in principle be free to vote for the widest possible range of candidates willing to put themselves forward for election: if members did not believe that it was right for members of some particular kind to serve as Chair of the Business Committee, it was open to them to reflect that in their voting preferences. Thus the Committee saw no need, in particular, to exclude members of the House of Bishops from standing for election: if members considered it inappropriate for a bishop to act as Chair they would no doubt reflect that view in the way they voted. The position in that respect was analogous to elections to the Synod itself: though some had argued that there should be additional restrictions as to eligibility for election to it (eg as to age) the view the Synod had itself taken was that it was preferable to leave electors to exercise their own judgement.
18. That said, the Committee recognised that if the Synod wished to exclude members of the House of Bishops from eligibility for election, that outcome could easily be achieved by amending the wording of the new SO 115(a)(i) so that it read "*a Chairman elected by the Synod from among the members of the House of Clergy or the House of Laity*".
19. As to the electorate, given that the Chair of the Business Committee would be acting on behalf of, and accountable to, all the members of the Synod the Committee could not see any justification for the electorate being anything other than the membership of the Synod as a whole.

20. So far as the procedure for the election was concerned, the Committee considered that it would be wrong to draw a distinction between the election of the Business Committee Chair and the election of other office-holders, and that (subject to what is said in the following paragraph) the rules for elections to Synodical bodies contained in SO 120 should accordingly apply to the election of the Chair. In particular, it did not see any need to require a candidate to be proposed and seconded by two people from each House of the Synod or to have served on the Synod for a minimum period of time.
21. The one departure that the Committee considered should be made from the usual arrangements under SO 120 was in relation to SO 120(e)(i), which provides that, where the unexpired portion of the outgoing office holder's term of office is less than twelve months a casual vacancy will not be filled unless the Business Committee otherwise directs: the Committee considered that, whilst that provision had the laudable aim of saving expense, given the nature of the Chair's role it was important that a new election was held as soon as practicable if a casual vacancy arose.
22. As to the Chair's term of office, the Committee agreed that the Chair should serve for the duration of the quinquennium, until his or her successor was elected or he or she ceased to be a member of Synod. However, no special provision was needed for that as that was already the effect of SO 118.
23. Whilst the Committee's view was that the Chair of the Business Committee should be elected, it considered that it would be helpful to the Synod to offer its views on how a nomination process should work, were the Synod to prefer to adopt that approach instead.
24. The Committee considered that, were an appointment process to be adopted, the Archbishops should make the appointment in their capacity as Presidents of the Synod, after consultation with the Appointments Committee. That is a well-established method for Synodical appointments – employed, for example, under Article 4(2) of the Constitution for the appointment of chairs of debates. The Committee also considered that there should continue to be a requirement for ratification of the appointment by the Synod. It did not, on the other hand, believe that there was any need for the Archbishops' Council to be consulted in addition to the Appointments Committee.
25. As to the class of those who could be nominated under such a procedure, the Committee agreed that any member of the Synod should be able to be nominated: to limit the field to, say, the seven elected members of the Business Committee would be no advance on the present position; and to limit it to them and the Standing Committees of the Houses of Clergy and Laity would run the risk of re-creating the present situation in which people became eligible for a specialist role as a result of having been elected to another body, and probably for quite different reasons.
26. So far as the question of the Chair's relationship with the Council was concerned, the Committee noted that (as described above) the effect of s.11 of the 1998 Measure would be that, whilst anyone who was already a member of the Council could stand for election as Chair, they would cease to be a member of the Council if they were elected. (Since s.11 would not apply to a nomination process, the position would be otherwise if the Chair were nominated; but the Committee did not see that as problematic – noting that that was the position in relation to the Appointments Committee under SO 116.)
27. The Committee accordingly went on to consider how the opportunity for liaison between the Business Committee and the Archbishops' Council that was inherent in the current arrangements

could be perpetuated if the Chair were to be elected. In that connection it understood the Business Committee to consider it important for there to continue to be the opportunity for close co-operation between the Council and the Business Committee on relation to matters relevant to the work of the latter body. In principle, the Committee accordingly favoured the Chair of the Business Committee having a general right to attend Council meetings. (It did not favour a right of attendance only for items of business relevant to the work of the Business Committee, given the possible difficulty in distinguishing between such items and other items of business.) The right of attendance would not, of course, carry any right to vote.

