

GENERAL SYNOD

**DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 32
THE CONVOCATIONS (ELECTIONS TO UPPER HOUSE) (AMENDMENT)
RESOLUTION 201-
THE CLERGY REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-
THE CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-**

REPORT OF THE REVISION COMMITTEE

Membership

Chair: Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester)

***Ex officio* members**

(Steering Committee): The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) (Chair)
The Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)
Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)
Canon Dr John Mason (Chester)
The Revd Canon Tony Walker (Southwell and Nottingham)

Appointed members:

The Rt Revd Pete Broadbent, Bishop of Willesden
Canon Dr Peter Capon (Manchester)
The Revd Canon Roger Driver (Liverpool)
Ms Alison Fisher (Leeds)
The Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy (*ex officio*, Archbishops' Council)
Mr Clive Scowen (London)

Consultant:

Mr Stuart Jones (Diocesan Registrar for the Diocese of Norwich)

Staff:

Mr Stephen Slack (Chief Legal Adviser)
Mr Christopher Packer (Legislative Counsel)
Mr Nicholas Hills (Central Secretariat)
Mr Sion Hughes Carew (Secretary)

1. The draft Synodical Government Legislation received First Consideration at the July 2013 group of sessions of the General Synod. The period for the submission of proposals for amendment under Standing Order 53(a) expired on 9th August 2013.
2. Submissions were received by the Revision Committee ('the Committee') within the permitted time frame from 27 members and were published on the Church of England website in accordance with Standing Order 53(aa). The Steering Committee also identified a number of issues which led to the proposal of further amendments to the draft legislation. A list of proposals for amendment (other than drafting amendments), and the Committee's decision in respect of each, is set out in Appendix I.

3. The Committee met on four occasions and the proposals which it accepted form the basis for the four items of draft legislation (GS 1902A-1905A) now before the Synod (in which amendments accepted by the Committee are shown in bold). Appendix II contains a destination table showing where new provisions have been inserted and how the provisions in the draft legislation at First Consideration (GS 1902-05) relate to those in the draft legislation now before the Synod.
4. Except where otherwise indicated, the decisions of the Committee were unanimous or taken with no member voting against.

COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The balance of representation as between the two provinces

5. Paragraph 1(2) and (3) of the draft Amending Canon in the form in which it was introduced would have removed the fixed maxima for the numbers of seats in the Lower Houses of the Convocations to be allocated to the two provinces, whilst limiting the total number of directly and specially elected proctors to 195. (That figure represents the current total of 195 for the number of directly and specially elected proctors: 136 for Canterbury and 59 for York.)
6. The overall effect of these changes, and that made by paragraph 1(4)(a) of the draft Amending Canon, would have been that the numbers of proctors to be elected to the Convocations by the dioceses (other than Sodor and Man) would be determined, under the opening words of paragraph 2 of Canon H 2, by reference to the number of electors within each diocese, subject to the overall maximum of 195.
7. Corresponding amendments would have been made in relation to the numbers to be elected to the House of Laity by paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution.
8. As introduced, therefore, the draft legislation would have removed the current weighting in favour of the northern province in both the House of Clergy and the House of Laity. (In both cases the effect of the rules is currently to require an allocation of places in the proportions 70:30; whereas if places were allocated entirely proportionately to the numbers of clergy / on electoral rolls respectively, the allocation would be closer to the proportions 72:28 in both Houses.) Although both the Elections Review Group and the Business Committee considered that the current weighting in favour of the province of York should be retained, the draft legislation was framed in the way it was (ie so as to remove the weighting) at the request of the Business Committee, because it thought that would allow the mind of the Synod more easily to be tested on whether the weighting should be removed.¹
9. Submissions supporting the removal of the weighting were received from two members. Submissions proposing that the draft legislation be amended so as to retain the *status quo* in this respect were received from five members.

¹ See paragraphs 12 to 17 of *The Work of the Elections Review Group: First Report of the Business Committee* (GS 1901).

10. Points made by members in favour of removing the weighting included that:

- removal of the weighting was a matter of justice, since the Synod's electoral arrangements needed to be fair in terms of the representation they gave to different parts of the country;
- correspondingly, the members of the Synod elected from the dioceses should represent similar numbers of people; and
- there was no coherent or principled justification for drawing what amounted to an arbitrary distinction between the provinces as such when there were dioceses in the southern province which could advance similar arguments to those advanced on behalf of the northern province in terms of their social and economic position, distance from London / the centre etc.

11. Points made by members in favour of removing the weighting included that:

- it was often difficult for the northern voice to be heard, given the London-centric nature of the Church's activities and functions, and the difficulty / time taken in travelling to London for meetings (as reflected, for example, in the fact that there were no members from the Northern Province on the House of Laity Standing Committee);
- the issue was really one about the relationship between the two provinces since they had different characters and if the representation of the northern province were reduced further, that could result in the northern province becoming even less able to make its distinctive voice heard in the councils of the Church;
- the issue of balance therefore did arise as between the provinces, not between specific geographical areas;
- the weighting reflected the commitment of the Church to the northern province and its Convocation, which in turn reflected the fact that the Church's ministry was to the entire nation and not just the prosperous south; and
- any further reduction in the representation of the northern province, at a time when it was becoming more difficult to recruit clergy to serve there, would be demoralising and could further exacerbate the drift of clergy to the south; and
- there was more at stake than adopting an abstract principle, since making changes based purely on mathematics might result in a poorer Synod.

12. Whilst a minority of the members of the Committee considered that the *status quo* was arbitrary and unjust, and that the Synod ought therefore to be encouraged to support the draft legislation as it stood, the majority considered that the current weighting ought to be retained so as to enable the distinctive voice of the northern province to be heard. Concern was also expressed about whether, if the weighting were removed, the northern province would be able to provide enough members to participate effectively in Synodical structures. However, the Committee recognised that the deployment of clergy was a separate matter, and was being considered elsewhere.

13. On the proposals to amend the draft legislation so as to preserve the *status quo* as regards provincial representation being put to the vote, there voted: in favour: 9; against: 1.

Adjustment of the provincial boundary

14. Two submissions were received which proposed a redistribution of dioceses as between the northern and southern provinces. However, the Committee was advised, and accepted, that both sets of proposals were out of order, on the basis that the redistribution of dioceses as between the provinces could not be achieved by the draft legislation: a Measure would be required for that purpose.
15. The Committee noted Mr Clive Scowen's proposal that, since the draft legislation could not alter the provincial boundary so as to enlarge the northern province, the Committee should recommend to the Dioceses Commission that it should consider making proposals to that end.

