LAW REFORM WORKING GROUP – FINAL REPORT

Introduction

1. A Law Reform Working Group consisting of officials from the Scottish Parliament, the Scottish Government and the Scottish Law Commission was set up in November 2011 to consider the rate of implementation of reports of the Scottish Law Commission.

2. At its first meeting the Group agreed the following remit—

“To consider and recommend an approach to Parliamentary scrutiny of certain Bills originating from Scottish Law Commission Reports”.

3. A list of members of the Group is set out in Annex A.

4. This report forms the conclusion of the Group’s deliberations and is submitted to David McGill (Head of Chamber and Reporting Group, Scottish Parliament) and Tim Ellis (Head of Cabinet Secretariat, Scottish Government) for their consideration.

Background

5. The Group was established to take forward the work of the Law Reform Working Group established in the previous session to consider the implementation of reports of the Scottish Law Commission (Commission reports).

6. At the outset of its deliberations, the original working group identified issues which were potentially impeding the implementation rate of Commission reports. These included the perception that the Parliament did not have the committee resources to scrutinise Bills arising from Commission reports and concerns around the potential impact that such Bills could have on the burdens placed on parliamentary committees. In addition, the original working group recognised that the greatest impact of these Bills being brought forward would be on the Justice Committee, which already had a substantial legislative workload. The challenge for the original working group was, therefore, to establish a means by which these Bills could be scrutinised without having a detrimental impact on the Parliament’s wider scrutiny and legislative functions.

7. A number of options were considered by the original working group, including establishing a fast-track scrutiny process or setting up an ad hoc committee to consider Bills of this type. Although these options had their advantages, the Group considered that there would still be resource implications associated with them and so it focused mainly on options which could be drawn from existing resources and which would not require substantial changes to Standing Orders.

8. With this in mind, the Group concluded that the Subordinate Legislation Committee was best placed to consider these Bills. In doing so, the Group recognised that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has responsibility for
considering the whole breadth of Scots law and it had the capacity within its workload to undertake this role. Referring the Bills to the Subordinate Legislation Committee was therefore considered to be the best means by which these Bills could be brought forward without there being a detrimental impact on the Parliament’s consideration of other matters. Although this approach would require some Standing Order changes, these should be relatively minor.

9. It was agreed to conduct a pilot process before the end of session 3 of the Parliament in which temporary changes would be made to the Subordinate Legislation Committee’s remit to allow it to consider a Bill arising from a Commission report. However, although this conclusion was endorsed by the Parliamentary Bureau, circumstances did not allow the pilot to take place.

Session 4 developments

10. This new working group was set up to continue the work of the original working group.

11. The new group also noted that, during consideration of its work programme at the start of this session, the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee agreed to consider the implementation of Commission reports as part of its work programme. It is therefore intended that this report can be used to inform any inquiry undertaken by the SPPA Committee into the issue.

Procedural and practical issues

12. The Group endorsed the original working group’s conclusion that referring Bills arising from Scottish Law Commission reports to the Subordinate Legislation Committee would be the most appropriate means for them to be scrutinised. Aside from the workload capacity of the Committee, the Group also acknowledged that the Committee had a wide range of experience across the whole breadth of Scots law and was familiar with dealing with complex legislation, both primary and secondary, through its existing scrutiny role.

13. The following paragraphs therefore set out in detail the procedural steps that the Group considers are necessary to increase the Parliament’s capacity to scrutinise Commission Bills, in particular, in order for the Subordinate Legislation Committee to be designated as lead committee in consideration of these Bills.

14. These steps would need to be augmented by minor adjustments to the Subordinate Legislation Committee’s remit.

Identification of Commission Bills

15. As a first step, the Group considered how Commission Bills would be identified as suitable for referral to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The original working group concluded that Bills which did not include substantive changes to the law should be excluded, namely the following types of Bill: Consolidation, Codification, Statute Law Revision and Statute Law Repeal Bills. The Scotland Act and Standing Orders already made provision for these. In addition, with
regard to those Bills which did include substantive changes to the law, the
original working group accepted that, in terms of “political profile, urgency and
contentiousness or some other compelling factor”, some Bills arising from
Commission reports would more appropriately form part of the Scottish
Government’s legislative programme.