28. However, the Committee was advised that it would not be possible for the Standing Orders to confer on the Chair a right of attendance at meetings of the Council, since that would be *ultra vires*. The power under which the Synod's Standing Orders are made, Article 11(1), provides that:

The General Synod may make, amend and revoke Standing Orders providing for any of the matters for which such provision is required or authorised by this Constitution [emphasis added], for the meetings, business and procedure of the General Synod.

But nothing in the Constitution required or authorised provision in relation to the membership of, or attendance at the meetings of, the Council. In any event, the Council is an autonomous charity, not subject to direction, or regulated, by the Synod – being governed instead by the terms of the 1998 Measure. The Committee accordingly concluded that it should not propose amendments to the Standing Orders purporting to confer any right of attendance at the Council's meetings.

29. Instead, the Committee agreed to draw the attention of the officers and members of the Synod, and of the Council, to the limitation on the provision that could be made by the Standing Orders in this connection and to invite the Council to consider how best to take steps to secure the continuation under the new arrangements of the opportunities for effective co-operation and liaison between the Council and the Business Committee that is inherent in the current arrangements.
30. Finally, the Committee considered that, whatever the nature of the selection process, the proposed amendments to SO 115 should take effect the day after the final day of the February group of sessions so that, if the amendments were carried, it would be possible for the process of selection to be set in hand shortly thereafter and for the new Chair to be in post by the time the Business Committee met to set the agenda for the July group of sessions in May.
31. The Committee noted that, if the position as regards the Chair of the Business Committee were to be changed, it could be argued that corresponding amendments should be brought forward in relation to the Chair of the Appointments Committee. However, although consistency in relation to the two appointments was superficially attractive, the Committee considered that, on closer analysis, the case for altering the position in relation to the Appointments Committee was weaker. In part that was due to the absence in the case of the Appointments Committee of any restriction on those who might be appointed as Chair – which was the driver for change in the case of the Chair of the Business Committee. But, additionally, the nature of the Appointments Committee's role was such as to raise questions, in the Committee's view, about the desirability of adopting the same approach as in the case of the Business Committee: it might be argued that the consequences of an elective appointment could be unfortunate in the case of the Appointments Committee, since the nature of its work required it to be, and to be seen to be, independent and that for its Chair to be elected could be seen as giving that role an undesirably 'political' character.

32. The Committee was not, accordingly, minded itself to bring forward proposals in relation to the Appointments Committee at this point. However, it noted that if Synod members considered that the position in relation to the Chair of the Appointments Committee should be altered to reflect the new position in relation to the Chair of the Business Committee, it would be open to them to give notice of a following motion calling for the Committee to bring forward amendments to the Standing Orders to that effect at a later group of sessions.
33. **Items 20 and 21** give effect to the Committee's decisions. **Item 20** changes the basis on which the Chair is appointed from that of nomination to that of election by and from the whole Synod. **Item 21** modifies the usual position under SO 120 in relation to the filling of a casual vacancy in the office of Chair so as to require an election to be held even if the unexpired portion of the outgoing Chair is less than twelve months.

PART III: MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS

Item 22

Standing Order 6 - Private members' motions

34. In the light of a question having arisen as to whether a member may withdraw a private member's motion of which he or she has previously given notice and which is still in the course of acquiring supporting signatures, the Committee proposes that SO 6 should be amended so as to confer an express power to enable a member to withdraw a PMM – but on the basis that *the member concerned* may not give notice of a motion in the same or substantially similar terms during the lifetime of the Synod. **Item 22** makes provision to that effect and makes other consequential amendments to SO 6.

Item 23

Standing Order 20 - Speaking more than once

35. The Committee noted that, whilst SO 20 allowed a member to speak twice when the '40 member rule' applied in relation to an amendment proposed in the course of the Revision Stage for draft legislation or liturgical business, it did not do so where that rule came into play because an amendment was proposed to an instrument being dealt with under the 'Preliminary Motion Procedure' for which provision is made in SO 71. The Committee therefore proposes that SO 20 be amended so as to include references to a member proposing an amendment to an instrument being considered under the Preliminary Motion Procedure and to a member appointed to move a motion under that procedure.
36. The Committee also proposes the deletion of the reference in SO 20(f) to a 'money motion', that expression no longer appearing elsewhere in the Standing Orders following the amendment in February 2009 of the Standing Orders relating to financial business.
37. **Item 23** makes provision to that effect.

Items 24, 25, 26 and 32

Draft diocesan reorganisation schemes

38. Part II of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 put in place new provisions in relation to the provincial and diocesan structure, including provision for the making of diocesan ‘reorganisation schemes’. Under s.7 of the 2007 Measure, such a scheme has to be laid before the General Synod for its approval. That approval may be given under a ‘deemed procedure’ of the kind for which provision is made in SO 69, except in cases in which the scheme has been laid before the Synod by the Dioceses Commission on the authority of the relevant archbishop because the diocesan synod of one or more of the dioceses affected has not given its consent.

