

## GENERAL SYNOD

## SIXTY-FIRST REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Standing Orders Committee has considered miscellaneous points of Synodical procedure and makes some proposals for amendment.

***This report has been updated and expanded since first issued.  
New material is indicated by side-lining.***

1. The Standing Orders Committee (“the Committee”) presents its 61<sup>st</sup> report to Synod.
2. The Committee’s membership is as follows—

Appointed members

The Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Chair) (Leeds)  
 Mr Geoffrey Tattersall KC (Manchester)  
 Mr Clive Scowen (London)  
 The Revd Treena Larkin (Lichfield)  
 The Revd Susan Lucas (Chelmsford)  
 The Revd Amatu Christian-Iwuagwu (London)  
 Mrs Karen Czapiewski (Gloucester)

Ex officio members

The Ven Luke Miller (Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury)  
 The Revd Kate Wharton (Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of York)  
 Dr Jamie Harrison (Chair of the House of Laity)  
 Mrs Alison Coulter (Vice-Chair of the House of Laity).

3. Most of the amendments proposed in the 61<sup>st</sup> report first time round at the February 2023 group of sessions were deemed approved under SO 40(5) and came into operation on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2023. Only three of the amendments were not reached and remain for consideration by Synod – the new SO 107A (further motions), the new SO 127 (Standing Orders Committee) and the consequential amendment to SO 11 (length of notice).

**Miscellaneous points of procedure**

**Limitation on number of amendments for any member per debate (SO 26)**

4. The Committee has been asked to consider whether there should be a limit on the number of amendments which any one member should be able to propose to any given item of business. The Committee notes that this concern may stem from the perception that certain items of business (in particular, legislative business) interest relatively few members and that only a handful of members propose amendments.
5. The Committee observes, however, that the February 2023 group of sessions showed a marked increase in interest in legislative business, with amendments proposed by a range of members, including some first elected in 2021. The Committee thinks that it would be undemocratic to impose a limit on the number of amendments which an individual may propose. Also, there are occasions when a proposed amendment would, if passed, require consequential amendments. The Legal Office drafts the consequential amendments required so that Synod can vote on a complete and coherent package. An arbitrary limit on numbers would frustrate that practice.

6. The Committee further considers that, where a particular member has proposed a large number of repetitive amendments, Synod will generally find a way to indicate that its patience is being tried.

#### **Amendments to motions (SO 27)**

7. The Committee has considered SO 27(6) in response to requests to review the requirement for an amendment to have the support of at least two other members. In particular, the question has been raised as to whether it would be appropriate to require at least 25 members in support. The Committee noted that the purpose of SO 27(6) is to ensure that an amendment may not be moved unless it has at least some support from other members. However, increasing the number of supporters from the current minimum of two would cause significant practical difficulties, both for the member wishing to move the amendment and for Synod staff. Having weighed up the arguments, the Committee has decided that it is content with SO 27(6) as it stands and it therefore proposes no amendment to it.

#### **Petitions (SO 43)**

8. The Committee was asked to consider SO 43 following the presentation of two petitions at the July 2022 group of sessions and another two at the February 2023 group of sessions. Those are thought to be the only occasions for many years on which a member has made use of the mechanism under SO 43. The Committee noted that SO 43 contains little by way of procedure but decided that it would not, for now at least, propose any amendments to provide a more structured procedure for the presentation of petitions. The Committee agreed instead that it would keep the matter under review.

#### **Revision following Revision Committee: amendments (SO 59)**

9. The Committee has identified a provision where the drafting could be helpfully simplified. Standing Order 59(5) currently requires the Steering Committee, when replying to a proposed amendment to a draft Measure at Revision Stage, to indicate either that it supports the amendment or that it does not support the amendment but wishes the debate to continue. The Committee noted that this proposition could be amended so that the opening words would read simply "If the Steering Committee indicates that it wishes the debate to continue...". The question of whether the Steering Committee supports an amendment or is in any case content for it to be debated is a point which the Steering Committee can indicate when speaking in reply.
10. **Amendments 1 and 2 in Part 1 of the Annex give effect to that simplification and were deemed approved in February 2023.**

#### **Deemed approval (SOs 65 and 106)**

11. The Committee has considered the procedure, referred to in SO 65(3) and provided for in many Measures, under which certain subordinate legislation is deemed to be approved unless a single member gives notice to trigger a debate on it. The Committee wishes to review this procedure but recognises that it cannot propose amendments to SO 65(3) unless the Measures setting out the procedure are themselves amended first. The Committee has asked the Legal Office to explore the history of this procedure, to assess possible changes and, if appropriate, to canvass proposals for change with the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament.