16. This left Bills making substantive changes to the law which could be described as
having their main purpose as “bringing the law up to date to reflect societal
changes, evolution of the common law or developing jurisprudence”. The original
working group concluded that it was Bills of this type which should be considered
for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

17. The new working group concurred with this general view but concluded that this
third category of Bills could be further refined and agreed that such a Bill could be
described as follows—

“A Bill implementing the recommendations of a Scottish Law Commission
report within the legislative competence of the Scottish Parliament—

(a) where there is a wide degree of consensus amongst key stakeholders
about the need for reform and the approach recommended;

(b) which does not relate directly to criminal law reform;

(c) which does not have significant financial implications;

(d) which does not have significant ECHR implications; and

(e) where the Scottish Government is not planning wider work in that
particular subject area.”

18. The Group recognised that the purpose of this exercise was to increase the
implementation of Commission reports and therefore consideration of the
Parliament’s capacity to scrutinise Bills arising from these reports was required.
On that basis, referring a Bill to the Subordinate Legislation Committee for
scrutiny which fell into this category did not necessarily mean that a “fast-track
process” was being established. As with any other Bill, the Bill would be subject
to the level of scrutiny required at Stage 1 in order for the Committee to form a
view on the Bill’s general principles. In addition, where there were potential
significant policy matters to be considered, the Group acknowledged that the Bill
would more properly be considered by the subject committee with policy
experience in that area. It was therefore important that careful consideration be
given to all of the individual conditions set out above in deciding whether a
particular Bill would be more appropriately referred to the Subordinate Legislation
Committee or to the relevant subject committee for scrutiny. Each of these
conditions is therefore considered in detail in the following paragraphs.

19. With regard to the generality of the conditions, the Group recognised that the
Commission had a remit covering all of Scots law irrespective of whether the
subject matter of the Bill fell within the legislative competence of the Parliament. The Group therefore noted that, as with every other Bill, careful consideration would need to be given to the legislative competence of any Bill introduced in the Parliament which implemented the recommendations of a Commission report.

20. In relation to condition (a) (where there is a wide degree of consensus amongst key stakeholders about the need for reform and the approach proposed), the Group was of the view that rather than try to determine how contentious the subject matter of the Bill was, the degree of consensus amongst stakeholders would be an indicator of how welcome generally the Bill would be amongst those individuals or groups on whom it would have the greatest impact. Where there was significant disagreement, the Group considered that the Bill would not be suitable for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

21. Under condition (b) (does not relate directly to criminal law reform), the Group recognised that any extensive revision to criminal law, such as a Bill which made changes to substantive criminal law or criminal procedures, could in itself be considered controversial. However it acknowledged that there may be circumstances where some reform of criminal law within the context of a Bill arising from a Commission report would be required. In particular the Group had in mind circumstances where, for example, the creation of criminal offences may only be incidental to the overall purpose of the Bill but were nevertheless necessary to the Bill’s operation. The Group considered that in these circumstances the condition may be met but it emphasised that these circumstances would have to be considered carefully.

22. In terms of condition (c) (does not have significant financial implications), the Group accepted at the outset of its deliberations that any Bill which it was anticipated the Presiding Officer would be likely to determine would require a financial resolution would not be suitable for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. In blunt terms, it recognised that any cost to the public purse could potentially create a degree of controversy. It also recognised that the financial impact the Bill had on external bodies was a factor that would have to be borne in mind in considering whether this condition was met.

23. The intention of condition (d) (does not have significant ECHR implications) was to ensure that consideration was given as to whether any particularly complex ECHR issues could potentially arise during the passage of the Bill.

24. The Group considered that condition (e) (where the Scottish Government is not planning wider work in that particular subject area) was necessary in order to ensure that the Scottish Government was not intending to bring forward legislation that could be used as a vehicle to make the legislative changes that the Commission recommended in its report. This condition was also included in recognition of the fact that the Scottish Government could also bring forward legislation arising from Commission reports as part of its own legislative programme.
25. The Group noted that there was an expectation that the Commission report would be accompanied by a draft Bill. It did recognise, however, that there may be a need for drafting revisions to be made to the Bill before introduction, though it concluded that such changes should only be necessary in ensuring that the Commission’s recommendations would be implemented. There should not, therefore, be any substantial changes to policy between the draft Bill and the Bill as introduced in the Parliament.

