

Review of Synodical Government in the Church of England

Second Report to the General Synod by the Follow-Up Group



**REVIEW OF SYNODICAL GOVERNMENT
IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

**SECOND REPORT TO THE GENERAL SYNOD
BY THE FOLLOW-UP GROUP**

INTRODUCTION

- 1 In July 1999 the General Synod considered the First Report of the Follow-up Group (GS 1354) taking forward the recommendations of the Review of Synodical Government in the Church of England chaired by Lord Bridge, which had been debated in November 1997. The substance of the recommendations in the First Report has been incorporated in draft legislation currently before the Synod.

- 2 In that First Report (Section 5) the Follow-up Group outlined a draft agenda for the second stage of its working. In brief this comprised two tranches of work:
 - (a) The production of guidance of good practice in relation to Deanery Synods, to strengthen the function of Deaneries as part of synodical governance within dioceses. (This area of work is consequent on the Follow-up Group's decision, in the light of responses from dioceses, not to pursue the recommendations relating to Deanery Synods in the original Bridge Report.)

For a summary of the Bridge proposals on Deaneries and the Follow-up Group's decision, see Appendix 2.

- (b) A consideration of those sections of the Bridge Report which related to the size and composition of the General Synod, including the so-called 'special constituencies'.

- 3 In addition, a number of other issues have come to the Follow-up Group's attention in the second period of its work, comprising:
 - (a) the place of Voluntary Societies and Mission Agencies within synodical government;

- (b) the legal status (and role) of the Diocesan Secretary;
 - (c) a proposal for constituting the Deanery Synod as a legal entity;
 - (d) the relationship between Diocesan Boards of Finance and Diocesan Synods;
 - (e) the residence qualification for retired clergy to be members of Deanery Synod;
 - (f) Private Members' Motions;
 - (g) Separate Accounts for District Church Councils;
 - (h) the composition of Bishop's Staff Meetings
 - (i) the accounting year for Parochial Church Councils.
- 4 The work of compiling guidance on good practice for Deanery Synods was entrusted to a sub-group chaired by a member of the Follow-up Group, the Revd Dr David Stone, and it has produced its guidance as a separate document (GS Misc 639), which will shortly be circulated to Synod members. That document is primarily intended for consideration by dioceses and deaneries, although we take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of the work of Deanery Synods and the need for that work to be imaginatively managed in ways which encourage local synodical involvement in the light of particular local circumstances. The remaining parts of this Report are taken up with recommendations on the complex and interrelated issues surrounding the appropriate size and composition of the General Synod and the other issues referred to in paragraph 3. Another topic was the representation of young people which we addressed in the context of Special Constituencies (paras 41-45 below).
- 5 As a part of its work the Follow-up Group had discussion on the underlying theological issues of representation in the Councils of the Church with the Theological Group of the House of Bishops.

COMPOSITION AND SIZE OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

- 6 The recommendations of the original Bridge Review of Synodical Government touching membership and size of the General Synod were

set out in paragraph 13.10 of GS 1252 (pages 115-118). In brief, they favoured the abolition of almost all special constituencies and an overall size for the General Synod of 390 as opposed to the total of 576, with power vested in the two Archbishops to appoint up to five additional members.

- 7 For reasons which will be set out in subsequent paragraphs the Follow-up Group does not endorse the original Bridge Report recommendations. Whilst there are superficial attractions to limiting the size of the General Synod under an arbitrary and pre-determined ceiling, a detailed unpacking of the consequences of abolishing or modifying the special constituencies cannot easily be accommodated within a Synod of 390 without serious compromise of equity in representation. Furthermore, the Follow-up Group has not been persuaded that the case against all special constituencies is as strong as the Bridge Group thought.
- 8 Other factors relating to special constituencies are the proportional balance between representation of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, the strong pressure (by the Retired Clergy Association and some others) to consider the case for representation of retired clergy in General Synod; and the position of Provincial Episcopal Visitors in relation to General Synod.
- 9 In its discussions the Follow-up Group has reviewed the case for and against each special constituency in turn, and the case for and against a number of particular proposed 'ceilings' for total membership of the General Synod. It has attempted to express its conclusions in recommendations which aim to strike a workable balance between the desire to reduce the size of General Synod and the need to secure consistent and equitable representation of different groups within the Church. In paras 10-54 we review each existing and proposed special constituency, summarising the arguments for and against its retention, modification or abolition. In the subsequent sections (paras 55-62) we consider models of total membership of the General Synod which take account of our proposals on special constituencies and the appropriate balance between representation of the Provinces of York and Canterbury.

Special Constituencies

- 10 The constituencies to come under review in this part of our Report are as follows:

- (i) Suffragan Bishops;
- (ii) Provincial Episcopal Visitors;
- (iii) Deans and Provosts;
- (iv) Archdeacons;
- (v) Religious Communities;
- (vi) The Channel Islands;
- (vii) The Armed Forces;
- (viii) The Prison Service;
- (ix) Universities;
- (x) Youth Representatives;
- (xi) Retired Clergy;
- (xii) Deaf people.

(i) Suffragan Bishops

- 11 One of the Bridge Report's recommendations (that the Bishop of Dover should be *ex-officio* a member of the House of Bishops rather than a candidate in the election of Suffragan Bishops) has already been dealt with in the Follow-up Group's First Report and has been the subject of an Amending Canon which is now in force.
- 12 The core membership of the House of Bishops is now the Diocesan Bishops with the Bishop of Dover; neither the Bridge Group nor the Follow-up Group questions the place of all Diocesan Bishops (with the Bishop of Dover) in the General Synod. There are currently nine elected Suffragan Bishops (three from York, six from Canterbury) bringing the total membership of the House of Bishops to 54. Any reduction in the overall size of General Synod will, proportionately, increase the weight of the House of Bishops within that total membership, given that there is an irreducible minimum of 45 (the 44 Diocesan Bishops, plus the Bishop of Dover). For that reason the Follow-up Group is sympathetic to the Bridge Group's Recommendation that there should be some reduction in the number of elected suffragan bishops.
- 13 It has, however, to be borne in mind that the role of suffragans in the General Synod is not identical with that of the diocesan bishops. A diocesan bishop is both a representative, in his own person, of his diocese and also part of the wider college of bishops in the Church. Suffragan bishops do not represent the dioceses in which they serve in quite that same sense: as a numerically significant body of senior clergy, they have interests and perspectives on issues which include the concerns of the dioceses in which they serve, the wider concerns of the college of

bishops, and their own distinctive perspective as a body of bishops suffragan. To exclude suffragans altogether from synodical representation would be to disenfranchise a significant group in the Church; to increase its representation (which some would argue for) would be to over-balance the presence of bishops in the General Synod. **The Follow-up Group is able to accept the Bridge Report Recommendation of a total of six suffragan bishops** (two from York, four from Canterbury) as a reasonable reduction from the present nine.

- 14 A subsidiary issue arose in discussion with the Theological Group of the House of Bishops, namely whether, as is already the case at meetings of the House of Bishops, a suffragan from the diocese concerned might be present at meetings of the General Synod when the See in question is vacant. Any such arrangement would clearly have to be strictly confined within defined circumstances. Such an arrangement would ensure episcopal representation of that diocese. On the other side, however, dioceses do not lack representation in the General Synod whereas, at a meeting of the House of Bishops, a diocese is often only represented by one episcopal voice. The Group took advice from the Standing Committee of the House of Bishops on this issue before agreeing the following recommendation. **The Follow-up Group recommends that when a See is vacant at the time of a meeting of the General Synod, and provided that a suffragan bishop from that diocese is not already an elected member of the Synod, the bishop charged with responsibility for the diocese during the vacancy should be entitled to attend, and speak at, sessions of the General Synod but without voting rights.**
- 15 A further subsidiary issue affecting membership of the House of Bishops stems from a suggestion (made by the Forces Synodical Council in the context of representation of the Armed Services, see para. 34 below) that the Bishop to the Forces might have an *ex-officio* place in the General Synod. The Follow-up Group does not recommend this proposal, on the grounds that the position of Bishop to the Forces is a responsibility delegated by the Archbishop of Canterbury (who is the Ordinary for the Armed Forces) which might at different times be held by a Suffragan or Diocesan and, if a Suffragan, one who might already be a member of General Synod by election. Taken in conjunction with our recommendations about representation of the Armed Forces (para. 34 below) the Follow-up Group takes the view that **there should not be an *ex-officio* place for the Bishop to the Forces.** For similar reasons, and on similar grounds, the Follow-up Group takes the view that **there**

should not be an *ex-officio* place for the Bishop with particular responsibility for Prisons. (See paragraphs 35-36 below.)