12. Standing Order 106(6) contains a similar procedure, under which Synod is deemed to have taken note of the annual report of the Archbishops' Council or of its Audit Committee unless a single member of Synod gives notice to trigger a debate on the report. The Committee considers this too low a threshold.
13. **Amendment 3 in Part 1 of the Annex increases from one to five the number of members required to give notice to trigger a debate under SO 106(6). The amendment was deemed approved in February 2023.**

#### **Liturgical business and "Living in Love and Faith" (SOs 78 and 120A)**

14. The Committee has received three proposals for amendment to the Standing Orders relating to the classification of any business before Synod arising from the Living in Love and Faith process.
15. The first proposal is to amend SO 120A to give an Anglican Communion representative an entitlement to call for a particular item of business to be designated as liturgical business or as Article 7 or 8 business, with the determination of its capability to be designated as such to be made by the Business Committee. The underlying thought is that the Anglican Communion representative would be well-placed to act as a 'critical friend' who could advise Synod to reflect further on complex liturgical matters.
16. The Committee does not favour the proposal on two grounds. First, the Committee thinks that it would be wrong in principle for the Standing Orders to make specific provision about business on a particular subject-matter (as opposed to business of a particular type). Furthermore, the Committee considers that it would be perverse to give an invited representative of the Anglican Communion (who merely has certain speaking rights at Synod meetings) the right to initiate a novel and significant procedure which is not available to elected members.
17. The second proposal is to amend SO 78 to provide that a draft form of service arising from the Living in Love and Faith process and before Synod for consideration is to be treated as having been introduced as liturgical business. The underlying concern is to involve Synod in the detail of whatever proposals emerge from the Living in Love and Faith process – in particular, to enable Synod to approve forms of service before they are commended by the House of Bishops. The Committee notes, however, that the only liturgical business which currently requires the approval of Synod is liturgical provision under Canon B2. This proposal would not, accordingly, prevent the House of Bishops from commending a form of service under Canon B5 without approval from Synod.
18. The third proposal relates to the second and is for a right of objection to the failure by the Business Committee to designate liturgical provision as liturgical business under SO 78. The underlying idea is to create a mechanism similar to that under SO 92 for challenging designation of business as Article 7 or 8 business or the absence of designation of business as such.
19. The Committee has concluded that this proposal is misconceived. It notes that the Business Committee's function under SO 78 is to decide on a matter of procedure rather than substance. The Business Committee is not required to decide, and would not be competent to decide, whether provision is liturgical but merely to decide which of three possible procedures under the Standing Orders should apply.

20. In this Committee's view, the comparison with designation under SO 92 does not assist. Under SO 91(1), the Business Committee has the function of deciding whether a particular item of business is Article 7 or 8 business and therefore whether it should be designated as such. Its function involves a decision on a matter of substance not just procedure. Accordingly, it is appropriate for SO 92 to provide a mechanism for objecting to the Business Committee's failure to designate business as Article 7 or 8 business.
21. This Committee acknowledges that it would be possible in theory to provide a mechanism for objecting to the absence of a designation by the Business Committee of liturgical provision as liturgical business; but it doubts that such a mechanism would have any practical effect. There are no circumstances in which the Business Committee, having before it liturgical provision to schedule for consideration at a coming group of sessions, would fail to designate it as liturgical business under one of the three possible procedures referred to in SO 78.
22. This Committee considers furthermore that it would be inconsistent with the requirement in SO 80(1) that liturgical business may be introduced only on the instructions of the House of Bishops if the Synod had to treat as liturgical business something which had not been introduced on such instructions. The Committee notes that this concern also applies to the second proposal as well as the third.
23. The Committee recognises that underlying all three of these suggestions is a desire to challenge a decision by the House of Bishops to commend a form of service under Canon B5 rather than proposing it for approval by Synod under Canon B2. The Committee is advised that the Standing Orders could not properly make such provision. The Standing Orders are concerned with the procedure of the Synod but, as Canon B5 does not give any role to the Synod, it would be ultra vires for the Standing Orders to impose restrictions on the operation of Canon B5. Rather, Canon B5 would itself have to be amended (by way of an Amending Canon) to create a role for Synod on a form of service before it is commended.
24. On a separate but related point, the Committee itself questioned the clarity of SO 78, in particular whether the nature of the designation is sufficiently clear. The Committee felt that the reader might think that the Business Committee was required to make a determination on substance rather than procedure. The Committee also wondered whether "liturgical business" should itself be defined or glossed in some way. The Committee considers that the word "designated" in SO 78 should be replaced with something less likely to confuse and that there should be an express reference to liturgical provision under Canon B2. **The Committee accordingly proposes to amend the definition of "liturgical business" in SO 78 to give effect to those points. Amendment 19 in Part 2 of the Annex would give effect to this proposal.**