The level of representation enjoyed by individual dioceses

16. Paragraph 1(2) of the draft Amending Canon as amended (paragraph 1(4)(a) of the draft as introduced) will remove the current limitation (to two) on the number of proctors to be elected from the Diocese in Europe, with the result that its representation in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation will be calculated on the same basis as the mainland dioceses. A corresponding change will be made in relation to the House of Laity by paragraph 3 of the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution.
17. Two submissions were received which proposed the removal of these provisions, on the grounds that the proposed increase was not justified by the numbers of clergy and laity in the diocese and that much of the business of the Synod did not relate directly to the Diocese in Europe (so that it was wrong for members of the diocese to vote on it).
18. Mr Clive Scowen made a more radical proposal, involving amendments to Canon H 2 and the Church Representation Rules to change the minimum number of seats a diocese would have from three to one, so as to secure that the representation of all dioceses, in both the Convocations and the House of Laity, is more closely proportionate to the numbers of their clergy / on electoral rolls respectively.
19. At the request of the Committee, staff ran the program used to allocate seats in the Lower House of both Convocations and the House of Laity, using the figures for clergy / numbers on electoral rolls respectively which had been collected for the 2010 elections, on the basis proposed by Mr Scowen. Two principal assumptions were made: first, that the *status quo* in relation to the weighting between the Province of Canterbury and Province of York *in the House of Clergy* should remain; and secondly, that the allocation to the Diocese in Europe in both the House of Laity and the House of Clergy should increase from 2 to 3. (In the House of Laity, this means that 1 seat is transferred from Rochester; in the House of Clergy, 1 seat is transferred from Southwark.) Sodor and Man was assumed to continue to have an allocation of 1 seat in both Houses.
20. The outcome of this exercise suggested that, if the minimum allocation of seats were reduced from 3 to 1, there would be no change in the allocation of places within the Convocation of York. In the case of the Convocation of Canterbury, the dioceses of Coventry, Europe,

Hereford and Truro would all lose 1 seat, while the dioceses of London, Chelmsford, Lichfield and Southwark would all gain 1 seat.

21. A similar picture emerged in the case of the House of Laity: if the weighting between the provinces remained as at present and the minimum allocation of seats were reduced from 3 to 1, there would be no change in the allocation of place within the Province of York. In the case of the Province of Canterbury, the dioceses of Bristol, Europe, Leicester and Truro would all lose 1 seat, while the dioceses of London, Gloucester, Rochester and St Edmundsbury and Ipswich would all gain 1 seat.
22. Mr Scowen argued that the exercise showed that there was no equitable basis for some dioceses having three representatives and that the principles of equity and equality of representation meant that their representation should be reduced accordingly.
23. A majority of the members of the Committee was not persuaded of the case for allowing the level of representation to float as freely as Mr Scowen proposed. It noted, firstly, that having a minimum of three places to be filled should deliver a more representative range of viewpoint amongst the representatives of a diocese, given the use of STV. And if a diocese were only allocated one place it would be very difficult for the person concerned to represent the diocese effectively. 'Fairness' of representation was not just about a strict correlation between the number of those represented and the number of those representing them. On Mr Scowen's proposal being put to the vote, there voted: in favour: 1; against: 7.
24. Nor was a majority of the Committee persuaded of the case for treating the Diocese in Europe as a special case: if there was to be a minimum level of representation, it should apply to all dioceses (other than the very special case of Sodor and Man). On the proposals to remove the proposed increase in the representation of the Diocese in Europe being put to the vote there voted: in favour: 2; against: 5.

Proctorial elections in the Dioceses of Sodor and Man and Europe

25. The Steering Committee proposed amendments to draft Amending Canon No.32 needed to adapt the arrangements for proctorial elections to the particular circumstances of the Diocese of Sodor and Man and the Diocese in Europe respectively, in relation to clergy having permission to officiate ('PTO').
26. The Steering Committee explained that in the case of the Diocese of Sodor and Man the Mission and Pastoral Measure (Isle of Man) 2012 (a piece of Manx Church legislation) had abolished the deanery synods there. That presented a difficulty from the point of view of the application of paragraph 4(e) of Canon H 2, under which those eligible to vote in proctorial elections include "*clerks in holy orders who are members of a deanery synod ... and have written permission from the bishop of the diocese to officiate within that diocese*". It also raised an issue as to the application of paragraph 5 of the Canon, which includes amongst those eligible to stand in proctorial elections clergy who "*would have been [entitled to vote under paragraph 4(e)] had they been members of a deanery synod*".
27. With the agreement of the Diocese of Sodor and Man, the Steering Committee accordingly proposed amendments to Amending Canon No.32 altering the effect of Canon H 2.4(e) so

that, in relation to Sodor and Man, it refers to clergy with PTO who are members of the diocesan synod (the class equivalent in Sodor and Man to clergy with PTO elected to a deanery synod in England) and makes corresponding provision in relation to Canon H 2.5. The Revision Committee accepted those proposals.

28. The Steering Committee explained that, in the case of the Diocese in Europe, difficulty arose from the fact that, under paragraph 42(a) of its Constitution, there is no general requirement for an archdeaconry to have deanery synods: an archdeaconry can have either an archdeaconry synod or deanery synods; and in the majority of archdeacons there is in fact an archdeaconry synod. Furthermore under paragraph 42(b) of the Constitution membership of the houses of clergy of both archdeaconry and deanery synods is confined to licensed clergy. Thus clergy with PTO are not currently eligible for membership of an archdeaconry synod or, where they exist, a deanery synod. Difficulties again arise therefore in relation to the effect of Canon H 2.4(e) and H 2.5.
29. With the agreement of the Diocese in Europe, the Steering Committee accordingly proposed amendments to Amending Canon No. 32 altering the effect of Canon H 2.4(e) so that, in relation to that diocese, it referred to clergy with PTO elected to the deanery or archdeaconry synod (the class equivalent in Europe to clergy with PTO elected to a deanery synod in England) and making a corresponding amendment to Canon H 2.5. The Revision Committee accepted those proposals.
30. The Revision Committee recognised that the amendment it agreed in relation to the Diocese in Europe will not provide a full answer to the difficulty to which the Steering Committee had drawn attention since the provisions of Canon H 4 will still, as drafted, disenfranchise clergy with PTO in the case of those archdeacons where there is an archdeaconry synod rather than deanery synods. However, it was given to understand by the diocesan registrar that the intention of the diocese is to amend the Constitution of the diocese so as to provide for clergy with PTO to be eligible for membership of both archdeaconry and deanery synods.

The number of suffragan bishops to be elected to the Upper Houses of the Convocations

31. Paragraph 2 of the draft Amending Canon as introduced provided for the number of suffragans elected to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury to be increased from 4 to 5. Paragraph 1 of the draft Convocations (Elections to the Upper House) (Amendment) Resolution made provision consequential on that.
32. Submissions were received from three members arguing against that change. Several referred to the fact that the number of diocesan bishops in the northern province was going to be reduced as a result of the West Yorkshire reorganisation scheme, arguing that that weakened the case in principle for an increase in the representation of the southern province in the House of Bishops or meant that now was not the moment to undertake it.
33. Additionally, several proposals were received that, given the reduction in the number of diocesan bishops in the northern province, a further one or two suffragans should be elected from the north - whether instead of, or in addition to, the additional southern suffragan for which the draft legislation provided.

