

GENERAL SYNOD

DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 39

SECOND REPORT OF THE REVISION COMMITTEE

Chair:	Prof. Joyce Hill (Leeds)
Ex officio members (Steering Committee):	The Ven. Dr Jane Steen, Archdeacon of Southwark (Southwark) (Chair) Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle) The Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (<i>ex officio</i>) The Revd Alyson Buxton (Lincoln) Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester)
Appointed members:	The Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich) The Revd Canon Sharon Jones (Manchester) Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London) The Ven. Dr Peter Rouch, Archdeacon of Bournemouth (Winchester)
Consultant:	Mr Stuart Jones (Diocesan Registrar for the Diocese of Norwich)

References in this report to “the Committee” are references to the Revision Committee.

Decisions taken by the Committee were taken unanimously unless otherwise indicated.

Part I

Introduction

1. The draft Church Representation, Ecumenical Relations and Ministers Measure (GS 2046) and draft Amending Canon No. 38 (GS 2047) received first consideration at the February 2017 group of sessions. The Committee exercised its power under SO 56(3) to divide the draft Measure and draft Amending Canon so that the provisions concerned with ecumenical relations became a separate Measure and separate Amending Canon. The resulting draft Ecumenical Relations Measure (GS 2046A) and draft Amending Canon No. 38 (GS 2047A) had their Revision stage at the February 2018 group of sessions, and are now before the Synod for Final Drafting and Final Approval. The remaining clauses and Schedules of the original Measure and paragraphs of the Amending Canon now form new drafts: the draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure (GS 2046AA) and draft Amending Canon No. 39 (GS 2047AA).
2. The new draft Measure gives effect to proposals contained in the second report of the Simplification Task Group. It contains provision:
 - replacing the Church Representation Rules contained in Schedule 3 to the Synodical Government Measure 1969 with a new set of Rules, and

- making amendments to the law concerning the requirement for those to be ordained to be provided with a parochial office.
3. The draft Amending Canon, which also gives effect to proposals contained in the second report of the Simplification Task Group, makes a number of amendments to the Canons. It includes:
 - amendments concerned with the requirements as to the holding of certain services in parish churches to cover the position of multi-parish benefices and benefices that are held in plurality; and
 - amendments to Canons concerned with ordination, and with the exercise of ministry.
 4. Explanations of each provision of the Measure and the Amending Canon as originally introduced were contained in the original explanatory memoranda (GS 2046X and GS 2047X respectively).
 5. In addition to its initial meeting on 25 September 2017 at which the decision was taken to divide the original Measure and Amending Canon, the Committee has met on seven occasions (17 January, 26 January, 12 February, 28 March, 17 April, 20 April and 11 May 2018), and has conducted some business by correspondence under Standing Order 56(4).
 6. As mentioned in the First Report, the Committee received submissions from 15 members (some of whom made more than one submission), and four submissions from non-members (one of whom made more than one submission). Three members exercised the right under Standing Order 55 to attend the September 2017 meeting of the Committee and speak to their proposals: Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln), Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) and Mr Clive Scowen (London).

Summary of decisions taken by the Committee

7. Having previously divided the original Measure and Amending Canon so that the provisions concerned with ecumenical relations became a separate Measure and separate Amending Canon, the Committee made a number of amendments to the remaining provisions relating to the Church Representation Rules, admission to Holy Orders, and the requirement to hold certain services in parish churches and removed provisions concerned with the qualification for appointment as a dean, archdeacon and residentiary canon. Together with the proposals which it accepted, the remaining provisions form the basis for the new draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure (GS 2046AA) and draft Amending Canon No. 39 (GS 2047AA) now before the Synod (in which amendments accepted or made by the Committee are shown in bold).
8. Appendix I contains tables of origin and destination, showing where new provisions have been inserted and how the provisions in the original draft Measure (GS 2046) at First Consideration relate to those in the draft now before the Synod.
9. Appendix II is a text of the Canons as proposed to be amended by Amending Canon No. 39.

Part II

Church Representation and Ministers Measure:

Clause 1 and Schedule 1 (Church Representation Rules)

A. Major issues

Summary of main features of the new Rules

10. The draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure gives effect to proposals that were contained in the second report of the Simplification Task group¹.
11. Clause 1 of and Schedule 1 to the Measure replace the existing Church Representation Rules contained in Schedule 3 to the Synodical Government Measure 1969 with a new set of Rules.
12. The new Church Representation Rules, while preserving various basic features of the old Rules – for example by providing for church electoral rolls, annual parochial church meetings, the membership and business of parochial church councils, elections to deanery and diocesan synods and to the House of Laity of the General Synod – implement a range of reforms.
13. Various procedural requirements relating to the church electoral roll have been eliminated. The rules relating to parish governance are now all set out in a self-contained part of the Rules. Those rules take the form of model rules which represent a simplified form of the existing rules. It will be open to a parochial church meeting to amend, supplement or replace the model rules by way of a scheme made by the meeting, subject to obtaining the approval of the bishop's council. Where a parish does not make a scheme, the model rules will automatically apply. Various provisions that were considered not to be necessary have not been carried forward in the model rules.
14. The new Rules make provision for the creation of joint councils covering two or more connected parishes (for example, parishes in multi-parish benefices). If the parishes involved agree, a joint council can take the place of the individual PCCs which go into abeyance. Such a joint council will be body corporate and thus a legal entity, like a PCC. This differs from the provision for joint councils under the old Rules where joint councils always represented an additional layer of governance.
15. The forms to be used under the Rules have been updated in various respects.

Notes to accompany the new Rules

16. The Committee considered it important that when the new Rules came to be published in booklet form, they should be accompanied by editorial notes – either in the margin or in the footer – to assist the reader where that would be helpful. Notes would, for example, draw attention to relevant references, both within the Rules and in other relevant legislation, or to relevant defined terms that are used in the Rules.

Data Protection

17. The Committee were conscious that the law relating to data protection was due to change with the coming into operation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on 25th May 2018. It therefore asked for advice from the Legal Office on what impact the changes would have in relation to the personal data that would need to be processed under the new

¹ Available at <https://www.churchofengland.org/about/renewal-and-reform/more-about-renewal-reform/simplification>

Rules (for example, the information contained in an application for enrolment on a church electoral roll, the information on the roll itself, or the information kept by the diocesan electoral registration officer).

18. The Committee noted that the regime for protecting personal data contained in the GDPR is not fundamentally different from the existing rules contained in the Data Protection Act 1998. Basically, it is lawful to use an individual's personal data either where that individual has consented to that use of his or her data, or where one or more other lawful grounds for that use of the data exists.
19. One major difference between the GDPR and the 1998 Act is to be found in the provisions concerned with the obtaining of consent from individuals to the use of their personal data. The Committee noted that the new provisions relating to consent are more stringent than the old provisions. In particular, an individual who has given consent to the use of his or her personal data has the right to withdraw consent at any time. And it must be as easy to withdraw as to give consent.
20. Were consent to be relied on as the lawful basis for processing data under the Church Representation Rules, the operation of the consent provisions of the GDPR would be exceptionally burdensome for most parishes, even if the forms contained in the Rules made detailed provision for the giving of consent. It would, for example, be necessary for a form to be readily available to those on the electoral roll to withdraw their consent to the use of the data they had originally provided on the application form. And PCCs and electoral roll officers would have to keep a careful record of current and withdrawn consents.
21. The Committee therefore went on to consider the provisions in the GDPR which, in certain contexts and subject to certain safeguards, permit the use of personal data without the need to obtain the consent of the individuals concerned.
22. The GDPR (in a similar way to the 1998 Act) distinguishes two types of personal data: *personal data*, and '*special category*' *personal data*. Special category data includes data revealing religious beliefs. Where personal data is special category data, in addition to one of the grounds for the lawful use of personal data generally, a special exception relating to special category data also has to be established for the use of that data to be lawful.
23. One of the lawful grounds for the use of personal data generally is where it 'is necessary for compliance with a legal obligation'. Another ground is where it 'is necessary for the performance of a task carried out ... in the exercise of official authority'.
24. Because the Rules are contained in legislation, the obligations they impose on persons such as PCCs, electoral roll officers and diocesan electoral registration officers are legal obligations. And, for similar reasons, the processing of data by a person who is required to do so by the Rules is done in the exercise of official authority. There are therefore lawful grounds, other than consent, for the use of personal data for the purposes of the Rules.
25. However, the Committee noted that the personal data that exists in connection with the Rules is data that reveals individuals' religious beliefs and is therefore special category data. A special exception would therefore also have to be established for the use of that data to be lawful.
26. The GDPR contains a special exception for the use of special category data (without the need for consent) where the data is used in the course of its legitimate activities and with appropriate safeguards by a foundation, association or any other not-for profit body with a political, philosophical, religious or trade union aim and on condition that the processing relates solely to members or to former members of the body or to persons who have regular

contact with it in connection with its purposes and that the personal data are not disclosed outside that body without the consent of the data subjects.

27. The Committee was advised that for the purposes of this exception, the relevant body would be the Church of England. It does not matter for this purpose that the Church of England is arranged internally so that it consists of a large number of different statutory bodies (PCCs, diocesan synods etc.). The wording of the exception in the GDPR indicates that it is not concerned with the particular legal form which the body in question takes, but rather with its aims and how it relates to its members and others.
28. The Committee was advised that the enrolment of members of the Church of England on a church electoral roll and the holding of elections etc. for the purposes of synodical government were clearly legitimate activities of the Church of England.
29. The Committee therefore took the view that the exception for the use of special category data in the course of legitimate activities by a religious body should be relied on.
30. The Committee noted that this exception requires ‘appropriate safeguards’ to be applied to the use of data for these purposes. The draft Rules make provision for limiting the availability of particular pieces of personal data so that, for example, where an electoral roll is displayed, only names but no other personal data are to be included. (See for example what is now rule 1(13).) But in order to comply with the requirement for ‘appropriate safeguards’ the Committee agreed that the Rules should also contain a requirement that personal data must be held securely. It therefore decided that the Rules should also contain a requirement to have regard to any guidance issued by the Archbishops’ Council on holding data securely. (See what is now rule 72.)
31. In summary the Committee decided that:
 - the Rules should not rely on consent for the purposes of compliance with the GDPR;
 - they should, instead, rely on the provisions of the GDPR identified above that would permit the use of personal data for the purposes of the Rules without the need to obtain consent.

Electronic communication

32. The Committee decided that the Rules should make comprehensive provision for the use of communication by email. That has been achieved by the inclusion of what is now rule 76 (communicating by email or post).
33. The giving by an individual of an email address is optional. (See the relevant entry now included in Form 1 (application for enrolment on church electoral roll) and what is now rule 1(12).)
34. If a person has provided an email address, any communication under the Rules may be sent to that email address. And where the Rules require a person’s name and address to be given to another person (for example, by the PCC secretary to the secretary of the deanery synod under what is now rule M10(9)), that includes giving the email address if the person concerned has provided one.
35. Where the Rules require a communication to be in writing, that requirement is satisfied by a communication sent by email if it is received in a form which is legible and capable of being used for subsequent reference. A communication under the Rules that is sent by email to the most recent address provided by the intended recipient is deemed to have been given at the time at which it is sent.

Electronic voting in elections

36. The Committee decided that the Rules should include provision to facilitate the use of electronic voting methods in elections to diocesan synods and to the General Synod.
37. What is now rule 56 requires the General Synod to make rules relating to the conduct of elections to the House of Laity. Those election rules may make provision as to the method by which, and the manner in which, the election is to be conducted. It would be open to the General Synod to make rules under that provision for elections to be conducted by means of electronic voting.
38. What is now rule 42 makes provision about the conduct of elections to diocesan synods. Paragraph (5) provides that if there is a system of electronic voting for elections to the General Synod, a diocesan synod may itself resolve to have a system of electronic voting for elections to that synod. If a diocesan synod does resolve to have a system of electronic voting, the elections to that synod must be conducted in accordance with rules which have been approved by the General Synod.

Revision of church electoral roll and preparation of new roll

39. The Committee made a number of amendments to the provisions concerned with church electoral rolls.
40. It removed provision which, in certain circumstances, required names to be removed from the roll during the course of the year. (See rule 2 which now provides only for the addition of names to the roll during the course of the year.) Names are only to be removed from the roll when the annual revision is carried out. (See rule 4.) The Committee considered this to be a useful simplification.
41. The Committee inserted provision (what is now rule 4(8)) that is intended to avoid a person's name being wrongly removed from a roll, or a person not being informed about the preparation of a new roll, by requiring the PCC, in cases where it is thought a person's entitlement has ceased, to take reasonable steps to establish the relevant facts. So, for example, where a person who is not a resident parishioner has not habitually attended public worship in the parish for the previous six months, the PCC will need to try to contact that person, or someone else likely to have the relevant information, to discover whether that person was prevented from attending by illness or other sufficient cause.
42. The Committee decided that instead of publishing a list of additions and removals following the annual revision of the roll, the PCC should simply publish the roll in its revised form. The Committee also decided that there should be flexibility as to the form in which PCCs must publish a revised roll (which could be in electronic form on a website). Rule 5 contains the relevant provisions.

Mission initiatives

43. The Committee decided that there should be better provision for the representation of mission initiatives on deanery synods. They also decided that those who worship in mission initiatives should be eligible for election to diocesan synods and the General Synod.
44. A mission initiative is established by a bishop's mission order under Part 7 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011. Mission initiatives can take a wide variety of forms. Some are established as charities with a formal membership structure; but they need not take this form. It would not therefore be possible for the Rules themselves to specify how mission initiatives are to be represented or how their members should be identified.

45. So far as their representation on deanery synods is concerned, the Committee decided that the existing provision of the Church Representation Rules – which permits diocesan synods to make schemes for the representation of mission initiatives – should be strengthened. Instead of such schemes being discretionary, where the bishop has so directed, the diocesan synod will be under a duty to make a scheme for the representation of a mission initiative on a deanery synod. The Code of Practice under section 84 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 will have to include guidance on the making of such schemes. And, in addition to that guidance, the bishop and the diocesan synod will, in formulating a scheme for the representation of a mission initiative, be required to have regard to the need to make due provision for the representation of the worshipping community involved in the mission initiative and to the governance of the initiative (which might, for example, involve reflecting its membership arrangements in the scheme).
46. The lay representatives of a mission initiative on a deanery synod will automatically be qualified electors for the purposes of elections to the house of laity of the diocesan synod by virtue of their names being recorded in the register of lay electors under what is now rule 27(3) and the provision made by what is now rule 39(1). They will be entitled to vote in elections to the House of Laity of the General Synod under what is now rule 54 by virtue of their membership of the house of laity of a deanery synod in the diocese.
47. The Committee decided, consistently with the other decisions it had taken, that a person who worships in a mission initiative should be eligible for election to the house of laity of the diocesan synod and the House of Laity of the General Synod. The Committee considered that the most satisfactory way of achieving that, given what has already been said about the variety of ways in which mission initiatives are constituted, was to follow the precedent which already exists in the Church Representation Rules in relation to those who worship in Royal Peculiars and at Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford. In those cases, a lay person who meets general requirements as to being a communicant etc. and as to age, is qualified for election if the person is declared by the dean to be a habitual worshipper.
48. What is now rule 36(3) accordingly provides that a lay person who is declared by the leader of a mission initiative in the deanery to be part of the worshipping community involved in the initiative is qualified for election by the house of laity of the deanery synod as a member of the diocesan synod. That is subject to the general requirement that the person must be an actual communicant and aged 16 or over. (Provision is made in rule 36(5) to cover the position where a mission initiative is in more than one deanery or a person is part of the worshipping community involved in mission initiatives in different deaneries. Where that is the case, the person must choose one of the deaneries for the purposes of his or her eligibility for election.)
49. Similarly, what is now rule 50 provides that a lay person who has been declared by the leader of a mission initiative to be part of the worshipping community involved in the initiative is qualified for election to the House of Laity of the General Synod. (See paragraph (7).) This is subject the same general qualifications as apply to other lay persons relating to having received holy communion, confirmation and age. (See paragraphs (1) to (4).)

House of Laity of the General Synod

50. The Rules contained in the draft Measure at the First Consideration Stage left it to election rules to be made by the General Synod (which would be made under the new Church Representation Rules) to specify who was entitled to vote in elections to the House of Laity of the General Synod. That was because at the time when the Measure was drafted the

question of who those electors should be was under consideration and it was considered undesirable to include provision which presupposed a particular outcome.

51. In July 2017 an informal ballot of members of the Synod was conducted to discover whether there was a consensus for changing the electorate for the House of Laity. The results of that ballot were included in the report of the Business Committee at the February 2018 group of sessions (GS 2079; see pages 6-7). The report concluded, “In general, the preference was for the status quo (i.e. elections from Deanery Synods) with the strongest preference being expressed in the vote from the House of Laity.”
52. The Committee decided that in the light of that result, and the absence of any clear support for changing the electorate for the House of Laity, the Rules themselves – as is the case under the existing Church Representation Rules – should set out the entitlement to vote in elections to the House of Laity. The Committee accordingly inserted what is now rule 54 (entitlement to vote) which provides that the diocesan electors are the members of the house of laity of each deanery synod in the diocese (subject to certain exceptions). The Committee also inserted rule 55 which makes provision about the nomination of candidates for election to the House of Laity.
53. Should the General Synod at some point in the future come to a different view from that reflected in the result of the July 2017 ballot, it would be open to the Synod to amend the relevant provisions of the Rules by way of resolution under section 7 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969 (as it could any other provision of the Rules).
54. The Committee also considered the provision concerned with the numbers of members of the House of Laity and the apportionment of the number of members between the Province of Canterbury and the Province of York. (See what is now rule 49.) The relevant provision in the existing Church Representation Rules requires the Synod to apportion the number of members between the provinces in the proportion of 70 to 30 (or as close to that as possible). That provision had been restated in the new Rules. The Committee recognised that by reference to numbers on electoral rolls and other measures, that proportion resulted in significant over-representation of the Province of York.
55. The Committee understood why that proportion had been considered suitable in the past but did not wish to bind the General Synod to it in the future. It decided that while the existing proportion of 70 to 30 should remain the default provision, it should be possible for the resolution of Synod under rule 49(3) specifying the total number of directly elected members of the House of Laity also to specify some other proportion if the Synod so decided. Paragraph (4)(b) of rule 49 accordingly allows for that to happen.

Parochial Church Councils – ensuring lay majority

56. The Committee decided that the Rules should contain provision to ensure that the lay members of a PCC form the majority of its members. The Committee considered that although it had generally been understood that this should be the case, the Church Representation Rules in their current form did not contain any provision to prevent the lay members ceasing to be in the majority. The Committee considered that the current position was open to abuse since a bishop could license a large number of curates to a parish who would then be able to outvote the lay members.
57. The Committee accordingly inserted paragraphs (2) and (3) of what is now rule M13. These provisions ensure that the lay members of a PCC will form the majority of its members by providing that a clerk in holy orders is not eligible for membership if, were he or she to become a member, the number of clerical members would equal or exceed the number of lay members. If two or more clerks are licensed to the parish on the same day

and those clerks becoming members of the PCC would result in the number of clerical members equalling or exceeding the number of lay members, none of the clerks licensed on that day become members of the PCC.

Parochial Church Councils – conduct of business by correspondence

58. The Committee considered that it would be desirable to make provision to enable parochial church councils to conduct business by correspondence where that was appropriate. The existing Rules provide for decisions to be taken at meetings; there is no other provision for decisions to be taken by the PCC.
59. The Committee recognised that there were occasions when PCCs needed to take decisions quickly – for example to approve expenditure on urgent repairs – without waiting to hold a meeting. The Committee noted that relevant legislation provided for the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the Church of England Pensions Board to conduct business by correspondence where that was appropriate and considered that PCCs should have a similar facility.
60. The Committee accordingly inserted what is now rule M27 (business by correspondence). That rule provides for the chair of the PCC – if he or she considers that any business can properly be conducted by correspondence – to instruct the PCC secretary to send proposals requiring approval to members. The chair has to specify the period by the end of which any objections are to be received and the number of objections needed to prevent the proposals from being approved. The proposals are treated as having been approved unless objections from the requisite number of members are received within the period specified.
61. The secretary must formally report the outcome to the next meeting of the PCC (with the result that the matter will be recorded in the minutes).

Joint Councils

62. The provisions in the Rules relating to joint councils, in the form they took when the Measure received First Consideration, provided for joint councils to replace the individual PCCs of the parishes which chose to participate in the joint council. All of the functions and all of the rights, property and liabilities of the individual PCCs would be transferred to the joint council and each individual PCC would go into abeyance for as long as the scheme establishing the joint council remained in force in relation to the parish in question.
63. That provision differed significantly from the provision made for team, group and joint councils in the existing Church Representation Rules. The existing provision results in the creation of an additional tier of synodical government where team, group or joint councils are established because, in each case, the individual PCCs also continue to function. The provision for joint councils in the new Rules (which replaces provision for team, group and joint councils, in any of the cases where they could be established, with a single provision for joint councils) did not leave any scope for the continued functioning of the individual PCCs while a joint council was in operation. That was to eliminate the additional tier of synodical government which had previously resulted where team, group and joint councils were established.
64. The Committee was informed by the Church Commissioners Pastoral Team that they had received a number of expressions of concern about the new provision from diocesan mission and pastoral secretaries. The proposed new form of joint council represented an 'all or nothing' option: either a parish gave up all of its PCC's functions to the joint council or it did not participate at all. That might make parochial church meetings much less willing to approve schemes for joint councils, as in many cases they would be reluctant to transfer all

of a PCC's functions, including the control of property, to a joint body; whereas they might, as at present, welcome the transfer of some functions. The Pastoral Team asked whether further consideration could be given to retaining the option for PCCs to transfer only some of their functions to a joint council.