39. Section 6(6) of the 2007 Measure provides that

If, in accordance with its Standing Orders, a motion is carried in the General Synod that any matter contained in the draft scheme and specified in the motion shall be reconsidered by the Commission the Commission shall withdraw the draft scheme, in which case the Commission may decide either not to proceed with the draft scheme or to re-submit the draft scheme to the General Synod, with or without amendment.

40. The Committee noted that the procedure referred to in s.6(6) was different from a power to amend the draft scheme and that none of the existing Standing Orders would facilitate the moving of a motion of the kind contemplated by that provision. In particular, the ‘Preliminary Motion Procedure’ under SO 71 could not be employed because that only provides for the consideration of amendments.

41. New provision in the Standing Orders is accordingly required. **Items 24, 25, 26 and 32** make such provision. The principal part of that provision is contained in the new SOs 71A to 71E to be inserted by **item 26**. Those new Standing Orders make arrangements for the laying of draft reorganisation schemes before the Synod and the process for the giving of approval (including, where allowed by the 2007 Measure, under a ‘deemed procedure’) and the moving of ‘motions for reconsideration’ – which, if passed, require the withdrawal of the draft scheme and its reconsideration by the Dioceses Commission in respect of some matter specified in the motion. **Items 24, 25 and 32** make consequential provision.

Item 27

New SO 91A - Final Approval of Article 8 schemes - special majorities

42. Article 8(1B) of the Synod’s Constitution provides that:

The General Synod may by resolution provide that the final approval of any such scheme as aforesaid [ie a scheme for a constitutional union or a permanent and substantial change of relationship of the kind specified in Article 8(1)], being a scheme specified in the resolution, shall require the assent of such special majorities of the members present and voting as may be specified in the resolution, and the resolution may specify a special majority of each House or of the whole Synod or of both, and in the latter case the majorities may be different.

This provision reflects the fact that the types of decision which, under SO 35(d), require a two-thirds majority in each House do not include a ‘scheme’ of the kind referred to in Article 8(1).

43. However, the Standing Orders do not at present provide for the moving of a motion of the kind envisaged by Article 8(1B). On the most recent occasion when a member wished to propose that the power to specify a special majority be invoked, no difficulty was encountered as a result of the

absence of any express provision since the member concerned was able to give notice of a motion proposing a special majority as a following motion arising out of a report.

44. The Committee does not consider it satisfactory for members to have to rely on the following motion procedure to be able to propose that the Synod exercise the power conferred by Article 8(1B), not least because a following motion of which notice is given by a member in his or her private capacity is subject to the provisions of SO 8 (under which it is subject to the time allowed in the agenda for the consideration of the business out of which it arises and, if not moved at the group of sessions at which that business is completed, lapses unless the Business Committee directs otherwise). In the Committee's view it is inappropriate that the powers of a member to invoke a provision of the Constitution should be constrained in that way.
45. The Committee accordingly proposes the insertion of a new express provision which confers a right on any member to move a motion intended to exercise the power conferred by Article 8(1B). **Item 27** makes provision to that effect.

Item 28

SO 107 - Supplementary Questions

46. Following an issue having arisen at the July 2011 group of sessions as to the position in relation to the number of supplementary questions that can be asked by a member where he or she has asked two questions and, with the permission of the Chair, a single answer is given to them, the Committee proposes that Standing Order 107(a) be amended to make it clear that, in such circumstances, the member may ask a supplementary question in relation to both original questions. **Item 28** accordingly makes provision to that effect.

Item 29

SO 113 - Representatives of other Churches: Attendance and Right to Speak

47. The Committee considered a request from the Council for Christian Unity ('the CCU') that SO 113 be amended so as to widen the occasions on which the representatives of other Churches who attend groups of sessions at the invitation of the Business Committee under SO 113(a) ('the ecumenical representatives') could request to speak. The CCU proposed that the ecumenical representatives should be able to speak in debates on (a) reports on the outcome of Article 8 references to the dioceses and (b) reports of Revision Committees for legislative and liturgical business. The Business Committee supported the CCU's proposals.
48. The CCU argued that the Synod had benefited from contributions made by the ecumenical representatives, who exercised their privilege with a sense of responsibility and had usually not requested to speak in matters which were purely internal to the Church of England. Furthermore, the arrangements for regulating the contributions of the ecumenical representatives were well-established and effective, as a result of which the number requesting to speak in any debate could be regulated.
49. However, in the view of the CCU there were a number of arguments for widening the range of debates in which the ecumenical representatives could seek to speak. They included that:
 - (a) Many issues affected not only the Church of England, but our partner churches as well; and allowing the ecumenical representatives to speak in debates at more advanced stages of

some categories of business would demonstrate the Church of England's openness to God's call to unity and might give a signal that the General Synod was being serious about hearing what ecumenical partners had to say.