34. The Committee considered that the submissions received conflated two distinct issues: the proposed increase in the number of southern suffragans, which was intended to provide a fairer level of representation for the suffragans in the province and, indeed, of suffragan and assistant bishops more generally (who were not well-represented in the Synod); and the question whether additional suffragans should be elected from the northern province to the House of Bishops as a response to the loss of two diocesan bishops under the West Yorkshire Reorganisation Scheme.
35. The Committee considered there to be a strong case in relation to the increase in the number of southern suffragans, for the reasons given by the Elections Review Group and the Business Committee. The Committee noted the considerable disparity in the levels of representation as between the southern and the northern provinces: in Canterbury there were 4 elected places for 47 suffragans and in York there were 3 for 16. Thus twice as many suffragans were needed to elect a suffragan in the south as were needed in the north; and it could be said that the south had borne the strain of the reductions imposed during the last round of reform, which had gone too far in this respect.
36. The current position could be said to be particularly unfortunate at a time when the importance of hearing the suffragans' voices was increasingly being recognised. Augmenting the representation in the south by one would enable a wider range of views to be heard in the House of Bishops; and doing so would only raise that representation to where it had been before the last round of Synodical reform. Indeed, one member considered that to increase the representation in both provinces by one would be to increase the problem as regards the proportionality of their representation, not to reduce it – and argued that there was therefore a case for increasing the Canterbury representation by two places.
37. The Committee did not therefore support the proposals for the removal of the provisions increasing the number of suffragan bishops to be elected from Canterbury to the House of Bishops.
38. Nor did it support the proposal that the number of southern suffragans be increased by two rather than one (only 2 members of the Committee supporting that proposal when it was put to the vote). It did, however, accept the proposals that the number of northern suffragans ought to be increased by one, following the loss of two diocesan bishops in the West Yorkshire Reorganisation Scheme.

The university constituencies

Introduction

39. Paragraph 1(6) of the draft Amending Canon in the form in which it was introduced would have removed the provision for electoral areas comprising universities – thus abolishing the university constituencies. Paragraphs 1(4)(b), 1(5), 1(7)(a), 1(8) and 1(9) made further amendments consequential upon that.

40. The Committee noted that this proposal was the major issue of contention at the July 2013 group of sessions and that the Synod voted in favour of a motion moved by the Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige in the form:

‘That this Synod request that the Steering Committee appointed under SO 49 to be in charge of the draft legislation arising from GS 1901 undertake full consultation with the University proctors regarding the proposals relating to the University constituencies in GS 1901, GS 1902 and GS 1904 and bring forward further proposals for consideration by the Revision Committee for the reform of those constituencies, based on accurate information.’

41. The Committee was informed that, as a result of the Synod resolution, the Steering Committee had conducted discussions with the university proctors, which had led to the formulation of the proposals that the Steering Committee brought to it.
42. The Committee also noted the proposal previously put forward by the Business Committee as an alternative to abolition, set out in paragraph 31 of The Work of the Elections Review Group: First Report of the Business Committee (GS 1901).

Submissions received

43. As was to be expected, a number of submissions were received in connection with the future of the university constituencies, thirteen of which (including some from the university members themselves) favoured their reform and only three their abolition.

Abolition

44. The three members who supported the proposal that the university constituencies be abolished did so partly for practical reasons (including their small size) and partly on grounds of principle – raising questions about whether there was a continuing justification for them. (Reference was made to the ability of university clergy to stand in proctorial elections if they held a licence, and questions raised as to whether the constituencies were a necessary or desirable way of providing a broad spread of theological expertise.)
45. On the proposal that the draft legislation should not be amended, so continuing to provide for the abolition of the university constituencies, there voted: in favour: 2; against: 8.

The appointment of theological advisers

46. Mr Clive Scowen argued that providing for the appointment of theological advisers with the right to speak, but not to vote, was a more satisfactory way of providing the theological expertise the Synod required, not least because that was more likely to deliver the necessary range of expertise, across the Anglican tradition, than was an electoral process (the outcome of which was unpredictable). In making his proposal Mr Scowen recognised that provision for the appointment of theological advisers was more properly made in the Synod’s Standing

Orders (like the existing provision for ecumenical representatives etc) rather than in the draft legislation.

47. In discussion by the Committee, arguments advanced against Mr Scowen's proposal included that it would not necessarily provide any element of representation or deliver a contribution to the work of the Synod (including its committees etc) by academics who were 'rooted' in the life of the Church (as would be the case under the Steering Committee's proposals by virtue of the need to be authorised by a bishop to officiate in a diocese). It was also suggested that what Mr Scowen's proposal would deliver was the possibility of further theological advice; but the Synod did not have any shortage of such advice (eg from the Faith and Order Commission) when it was needed. What the university constituencies delivered was a contribution from members with theological and related expertise.
48. On the proposal that the draft legislation be amended so as provide for the appointment of theological advisers instead of, or in addition to, members elected from reformed university constituencies, there voted: in favour: 1; against: 8.

Issues arising in connection with reformed university representation

49. The Committee therefore turned to consider the proposals arguing for the retention of reformed university constituencies. It seemed to the Committee that the principal issues arising in that connection were as follows:

- If there should continue to be university constituencies, should there be several constituencies or a single national constituency?
- In either case, how many university members should there be?
- What should the electorate be? In that connection the major issues appeared to be:
 - the nature of the academic role in which electors/candidates should be engaged (eg whether they should have to be teachers or researchers in a theological or related faculty of a university (or possibly a theological college);
 - whether lay persons or persons in episcopal orders should be able to stand; and
 - the process by which the entitlement of those claiming to be entitled to vote should be established (whether by self-registration or otherwise).

Submissions proposing reformed constituencies

50. The submissions received which argued for the retention of reformed university constituencies canvassed the possibilities of a single national constituency, a single constituency in each province or more than one constituency in each province.

51. On the number of members to be elected, the university members themselves were prepared to contemplate a reduction in the overall level of representation (currently 6: 4 in Canterbury and 2 in York) to 4 or 5 members. Other submissions proposed a reduction to 4 or 3.
52. On the issue of academic qualifications, only one submission argued in favour of the retention of the current position, in which the constituencies are open to university clergy irrespective of whether they are employed for the purposes of teaching and research.
53. On the issue of the nature of the subject in which the clergy concerned must be engaged in teaching or research, several proposals (including that of the Business Committee) referred to electors and candidates having to be members of theology faculties. The submissions of the university members proposed extending the franchise to recognised university teachers etc engaged in peer review in theology departments “or in other allied disciplines”.
54. The university members also canvassed the possibility of persons in episcopal orders being eligible to vote and stand in the constituency, provided they met the relevant academic requirements.
55. Other submissions raised the possibilities of extending the constituency to include (a) the staff of theological colleges and courses and (b) lay persons (provided they meet the same academic requirements as the clergy).
56. The Steering Committee raised a further issue for consideration, namely whether there should be a new requirement for any clerical members of the constituency to have a current licence, or at least permission to officiate, from a diocesan bishop – which it suggested might be justified on the basis that members of the General Synod should have some active role in the life of the Church and, in the case of clergy, demonstrably meet the expectations of the Church in relation to those authorised to undertake public ministry.
57. As to the manner in which the entitlement to vote should be established, the Business Committee’s proposal envisaged that the presiding officer would, as now, seek confirmation from the relevant departments as to which of their staff were eligible to vote and (by implication) be entitled to rely on the certificate given.
58. However, the university members proposed a system of self-registration with the presiding officer, involving a process of advertising followed by registration of those who claimed to be entitled to vote by reference to the new rules.