65. The Committee accepted the concerns raised. It decided that they should be addressed by increasing the options available. A scheme establishing a joint council should include provision for the transfer from the PCC of each parish to the joint council of either (a) all property, rights, liabilities and functions, or (b) only such property, rights, liabilities and functions as were specified in the scheme. Option (a) would enable two or more connected parishes to establish the sort of joint council that was originally envisaged by the new Rules (with the individual PCCs going into abeyance). Option (b) would enable connected parishes to form a joint a council but still reserve some functions to their individual PCCs where that was as far as the individual parishes were prepared to go. It would be possible for a joint council to move from option (b) to option (a) at some stage if the parishes wished to make that change.
66. The relevant provision is made by what is now rule M35(2).

Disqualification etc. – safeguarding provisions

67. The Committee spent some time considering the safeguarding provisions in Part 7 of the Rules (which are concerned with disqualification from serving on the various bodies established by the Rules and related matters).
68. The Committee had some concerns about the provisions which enable a bishop to waive a disqualification that arises where a person has been convicted of an offence mentioned in Schedule 1 to the Children and Young Persons Act 1933. While the Committee recognised that there might be circumstances in which it would be appropriate for such a waiver to be granted, the Committee considered that a bishop should be able to revoke the waiver if further material came to light indicating that it should not have been granted.
69. The Committee noted that the disqualification provisions concerned with safeguarding had been inserted into the existing Church Representation Rules quite recently by the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016. That legislation had made similar provision in relation to disqualification and waiver in respect of churchwardens by amending the Churchwardens Measure 2001. The Committee was informed that the question of whether a waiver should be permanent had been considered by the Revision Committee for the Safeguarding Measure who had decided that it should be.
70. Therefore, despite the concerns it had, the Committee decided that it should not amend the waiver provisions in the Church Representation Rules to provide for the revocation of waivers. The Committee accepted that to do so would be in effect to overrule the decision that had been recently taken by another Revision Committee, and one which had specialist safeguarding advice available to it in the course of the consideration of legislation which was specifically focused on safeguarding matters.
71. The Committee nevertheless hoped that the matters which had given rise to its concerns would be given further consideration in the near future in the course of work reviewing safeguarding provision made by church legislation.
72. The Committee did, however, consider that it could properly make drafting amendments to the provisions, in the Rules, the Churchwardens Measure 2001 and the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003, that require the bishop (or archbishop) to consult the diocesan safeguarding adviser and others before granting a waiver or imposing a suspension.

73. The relevant provisions are currently expressed as imposing a requirement on the bishop or archbishop to consult those persons “before giving a waiver” and “before suspending a person” or, in relation to clergy, “before serving a notice” of suspension or “before exercising” a power to suspend. The Committee was concerned that these provisions might be misunderstood as imposing a duty to consult only where the bishop or archbishop was minded to suspend or to grant a waiver (but not if he or she was not minded to do so). Although that was not the intention, the Committee decided that the relevant provisions should be amended so that they were expressed in terms of requiring the bishop or archbishop to carry out the consultation “before deciding whether” to suspend, or to grant a waiver etc. That would make it clear that the duty to consult applied, irrespective of what the bishop had in mind to do.

B. Consideration of the draft Measure clause by clause including proposals for amendment

Clause numbers etc. here refer to the numbers in GS 2046 and GS 2047 before they were divided by the removal into a separate Measure and separate Amending Canon of the provisions concerned with ecumenical relations and before amendments were made to the remaining provisions.

Where a particular rule (or sub-division of a rule) is not expressly mentioned, there were no proposals for amendment in relation to that rule (or sub-division) and the Committee did not make any amendments of its own.

Clause 1

74. The Committee inserted a new subsection (2) in clause 1 to amend section 7 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969. That section enables the General Synod to amend the Church Representation Rules contained in Schedule 3 to the 1969 Measure by resolution. But as matters currently stand, it is not possible for such a resolution to include transitional, transitory or saving provision in connection with the commencement of the amendments made by the resolution. Subsection (2) inserts a new subsection (1A) in section 7 of the 1969 Measure to make that possible, on the basis that it may be helpful for the Synod to have a power to make transitional, transitory and saving provision when future amendments to the Rules are made by resolution.

Schedule 1: New Schedule 3 to the Synodical Government Measure 1969

General points

75. A number of members helpfully pointed out typographical and other minor drafting errors in the new Rules. These have been corrected.
- rule 4(7) – change “(5)” to “(6)”
 - rule 8 – insert “roll” between “electoral” and “officer”
 - rule 13(1)(d), (e) and (g) – change “paragraph” to “rule”
 - rules 13(6) and 16(4) – refer instead to “diocesan electoral registration officer”
 - rules 27 and 28 – change “deanery” to “diocesan”
 - rule 48(b) – change “the person” to “a person”

- rule 58(10) – specify that reference to “is” in paragraph (2) is to second instance of the word
- rule 69(4)(a) – change “of” to “or”
- rule M11(6)(b) – change “special” to “extraordinary”
- rule M22(1)(d) – change “the person” to “a person”
- Form M1 – insert asterisk on line of text relating to election of deanery synod representatives

76. **Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)** proposed that references to “sidesmen” ought to be replaced with “sidespeople” in the interests of inclusivity.
77. The Committee was advised that the term ‘sidesmen’ was of ancient usage and thought to be a corruption of ‘synods-men’. The synods-men/sidesmen were originally those who – in addition to the churchwardens – would be summoned by the archdeacon to serve at his visitation as members of a ‘jury of presentment’ (i.e. a jury which denounced members of the clergy and laity for ecclesiastical offences). Their other function – which still remains – was to serve as assistants to the churchwardens (see Canon E2). Women, as well as men, have always been eligible to serve as churchwardens and sidesmen.
78. The Committee did not consider that it should make an amendment to references to ‘sidesmen’ in the Rules: where a gender neutral term was preferred, the alternative of ‘assistants to the churchwardens’, as used in the title to Canon E 2 could be used. Members accordingly rejected Mr Bacon’s proposal but made an amendment to paragraph 10(2) of Schedule 2 to the Measure (which amends the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure 1956, to include a reference to the alternative term ‘assistants to the churchwardens’. Mr Bacon had also proposed that an amendment would be needed to Canon E 2(1) to remove the reference to the annual meeting having the power to appoint sidesmen. The Committee accepted the proposal, and a consequential amendment was made to Canon E 2 in the Amending Canon.
79. **Mr Clive Scowen (London)** proposed that a provision be included that wherever in the Rules addresses were required to be given or collected, that should include email addresses, and express authority should be given in the Rules for email addresses to be stored and used for communications, elections, etc.
80. Regarding the first part of Mr Scowen’s submission, the Committee was persuaded that email addresses ought to be collected and utilised in communication under the Rules (see paragraphs 36-38 above). The Committee accepted Mr Scowen’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect.
81. Regarding the second part of Mr Scowen’s submission, again the Committee was persuaded that provision ought to be made in the Rules giving authority for email addresses (and indeed other personal data) to be held and used for purposes related to the Rules (see paragraphs 32-35 above). The Committee accepted Mr Scowen’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect.

Rule 1

82. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that there ought to be a cross-reference in the rule to rule 73(2) to make clear that inhabitants of extra-parochial places were deemed to be members of the adjoining parish, as in current rule 1(3).

83. **Mr Clive Scowen** also proposed that there ought to be a cross-reference in the rule to rules 74(6) and 75(1) to make clear that a reference to a person's name being on the electoral roll of a parish included, in the case of a person's name being on the roll of a guild church, the person's name being on the roll of the parish in which the guild church was situated. He also considered that having the definition/provisions relating to guild churches split over two rules was unhelpful.
84. The Committee decided against inserting the proposed cross-references. It considered that as there were numerous references elsewhere in the rules to residence and being on the roll, it would be odd and inconsistent to make special provision here, and therefore resolved to reject Mr Scowen's proposal. Instead the Committee agreed that a reference be included in the accompanying notes (see paragraph 16 above) to explain the situation.
85. Regarding the definition of 'guild church' currently in rule 75, the Committee agreed that it would fit better after rule 74(6), and amended the text accordingly.

Rule 1(3)

86. **Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)** proposed that a requirement that the person "has habitually attended public worship in the parish during the preceding six months" be included in the rule.
87. The Committee was advised that this would take away the right of resident parishioners who were members of the Church of England but who had not habitually attended public worship in the parish in the preceding six months to have their names entered on the church electoral roll. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Greenwood's proposal as it would amount to a substantial departure from previous policy.
88. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** also queried what the definition of "a member of the Church of England", and what the concomitant responsibilities, duties, obligations and expectations, might be.
89. The Committee was advised that the concept of membership was rather a loose one in the Church of England and that no single, overarching conception of membership existed. Members considered a paper on the concept of 'membership' in the Church of England by the Deputy Legal Adviser, and – having considered the issues surrounding the matter – resolved that no action was required.

Rule 1(4)

90. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** also queried what the definition of "habitually attended public worship" might be, and whether a definition might usefully be included within the Rules.
91. The Committee considered a paper by the Revd Judith Egar (formerly a Legal Adviser in the Legal Office) on the background to the concept of habitual worship. The Committee was also advised that the same concept was used in the Church of England Marriage Measure 2008 as one basis on which a person may establish a qualifying connection with a parish and, accordingly, the right to marry in the parish church. The statutory guidance on the Marriage Measure issued by the House of Bishops provided some helpful guidance on what is meant by having habitually attended public worship in a parish for not less than six months. So far as relevant to the issue raised here, that guidance states–

What is required to show that a person has “habitually attended public worship in [the] parish for not less than six months” under the Measure?

60 “**Habitually**” is not defined by the Measure. It means “as a matter of habit” and requires an element of habit and regularity.

61 The **Minister should regard the test as satisfied** if:

- the person concerned has worshipped in the parish over a period of years and regularly attended worship at least three times a year at the same festivals/occasions (e.g. Christmas, Easter, Whitsun, Harvest Festival, Remembrance Sunday), unless he or she was prevented from doing so by e.g. illness; or
- the person concerned has worshipped in the parish for a shorter period, but for 6 months or more, and has attended regularly at least once a month unless prevented by illness etc.

62 The Minister should **not** in any case adopt a stricter test than that which is normally applied in the parish in cases where a person applies for entry on the church electoral roll under the Church Representation Rules on the basis of habitual worship there for at least 6 months.

63 The **worship**:

- need not be in the parish church.
- need not be on Sundays – for example it could be by a person regularly attending a weekday communion service in the parish near his or her place of work.
- must be public worship - it would not for example cover worship in a school or college, restricted to pupils/students, staff and others connected with the school or college;
- must be worship according to the rites of the Church of England. However, the Minister can assume (in the absence of any reason to think to the contrary) that a service satisfies this test if e.g.:
 - it takes place in a Church of England church or place of worship; or
 - it takes place in a formally constituted LEP (except in relation to Holy Communion presided over by a non-Anglican minister); or
 - it is a Church of England service in a shared church building.

If the Minister is in doubt about whether the case falls within the Measure, he or she should consult the diocesan registrar.

92. The Committee agreed that it would be exceptionally difficult to provide a statutory definition of ‘habitual worship’, and resolved not to amend the provision.

Rule 1(5)

93. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the provisions of this rule added to those of rules 1(3) and 1(4).

94. The Committee was advised that rule 1(5) enabled those who were members of churches not in communion with the Church of England (e.g. the Methodist Church of Great Britain) – but who nevertheless were prepared to declare themselves also to be members of the Church of England – to apply for enrolment. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Rule 1(6)

95. **Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle)** suggested that the rule be deleted, and a new rule included immediately after rule 1 relating to a person's entitlement to be included on more than one electoral roll.
96. The Committee was advised that rule 1(6) established the entitlement to be on more than one roll. The consequences of being on more than one roll – which involve the person concerned having to choose one of those rolls for certain purposes – were already dealt with at the relevant places in the Rules (see rules 14(2), 30(6), M12(3)).
97. Dr Angus did not press his proposed amendment. However, regarding the presentational concern about the consequences of being on more than one roll appearing at various points in the Rules, the Committee resolved to insert a signpost to those provisions at the end of rule 1(6).

Rule 1(8)

98. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the words “by the PCC or under the direction of the PCC” were intended to convey: if they were to apply in cases where there was no electoral roll officer, other rules (e.g. existing rule 3(1)) would also need amending). She suggested that if this were so, the provision under the current rules relating to the office of treasurer (i.e. that if no one is appointed to act as such, one of the churchwardens must do so (Appendix II, para 1(e)(ii))) could be employed).
99. The Committee was advised that the position was as set out in paragraph 7 of the Drafting Notes appended to the Explanatory Memorandum (GS 2046X) prepared by Legislative Counsel. The new Rules emphasised the distinction (which already existed in the CRRs) between the PCC – which had the function of keeping the roll – and the electoral roll officer, who discharged that function under the PCC's direction.
100. The words queried by Ms Higgins were not intended to apply to cases where there was no electoral roll officer. The PCC were under a duty to appoint such an officer; but as the function of keeping and revising the roll was conferred on the PCC it could carry out those functions itself rather than giving directions to the electoral roll officer. The Committee accordingly resolved that no action was required.

Rule 1(10)

101. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what would happen to the electoral roll of the old parish in cases where a new parish was created by a pastoral scheme. She suggested that if the names being added to the new roll remained on the old roll until removed by way of rule 2, 4 or 5, then that ought to be made clear.
102. The Committee was advised that this paragraph of rule 1 was concerned with the situation where a new parish was created by carving it out of one or more existing parishes. Rule 1(10) provided for the automatic inclusion on the electoral roll of the new parish of some of the names from the electoral roll of the parish(es) out of which it is carved. But the rule was

silent as to whether those names were also to remain on the roll of the (now reduced) parish out of which the new parish was carved.

103. The Committee considered whether – when a new parish was carved out of an existing parish – the names that were automatically included on the roll of the new parish ought, at the same time, to be automatically removed from the roll of the other, now smaller, parish. The Committee resolved that it should be left up to the parish(es) concerned to make any consequential removals from the roll of the old parish, and that no action was therefore required.

Rule 1(11)

104. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether a person's email address ought also to be specified on the electoral roll of the parish.
105. As per its decision in relation to Mr Scowen's general point about the collection and use of email addresses, the Committee was persuaded that if an applicant for enrolment were to provide an email address on Form 1, that email address ought to be included on the register and therefore available to the electoral roll officer, but not be disclosed when the roll was open for inspection. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 1(12).
106. The Committee also made an amendment of its own, making provision so that postal addresses came into the same category as email addresses, and consequently would not be disclosed when the roll was open for inspection. See what is now rule 1(13).

Rule 2(2)

107. The Committee considered that the rule could be simplified by removing the requirement for names to be removed from the roll during the course of the year, leaving removals to take place on the annual revision of the roll. The Committee made amendments accordingly. See paragraph 40 above.

Rule 2(7)

108. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that the Rule ought to be deleted, considering that rule 2(8) would apply in the case of a person ceasing to reside in the parish.
109. The Committee was advised that rules 2(7) and (8) were concerned with different cases: paragraph (7) was concerned with those who were eligible for inclusion on the roll under rule 1(3); while paragraph (8) covered those who were eligible under rule 1(4). They accordingly resolved to reject Mr Bacon's proposal.

Rule 2(8)

110. **Dr Chris Angus** proposed the inclusion of a paragraph after rule 2(8) stating that if a person was liable to removal from an electoral roll under rule 2(7) or 2(8) they be afforded the opportunity to make a statement as to whether they had been prevented from habitually attending public worship in the parish by illness or some other sufficient cause.
111. The Committee agreed that, in the interests of natural justice, such a person ought, so far as practicable, to be afforded an opportunity to give reasons for their not having habitually attended public worship.

112. Rather than adopting Dr Angus’s particular proposal, the Committee made an amendment of its own, so that the onus would be on the PCC to take reasonable steps to establish the relevant facts before removing a name from the roll in the cases with which Dr Angus was concerned. The Committee resolved that the same requirement ought to apply to individuals liable for removal under rule 2(6), who were not entitled to have their name entered on the roll at the time it was entered. See what is now rule 4(8) and the equivalent amendment in what is now rule 7(2).

Rule 3(2)

113. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the drafting was equivocal, and wondered what would happen, for example, if someone asked to see the list of additions and removals after 15 days.
114. The Committee was advised that under existing CRR 1(8) there was a requirement to display a list of additions and removal to the roll on the church door for at least 14 days. One of the recommendations of the Simplification Task Group was to remove this requirement for display and replace it with a right of inspection. Rule 3(2) therefore required that the list of additions and removals must be available for inspection for 14 days. If someone wished to inspect the list outside that period they would have no right to do so and it would be for the PCC to decide whether to permit such inspection to take place. The Committee accepted the Legal Office’s advice, and resolved that no action was required.
115. The Committee made an amendment to remove the words “and it must be available for inspection for at least 14 days” from the end of the rule, to enable a person to inspect the list of additions outside that period. See what is now rule 2(3).

Rule 4(5)

116. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why only the additions to and removals from the electoral roll since the last revision were to be reviewed at each revision, and not the whole roll against rules 2(3)-(8).
117. The Committee was advised that this provision reproduced the equivalent provision in the existing CRRs. If someone wished to inspect the entire roll, they had no automatic right to do so, and it would be for the PCC to decide whether to permit such inspection to take place. The Committee resolved that no action was required in response to the issue raised. But, in the light of the decision referred to at paragraph 40 above, references to removals made since the previous revision were removed.

Rule 4(6)

118. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the drafting was equivocal, and queried what would happen, for example, if someone asked to see the list of additions and removals after 15 days. She also considered that the “copy of the roll as revised” ought only to include the names of the persons on the roll, not their personal/contact details.
119. Regarding the first part of Ms Higgins’ submission, as per its decision on rule 3(2), the Committee resolved that no action was required.
120. Regarding the second part of her submission, the Committee had resolved in its consideration of rule 1(11) that email addresses, postal addresses and other personal data would not be included on the copy of the revised roll made available for inspection.

121. The Committee made an amendment of its own, described above at paragraph 42. See what is now rule 5.

Rule 5

122. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that there ought to be an end date for the display of the notice required by paragraph (1) – perhaps the date of preparation of the new roll.
123. The Committee did not consider it necessary to introduce further regulation on this matter, and therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule 5(7)

124. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that those whose names were to be removed from the roll under rule 2 ought also to be informed.
125. The Committee had resolved in its consideration of rule 2(8) to make provision requiring the PCC to take reasonable steps to establish the relevant facts before removing from the roll the name of an individual who had not attended in the period of six months

Rule 5(8)

126. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the addresses (and potentially email addresses) of the persons entitled to have their names on the roll would also need entering.
127. The Committee noted that this was covered by the amendment that it had made in relation to rule 1(11).

Rule 5(9)

128. The Committee considered the provision in the rule which required a person prevented from habitually attending worship to “specify the circumstances” in their application form for inclusion on the roll. The Committee considered that it was neither desirable nor appropriate to request detailed information of a sensitive nature in such a case. It therefore made an amendment to the rule (and to Form 1) so that the person must “briefly state” why he or she did not comply with the condition relating to habitual attendance at public worship.

Rule 6

129. The Committee made some drafting amendments to the rule (see what is now rule 8) and to Form 1.

Rule 8

130. The Committee made an amendment of its own, replacing the date 1 June with 1 July: see what is now rule 10. This is in line with the changes that were made to other dates contained in the Rules. Those changes were made to give parishes until the end of May to hold the annual parochial church meeting.

Rule 10(1)

131. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the conduct and content of the annual meeting ought not to be capable of variation, and suggested that the rule ought to apply only to Part 9, Section B: Parochial Church Council. It also suggested that some guidance and templates

be made available, perhaps alongside the Church Commissioners' Code of Practice to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011.

132. The Committee was advised that the Simplification Task Group, whose proposals were given effect by the proposed new Rules, had felt that the existing CRRs reflected a 'one size fits all' approach to parish governance. They were therefore no longer suitable for instances which departed from a 'standard' parish model: large parish churches which wanted a more cathedral-like system of governance; multi-parish benefices; or where pastoral schemes were in operation, for example. The proposed new Rules aimed to permit far greater freedom and flexibility by allowing parishes create their own individual schemes for governance.
133. The Committee agreed that it would be unsatisfactory to introduce further regulation which would have the effect of fettering future schemes set up by parishes, and therefore resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal. However, the Committee did recognise the need for clear guidance, which would enable the Rules themselves to remain nimble, and resolved to recommend that such guidance (including examples of schemes) be provided for when the new Rules came into effect.

Rule 10(2)

134. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the provisions of the rule went too far and would enable a parish to exclude all *ex officio* members and the churchwardens from a PCC, and to vary the qualifications for election and rewrite the provisions for the annual meeting. He proposed that rule 10(2)(a) to (c) be replaced by "(a) rules M1 to M11 (The Annual Meeting)", and that rule 10(2)(d) be amended to include rule M12(1)(e), (f) and (i) as well as rule M12(11).
135. For the same reasons in relation to rule 10(1), the Committee considered that it would be unsatisfactory to restrict the freedom and flexibility which the new rules were intended to provide. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Scowen's proposal.
136. The Committee did, however, make some amendments in consequence of other substantive amendments it made. (See what is now rule 12(2).)

Rule 11

137. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried when the scheme would come into effect if there was no commencement provision in the scheme, and suggested that wording similar to that in rule 22(5) or 38(7) might be employed.
138. The Committee agreed that provision ought to be made to require schemes to include provision for their coming into operation. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 13(6).