(ii) Provincial Episcopal Visitors

- 16 It has been suggested to the Follow-up Group that further consideration should be given to the representation of Provincial Episcopal Visitors in General Synod (with or without voting rights). The Synod has already considered this issue twice (in November 1993 and November 1995). Although the Follow-up Group has listened attentively to the debate (July 2000) on the report of the Review of the Working of the Act of Synod, no vote was taken after that debate and the Review's Recommendation on this issue (that there should be a non-voting place for one Provincial Episcopal Visitor in the Synod) remains to be addressed. **For that reason we recommend that the matter should be addressed in a separate debate.**
- 17 Subsequent sections of this Report dealing with special constituencies (paras 18-50) relate to the membership of the Houses of Clergy and Laity (or to both). Issues affecting both clerical and lay representation will be dealt with under each heading.

(iii) Deans and Provosts

- 18 At the time of drafting this Report there remain some Provosts, though any subsequent legislation would probably only need to refer to Deans in view of the gradual implementation of the provisions of the Cathedrals Measure 1999.
- 19 The Bridge Report recommended the abolition of this constituency, and that Deans and Provosts should be qualified as electors in the proctorial elections for the dioceses. The Bridge Report further recommended that Deans and Residentiary Canons of the Collegiate Churches of St Peter in Westminster, St George Windsor, and the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity in Gibraltar, should take part in the proctorial elections for the dioceses of London, Oxford and Gibraltar in Europe respectively.
- 20 In considering this matter one factor drawn to the Follow-up Group's attention was whether any retention of a special constituency ought to be broadened to be of 'Cathedrals'; and thus include residentiary canons. In view of the provisions of the recent Cathedrals Measure, which include

laity in the cathedral governing bodies (with possible implications for the balance between the Houses of Clergy and Laity in the Synod), and in view of the fact that many residentiaries are also heavily involved in diocesan work, the Follow-up Group has taken the view that if a special constituency were to continue it should be limited as at present to the Deans of cathedrals (and Westminster Abbey and Windsor).

21 There are a number of views expressed about the appropriateness or otherwise of a separate constituency for Deans. Among these are that:

- (a) the Cathedral is an integral part of its diocese, not a separate institution;
- (b) contributions made to Synod debates by Deans and Provosts are as likely to reflect individual experience and expertise as much as a specifically 'cathedral' perspective;
- (c) a fair number of residentiary canons are already elected as Proctors for the clergy and able to speak on cathedral matters when they arise (as would Deans if similarly elected);
- (d) cathedrals have distinctive channels of missionary engagement through which they relate to the secular world;
- (e) a cathedral-based perspective can complement the predominant voice from parochial and diocesan experience in the Councils of the Church.

22 The Follow-up Group is evenly divided on these issues. It has decided to **accept the Bridge Report Recommendation that the special constituency be abolished**, with its consequence that the Deans (and residentiary clergy) of Royal Peculiars be qualified as electors and be eligible for election to the House of Clergy from the appropriate dioceses. The Follow-up Group, however, places on record its view that, if a Synod debate were to result in a decision that a special constituency be retained, an appropriate level of representation, including the Deans (but not other clergy) of the Royal Peculiars, would be not more than nine (three from York, six from Canterbury).

(iv) Archdeacons

- 23 The future representation of Archdeacons is recognised to be of crucial importance in determining the composition of General Synod in that it is (as presently constituted) the largest of the special constituencies (43, one per diocese except Gibraltar in Europe). The Bridge Report proposed abolition of a special constituency, leaving Archdeacons to be candidates and voters in the clergy Proctor elections for their dioceses.
- 24 Considering these issues the Follow-up Group also had to bear in mind that, under current arrangements, Archdeacons are able to stand in the proctorial elections (apart from the one designated Archdeacon from the diocese). They are also entitled to retain a seat won as a Proctor if they are appointed Archdeacon in the diocese. By these means there were at the end of the 1995-2000 Synod ten Archdeacons in the General Synod as currently constituted (beyond the basic 43 places provided for as a special constituency); two such were elected in November 2000.
- 25 The Follow-up Group has had to consider the arguments for retaining the distinctive voice of Archdeacons in the General Synod. These have included:
- (a) the close engagement of Archdeacons with the practical administration of diocesan affairs which lends value to their contributions to Synod;
 - (b) the high profile and electability of Archdeacons in their dioceses, so that if the special constituency were to be abolished the number of Archdeacons elected as Clergy Proctors might be increased further which might then give rise to criticism;
 - (c) that the archidiaconal perspective is coloured by the circumstances of each diocese, so that a smaller group of Archdeacons in a special constituency would not carry forward the distinctive 'character' of each diocese in the same way.
- 26 Having weighed these considerations the Follow-up Group recommends that **the existing constituency of one representative Archdeacon per diocese should be retained**, but that **the avenue of election as a Clergy Proctor should be abolished**, and that a Proctor who becomes an Archdeacon in the middle of a quinquennium should only be allowed to

retain that seat with the permission of the clergy members of the Bishop's Council of the diocese in which he had served as a Clergy Proctor.

- 27 In reaching this recommendation the Follow-up Group gave careful consideration to the alternative suggestion of a smaller archidiaconal constituency comprising, say, 22 Archdeacons elected from and by their peers with an inter-provincial split of 15 (Canterbury) to 7 (York). In view of the points made in para. 24, the Group has taken the view that there is justification for one Archdeacon per diocese but that any larger representation (by the alternative proctorial route) cannot be justified within a smaller General Synod.

(v) Religious Communities

- 28 One special constituency which the Bridge Report recommended be retained was that of the religious communities (albeit on a reduced scale). There are currently five representatives of religious communities, one clerical from each Province, two lay from Canterbury and one lay from York. (The provincial distinction is determined on the basis of the location of the Mother House of the Community concerned, irrespective of where the particular representatives of religious communities reside.) The Bridge Recommendation was to reduce the number of clerical Proctors from the religious communities to one (elected from all religious communities across both Provinces), and the lay representation to be reduced to two (one from each Province).
- 29 The Follow-up Group accepts the Bridge case for a continuation of a special constituency, not only because of the distinctive contribution which members of religious communities bring to General Synod debates but also because Religious are not often likely to secure election through ordinary diocesan channels. It also takes the view that the dispersal of Mother Houses across the two Provinces is not determined by the provincial boundaries and that continued election for both clerical and lay representatives should in future be from all religious communities irrespective of Province. It further takes the view that reduction from two clerical representatives to one would too much curtail the representation and would **recommend retaining two clerical representatives of religious communities.** It accepts the Bridge Recommendation, however, that **the lay representation should be reduced from three to two.** It therefore recommends a Religious Communities constituency of two clerical and two lay representatives to be elected from all religious communities across both Provinces -

successful clerical candidates would then take their seats in the Convocation of the Province in which the Mother House of their community was situated.

- 30 The Follow-up Group takes the view that members of religious communities should be confined to the Religious Communities constituency, both as voters and candidates. Even if some clerical Religious hold a licence in the diocese where they reside, they should not be able to participate in the proctorial elections.