Proposals from the Steering Committee

59. In the light of its discussions with the university members and an initial discussion by the Committee of the submissions received, the Steering Committee brought forward for consideration by the Committee a detailed package of proposals for the reform of the university constituencies. In the light of the views expressed by the Synod and the Committee’s discussions with the university members, the Steering Committee considered that reform, rather than abolition of the constituencies was the right way forward, and

believed that reform could be carried out in a way which met a number of the objections previously made to the current position.

60. The elements of the Steering Committee's proposals were as follows:

Numbers of constituencies and members to be elected in them

- There should be a single, clerical, constituency, electing four members.
- There should be a constraint requiring at least one member to be elected from a university in each province.
- There should not, however, be any constraint on the number of persons to be elected from one university (including the colleges within it).
- The persons elected would take their places in the Convocation of the province in which the university concerned is situated.

Composition of the electorate

Those eligible to vote would be those persons whose names appear on a register of electors maintained by the presiding officer, following a person certifying to the presiding officer (under the procedure set out below) that he or she:

- is a priest or deacon having authority to officiate within a diocese from the bishop of a diocese;
- who is either:
 - employed to teach **and** research by:
 - a university in the province; or
 - a college of a collegiate university in the province; or
 - a fellow of a college in a collegiate university in the province;
- and is:
 - in the case of the University of Oxford, a member of Congregation;
 - in the case of the University of Cambridge, a member of the Regent House; and
 - in the case of the University of Durham, a member of Convocation.

The process for establishing eligibility to vote

The register of electors would be maintained by the presiding officer. A person would be entitled to have his or her name entered in it on declaring in writing to the presiding officer that he or she meets the requirements for eligibility to vote.

The presiding officer would be required:

- to publish the register on the Church of England website; and

- to give a specified period of public notice, by such means as he or she thinks fit, of any election (including one to fill a casual vacancy), inviting persons who consider themselves eligible to apply to have their names included in the register upon making the necessary declaration to the presiding officer.

The presiding officer could add names to, or remove names from, the register at any time other than during the period between the sending out of nomination forms for an election and the declaration of the result of that election.

Eligibility for election

The requirements in relation to eligibility to stand for election would be the same as those in relation to eligibility to vote.

The process for conducting elections

The processes for the conduct of elections, in terms of the issue of nomination and voting papers etc, would be the same as at present.

The Committee's consideration of the Steering Committee's proposals

61. A majority of the Committee welcomed the Steering Committee's proposals, accepting that there was a case for the retention of the university constituencies provided that they could be reformed satisfactorily, especially from the point of view of reducing both the amount of work required to run elections to them and the risk of legal challenge to the outcome of such elections.
62. The Committee considered the Steering Committee's proposals in detail, touching on the following points (amongst others):
 - (a) The Committee considered that there should be a single constituency, but with a constraint requiring at least one member to be elected from each province, on the ground that there would otherwise be a risk that the northern province could have no university representation.
 - (b) On the size of the constituency, the Committee considered the choice to be between 3 and 4 members. Some members considered that if there were only 3 places there would be a real risk that only Oxford, Cambridge and Durham would ever be represented. Others thought that 4 members represented over-representation given the likely size of the electorate. On the proposal that the universities elect 3 members, there voted: in favour: 1; against: 7. On the proposal that the universities elect 4 members, there voted: in favour: 8; against: 1.
 - (c) On the question whether bishops should be eligible for election, the view was expressed that episcopal representation in this constituency would be difficult to justify without a wider consideration of the nature and extent of episcopal

- representation in the Synod. It was also noted that the legislative provision required to achieve that outcome would add further to the complexity of the draft legislation. On the proposal that the constituency should extend to anyone in holy orders (including those in episcopal orders), there voted: in favour: 1; against: 6.
- (d) The Committee welcomed the proposal that university members should have to be authorised by a bishop (not necessarily the bishop of the diocese in which the relevant university was situated) to minister in his diocese. It considered that that had advantages both in terms of securing that the doctrine and conduct of the member could be assumed to be consistent with the norms of the Church and of saying something about the wider ‘rootedness’ of the member in the life and tradition of the Church.
 - (e) The Committee did not consider that there should be any requirement for the members of the constituency to have to teach etc in any particular subject. Whilst the objective of providing theological expertise would be most directly achieved by requiring that members of the constituency should teach theology, to insist on that would be to limit the field unduly – there were other disciplines (such as ecclesiastical history) whose practitioners could (and did) make a valuable contribution to the life of the Synod. The Committee was advised, and accepted, that it would be problematic to impose a requirement of the kind proposed by the university members (“other allied disciplines”) since that would be too uncertain in its effect to be deployed in a legislative instrument. The Committee therefore concluded that the better course was not to impose any requirement as to the subject(s) in which members of the constituency taught and researched but to leave it to its electorate to exercise a judgment between candidates – including as to the relevance of the subject to the contribution they could make to the work of the Synod if elected to it.
 - (f) The Committee did not consider that there should be any requirement that those eligible to vote and stand for election should be in full time employment.
 - (g) As regards the proposal that the constituency should be extended to staff of theological colleges and courses, the point was made that their work would not be peer reviewed in the same way as that of staff teaching in a university. One member questioned whether that was the case, arguing that in fact the staff of theological colleges and courses did undertake research; but in response it was suggested that, whilst they might in practice engage in research, it was not necessarily the case that they would be required to do so as a condition of their employment. On the proposal that the constituency extend to those employed to teach and research by a Church of England theological college or course, there voted: in favour: 4; against: 6.
 - (h) The Committee noted the argument that the constituency should be extended to include lay people. However, it was not convinced that the constituency should be widened in that way, for a variety of reasons. In particular, even those who were in favour of the proposal in principle were concerned that, given (for the reasons explained above) it did not seem possible to limit the constituency to those engaged in teaching particular subjects, the constituency could become unacceptably large. Concerns were also expressed about the complexity of the legislative provision that would be required (including significant additional

proviso being added to the Church Representation Rules). The Committee also noted that even if the constituency were extended to lay people it would not necessarily include some high regarded academics as they could be self-employed.

63. The Committee accordingly agreed to amend the draft legislation in a number of respects to give effect to the Steering Committee's proposals described in paragraph 62 above.