Rule 11(2)

139. **The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)** queried whether the bishop's council would consider schemes referred to it effectively.
140. The Committee considered that as the bishop's council would have the benefit of the advice of the diocesan registrar, there was no need to introduce further provision in the rule. The Committee therefore resolved that no action was required.

141. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the reference in the rule to “the bishop’s council and standing committee” (also in rules 30(5), 39(2)(g), 39(5), 40(3), 53(1), 53(2), 73(2), M33(2) and M33(3)) was misleading, as they were the same thing: if one was not aware of this, she suggested, it would appear that the scheme would need to be referred to two separate bodies. She proposed that the reference (wherever it appeared) be amended to read “the bishop’s council (as the standing committee of the diocesan synod)” for clarity.
142. The Committee was advised that the description of the body in question as ‘the bishop’s council and standing committee’ was well-established and used in almost all statutory references. The Committee accepted the Legal Office’s advice, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.
143. The Committee made a drafting amendment of its own, so as to refer to the body in question by use of the singular pronoun instead of the plural wherever this occurred in the rules for the sake of clarity.

Rule 11(3)

144. **The Revd Paul Benfield** queried whether a scheme approved by the bishop’s council without being satisfied of the provisos in subparagraphs (a) and (b) would be *ultra vires* and therefore invalid.
145. The Committee was advised that the bishop’s council would be acting outside its powers – and therefore unlawfully – if it approved a scheme without being satisfied as to the matters in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b). A bishop’s council ought to record in its minutes that it was so satisfied in addition to recording that it had approved a scheme. The Committee resolved that no amendment was required.
146. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that the phrase “due representation of the laity of the parish” was equivocal.
147. The Committee agreed that the drafting was capable of misinterpretation, and resolved to amend the wording to read “due provision for the representation of the laity of the parish” for clarity. See what is now rule 13(4).
148. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that rule 11(3)(a) be amended so that the words “and safeguards their rights” be included after the words “laity of the parish”.
149. The Committee was not clear which rights Mr Scowen was referring to in his submission. The Committee was advised that if the rights of the laity under Part 9 were meant, then the provision would not work, as schemes were by definition concerned with providing alternative provision to that contained in Part 9. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Scowen’s proposal.
150. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that a further sub-paragraph be included at the end of the Rule to read “(c) is necessary in all its particulars to enable the proper governance of the parish”.
151. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed similarly that a further sub-paragraph be included at the end of the Rule to read “(c) ensures effective governance as a charity”.
152. The Committee agreed that an amendment of the sort suggested by Mr Scowen and the Diocese of Worcester was required, and resolved to amend the rule appropriately. See what is now rule 13(4).

Rule 11(4)

153. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that, if after the annual meeting approved the scheme the bishop's council then had to consider and approve it with amendments, the reference in the rule ought to be to "at a subsequent annual parochial church meeting...". Ms Higgins made a similar proposal in relation to rule M33(4).
154. The Committee agreed that it went without saying that the approval would have to be given at a subsequent meeting, and that the same applied to rule M33(4). The Committee therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.
155. The Committee made an amendment of its own to the rule which would require a copy of a scheme to be sent to the diocesan registry and the secretary of the bishop's council. See what is now rule 13(7).
156. The Committee also made an amendment of its own to the rule which would require information relating to the number of persons present and voting/not voting on the approval of a scheme to be sent to the bishop's council. See what is now rule 13(2).

Rule 13(1)

157. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what might happen if a cleric held office/a licence in more than one deanery: rule 33(2) implied that such a person could be a member of more than one, but may not stand for election in more than one. If that were so, she suggested that the Rules ought to state this explicitly; and if not, that some arrangement was needed for the choosing of one deanery over another, with consequential amendments to be made to rule 33(2).
158. The Committee agreed that the position was clear from the rules as drafted, and therefore resolved that no action was required.

Rule 13(2)

159. **Dr Chris Angus** proposed that the wording "for every ten (or part of ten)" clerks was confusing, and proposed reverting to the previous wording "for every ten clerks or part thereof".
160. The Committee was advised that the Legal Office sought to avoid words like "thereof" as not being plain English. Furthermore, it was not clear that the words "or part thereof" in the current CRRs were accurate (albeit the intention was fairly obvious). The Committee resolved to amend the drafting to ensure clarity. See what is now rule 15(2).
161. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that the words "or chosen" ought to be deleted (in this rule, and wherever else they appeared in the Rules in equivalent cases), so as to require an election to take place in the interests of transparency and democratic process.
162. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed similarly that it was unclear why the bishop should determine whether clergy who hold permission to officiate ought to be elected or chosen. He proposed that rules 13(1)(f) and 13(2) be amended to require an election in all cases.
163. The Committee considered that removing the word 'chosen' would restrict the options available to the bishop in approving the method of selection, and reduce the possibility of flexibility or informality. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Bacon's and Mr Scowen's proposals.

164. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the manner of election or choosing of a clerk as per rule 13(1)(f) employed in the Diocese of Worcester (it being the responsibility of the secretary of the diocesan synod) had much to commend it.
165. The Committee was pleased to hear that such a system worked for the Diocese of Worcester, but did not feel it necessary to impose such a system across the board. The Committee therefore resolved that no action was required.

Rule 13(3)

166. **Dr Chris Angus** proposed that the wording “who are qualified for membership of the deanery synod under paragraph (1)(f)” was ambiguous ought to be clarified.
167. The Committee agreed that greater clarity was required, and resolved to amend the drafting of the rule accordingly, referring to “a clerk who is eligible for membership” under that paragraph. (See what is now rule 15(3).)
168. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that references to the “rural dean” in this rule and elsewhere be instead to the “area dean”; or that a cross-reference be included to a definition to make clear that the two terms were co-ordinate.
169. The Committee was advised that the proper term was ‘rural dean’, that being the name of an established (and ancient) office in the Church. As Mr Scowen acknowledged, section 12(4) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2000 provided –

(4) The bishop of a diocese may by order declare that the office of rural dean shall, in any deanery in that diocese, be called the office of area dean; and, accordingly, in any enactment (including this section), Canon or other instrument references to a rural dean shall be construed as including references to an area dean.
170. Accordingly, where the rural dean was called an area dean, any reference in the Rules to a rural dean was to be read as including the area dean. (The index in Part 11 of the Rules includes an entry for “rural dean”, which refers to the definition in the 2000 Measure.) It was also not clear what in practical terms would be achieved by making such amendments. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Scowen’s proposal.

Rule 13(5)

171. **Dr Chris Angus** proposed that the intention of this paragraph – i.e. the synchronisation of returns for the house of clergy with the triennial elections to the house of laity – ought to be made explicit for clarity.
172. The Committee agreed that additional clarity was desirable, resolved to accept Dr Angus’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 20.

Rule 14

173. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed the inclusion of a paragraph equivalent to rule 13(5), requiring the secretary of a deanery synod to give the diocesan electoral registration officer a list of the names and addresses of the members of the house of laity, in an attempt to minimise anomalies and errors.
174. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** made the same suggestion regarding an equivalent to rule 13(5), and also of rule 13(6). If this were not possible, she proposed that the diocesan electoral

registration officer ought to be notified of those who are elected under rules 14(1)(a) and 14(1)(f) and any changes during the course of the year.

175. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** also proposed that the requirement for notification of those lay persons co-opted to the deanery synod (per rule 14(1)(g)) ought to be contained in rule 14, not rule 16(4).
176. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that an equivalent provision to that in rule 13(5) ought to be included in rule 14.
177. The Committee agreed that amendments of the sort proposed in these submissions would be desirable. It considered that a comprehensive rule requiring a list of members of both houses of each deanery synod to be given to the diocesan electoral officer should be included and agreed the necessary amendment. See what is now rule 20.

Rule 14(1)(a)

178. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that a provision be included permitting the annual meeting to impose a limit of terms a deanery synod member might serve.
179. The Committee was persuaded that there ought to be provision for some form of term limit to be imposed, in an effort to encourage growth and energy and to allow flexibility. However, there was some debate as to which body ought to be empowered to decide to impose such a limit, be it the APCM, PCC, deanery synod or diocesan synod.
180. In a vote on whether to amend the rule by making provision akin to that in the Churchwardens Measure 2001, whereby a term limit was imposed but could be disappplied by the PCC, there voted in favour: 7; against: 1. In a vote on the number of consecutive terms being set at two, with only prospective effect, and not applicable in the case of casual vacancies, the Committee voted unanimously in favour.
181. The amendment to give effect to the Committee's decision was made to the Model Rules in Part 9 as it related to proceedings and elections at the annual parochial church meeting. See what is now rule M6(5) and (6).

Rule 14(2)

182. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that if a person was licensed to work in more than one deanery, and that person chose one of the deaneries concerned for the purposes of their membership of the deanery synod, they ought to be required to notify the secretary of the deanery synod(s) concerned and the diocesan electoral registration officer.
183. The Committee did not consider it necessary to introduce such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule 15(2) and (3)

184. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the words "in the deanery" at the end of the rule be amended to read "in the respective deaneries" for clarity.
185. The Committee agreed that it would be desirable for the rule to be clearer in that regard and made amendments accordingly. See what is now rule 17(2) and (3).

Rule 15(5)

186. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the purpose of the rule was, when the rest of rule 15 was concerned with the entitlement of various individuals to be members of the deanery synod.
187. The Committee agreed that this seemed a logical place to put the provision, and resolved that no action was required.

Rule 16

188. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed the addition of a paragraph to the rule limiting the term of office of a person co-opted to a deanery synod, but allowing them to be re-co-opted following the triennial house of laity elections, so that the reasons for the co-option might be reconsidered periodically.
189. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Bacon's proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 18(4).

Rule 17(1)(a)

190. **Dr Chris Angus** proposed that the intention of this paragraph – i.e. that the triennial elections to the house of laity should occur in the same year in every parish – ought to be made explicit for clarity.
191. The Committee did not make an amendment but recommended that a reference to the matter be included in the accompanying notes to the new Rules when they are published in booklet form (see paragraph 16 above).

Rule 17(3)

192. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the wording of the rule be amended to read "A diocesan synod must calculate the number of representatives from a parish for the purposes of paragraph (2) in proportion to the number of names on the roll of the parish specified in the notification under rule 8", in the interests of democratic fairness.
193. The Committee considered that amending the rule in line with Mr Scowen's proposal would remove the diocesan synod's discretion in the matter, and would therefore remove flexibility. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Scowen's proposal.

Rule 17(3)(a)

194. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that provision be made for calculating the number of representatives to be elected from newly created parishes that came into being after the notification under rule 8 but before the elections at the annual meeting, and also for adding representatives if a parish was created during the three-year period to serve for a short term.
195. The Committee agreed that these possibilities ought to be provided for, and was advised that an amendment to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 was the most effective way of ensuring this. The Committee therefore resolved to make such an amendment. See what is now paragraph 31 of Schedule 2 to the Measure.

Rule 17(4)

196. The Committee made an amendment of its own to delete this paragraph of the rule, as it considered that a diocese ought to be permitted the flexibility to impose their own limits based on particular circumstances.

Rule 18(1)

197. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that the rule be deleted, thereby leaving the fixing of the number of members of the deanery synod to the common sense of the diocesan synod.
198. The Committee considered that the provisions in the paragraph gave guidance and variety, and ought to be maintained. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Benfield's proposal. In doing so, the Committee noted that it was open to a diocesan synod to make a scheme under rule 19 varying the preceding provisions of that Part of the Rules, including the provision to which Mr Benfield referred. A diocesan synod which wished to do so therefore had the means at its disposal to fix different numbers in relation to the deanery synods in the diocese.

Rule 19

199. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the rule ought to apply expressly to rule 18 so as to enable a diocese to vary the numerical constraints in rule 18 where it needed to do so and circumstances so required.
200. The Committee was advised that the reference to "the preceding provisions of this Part of the Rules" already ensured that the power in this rule applied to rule 18. The Committee did not consider that there should be any rules to which the power in this rule should not apply. The Committee therefore rejected Mr Scowen's proposal.

Rule 20(1)

201. The Committee made an amendment of its own which would require the diocesan synod to make a scheme for the representation of cathedral clergy on a deanery synod, rather than merely permit them to do so.

Rule 20(2)

202. The Committee made an amendment of its own to separate the provision for Westminster Abbey and St George's Chapel, Windsor and Christ Church, Oxford from the provision relating to cathedrals as these institutions were not constitutionally related to cathedrals to which the Cathedrals Measure 1999 applies.
203. The Committee also made an amendment of its own equivalent to that at rule 21(1) requiring a diocesan synod to make a scheme for the representation of cathedral laity on a deanery synod.

Rule 21

204. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether a scheme for bishop's mission initiatives created under the rules currently in force would continue to apply in perpetuity by virtue of paragraphs 4 and/or 7 of the transitional provisions contained in Schedule 3 of the Measure.

205. The Committee was advised that schemes made under the current CRRs would continue to have effect by virtue of paragraph 8 of Schedule 3. The Committee made a drafting amendment to refer expressly to schemes.

Rule 21(1)

206. **The Revd Barry Hill (Leicester) and the Ven. Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester)** proposed that the provision for representation of persons involved in a bishop's mission initiative on the deanery synod ought to be automatic, rather than dependent upon the deanery synod agreeing to a request for such by the bishop.
207. The Committee was advised that it would be difficult to see how such automatic representation would work given that there was no generally applicable form which mission initiatives took, and it was therefore not clear how provision of this nature could be made. However, the Committee decided that there should be better provision for the representation of mission initiatives on deanery synods (see paragraphs 43-49 above), and resolved to amend the provision of the rule to require a diocesan synod, at the direction of the bishop, to make a scheme for the representation on a deanery synod of persons to whom a mission order applied. See what is now rule 24.
208. **The Ven. Dr Peter Rouch** also proposed that provision of representation ought to extend to the less formal 'Fresh Expression of Church' arrangements. He proposed that this might be accomplished by way of the creation of a legal entity/structure in analogy to the parish, to enable such arrangements to have ecclesiastical identity, and subsequently a basis for synodical participation.
209. The Committee agreed that some of the same issues arose in relation to 'Fresh Expressions', as they had no generally applicable form, and that the creation of new legal entities for this purpose did not seem to be necessary or desirable. The Committee did not consider that it would be practical or desirable to make provision in the Rules relating to arrangements that were not formally constituted by bishop's mission orders as mission initiatives.

Rule 22(2)

210. **Dr Chris Angus** suggested that the wording "approves it with a majority of at least two-thirds of its members present and voting" to be potentially problematic, and proposed a clarification.
211. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** made the same observation, and proposed that the wording be changed to "approves it by a majority...", as per rule 11(1).
212. The Committee agreed that the provision could be misinterpreted, and resolved to amend the rule to make the references to majorities clearer. See what is now rule 25(2).

Rule 23(2)(a)

213. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that deanery lay chairs be styled "lay deans".
214. The Committee considered whether the use of the name 'dean' for the lay chair of a deanery synod was apt. The Committee noted that rural deans had particular duties which were set out in Canon C 23; the lay chair of a deanery synod did not have an equivalent set of duties. Styling the lay chair a 'dean' might therefore result in confusion as to what the role entails.
215. The Committee rejected Mr Greenwood's proposal.

Rule 23(2)(b)

- 216. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that the sub-paragraph be deleted, considering it to be overly prescriptive.
- 217. The Committee did not agree that the provision was overly prescriptive but resolved to amend the sub-paragraph to make its meaning more obvious. See what is now rule 26(2)(b).

Rule 23(4)

- 218. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that a provision be included in the rule permitting the deanery synod to set maximum terms of office for continuous service in particular offices and on the standing committee.
- 219. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Greenwood's proposal, and to make an amendment to give the diocesan synod the power to set maximum terms of office for officers of deanery synods. See what is now rule 26(4).

Rule 24

- 220. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that this rule be moved to Part 4 of the Rules ("diocesan synods"), as the rule was concerned with establishing the electorate for the diocesan synod.
- 221. The Committee agreed that paragraphs (5) to (9), which provided for certain formalities in the conduct of elections, fitted better in Part 4 of the Rules (so far as they related to elections to diocesan synods) and in the rules to be made under rule 49 (so far as they related to elections to the House of Laity of the General Synod). However, the Committee considered that it was sensible to retain paragraphs (1) to (4) in this Part of the Rules, as they were concerned with recording the membership of deanery synods. The Committee therefore resolved to make an amendment to effect this. See what are now rules 27 and 39.

Rule 24(2) and (3)

- 222. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether separate registers of clerical and lay electors were really required, or whether the ability to produce registers from an electronic database might be permitted.
- 223. The Committee was advised that while separate registers were required, they did not have to be contained in separate books: producing registers from an electronic database was permitted. The Committee accepted that no action was required.
- 224. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** also proposed that the address required by the Rules ought to be the person's email address in the case of electors who had notified the diocesan electoral registration officer that he or she wished to receive and send nomination papers and receive election addresses by email, and the postal address in all other cases. This would, she proposed, permit the deletion of rule 24(8), which required that both addresses be included on the register.
- 225. The Committee had resolved in its consideration of the Rules generally to make provision for the use of email addresses.

Rule 24(5)

- 226. **Dr Chris Angus** and **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the phrase "nomination papers" ought to be supplemented so that it was clear to which election the papers related.

227. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the rule be amended so that the words “issued under rule 36 or under rules made under rule 49” be inserted after the words “nomination papers” in the interests of clarity.
228. The Committee considered that the removal of the relevant paragraphs of rule 24 into Part 4 of the Rules resulted in the references to nomination papers being clear in that context. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Dr Angus’, Ms Higgins’ and Mr Scowen’s proposals.

Rule 24(9)

229. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried for what period the registers of electors ought to be open for inspection at the diocesan office.
230. The Committee made an amendment providing that the register was to be available for inspection from the issue of nomination papers to the close of nominations. See what is now rule 39(6).

Rule 25(3)

231. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that an election return ought also to be given to the secretary of the deanery synod.
232. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the reference to the “secretary to the diocesan synod” in the rule ought to be to the “secretary to the deanery synod”, as per the current provision in Rule 48(1).
233. The Committee noted that the reference in rule 25(3) to the secretary of the diocesan synod was a printing error and corrected it to refer to the secretary of the deanery synod.

Rules 27 and 28

234. The Committee corrected printing errors so that references to deanery synods became references to diocesan synods.

Rules 28 and 29

235. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that it would be helpful if the chair of the diocesan board of education were an *ex officio* member of the diocesan synod.
236. The Committee resolved to accept the Diocese of Worcester’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what are now rules 31(1)(g) and 32(1)(e).

Rule 28(1)(a)

237. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why a bishop would be an *ex officio* member of the house of clergy of a deanery synod, and asked why if they were not a member of the house of bishops of the diocesan synod they should be on the synod at all.
238. The Committee considered the matter, and was not convinced that a person in episcopal orders who was not the diocesan or suffragan bishop, but who was working in a diocese, ought to be eligible for nomination to the house of clergy of a diocesan synod when there was a provision in rule 27(c) (now rule 30(c)) for such a person to be nominated to the house of bishops. The Committee therefore resolved to leave out paragraph (a).

Rule 28(1)(b)

239. **Dr Chris Angus** queried how the rule would apply in those dioceses which had more than one cathedral.
240. The Committee was advised that in any Act or Measure passed after 1850, words in the singular include the plural. Therefore, where a diocese had more than one cathedral, rule 28(1)(b) was to be read as referring to the deans of the cathedral churches of the diocese. The Committee noted that no action was required.

Rule 28(1)(e)

241. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the intention of the rule was to make the clerical members of the religious communities in the province the electors for one member of the diocesan synod in question, or whether the reference should instead be to the clerical members of the religious communities in the diocese.
242. **Mr Clive Scowen** suggested that the provision for one religious or *ex officio*/co-opted member of the house of clergy was not consistent with the concept of *ex officio* membership, as the person would be chosen or elected by an individual/a constituency from a pool of potential members. He proposed that all clergy who were members of the General Synod and resident in the diocese – whether elected, co-opted, religious or *ex officio* – should be *ex officio* members of the diocesan synod.
243. The Committee was advised that rule 28(1)(e) was intended to restate existing CRR 30(4)(a)(v). It appeared that the intention of CRR 30(4)(a)(v) was that any member of the Lower House of Convocation of the Province who had been elected to Convocation by the clerical members of the religious communities of the province and who resided in the diocese was an *ex officio* member of the house of clergy of the diocesan synod. Canon H 2 provided, in respect of each of the provinces, for not more than two persons chosen by the clerical members of religious communities based in the province to be members of the Lower House of each Convocation. The reference in rule 28(1)(e) to “one other member” was therefore not correct as both of the representatives of religious communities could reside in the same diocese and if that were the case both should be *ex officio* members of the house of clergy of the diocesan synod.
244. The Committee noted the advice, and made an amendment of its own to correct the reference in rule 28(1)(e). See what is now rule 31(1)(d).

Rule 28(4)

245. **Dr Chris Angus** queried whether the University of London was the only relevant university with a presence in more than one diocese.
246. The Committee resolved to retain the express provision relating to London University (as that was the one case that is known) and to add a general provision to the same effect for any other cases there might be, so that a university or TEI would be treated as being in the diocese where its main site was, and made an amendment to give it effect. The Committee was advised that this was a test that was used in secular legislation (for determining, for example, the local authority with which an institution should work for certain purposes). See what is now rule 31(4)(b).