(vi) The Channel Islands

- 31 The Bridge Report proposed the abolition of the alternating *ex-officio* place in General Synod for the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey and the special lay constituency for the Channel Islands.
- 32 The Follow-up Group has received advice on the constitutional and legal complexities which would be involved if an attempt were made to implement the Bridge Recommendations, and suggests that **the existing arrangements be left in place with one modification**, namely that the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey should agree between themselves which one of them is to represent the Channel Islands in the General Synod (with the Bishop of Winchester arbitrating in case of dispute between the two Deans). The constitutional and legal complexities referred to in this paragraph are briefly summarised in Appendix 3 to this Report.

(vii) The Armed Forces

- 33 The Armed Forces are currently represented in General Synod by *ex-officio* membership of the three Service Archdeacons. The Bridge Report recommended the replacement of the three Service Archdeacons by a Service representation comprising three Chaplains (to be elected from the Archdeaconry Synods of each of the Armed Services) and three lay members (one from each of the Services).
- 34 The Follow-up Group is mindful of the arguments put forward by the Forces Synodical Council and others that Service personnel (both clerical and lay) are a largely disenfranchised group, even though they include many active Church members. The nature of Service establishments, frequent postings and mobility make it unlikely that the clergy and laypeople concerned will become sufficiently involved in local parish and

diocesan life to secure representation through the diocesan elections; to depend solely on the three Service Archdeacons as representatives is no longer seen as adequate. It has been put to the Group, however, that to exclude the three Service Archdeacons entirely, given the context of service life, would be inappropriate. The Follow-up Group's view is that **the Bridge Recommendation should be accepted but with the addition of one Service Archdeacon** (elected from among the three) to represent the 'headquarters' interests of the Services. In the case of disagreement the Archdeacon would be chosen by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop to the Forces. (For the Group's recommendation concerning the Bishop to the Forces see para. 15 above.). In line with the Follow-up Group's recommendation for diocesan Archdeacons (para. 26 above) the choice of one only of the three Service Archdeacons to sit in General Synod should preclude the other two standing as clergy candidates in election of other Service Representatives. This recommendation for an increased level of representation from the Services will certainly raise a question as to whether the Forces Synodical Council should be included in the apportionment on dioceses for financial support of central Church activities. Some discussion of this issue has begun and is continuing.

(viii) The Prison Service

- 35 The original Bridge Report recommended the cessation of *ex-officio* membership in the General Synod for the Chaplain-General of Prisons, and that Prison Chaplains should take part in the proctorial elections of the diocese in which they served. In considering representation of the Prison Service the Follow-up Group has once again divided evenly and reached its recommendation through the Chairman's casting vote. In favour of the Bridge Recommendation for abolishing the *ex-officio* place of the Chaplain-General of Prisons is the argument that Hospital Chaplains are also, in many instances, paid by the Government but still take a full part in diocesan electoral processes. Prison Chaplains invariably hold a licence in the diocese of their residence and are eligible to take part in proctorial elections. On the other hand, it may be argued that, like Armed Service Chaplains, Prison Chaplains are paid by the Government and are deployed in ways which make it difficult for them to take a full part in diocesan life. In the nature of the case an analogy with the Armed Services cannot be pressed further since there is no place for synodical structures for laity within the Prison Service, nor are prison service Chaplains subject to service abroad as are those in the Armed Forces. The argument for giving the Chaplain-General of Prisons an *ex-*

officio place in General Synod is that there would be at least one voice to speak for that Service. It is, however, the case that whenever prison issues are debated there are always found to be many members of Synod with experience of ministry in prisons and it will often be the case that the Bishop for Prisons is a member of Synod.

- 36 After considering these issues the Follow-up Group recommends **that the Bridge Recommendation be implemented and that there should no longer be an *ex-officio* place for the Chaplain-General of Prisons in the Synod.**

(ix) The Universities

- 37 The question of a special constituency for Universities is among the more difficult to resolve. The present arrangements are that there is an entirely clerical constituency comprising four representatives from the Province of Canterbury (three from the Universities of Cambridge, London and Oxford, and the fourth representing the remaining Universities) and two representatives from the York Province (one representing the Universities of Durham and Newcastle, the other representing the remaining Universities). The electorate (and field for candidates) is determined by enquiring of Universities the Clerks in Holy Orders in their employ. Such persons are then entered on the register of electors for the University constituency and excluded from the diocesan proctorial elections.
- 38 The origins of this arrangement lie in the days of fewer Universities when the teachers of theology would usually be Clerks in Holy Orders and ordained members of the Church of England. Proctors from the constituency are expected to provide theological reflection and expertise in debate. The value of such theological contributions in the counsels of General Synod is undoubted and appreciated, but in the view of the Follow-up Group the current arrangement for University proctorial elections is no longer the best way of securing such expertise.
- 39 The rapid expansion of Higher Education in recent years and the many new Universities mean that there are a good many more institutions whose clerical employees are eligible for this constituency than was the case until recent times. Some of these Universities employ clergy who are not engaged in theological study or teaching but follow other academic disciplines or are university administrators, or have purely pastoral duties. The growth in numbers of non-stipendiary ministers and

local ordained ministers within a wider spread of academic institutions means there is increased possibility of clerical employees of universities who are not connected with the study of theology. The present system also excludes those who teach in Theological Colleges, unless they also happen to hold a university post. A further disadvantage of the present system is that there is no avenue for lay representation of academic theological expertise (other than the normal route of diocesan lay elections) although a number of posts in Theology Faculties and Departments, and in Theological Colleges, are now held with distinction by Anglican laypersons.

- 40 The Follow-up Group has taken the view that there is value in continuing to provide a channel by which theological expertise can be ensured in the membership of the General Synod. It is equally convinced that the existing arrangements are not adequate to meet the need. **The Follow-up Group's recommendation is that the provision of appropriate theological expertise in General Synod should, ultimately, be ensured by the appointment jointly by the Presidents of not more than five persons as members of General Synod after consultation with the Appointments Committee (see paras 58-59 below).** Exercise of such a right of appointment in the interests of academic theological expertise would, however, only be made after the composition of the General Synod was known (so that due regard could be had to the number of theologians who had secured election by normal proctorial and lay elections).

(x) Youth Representatives

- 41 A recent vote in the General Synod (July 2000) requested consideration of means of securing more young members in General Synod. The Follow-up Group had already begun to examine the issue before the July 2000 debate. Some members have also met with representatives of the Young Adult Network.
- 42 The Follow-up Group and representatives of the Young Adult Network agree that the most satisfactory way for increased representation of young people is for them to stand and be elected in the normal proctorial and lay elections, and the Group notes that the Autumn 2000 elections provided the Synod with ten members aged twenty-six and under. The Group notes that there are a number of ways in which steps might be taken to increase youth representation in General Synod without the necessity for a special constituency, and the Group would not in fact favour creating

such a constituency. To do so would open the door to demands for the creation of more such constituencies and fly in the face of earlier Synod decisions about the representation of other groups, eg those from minority ethnic communities. We believe that the way forward is to encourage wider representation of young people in Synod generally through specially aimed publicity, the work of the Young Adult Network, and etc.

- 43 Some of the difficulties which have been cited for the election of young members would apply equally to other groups in Synod (eg the difficulty of attending weekday sessions, a likelihood of not being resident in one location for a five-year term; cost of printing election addresses) and these are undoubtedly issues which will need to be addressed either by a future Elections Review Group or the Business Committee.
- 44 There is however a separable issue concerning young people: should a voice in Synod be guaranteed for any organised Church of England Youth Council. We understand that there are current discussions about the possible establishment of such a Youth Council which would include representation from all dioceses. A formally established Council might reasonably look for a structured way in which its views might be made known to the General Synod.
- 45 It will certainly be argued that General Synod members aged under twenty-six who succeed in the normal elections will be expected, and expect, to contribute across the range of debates from their particular perspective; spokespersons from a Youth Council would be looked to for a more specific 'young person's viewpoint'. It is difficult for the Follow-up Group to make specific recommendations prior to there being a formally established body. The Follow-up Group takes the view that if such a body comes to exist, the Business Committee would be justified in asking the Synod whether a number of named representatives from it could have places in the Synod, either as voting or non-voting members, thus testing the Synod's mind on the issue. Such a proposal might also air the possibility of reciprocal arrangements for some General Synod members to have a place on the Youth Council.