The religious communities

64. The Revd Christopher Hobbs proposed a reduction in the number of those representing the religious communities, from four to two. (At present, two members are elected to the Convocations (or one of them, depending on where the mother house of the religious communities concerned is situated) and two to the House of Laity.)
65. The Committee noted that that position had been established in the course of the legislative process that gave effect to the recommendations of the Review of Synodical Government ('the Bridge Review'), which gave careful consideration to the representation of the religious communities. In particular, the level of representation derives from consideration of the issue by the Legislative Drafting Group, the report of which explained that the Group "felt that two Religious in each of the Houses of Clergy and Laity was a fair and balanced representation of this constituency, while reducing by one the current representation of the Religious on the Synod".²
66. In the light of that position, the Committee asked staff to establish the size of the electorate for the constituencies. It was advised that in the 2010 elections there had been 65 electors in the clerical constituency and 309 in the lay constituency. As regards current numbers, in 2012 (the latest year for which figures were available) it appeared that there were potentially 79 electors in the clerical constituency (57 in the Province of Canterbury, 22 in the Province of York) and 306 in the lay constituency (244 in the Province of Canterbury and 62 in the Province of York).
67. On Mr Hobbs's proposal being put to the vote there voted: in favour: 1; against: 8.

***Ex officio* members**

68. An issue not addressed by the draft legislation but on which five submissions were received was that of the Synod's *ex officio* members. Two expressed the desire that thought to be given to the position of the *ex officio* members given that their number will be increasing, two proposed that they should not be able to vote and, more radically, one proposed that they should cease to be members of the Synod and should instead have rights to attend and speak.

² GS 1484-7X, paragraph 72.

69. The ex officio members comprise:

In the House of Clergy –
the Chaplain General of Prisons;

In the House of Laity –
the First and Second Church Estates Commissioners; and

In either the House of Clergy (if a priest or deacon) or the House of Laity –

the three legal officers (ie the Dean of the Arches and the two Vicars General);
the nominated members of the Archbishops' Council (of whom there may be up to six);
the Third Church Estates Commissioner; and
the Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board.

70. The Chair of the Dioceses Commission will also become an ex officio member of the relevant House upon the coming into force of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2014 and Amending Canon No.31.

71. The Committee noted that the concerns expressed appeared to focus around the House of Laity, 6% of the membership of which was ex officio. However, it also noted that it could not address the position in relation to the single largest group of ex officio members - the ex officio members of the Archbishops' Council – since they sat by virtue of provisions in the National Church Institutions Measure 1998 (which meant that primary legislation would be needed to change the position).

72. In any event, the Committee considered that ex officio members allowed specialist skills to be brought to the Synod that might not otherwise be available to it, and made it more effectively representative of the Church of England. For such members to play an effective part they needed to be full members rather than simply having rights to attend and speak. The argument that only those who had undergone a process of election should be able to vote was unpersuasive.

73. The Committee agreed not to accept any of the proposals in relation to the ex officio members. However, two of its members expressed the view that the general position surrounding such members would be worthy of consideration by the Business Committee.

Representation of those worshipping in 'Fresh Expressions'

74. The Revd Christopher Hobbs made a proposal concerning the representation of people worshipping in 'Fresh Expressions', stating that he wished to be taken into account in calculating the number of persons to be elected from a diocese to the House of Laity and to be able to vote in the elections held for that purpose.

75. The Committee noted that there were two types of ‘Fresh Expression’: those linked to a parish (where General Synod representation was via the electoral roll of the parish); and those created under a Bishops Mission Order (‘BMO’) (which could, but was not required to, contain provision for representation). The Committee understood that what Mr Hobbs was in fact seeking was an amendment to the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 (‘the DPMM’), which had created BMOs, so as to impose a requirement for a BMO to include provision for the representation of those worshipping in them.
76. The Committee accepted that, if that was the case, the underlying aim of the submission could not be given effect by the draft legislation being considered by the Committee. However, the Bishop of Willesden informed the Committee that the Simplification Group, of which he was Chair, was already looking at ways of ensuring that those worshipping in BMOs could be represented in Synodical structures, which could result in an amendment being made to the DPMM in due course.
77. The submission was therefore ruled out of order, but the Committee expressed the wish that the Simplification Group add the specific issue of Synodical representation of those worshipping in Fresh Expressions to their agenda in relation to BMOs and the DPMM.

OTHER ISSUES RELATING TO ELECTIONS TO THE CONVOCATIONS AND THE HOUSE OF LAITY

The electorate for the House of Laity of the General Synod

78. Several submissions touched on the question of the electorate of the House of Laity.
79. The Committee noted that at its November 2013 group of sessions the General Synod had rejected both proposals contained in the Second Report of the Business Committee on the Work of the Elections Review Group (GS 1902) and other proposals for the reform of the current electorate of the House of Laity. It acknowledged that there had been a recent groundswell of thinking more hopefully about deanery synods and encouraging them to be more vibrant. It therefore considered that there was no need at present to make any amendments to the electorate for the House of Laity.
80. However, a minority of the members asked that it be recorded in the Committee’s report that they desired the matter to be raised again, perhaps early in the new quinquennium, with the possibility of a seminar being held in York to explore the possibilities for reform.

The reinstatement of the former Rule 36(3) Church Representation Rules

81. Rule 36(2) Church Representation Rules provides for General Synod to determine by resolution the number of members to be elected by each diocese to the House of Laity, the number to be elected by each diocese being “as nearly as possible proportionate to the total number of names on the rolls of the parishes of the diocese in question.” The previous

mechanism for determining the numbers of names on the electoral rolls of the dioceses was contained, prior to 2004, by Rule 36(3), which provided that:

“The secretary of each diocesan synod shall, not later than the 1st August in the fourth year after the last preceding election of the House of Laity, certify to the secretary of the General Synod the total number of names on the rolls of the parishes of the diocese.”

82. That reflected Rule 4 Church Representation Rules, which requires each PCC, not later than 1st June, to “notify in writing the secretary of the diocesan synod the number of names on the roll of each parish as at the date of the annual meeting.”
83. However, Rule 36(3) was repealed by paragraph 12(c) of the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2004, which came into force on 1st August 2004. Its repeal was proposed by the Legislative Drafting Group charged with preparing draft legislation to give effect to those recommendations of the Bridge Review which the Synod had accepted. In paragraphs 114-5 of its report (GS 1484-7X) it stated:

“114. It was also put to the Group that Rule 36(3) of the CRRs needed to be changed: this requires diocesan secretaries to certify to “the secretary [sic] of the General Synod”, no later than 1st August in the fourth year after the last ‘general election’, the total number of names on electoral rolls in their diocese (for the purpose of ensuring that the number of members of the House of Laity to be elected by diocesan electors is proportionate to the numbers on the electoral rolls of the dioceses).

115. The Group was of the view this would normally now represent an unnecessarily early deadline and would result in inaccurate figures being used. At first sight, it would accordingly seem desirable to postpone the date by which this has to be done. However, the Group understood the intention to be that, with effect from the next general election in 2005, rather than obtaining this data from dioceses, the figures for electoral roll membership collected by the Research and Statistics Unit of the Archbishops’ Council would be used instead. The Group therefore agreed to recommend that Rule 36(3) be deleted in its entirety.”