Rule 29(1)(e)

247. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried, as per her submission on rule 28(1)(e), whether the intention of the rule was to make all members (both lay and clerical) of the religious communities in the province the electors for one member of the diocesan synod in question, or whether the reference should instead be to the (lay) members of the religious communities in the diocese. She also queried who decided whether the person who held office under this rule would be an *ex officio* or co-opted member of the House of Laity of the General Synod, or else a person chosen by and from the religious communities of the province.
248. **Mr Clive Scowen** made the same suggestion as in regard to rule 28(1)(e), and proposed that all laity who were members of the General Synod and resident in the diocese – whether elected, co-opted, religious or *ex officio* – should be *ex officio* members of the diocesan synod.
249. **The Diocese of Worcester** queried whether the reference to “one” other member of the house of laity was correct, given that current rule 30(5)(a)(iv) provided for “any” other members. If “one” was correct, it queried how the choice was to be made in cases where there was more than one person so qualified. (The same was true of the provisions for the house of clergy in Rule 28(1)(e), a change to current Rule 30(4)(a)(v).)
250. The Committee was advised that rule 29(1)(e) was intended to restate existing CRR 30(5)(a)(iv). It appeared that the intention of CRR 30(5)(a)(iv) was that any member of the House of Laity of the General Synod who had been elected to that House by the lay members of the religious communities and who resided in the diocese was an *ex officio* member of the house of laity of the diocesan synod. Rule 41(1)(b) provided for two persons chosen by the lay members of religious communities based in the province to be members of the House of Laity of the General Synod. The reference in rule 29(1)(e) to “one other member” was therefore not correct as both of the representatives of religious communities could reside in the same diocese and if that were the case both should be *ex officio* members of the house of laity of the diocesan synod.
251. The Committee noted the advice, and made an amendment of its own to correct the reference in rule 29(1)(e). See what is now rule 32(1)(f).

Rule 30(5) and (6)

252. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that a provision be included requiring the person nominated under the rule to notify the secretaries to the deanery and diocesan synods.
253. The Committee considered that it would seem odd for the person nominated to have this responsibility, and that including such a provision would limit any possible flexibility if, for example, a person happened to live in one deanery, work in another and worship in yet another. The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule 31(2)

254. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether diocesan secretaries ought also to be disqualified from standing for election to, being nominated to, or being an *ex officio* member of, a diocesan synod.
255. The Committee considered that as a diocesan secretary did not necessarily have a particular role in relation to the diocesan synod, unlike a diocesan registrar, and that there was

therefore no need for them to be disqualified. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule 33

- 256. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that a provision be included permitting the deanery synod to set maximum terms of office for continuous service as a member of a diocesan synod.
- 257. The Committee considered that as it was often difficult to get people to stand for election to diocesan synods, introducing a limit on the number of terms a person could serve was likely to be unhelpful. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Greenwood's proposal.

Rule 32(2)

- 258. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried which dates the bishop was required to fix and notify the secretary of the deanery synod of, given that some dates were chosen by the presiding officer (see rules 36(3) and 37(3)).
- 259. The Committee was advised that the bishop had to fix the date of the election. The Committee resolved to clarify the position, and made an amendment to requiring the bishop to fix the timetable and date for each election and to ensure that the secretary of each deanery synod was informed. See what is now rule 35(2).

Rule 33(6)

- 260. **Dr Chris Angus** queried whether the requirement of the rule for a person who was on the roll of more than one parish to choose one parish in order to be eligible for election by the house of laity was for the purpose of deciding which deanery they belong to.
- 261. The Committee was advised that that was the purpose of the rule. The Committee therefore resolved that no action was required.

Rule 33

- 262. The Committee made an amendment of its own so that a lay person who was declared by the leader of a mission initiative in the deanery to be part of the worshipping community involved in the initiative would be eligible for election to the diocesan synod. See paragraphs 43 – 49 above.

Rule 34(4)

- 263. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the secretary of the deanery synod was only required to certify to the secretary of the diocesan synod the number of members of the house of clergy of the deanery synod, and not also the number of members of the house of laity.
- 264. The Committee was advised that the reason for the different provisions was that the numbers were decided on different bases. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Rule 35(4)

- 265. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the diocesan electoral registration officer ought to provide the presiding officer with the name and address of qualified electors within seven days, as per rule 24(7).
- 266. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal in part: provision had already been made in a new rule which covered the matter. See what is now rule 39(5).

Rule 36(1)

- 267. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the words “in that election” be included at the end of the rule to make clear that a qualified elector in one deanery might not nominate someone in a different deanery.
- 268. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 40(1) and (2).

Rule 36(3)

- 269. **Dr Chris Angus** queried whether the meaning of “in person” was the same as “by hand”; and whether “fax” ought to be replaced by “electronic means”.
- 270. The Committee was advised that “in person” did mean the same as “by hand”.
- 271. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that the Rule ought to be amended to allow delivery by email or other electronic means.
- 272. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that explicit provision ought to be made for the submission of nomination papers by email (with a requirement in rule 36(4) that the original paper also be submitted to the presiding officer).
- 273. The Committee had already made general provision for the use of electronic means. The Committee therefore resolved that no further action was required.
- 274. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that email needed to be added as a method of delivering a nomination paper, given the provisions of rule 24(8). She queried whether it would be possible for someone to deliver such a paper by email without having notified the diocesan electoral registration officer, and suggested that the drafting be amended to clarify the situation. She also queried whether nomination papers received by email were required to be scanned copies of the original showing an actual signature, or whether a typed/electronic signature was sufficient.
- 275. The Committee made amendments of its own to facilitate email communication and to clarify some procedural points. See what is now rule 40(5) and (7).

Rule 36(4)

- 276. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule (which related to fax) be deleted.
- 277. The amended provisions of what are now rule 40(5) and (7) no longer refer to fax but instead to email and to scanned copies of papers.

Rule 36(5)

- 278. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule be redrafted to take account of the wording of the relevant form and practical realities, including reference to when the statement must be received and expressing a preference for electronic submission where possible.
- 279. This point is addressed in what are now rule 40(5) and (7).

Rule 36(8)

- 280. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the addition of the words “in accordance with paragraph (3)” at the end of the rule.

281. The Committee made some amendments to draw out the meaning of this provision. See what is now rule 40(10).

Rule 36(9)

282. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the address of the qualified elector to be supplied to the candidate ought to be an email address, except in cases where the elector had not notified the diocesan electoral registration officer that they wished to receive and send nomination papers by email.
283. The Committee noted that the point was covered by the general provision it had agreed to make relating to the provision of email addresses.

Rule 37

284. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that a paragraph be included making clear that if the number of candidates in an election was the same or fewer than the number of seats, all of the candidates are deemed to have been elected.
285. The Committee inserted a new short rule as to the requirement for holding an election. See what is now rule 41.

Rule 37(3) and (4)

286. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that the phrase “[a] voting paper... which is marked” in rule 37(3) was equivocal.
287. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule 37(3) be redrafted to make clear the method of returning the voting paper, including reference to when the paper must be received.
288. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that rule 37(4) be redrafted to make clear the requirement that the voting paper be returned in accordance with the provisions of rule 37(3), marked with the voting preferences, signed by the elector on the reverse, and that the elector’s full name be written on the reverse.
289. The Committee agreed to a more general revision of rule 37 which takes into account these submissions. See what is now rule 42.

Rule 38(4)(b) and (c)

290. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** considered the wording “approves it with a majority of at least two-thirds of its members present and voting” in these rules to be potentially problematic, and proposed the wording be changed to “approves it by a majority...”, as per rule 11(1). (This is the same point as raised in relation to rule 22.)
291. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 43(4).

Rule 39(2)

292. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried where the requirement to elect chairs of the houses of clergy and laity were to be found in the Rules; if elsewhere, she proposed that they ought to be included in rule 39(2).
293. The Committee was advised that the existing CRRs did not contain any provision for the election of chairs of the houses of clergy and laity: provision was made in the standing

orders of diocesan synods. However, as the Rules assumed that there would be a chair of each of those houses, the Committee considered it desirable to include provision in rule 39(2) requiring the standing orders to make such provision. The Committee accepted the Legal Office's advice, and resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal; an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 44(2)(b).

Rule 40(1)

- 294. **The Revd Paul Benfield** queried whether an election to fill a casual vacancy by a meeting of the relevant house contravened the provisions of rule 37(2) requiring voting papers.
- 295. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** made a similar point, querying what the relevance of a meeting would be, given the reference in rule 65(1) to casual vacancies being filled in the same manner as at ordinary elections.
- 296. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the rule was unclear as to how an election was to be held, and proposed that in the circumstances, it would be helpful to dis-apply rules 36 and 37 and make provision for the election to proceed along the lines of those at an annual meeting.
- 297. The Committee agreed to make an amendment to clarify the situation and provide for the conduct of by-elections in the simplest way possible. See what is now rule 45 and the reference in what is now rule 42(3).

Rule 41

- 298. **Mr Ian Le Marquand (Channel Islands: Guernsey)** observed that the lay representatives elected under the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure 1931 were not included among the members of the General Synod's House of Laity in the rule, yet were referred to obliquely in rule 44(1). He proposed that the representatives be included among those in rule 41 for reasons of clarity.
- 299. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Le Marquand's proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 46(1)(b).

Rule 41(1)(b)

- 300. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule ought to specify "two persons chosen by and from the lay members of religious communities...".
- 301. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 46(1)(c).

Rule 41(3)

- 302. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether a cross-reference ought to be included in the Rule to the total number of persons elected or chosen in rule 41(3).
- 303. The Committee did not consider the proposed amendment to be necessary.

Rule 42(1)

- 304. The Committee was advised that rule 42(1)(e) needed to be deleted as the Central Board of Finance had been wound up. The Committee made an amendment to that effect.

305. **The Revd Paul Benfield** and **Dr Graham Campbell (Chester)** proposed that the list of *ex officio* members of the House of Laity ought to include the chair of the Dioceses Commission, by virtue of section 9 of the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 2014.
306. The Committee noted that this was an oversight in the drafting of the rule, and made an amendment to given them effect.
307. **The Revd Paul Benfield** queried whether the words “who is an actual communicant” were redundant given the provisions of rule 45(2).
308. The Committee was advised that rule 45(2) was concerned only with elected members of the House of Laity of the General Synod, while rule 42(1) was concerned with *ex officio* members: the words “who is an actual communicant” in rule 42(1)(g) were therefore required. The Committee resolved that no action was required.
309. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that there was some duplication in the rule and rule 74(2).
310. The Committee did not consider the duplication to be problematic, and resolved that no action was required.

Rule 44(1)

311. **Mr Nigel Bacon** considered there to be a drafting error within this rule, which should either read “elected by deanery synods”, or else “elected by diocesan electors”.
312. The Committee agreed that this was an error, which was pointed out in a Notice Paper at the February group of sessions. An amendment was made to correct the error: see what is now rule 49(1).

Rule 44(8)

313. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried where “Presidents” was defined, and proposed its inclusion in rule 75(1).
314. The Committee agreed that there was no need to provide a definition, the Presidents being established under article 4 of the Constitution of the General Synod (which, like the Church Representation Rules, was contained in a Schedule to the Synodical Government Measure 1969). The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule 45(7)

315. **Dr Chris Angus** queried whether the requirement of the rule for a person who was on the roll of more than one parish to choose one parish in order to be eligible for election by the house of laity was for the purpose of deciding which diocese they belonged to; and whether the parish a person chose under this Rule could be different from that chosen under rule 33(6).
316. The Committee was advised that the answer to both questions was yes. The Committee resolved that no action was required.
317. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that if a person’s name was on the electoral roll of more than one parish, and that person chose one of the parishes concerned for the purposes of their standing for election to General Synod, they ought to be required to notify the secretary of the deanery synod(s) concerned and the diocesan electoral registration officer.

318. The Committee was not convinced of the need for such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule 46(2)

319. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)** proposed that the final clause ("and the number... at least three") be deleted, as such a provision would render the Rule inoperable in dioceses with fewer than six lay representatives.
320. The Committee was advised that the rule was not intended to be operable in such a diocese. The Committee accordingly resolved to reject Preb. Cawdell's proposal.

Rule 49(2)(a)

321. The Committee made an amendment of its own to reintroduce the provision contained in the current CRRs that entitlement to vote in an election to the House of Laity of the General Synod was based on membership of the house of laity of a deanery synod (see paragraphs 50-55 above).

Rule 50

322. The Committee made an amendment of its own to restate a provision in the existing rule 44 of the Church Representation Rules to the effect that an appeal could not be brought against the allowance or disallowance of a vote where the outcome of the appeal could not be material to the result of the election. See what is now rule 58(4).

Rule 50(7)

323. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that "in writing" include by email.
324. This is covered by the general provision the Committee made in relation to email.
325. The Committee made an amendment of its own requiring the appellant to state the grounds of appeal. See what is now rule 58(7)(b).

Rule 50(8)

326. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether, if the notice was sent by post, "given" meant the date despatched or received.
327. See below in relation to rule 67.

Rule 50(8)(b)

328. **Dr Chris Angus** and **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how the rule would apply in cases where the roll, register or list had not been made available for inspection, and suggested clarification.
329. The Committee was advised that it was a requirement for the roll, register or list to be made available for inspection (see what are now rules 2(3), 5(1) and 8(1)(b) and (4)), and that it would be undesirable to make provision for what should happen if those rules were not complied with. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Rule 51(2)

330. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that if, as per his suggestion regarding rule 13(2), the element of choice was abandoned and an election required, reference to "choice" could be deleted.

331. See above in relation to rule 13(2).

Rule 51(6)

332. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** proposed that the words “of that house” be deleted and replaced with “of the house of clergy” to prevent perceived conflicts of interest in appeals.
333. The Committee did not consider it necessary to introduce such provision. The Committee resolved to reject Preb. Cawdell’s proposal.

Rule 51(7)

334. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** proposed that the words “of that house” be deleted and replaced with “of the house of laity” to prevent perceived conflicts of interest in appeals.
335. The Committee did not consider it necessary to introduce such provision. The Committee resolved to reject Preb. Cawdell’s proposal.

Rule 51(8)

336. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that “in writing” include by email.
337. The Committee was advised that this was covered by the general provision it had agreed to make in relation to email.

Rule 54(3)

338. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that the rule be deleted, and provision for the bishop’s council to accept appeals proposed after 14 days be included in rule 51 or 53.
339. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the power to extend the period in which a notice of appeal might be given ought to rest with the person to whom notice of the appeal was in fact given, perhaps with the consent of the bishop’s council.
340. The Committee decided to make amendments to make comprehensive provision for dealing with out of time appeals. Out of time appeals would have to be referred to the bishop’s council and standing committee, as with any other appeal. The bishop’s council and standing committee would then be required to appoint an appeal panel. The panel would decide whether to hear an out of time appeal. See what is now rule 60(3) and (4).

Rule 54(7)

341. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule ought to state explicitly that the panel would make a direction both on the principle of payment by another party or the DBF and on the amount to be paid, to cater for extortionate costs bills.
342. The Committee decided to leave out paragraph (7). This would remove the possibility of one party being required to pay another party’s costs and would therefore avoid arguments about how the level of costs should be assessed. Instead, each party would be responsible for his or her own costs. The Committee did not consider that party’s costs should amount to much as they did not consider that parties should generally need to engage solicitors and counsel in relation to appeals under the Rules.

Rule 54(8)

343. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that a provision be included so that, should the appeal panel and diocesan board of finance disagree as to what was a “reasonable amount”, the bishop’s council be empowered to determine the matter.
344. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule be redrafted for clarity to make reference to the panel specifying the sum to be paid. She also queried who paid for unreasonable expenses, and who decided what was in fact “reasonable”. She proposed that the DBF ought to pay in all cases, and the panel then direct that the party reimburse the DBF as applicable.
345. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Bacon’s and Ms Higgins’ proposals in part, and made an amendment requiring the appeal panel to specify the amount of its reasonable expenses which a party must pay. The diocesan board of finance would be liable to pay the panel’s expenses in so far as they were not paid by a party. It was not necessary for the board to have to form a view as to whether a panel’s expenses were reasonable and the Committee removed that provision. See what is now rule 61(6) and (7)

Rule 55

346. **Mr Nigel Bacon** proposed that a paragraph be included to make clear that disqualification as a charity trustee would also have the effect of disqualifying a person from membership of General Synod.
347. The Committee was advised that this was misconceived given that membership of the General Synod did not of itself involve exercising trusteeship of a charity. While it did involve membership of a PCC, disqualification in relation to a PCC was provided for in rule 55(5) (now rule 62(4)); disqualification would arise from the relevant provisions of the Charities Act 2011. The Committee accordingly resolved to reject Mr Bacon’s proposal.

Rule 55(2)

348. **The Revd Paul Benfield** considered the drafting to be equivocal and, if intended to permit the First Church Estates Commissioner to serve as a member of the General Synod, queried why the Rule did not apply to any other employee of the Church Commissioners.
349. The Committee was advised that there was a printing error in rule 55(2) – “respect” should have been “receipt”. The Committee resolved to amend the text as a printing correction. The rule (now rule 62(2)) is intended to permit the First and Third Church Estates Commissioners (to whom salaries approved by the Treasury are payable under statutory provisions) to serve as members of the General Synod.

Rule 56(1)

350. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that there ought to be an explicit provision for the vacation of the seat of a clerical member who ceased to be eligible.
351. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal. See what is now rule 63(1).

Rule 57(7)(b)

352. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the words “standing committee of the” ought to precede the words “deanery synod” in the rule, in accordance with the equivalent provisions for the clergy in rule 57(2)(b).

353. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Scowen’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 64(8).

Rule 58(2)

354. **The Revd Paul Benfield** and **Mr Kenneth Gumbley** proposed that the drafting ought to be amended so that a seat was only vacated if a person ceased to have his or her name on the electoral roll of a parish in the diocese, rather than on the roll of the parish “for which” they were elected.
355. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** made a similar point, querying the wording “of the parish for which the member was elected”. She proposed that reference instead ought to be made to the eligibility criteria in rule 45(5)(a).
356. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Benfield’s and Mr Gumbley’s proposals and Ms Higgins’ proposal in part, and made an amendment to give them effect. See what is now rule 65(2).

Rule 58(3) and 58(4)

357. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that reference to a scheme under rule 20(2) was unnecessary, and that reference instead ought to be made to the eligibility criteria in rule 45(5)(b).
358. The Committee considered that the provision was satisfactory as it stood, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rules 61 and 62

359. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether equivalent provision had been made relating to churchwardens and, if so, whether cross-references ought to be included, as at rule 55(6).
360. The Committee was advised that provision relating to disqualification of churchwardens was made in the Churchwardens Measure 2001, and that the Church Representation Rules were not concerned with eligibility to serve as a churchwarden. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Rule 61(2)

361. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why a person’s seat on the PCC or DCC was not vacated upon their inclusion on a barred list.

Rule 61(4)

362. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why a person’s seat on the PCC or DCC was not vacated upon their conviction on an offence mentioned in Schedule 1 to the Children and Young Persons Act 1933.
363. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposals, and made an amendment to ensure consistency by making express provision for the seat of a member of a PCC or district church council to be vacated where the person was included in a barred list or convicted of certain serious offences and thus disqualified from serving as a member. See what is now rule 68(3).

Rule 61(7)(b)

364. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the waiving by a bishop of a person's disqualification in one diocese ought to apply in other dioceses, particularly if the decision was to apply in perpetuity. If the intention was to bind other bishops, she proposed that the wording of note 3(4) in form M1 ought to be amended.
365. The Committee was advised that the Revision Committee on the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 (which amended the provision of the current CRRs from which rule 61(7) derives) decided that a waiver should be permanent and comprehensive. In paragraph 22 of its Report (GS 1952-3Y), it said—
- “The Steering Committee...proposed that a waiver should be permanent, and that it should not be confined to the diocese in question but should bind other dioceses. That was desirable from the point of view of certainty and consistency – it would be undesirable if bishops could override decisions made by their predecessors or by fellow bishops in other dioceses. The Committee agreed with the Steering Committee.”
366. The Committee accordingly resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal. See paragraphs 67 - 73 above in relation to disqualification and safeguarding more generally.

Rule 62(1)

367. The Committee made an amendment of its own to apply the rules relating to disqualification to joint councils. See what is now rule M37.

Rule 62(3)

368. The Committee made an amendment of its own to clarify the requirement for the bishop to consult before deciding whether or to suspend. See above in paragraphs 67 – 73 for further detail.

Rule 65

369. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether a provision might be included making explicit the requirement to notify the appropriate people of the vacancy and its filling.
370. The Committee did not consider it necessary to include such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.
371. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the title of the rule ought to be amended, as only paragraphs (1), (2) and (4) dealt with casual vacancies; or else that paragraphs (3), (5) and (7) be separated into different rules.
372. The Committee accepted Mr Scowen's proposal in part and made an amendment to move paragraphs 65(5) to (7) under a separate italic heading of “Irregularities”. See what are now rules 73 and 74.

Rule 65(1)

373. **The Revd Paul Benfield** queried whether the rule was compatible with rule 40(1).

374. The Committee resolved to accept Mr Benfield’s proposal, and made an amendment to include words to exempt elections which took place at a meeting of a house of a deanery synod. See what is now rule 73(1).

Rule 65(2)

375. **Dr Chris Angus** considered the drafting to be equivocal.
376. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the drafting be amended to read “to be filled by the time of elections”, rather than “to be filled at the time of elections”.
377. The Committee resolved to accept Dr Angus’ and Ms Higgins’ proposals in part, and made an amendment making provision for casual vacancies to be filled by the time of the next election. See what is now rule 73(2).

