

**A SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE DRAFT LEGISLATION**  
**AS AMENDED BY THE REVISION COMMITTEE**

(Amendments or new provisions made by the Revision Committee are shown in bold, with cross references to the main report shown in square brackets).  
The background to these proposals is contained in the drafting group's report  
(GS 1484-7X)

**General Synod**

1. The balance of elected proctors and lay members between the two provinces to be moved from 68/32 to 70/30.
2. Two new special constituencies for archdeacons of eight from Canterbury and four from York, to be elected from all archdeacons in the respective provinces. Archdeacons to be barred from participating in proctorial elections. **European archdeacons to remain in proctorial election for the diocese in Europe [38].**
3. **Two special constituencies for deans of three from Canterbury and two from York [24].**
4. Two special constituencies for suffragan bishops of four from Canterbury and three from York.
5. When a See is vacant, 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 to be entitled to attend and speak, but not vote.
6. The electorate for proctorial elections to the General Synod to be expanded to include those clergy with permission to officiate elected to a **deanery** synod, [33] who should also be eligible to stand for election to the General Synod. (Those clergy will substantially comprise retired clergy.)
7. A constituency of seven for the armed forces: at least three to be clergy and at least three to be lay. To be elected (apart from the service archdeacons or the Bishop to the Forces, if they were to be included in the clergy numbers), the elections to be conducted using STV if appropriate. The Forces Synodical Council to decide exactly how this constituency should be constituted before each general election.
8. All the special constituencies for university clergy to be abolished. **All university clergy to be given the right to vote and stand in proctorial elections regardless of whether they hold the bishop's licence [29].**
9. Two clergy and two lay representatives to be elected from the Religious Communities.

## Other matters

1. Rule 37(1)(a) of the CRRs to be amended to make it clear that it requires compliance only with those aspects of the definition of “*actual communicant*” which deal with issues other than entry on a roll.
2. Rule 37(1)(c) CRR (on qualification of electors to House of Laity of General Synod) to be amended to substitute (in the case of a cathedral which is not a parish church) a reference to “*persons entered on the roll required to be kept of members of the cathedral community*” for “*habitual worshipper*”. **This amendment to be extended to CRR 27(1)(b) and CRR 31(3) (dealing with deanery synods and diocesan synods respectively) with consequential changes to CRR 46(1), (2) and (4) [93] (excluding the Royal Peculiars and Christ Church, Oxford from all these amendments) [94]. In CRR 31(3), remove requirement for dean to certify association with the deanery [95].**
3. **The date for the next preparation of new church electoral rolls to be moved forward to 2007 [82].**
4. **Provision in Rule 2(7) CRR that a new roll comes into effect on day of publication to be clarified [86].**
5. **Appendix II to CRR - notice of PCC meeting may be given by e-mail, to any PCC member who has authorised it [91].**
6. Rule 11(7) CRR to be amended so that votes may be given (a) by a show of hands; or if one person objects to a show of hands (b) by a vote conducted using signed voting papers or (c) if 10% of those present and voting so request, by a vote using numbered ballot papers.
7. **In Rule 9(4) CRR, delete the reference to further publication of the accounts of the PCC after approval by the APCM, which implies (wrongly) that the Church Accounting Regulations make provision for this [90].**
8. **Rule 25(2) CRR to be amended so that a diocesan synod in deciding numbers to be elected to deanery synods may have regard to the number of parish churches (or districts) in each parish, as well as to electoral roll numbers [92].**
9. Eligibility to stand and vote in deanery synod elections to include “*clerks in holy orders having permission to officiate*” with the option of eligibility being on the basis of either habitual worship at a church in the deanery for six months or that of residence in the deanery.
10. **Rule 10(1)(c), 24(7), 30(5)(c) and 31(3) CRR to be amended to lower the minimum age for election to deanery and diocesan synod from eighteen to sixteen [97].**
11. **Rule 36(2) CRR and Appendix I – the voting paper for elections to diocesan synod to be amended so the voting column is on the left hand side [99].**
12. In Rule 36(2) CRR the words “*the last day of November in the fourth year*” to be replaced by the words “*the last day of February in the fifth year*”.
13. Rule 36(3) CRR (on the certification of total number of names on electoral rolls before a general election to the General Synod) to be deleted in its entirety.
14. **Rule 20(3)(b) of Clergy Representation Rules and Rule (39)(5)(b) CRR – additionally, candidates to be provided with details of each elector’s e-mail address (if any) [68].**
15. The responsibility for copying and posting election addresses to belong entirely to the presiding officer.
16. **Rule 20(4) of Clergy Representation Rules and Rule 39(6) CRR – copy of election address may be provided by electronic means [67].**
17. Rule 20(2) and (6) of the Clergy Representation Rules and Rule 39(4) and (8) CRR to be amended so that voting papers specify whether a candidate is seeking re-election to the General Synod and, if so, the candidate’s previous **terms of office** [72] on the Synod.
18. **Inconsistencies between the Canons and the Clergy Representation Rules on filling of casual vacancies removed [78].**
19. Canon H2 and Rule 46 Clergy Representation Rules to be amended to give the relevant clerical or lay members (as the case may be) of the Bishop’s Council a mandatory duty to review their decision annually on allowing a member to retain a seat on ceasing to be eligible.
20. **Changes to composition of General Synod and general elections to it, to come into force on promulgation of Canon (not affecting current membership or the filling of casual vacancies). Deanery**

**An illustration of the composition of the General Synod of the Church of England as provided by the draft legislation as amended by the Revision Committee.**

(Full details in Appendix I)