(xi) Retired Clergy

- 46 The Follow-up Group has received representations from the Retired Clergy Association and some others drawing attention to the disenfranchisement of retired clergy (except for the provisions under Church Representation Rule 24(2) that retired clergy might elect

representatives to serve on Deanery Synods). At a time when the number of 'active' retired clergy is growing, the Follow-up Group acknowledges the strength of the arguments that are advanced in favour of some degree of representation in General Synod for this group of clergy.

- 47 As is made clear in the text of a Diocesan Synod Motion currently before General Synod (from the Diocese of Manchester) the definition of 'retired clergy' is not straightforward. The provision in Church Representation Rule 24(2) refers to clergy 'in receipt of a pension'. The current wording of the Rule requires a person appointed to be in receipt of a pension in accordance with the provisions of the Clergy Pensions Measure 1961 which limits any representation of retired clergy to those who have been in receipt of a stipend before retirement. Recent developments mean that there is strong likelihood that a potential candidate for nomination to a Deanery Synod (under the existing Rules), or in connection with any possible widening of enfranchisement, might not be in receipt of a pension as defined in the 1961 Measure. Non-stipendiary clergy and local ordained clergy will have 'retired' from some other occupation and derive their pension from sources other than those covered by the 1961 Measure. The Manchester Diocesan Synod Motion has drawn attention to this anomaly; the Group further recognises that in such a situation it is difficult to define 'retired' with sufficient precision for reflection in Representation Rules. The clergy for whom representation is sought will almost always hold Permission to Officiate rather than a licence and in considering questions related to retired clergy (in this section of the report and in paragraph 76 below) the Follow-up Group has agreed to make recommendations in respect of clergy holding a Permission to Officiate even though that will include some clergy who are not 'retired' or in receipt of a pension. Although the Follow-up Group recognises that the largest number of such ordained ministers will come into any definition of 'retired'; the principles involved are equally applicable to such active clergy as there may be who for various reasons exercise a ministry with 'Permission to Officiate' rather than under licence. Clergy who do not hold either form of this recognition of their ministry will not, usually, expect to qualify for representation in the Church's synodical system. For the remainder of this section of the report, therefore, references will be made to clergy with Permission to Officiate rather than to 'retired' clergy.
- 48 The Follow-up Group considered a system of representation by which retired clerks who are members of a deanery synod under the provision of Church Representation Rule 24(2) are included in the electorate in

proctorial elections and are also allowed to stand as candidates. Such a system would be similar to the limited form of representation outlined in paragraph 10.3 of the Bridge Report. Although this option has the merit of adapting the present arrangements to include a group of clergy who are currently disenfranchised, such a change would raise issues about whether it was practical to bring together all proctors but only a proportion of retired clergy in the same electorate. It would be open to question whether any cleric with Permission to Officiate could gather sufficient votes to be elected in competition with candidates from the licensed clergy.

- 49 By a majority the Follow-up Group's view (like that of the Bridge Group) is that more direct representation of such clergy in General Synod should be established. Whatever mechanism was adopted there would be organisational complexity. After reviewing possible models the Group suggests that representation could be organised on the following basis:
- (a) The Diocesan Electoral Roll Officer should inform the Provincial Registrar of the names and addresses of clerics holding Permission to Officiate serving on a deanery synod.
 - (b) The election shall be held on a provincial basis and any cleric with Permission to Officiate in a diocese in the Province should be eligible to be a candidate even if not currently a member of a Deanery Synod under the provisions of Church Representation Rule 24(2), but the candidate must be proposed and seconded by clerics with Permission to Officiate who serve on a Deanery Synod in the Province. The voters would be confined to those with Permission to Officiate who are members of Deanery Synods in the Province. This reflects the position of the laity.
 - (c) Arrangements would need to be in place to ensure that no cleric with Permission to Officiate (possibly in more than one diocese) acquired voting or candidacy rights in more than one Province.
 - (d) If such provisions were to be implemented clerics elected to General Synod on the basis of 'Permission to Officiate' should serve among the Proctors for the diocese in which they hold Permission to Officiate and not function as a 'special constituency'. When elected to General Synod such clerics shall have *ex officio* membership of the diocesan synod and deanery synod where they reside. Membership of the PCC should not be automatic but only where the PCC co-opts under Rule 14.

(e) On the question about the number of special places on General Synod the Follow-up Group considers that 6 places (4 from Canterbury and 2 from York) would be appropriate. The Group was advised that there are currently about 4,200 clergy with Permission to Officiate in the Church of England. This total would suggest a '10%' group of about 400 clergy serving on deanery synods under the provisions of Church Representation Rule 24(2). The figure of 6 General Synod representatives most conveniently divides into four and two according to the 70:30 provincial ratio referred to in paragraph 57 below.

50 The Follow-up Group takes the view that such representation of those with 'Permission to Officiate' should be limited to those in priest's and deacon's orders. To extend the right of representation to retired Bishops (who could have Permission to Officiate even if formally appointed Assistant Bishop) would present difficulties in finding practical ways in which they might be identified, and would further increase the proportion of the House of Bishops within the Synod as a whole.

(xii) Representation of Deaf people

51 At a very late stage in the Follow-up Group's work, when the text of this draft report had been largely agreed, attention was drawn by the National Deaf Church Conference to a range of issues surrounding synodical representation of Deaf people.

52 It was apparent that there was some concern that those worshipping with separate "churches" for Deaf people might be excluded from any participation in synodical government at all. The Follow-up Group draws attention to the provisions of Church Representation Rule 24(6)(c) under which (with the bishop's agreement) representation can be given within the Synodical system at deanery and diocesan level to groups such as Deaf people. Discussions continue on whether these provisions might be modified to include an easier access to electoral rolls and thus to the franchise for General Synod.

53 These questions of representation for Deaf people in General Synod could not be adequately discussed by the Follow-up Group, or incorporated into this report, if its work was not to be unreasonably delayed. It has already drawn the attention of those who made representations to the possibilities that exist for intervention in the General Synod debate on this Report (and in subsequent legislative processes, should the General Synod call for

these). The Group encourages those who are concerned with these issues to intervene at those synodical stages.

- 54 The Group further recognise that any discussion of synodical representation for Deaf people will give rise to questions about the adequacy of arrangements for the representation of others potentially disadvantaged in parallel ways, eg the visually impaired. There are further questions, more concerned with the organisation of the Synod's life than with the Follow-up Group's work, as to the appropriate arrangements to be made at meetings of the General Synod for those who are so disadvantaged. The Group notes that circumstances have already resulted in appropriate arrangements being made when the need for them has arisen in connection with a disability.