#### **Following motions (SOs 105, 106 and 107)**

25. The Committee considered the procedure applicable to motions commonly referred to as "following motions". Specifically, these are the motions under SO 105(5), (6) or (9) (further motions to ordinary reports), SO 106(9) (further motions to annual reports) and SO 107(4)(b) or (5)(b) (further motions to presentations). The Committee considers that the Synod as a whole should have some involvement in the procedure.

26. **The Committee accordingly proposes to apply ‘the 25-member rule’ to a following motion, so that debate on it would continue only if those responsible for the report or presentation concerned, or at least 25 members, wish the debate to continue. Amendment 20 in Part 2 of the Annex would give effect to this proposal. Paragraphs (4) and (5) of the proposed new SO 107A adopt the same simplified form of words as is used in Amendments 2 and 3 to SO 59 (discussed in paragraphs 6 and 7 of this Report).**

#### **Questions (SOs 112 and 113)**

27. The Committee noted that several questions have arisen on the workings of Question Time at groups of sessions – in particular, the adequacy and clarity of the list in SO 112(1) and the procedure under SO 113(4) and (5) for asking supplementary questions. The Committee wishes to explore these matters and has asked the Legal Office and Central Secretariat to assess possible options for change. At this stage therefore, the Committee does not propose any amendments to SO 112 or 113.

#### **Representatives of other Churches etc. (SOs 120A and 121)**

28. There have been some practical difficulties in applying the condition in each of SOs 120A(2) and 121(2) that an Anglican Communion representative or a representative of another Church may speak in debate only “by prior arrangement”.
29. **Amendments 4 and 5 in Part 1 of the Annex, which removed that condition in each case, were deemed approved in February 2023.**

#### **Representatives of Church of England Youth Council (SO 122)**

30. Given that the Church of England Youth Council no longer exists, the Committee has considered whether the reference to it in SO 122(1) should be omitted. While agreeing in principle with the desirability of removing redundant provisions, the Committee wanted to find out whether it might be possible to achieve alternative representation of younger people on Synod. The Committee has asked that the subject of youth representation be referred to the Business Committee and the Archbishops’ Council.
31. The Committee accordingly remains content with SO 122(1) in its current form and does not propose any amendments to it.

#### **Amendments to the Standing Orders moved by individual members (SO 127)**

32. Any amendments to the Standing Orders moved by an individual member in that member’s personal capacity will not have had prior consideration by the Committee and are not subject to ‘the 25-member rule’ or other Synodical control. The Committee does not wish to restrict any member’s power to propose amendments to the Standing Orders but it does take the view that it is important in principle for Synod to have the benefit of the Committee’s analysis before being asked to decide on amendments.
33. Any member who wishes to propose an amendment to the Standing Orders should, if possible, raise the proposal with the Committee. It can then address the proposal in its next report, whether by itself proposing an amendment or by explaining why it has decided not to do so. The Committee considers that, once its report has been published, an amendment by an individual member should be moved only if it relates to a matter in that report.