Scottish Government response to Commission Reports
26. In considering whether a Commission Bill would be suitable for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Group concluded that all of these conditions would have to be met. Consideration was therefore given to how these conditions could be applied. As a starting point it noted that all Commission reports are laid before the Parliament and that, as a matter of practice, the relevant Minister responded formally to the Commission within three months of the report being submitted to the Scottish Ministers. The Group therefore concluded that the response should contain a statement by the Minister addressing each of the above conditions in detail, providing clear reasons as to why the conclusion had been reached in each case and providing an overall conclusion as to whether or not, in the Minister’s view, any Bill arising from the Commission report would be suitable for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The Minister would also be expected to outline in the response whether in his or her view the Bill would fall within the legislative competence of the Scottish Parliament. The Group agreed that the Minister’s response should also be laid before the Parliament.

Referral of Bills
27. Where the relevant Minister had indicated in the response to a Commission report that a Bill implementing the recommendations in the report would, in his or her view, be appropriate for scrutiny by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Group agreed that a decision would have to be taken by the Parliament on whether it concurred with this position. The Group therefore gave consideration to the means by which the Parliament would form such a view.

28. Set out below are three options which suggest ways in which this could be done. To support any of these options would require a slight adjustment to the Subordinate Legislation Committee’s remit.

Option 1: consideration by Parliamentary Bureau as to whether the Bill should be scrutinised by the Subordinate Legislation Committee

29. The Group noted that, under Standing Orders, once any Public Bill is introduced in the Parliament it is referred by the Parliamentary Bureau to the subject committee within whose remit the subject matter of the Bill falls. Where the subject matter of the Bill falls within the remit of more than one committee, the Parliament may on a motion of the Parliamentary Bureau designate one of those committees as the lead committee.
30. Where the Minister’s response to a Commission report indicated that the Minister considered that the Bill would be more appropriately scrutinised by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Group noted that one option would be for the Bureau to consider whether it concurred with this conclusion. If it did, the Parliament would be invited on a motion of the Parliamentary Bureau to agree to designate the Subordinate Legislation Committee as lead committee in consideration of the Bill. Otherwise, the Bill would be referred to the relevant subject committee for consideration. This option was regarded as the most straightforward as it followed existing practice in terms of Bill referral.

31. The Group did note that the Minister’s response would be made within three months of the Commission report being formally submitted to the Scottish Ministers. There may therefore be circumstances where a Bill could be introduced before the Minister’s response had been made. In such circumstances the views of the Minister could be elicited at an official level. However, where a Bill was brought forward by an individual Member there were certain pre-conditions which would have to be met before the Bill could be introduced, such as garnering enough cross-party support for a Bill at the draft proposal stage. In addition, a proposal for a Committee Bill would require parliamentary time in order for it to proceed. Finally, the views of the Minister would be available if a Bill was brought forward as a Government Bill. It was therefore anticipated that, more often than not, the Minister’s views would be available to the Parliamentary Bureau at the time it was considering which committee should be designated as the lead committee.

**Option 2: consideration by subject committee as to whether the Bill should be scrutinised by the Subordinate Legislation Committee following the Bill’s introduction**

32. The Group noted that there may be merit in involving the subject committee with policy experience in the relevant subject area in considering the Minister’s opinion as to whether the Bill should be scrutinised by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. It therefore agreed that, as an alternative, the putative subject committee could be invited by the Parliamentary Bureau to form a view on the Minister’s statement set out in the response to the Commission. That committee would be required to form a clear view as to whether all of the conditions set out in paragraph 17 above were satisfied. The Group acknowledged that it would be for the subject committee to determine what steps it would need to take to determine how it would form such a view, however, it anticipated that this exercise should not take an extensive period of time.

33. The subject committee would then report its conclusions to the Parliamentary Bureau and it would be for the Parliamentary Bureau to decide, in light of the committee’s comments, whether to designate it or the Subordinate Legislation Committee as lead committee in consideration of the Bill.