Size of the General Synod

- 55 The Bridge Report made specific recommendations about the size of the General Synod (GS 1252, pp 74-77). It argued for a General Synod with 390 members (plus the possibility of five archiepiscopal nominees). In arguing for such a reduction it noted the reduction of 2113 in the number of clerical electors between 1970 and 1995 and of 1,092,379 in the number on Church Electoral Rolls in the same period. The Bridge Report took the view that such reduction in numbers made it appropriate that the size of General Synod (and therefore of each of its constituent Houses) should be reduced. It argued that a smaller Synod would encourage more effective representation by enabling a higher degree of participation in discussion, would be cheaper, and be less demanding in time and administration.
- 56 As has already been noted (paragraph 7 above) consideration of the number, size and composition of special constituencies interrelates closely with questions surrounding the size and composition of the General Synod as a whole. A decision to retain some special constituencies (in line with the recommendations already set out) inevitably has consequences for balances within the membership of General Synod, and such balances might not easily or satisfactorily be resolved if the overall membership were to be reduced too drastically.
- 57 In its breakdown of its proposed membership of 390 among the Houses and Constituencies, the Bridge Report retained the current proportion of membership from the Provinces of Canterbury and York, 257 from Canterbury and 108 from York (a further 25 being from either Province,

eg *ex-officio* or appointed); a proportion of 68% to 32%. The suggestion has been made in recent Synod interventions that a more equitable distribution might be 72% to 28%, but application of such a model seriously challenges equity of representation. In the sizes and models discussed in ensuing paragraphs, alternative breakdowns have therefore been suggested to reflect a differential of 70% to 30% between the provinces thus recognising the need for some change in the proportions without moving as far as a 72%/28% split. The Follow-up Group has also opted to work with a minimum of 3 clerical and 3 lay representatives from all dioceses (with the exception of Sodor and Man and Europe) which has been the basis to date. It takes the view that a balanced representation from an area the size of an English diocese suggests such a minimum of three. As has already been noted, the smaller the overall membership of the projected Synod the larger the proportion taken up by the House of Bishops.

58 If the recommendations regarding special constituencies (set out in paras 10-50 above) were to be implemented (including a quota of five archiepiscopal appointments to reflect academic theological expertise) there would be 67 plus at least 13 *ex-officio* members: (6 appointed members of the Archbishops' Council; 3 Legal Officers; 3 Church Estates Commissioners; and the Chairman of the Church of England Pensions Board) as compared with 84 (plus 13 *ex-officio*) in the current Synod of 581. On the 'Bridge Model' of 395 (including archiepiscopal appointees), after deducting 51 members of the House of Bishops (344), 331 places would be left for Proctors and members of the House of Laity through the diocesan elections, plus 8 *ex-officio*. The Group has taken the view that this would be too small a number to secure equitable representation from all dioceses and a sufficient working membership of the Synod.

59 For this reason the Follow-up Group has preferred to begin with models larger than those of the Bridge Report Recommendations but to continue to look for a significant reduction in the overall membership. It takes the view that for a reduction to be regarded as significant the total should come below 500 disregarding the power of co-option. In reaching its recommendations on questions of special constituencies the Group has had in mind an eventual total membership of General Synod ranging between 480 and 499 (including *ex-officio* and Archiepiscopal appointees) so as to reflect the wide variety of expertise in different parts of the Church of England. It takes this to be of more importance than either a doctrinaire adherence to reduced numbers reflecting reduction in church membership, or the saving of costs.

- 60 For the Follow-up Group this consideration weighs more heavily than purely financial arguments of cost saving. It is evident from the Bridge Report and subsequent correspondence, however, that many are concerned about costs and we give details of approximate costs per member for meetings in London and York in Appendix 4.
- 61 The figures given in the preceding paragraphs are on the basis of voting membership. The Follow-up Group presumes the continued presence of our ecumenical members (without voting rights) as additional to the number of members discussed in this report. The experience of participation by members appointed from other Churches has been of such recognised value that it should continue, and the number of such representatives should be additional to the voting membership of the Synod.
- 62 The computer-generated models illustrating the proposals in paras 57-59 are annexed to this Report for information (Appendix 5). The Follow-up Group draws no final conclusions on exact numbers (which cannot easily be done until decisions on Special Constituencies have been taken). It recommends, however, that **a total membership in the range of 480-490 (plus appointees) would be consistent with adequate representation and at the same time secure a significant reduction from the present total of 581.** Those who argue for the reduction below 400 recommended in the Bridge Report need to consider the criticism of inadequate representation which would inevitably result, given the complex and diverse range of interests in the Church which properly look for a voice in its central councils.

Other Matters

- 63 In the course of its second phase of work the Follow-up Group has been asked to give attention to a number of other issues as follows listed in paragraph 3.

(a) *Voluntary Societies and Mission Agencies*

- 64 In the light of some views voiced in correspondence the Follow-up Group revisited the Bridge Report Recommendation (para. 8.3) that there should be no special representation for Voluntary Societies and Mission Agencies in General Synod. The Group **continues to support that Recommendation**, noting that clergy and laypeople in this category

become well known to the diocesan electorates through travel and personal contacts; a number have been elected to the General Synod as diocesan representatives.

(b) Role and Status of Diocesan Secretary

- 65 One matter outstanding from consideration of the Bridge Report which was not resolved in the Follow-up Group's First Report was the recommendation that 'Statutory provision should be made which will give the Diocesan Secretary a legal persona but also allow dioceses themselves to allocate to the Secretary such functions as they deem appropriate'.
- 66 In seeking to produce a proposal which would address this recommendation the Follow-up Group has had discussions with the Consultative Group of DBF Chairmen and Secretaries and has taken legal advice. The Follow-up Group is aware of the varying practice and perception of the role of the Diocesan Secretary from diocese to diocese, and the distinct roles of the Diocesan Synod and DBF as parties to the appointment of such an officer. The Consultative Group is producing a document giving guidance on this subject and dioceses will wish to study and discuss this in the light of their particular needs.
- 67 Subject to drafting by Standing Counsel, the Follow-up Group proposes wording on the following lines to be included in legislation in order to give legal persona to the role and office of Diocesan Secretary and to the appointment of such an officer:

'There shall be an office entitled 'Diocesan Secretary' the holder of which shall be the chief administrative officer of the diocese appointed on terms as shall be determined by the Diocesan Synod and such officer may also be appointed to be the Secretary of the Diocesan Synod and the Diocesan Board of Finance.'

- 68 It is also for consideration whether a Diocesan Secretary who has been elected to the General Synod should become an *ex-officio* member of a Diocesan Synod or whether there should be a provision preventing such a person being a member of the Synod of which he or she is the servant.

(c) *Corporate and employer status for Deanery Synods*

- 69 One issue consistently raised in submissions to the Follow-up Group was whether Deanery Synods should be given corporate and employer status in law. In times when many more initiatives and projects are being undertaken on a deanery-wide basis the need to employ personnel to further such initiatives and projects increasingly arises. Since Deanery Synods do not have corporate or employer status the current practice is to rely on the diocese to be the employer on behalf of the Deanery, or for a particular parish within the Deanery to take on the duties of employer on behalf of the whole Deanery. Would it be sensible for Deanery Synods to be constituted as corporate bodies able to act as employer in their own right?
- 70 In order to gain some sense of the support there might be for such a move dioceses were asked to comment on the issue. Some 25 dioceses responded (most after taking wider soundings within deaneries). The responses were more or less equally divided between those welcoming the possibility of more flexibility by giving corporate status to deaneries and those who had concerns over possible liabilities falling on Deanery Synod members and the complexities of coping with employment legislation at that level.
- 71 While noting the support for deaneries to develop their own projects, the Follow-up Group did not feel that corporate status was the appropriate vehicle for achieving this. Deaneries could only become corporate entities by changing the current legislation, a method that is not recommended for the following reasons:
- It would oblige all deaneries to become bodies corporate.
 - While it would be possible to make legislative provision for some deaneries to become bodies corporate if they so wished, that would add considerable complexity to the arrangements.
 - It would seem desirable that if projects are to be undertaken on behalf of a deanery they should be undertaken through a body having charitable status (so as to secure tax relief and access to charitable funding); and it is doubted whether deanery synods in their present form would be eligible for such status in view of their purposes as set out in Section 5 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969. (Whether this is in fact the case is being explored with the Church Commissioners.)

- 72 The Follow-up Group believes that deaneries wishing to undertake major projects, including the employment of staff, will wish to do so through the medium of a charitable entity. On the assumption that deanery synods are not themselves eligible for charitable status, the Follow-up Group recommends that deaneries wishing to consider projects of this kind should consider establishing a separate charitable entity for the purpose. Two forms of charitable vehicle are recommended: a charitable trust and a charitable company limited by guarantee. Deaneries planning to go in either of these directions would need to take legal advice and consult their diocesan office. Details about these recommended forms of charitable vehicle are explained in the "Good Practice in Deaneries" report from the Follow-up Group's Deanery Sub-Group (GS Misc 639) which will shortly be circulated to General Synod members.