34. But the Committee believes that, as an exception to that, the Chair should have a discretion to permit an amendment that does not relate to anything in the Committee's report. The Chair might exercise that discretion in circumstances where, for example, a proposed amendment relates to a matter which could not have been foreseen when the Committee was preparing its report.
35. **The Committee accordingly proposes to introduce procedural requirements to that effect. Amendments 18 and 21 in Part 2 of the Annex would give effect to this proposal (Amendment 18 is consequential on Amendment 21).**

#### **Resignation from certain Committees without resignation from Synod (SO 128)**

36. It is not currently possible under the Standing Orders for a member of the Standing Orders Committee, the Legislative Committee, the Business Committee or the Appointments Committee to resign from that Committee unless the member also resigns from Synod itself. The Committee does not consider that satisfactory.
37. **Amendments 6 to 8 in Part 1 of the Annex, which enable members to resign from any of the Committees in question without also resigning from Synod, were deemed approved in February 2023.**

#### **Crown Nominations Commission: duration of membership (SO 140)**

38. The Committee assessed the effect of the amendments made to the Standing Orders in July 2022 following the proposals in its Sixtieth Report (GS 2276) and concluded that a few minor consequential and supplementary amendments were required to give full effect to what Synod agreed then.
39. The Committee considered that the references in SO 140 to members elected "by" the House of Clergy "or" the House of Laity were not sufficiently accurate and were not consistent with SO 137(1)(b) and (c), which refer merely to being elected "from" either House. Standing Order 137B(3) provides for a single electorate made up of the members of the House of Clergy and the members of the House of Laity.
40. **Amendment 9 in Part 1 of the Annex, which replaced each reference in SO 140 to being elected "by" either House with a reference to being elected "from" either House, was deemed approved in February 2023.**
41. It is not currently possible for a member to resign from the Crown Nominations Commission ("the CNC") without undergoing the automatic consequence of resignation from the Synod itself. Again, the Committee does not think this satisfactory.
42. **Amendments 10 and 11 in Part 1 of the Annex, which provide for a simple power of resignation from the CNC, were deemed approved in February 2023.**
43. The policy agreed by Synod in July 2022 for filling a casual vacancy in an elected pair is that the vacancy would be filled only when both members have left the pair and that an election would be held only for a new pair and not to replace just one member. The Committee considered that SO 140(7) did not give effect to this with sufficient clarity.
44. **Amendment 12 in Part 1 of the Annex, which clarifies SO 140(7), was deemed approved in February 2023.**

45. Standing Order 137(3B) and (3C) provide for substitutes to be chosen if neither member of an elected pair will be able to attend the meetings of a particular CNC. The Committee considered that, as a result, SO 140(9) had become redundant as duplication.
46. **Amendment 13 in Part 1 of the Annex, which omitted SO 140(9), was deemed approved in February 2023.**
47. The Committee considered that SO 140(10) required adjustment in consequence of the introduction of elected pairs. Specifically, the procedure under which the Chair of the House concerned can dismiss a member for persistent non-attendance should apply to both members of a pair and the period of non-attendance that should elapse before the Chair could dismiss the members should be extended from six to twelve months, beginning with the last time either of the pair did attend a CNC meeting.
48. **Amendments 14 to 17 in Part 1 of the Annex provide for SO 140(10) to apply to both members of an elected pair and for the period for persistent not-attendance to increase from six to twelve months. The amendments were deemed approved in February 2023.**
49. Following the February 2023 group of sessions, the Committee received a request to reconsider the procedure where a vacancy in an elected pair arises. Currently, the vacancy would not be filled until there was also a vacancy in the other place in the pairing, and the remaining member of the pair would have the opportunity to continue solo. The concern has been raised, though, that that approach has several drawbacks. First, it may leave the remaining member with an unmanageable workload. Second, the remaining member would no longer satisfy the requirement applicable at the time of the election, namely that both members of the pair are elected together as a pair (and not separately as two individuals). Third, Synod's choice of the pair in question is no longer being fulfilled if the remaining member continues solo.
50. In place of that current arrangement, it is proposed that the single vacancy would be filled under SO 134 with the remaining member continuing to serve. If the vacancy occurs within two years of the original election, then the votes from that original election would be used and the pair so elected would nominate one of their number to serve alongside the remaining member. If the vacancy occurs more than two years after the original election, there would be a by-election and candidates would stand as individuals willing to join the remaining member in a new pairing. In support of that proposal, it is argued that an arrangement on these lines would retain the purpose of pairings, namely to ensure greater diversity of representation and to spread the workload.
51. The Committee is not persuaded by this proposal. It is not convinced that the proposal would necessarily achieve diversity of representation; only an appointment (perhaps by the Chair of the House concerned) of a person of similar views to the departing member could ensure that. Furthermore, the Committee thinks it would be premature to change arrangements which Synod voted for only recently and which have so far had little time to operate in practice.
52. The Committee has agreed to review the arrangements for elected pairs in a couple of years to assess whether any changes are required. In the meantime, it does not propose any amendments on this point.