84. The provision for the repeal was included in the draft legislation as introduced and was not subject to any proposals for its amendment in the course of the Revision Committee Stage or the Revision Stage. The Committee considered that it must therefore be taken to have commended itself to the Synod.
85. Thus since 2004 there has been no formal way for the General Synod to ascertain the total number of names on the rolls of each diocese. In practice, the numbers have been taken from the annual ‘Statistics for Mission’ form. With the benefit of hindsight this has not been entirely satisfactory since that form asks for the electoral roll numbers in the previous year, so that the section 36(2) calculation is being made on figures that are at least 18 months out of date. This means that the figures used for calculating the allocation of seats in the House

of Laity are around 12 months older than those used for calculating the allocation of seats in the Lower House of each Convocation. As more up-to-date figures are often available in the dioceses, this has also led to concerns being expressed about the basis of allocation.

86. The Steering Committee accordingly proposed to the Committee that the former Rule 36(3) be re-instated (in a slightly amended form, referring to ‘the Clerk to the General Synod’) proposing an amendment to the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution to that end. The Committee agreed to accept the proposal.
87. In doing so it recognised that, since the provision would require returns to be made by 1st August in the relevant year, in practice a new provision could not come into force in relation to the 2015 elections. But it was advised that that need not present a problem in practice since the diocesan secretaries can be asked to produce the information that the restored provision would otherwise have supplied. (Diocesan secretaries are already asked to provide clergy numbers for the purpose of allocating seats and could be asked to provide numbers on electoral rolls at the same time.)

Nominating candidates by electronic means

88. At the November 2013 group of sessions the General Synod resolved:

‘That this Synod request legislative proposals to be brought forward to:

- (i) make provision by 2020 for elections to the General Synod to be undertaken online; and*
- (j) make provision by 2015 for nominations for elections to the General Synod to be undertaken by email.’*

(This represented a diluted version of the motion originally before it, which had also called for the establishment of an electoral college for elections by the laity to the General Synod and diocesan synods.)

89. To give effect to this mandate, the Steering Committee proposed a number of amendments to the draft Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Resolution, the draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution and the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution. In essence these amendments allowed a duly completed nomination form to be submitted by electronic means, in addition to the other means by which such forms can currently be submitted (ie by post, by facsimile or in person). They also required nomination forms to be sent to electors by email where an elector had authorised that. And whilst they did not dispense with the need for a nomination form to be completed and signed by both the candidate and his or her proposer and seconder, they would mean that there would no longer be a need for the presiding officer to be sent the original paper copy of the nomination form.

90. The Committee noted that the Steering Committee's proposals might not go as far as at least some members of the Synod would have wished or expected. However, it recognised that, as the Steering Committee explained, it would not have been possible, in the time available, to plan and develop an online nominations process as such, involving a secure site on which nominations could be made. Thus whatever was done for the 2015 elections had to involve a paper-based nomination system. And even adapting that to allow online expressions of support for candidates would have been a complex exercise, requiring extensive consultation with the dioceses.
91. In consequence, the Committee accepted the Steering Committee's proposals, which it considered would meet at least some of the objectives intended by the Elections Review Group (including the introduction of arrangements more closely aligned with those for elections from the General Synod, in which the electronic submission of nomination forms is already allowed).
92. The Committee went on to agree amendments involving a small further relaxation of the current rules, namely the removal of the requirement that, where a nomination form is sent by facsimile, the original must be received by the presiding officer within three days of the close of nominations if the candidate's name is to appear on the voting paper.

Publication of election addresses on the diocesan website

93. The Revd Hugh Lee proposed the insertion of the words "at least a week" before the words "before voting papers are issued" in the new Rule 39(6A) to be inserted by paragraph 7 of the Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution, in order to ensure that the presiding officer posted this information in good time before the issue of voting papers.
94. The Committee's attention was drawn to the pressured nature of the election process and the considerable logistical burden to which presiding officers could be subject in larger dioceses as a result of the need to copy and collate election addresses. Requiring them to put the addresses on the website at a particular point would add to their burdens in that respect.
95. Members acknowledged the limitations on presiding officers and questioned whether the majority of electors were as anxious to see the election addresses at the earliest possible moment in the way that Mr Lee appeared to assume: it was suggested that most would not take an active interest in the election until their voting papers arrived. It was also argued that the more requirements that were imposed on presiding officers, the more scope there was for appeals.
96. In the light of those considerations the Committee did not accept Mr Lee's proposal, or a variant of it proposed by a member under which election addresses would have had to have been posted "at least three working days" before voting papers were issued. Instead, as a way of meeting the spirit of Mr Lee's proposal the Committee agreed strongly to recommend that the guidance notes for presiding officers produced by the Legal Office to be amended to encourage the publication of election addresses on the diocesan website "as soon as reasonably practicable".

Proposed requirement for candidates to respond to questions

97. Mrs April Alexander proposed that electors should have the right to require candidates to answer questions in public, whether at a hustings meeting, online or otherwise, so that their views could be discovered. The Committee did not accept this proposal, which seemed to it to be both disproportionate to the mischief at which it was directed and problematic in terms of the absence of any effective sanction. Additionally, the Committee thought it likely to be a potentially fertile source of election appeals, by reference to alleged failures to answer questions, or answer them fully or accurately.
98. The Committee considered it preferable that dioceses be encouraged, by guidance, to recognise that, in the light of technological advances, there were other means than the traditional hustings meeting (which it recognised was increasingly rare) to allow candidates to engage with the electorate and to be creative in their use of the range of alternatives to such meetings.

Notification of election results

99. The Revd Hugh Lee proposed that the results of any diocesan election to the Synod (whether a ‘general election’ or to fill a subsequent casual vacancy) should be sent to “all the candidates, to all members of the Synod in that diocese, and to all the electorate for whom the presiding officer has email addresses”.
100. The Committee noted that the present requirements as regards the circulation of election results involve a full return of the result and the result sheet being sent by the presiding officer within four working days of the declaration of the result of the election to every candidate, the Clerk to the Synod and the General Synod Elections Scrutineer.³ The presiding officer must also display the result sheet in the diocesan office in such manner as the diocesan bishop may approve.⁴
101. The Committee suggested an alternative to Mr Lee’s proposal, involving less expense and effort than an obligation to send the results to all the electors, in the form of a new requirement on the presiding officer to post the election results on the diocesan website (in the case of diocesan elections) and the Church of England website (in the case of other elections), as well as being sent, in the case of a diocesan election to fill a casual vacancy, to those currently elected to represent the diocese in the relevant House. It understood that such a requirement would reflect the general current practice, at least in the case of ‘general elections’ themselves.⁵

³ See Rule 20(9) Clergy Representation Rules and Rule 23(11) Church Representation Rules.

⁴ See Rule 20(10) Clergy Representation Rules and Rule 23(12) Church Representation Rules.

⁵ The *Notes for the Guidance of Dioceses* produced by the Legal Office for the 2010 elections also contained a recommendation “*that the election results be published in the Church press as soon as possible after the declaration of the result for the whole diocese to see ...*”.

102. Mr Lee agreed that this proposal met the spirit of his own, which he accordingly withdrew. The Committee accordingly agreed to amend the Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution and the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution to give effect to its proposal.