- (b) The categories of business which represent Article 8 business (as defined in SO 131) included any "*scheme for ... a permanent and substantial change of relationship between the Church of England and another Christian body, being a body a substantial number of whose members reside in Great Britain*". It would be helpful if the ecumenical representatives of Churches which might be affected by such a scheme were allowed to speak at later stages of the business.
- (c) Legislative, doctrinal and liturgical business might impact on partner churches in indirect ways, although even if not Article 8 business. Allowing representatives of other Churches to speak in the later stages of such business would help the Synod to assess the importance of that impact.
- (d) The Revision Stage of legislative and liturgical business could introduce significant and substantial amendments. The ecumenical representatives might have pertinent observations to make which might enhance the General Synod's scrutiny of such revisions.

50. On the other hand, the CCU recognised that there were also factors that made the possible extension of the ecumenical representatives' ability to speak a sensitive one. They included that:

- (a) The ecumenical representatives might become drawn into the internal politics of the General Synod, which would undermine their role as critical friends and reflectors. Not allowing them to speak shielded them from this potential hazard and embarrassment.
- (b) Voting on such business at the Revision and Final Approval Stages may be very close, especially where special majorities in each house were required. By speaking in these debates, the ecumenical representatives could have a decisive influence, which might compromise their position by laying them open to a charge of unduly influencing the outcome.
- (c) Some members might be of the view that business of significance for the Church of England, and more especially business which might change its nature, should only be decided by members of the Church of England, and that to allow the ecumenical representatives to speak in debates on such business would be to give those other churches an inappropriate role in the governance of the Church of England, of a kind which compromised its autonomy.

51. Balancing these considerations against each other, the CCU recommended the modest changes to the position described above.

52. The Committee noted that in fact SO 113 already allowed the ecumenical representatives the ability to request to speak in the debate on the Business Committee's report on the outcome of an Article 8 reference provided it did not relate to legislative or liturgical business.

53. The Committee found the issue of whether the ecumenical representatives should be able to request to speak in a wider range of debates on legislative and liturgical business a more difficult one. It accepted that the contributions of the ecumenical representatives were valued and respected, but considered that that made the issue of their role the more sensitive – since their views could have an impact on the outcome on the Synod's processes. The later those views were expressed in the process, the more likely that was.

54. Not least given the likely significance of Article 8 business of a legislative or liturgical kind, the Committee did not consider it right to propose any change to SO 113 to enable the ecumenical representatives to request to speak in debates on the report on the outcome of references on such business. It did, however, see the strength of the case for allowing the ecumenical representatives to speak in the ‘take note’ debate on the report of the Revision Committee for legislative or liturgical business (even if such business represented Article 8 Business), and accordingly agreed to propose an amendment to SO 113 to that effect. **Item 29** makes provision to that effect by inserting the debate on the report of a Revision Committee as a further exception to the rule that the ecumenical representatives may not speak on legislative or liturgical business.
55. The Committee makes this proposal on the understanding that the new provision will be sparingly used and that (a) the CCU staff will advise the ecumenical representatives that it should only be exercised when there has been a significant change to the draft legislative or liturgical business since First Consideration (rather than being seen as an opportunity to say something which could have been said at First Consideration); and (b) the CCU staff will also advise the chairs of debates on whether it was appropriate to call the ecumenical representative to speak.

Item 30

SO 113A - The Deaf Church Conference

56. The Deaf Church Conference now being known as ‘Deaf Anglicans Together’, **Item 30** amends Standing Order 113A accordingly.

Item 31

SO 113B - Attendance and Right to Speak

57. The Committee noted that the reference in Standing Order 113B(a) to section 8 of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1983 needed to be replaced by a reference to section 14 Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 – which now makes the provision under which the functions of a diocesan bishop are exercised during a vacancy in see. It also noted the need to make provision for the possibility that more than one bishop may be appointed to exercise such functions. **Item 31** provides accordingly.

On behalf of the Committee:

Geoffrey Tattersall QC
Chair

January 2012