Rule 65(3)(b)

378. **Dr Chris Angus** considered that the reference to “modifications” required clarification.
379. The Committee resolved to accept Dr Angus’s proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect. See what is now rule 73(3)(b).

Rule 65(4)

380. The Committee made an amendment of its own to clarify the meaning of this provision. See what is now rule 73(4).

Rule 65(6)

381. The Committee made an amendment of its own to amend the period of six months within which the by-election was to be held to three months. The Committee considered that three months provided a reasonable period of time for the completion of a fresh election where the previous election had been declared void. See what is now rule 74(3).

Rule 66(2)(b)

382. **Mr Clive Scowen** made a proposal in relation to elections where constraints applied. He proposed that if the number of candidates of the particular category nominated was less than the required given number, the seat(s) for which there were no nominations ought to remain vacant and be filled at a by-election, rather than be allocated to candidates who did not fulfil the criterion.
383. The Committee did not consider it necessary to include such a provision, and resolved to reject Mr Scowen’s proposal.

Rule 67

384. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the rule dealt only with post, and not also with email given the provisions in rule 24(8). She proposed that it ought also to cover hand delivery and delivery in person, along with a deemed date of service for each method of giving the notice.
385. The Committee noted that this point was not covered by the decision it had taken to include general provision, in place of rule 67, making general provision for the use of email. See what is now rule 76.

Rule 68(1)

386. The Committee made an amendment to exclude waivers from the general power of variation and revocation (see what is now rule 77(5)). A power to revoke a waiver from a disqualification would be inconsistent with the provision made by the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016. See paragraphs 67-71 above

Rule 69(4)(c)

387. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the bishop should be permitted to alter the time for holding an election to the House of Laity of the General Synod, but not for filling a casual vacancy on the deanery synod.
388. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to remove the right of the bishop to make such an alteration, restating the provision in rule 53(1)(c) of the existing CRRs. See what is now rule 78(4).

Rule 69(6)(a)

389. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the provision was strictly necessary, and considered the limitation to leave a lacuna if the irregularity (i.e. the "invalid" thing) was not sufficiently serious to warrant the invoking of rule 65(5).
390. The Committee was advised that the provision was necessary to make clear the bounds of the bishop's power to make provision for any matter not provided for in the Rules. The Committee accepted the Legal Office's advice, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule 73(2)

391. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the wording of the rule be amended to read "A reference in these Rules to being a resident of a parish or deanery...", so as to prevent unintended consequences of incorporating all extra parochial places into the adjacent respective parishes.
392. The Committee resolved to accept the Diocese of Worcester's proposal in part, and made an amendment to clarify the situation. See what is now rule 82(2).

Rule 74(1)

393. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the definition of "minister" ought also to refer to a curate in charge of a conventional district.
394. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to give effect to it. See what is now rule 83(1).

Rule 74(1)(b)

395. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether a priest in charge could hold only one parish within a benefice.
396. The Committee was advised that this was not in fact possible. The Committee therefore resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment accordingly. See what is now rule 83(1)(a).

Rule M1(1)

397. **Dr Graham Campbell** observed that the period during which the annual meeting must be held (1 January to 31 May) was a month longer than in the current Rules. He queried whether, given that rule 13(4)(b) provided that a member of a deanery synod held office from 1 June following the date of an election, the date of 31 May might be erroneous.
398. **The Ven. Dr Michael Gilbertson (Chester)** made the same observation and queried, if it was intended to extend the period by an extra month, whether an amendment to section 4(1) of the Churchwardens Measure 2001 was necessary, as that Measure required an annual meeting to be held by 30 April for the election of churchwardens.
399. **The Diocese of Worcester** made the same observation and queried whether, given that rule 13(4)(b) provided that a member of a deanery synod held office from 1 June following the date of an election, the date of 31 May might be erroneous. It also queried whether an amendment to section 4(1) of the Churchwardens Measure 2001 was necessary, as that Measure required an annual meeting to be held by 30 April for the election of churchwardens.
400. The Committee was advised that the extension of the time for the holding of the annual meeting to 31 May reflected the policy of the Simplification Task Group. It placed less pressure on parishes and improved the prospects of the examined financial statements being ready. The Committee noted that advice, and resolved to accept Dr Campbell's, Dr Gilbertson's and the Diocese of Worcester's proposals in part. Having agreed with the policy of extending the time for holding the annual meeting, the Committee agreed that there was a need to alter the period for the choosing of churchwardens in the same way, and to change the date from which members of a deanery synod held office. It made amendments to give these decisions effect. See what is now paragraph 21 of Schedule 2 to the Measure.
401. **The Revd Christopher Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)** proposed that the requirement to hold an annual meeting be removed for those churches with fewer than 50 people on the electoral roll and where the PCC had passed a resolution to that end.
402. The Committee did not see how a parish would be able to elect members of its PCC if there was no annual meeting. In any event, a meeting of parishioners needed to be held each year to choose churchwardens, so it was not clear what practical advantage would arise from dispensing with the annual parochial church meeting. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Robinson's proposal.

Rule M2(4)

403. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the words "or curacy" related to: if to a curate in charge of a conventional district, she proposed that this ought to be made clear; if not, she queried what was the relevance of a curacy being vacant, as curates were not involved in the notification process.
404. The Committee was advised that curacy referred to the office of curate in charge of a conventional district. A conventional district was assimilated to the position of a parish by rule 73(1)(a). The Committee had resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal in relation to rule 74(1) to amend the definition of "minister" to include the curate in charge of a conventional district, so no further action was required in relation to this rule.

405. However, the Committee was advised that rule M2(4) was also problematic in referring to the vacancy of the benefice. Where a benefice had a priest in charge, the benefice was nevertheless vacant. It was, however, clear from rule 74(1) that it was intended that a priest in charge should – so far as the Rules are concerned – be in the same position as an incumbent. The Committee accordingly resolved to amend rule M2(4) to cover the position where there was nobody who met the definition of “minister” in rule 74(1) or where the minister was absent etc. Amendments were also made to make provision equivalent to rule M2(4) in rules M4(1) and M10(1) (now M11(4)).

Rule M3(2)

406. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how the special meeting being treated as an annual meeting would work, particularly in terms of the accounts, and of acting in accordance with the provisions of rule M5(1).
407. The Committee agreed with the point raised and decided to address it by deleting rule M3(2)(b).

Rule M4

408. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the lay vice-chair ought to take precedence over the team rector in chairing the PCC of a parish in a team ministry and in the absence of the minister.
409. The Committee considered that as the team rector was the incumbent of the benefice it was natural for him or her to chair the meeting in the absence of a team vicar with special responsibility for chairing the meeting. The Committee therefore rejected Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule M4(2)

410. **The Revd Paul Benfield** considered the Rule to be incomplete.
411. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Benfield’s proposal: rule M4(2) was trailed by rule M4(1)(c)(ii), and was complete in itself.

Rule M4(3)

412. **The Revd Paul Benfield** proposed that there was some text missing from the rule as it did not follow from what was written before.
413. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Benfield’s proposal: rule M4(3) was concerned with an aspect of chairing, provision for which was made in the previous two paragraphs.

Rule M5(1)(a)

414. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the inclusion of the word “electoral” before “roll”.
415. The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal: rules 1(1) and 75(1) (now rule 84(1)) defined “roll”, so no further classification was deemed necessary.

Rule M5(1)(b)

416. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that the words “including the mission statistics for the previous year” be included at the end of the rule.

Rule M5(1)(c)

417. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that the words “plus the financial statistics for the previous year” be included at the end of the rule.
418. The Committee was not convinced of the need for such provision: a parish was empowered to report on whatever matters it considered appropriate, and if such provisions were to be included the Rules they would need to specify with some particularity the nature of statistics in question. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Mr Greenwood’s proposals.

Rule M5(3)

419. **The Diocese of Worcester** observed that the rule does not include the requirement made recently to the current rule 9(2A) that “The annual report... shall include a statement as to whether the council has complied with the duty under section 5 of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 (duty to have regard to House of Bishops’ guidance on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults”, and proposed that it should.
420. The Committee resolved to accept the Diocese of Worcester’s proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect. See what is now rule M5(3).

Rule M5(5)

421. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what would happen if the PCC did not approve the financial statements.
422. The Committee was advised that the position would be that rule M5(5) would not apply. It was likely that the annual meeting, having completed its other business, would adjourn under rule M5(13)(a) and reconvene when the PCC had approved the financial statements.
423. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether it was strictly necessary for copies of the signed statements to be made available online, given sensitivities around signatures.
424. The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal, as typed signatures could be used for this purpose if there were security concerns.

Rule M5(6)

425. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how the requirement to make the statements “available in copy form” in the rule was different to making “a copy of the signed statements available for inspection” in rule M5(5)(a). She proposed that this rule and rule M5(5) be combined, given the overlap.
426. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal in part, and made amendments to address the matter. See what is now rule M5(7).

Rule M5(8)(c)

427. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that there ought to be a cross-reference to a rule determining whether an auditor or independent examiner is required.
428. The Committee was advised that this was misconceived as the rules did not prescribe whether an auditor or independent examiner was required; the relevant requirement was specified by the Business Committee under rule M5(4)(b) (see what is now rule M5(5)(b)). The Committee accordingly rejected Ms Higgins’ proposal.

429. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the rule ought also to exclude the appointment of a person connected to a member of the PCC in terms of the Charities Acts and section 3A(4) of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure 1956.
430. The Committee did not consider that such an exclusion was required, given the provisions contained in rule M5(9). That rule requires a person who is to be appointed as the independent examiner to come within the description given in section 145(1)(a) of the Charities Act 2011 (i.e. an independent person with requisite ability and experience etc.).

Rule M5(10)

431. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that “sidesmen” ought to be replaced with a more non-gender specific term.
432. The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal: see paragraphs 76-78 above.

Rule M5(11)

433. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule be redrafted to read: “In the case of a special meeting for a new parish under rule M3, the meeting must (in addition to its other business) – (a) decide whether to vary the number of representatives of the laity there would otherwise be for the parish under rule M12(4), and a resolution to vary the numbers under this paragraph will have effect for the elections at the special meeting, and (b)...”.
434. **Mr Robert Higham** observed that the drafting of rule M5(11) seemed to suggest that in the case of new parishes, the special meeting had discretion to decide on the number of lay representatives the PCC was to have, whereas rules M12(4) and (5) were more prescriptive. He proposed that this discrepancy was also apparent in the current Rules (rules 9(6)(a) and 14(1)(g) respectively).
435. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ and Mr Higham’s proposals in part, and made an amendment to provide that rule M12(4) (now rule M13(7)) which specified the number of parochial representatives did not apply until the first annual meeting of the new parish. See what is now rule M5(13).

Rule M5(11)(b)

436. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how the meeting would be able to elect parochial representatives of the laity to the deanery synod if the new parish had not been certified as having the right to any representatives, given that it would not have had an electoral roll at the time of the previous annual meeting.
437. The Committee noted that this issue had been overtaken by its decision to leave out rule M3(2).

Rule M6(2)

438. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that a person whose name was on the electoral roll of more than one parish, when choosing which parish they wished to belong to for the purposes of qualification for election to the deanery synod or PCC, ought to notify the secretary to the PCC of each of the parishes on whose electoral roll their name appeared.
439. The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal, as it was not clear what use such information would be to the PCC Secretary.

Rule M6(4)

440. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the provisions of rule M6(5)(b) (now rule M6(7)(b)) did not apply to lay representatives of a deanery synod: the result of the drafting as it stood was that a person could be nominated for election as a lay representative to the deanery synod if they had been disqualified from being the trustee of a charity, but could not be nominated for election as a lay representative to the PCC, despite deanery synod representatives being *ex officio* members of their PCCs and therefore trustees.
441. The Committee was advised that membership of a deanery synod did not of itself involve exercising any functions as a charity trustee. While it did involve *ex officio* membership of a PCC, disqualification in relation to a PCC was provided for in rule 55(5); the necessary disqualification would arise from the relevant provisions of the Charities Act 2011. The Committee accordingly resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule M7(3)(a)

442. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether someone without a pre-existing right to attend the annual meeting could in practice nominate and second a candidate, as the drafting proposed.
443. The Committee made an amendment to require both the person nominating and the person seconding to be persons who were entitled to attend the meeting.

Rule M7(7)

444. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the drafting implied that a clerk in Holy Orders could vote in elections other than those of lay representatives to the PCC. If this were so, she proposed that the drafting of rule M7(6) required amendment.
445. The Committee decided to leave out rule M7(7) on the basis that it was unnecessary. It was clear from rule M7(6) that the electorate were the persons whose names were on the electoral roll.

Rule M8(1)

446. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried who the person presiding over the election would be, and how they were to be appointed: the only provision relating to appointment appeared to be in rule M9(5), which only applied if postal votes were involved.
447. The Committee made an amendment to clarify the position. See what is now rule M7(11).

Rule M8(5)

448. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that email addresses of members also be kept by the secretary to the PCC.
449. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect, which would enable email addresses to be included in the list. See what is now rule M10(7) and (8).

Rule M8(7)

450. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** and **the Diocese of Worcester** queried whether there ought to be a deadline for the secretary to the PCC to give the details of those elected to the deanery synod to the diocesan electoral registration officer and the secretary of the diocesan synod.

451. The Committee did not consider there was any need for such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' and the Diocese of Worcester's proposals.

Rule M8(7)(b)

452. **The Diocese of Worcester** considered that the reference to "the secretary of the diocesan synod" ought to be to "the secretary of the deanery synod".
453. The Committee resolved to accept the Diocese of Worcester's proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect. See what is now rule M10(9).

Rule M9(8)

454. **The Ven. Dr Michael Gilbertson** proposed that the words "signed on the back by the voter" be inserted after "The completed voting paper", in line with the provisions of rule M7(9).
455. The Committee resolved to accept Dr Gilbertson's proposal in part, and made an amendment to provide a more general redrafting of rule M9(8). See what is now rule M9(6).

Rule M10(1)

456. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the duty of convening a special parochial church meeting might usefully be imposed upon the chair of the annual meeting, to cover instances where there was no minister.
457. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect. See what is now rule M11(4).

Rule M12

458. **The Revd Dr Mark Bratton (Coventry)** considered there to be an issue regarding the number of representatives of the laity on a PCC under rule M12(1)(j) to be elected at the annual meeting in cases where the number of names on the electoral roll of the parish increased or decreased past the thresholds in rule M12(4). He proposed that the number of lay representatives elected at each annual meeting be one third of the total number set by rule 12(4), provided that a) a decision under rule M13(2) was not in effect; and b) that not all of the lay representatives were due to be elected.
459. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such a provision, as it was possible for the number of representatives of the laity to be elected to be altered each year. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Dr Bratton's proposal.
460. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that the annual meeting ought to be permitted to alter the size of the PCC to take account of *ex officio* diocesan synod/General Synod representatives; or to amend the rule so that elected deanery synod representatives counted towards the total of representatives elected by the PCC.
461. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Greenwood's proposal, as the annual meeting was already empowered to make such an alteration by way of a scheme under rule 10.
462. The Committee made an amendment of its own to ensure that the lay members of a PCC always formed the majority of its members (see paragraphs 56-57 above).

Rule M12(1)(h)

463. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether making a Reader licensed to the parish or to an area including the parish a member of the PCC ought to be an item of business for the annual meeting included in rule M5.
464. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule M12(1)(i) and Rule M12(3)

465. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** considered that the drafting currently implied that a person who was elected to a deanery synod and whose name was on the electoral roll of more than one parish, in different deaneries, could choose to be a member of the PCC of the parish in a deanery different to the one of which they were an elected member.
466. The Committee agreed with Ms Higgins and made an amendment to address the issue so that a lay person who is elected to a deanery synod by a parish may belong only to the PCC for that parish. But a person who becomes a member of a deanery synod otherwise than by virtue of election must choose the parish whose PCC he or she will join. See what is now rule M13(5) and (6).

Rule M12(2)

467. The Committee made an amendment of its own to provide for the requirement to be an actual communicant to also apply to membership under paragraph (1)(e) and (f). See what is now rule M13(4). This provision is necessary as it is possible, if the bishop gives permission under section 1(4) of the Churchwardens Measure 2001, for a person who is not a communicant to be chosen as a churchwarden.

Rule M12(7)

468. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the drafting currently implied that no other person (including interested congregation members) was permitted to attend the PCC. If this were so, she proposed making this explicit for clarity.
469. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** also queried who was able to issue invitations to attend/attend and speak at meetings of the PCC. She also queried whether archdeacons and bishops were entitled to attend such meetings, or whether they needed to be invited.
470. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposals in part, and made amendments to clarify the provisions relating to attendance and voting at PCC meetings in what is now rule M22.

Rule M12(7) and (8)

471. **The Ven. Dr Michael Gilbertson** proposed that the current drafting of the Rules could be read as suggesting that an incumbent, priest in charge or team vicar within a group ministry would not be permitted to vote at their own PCC meeting. He proposed that rule M12(7) be amended for clarity.
472. The Committee made an amendment to clarify the position in what is now rule M22.

Rule M13(3)

473. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the rule ought also to make clear what the procedure would be if an annual meeting changed from an arrangement where PCC members served three-year terms to one where they served one-year terms.
474. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such a provision, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule M13(4)

475. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what would happen if an annual meeting failed to review its decision that elected lay members of the PCC were to retire at the conclusion of the annual meeting following their election at least once every six years.
476. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to impose sanctions in such a situation.

Rule M13(5)

477. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the words "Unless a decision under paragraph (2) is in force" precede the text of the rule; and that the word "but" be amended to "And", being the start of a new sentence.
478. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal in part, and made an amendment to clarify the matter. See what is now rule M14(5).

Rule M13(7)

479. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule be redrafted to read "The annual meeting may decide that nobody may hold office under rule M12(1)(j) for a continuous period which exceeds such number of years as the annual meeting may decide, but years served prior to the date of the meeting shall not be taken into account for reckoning the continuous period of service."
480. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such an amendment, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rules M16-M19

481. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that provision ought to be made in the Model Rules requiring the PCC to appoint a parish safeguarding adviser, drafted in a similar way to the requirement to appoint a secretary and a treasurer (rule M17), and with the same disqualifications.
482. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such an amendment: the parish safeguarding officer was not an officer of the PCC. Requirements in relation to the appointment of parish safeguarding officers are contained in guidance issued by the House of Bishops under section 5 of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016. That section imposes a duty on parochial church councils to have due regard to that guidance. It would be undesirable to duplicate the effect of that legislation and provisions of the guidance made under it in the Church Representation Rules. The Committee therefore resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal.

Rule M16(2)

483. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that PCC vice-chairs might be styled “lay chairs”.
484. The Committee resolved to reject Mr Greenwood’s proposal, as to make such provision would be misleading: such persons were vice-chairs, the minister being the chair.

Rule M17(3)(a)

485. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how a churchwarden may not be a member of the PCC.
486. The Committee was advised that a churchwarden permitted to hold office under section 1(4) of the Churchwardens Measure 2001 might not be an actual communicant or have his or her name on the electoral roll of the parish. The Committee accepted the Legal Office’s advice, and resolved that no action was required.

Rule M17(5)

487. The Committee made an amendment of its own to remove this paragraph of the rule and leave the matter of the remuneration of the PCC secretary or treasurer to the general principles of charity law. Any necessary guidance could be provided in the accompanying notes when the Rules were published.

Rule M18(4)

488. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the wording from the end of rule M17(5) (“but if it does so, the person is not eligible for membership of the PCC (even by co-option under rule M12(1)(k))”) ought to be included at the end of the rule.
489. The Committee decided to remove paragraph (4), and leave the matter of the remuneration of the electoral roll officer to the general principles of charity law.

Rule M19(2)

490. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the rule ought also to exclude the appointment of a person connected to a member of the PCC in terms of the Charities Acts and section 3A(4) of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure 1956.
491. The Committee did not consider there to be a need to make such a provision: see above on rule M5(8)(c).

Rule M20(1)

492. **Dr Graham Campbell** considered the phrase “a sufficient number of meetings to enable the efficient transaction of its business” to be equivocal, and potentially open to abuse. He proposed that the rule be amended to provide for a minimum of two meetings per year, but that if one of those meetings occurred within four weeks of the annual meeting, it ought not to be counted. **The Reverend Canon Jonathan Alderton Ford** made a similar point about potential abuse, proposing that four be prescribed as the minimum number of meetings.
493. The Committee did not consider that a requirement to hold two, or four, meetings per year would any the less open to abuse. The Committee resolved to reject Dr Campbell’s and Canon Alderton Ford’s proposals.

Rule M21(2)

494. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried why the place of the meeting had to be specified in the notice, given that there was no public right of attendance.
495. The Committee noted that members needed to know where the meeting was to take place, and resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.

Rule M21(4)

496. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the rule begin with the words "Subject to paragraph (5)...".
497. The Committee considered that "But" at the beginning of paragraph (5) achieved the result without detracting from the content of paragraph (4), and therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins' proposal.
498. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the rule ought to be clearer regarding the content of all motions on the agenda, in line with the paragraph 8(a) of the Legal Advisory Commission's Opinion on Parochial Church Councils from October 2016 which stated "Notices of motion should contain the words of the motion proposed to be moved, but notices fairly indicating the purport of the words may be accepted".
499. The Committee considered that the rule as it stood already set out the basic requirement with an appropriate level of detail by requiring the agenda to include "any motions or other business proposed by members of which the secretary has received notice". The Committee resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal.