103. It went on to agree to make further changes to both those instruments in order to:

- (k) make minor changes to the provisions in the Clergy Representation Rules and the Church Representation Rules with regard to the display of election results in diocesan offices and the General Synod Office;
- (l) clarify the position as regards the publication of the result of elections to fill casual vacancies (which it agreed should replicate the position as regards the publication of the results of a ‘general election’); and
- (m) amend Rule 23(5) Clergy Representation Rules to remove the requirement for the presiding officer to inform the Provincial Registrar of anyone elected to fill a casual vacancy, which it was advised does not serve any useful purpose.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

Amendment of further references to the Central Board of Finance

104. Paragraph 8 of the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution in the form in which it was originally introduced would have removed a reference in Rule 46A(c) of the Church Representation Rules to the Central Board of Finance (‘the CBF’), which has now been wound up. However, that reference will now be removed by the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2014 upon its coming into force. The Committee therefore agreed that paragraph 8 should be deleted.

105. Further references to the CBF remain in Rule 8(3)(f) of the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules. On a proposal from the Steering Committee, the Committee accordingly agreed that those references be replaced by references to the Archbishops’ Council.

Filling of casual vacancies which arise during a quinquennium

106. Provision is made in relation to both the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocations and the House of Laity for a casual vacancy which arises during the last twelve months of the quinquennium not to be filled without the agreement of the archbishop or (in the case of diocesan elections) the relevant members of the bishop’s council. However, that provision is not well expressed, referring as it does to “the period for holding a general election [being] due to begin within 12 months of the vacancy”: the difficulty with that is that, under the Church of England Convocations Act 1966, although the Convocations are dissolved (with

the effect, under s.1(4) of the Synodical Government Measure 1969, that the Synod is also dissolved) at the expiry of five years from their being called together, in theory it remains open to Her Majesty to dissolve them at some earlier time. Thus the reference to “a general election [being] due to begin within 12 months of the vacancy” is not entirely apt.

107. The Committee accordingly agreed amendments to the draft Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Resolution, the draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution and the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution so that, in each of the contexts in which that language is used, a new provision is inserted to ‘gloss’ its meaning by providing that the time when the period for holding a general election is due to begin is the time when the Convocations are dissolved under section 1(2) of the 1966 Act – ie at the end of their five year term.

The Armed Forces Synod

108. Rule 35(1)(d) CRRs contains a reference to ‘the Forces Synodical Council’. In fact, that body is now known as ‘the Armed Forces Synod’. In consequence, references to it in Canon H 2.1(d) and H 3.1 are in the process of being replaced by references to it in its new name by Amending Canon No 31 (which will be enacted at the July group of sessions). The Steering Committee therefore proposes that a further provision amending Rule 35(1)(d) be included in the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution.

Miscellaneous technical amendments

109. The Committee made a number of miscellaneous technical amendments to all four items of draft legislation, with a view to clarifying and/or improving the way in which they are expressed.

Geoffrey Tattersall, QC (Manchester) (Chair)
On behalf of the Committee

June 2014

Appendix I

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND THE COMMITTEE'S DECISIONS

- * – attended the Revision Committee meeting and spoke to their submission under Standing Order 53(b)
 ^ – authorised another member of Synod to attend the Revision Committee meeting and speak to their submission under Standing Order 53(b)
 # – proposed in Committee by a member of the Committee

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 32

Name	Summary of proposal	Committee's decision
Dr Graham Campbell	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Canon Dr Peter Capon*#	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Revd Canon Joyce Jones*	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Ven. Cherry Vann, Archdeacon of Rochdale^	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Revd Paul Benfield	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Steering Committee	Delete paragraphs 1(2) and (3) to maintain the <i>status quo</i> .	Accepted
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Amend the first sentence of Proviso (a) to paragraph 2 in Canon H 2 so that the number of proctors does not exceed 195 in aggregate, and that each diocese shall have at least 1 directly elected proctor.	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen#	To remove the constraints on proportionality currently in place as relating to the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen#	Delete paragraph 1(4)(a) to prevent increased representation from the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Delete paragraph 1(4)(a) to prevent increased representation from the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Mr Gerry O'Brien	Delete paragraph 1(4)(a) to prevent	Rejected

	increased representation from the Diocese in Europe.	
Mrs April Alexander	Delete paragraph 1(6) to maintain the status quo for the University constituencies.	Accepted in part
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Provide for 6 theological advisers (with attendance and speaking, but not voting, rights) to be appointed (possibly for three-year terms).	Rejected
Very Revd Peter Bradley, Dean of Sheffield	Provide for 4 seats in the constituencies; the electorate to be “Senior Members” of Theology Faculties.	Accepted in part
Revd Canon Prof. Richard Burridge*	Provide for an electorate of lay and ordained university teachers and researchers in Theology or a related discipline; lay or ordained university teachers/researchers also on the staff of a theological college; and to provide for self-registration.	Accepted in part
Dr Graham Campbell	Provide for the number of seats in the University constituencies to be commensurate with the overall size of the constituency; also to provide for a clear electoral register.	Accepted in part
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Include representation of theological colleges; decrease number of seats to 2 in southern province and 1 in northern; clergy to decide whether to be on academic electoral roll or diocesan.	Accepted in part
Revd Hugh Lee*	Require self-registration; reduce to 1 constituency, covering all ordained and lay members of university faculties of Theology (and similar) in England.	Accepted in part
Revd Duncan Dormor and Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby*	Provide for an electorate of university (or collegiate) teachers or researchers of Theology or related discipline; recognised university teachers/researchers who are also on the staff of a theological college and Senior Members of the university; and to require self-registration.	Accepted in part

Br Thomas Quin OSB [^]	Provide for an electorate consisting of lay and ordained academic teachers in Theology faculties in universities in England.	Accepted in part
Mr Peter Smith	Provide for an electorate of the ordained members of university Theology faculties, elected from 4 constituencies rather than 6.	Accepted in part
Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden	Provide for an electorate consisting of all teachers (ordained and lay) on Church of England-recognised ordination courses.	Rejected
Dr Anna Thomas-Betts	Amend paragraph 3 of Canon H 2 to provide for a single constituency returning 3 or 4 members; rename the constituency 'Academic Theology Constituency'.	Accepted in part
Revd Dr Kevin Ward	Provide for an electorate of lay and ordained university teachers and researchers in Theology or a related discipline; lay or ordained university teachers/researchers also on the staff of a theological college; and to provide for self-registration.	Accepted in part
Revd Dr Rowan Williams	Delete paragraph 1(6) to maintain the status quo for the University constituencies.	Rejected
Steering Committee	Provide for a single, clerical, constituency, electing four members, with at least one member elected from each province, and no constraint on the number elected from one university (or constituent colleges thereof).	Accepted
Steering Committee	Require that the electorate be priests or deacons having authority to officiate within a diocese from the bishop of a diocese in the Church of England.	Accepted
Mr Clive Scowen [#]	Amend the electorate requirement to "in holy orders".	Rejected
Canon Dr Peter Capon [#]	Extend electorate to include those academic staff employed to teach and research at Anglican Theological colleges or courses.	Rejected