(d) The relationship between Diocesan Boards of Finance and Diocesan Synods

- 73 One of the Bridge Report's Recommendations (6.30) was that where the DBF and the Diocesan Synod are not identical, the DBF should be subordinate to the resolutions of the Diocesan Synod. There was a further request that the 1925 Measure be amended to remove remaining doubt about the legality of establishing a single body to perform the functions of both a Diocesan Synod and a Diocesan Board of Finance, and otherwise to provide flexibility for dioceses to make arrangements for the conduct of their financial business which best suit their circumstances.
- 74 The Follow-up Group has heard legal opinion that since the DBF has statutory financial powers and responsibilities it would be constrained if it were to be made subordinate to another body (the Diocesan Synod) and the Group also notes that in November 2000 an amendment to the Draft Synodical Government Measure which would have given Diocesan Synods a duty to approve/disapprove interim budgets, lapsed for lack of support. The Follow-up Group is seeking the views of the Charity Commission on this aspect of the Bridge proposals which will be reported to the Synod in due course.
- 75 The Follow-up Group is in broad sympathy with the overall trend (both in dioceses where the DBF and Diocesan Synod are distinct and also dioceses where the two bodies have merged) to bring policy and finance into closer relation. The Follow-up Group therefore **supports the**

implementation of legislation to remove any doubt about the legality of merging the two bodies and to enshrine arrangements which would promote the alignment of the work and activities of the Diocesan Synod and DBF. The Follow-up Group also notes that in some dioceses the Bishop's Council has been given a role in co-ordination of functions and any legislation will need to make clear the relationship of the Bishop's Council (as Standing Committee of the Diocesan Synod) to the DBF.

(e) Residence qualification for retired clergy members of Deanery Synod

- 76 One matter raised in correspondence relates to the provisions of Church Representation Rule 24(2)(d) that a retired Clerk qualifying for membership of a Deanery Synod should be resident in that Deanery. The correspondent submitted that this was a more stringent residence qualification than would apply to anyone else who would be able to qualify for membership of a Deanery Synod in which they did not reside, by entry on an electoral roll or because of the defined location of their work under licence. **The Follow-up Group supports moves to bring required qualifications for clergy with Permission to Officiate into line with those for other members of the Deanery Synod and urges that legislative provision should include an entitlement for a clergyman with Permission to Officiate (see paras 46-49 above) to qualify for membership of a Deanery Synod on the basis of the church where he or she has habitually worshipped for six months even if that were not in the Deanery of his or her residence.**

(f) Private Members' Motions

- 77 Among the outstanding points in the Bridge Report which were not covered in the Follow-up Group's First Report were the recommendations relating to Private Members' Motions (Bridge 13.11). The recommendation was that the Private Member should be required to take a proposed Private Member's Motion to the appropriate Diocesan Synod for endorsement before it could appear on the Agenda of the General Synod. The Follow-up Group has expressed the view to the Business and Standing Orders Committees that this would unduly constrain a member's wish to bring a particular topic to the attention of the General Synod and add to already crowded Diocesan Synod Agendas. The Follow-up Group favours an affirmation of both Diocesan Synod and

Private Members' Motions and takes the view that it would normally be desirable to see a provision for debate of at least one Private Member's Motion and one Diocesan Synod Motion at each Group of Sessions of the General Synod (with an exception for Private Members' Motions at the first group of sessions in any quinquennium).

(g) Separate Accounts for District Church Councils

- 78 Power for District Church Councils to have separate accounts from the parent Parochial Church Council was included in a Statutory Instrument. The Charity Commission considered that DCCs were not charities in their own right and that it was not appropriate for there to be separate accounting arrangements for DCCs. Accordingly, arrangements to repeal these provisions have been included in the Synodical Government (Amendment) Measure to be considered for Final Approval at the July 2001 sessions. Representatives of the Diocese of Liverpool are not content with this and, as a consequence, the Follow-up Group has looked again at the matter in the course of the second stage of its work. Although the Follow-up Group recognises the strength of feeling in the Diocese of Liverpool, it has taken the view that, in the light of the stance taken by the Charity Commission, it cannot support a proposal that separate accounting powers be given to DCCs.

(h) Composition of Bishop's Staff Meetings

- 79 One matter raised in correspondence was a concern about the over-clericalisation of Bishop's Staff Meetings and a suggestion that there be a statutory requirement to include lay representation. The Follow-up Group takes the view that although most dioceses have a Bishop's Staff Meeting of known composition and frequency of meeting, it is not a statutory body and, in the Group's view, it is best left without formal legal status so as to leave each diocesan bishop free to adjust its composition and style of working to suit his own particular episcopal ministry. The Follow-up Group notes that in a good many dioceses the Diocesan Secretary (usually a layperson) attends all or a good part of the proceedings of a Bishop's Staff Meeting. The essence of such a meeting is that it is a periodic gathering of those with executive responsibility in support of the diocesan bishop's ministry. Function and the diocesan bishop's wishes, rather than lay or ordained status, should be the determining factor in deciding who attends.

(i) Accounting year for parochial church councils

- 80 Another matter raised in correspondence with the Follow-up Group concerned the accounting year for parochial church councils. The request was that PCCs should be able to choose the end of their accounting year to suit their own convenience and so enable one experienced examiner to act for more than one PCC if the work of examining the accounts could be staggered. The Follow-up Group has taken the view that this matter does not naturally fall into its terms of reference and suggests that the matter be raised with any Elections Review Group established for the 2000-2005 Synod or be dealt with by way of a proposed amendment to the Revision Committee for the Synodical Government (Amendment) Measure when it is convened in connection with the proposals in this Second Report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 81 Recommendations the Follow-up Group brings to Synod in the preceding paragraphs are summarised as follows.

(a) SPECIAL CONSTITUENCIES

(1) Suffragan Bishops (para. 13)

The Group accepts the Bridge Report Recommendation of a total of six suffragan bishops (two from York, four from Canterbury) as a reasonable reduction from the present nine.

(2) Suffragan bishop representing the dioceses on General Synod during a vacancy (para. 14)

The Follow-up Group recommends that when a See is vacant at the time of a meeting of the General Synod, and provided that the suffragan bishop from that diocese is not already an elected member of the Synod, the bishop charged with responsibility for the diocese during the vacancy should be entitled to attend, and speak at, sessions of the General Synod but without voting rights.

(3) Bishop to the Forces (para. 15)

The Follow-up Group recommends that there should not be an *ex-officio* place for the Bishop to the Forces.

(4) Bishop to Prisons (para. 15)

The Follow-up Group recommends that there should not be an *ex-officio* place for the Bishop with particular responsibility for Prisons.

(5) Provincial Episcopal Visitors (Para. 16)

The Follow-up Group recommends that the issue of the representation of Provincial Episcopal Visitors in the General Synod should be addressed in a separate debate in the General Synod.

(6) Deans and Provosts (para. 22)

The Follow-up Group accepts the Bridge Recommendation that the special constituency for Deans and Provosts be abolished.

(7) Archdeacons (para. 26)

The Follow-up Group recommends:

- (i) that two existing constituency of one representative Archdeacon per diocese should be retained;
- (ii) that the avenue of election as a Clergy Proctor should be abolished; and
- (iii) that a Proctor who becomes an Archdeacon in the middle of a quinquennium should only be allowed to retain that seat with the permission of the clergy members of the Bishop's Council of the dioceses in which he had served as a Clergy Proctor.

(8) Religious Communities (para. 29)

The Follow-up Group recommends:

- (i) that the two clerical representatives of religious communities be retained;
- (ii) that the number of lay representatives of religious communities be reduced from three to two (as recommended in the Bridge Report); and
- (iii) that the clerical and lay representatives be elected from all religious communities across both Provinces and successful candidates would take their seats in the Convocation of the Province in which the Mother House of their community was situated.