Rule M22(1)(b)

500. **Dr Chris Angus** considered this provision to be misguided, and that in the absence of the chair of the PCC, the vice-chair ought to chair the meeting.
501. The Committee was advised that removing the provision would remove the facility for a curate to be temporarily in charge where the bishop and the PCC considered that to be desirable. There might also be parishes where no lay person was prepared to chair the PCC. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Dr Angus's proposal, but decided to rearrange the relevant provisions to reflect the fact that the cases covered by paragraph (1)(b) arose only very occasionally. See what is now rule M24(1)-(3).

Rule M22(3)

502. The Committee noted that this provision was open to potential abuse as it would enable a PCC to resolve, against the minister's wishes, that the minister should vacate the chair generally with the result that the minister would no longer be able to chair any meeting of the PCC. The Committee accordingly amended the provision so that the chair could choose to vacate the chair but could only be required to do so by the PCC with the agreement of the archdeacon. See what is now rule M24(4).

Rule M23

503. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** proposed the addition of a new rule after rule M23(6) empowering a PCC to hold electronic/'virtual' meetings, subject to a specification that any resolutions voted on be subject to a request by any member for a physical meeting to be held.

504. The Committee resolved to accept Preb. Cawdell's proposal in part, and made an amendment to permit some business to be conducted by correspondence where the chair thought it appropriate: the Committee was advised that the Pensions Board, Archbishops' Council and Committees of the General Synod already had powers to this effect. The Committee did not consider it necessary to legislate for video-conferencing or 'virtual' meetings to be held in real time. See what is now rule M27 (business by correspondence). Rule 76 will enable the secretary to conduct the correspondence by email with those PCC members who have provided an email address.

Rule M24(5)(d)

505. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** proposed that the words "who may include the Area Dean or Deanery Lay Chair of the appropriate deanery" be included after "(a), (b) or (c)".
506. The Committee agreed that this was unnecessary as there was nothing to exclude those persons as the rule stood, and resolved to reject Mr Greenwood's proposal.

Rule M26(1)

507. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** proposed that the number of members of the standing committee of the PCC be reduced from five to three, given the difficulty in some rural parishes in getting people to stand for election to the PCC.
508. The Committee did not consider there was a need for such a reduction, and resolved to reject Preb. Cawdell's proposal. If the PCC consisted of only five persons, there was no reason why all five should not also serve on the standing committee.

Rule M26(3)

509. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** proposed that the word "must" be deleted and replaced with "may", given that churchwardens were likely to be *ex officio* members of the PCC in the first place.
510. The Committee did not consider there was a need for such a provision, and resolved to reject Preb. Cawdell's proposal.

Rule M26(5)(a)

511. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried where a PCC may be able to identify which are the duties of the PCC which cannot be transacted by the standing committee.

Rule M26(5)(b)

512. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the PCC could expressly delegate a power of the PCC which is subject to the passing of a resolution by the PCC or compliance by the PCC with some other requirement.
513. The Committee was advised that the Legal Advisory Commission of the General Synod had published advice on these matters, available at https://www.churchofengland.org/media/3332307/parochial_church_councils.pdf (see para 18f). This Opinion could be updated when the new rules had been finalised. The Committee accepted that no action was required.

Rule M29

- 514. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that it would be beneficial if the rules redefined the status of district church councils as part of the corporate personality of the PCC (in effect as an elected committee of the PCC).
- 515. The Committee considered that it was not clear what this proposal was intended to achieve. In any event DCCs are not committees of the PCC. The Committee resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal.
- 516. **The Diocese of Worcester** observed that the rule does not make provision for schemes to be approved by the bishop's council, as in the current rule 18, and proposed that a provision similar to that in rule M33(2) ought to apply.
- 517. The Committee did not consider that there was a need for such a provision, and resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal, leaving the making of the scheme to the parish(es) involved.
- 518. The Committee made an amendment of its own to the rule to separate into two self-contained rules the provisions concerned with making provision for the representation of places of worship on a PCC and the provisions concerned with district church councils. Other improvements to these provisions were also made by the Committee, including by inserting a description of the purpose of a DCC. See what are now rules M32 and M33.

Rule M29(1)

- 519. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried how the rule would apply in cases where a church/building was used by more than one congregation.
- 520. The Committee noted that the Rule did not apply in such cases. It was concerned with making provision for parishes which have different places of worship, not different worshipping congregations in the same place of worship.

Rule M30

- 521. **The Diocese of Worcester** queried whether consideration had been given to including powers for a scheme to provide for a joint annual meeting and a joint annual meeting of parishioners.
- 522. The Committee was advised that rule M30 provided for the establishment of joint councils but not for joint parochial church meetings. Consideration had been given to including powers of the sort referred to, but the Committee did not consider that it was appropriate to remove the requirement for each parish to hold an annual parochial church meeting. The Committee noted that each parish would continue to hold an annual meeting of parishioners to choose churchwardens; holding an annual parochial church meeting at the same time did not represent much of an additional burden. If it was desired to get rid of all of the incidents of there being separate parishes, the parishes should be united by a pastoral scheme. The Committee resolved to reject the Diocese of Worcester's proposal.

Rules M30-M33

- 523. The Committee made an amendment of its own, after consultation with the Church Commissioners Pastoral Team, relating to the creation of joint schemes and the transfer of functions and property etc. (see paragraphs 62-66 above).

Rule M30(1)

524. **Mr Adrian Greenwood** queried whether, in cases where the annual meetings of connected parishes decided to make a scheme for the establishment of a joint council, each parish would still maintain its own electoral roll. This would affect, inter alia, the number of deanery synod representatives to be elected.
525. The Committee was advised that so long as the parishes remained distinct parishes, separate electoral rolls would have to be maintained for them. That was because various rights – including the right to marry and to be buried in the churchyard, and the right to elect churchwardens and parochial representatives of the laity to a deanery synod – arose by virtue of being a parishioner or being included on the church electoral roll of a parish. If it was desired to have a single roll the parishes in question should be united by pastoral scheme. The Committee accordingly rejected Mr Greenwood’s proposal. An amendment was made that to make it clear that the status of the parish and the rights of parishioners were unaffected by a scheme for a joint council: see what is now rule M35(9).

Rule M30(2)

526. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the intention of the rule was: she proposed that, as drafted, the rule implied that the initial scheme for establishing a joint council might not include the minister and representatives from other parishes, but that these might be included subsequently. She proposed that the drafting of rule M30(1) and (2) be reworded for clarity.
527. The Committee noted that was not what the rule provided: rule M30(2) was concerned only with the addition of further parishes to a scheme. The minister and representatives of the original parishes were provided for in M30(1). The Committee resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule M32(1)(a)

528. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that if the intention of the rule was to make provision for who would be the chair of the joint council, and for how long, before another minister became chair, this ought to be made clearer.
529. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect. See what is now rule 36(1)(a).

Rule M32(2)

530. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** considered the drafting to be equivocal. She proposed that if the meaning was to make clear that the existence of a joint council did not mean that a parish would also have joint annual meetings, then this ought to be made clearer.
531. The Committee considered that it was clear from rule M32(2) that the existence of a joint council did not affect the ability of each parish to hold parochial church meetings, and therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

Rule M33

532. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried when the scheme would come into effect if there were no commencement provision in the scheme. She proposed that wording similar to that in rule 22(5) or 38(7) might be employed.

533. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins’ proposal, and made an amendment to provide for the scheme to come into operation on the day specified in the scheme. See what is now rule 38(7).
534. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether the scheme ought to provide for who would be the first members of the joint council, or alternatively when and how the first members would be elected. She also queried what would happen to the terms of office of the first members, and whether such terms might be prematurely terminated.
535. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** also queried whether all members might participate in all business of a joint council, or whether only members from one parish might approve, for example, their own accounts and not those of another parish if that parish had not approved them; or would the two parishes prepare joint accounts? She also queried whether members from one parish would be able to have a say in the appointment of sidesmen in the other parish.
536. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** additionally queried whether the quorum provisions of a scheme ought to provide for a minimum number of attendees from each parish in a joint council.
537. The Committee was advised that these would all be matters for the scheme to deal with as appropriate to the particular case, and that provision was therefore not necessary in the Rules.
538. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether there would need to be a provision to make all references to a PCC (either in Part 9 of the Rules, or more generally) to be read as references to the joint council where such a council existed. If so, she queried whether each of these would work in practice – could two parishes in a joint council, for example, appoint different independent examiners?
539. The Committee made an amendment to add a reference to other enactments to rule M32(5) so that a scheme could make provision of the sort Ms Higgins referred to. See what is now rule M36(5).
540. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried whether there would be a model rule M30 scheme.
541. The Committee was advised that the Church Commissioners intended to prepare one or more model schemes in due course which would be made available online.

Rule M33(1)

542. **Mr Kenneth Gumbley** queried whether the rule ought to apply to schemes made under rule M29, as well as those made under rule M30.
543. The Committee did not consider that it was necessary to include such a provision, and therefore resolved to reject Mr Gumbley’s proposal.

Rule M33(4)

544. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that, if after the annual meeting approved the scheme the bishop’s council then had to consider and approve it with amendments, the reference in the rule ought to be to “at a subsequent annual parochial church meeting...”.
545. As per its consideration of Ms Higgins’ proposal regarding rule 11(4), the Committee agreed that it went without saying that the approval would have to be given at a subsequent meeting. The Committee therefore resolved to reject Ms Higgins’ proposal.

546. The Committee made amendments itself equivalent to those agreed in relation to rule 11 requiring a copy of a scheme to be sent to the diocesan registry and the secretary of the bishop's council, and information relating to the number of persons present and voting/not voting on the approval of a scheme to be sent to the bishop's council.

Forms – design and layout

547. The Committee noted submissions that had been received about the precise design and layout of the Forms in Part 10 of the Rules. The Committee was advised that the Forms as set out in the legislation showed only the information that must be contained in the Forms as used and the order in which that information was required to appear. The Forms as printed in the legislation, the design and layout of which is constrained by the software that has to be used for legislation, were not intended for printing off and use as they stood. Those who use the forms will be able to adjust the layout and design as they wish provided the information in the form and its ordering remains the same as in the statutory forms. Editable versions of the new forms are expected to be made available on the Parish Resources website (as the current forms have been for some time).

Form 1

548. **The Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell** and **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that provision be made in the form for the entry of an email address.
549. The Committee resolved to accept Preb. Cawdell's and Miss Higgins' proposals, and an amendment was made to give them effect.
550. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the text in declaration 2C (and note 2) added to the matter.
551. As per its consideration of rule 1(5), the Committee was advised that the text enabled those who were members of churches not in communion with the Church of England (e.g. the Methodist Church of Great Britain) – but who nevertheless were prepared to declare themselves also to be members of the Church of England – to apply for enrolment. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Form 2

552. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** observed that the requirement to display a copy of the electoral roll "on the principal door of the Parish Church" seemed not to fit with the provisions in the Rules.
553. The Committee made an amendment to permit the PCC to publish the roll in whatever form it decided, a copy being available for inspection on a reasonable request being made to the PCC.
554. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the text in paragraph (e) added to the matter.
555. As per its consideration of rule 1(5) and Form 1, the Committee was advised that the text enabled persons who were members of churches not in communion with the Church of England, but also members of the Church of England, to apply for enrolment. The Committee accepted the Legal Office's advice, and resolved that no action was required.
556. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the replacement of the term "the undersigned".

557. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to replace the term with "the Church Electoral Roll Officer".

Form 3

558. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the replacement of the term "the undersigned".
559. As per its consideration of Form 2, the Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to replace the term with "the Church Electoral Roll Officer".
560. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** observed that the section of the form relating to the publishing of the electoral roll would need to be amended in line with what the final text of the relevant Rule provided.
561. The Committee made an amendment accordingly.
562. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** queried what the text in paragraph (e) added to the matter.
563. As per its consideration of rule 1(5), Form 1 and Form 2, the Committee was advised that the text enabled persons who were members of churches not in communion with the Church of England, but also members of the Church of England, to apply for enrolment. The Committee accepted the Legal Office's advice, and resolved that no action was required.
564. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that the text "by the date shown above for the ending of the revision of the Church Electoral Roll by the Parochial Church Council" in the paragraph relating to forms of application for enrolment be replaced by "the earlier of the dates given above".
565. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and an amendment was made to give it effect.

Form 5

566. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed the addition of the words "of the above deanery synod" after the words "of the House of Clergy / Laity" in note 1.
567. The Committee resolved to accept Ms Higgins' proposal, and made an amendment to give it effect.

Form 6

568. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that it be made more clear in note 6 what "delivered (by post or otherwise)" meant in practice.

Form 7

569. **Ms Gabrielle Higgins** proposed that it be made more clear in note 6 what "delivered (by post or otherwise)" means in practice – is email permitted, for example?
570. This point had been addressed in relation to the Rules more generally. The Committee resolved that no action was required.

Form M1

571. **Dr Chris Angus, Mr Kenneth Gumbley, the Revd Paul Benfield and Ms Gabrielle Higgins** considered that the reference to "For the appointment of sidesmen" on the notice of

the annual meeting (and in note 4) to be erroneous, following the removal of this power from the annual meeting in rule M5(10).

572. The Committee agreed and made an amendment accordingly.

Part 11

573. The Committee made an amendment of its own to include an index which specified where various expressions were defined, glossed or explained in the Rules.

Schedule 2

Para 27(2)

574. **The Diocese of Worcester** proposed that the paragraph be amended so that paragraph 2(9) of Schedule 3 to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 be amended to read “Where a team council has been established by a pastoral scheme or by a scheme made under the Church Representation Rules in respect of a benefice comprising more than one parish, the team council shall appoint such number of persons, but not less than four, as will enable each of those councils to have at least one representative, but not more than two representatives, to act as representatives of those councils in connection with the selection of a vicar in the team ministry and, in sub-paragraph (7), the words “parish representatives” shall be construed accordingly.”
575. The Diocese of Worcester’s proposal lapsed, having been overtaken by the provision now being made relating to joint councils in what is now paragraph 32 of Schedule 2 (see paragraphs 62-66 above).
576. The Committee made various amendments of its own to Schedule 2 to give effect to decisions taken during its consideration of the Rules in relation to waiving disqualifications, the date by which churchwardens had to be chosen, the revocation of suspension and the representation of new parishes on deanery synods.

Schedule 3

Para 3

577. **The Diocese of Worcester** considered the provision to permit existing joint PCCs to continue while the respective PCCs themselves would fall into abeyance. It proposed that instead schemes for existing joint PCCs ought to be revoked.
578. **The Diocese of Worcester** also proposed that schemes for existing team councils and group councils might be permitted to continue prior to revocation for a period of X months within which such a council could resolve to continue as a self-constituted body to enable consultation between the PCCs in the area of the team or group ministry.
579. The Diocese of Worcester’s proposals lapsed, having been overtaken by the provision now being made relating to joint councils (see paragraphs 62-66 above).

Part III
Church Representation and Ministers Measure:
Provisions relating to ministers

Clause 5 of the Measure as introduced (now clause 2) – admission to holy orders

580. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed a drafting amendment to replace “is provide” with “is to be provided”. Legislative Counsel advised that the proposed amendment would make the meaning of the provision clearer. The Committee accepted the amendment.
581. No other proposals for amendment had been received in respect of clause 5 and the Committee did not make any amendments of its own.

Clause 6 of the Measure as introduced – qualification for appointment as dean, archdeacon and residentiary canon

582. **The Reverend Paul Benfield** proposed that the clause should be left out of the Measure on the basis that there was no explanation for removing the requirement contained in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840, and reproduced in the Canons, that a person must have been in holy orders for six years to be eligible for appointment as a dean, archdeacon or residentiary canon.
583. **The Reverend Paul Hutchinson (York)** proposed that the requirement should be retained because of the seniority of these appointments and the complexity involved in carrying out the duties that went with them.
584. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed that the requirement should be retained so far as it related to an appointment as dean.
585. The Committee agreed with Mr Benfield that no adequate explanation for the clause had been provided by the Simplification Task Group and agreed that the requirement to have been in holy orders for six years for these appointments was appropriate and should remain in place. The Committee accordingly decided that the clause should be left out of the draft Measure.
586. Mr Hutchinson had proposed in the alternative to his principal submission that the new section 27 of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840 (which would have been inserted by the Measure and would have removed the six-year requirement) should make it clear that a residentiary canon must nevertheless be in holy orders.
587. This proposal lapsed as a result of the Committee’s decision to leave out clause 6.
588. Mr Scowen further proposed that the requirement (in section 27 of the 1840 Act and in the Canons) that a person must be in priest’s orders to be eligible for appointment as an archdeacon should be removed so that it would be possible for a person in deacon’s orders only to be appointed.
589. The Committee noted that an identical proposal had been the subject of a debate in the General Synod in February 2012. The motion, brought by the Chichester diocesan synod, called for legislation to amend the qualification for appointment as archdeacon so that those in deacon’s orders only would be eligible provided they had been in holy orders for six years. The Committee further noted that the motion was clearly defeated in all three houses of the General Synod.

590. The Committee considered that the arguments against making the proposed change that were considered by the Synod in 2012 had not changed. In the light of that, the Committee did not consider there was any merit in making the change itself.

Clause 7 of the Measure as introduced (now clause 3) – short title, commencement and extent

591. No proposals for amendment were received in respect of clause 7 and the Committee did not make any amendments of its own.

Part IV

Amending Canon No. 39

A. General

592. **Ms Carolyn Graham** proposed that instances of non-gender neutral language currently extant within the Canons should be amended by the Amending Canon so as to become gender neutral.
593. As Ms Graham acknowledged, none of the text which is being inserted by the amending canon used gender specific language; the Amending Canon had been drafted to avoid doing so. What concerned Ms Graham was that there were gender specific terms in the existing text of some the Canons which were the subject of amendment.
594. The Committee considered that while it would be possible to make a range of further amendments to the Canons that are being amended so that references, for example, to “he” / “him” became references to “he or she” / “him or her” throughout, the result of that would be less helpful than Ms Graham proposed. The whole body of Canons was drafted in the 1960s when it was not the practice to employ gender neutral terms in the drafting of legislation. As a result, male gender specific pronouns are employed throughout the Canons. While that is now unhelpful, it would nevertheless be anomalous – and potentially confusing – for only some Canons to be amended so as to use non-gender specific terms while all the other Canons continued to employ different terminology.
595. The Committee considered that Ms Graham had identified a legitimate concern, but that because the concern related to the Canons as a whole the issue should be dealt with at some point in the future by way of revising the complete body of Canons, rather than being attempted piecemeal with the result that different Canons adopted different terminology.

B. Services

Paragraph 1 – Morning and Evening Prayer

596. On paragraph 1 of the Canon, and the amendments to Canon B 11 (services of Morning and Evening Prayer), **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed removing altogether from Canon B 11 the requirement for Morning and Evening Prayer to be said or sung in every parish church at least on all Sundays, given what he considered to be the small number of churches that actually did so in practice.
597. Alternatively, he proposed reducing the requirement to one service.
598. As to Mr Scowen’s proposals, the Committee noted that the Simplification Task Group had consulted on the proposal and were content to retain a requirement for the saying or singing of Morning and Evening Prayer, but with that requirement applying in future to each

benefice rather than to each parish. That represented a significant relaxation of the requirement which ought to assist those who minister in multi-parish benefices.

599. The Committee nevertheless went on to consider whether some further relaxation of the requirement was called for. The Committee did not consider that the requirement that would result from the amendment made by the Amending Canon – i.e. Morning and Evening Prayer daily in one of the churches in a benefice – was unduly onerous. Where that was the case, application could be made to the Bishop under Canon B 14A for dispensation on a regular basis.
600. The Committee considered in some detail a proposal from one of its members to amend Canon B 14A to enable the bishop to grant a general dispensation in the diocese from the requirements of Canon B 11 where the bishop had made alternative arrangements for daily prayer that would sustain the corporate spiritual life of the benefices in the diocese and the pattern of life enjoined upon ministers by Canon C 26.
601. While the Committee considered that such provision might well be workable, it was concerned that relaxing the requirement for daily Morning and Evening Prayer further than the Amending Canon already provided for would amount to a fundamental change in what was supposed to be the normal pattern of worshipping life in the Church of England. The Committee did not consider that it had a mandate for making such a change.
602. The Committee nevertheless agreed to include in this report a form of amendment providing for a general diocesan dispensation where the bishop had made alternative arrangements so that any member of the General Synod who wished to test the Synod's mind on the question could do so by tabling the amendment for the Revision Stage. The Committee accordingly offers the following form of amendment:

In paragraph 3, after sub-paragraph (3), insert—

“(3A) After paragraph 1, insert—

“1A. The reading of Morning and Evening Prayer as required by Canon B 11 may be dispensed with on a general basis for a diocese if the bishop has made such alternative provision for daily prayer as may best serve to sustain the corporate spiritual life of the benefices in the diocese and the pattern of life enjoined upon ministers by Canon C 26.

In making alternative provision as mentioned in this paragraph, the bishop must be satisfied that there is good reason for doing so and shall ensure that no church ceases altogether to be used for public worship.”

603. **The Reverend Paul Hutchinson** proposed that the Canon should be amended so that the celebration of a service of Holy Communion would be deemed to fulfil the requirement to say or sing Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer (as the case may be).
604. The Committee was not attracted to this proposal as a service of Holy Communion was different in its nature from a service of Morning or Evening Prayer. The Committee did not consider that a celebration of Holy Communion ought to be taken as fulfilling the requirements in relation to services of Morning and Evening Prayer.
605. In addition to his proposals outline above, Mr Scowen further proposed an amendment of Canon B 11 so that it included ‘A Service of the Word’ as an alternative to Morning and Evening Prayer.