**Option 3: consideration by subject committee of whether the Bill should be scrutinised by the Subordinate Legislation Committee prior to it being introduced in the Parliament**
34. As a slight alternative to the process set out in option 2, the Group concluded that the subject committee could form a view on the statement provided by the relevant Minister in response to the Commission report prior to any Bill being introduced. In these circumstances, again the Group agreed that the subject committee would report its conclusions to the Parliamentary Bureau to inform its decision on which committee should be designated as lead committee where a Bill was introduced.

35. Although the Group’s preferred option was for the Bill to be introduced before any consideration was given to the Minister’s response, the Group did note that there were certain advantages to considering the question as to which committee would be the most appropriate one to be the lead committee prior to the Bill’s introduction—

- Firstly, the member in charge would be clear as to the process of scrutiny the Bill would go through before introducing the Bill.

- Secondly, there may be circumstances where the subject committee decided during the course of its inquiry into the Minister’s statement in the response to the Commission report that it wished to bring the Bill forward as a Committee Bill. Applying the process in this way would allow that to happen.

36. However, in these circumstances careful consideration would have to be given to determining whether a Bill introduced was actually in the same terms as the draft Bill which accompanied the Commission report and the extent to which any divergence from the recommendations in the Commission report would be acceptable. In reality, it was anticipated that the Commission report would be accompanied by a draft Bill and so, while accepting that, as noted earlier, some drafting revisions may be made to the Bill before introduction, the Group’s conclusion remained that there could not be any substantial changes to policy during the period between the submission of the report to Scottish Ministers and the Bill being introduced in the Parliament. The Group also recognised that this would be something that the Subordinate Legislation Committee could give consideration to during its scrutiny of the Bill.

37. In addition, as a general point the Group agreed that the decision that the Bill should be treated as a Commission Bill for referral to the Subordinate Legislation Committee should stand for the remainder of the parliamentary session but did note that following an election the new Administration would have to make another statement if it considered that the Bill could be treated as a Commission Bill. The Parliament would also need to take a further decision on whether it agreed with the Minister’s conclusion.

Introduction of Bills

38. As a general observation, the Group noted that standing orders allow for three main types of Public Bill—
• Government Bills which are introduced by a member of the Scottish Government;
• Members’ Bills which are introduced by a member of the Parliament; and
• Committee Bills which are introduced by a committee of the Parliament (the subject matter of the Bill must fall within the remit of the committee).

39. As Public Bills, Commission Bills could be introduced by the Scottish Government, by an individual MSP or by a committee of the Parliament. The Scottish Minister introducing the Government Bill, the Member proposing the Members’ Bill or the convener of the committee proposing the Committee Bill would be the member in charge of the Bill.

40. The same Standing Order requirements for Public Bills would apply to a Bill introduced which implemented a Commission report. It would therefore have to be accompanied by Explanatory Notes, a Financial Memorandum, a Policy Memorandum and a Delegated Powers Memorandum (where the Bill contained any delegated powers).

41. As with every Bill introduced in the Parliament, the Presiding Officer would also be required to form a view as to whether the subject matter of the Bill was within the legislative competence of the Parliament.

Parliamentary scrutiny of a Commission Bill

42. Whichever of the options set out above was adopted, where there was agreement that a Commission Bill should be referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Group recognised that the usual procedures would apply in reporting to the Parliament on the general principles of the Bill at Stage 1. It would therefore be for the Subordinate Legislation Committee to determine how best to conduct its scrutiny role. The Group also noted that all other requirements at Stage 1 would apply and so, despite the condition that the Bill should not have significant financial implications, the Finance Committee would still have to consider any financial aspects of the Bill. Furthermore, in addition to reporting on the general principles, the Subordinate Legislation Committee would also consider any delegated powers contained within the Bill. The standard procedures would also apply at Stages 2 and 3.

43. The Group recognised the potential for unexpected issues to arise during scrutiny of a Bill which may have a bearing on the level of controversy entailed. Standing Orders do not make general provision for a lead committee to propose to the Parliamentary Bureau that a Bill be re-referred to another lead committee. However, the Group considered that a mechanism would be needed to allow the Subordinate Legislation Committee to refer a Commission Bill back to the Parliamentary Bureau if during the course of its scrutiny it felt that the subject committee would be in a better position to consider the Bill.

