

## **Appointments to the Archbishops' Council**

### **Note by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York**

1. As members of the General Synod know, the terms of office of the six current appointed members of the Archbishops' Council expire on 31 December 2001. We now bring to Synod our proposals for fresh appointments to run from 1 January 2002.
2. In reaching these proposals we have consulted both the Appointments Committee and the Council, as we are required to do by paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 1 to the National Institutions Measure 1998. We have been assisted by a small advisory group set up on the lines envisaged in GS 1377 and consisting of the following elected members of the Council:

The Revd Canon Bob Baker  
Canon Dr Christina Baxter  
Mr Brian McHenry  
The Revd Canon Glyn Webster

and two elected members of the Appointments Committee:

Mr Anthony Archer  
Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams

We are grateful for their help. We have also, of course, met individually with each of the present appointed members.

3. The following considerations have been very much in our minds:
  - (a) we have found widespread recognition of the contribution which the existing members have made to the early life of the Council. Wider questions relating to the composition of the Council will fall to be reviewed at a later date when the overall arrangements made by the 1998 Measure are considered, but no one doubts the expertise, commitment and enthusiasm shown by the present members. For this, the whole Church must be grateful;
  - (b) at this relatively early stage in the life of the Council (it is still less than three years old), there is a particularly strong case for building

in an element of continuity in the appointments. It takes time for a group to understand its task and gel together. Continuity would be helped if (re)appointments to the Council were for staggered periods;

- (c) appointments to the Council need to be judged in the context of the challenges facing both it and the Church in the coming period. So the opportunity to introduce fresh talent at regular intervals would be helpful.
4. With these and other factors in mind, we have concluded that we should propose to Synod the re-appointment of all existing Council members but for varying terms. So two members would be re-appointed for one year, two for three years and two for the maximum term allowed under the National Institutions Measure of five years.
  5. There is a legal difficulty about our proposal that two members of the Council should be re-appointed for only one year. This is that paragraph 4(2) of Schedule 1 of the 1998 Measure provides that the term of office of Council members shall be not less than three nor more than five years. The legal position is explained fully in GS 1431X. So if Synod accepts our advice this will require it to amend this provision by passing the necessary resolution (which will subsequently have to be laid before Parliament). Again the processes required are set out clearly in GS 1431X.
  6. We do not lightly suggest amending the Measure in this way. However, we believe such a step to be justified not only by the immediate circumstances in which we find ourselves but by the greater flexibility in relation to appointments which it would afford in future. For example it is perfectly feasible that an appointed member will be in the midst of a particular piece of work for the Church at the time their appointment is due to cease and it would make sense to extend their appointment for a period so that they can complete it, but not for so long as three years. That indeed is the position in at least one current case.
  7. In proposing this minor change to Synod we make clear that:
    - (a) the change does not affect any other than the appointed places on the Council; and
    - (b) it would not in any normal circumstances be our intention to make a new appointment to the Council for less than three years.

8. Synod will have the opportunity to decide whether or not to make this minor amendment to the National Institutions Measure immediately prior to its consideration of our proposals relating to the appointment of individuals to the Council. Should it approve the amendment, we seek Synod's agreement to the following re-appointments to the Council:
  - (a) for a term of one year – Stephen Bampfylde and Elizabeth Paver
  - (b) for a term of three years – David Lammy and Jayne Ozanne
  - (c) for a term of five years – Michael Chamberlain and Peter Toyne
9. If Synod declines to amend the National Institutions Measure we shall seek approval of the re-appointments for three and five years only. The appointments of Mr Bampfylde and Mrs Paver would thus end on 31 December this year. (Should Synod pass the amending resolution but Parliament annul it for whatever reason, the terms of appointment of Mr Bampfylde and Mrs Paver would cease at the point at which the amending resolution was annulled.)
10. Whatever the outcome with respect to the proposed amendment of the Measure, we intend to set in hand in the new year arrangements to enable two fresh appointments to be made to the Council from (at the latest) January 2003.
11. To sum up, we seek Synod's approval to the amendment of paragraph 4(2) of Schedule 1 to the National Institutions Measure as outlined in GS 1431X and to the re-appointments to the Council set out in paragraph 8 above, which we believe to be in the best interests of the Council at this time as it seeks to serve the whole Church.

George Cantuar:

David Ebor:

October 2001