606. The Committee was advised that ‘A Service of the Word’ had been authorised by the General Synod under Canon B 2 as an alternative to Morning and Evening Prayer. There was therefore no need for any further provision to be made in the Canons to enable A Service of the Word to be used in the way Mr Scowen suggested.

C. Ministers

Paragraph 5 (now paragraph 4) ordination of deacons and priests

607. **Mr Clive Scowen** proposed a drafting amendment equivalent to the amendment he proposed in relation to clause 5 of the draft Measure.
608. For the same reasons as given in relation to clause 5, the Committee accepted the proposed amendment.

Paragraph 6 (now paragraph 5) – ministers exercising ministry

609. No proposals for amendment were received and the Committee made no amendments of its own.

Paragraphs 7 (now paragraph 6) and 8

610. The Committee agreed that paragraphs 7(2) and (3) and 8 should be left out of the Amending Canon in consequence of the decision it had taken to leave out clause 6 of the Measure (which was concerned with the same subject matter).
611. What is now paragraph 6 is accordingly concerned only with deleting references to provosts in various Canons.

New paragraph (now paragraph 7)

612. The Committee inserted what is now paragraph 7 to make the consequential amendment to Canon E 2 that is referred to in paragraph 78 above.

Paragraph 9 (now paragraph 8)

613. No proposals for amendment were received and the Committee made no amendments of its own.

Paragraph 10 (now paragraph 9)

614. No proposals for amendment were received and the Committee made no amendments of its own.

On behalf of the Committee

June 2018

Prof. Joyce Hill (Chair)

APPENDIX I

TABLE OF ORIGINS

<i>Provision at Revision Stage</i>	<i>Provision at First Consideration</i>
1 (1)	1(1)
(2)	(2)
(3)	(3)
(4)	(4)
(5)	(5)
(6)	(6)
(7)	(7)
(8)	(8)
(9)	(9)
(10)	(10)
(11)	(11)
(12)	New
(13)	(12)
2 (1)	2 (1)
(2)	3 (1)
(3)	3 (2)
3 (1)	4 (1)
(2)	4 (2)
(3)	4 (3)
4 (1)	2 (2) and 4 (5)
(2)	2 (3)
(3)	2 (4)
(4)	2 (5)
(5)	2 (6)
(6)	2 (7)
(7)	2 (8)
(8)	New
(9)	2 (9)
(10)	4 (4)
5 (1)	4 (6)
(2)	4 (6)
(3)	4 (6)
(4)	4 (7)
6 (1)	5 (1)
(2)	5 (2)
(3)	5 (3)
(4)	5 (4)
(5)	5 (5)
7 (1)	5 (6)
(2)	5 (7)
(3)	5 (8)
(4)	5 (9)
(5)	5 (9)
8 (1)	6 (1)
(2)	6 (4)
(3)	6 (2) and (3)
(4)	6 (5)
(5)	6 (6)
9 (1)	7 (1)

9 (2)	7 (2)
10	8
11	9
12 (1)	10 (1)
(2)	10 (2)
13 (1)	11 (1)
(2)	11 (2) (part)
(3)	11 (2) (part)
(4)	11 (3)
(5)	11 (4)
(6)	New
(7)	New
14	12
15 (1)	13 (1)
(2)	13 (2) (part)
(3)	13 (2) (part)
(4)	13 (3)
(5)	13 (4)
16 (1)	14 (1)
(2)	14 (2)
(3)	14 (3)
(4)	14 (4)
17 (1)	15 (1)
(2)	15 (2)
(3)	15 (3)
(4)	15 (4)
(5)	15 (5)
18 (1)	16 (1)
(2)	16 (2)
(3)	16 (3)
(4)	New
19 (1)	17 (1)
(2)	17 (2)
(3)	17 (3)
(4)	17 (5)
20 (1)	13 (5)
(2)	16 (4)
(3)	13 (6)
21 (1)	18 (1)
(2)	18 (2)
(3)	18 (3)
22 (1)	19 (1)
(2)	19 (2)
23 (1)	20 (1) and (2) (part)
(2)	20 (2) (part)
(3)	20 (3)
24 (1)	21 (1)
(2)	New
(3)	New
(4)	21 (2)
25 (1)	22 (1)
(2)	22 (2)

(3)	22 (3)
25 (4)	22 (4)
(5)	22 (5)
26 (1)	23 (1)
(2)	23 (2)
(3)	23 (3)
(4)	New
(5)	23 (4)
27 (1)	24 (1)
(2)	24 (2)
(3)	24 (3)
(4)	24 (4)
(5)	New
28 (1)	25 (1)
(2)	25 (2)
(3)	25 (3)
29 (1)	26 (1)
(2)	26 (2)
30	27
31 (1)	28 (1)
(2)	28 (2)
(3)	28 (3)
(4)	28 (4)
32 (1)	29 (1)
(2)	29 (2)
33 (1)	30 (1)
(2)	30 (2)
(3)	30 (3)
(4)	30 (4)
(5)	30 (5)
(6)	30 (6)
34 (1)	31 (1)
(2)	31 (2)
35 (1)	32 (1)
(2)	32 (2)
(3)	32 (3)
36 (1)	33 (1)
(2)	33 (2)
(3)	33 (3)
(4)	33 (6)
(5)	New
37 (1)	34 (1)
(2)	34 (2)
(3)	34 (3)
(4)	34 (4)
(5)	34 (5)
(6)	34 (6)
(7)	34 (7)
38 (1)	35 (1)
(2)	35 (2)
(3)	35 (3)
39 (1)	33 (4)
(2)	33 (4)
(3)	24 (5)

39 (4)	24 (6)
(5)	24 (7) and 35 (4)
(6)	24 (9)
(7)	New
(8)	33 (5)
40 (1)	36 (1) (part)
(2)	36 (1) (part)
(3)	35 (5) and 36 (2)
(4)	36 (5)
(5)	New
(6)	36 (3)
(7)	New
(8)	36 (6)
(9)	36 (7)
(10)	36 (8)
(11)	36 (9)
41 (1)	New
(2)	37 (1) (part)
42 (1)	37 (1) (part)
(2)	37 (2) (part)
(3)	37 (2) (part)
(4)	37 (3) and (4)
(5)	New
(6)	37 (5)
(7)	37 (6)
(8)	37 (7)
43 (1)	38 (1)
(2)	38 (2)
(3)	38 (3)
(4)	38 (4)
(5)	38 (5)
(6)	38 (6)
(7)	38 (7)
44 (1)	39 (1)
(2)	39 (2)
(3)	39 (3)
(4)	39 (4)
(5)	39 (5)
(6)	39 (6)
(7)	39 (7)
45 (1)	40 (1) (part)
(2)	40 (1) (part)
(3)	40 (2)
(4)	New
(5)	40 (3)
46 (1)	41 (1)
(2)	41 (2)
(3)	New
(4)	41 (3)
(5)	41 (4)
47 (1)	42 (1)
(2)	42 (2)
48 (1)	43 (1)
48 (2)	43 (2)

(3)	43 (3)
(4)	43 (4)
(5)	43 (5)
(6)	43 (6)
49 (1)	44 (1)
(2)	44 (2)
49 (3)	44 (3)
(4)	44 (4) (part)
(5)	44 (4) (part)
(6)	44 (5)
(7)	44 (6)
(8)	44 (7)
(9)	44 (8)
(10)	44 (9)
50 (1)	45 (1)
(2)	45 (2)
(3)	45 (3)
(4)	45 (4)
(5)	45 (5)
(6)	45 (6)
(7)	New
(8)	45 (7)
(9)	New
(10)	45 (8)
(11)	45 (9)
51 (1)	46 (1)
(2)	46 (2)
(3)	46 (3)
(4)	46 (4)
(5)	46 (5)
52 (1)	47 (1)
(2)	47 (2)
(3)	47 (3)
53 (1)	48
(2)	New
(3)	New
54 (1)	New
(2)	New
(3)	New
(4)	New
(5)	24 (5) (part)
(6)	24 (6) (part)
(7)	24 (7) (part)
(8)	New
(9)	New
(10)	New
55 (1) to (11)	New
56 (1)	49 (1)
(2)	49 (2)
(3)	49 (3)
(4)	49 (4)
57 (1)	50 (1)
57 (2)	50 (2)
(3)	50 (3)

(4)	50 (7)
(5)	50 (4)
(6)	50 (5)
(7)	50 (6)
(8)	50 (8)
58 (1)	51 (1)
(2)	51 (2)
(3)	51 (3)
(4)	New
(5)	51 (4)
(6)	51 (5)
(7)	51 (8)
(8)	51 (6)
(9)	51 (7)
(10)	51 (9)
(11)	51 (10)
(12)	51 (11)
(13)	51 (12)
59 (1)	52 (1)
(2)	52 (2)
(3)	52 (3)
(4)	52 (4)
60 (1)	53 (1)
(2)	53 (2) (part)
(3)	New
(4)	New
(5)	53 (2) (part)
(6)	54 (3)
(7)	53 (3)
61 (1)	54 (1)
(2)	54 (2)
(3)	54 (4)
(4)	54 (5)
(5)	54 (6)
(6)	54 (8) (part)
(7)	54 (8) (part)
62 (1)	55 (1)
(2)	55 (2)
(3)	55 (3)
(4)	55 (5)
(5)	55 (4)
(6)	55 (6)
63 (1)	New
(2)	56 (1)
(3)	56 (2)
(4)	56 (3)
(5)	New
(6)	56 (4)
(7)	56 (5)
(8)	56 (6)
(9)	56 (7)
64 (1)	57 (1)
(2)	57 (2)
(3)	57 (3)

(4)	57 (4)
(5)	57 (5)
(6)	57 (6)
(7)	New
(8)	57 (7)
(9)	57 (8)
(10)	57 (9)
(11)	57(10)
65 (1)	58 (1)
(2)	58 (2) and (10)
(3)	New
(4)	58 (3)
(5)	58 (4)
(6)	New
(7)	58 (5)
(8)	58 (6)
(9)	58 (7)
(10)	58 (8)
(11)	58 (9)
66 (1)	59 (1)
(2)	59 (2)
67 (1)	60 (1)
(2)	60 (2)
68 (1)	61 (1)
(2)	61 (3)
(3)	61 (2) and (4)
(4)	61 (5)
(5)	61 (6)
(6)	61 (7)
(7)	61 (8)
(8)	61 (9)
69 (1)	62 (1)
(2)	62 (2)
(3)	62 (3)
(4)	62 (4)
(5)	62 (5)
(6)	62 (6)
(7)	62 (7)
(8)	62 (8)
(9)	62 (9)
(10)	62(10)
(11)	62(11)
(12)	62(12)
(13)	62(12)
70 (1)	63 (1) (part)
(2)	63 (1) (part)
(3)	63 (2)
71 (1)	64 (1)
(2)	64 (2)
72	New
73 (1)	65 (1)
(2)	65 (2)
(3)	65 (3)
(4)	65 (4)

74 (1)	65 (5)
(2)	65 (6)
(3)	65 (7) (part)
74 (4)	65 (7) (part)
75 (1)	66 (1)
(2)	66 (2)
(3)	66 (3)
76 (1)	New
(2)	New
(3)	New
(4)	67 and new
77 (1)	68 (1)
(2)	68 (2)
(3)	68 (3)
(4)	68 (4)
(5)	New
78 (1)	69 (1)
(2)	69 (2)
(3)	69 (3)
(4)	69 (4)
(5)	69 (5)
(6)	69 (6)
(7)	69 (7)
79 (1)	70 (1)
(2)	70 (2)
(3)	70 (3)
(4)	70 (4)
(5)	70 (5)
(6)	70 (6)
(7)	70 (7)
(8)	70 (8)
(9)	70 (9)
80 (1)	71 (1)
(2)	71 (2)
(3)	71 (3)
(4)	71 (4)
81 (1)	72 (1)
(2)	72 (2)
(3)	72 (3)
82 (1)	73 (1)
(2)	73 (2)
(3)	73 (3)
(4)	73 (4)
83 (1)	74 (1)
(2)	74 (2)
(3)	74 (3)
(4)	74 (4)
(5)	74 (5)
(6)	74 (6)
83 (7)	75 (1) (part)
(8)	74 (7)
(9)	74 (8)
84 (1)	75 (1) (part)
(2)	New

(3)	75 (2)
M1 (1)	M1 (1)
M1 (2)	M1 (2)
(3)	M1 (3)
(4)	M1 (4)
M2 (1)	M2 (1)
(2)	M2 (2)
(3)	M2 (3)
(4)	M2 (4)
M3 (1)	M3 (1)
(2)	M3 (2)
(3)	M3 (3)
M4 (1)	M4 (1)
(2)	M4 (2)
(3)	M4 (3)
M5 (1)	M5 (1)
(2)	M5 (2)
(3)	New
(4)	M5 (3)
(5)	M5 (4)
(6)	M5 (5)
(7)	M5 (5) and (6)
(8)	M5 (7)
(9)	M5 (8)
(10)	M5 (9) (part)
(11)	M5 (9) (part)
(12)	M5(10)
(13)	M5(11)
(14)	M5(12)
(15)	M5(13)
(16)	M5(14)
M6 (1)	M6 (1)
(2)	M6 (2)
(3)	M6 (3)
(4)	M6 (4)
(5)	New
(6)	New
(7)	M6 (5)
M7 (1)	M7 (1)
(2)	M7 (2)
(3)	M7 (3)
(4)	M7 (4)
(5)	M7 (5)
(6)	M7 (6)
(7)	M7 (8)
(8)	M7 (9)
(9)	M7(10)
(10)	M7(11)
M7(11)	New
M8 (1)	M9 (1)
(2)	M9 (2) (part)
(3)	M9 (3)
M9 (1)	M9 (4)
(2)	M9 (2) (part)

(3)	M9 (5)
(4)	M9 (6)
(5)	M9 (7)
(6)	M9 (8)
M10 (1)	M8 (1)
(2)	M8 (2)
(3)	M8 (3)
(4)	M8 (4)
(5)	M8 (5)
(6)	M8 (6)
(7)	New
(8)	New
(9)	M8 (7)
M11 (1)	M10 (1)
(2)	M10 (2)
(3)	M10 (3)
(4)	New
M12 (1)	M11 (1)
(2)	M11 (2)
(3)	M11 (3)
(4)	M11 (4)
(5)	M11 (5)
(6)	M11 (6)
M13 (1)	M12 (1)
(2)	New
(3)	New
(4)	M12 (2)
(5)	M12 (3) (part)
(6)	M12 (3) (part)
(7)	M12 (4)
(8)	M12 (5)
(9)	M12 (6)
(10)	M12 (9)
(11)	M12(10)
(12)	M12(11)
(13)	M12(12)
M14 (1)	M13 (1)
(2)	M13 (2)
(3)	M13 (3)
(4)	M13 (4)
(5)	M13 (5)
(6)	M13 (6)
(7)	M13 (7)
(8)	M13 (8)
(9)	M13 (9)
(10)	New
M15 (1)	M14 (1)
M15 (2)	New
(3)	M14 (2)
M16 (1)	M15 (1)
(2)	M15 (2)
M17 (1)	M16 (1)
(2)	M16 (2)
(3)	M16 (3)

M18 (1)	M17 (1)
(2)	M17 (2)
(3)	M17 (3)
(4)	M17 (4)
M19 (1)	M18 (1)
(2)	M18 (2)
(3)	M18 (3)
M20 (1)	M19 (1)
(2)	M19 (2)
(3)	M19 (3)
(4)	M19 (4)
(5)	M19 (5)
M21 (1)	M20 (1)
(2)	M20 (2)
(3)	M20 (3)
(4)	M20 (4)
M22 (1)	New
(2)	M12 (7)
(3)	M12 (8)
(4)	New
M23 (1)	M21 (1)
(2)	M21 (2)
(3)	M21 (3)
(4)	M21 (4)
(5)	M21 (5)
(6)	M21 (6)
(7)	M21 (7)
(8)	M21 (8)
M24 (1)	M22 (1) (part)
(2)	M22 (1) and (2) (part)
(3)	M22 (2) (part)
(4)	M22 (3)
M25 (1)	M23 (1)
(2)	M23 (2)
(3)	M23 (3)
(4)	M23 (4)
(5)	M23 (5)
(6)	M23 (6)
M26 (1)	M24 (1)
(2)	M24 (2)
(3)	M24 (3)
(4)	M24 (4)
(5)	M24 (5)
(6)	M24 (6)
(7)	M24 (7)
M27 (1) to (3)	New
M28 (1)	M25 (1)
(2)	M25 (2)
M29 (1)	M26 (1)
(2)	M26 (2)
(3)	M26 (3)
(4)	M26 (4)
(5)	M26 (5)
(6)	M26 (6)

M30 (1)	M27 (1)
(2)	M27 (2)
M31 (1)	M28 (1)
(2)	M28 (2)
(3)	M28 (3)
M32 (1)	M29 (1) (part)
(2)	M29 (6) (part)
(3)	New
(4)	New
(5)	New
(6)	M29 (8) (part)
M33 (1)	M29 (1) (part)
(2)	M29 (2)
(3)	M29 (3)
(4)	M29 (4)
(5)	M29 (5)
(6)	New
(7)	M29 (6) (part)
(8)	New
(9)	New
(10)	New
(11)	M29 (7)
(12)	New
(13)	M29 (8) (part)
M34 (1)	M30 (1)
(2)	M30 (2)
(3)	M30 (3)
(4)	M30 (4)
M35 (1)	M31 (1)
(2)	M31 (2)
(3)	New
(4)	M31 (3)
(5)	New
(6)	New
(7)	New
(8)	New
(9)	New
M36 (1)	M32 (1)
(2)	M32 (2)
(3)	M32 (3)
(4)	M32 (4)
(5)	M32 (5)
M37 (1) and (2)	New
M38 (1)	M33 (1)
(2)	M33 (2) (part)
M3 (3)	M33 (2) (part)
(4)	M33 (3)
(5)	New
(6)	M33 (4)
(7)	New
(8)	New

TABLE OF DESTINATIONS

<i>Provision at First Consideration</i>	<i>Provision at Revision Stage</i>
1 (1)	1 (1)
(2)	1 (2)
(3)	1 (3)
(4)	1 (4)
(5)	1 (5)
(6)	1 (6)
(7)	1 (7)
(8)	1 (8)
(9)	1 (9)
(10)	1(10)
(11)	1(11)
(12)	1(13)
2 (1)	2 (1)
(2)	4 (1)
(3)	4 (2)
(4)	4 (3)
(5)	4 (4)
(6)	4 (5)
(7)	4 (6)
(8)	4 (7)
(9)	4 (9)
3 (1)	2 (2)
(2)	2 (3)
4 (1)	3 (1)
(2)	3 (2)
(3)	3 (3)
(4)	4(10)
(5)	4 (1)
(6)	5 (1) to (3)
(7)	5 (4)
5 (1)	6 (1)
(2)	6 (2)
(3)	6 (3)
(4)	6 (4)
(5)	6 (5)
(6)	7 (1)
(7)	7 (2)
(8)	7 (3)
(9)	7 (4) and (5)
6 (1)	8 (1)
(2)	8 (3)
(3)	8 (3)
(4)	8 (2)
(5)	8 (4)
(6)	8 (5)
7 (1)	9 (1)
(2)	9 (2)
8	10
9	11
10 (1)	12 (1)
(2)	12 (2)

11 (1)	13 (1)
(2)	13 (2) and (3)
(3)	13 (4)
(4)	13 (5)
12	14
13 (1)	15 (1)
(2)	15 (2) and (3)
(3)	15 (4)
(4)	15 (5)
(5)	20 (1)
(6)	20 (3)
14 (1)	16 (1)
(2)	16 (2)
(3)	16 (3)
(4)	16 (4)
15 (1)	17 (1)
(2)	17 (2)
(3)	17 (3)
(4)	17 (4)
(5)	17 (5)
16 (1)	18 (1)
(2)	18 (2)
(3)	18 (3)
(4)	20 (2)
17 (1)	19 (1)
(2)	19 (2)
(3)	19 (3)
(4)	Omitted
(5)	19 (4)
18 (1)	21 (1)
(2)	21 (2)
(3)	21 (3)
19 (1)	22 (1)
(2)	22 (2)
20 (1)	23 (1)
(2)	23 (1) and (2)
(3)	23 (3)
21 (1)	24 (1)
(2)	24 (4)
22 (1)	25 (1)
(2)	25 (2)
(3)	25 (3)
(4)	25 (4)
(5)	25 (5)
23 (1)	26 (1)
(2)	26 (2)
(3)	26 (3)
(4)	26 (5)
24 (1)	27 (1)
(2)	27 (2)
(3)	27 (3)
24 (4)	27 (4)
(5)	39 (3) and 54 (5)
(6)	39 (4) and 54 (6)

(7)	39 (5) and 54 (7)
(8)	Omitted
(9)	39 (6)
25 (1)	28 (1)
(2)	28 (2)
(3)	28 (3)
26 (1)	29 (1)
(2)	29 (2)
27	30
28 (1)	31 (1)
(2)	31 (2)
(3)	31 (3)
(4)	31 (4)
29 (1)	32 (1)
(2)	32 (2)
30 (1)	33 (1)
(2)	33 (2)
(3)	33 (3)
(4)	33 (4)
(5)	33 (5)
(6)	33 (6)
31 (1)	34 (1)
(2)	34 (2)
32 (1)	35 (1)
(2)	35 (2)
(3)	35 (3)
33 (1)	36 (1)
(2)	36 (2)
(3)	36 (3)
(4)	39 (1) and (2)
(5)	39 (8)
(6)	36 (4)
34 (1)	37 (1)
(2)	37 (2)
(3)	37 (3)
(4)	37 (4)
(5)	37 (5)
(6)	37 (6)
(7)	37 (7)
35 (1)	38 (1)
(2)	38 (2)
(3)	38 (3)
(4)	39 (5)
(5)	40 (3)
36 (1)	40 (1) and (2)
(2)	40 (3)
(3)	40 (6)
(4)	Omitted
(5)	40 (4)
(6)	40 (8)
36 (7)	40 (9)
(8)	40(10)
(9)	40(11)
37 (1)	42 (1)