44. The Group did note, however, that the expectation was that where Stage 1 consideration had been completed the Subordinate Legislation Committee would continue to be lead committee in consideration of the Bill for the remainder of its
passage through the Parliament. The main reasoning behind this was that the Subordinate Legislation Committee would have gained the necessary experience and knowledge of the Bill during Stage 1 scrutiny which would outweigh any general experience of the subject area that the subject committee may have.

Support for Member in charge of a Commission Bill

45. The Scottish Government recognised that there will be some Bills deriving from Scottish Law Commission reports where it would always be appropriate for it to take the lead in putting through the Parliament, such as those Bills which have a political profile, urgency or contentiousness or some other compelling factor which leads to their inclusion in the Scottish Government’s legislative programme. The Government noted that in some cases it may also sponsor Bills which are less contentious and are Law Reform measures. However, the Scottish Government considered that it could also be appropriate for an individual MSP or parliamentary committee to sponsor Bills of the type discussed by the working group which are by their nature not expected to be politically or otherwise contentious.

46. Consideration was given by the Group to the support that would be required for a member or a committee introducing a Bill arising from a Commission report. The Scottish Law Commission indicated that it would be able to provide support to the member or committee introducing the Bill in preparation for introduction (with support from the Scottish Government). In particular, in terms of the provision of accompanying documents, the documentation prepared by the Commission during the production of the report could be easily adapted to create these documents.

47. However, the Group recognised that further consideration needed to be given to the support which would be available in establishing whether the Bill would be within the legislative competence of the Parliament. In particular, the Group noted that the provisions in the Scotland Act 2012 would require any member introducing a Bill to provide a statement of legislative competence on introduction (previously this was only a requirement of a member of the Scottish Government). The Group did not reach a conclusion in relation to the category of Bills considered in this report and noted that consideration of the provision of support for this issue in relation to all non-Government Bills was being taken forward separately within the Parliament.

48. In addition, no matter who introduced the Bill, the Group did note that certain actions could only be taken by the Scottish Government in terms of legislation generally. This included considering whether a Bill would require the consent of the Crown and dealing with the Palace in these circumstances, or alerting the UK Government to any implications of the Bill such as any requirements for section 104 orders. These actions would continue to be carried out by the Scottish Government.

---

1 Section 104 orders are made under the Scotland Act 1998 and are used to make provision either in reserved areas of Scots law or in the law of another jurisdiction in the UK that the Scottish Parliament was unable to make but which is necessary to complete the wider Bill project.
Government in terms of these types of Bills irrespective of which member introduced them.

49. The Group also noted that consideration would have to be given to the level of support available to the member or committee during the Bill’s passage through the Parliament. Notwithstanding the expectation that Commission Bills adopting the new procedure will be relatively uncontroversial in terms of their subject matter, the Group acknowledged that there was the strong possibility that a Commission Bill could give rise to some complex legal issues. The Scottish Law Commission is a statutory body established by the Law Commissions Act 1965. The Commission’s duties relate to the systematic development and reform of the law. The Commission’s main functions are to make recommendations to Ministers for reform of the law, and to provide advice and information to government departments. The Commission therefore cannot provide legal advice to individual MSPs or Parliamentary committees and must, as an apolitical body, retain its independence. As a result, it could not, for example, provide briefing and speaking notes or notes on amendments for an MSP when a Bill is going through Parliament. The Commission would be, though, in a position to provide information and support to a member on a wide variety of issues, such as:

a. The responses made to the Commission’s Discussion Paper (Before producing a final report, the Commission issues a Discussion Paper to seek views on the proposals. This is the equivalent of the Government’s consultation paper).

b. Any options considered by the Commission and rejected.

c. The Commission’s recommendations and the reasons for them.

d. Help with finalising the accompanying documents and the Delegated Powers Memorandum before the Bill is introduced into the Parliament.

50. The Group discussed the support provided for non-Government Bills by the Parliament’s Non-Government Bills Unit (NGBU). NGBU’s role is primarily to provide support for individual members in developing proposals for Bills. In the first instance this involves providing support to the member from the stage of policy development up to the introduction of the Bill. Although the unit also has a role in supporting the member throughout the various stages of the Bill, this is only in relation to Bills to which it has had direct involvement in policy development at the pre-introduction stage. Having a full understanding of the underlying policy enables it to be in a position to provide effective support and, as this would not be the case with Bills arising from a Commission report, it would not be in a position to support a member in bringing forward such a Bill.