53. A drafting point has emerged on SO 141(6), which currently provides that “*A name may not be submitted to the Prime Minister unless it has received the support of at least two-thirds of the total number of the voting members of the Commission...*”. The “voting members” of the Commission are listed in SO 137(1) and include “six members” elected from the House of Clergy and “six members” elected from the House of Laity. SO 137(1) had previously listed three members in each case and a question has now arisen as to whether the new reference to six members has an impact on SO 141(6).
54. The Committee considers that it is clear from SO 137(3A) that “*only one member of each pair...may serve as a member of the Commission on its consideration*” of the vacancy in question. It would therefore be surprising if a person who had taken no part in the deliberations on a vacancy were entitled to vote at the end of those deliberations. The Committee is advised that the natural interpretation of SO 141(6) is that the voting members referred to are those who have been taking part so far. But the question has been raised and, in so far as there is a doubt, the Committee wishes to remove it.
55. **The Committee accordingly proposes to amend SO 141 so as to remove the doubt. Amendment 22 in Part 2 of the Annex would give effect to that proposal.**

#### **Removal of member from one House to another (SOs 128 and 146)**

56. The Committee has considered the meaning and applicability of SOs 128(3)(a) and 146(6)(a) which provide, for each of the Committees referred to in paragraph 36 above and the Crown Nominations Commission, that a vacancy occurs on the removal of an elected member from one House to another. The Committee, having analysed these provisions, noted that they would cover a case where, for example, a member of the House of Clergy (whether elected or ex officio) becomes a diocesan bishop and therefore a member of the House of Bishops. They would also cover a case where an ex officio member of the House of Laity is ordained and therefore becomes an ex officio member of the House of Clergy.
57. The Committee has concluded that SOs 128(3)(a) and 146(6)(a) are sufficiently clear and does not propose any amendments to them.

#### **Requirement for members to stand to indicate support**

58. A number of provisions in the Standing Orders require a member to stand to indicate support or, if “unable to do so”, to indicate support “by some other means”. The quoted wording is intended to address the concern that an unqualified requirement for members to stand might be disability discrimination – see SOs 29(1C), 59(6), 69(6), 77(8), 82(1)(c), 84(3), 87(9), 89(9) and 90(7).
59. The Committee was made aware that this requirement had attracted criticism from members who can stand, albeit with considerable difficulty, and who think that they cannot take the opportunity to indicate support “by some other means”.
60. The Committee recognised the need to act to address this criticism and referred the point to the Ministry Division’s Committee for Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People for its view on how best to approach the issues involved. That Committee favoured referring to being unable to stand “without difficulty”. Revd Canon Timothy Goode proposed amendments to that effect at the February group of sessions but they were not reached.



61. **This Committee is accordingly pleased to propose those amendments now – see Amendments 23 to 33 in Part 2 of the Annex.**

#### **Demise of the Crown**

62. The Committee has had drawn to its attention two references in the Standing Orders to Her late Majesty which, following the recent demise of the Crown, need now to refer to His Majesty.
63. **The Committee accordingly proposes to amend SOs 64(3) and 65(4) to change those references – see Amendments 34 and 35 in Part 2 of the Annex.**