Steering Committee	Require that the electorate be either employed to teach and research by a university (or constituent college thereof), or a fellow of a college in a collegiate university.	Accepted
Steering Committee	Require that the electorate be a recognised teacher, by reference to their membership of Congregation, Regent House of Convocation.	Accepted
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Amend paragraph 2(2) to maintain the status quo for southern suffragan bishops; increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Rejected
Revd Canon Joyce Jones*	Amend paragraph 2(2) to maintain the status quo for southern suffragan bishops; increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 2.	Rejected
Most Revd and Rt Hon John Sentamu, Archbishop of York	Amend paragraph 2(2) to maintain the status quo for southern suffragan bishops.	Rejected
Ven. Cherry Vann, Archdeacon of Rochdale^	Amend paragraph 2(2) to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 2.	Rejected
Mrs Rosemary Lyon	Amend paragraph 2(2) to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Accepted
Dr Graham Campbell	Amend paragraph 2(2) to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Accepted
Revd Paul Benfield	Amend paragraph 2(2) to increase number of northern suffragan bishops.	Accepted
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Amend paragraph 2(2) to increase number of southern suffragans by 2 and number of northern suffragans by 1.	Rejected
Revd Preb. Charles Marnham	Remove the right of <i>ex officio</i> members of Synod to vote.	Rejected
Revd Stephen Trott	Remove the right of <i>ex officio</i> members of Synod to vote.	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Remove <i>ex officio</i> members of Synod (except the Dean of the Arches & Auditor, the Vicars-General, and the Church Estates Commissioners), and give them rights to attend and speak instead.	Withdrawn

Revd Christopher Hobbs	Reduce the number of Religious Communities representatives from 4 to 2.	Rejected
Mr Tim Hind	Redistribute dioceses between the provinces.	Out of order
Mrs Anne Martin	Redistribute dioceses between the provinces.	Out of order
Steering Committee	Amend Canon H 2 to adapt the provision for clergy with PTO to the circumstances of the Dioceses of Sodor & Man and Europe.	Accepted

THE CONVOCATIONS (ELECTIONS TO UPPER HOUSE) (AMENDMENT)
RESOLUTION 201-

Name	Summary of proposal	Committee's decision
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Amend paragraph 1 to maintain the status quo for southern suffragan bishops; increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Rejected
Revd Canon Joyce Jones*	Amend paragraph 1 to maintain the status quo for southern suffragan bishops; increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 2.	Rejected
Ven. Cherry Vann, Archdeacon of Rochdale^	Amend paragraph 1 to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 2.	Rejected
Mrs Rosemary Lyon	Amend paragraph 1 to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Accepted
Dr Graham Campbell	Amend paragraph 1 to increase number of northern suffragan bishops by 1.	Accepted
Revd Paul Benfield	Amend paragraph 1 to increase number of northern suffragan bishops.	Accepted
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Amend paragraph 1 to increase number of southern suffragans by 2 and number of northern suffragans by 1.	Rejected
Steering Committee	Add a new paragraph amending Rule 8(3)(f) to substitute a reference to the Archbishops' Council for the reference to the CBF.	Accepted

**THE CLERGY REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201- AND
THE CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-**

Name	Summary of proposal	Committee's decision
Revd Christopher Hobbs	Reduce the number of Religious Communities representatives from 4 to 2.	Rejected
Steering Committee	To make provision for nominations in Synodical elections to be submitted by email.	Accepted
Mr Clive Scowen#	To dispense with the requirement of sending a hard copy of the nomination if already sent by facsimile.	Accepted
Mrs April Alexander*	To require candidates to answer questions publicly.	Rejected
Revd Hugh Lee*	Amend new Rule 39(6A) to require the Presiding Officer to post election addresses on the diocesan website "at least a week" before the issue of voting papers.	Rejected
Steering Committee	Include a recommendation in guidance notes that election addresses be published as soon as reasonably practicable.	Accepted
Revd Hugh Lee*	Results of diocesan elections to Synod to be sent to all candidates, members of Synod in that diocese, and the electorate.	Withdrawn
Rt Revd Pete Broadbent, Bishop of Willesden#	Results of diocesan elections to Synod to be sent to all candidates, all members of Synod in that diocese, and to be posted on diocesan website; results of other elections to Synod to be sent to all candidates, and to be posted on Church of England website.	Accepted

THE CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-

Name	Summary of proposal	Committee's decision
Dr Graham Campbell	Delete paragraphs 2 and 4 to maintain the status quo for the Laity	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen*#	Amend the first sentence of Rule 36(1) so that the number of proctors does not exceed 195 in aggregate, and that each diocese shall have at least 1 directly elected proctor.	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen#	To remove the constraints on proportionality currently in place as relating to the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Mr Clive Scowen#	Delete paragraph 3 to prevent increasing representation from the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Delete paragraph 3 to prevent increasing representation from the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Mr Gerry O'Brien	Delete paragraph 3 to prevent increasing representation from the Diocese in Europe.	Rejected
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Provide representation for lay people worshipping in 'Fresh Expressions'.	Out of order
Revd Christopher Hobbs*	Create an electoral college formed of members of deanery synods.	Rejected
Revd Hugh Lee*	Extend electorate for the House of Laity to all lay members of PCCs.	Rejected
Steering Committee	Add a new paragraph amending Rule 35(1)(d) to replace the reference to the Forces Synodical Council with one to the Armed Forces Synod.	Accepted
Steering Committee	Reinstate former Rule 36(3) CRRs.	Accepted
Steering Committee	Delete paragraph 8 (which repeals the reference to the CBF in Rule 46A(c) CRRs).	Accepted

Appendix II Destination table

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 32

GS 1902 (as at First Consideration)	GS 1902A (as amended by the Revision Committee)
1(1)	1(1)
1(2)	-
1(3)	-
1(4)	1(2)
1(5)	-
1(6)	-
-	1(3)-(4)
1(7)	1(5)
1(8)-(9)	-
-	1(6)
2(1)-(2)	2(1)-(2)
-	2(3)
3	3

THE CONVOICATIONS (ELECTIONS TO THE UPPER HOUSE) (AMENDMENT)
RESOLUTION 201-

GS 1903 (as at First Consideration)	GS 1903A (as amended by the Revision Committee)
1	1
2	2
-	3
-	4
3(1)-(3)	5(1)-(3)

THE CLERGY REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-

GS 1904 (as at First Consideration)	GS 1904A (as amended by the Revision Committee)
1	1
-	2
-	3
-	4
2	5
-	6
3	7
-	8
-	9
4	10
5	-
6	-
-	11
-	12
-	13
-	14
-	15
7	16

THE CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 201-

GS 1905 (as at First Consideration)	GS 1905A (as amended by the Revision Committee)
1	1
-	2
2	-
3	3
4	-
-	4
-	5
-	6
5	7
-	8
6	9
-	10
-	11
7	12
8	-
-	13
-	14
-	15
9	16
10	17
11	18
12	19
13	20