(2)	42 (2) and (3)
(3)	42 (4)
(4)	42 (4)
(5)	42 (6)
(6)	42 (7)
(7)	42 (8)
38 (1)	43 (1)
(2)	43 (2)
(3)	43 (3)
(4)	43 (4)
(5)	43 (5)
(6)	43 (6)
(7)	43 (7)
39 (1)	44 (1)
(2)	44 (2)
(3)	44 (3)
(4)	44 (4)
(5)	44 (5)
(6)	44 (6)
(7)	44 (7)
40 (1)	45 (1) and (2)
(2)	45 (3)
(3)	45 (5)
41 (1)	46 (1)
(2)	46 (2)
(3)	46 (4)
(4)	46 (5)
42 (1)	47 (1)
(2)	47 (2)
43 (1)	48 (1)
(2)	48 (2)
(3)	48 (3)
(4)	48 (4)
(5)	48 (5)
(6)	48 (6)
44 (1)	49 (1)
(2)	49 (2)
(3)	49 (3)
(4)	49 (4) and (5)
(5)	49 (6)
(6)	49 (7)
(7)	49 (8)
(8)	49 (9)
(9)	49(10)
45 (1)	50 (1)
(2)	50 (2)
(3)	50 (3)
(4)	50 (4)
(5)	50 (5)
45 (6)	50 (6)
(7)	50 (8)
(8)	50(10)
(9)	50(11)
46 (1)	51 (1)

(2)	51 (2)
(3)	51 (3)
(4)	51 (4)
(5)	51 (5)
47 (1)	52 (1)
(2)	52 (2)
(3)	52 (3)
48	53 (1)
49 (1)	56 (1)
(2)	56 (2)
(3)	56 (3)
(4)	56 (4)
50 (1)	57 (1)
(2)	57 (2)
(3)	57 (3)
(4)	57 (5)
(5)	57 (6)
(6)	57 (7)
(7)	57 (4)
(8)	57 (8)
51 (1)	58 (1)
(2)	58 (2)
(3)	58 (3)
(4)	58 (5)
(5)	58 (6)
(6)	58 (8)
(7)	58 (9)
(8)	58 (7)
(9)	58(10)
(10)	58(11)
(11)	58(12)
(12)	58(13)
52 (1)	59 (1)
(2)	59 (2)
(3)	59 (3)
(4)	59 (4)
53 (1)	60 (1)
(2)	60 (2) and (5)
(3)	60 (7)
54 (1)	61 (1)
(2)	61 (2)
(3)	60 (6)
(4)	61 (3)
(5)	61 (4)
(6)	61 (5)
(7)	Omitted
(8)	61 (6) and (7)
55 (1)	62 (1)
55 (2)	62 (2)
(3)	62 (3)
(4)	62 (5)
(5)	62 (4)
(6)	62 (6)
56 (1)	63 (2)

(2)	63 (3)
(3)	63 (4)
(4)	63 (6)
(5)	63 (7)
(6)	63 (8)
(7)	63 (9)
57 (1)	64 (1)
(2)	64 (2)
(3)	64 (3)
(4)	64 (4)
(5)	64 (5)
(6)	64 (6)
(7)	64 (8)
(8)	64 (9)
(9)	64(10)
(10)	64(11)
58 (1)	65 (1)
(2)	65 (2)
(3)	65 (4)
(4)	65 (5)
(5)	65 (7)
(6)	65 (8)
(7)	65 (9)
(8)	65(10)
(9)	65(11)
(10)	65 (2)
59 (1)	66 (1)
(2)	66 (2)
60 (1)	67 (1)
(2)	67 (2)
61 (1)	68 (1)
(2)	68 (3)
(3)	68 (2)
(4)	68 (3)
(5)	68 (4)
(6)	68 (5)
(7)	68 (6)
(8)	68 (7)
(9)	68 (8)
62 (1)	69 (1)
(2)	69 (2)
(3)	69 (3)
(4)	69 (4)
(5)	69 (5)
(6)	69 (6)
(7)	69 (7)
(8)	69 (8)
62 (9)	69 (9)
(10)	69(10)
(11)	69(11)
(12)	69(12)
(13)	69(13)
63 (1)	70 (1) and (2)
(2)	70 (3)

64 (1)	71 (1)
(2)	71 (2)
65 (1)	73 (1)
(2)	73 (2)
(3)	73 (3)
(4)	73 (4)
(5)	74 (1)
(6)	74 (2)
(7)	74 (3) and (4)
66 (1)	75 (1)
(2)	75 (2)
(3)	75 (3)
67	76 (4)
68 (1)	77 (1)
(2)	77 (2)
(3)	77 (3)
(4)	77 (4)
69 (1)	78 (1)
(2)	78 (2)
(3)	78 (3)
(4)	78 (4)
(5)	78 (5)
(6)	78 (6)
(7)	78 (7)
70 (1)	79 (1)
(2)	79 (2)
(3)	79 (3)
(4)	79 (4)
(5)	79 (5)
(6)	79 (6)
(7)	79 (7)
(8)	79 (8)
(9)	79 (9)
71 (1)	80 (1)
(2)	80 (2)
(3)	80 (3)
(4)	80 (4)
72 (1)	81 (1)
(2)	81 (2)
(3)	81 (3)
73 (1)	82 (1)
(2)	82 (2)
(3)	82 (3)
(4)	82 (4)
74 (1)	83 (1)
(2)	83 (2)
74 (3)	83 (3)
(4)	83 (4)
(5)	83 (5)
(6)	83 (6)
(7)	83 (8)
(8)	83 (9)
75 (1)	83 (7) and 84 (1)
(2)	84 (3)

M1 (1)	M1 (1)
(2)	M1 (2)
(3)	M1 (3)
(4)	M1 (4)
M2 (1)	M2 (1)
(2)	M2 (2)
(3)	M2 (3)
(4)	M2 (4)
M3 (1)	M3 (1)
(2)	M3 (2)
(3)	M3 (3)
M4 (1)	M4 (1)
(2)	M4 (2)
(3)	M4 (3)
M5 (1)	M5 (1)
(2)	M5 (2)
(3)	M5 (4)
(4)	M5 (5)
(5)	M5 (6) and (7)
(6)	M5 (7)
(7)	M5 (8)
(8)	M5 (9)
(9)	M5(10) and (11)
(10)	M5(12)
(11)	M5(13)
(12)	M5(14)
(13)	M5(15)
(14)	M5(16)
M6 (1)	M6 (1)
(2)	M6 (2)
(3)	M6 (3)
(4)	M6 (4)
(5)	M6 (7)
M7 (1)	M7 (1)
(2)	M7 (2)
(3)	M7 (3)
(4)	M7 (4)
(5)	M7 (5)
(6)	M7 (6)
(7)	Omitted
(8)	M7 (7)
(9)	M7 (8)
(10)	M7 (9)
(11)	M7(10)
M8 (1)	M10 (1)
M8 (2)	M10 (2)
(3)	M10 (3)
(4)	M10 (4)
(5)	M10 (5)
(6)	M10 (6)
(7)	M10 (9)
M9 (1)	M8 (1)
(2)	M8 (2) and M9 (2)
(3)	M8 (3)

(4)	M9 (1)
(5)	M9 (3)
(6)	M9 (4)
(7)	M9 (5)
(8)	M9 (6)
(9)	Omitted
M10 (1)	M11 (1)
(2)	M11 (2)
(3)	M11 (3)
M11 (1)	M12 (1)
(2)	M12 (2)
(3)	M12 (3)
(4)	M12 (4)
(5)	M12 (5)
(6)	M12 (6)
M12 (1)	M13 (1)
(2)	M13 (4)
(3)	M13 (5) and (6)
(4)	M13 (7)
(5)	M13 (8)
(6)	M13 (9)
(7)	M22 (2)
(8)	M22 (3)
(9)	M13(10)
(10)	M13(11)
(11)	M13(12)
(12)	M13(13)
M13 (1)	M14 (1)
(2)	M14 (2)
(3)	M14 (3)
(4)	M14 (4)
(5)	M14 (5)
(6)	M14 (6)
(7)	M14 (7)
(8)	M14 (8)
(9)	M14 (9)
M14 (1)	M15 (1)
(2)	M15 (3)
M15 (1)	M16 (1)
(2)	M16 (2)
M16 (1)	M17 (1)
(2)	M17 (2)
(3)	M17 (3)
M17 (1)	M18 (1)
M17 (2)	M18 (2)
(3)	M18 (3)
(4)	M18 (4)
(5)	Omitted
M18 (1)	M19 (1)
(2)	M19 (2)
(3)	M19 (3)
(4)	Omitted
M19 (1)	M20 (1)
(2)	M20 (2)

(3)	M20 (3)
(4)	M20 (4)
(5)	M20 (5)
M20 (1)	M21 (1)
(2)	M21 (2)
(3)	M21 (3)
(4)	M21 (4)
M21 (1)	M23 (1)
(2)	M23 (2)
(3)	M23 (3)
(4)	M23 (4)
(5)	M23 (5)
(6)	M23 (6)
(7)	M23 (7)
(8)	M23 (8)
M22 (1)	M24 (1) and (2)
(2)	M24 (2) and (3)
(3)	M24 (4)
M23 (1)	M25 (1)
(2)	M25 (2)
(3)	M25 (3)
(4)	M25 (4)
(5)	M25 (5)
(6)	M25 (6)
M24 (1)	M26 (1)
(2)	M26 (2)
(3)	M26 (3)
(4)	M26 (4)
(5)	M26 (5)
(6)	M26 (6)
(7)	M26 (7)
M25 (1)	M28 (1)
(2)	M28 (2)
M26 (1)	M29 (1)
(2)	M29 (2)
(3)	M29 (3)
(4)	M29 (4)
(5)	M29 (5)
(6)	M29 (6)
M27 (1)	M30 (1)
(2)	M30 (2)
M28 (1)	M31 (1)
(2)	M31 (2)
M28 (3)	M31(3)
M29 (1)	M32(1) and M33(1)
(2)	M33(2)
(3)	M33(3)
(4)	M33(4)
(5)	M33(5)
(6)	M32(2) and M33(7)
(7)	M33(11)
(8)	M32(6) and M33(13)
M30 (1)	M34 (1)
(2)	M34 (2)

(3)	M34 (3)
(4)	M34 (4)
M31 (1)	M35 (1)
(2)	M35 (2)
(3)	M35 (4)
M32 (1)	M36 (1)
(2)	M36 (2)
(3)	M36 (3)
(4)	M36 (4)

(5)	M36 (5)
M33 (1)	M38 (1)
(2)	M38 (2) and (3)
(3)	M38 (4)
(4)	M38 (6)

TEXT OF CANONS AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED

B 11 Of Morning and Evening Prayer in parish churches

1. Morning and Evening Prayer shall be said or sung ~~in every parish church~~ in at least one church in each benefice or, where benefices are held in plurality, in at least one church in at least one of those benefices, at least on all Sundays and other principal Feast Days, and also on Ash Wednesday and Good Friday. Each service shall be said or sung distinctly, reverently, and in an audible voice. Readers, such other lay persons as may be authorized by the bishop of the diocese, or some other suitable lay person, may, at the invitation of ~~the minister of the parish~~ the minister who has the cure of souls or, where the cure is vacant or the minister is incapacitated, at the invitation of the churchwardens say or sing Morning and Evening Prayer (save for the Absolution).

2. ~~On all other days the minister of the parish, together with other ministers licensed to serve in the parish, shall make such provision for Morning and Evening Prayer to be said or sung either in the parish church or, after consultation with the parochial church council, elsewhere as may best serve to sustain the corporate spiritual life of the parish and the pattern of life enjoined upon ministers by Canon C 26.~~ On all other days, the minister who has the cure of souls, together with other ministers licensed to serve in the benefice (or one or more of the benefices), shall make such provision for Morning and Evening Prayer to be said or sung either in at least one of the churches in the benefice (or at least one of the churches in at least one of the benefices) or, after consultation with the parochial church council of each parish in the benefice (or benefices), elsewhere as may best serve to sustain the corporate spiritual life of the benefice (or benefices) and the pattern of life enjoined upon ministers by Canon C 26. Public notice shall be given ~~in the parish~~, by tolling the bell or other appropriate means, of the time and place where the prayers are to be said or sung.

3. The reading of Morning and Evening Prayer ~~in any parish church~~ as required by this Canon may only be dispensed with in accordance with the provisions of Canon B 14A.

B 14 Of Holy Communion in parish churches

1. The Holy Communion shall be celebrated ~~in every parish church~~ in at least one church in each benefice or, where benefices are held in plurality, in at least one church in at least one of the benefices at least on all Sundays and principal Feast Days, and on Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday. It shall be celebrated distinctly, reverently, and in an audible voice.

2. The celebration of the Holy Communion ~~in any parish church~~ as required by this Canon may only be dispensed with in accordance with the provisions of Canon B 14A.

~~3. In churches and chapels dependent on a parish church, the Holy Communion shall be celebrated as regularly and frequently as may be convenient, subject to the direction of the Ordinary under Canon B 14A.~~

B 14A Of services in churches and other places of worship

1. The reading of Morning and Evening Prayer ~~in any parish church~~ as required by Canon B 11 or the celebration of the Holy Communion ~~in any parish church~~ as required by Canon B 14 may be dispensed with as follows:

- (a) on an occasional basis, as authorized by ~~the minister and the parochial church council~~ the minister who has the cure of souls and the parochial church council of each parish in the benefice acting jointly;
- (b) on a regular basis, as authorized by the bishop on the request of ~~the minister and the parochial church council~~ the minister who has the cure of souls and the parochial church council of each parish in the benefice acting jointly.

~~In exercising the powers under this paragraph the minister and the parochial church council or the bishop as the case may be~~ In giving an authorization under this paragraph, the person or persons doing so must be satisfied that there is good reason for doing so and shall -

- ~~(i) have regard to the frequency of services of Morning and Evening Prayer or the celebration of the Holy Communion (as the case may be) in other parish churches or places of worship in the benefice; and~~
- (ii) ensure that no church ceases altogether to be used for public worship.

~~2. Where there is more than one parish church or place of worship in a benefice or where a minister holds benefices in plurality with more than one parish church or place of worship the minister and the parochial church council acting jointly shall make proposals to the bishop as to what services of Morning and Evening Prayer or the celebration of the Holy Communion (as the case may be) are to be held in each of the parish churches or places of worship and if the bishop is satisfied with the proposals he shall authorize them accordingly. In default of the minister and parochial church council making satisfactory proposals, the bishop shall make such direction as he considers appropriate. In exercising the powers under this paragraph the bishop shall ensure that no church ceases altogether to be used for public worship.~~

~~3. The powers under paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Canon shall extend to any parish centre of worship designated under section 29(2) of the Pastoral Measure 1983.~~

4. The bishop of a diocese may, subject to Canons B 11 and B 14 and the preceding paragraphs of this Canon, direct what services shall be held or shall not be required to be held in any church in the diocese ~~which is not a parish church~~ or in any building, or part of a building, in the diocese licensed for public worship under ~~section 29 of the Pastoral Measure 1983~~ section 43 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 but not designated as a parish centre of worship.

C 5 Of the titles of such as are to be ordained deacons or priests

1. ~~Any person to be admitted into holy orders shall first exhibit to the bishop of the diocese of whom he desires imposition of hands a certificate that he is provided of some ecclesiastical office within such diocese, which the bishop shall judge sufficient, wherein he may attend the cure of souls and execute his ministry.~~ A bishop may admit a person into holy orders only if, subject to paragraphs 2 and 3, the bishop is satisfied that the person is to be provided with an office to be held under Common Tenure in the bishop's diocese.

2. A bishop may also admit into holy orders

- (a) any person holding office in any university, or any fellow, or any person in right as a fellow, in any college or hall in the same;
- (b) any master in a school;
- (c) any person who is to be a chaplain in any university or in any college or hall in the same or in any school;
- (d) any person who is to be a member of the staff of a theological college;
- (e) any person who is living under vows in the house of any religious order or community:

Provided that the said university, college, hall, school, or house of a religious order or community be situate within his diocese.

3. A bishop may also admit into holy orders persons for service overseas in accordance with the statutory provisions in that behalf in force from time to time.

4. No person shall be admitted into holy orders by any bishop other than the bishop of the diocese in which he is to exercise his ministry, except he shall bring with him Letters Dimissory from the bishop of such diocese.

5. Notwithstanding any provision of the preceding paragraphs of this Canon, the ancient privilege of any fellow or any person in right as a fellow in any college or hall in the University of Oxford or of Cambridge to be admitted into holy orders without Letters Dimissory by any bishop willing to ordain him shall be unimpaired.

C 8 Of ministers exercising their ministry

1. Every minister shall exercise his ministry in accordance with the provisions of this Canon.

2. A minister duly ordained priest or deacon, and, where it is required under paragraph 5 of this Canon, holding a licence or permission from the archbishop of the province, may officiate in any place only after he has received authority to do so from the bishop of the diocese or other the Ordinary of the place.

Save that:

(a) The minister having the cure of souls of a church or chapel or the sequestrator when the cure is vacant or the dean or provost and the canons residentiary of any cathedral or collegiate church may allow a minister, concerning whom they are satisfied either by actual personal knowledge or by good and sufficient evidence that he is of good life and standing and that he has authority to officiate in accordance with this Canon (whether in that or another diocese), to minister within their church or chapel—

(i) except in a case within paragraph (ii), for a period of not more than seven days within three months without reference to the bishop or other Ordinary, or

(ii) in the case of a minister who is instituted to a benefice in that diocese or admitted to serve within that diocese by licence under the hand and seal of the bishop and who is not subject to a direction under paragraph 4A, for an indefinite period without reference to the bishop or other Ordinary.

and a minister so allowed shall be required to sign the services register when he officiates.

(b) No member of the chapter of a cathedral church shall be debarred from performing the duties of his office in due course and exercising his ministry within the diocese merely by lack of authority from the bishop of the diocese within which the cathedral is situate.

(c) Any minister who has a licence to preach throughout the province from the archbishop or throughout England from the University of Oxford or of Cambridge, may preach the Word of God in any diocese within that province or throughout England, as the case may be, without any further authority from the bishop thereof.

(d) A funeral service which may, under section 2 of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1992, be performed in a parish without the consent of the minister of the parish may be performed without any further authority from the bishop of the diocese within which the parish is situated.

3. The bishop of a diocese confers such authority on a minister either by instituting him to a benefice, or by admitting him to serve within his diocese by licence under his hand and seal, or by giving him written permission to officiate within the same.

4. No minister who has such authority to exercise his ministry in any diocese shall do so therein in any place in which he has not the cure of souls without the permission of the minister having such cure, except at the homes of persons whose names are entered on the electoral roll of the parish which he serves and to the extent authorized by the Extra-Parochial Ministry Measure 1967, or in a university, college, school, hospital, or public or charitable institution in which he is licensed to officiate as provided by the said Measure and Canon B 41 or, in relation to funeral services, as provided by section 2 of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1992 or in the case of a bishop's mission order to the extent authorized by section 47(11) of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007, read with section 47(14) of that Measure.

4A. In the case of a minister who is instituted to a benefice or admitted to serve within a diocese by licence under the hand and seal of the bishop of the diocese, the bishop may direct that the

minister may officiate only in the benefice or (as the case may be) the place to which the licence applies.

5. A minister who has been ordained priest or deacon –

(a) by an overseas bishop within the meaning of the Overseas and Other Clergy (Ministry and Ordination) Measure 1967;

(b) under section 5 of that Measure for ministry overseas;

(c) by a bishop in a Church not in communion with the Church of England, whose orders are recognized or accepted by the Church of England;

may not minister in the province of Canterbury or York without the permission of the archbishop of the province in question under the said Measure: Provided that this paragraph shall not apply to any person ordained priest or deacon by any such bishop on the request and by the commission in writing of the bishop of a diocese in the province of Canterbury or York.

6. A minister who does not have authority to officiate in accordance with this Canon or is prohibited or suspended under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 from exercising the functions of his Orders may not vest in a church or chapel during divine service.

7. The minister having the cure of souls of a church or chapel or the sequestrator when the cure is vacant or the dean or provost and the canons residentiary of any cathedral or collegiate church may not allow a minister to officiate or vest in the church or chapel if they know that the minister does not have authority to officiate, or is prohibited or suspended, as mentioned in paragraph 6.

8. (1) A minister who has authority to officiate in a diocese in accordance with this Canon shall participate in such arrangements as the bishop of the diocese approves for the provision of training in matters relating to the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults.

(2) In this paragraph—

“child” means a person aged under 18, and

“vulnerable adult” has the same meaning as in the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016”.

E 2 Of sidesmen of assistants to the churchwardens

1. The sidesmen of the parish shall be appointed ~~by the annual parochial church meeting or, if need arises between annual parochial church meetings,~~ by the parochial church council.

....

E 8 Of the admission and licensing of lay workers

....

6. The bishop of every diocese shall keep a register ~~book~~ wherein shall be entered the name of every person either admitted or licensed by him as a lay worker, together with the particular duties which that person has been licensed to perform.