#### **Use of Latin in the Standing Orders**

64. Questions about the use of Latin in the Standing Orders have been raised with the Committee. However, it is not obvious to the Committee what has prompted the concern. A decision was taken on the consolidation of the Standing Orders in 2015 not to replicate Latin where English would be clearer. But one case where the then members of the Committee thought it important to retain Latin was the reference to a “gravamen” in what is now SO 42. That is of course a Latin word, though it is defined in SO 42(4) to have a special meaning in the SOs. The Committee thinks that familiarity with Latin is not required to understand the concept of a “gravamen”.
65. The Committee notes that a handful of Latin references appear elsewhere in the SOs. The abbreviation “etc.” is used in some parenthetical descriptions and heading (see, for example, SOs 11(5), 19(1), 27(1), 37(4), 47, 148 and 151). Although “etc.” derives from Latin, its use in English is firmly established and the Committee finds it difficult to think of a better alternative. The SOs do use a couple of words which are themselves Latin, although they have a distinct meaning in English – namely, “quorum” (see SO 16) and “decorum” (see SO 46). Again, the Committee considers each of those to be the natural word to use in the context.
66. A few more Latin expressions appear in the Standing Orders of the individual Houses – in particular, “mutatis mutandis”. It is, though, a matter for each House to determine whether it wishes to amend those references.
67. Finally, the Committee notes *en passant* that the one case where the Standing Orders use a foreign expression is the French phrase “*en bloc*” in SO 59.

**Joyce Jones**  
Chair

June 2023

## AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS

### PART 1 – AMENDMENTS DEEMED ACCEPTED FEBRUARY 2023

#### Standing Order 59 (Revision following Revision Committee: amendments)

1. In Standing Order 59, in paragraph (5), omit “supports the amendment or that, although it does not support the amendment, it nevertheless”.

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment simplifies the drafting so that SO 59(5) begins “If the Steering Committee indicates that it wishes the debate to continue...”.*

2. In Standing Order 59, in paragraph (6), omit “supports the amendment or that it”.

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment is consequential on amendment 1.*

#### Standing Order 106 (Annual reports)

3. In Standing Order 106, in paragraph (6), for the words from “a member” to the end substitute “at least five members of the Synod give due notice that they wish to debate the motion appended to the report; and each member must include in the notice details of the member’s points of concern.”

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment provides that the Synod is deemed to take note of the Archbishops’ Council’s annual report or the report of its Audit Committee unless at least five members give notice of their wish for a debate. Currently only one member has to give such notice.*

#### Standing Order 120A (Representatives of Anglican Communion)

4. In Standing Order 120A, in paragraph (2), omit “, by prior arrangement,”.

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment removes the condition that an Anglican Communion representative may speak in debate only by prior arrangement.*

#### Standing Order 121 (Representatives of other Churches)

5. In Standing Order 121, in paragraph (2), omit “, by prior arrangement,”.

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment removes the condition that a representative of another Church may speak in debate only by prior arrangement.*

#### Standing Order 128 (Committees: duration of membership)

6. In Standing Order 128, in paragraph (1), after “of a new Synod” insert “; but that is subject to paragraph (1A)”.

***Explanatory statement:*** *this amendment is consequential on amendment 7.*

7. In Standing Order 128, after paragraph (1) insert—

“(1A) A member of a Committee referred to in paragraph (1), other than an ex officio member, may resign from the Committee by giving notice in writing to the Clerk and to the Chair of the Committee.”

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment gives a member of the Legislative Committee, Business Committee, Appointments Committee or Standing Orders Committee the right to resign from that Committee without also having to resign from Synod. The member in question instead continues to be a member of the Synod.*

8. In Standing Order 128, in paragraph (3)(b), after “a member of” insert “the Committee or of”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment is consequential on amendment 7.*

#### **Standing Order 140 (Crown Nominations Commission: duration of membership)**

9. In Standing Order 140, in each of paragraphs (1) to (3), (5), (6)(a), (8) and (10) for “elected by” substitute “elected from”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment and amendments 12 to 17 are consequential on or supplementary to the amendments made in July 2021 to provide a new system of electing pairs of central members of the Crown Nominations Commission. This amendment acknowledges that the members in question are elected from (rather than by) the House of Clergy or the House of Laity.*

10. In Standing Order 140, after paragraph (1) insert—

“(1A) A member elected from the House of Clergy or the House of Laity may resign from the Commission by giving notice in writing to the Chair of the Commission.”