51. The Scottish Government indicated that it would not always be in a position to provide support to a Member who brings forward a Bill deriving from a Commission Report. However, it would expect to continue to play a full role in the parliamentary consideration of the Bill, including giving evidence and participating in amendment stages.

52. Ultimately the Group recognised that this matter may have a bearing on the format of the Stage 1 scrutiny applied by the Subordinate Legislation Committee.
For example, a round-table evidence session including the Commission and Scottish Government officials as witnesses was an option that could be considered as an effective approach.

53. The Group also recognised that certain pre-conditions exist for Members’ Bills and Committee Bills before they can be introduced. It agreed that these pre-conditions should still apply in relation to Commission Bills. However, in doing so, it noted that there were certain aspects of the process that the Commission would have gone through in producing its report. For example, the consultation exercise undertaken by the Commission in the production of its report could satisfy the requirement for an individual member to have consulted on the Bill before introduction. This, of course, would be a matter on which the relevant subject committee would take a view under the Standing Orders rules on statements of reasons why the case for the Bill has already been established (Rules 9.14.3 to 9.14.7 of Standing Orders).

54. In terms of a Commission Bill being brought forward as a Committee Bill, the Group noted that the only circumstances where this could happen would be where the relevant subject committee had agreed to do so. Although it would be possible for the Subordinate Legislation Committee to introduce a Commission Bill, if it did so it could not be designated as lead committee to scrutinise its own Bill. Although there is no specific provision in Standing Orders which restricts a Committee scrutinising its own Bill, there are obvious issues of propriety and transparency to bear in mind in determining which committee should be designated as lead committee. It would therefore be very difficult for a committee to scrutinise a Bill effectively which it had sponsored in its own right.

55. While accepting that it is not possible to envisage every possible circumstance in which a Bill arising from a Commission report would be introduced, the Group was of the view that the options set out above offered sufficient flexibility to cover all circumstances.

Recommendation

56. In summary, the Group recommends that, in order to increase the implementation rate of Scottish Law Commission reports, a mechanism should be introduced whereby the Subordinate Legislation Committee could be designated as lead committee in consideration of Bills implementing Commission reports where the conditions set out in this report were met.

57. The Working Group recommends that the key elements of this be:

   a. The use of a set of key criteria (set out in paragraph 17) to determine eligibility for referral of Bills arising from Scottish Law Commission reports to the Subordinate Legislation Committee for consideration,

   b. The Scottish Government to set out in its formal response to a Scottish Law Commission report, addressing the criteria set out in paragraph 17,
whether it considered the Bill met this criteria and to lay that response before the Parliament,

c. For the Scottish Parliament to have the opportunity to consider whether it agreed with the Scottish Government’s analysis of whether a Bill met the criteria set out in paragraph 17 and was therefore suitable for referral to the Subordinate Legislation Committee,

d. Of the three suggested options for determining designation of lead committee for consideration of Bills arising from Scottish Law Commission reports, the Group considers that option 1, whereby the Parliamentary Bureau would determine whether the Bill should be referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee for consideration, would be the most appropriate,

e. That it recognises that the Scottish Government, an individual MSP or a Committee of the Parliament may seek to introduce a Bill which implements the recommendations of a Scottish Law Commission report,

f. That the same Standing Orders requirements which apply to Public Bills should apply to these Bills (meaning they would require to be accompanied by Explanatory Notes, a Financial Memorandum, a Policy Memorandum and a Delegated Powers Memorandum (where appropriate)),

g. That the Finance Committee and Subordinate Legislation Committee should consider the financial and delegated powers features of these Bills as they would with any Public Bill,

h. That a mechanism would be needed to allow the Subordinate Legislation Committee to refer the Bill back to the Parliamentary Bureau if during the course of its scrutiny it felt that the subject committee would be in a better position to consider the Bill (but with the expectation that where Stage 1 consideration had been completed that the Subordinate Legislation Committee would continue to be lead committee in consideration of the Bill for the remainder of its passage through the Parliament)

58. In addition, the Group recommends that the provision of support for Members bringing forward these Bills should be kept under review.
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