(9) Channel Islands (para. 32)

The Follow-up Group recommends that the existing arrangements for clerical and lay representation from the Channel Islands be left in place with one modification, namely that the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey should agree between themselves which of them is to represent the Channel Islands in the General Synod (with the Bishop of Winchester arbitrating in the case of a disagreement).

(10) Armed Forces (para. 34)

The Follow-up Group accepts the Bridge Report Recommendations of:

- (i) the replacement of the three Service Archdeacons by a Service representation comprising three Chaplains (to be elected from the Archdeaconry Synods of each of the Armed Services; and
- (ii) three lay members (one from each of the Services).

In addition the Follow-up Group recommends a place on the General Synod for one Service Archdeacon (elected from among the three) with the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop to the

Forces arbitrating in the case of a disagreement. A Service Archdeacon not elected for this place should not be eligible to be a candidate in the election of chaplains from the Archdeaconry Synods (described at (i) above).

(11) Chaplain-General of Prisons (para. 36)

The Follow-up Group recommends that the Bridge Recommendation be implemented and that there should no longer be an ex-officio place for the Chaplain-General of Prisons in the Synod.

(12) The Universities (para. 40)

The Follow-up Group accepts the Bridge Report Recommendation for the repeal of the provisions of Canon H2 which secure six places in the House of Clergy to be elected by certain universities. The Group recommends that appropriate theological expertise in General Synod should be ensured by the appointment jointly by the Presidents of not more than five persons as members of the General Synod after consultation with the Appointments Committee.

(13) Retired Clergy (para. 49)

The Follow-up Group recommends a representation of 6 retired clergy on the General Synod (4 from the Province of Canterbury and 2 from the Province of York) to be elected by those clerics holding Permission to Officiate who serve on deanery synods. Details of this proposal are contained in paragraph 49 above.

(14) Voluntary Societies and Mission Agencies (para. 64)

The Follow-up Group supports the Bridge Report Recommendation that there should be no special representation for Voluntary Societies and Mission Agencies in General Synod.

(b) OVERALL SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(15) Size and Membership of the General Synod (para. 62)

The Follow-up Group recommends a total membership in the range of 480-490 (plus appointees). A possible model of such membership is contained in Appendix 4 alongside models of the current membership and the model proposed in the Bridge Report.

(d) OTHER MATTERS

(16) Role and Status of Diocesan Secretary (paras 65-68)

The Follow-up Group supports the Bridge Recommendation to give the office of diocesan secretary a legal persona. A form of wording for inclusion in statutory legislation is suggested in paragraph 67.

**(17) Relationship between Diocesan Boards
of Finance and Diocesan Synods (para. 75)**

The Follow-up Group recommends the implementation of legislation to remove any doubt about the legality of merging the two bodies and to enshrine arrangements which would promote the alignment of the work and activities of the Diocesan Synod and DBF.

**(18) Residence qualification for retired clergy members of
Deanery Synod (para. 76)**

The Follow-up Group supports moves to bring required qualification for clergy with Permission to Officiate into line with those for other members of a deanery synod. Paragraph 76 contains further details.

Church House SW1
April 2001

On behalf of the Follow-up Group
JUDITH ROSE
Chairman

APPENDICES

- 1 Membership and terms of reference
- 2 Summary of Bridge Report proposals on Deaneries and the Follow-up Group's decision.
- 3 A note about the Channel Islands.
- 4 Cost per member of sessions of General Synod.
- 5 Models of General Synod Membership.

APPENDIX ONE

Membership

The Venerable Judith Rose, Archdeacon of Tonbridge
(Chairman)

The Rt Revd Peter Forster, Bishop of Chester
Professor Michael Clarke
Mrs Penny Granger
The Revd Ben Hopkinson
Mr John Leigh
The Revd Dr David Stone

Mrs Lesley Farrall (Diocesan Assessor from April 1999)

Terms of Reference

To consider the recommendations of the "Synodical Government in the Church of England" report – taking into account the comments on them during the General Synod debate and by dioceses, General Synod members and others – and to make proposals to the Archbishops' Council as to future action.

APPENDIX TWO

BRIDGE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT DEANERIES with reference to paragraph 2 (a)

Deaneries and deanery synods

The main recommendation made in the Bridge Report concerning deaneries concerned the separation of deanery synods from the synodical system. This recommendation was worded as follows:

We recommend that the statutory requirement for deanery synods to be part of the formal structure of synodical government should be repealed. (para 5.19 page 34)

There were a number of consequential recommendations which can be summarised as follows:

- Each diocese would be required to produce scheme(s) for deanery arrangements to be approved by the deanery synod. (para 5.20 page 34)
- Diocesan synods would acquire statutory functions of approving arrangements for the effective operation of deaneries, informing deaneries and parishes about diocesan policy and receiving and, where necessary, taking action on matters referred to it. (para 6.6 page 38)
- The electorate from deanery synods for lay membership of diocesan and General Synod was to be replaced by an electorate of "synodical electors" who would be elected by each parish at its annual parochial church meeting. A similar arrangement was proposed for cathedral worshippers. (paras 10.13 and 10.14 on pages 20-21)

The Bridge Report Follow-Up Group decided not to pursue these recommendations but instead proposed the creation of a model of good practice and to this end invited comments and suggestions by 1 June 2000 (see paras 4.1 to 4.6 and Appendix Two of the First Report).

A Sub-Group of the Follow-Up Group considered the many responses received and summarised its conclusions in the "Good practice in deaneries" report (GS Misc 639).

Deanery boundaries

The Bridge Report also contained a proposal for a "fast-track" procedure by which deanery boundaries would be altered by the diocesan synod (with a parish right of appeal to an independent body) rather than by a Pastoral Measure scheme or order (para 5.21 page 35).

The Follow-Up Group decided to recommend statutory legislation for this recommendation (paras 2.9 and 2.10 in the First Report) and that proposal subsequently came into effect as part of the Church of England Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 2000 (amending Section 14 of the Pastoral Measure). The Church Commissioners acquired the appellate function.

APPENDIX THREE

REPRESENTATION OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS ON THE GENERAL SYNOD

with reference to paragraphs 31 and 32

1. The Bridge Report recommendations

The following recommendations were made in Chapter Eight of the Bridge Report about clergy and lay representation of the Channel Islands

That the provisions of Canon H2 and the rules made thereunder which secure one place in the House of Clergy for either the Dean of Jersey or the Dean of Guernsey be repealed (paras 8.29 and 13.10 pages 64-65 and 116)

That the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure 1931 be repealed and that, so far as necessary, Rule 36 of the Church Representation Rules be amended to provide that candidates from the deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey shall be eligible for election to the House of Laity in the same way as any other lay candidates from the diocese of Winchester (paras 8.48 pages 71 and 117)

2. The Bridge Group's view

The Bridge Report did not make a detailed argument about the unusual position of the Island but its recommendations as quoted above were consistent with the general principle as expressed in paragraph 8.9 that clergy and laity currently elected by "special constituencies" should as far as possible be candidates and voters "in the same way as other clergy and lay people in the dioceses".

3. The main constitutional and legal considerations

A number of representations were received including detail about the specific history of the Channel Islands in relation both to the United Kingdom and to the Church of England. The main constitutional and legal factors that emerged from the representations were as follows:

- (i) The Channel Islands are a Crown Possession but not part of the United Kingdom; being a portion of the Duchy of Normandy still annexed to the Crown.
- (ii) The Islands are not part of Winchester Diocese but merely "attached" to it. In 1499, at the request of King Henry VII, Pope Alexander VI placed the Channel Islands under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester but did not incorporate them as part of Winchester diocese. This jurisdiction was confirmed by Queen Elizabeth I in 1568 and King Charles II in 1662.
- (iii) The Canons of the Church of England do not apply in the Islands. Jersey has its own canons. Guernsey has no canons at all and looks to the authority of its Dean.
- (iv) The 1931 Representation Measure and 1931 Church Legislation Measure were drafted to reflect the special position of the Channel Islands.
- (v) The changes proposed by the Bridge Report would involve a complicated process involving other measures besides the Channel Islands Representation Measure. The Islands have separate legislatures from the Westminster Parliament which would need to be consulted by the Home Secretary before any amending Measure could be brought into force in the Islands by Order in Council on the initiative of the Bishop of Winchester.