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment gives a member of the Crown Nominations Commission the right to resign from the Commission without also resigning from Synod. The member concerned would continue as a member of Synod.*

11. In Standing Order 140, in paragraph (6)(b), after “a member of” insert “the Commission or of”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment is consequential on amendment 10.*

12. In Standing Order 140, for paragraph (7) substitute—

“(7) A vacancy arising in respect of a member of a pair referred to in SO 137(3A) is to be filled only if and when there is a vacancy in respect of each member of the pair; and if those circumstances arise, the two vacancies are to be filled by the election of two members as a pair, with SO 134 to apply with whatever modifications are necessary for the election of a pair rather than an individual.”

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment clarifies that a casual vacancy in a pairing of elected central members on the Crown Nominations Commission is to be filled only when both members have left the pairing – so, an election would only be held for a new pair and not to replace just one member of it.*

13. In Standing Order 140, omit paragraph (9).

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment removes a provision that is redundant in light of SO 137(3B) and (3C), which enable the appointment of substitutes to a pairing.*

14. In Standing Order 140, in paragraph (10), for “a member” substitute “each member of a pair”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment adjusts the process potentially leading to resignation which applies where an elected central member persistently fails to attend meetings of the Crown Nominations Commission. The process instead applies where each member of an elected pair fails to attend the meetings.*

15. In Standing Order 140, in paragraph (10), for “six months” substitute “twelve months from the last attendance of either member of the pair”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment increases from six months to twelve months the duration of the period of non-attendance required before the process potentially leading to resignation applies.*

16. In Standing Order 140, in paragraph (10)(a), for “the member” substitute “each member of the pair”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment and amendment 17 are consequential on amendment 14.*

17. In Standing Order 140, in paragraph (10)(b), for “the resignation” substitute “each resignation”.

## PART 2 – AMENDMENTS STILL TO BE CONSIDERED

### Miscellaneous matters

#### **Standing Order 11 (Length of notice: special cases)**

18. In Standing Order 11, in paragraph (1)(d), after “Standing Orders” insert “under SO 127(6A) or (6B)”.

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment is consequential on amendment 8 and would ensure that the rules on the period of notice for members to table amendments to the Standing Orders reflect the proposed amendments to SO 127.*

#### **Standing Order 78 (meaning of “liturgical business”)**

19. For the text of Standing Order 78 substitute—

““Liturgical business” means a service or other liturgical provision to be made under Canon B2 and which the Business Committee has determined is to be subject to one of the following procedures—

- (a) the procedure under SOs 79 to 88;
- (b) the procedure under SO 89;
- (c) the procedure under SO 90.”

***Explanatory statement:*** this amendment would clarify the definition of “liturgical business” by replacing reference to designation and referring expressly to Canon B2.

### After Standing Order 107

20. After Standing Order 107 insert the following—

*“107A Further motions*

- (1) This Standing Order applies to a motion under—
  - (a) SO 105(5), (6) or (9) (further motions to ordinary reports),
  - (b) SO 106(9) (further motions to annual reports), or
  - (c) SO 107(4)(b) or (5)(b) (further motions to presentations).
- (2) The mover of a motion to which this Standing Order applies may speak for not more than five minutes; immediately after that, the relevant person may speak in reply.
- (3) The “relevant person” is—
  - (a) in the case of a motion referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), the Chair or another member of the body that produced the report in question;
  - (b) in the case of a motion referred to in paragraph (1)(c), a member of the Synod nominated by the Chair on account of that member’s involvement in the presentation or interest in its subject matter.
- (4) If the relevant person indicates a wish for the debate to continue, the debate on the motion continues.
- (5) If the relevant person does not indicate a wish for the debate to continue, the Chair must declare the motion to have lapsed unless at least 25 members indicate that they wish the debate to continue; and if at least 25 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue, debate on the motion is resumed.
- (6) When debate on the motion has come to an end (whether or not following a motion for the Closure) but before the motion is put to the vote, the mover of the motion may speak in reply for not more than three minutes.”

***Explanatory statement:*** this amendment would apply the 25-member rule to what are commonly referred to as ‘following motions’, namely further motions to a report or presentation. Debate on a further motion would continue only if the relevant member for the report or presentation agrees or at least 25 members wish the debate to go on.