- (vi) The clergy serving in the Islands are electors (and can stand for election) in the diocesan constituency by virtue of being beneficed or licensed by the Bishop of Winchester. The laity are elected by and from the laity of the Islands and, with whichever of the Deans is serving on the General Synod for the Islands, should be listed under "The Channel Islands" in the list of members rather than as part of the Diocese of Winchester.

APPENDIX FOUR

COST OF SYNOD SESSIONS IN LONDON AND YORK with reference to paragraph 60

The figures below take account of subsistence (accommodation and meals), travel and postage but exclude a number of other factors which are not directly related to the number of members e.g. the cost of printing reports, committees that meet between the sessions, the hiring of rooms and equipment for the sessions

COST PER MEMBER FOR A THREE SESSION YEAR

The major elements of a cost per member for a year in which there are February and November sessions in London and a July session in York are shown below using November 1999, February 2000 and July 2000 as an example.

November 1999 subsistence	£202:71	per member
February 2000 subsistence	127:73	per member
July 2000 subsistence	209:74	per member
(Subsistence for the three sessions	540:18	per member)
Travel costs	139:44	per member
Postage	24:93	per member
Total	704:55	per member

COST PER MEMBER FOR A TWO SESSION YEAR.

The major elements of a cost per member for a year in which there is a July session in York and November sessions in London are shown below using November 1999 and July 2000 as an example.

November 1999 subsistence	£202:71	per member
July 2000 subsistence	209:74	per member
(Subsistence for the two sessions)	412:45	per member)
Travel costs	109:38	per member
Postage	24:93	per member
Total	£546:76	per member

APPENDIX FIVE MODELS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF GENERAL SYNOD
 With reference to paragraph 62

House of Bishops

	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model
Diocesans	44	44	44
Bp of Dover	1	1	1
Representative suffragans:			
Canterbury	6	4	4
York	3	2	2
Total House of Bishops	54	51	51

House of Clergy

House of Laity

	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model
Deans						
Canterbury	10	-	-			
York	5	-	-			
Representative Archdeacons						
Canterbury	29	-	29			
York	14	-	14			
Service Archdeacons	3	-	1			
Armed Forces Elected representatives -		3	3	-	3	3
Chaplain-General of Prisons	1	-	-			
University Proctors						
Canterbury	4	-	-			
York	2	-	-			
Religious communities						
Canterbury	1	-	-	2	1	-
York	1	-	-	1	1	-
Provinces combined	-	1	2	-	-	2

House of Clergy (continued)

House of Laity (continued)

2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model
---------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------

Ex-officio

Either province	-	-	-	2	3	2
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

(N.B. these current two ex-officio places are for the First and Second Church Estates Commissioners. A third place (which was current at the time of the Bridge Report but has since ceased) was for the Chair of the then Central Board of Finance)

Retired Clergy places

Canterbury	-	-	4		
York	-	-	2		

Province of Canterbury Proctors

Elected lay representatives

Canterbury	3	3	3	4	3	3
London	9	7	8	10	5	9
Winchester	4	3	3	7	4	5
Channel Islands	1	0	1	2	0	2
Bath and Wells	4	3	3	7	5	6
Birmingham	3	3	3	3	3	3
Bristol	3	3	3	4	3	3
Chelmsford	6	5	5	9	6	8
Chichester	6	4	5	10	7	9
Coventry	3	3	3	3	3	3
Derby	3	3	3	4	3	3
Ely	3	3	3	4	3	3
Europe	2	2	2	2	2	2
Exeter	4	3	3	6	4	5
Gloucester	3	3	3	5	3	4
Guildford	4	3	3	5	3	4
Hereford	3	3	3	3	3	3
Leicester	3	3	3	3	3	3
Lichfield	6	4	5	9	6	8
Lincoln	4	3	3	5	3	4
Norwich	4	3	3	5	3	3
Oxford	8	6	7	10	6	9
Peterborough	3	3	3	3	3	3
Portsmouth	3	3	3	3	3	3

House of Clergy (continued)

House of Laity (continued)

	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model	2000- 2005	Bridge model	BRFG model
Rochester	4	3	3	6	3	4
St Albans	6	4	4	8	5	7
St Eds and Ips	3	3	3	5	3	4
Salisbury	5	3	4	8	5	7
Southwark	7	6	6	8	5	7
Truro	3	3	3	3	3	3
Worcester	3	3	3	4	3	3

Total proctors/lay representatives for:

Canterbury	126	104	110	168	114	143
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Province of York

Proctors

Elected lay representatives

York	6	3	4	8	4	7
Durham	5	3	4	6	3	5
Blackburn	5	3	4	8	5	7
Bradford	3	3	3	3	3	3
Carlisle	3	3	3	5	3	4
Chester	5	3	4	11	6	9
Liverpool	5	3	4	7	4	5
Manchester	7	4	5	8	4	7
Newcastle	3	3	3	4	3	3
Ripon and Leeds	3	3	3	4	3	3
Sheffield	4	3	3	5	3	4
Sodor and Man	1	1	1	1	1	1
Southwell	4	3	3	4	3	3
Wakefield	4	3	3	5	3	4

Total proctors/lay representatives for

York Province	58	41	47	79	48	65
---------------	----	----	----	----	----	----

Total proctors/lay representatives for both

Provinces	184	145	157	247	162	208
-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Total for House	254	149	212	252	170	215
-----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

	2000-	Bridge	BRFG
	2005	model	model

Ex-officio

Either House of Clergy
or House of Laity

Either Province

5	5	5
---	---	---

(N.B. These 5 ex-officio places belong to the Third Church Estates Commissioner, the Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board, the Dean of the Arches and the two Vicars General)

Appointed members

From House of Bishops, Clergy or Laity

Either Province

6	5	11
---	---	----

(N.B. there are currently up to six ex-officio places on the General Synod for appointed members of the Archbishops' Council; the Bridge Report recommended up a power for the Archbishops to appoint up to five people as members of the Synod; in the Follow-Up Group's model there are up to eleven places (up to six related to the Archbishops' Council appointed members and up to five appointments in relation to the provision of appropriate theological expertise (see para 40 of this report)).

Total General Synod membership
(excluding ecumenical and co-opted places)

571	380	494
-----	-----	-----

ECUMENICAL REPRESENTATIVES

Eight representatives of other Churches are currently appointed and will continue to be appointed to the Synod under its Standing Orders with speaking but not voting rights.

CO-OPTED PLACES: HOUSE OF CLERGY

The Convocation of Canterbury has the current power to co-opt up to three of its members to the House of Clergy and the Convocation of York has a similar power for up to two of its members. These powers were not affected by any proposals of the Bridge Report or the Bridge Report Follow-Up Group.

CO-OPTED PLACES: HOUSE OF LAITY

The House of Laity of the General Synod has the current power to co-opt up to five lay members of the Church of England to its number. This power was not affected by any proposals of the Bridge Report or the Bridge Report Follow-Up Group.

DIVISOR METHOD TO DETERMINE ALLOCATION OF SEATS BY DIOCESE

In all three models each diocese (except for Europe and Sodor and Man) has a minimum of three clergy and three lay representatives. The "Largest Divisor" method was used to allocate the seats. Details about this method (and other possible computer-generated methods) can be obtained from Canon Michael Hodge.

Published by the General Synod of the Church of
England and on sale at the Church House Bookshop,
31 Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BN

Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2001

£4