### Standing Order 127 (Standing Orders Committee)

21. In Standing Order 127, for paragraph (6) substitute—

- “(6) The Committee must make a written report to the Synod on—
- (a) any amendments which it proposes, and
  - (b) any proposal for amendment made by a member of the Synod in response to which the Committee does not propose an amendment.
- (6A) A member of the Synod may give notice under SO 11(1)(d) of—

- (a) an amendment to an amendment proposed by the Committee, or
- (b) an amendment which relates to a proposal included in the Committee's report under paragraph (6)(b).

(6B) A member of the Synod may give notice under SO 11(1)(d) of an amendment which does not come within paragraph (6A)(a) or (b); but the amendment may be moved only with the permission of the Chair.

(6C) The mover of an amendment under paragraph (6A) or (6B) may speak for not more than five minutes; immediately after that, a member of the Committee may speak in reply.

(6D) If the Committee indicates that it wishes the debate to continue, the debate on the amendment continues.

(6E) If the Committee does not indicate that it wishes the debate to continue, the Chair must declare the amendment to have lapsed unless at least 25 members indicate that they wish the debate to continue; and if at least 25 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue, debate on the amendment is resumed.

(6F) Paragraphs (6C) to (6E) do not apply to an amendment which, in the opinion of the Chair, is consequential on an amendment already carried; and the Chair must inform the Synod of his or her ruling.

(6G) When debate on an amendment has come to an end (whether or not following a motion for the Closure) but before the amendment is put to the vote, the mover of the amendment may speak in reply for not more than three minutes."

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment would make detailed provision about the right of members to move amendments to the Standing Orders. An amendment would either have to amend an amendment in the Standing Orders Committee's report or have to relate to some other matter covered by the report. The Chair of the debate could also give a member permission to move an amendment which does not meet either of those criteria. The 25-member rule would apply to members' amendments. Accordingly, a member's amendment would be debated only if the Standing Orders Committee agrees or if at least 25 members wish it to be debated.*

#### **Standing Order 141 (Crown Nominations Commission: business and procedure)**

22. In Standing Order 141, in paragraph (6), after "the Commission" insert "who have been serving on the Commission's consideration of the vacancy in question".

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment would remove any doubt there might otherwise be as to the meaning of the reference to two-thirds of the total number of the voting members of the Crown Nominations Commission.*

#### **Amendments relating to requirement to stand to indicate support**

##### **Standing Order 17 (right to speak)**

23. In Standing Order 17, in paragraph (1), after "to do so" insert "without difficulty".

**Explanatory statement:** *this amendment and amendments 24 to 33 would provide that, wherever the Standing Orders require members to stand, the exception for those*

*members who are unable to do so is to be developed so that any member who can stand but with difficulty is also entitled to indicate support by some other means.*

**Standing Order 29 (order of consideration)**

24. In Standing Order 29, in paragraph (1C), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 46 (decorum)**

25. In Standing Order 46, in paragraph (1), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 59 (Revision following Revision Committee: amendments)**

26. In Standing Order 59, in paragraph (6), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 69I (procedure on motion for approval or referral back)**

27. In Standing Order 69I, in paragraph (6), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 77 (procedure for consideration of scheme: motion for reconsideration)**

28. In Standing Order 77, in paragraph (8), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 82 (reports on question of doctrine)**

29. In Standing Order 82, in paragraph (1)(c), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 84 (optional re-committal following Revision Committee)**

30. In Standing Order 84, in paragraph (3), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 87 (further revision)**

31. In Standing Order 87, in paragraph (9), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 89 (minor adjustments to forms of service)**

32. In Standing Order 89, in paragraph (9), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Standing Order 90 (extension or discontinuance of liturgical business already approved)**

33. In Standing Order 90, in paragraph (7), after “to do so” insert “without difficulty”.

**Amendments relating to the demise of the Crown**

**Standing Order 64 (final approval)**

34. In Standing Order 64, in paragraph (3), for “Her Majesty’s” substitute “His Majesty’s”.

35. In Standing Order 65, in paragraph (4), for “Her Majesty” substitute “His Majesty”.