	Existing	Bridge	Legislative Drafting Group	Revision Committee	Change from existing
<b>House of Bishops</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-2</b>
Diocesan Bishops	44	44	44	44	
Suffragan Bishops	9	6	7	7	-2
Bishop of Dover	1	1	1	1	
<b>House of Clergy</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-46</b>
Elected	183	145	182	184	+1
Deans	15	0	5	5	-10
Archdeacons	43	0	12	12	-31
Armed Forces	3	3	3	3	
Universities	6	0	0	0	-6
Religious Communities	2	1	2	2	
Chaplain General of Prisons	1	0	1	1	
Dean of Guernsey or Jersey	1	0	1	1	
<b>House of Laity</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-44</b>
Elected	245	162	198	199	-46
Channel Islands	2	0	2	2	
Armed Forces	0	3	3	3	+3
Religious Communities	3	2	2	2	-1
First and Second Commissioners	2	2	2	2	
Chairman CBF	0	1	0	0	
<b>Any House</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+1</b>
Seventh Armed Forces	0	0	1	1	+1
Dean of the Arches and Auditor	1	1	1	1	
Vicars-General	2	2	2	2	
Third Commissioner	1	1	1	1	
Chairman Pensions Board	1	1	1	1	
Appointed Archbishops' Council	6	0	6	6	
Appointed Theological experts	0	5	3	0	
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>-91</b>

\*Excluding co-opted members and ecumenical representatives

**GENERAL SYNOD**

**DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO.26  
DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT)  
RESOLUTION 200-  
DRAFT CLERGY REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT)  
RESOLUTION 200-  
DRAFT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES (LAY REPRESENTATION)  
RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 200-**

**REVISION COMMITTEE REPORT**

- Chairman:** Canon Alan Cooper (Manchester)
- Ex officio members:  
(Steering Committee)** The Bishop of Dover (the Right Reverend Stephen Venner) (Ex-officio) (Chairman)  
Mr Stuart Emmason (Manchester)  
Canon Sarah James (Gloucester)  
The Reverend Simon Killwick (Manchester)  
The Archdeacon of Norwich (the Venerable Clifford Offer) (Norwich)
- Appointed members:** Mrs Nicolete Fisher (Lincoln)  
Sister Janette OHP (Religious Communities - York)  
The Reverend Prebendary Kay Garlick (Hereford)  
Mr Harry Marsh (Chelmsford)  
The Reverend Canon Michael Walters (Chester)
- Consultants:**
- Diocesan Secretaries:** Mr Philip Arundel (Diocesan Secretary of Ripon and Leeds)
- Diocesan Registrars:** Mr Andrew Johnson (Diocesan Registrar of Salisbury)
1. Draft Amending Canon No. 26, the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200-, the draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200- and the draft Religious Communities (Lay Representation) Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200- (“the draft

legislation”) all received First Consideration from the General Synod (“the Synod”) at the February 2003 Group of Sessions. The Business Committee determined in accordance with Standing Order 68(a) that the draft legislation should be considered in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders relating to Measures. The period for the submission of proposals for amendment expired on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003.

2. In addition to proposals from the Steering Committee, proposals for amendment (submitted in accordance with Standing Order 53(a)) were received from the members of Synod listed in part one of appendix II. Proposals for amendment were also received from those non-Synod members (or bodies containing non-Synod members) listed in part two of appendix II, all of which were considered by the Revision Committee (“the Committee”).
3. The Committee met on eight occasions and the proposals which the Committee accepted form the basis for the draft legislation (GS 1484-7A) now before the Synod. As required by Standing Order 54(b), appendix III is a summary of the proposals received and of the Committee’s consideration of them. Appendix IV contains a destination table relating the provisions of the draft legislation at First Consideration to those in the draft legislation as now returned to the Synod.
4. All the Committee’s voting figures are contained in the main body of the report, except those on the representation of archdeacons, cathedral deans, and suffragan bishops on the General Synod, which can be found in appendix V, and those on the representation of the universities on the General Synod, which can be found in appendix VI. Throughout the report the abbreviation “CRR” refers to the Church Representation Rules or a specific Church Representation Rule as required by the sense.

## **SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD**

### **General principles**

5. In considering the proposals for amendment received on the size and composition of the General Synod, the Committee bore in mind the following principles proposed to it by the Steering Committee.
  - (a) the General Synod had agreed that its overall size should be reduced;

- (b) the route of direct election from the dioceses should be the preferred route wherever possible;
- (c) a real case had to be made for the continuance of a special constituency – whether because the group concerned had a distinctive voice or perspective which needed to be represented on the Synod and which was unlikely to be heard in the absence of a special constituency, or because including those concerned in the diocesan elections could distort them;
- (d) if special constituencies were required, then their size in proportion to their electorates should be roughly comparable. (The Archdeacon of Norwich dissented from this principle in respect of the size of the special constituency for archdeacons).

The Committee also agreed as a working principle that it would first consider in turn the representation of archdeacons, cathedral deans and suffragan bishops on the General Synod and come to some preliminary decisions on each. But having done so, the Committee would revisit its preliminary decisions on all three of these special constituencies to consider them in the round, in order to ensure that its proposals in relation to them were consistent with each other in the light of the principles described above

## **Archdeacons**

6. The general tenor of the representations received by the Committee was that archdeacons were in a different position from other special constituencies because of the role they played in the dioceses and parishes, which meant that they were able to offer a unique contribution to the Synod in relation to one of its primary functions, that of passing legislation. Their representation thus needed to be such as to enable that contribution to be heard effectively by the Synod as it drafted new legislation. It was also suggested that one archdeacon from each diocese was needed to ensure that each diocese remained fully informed of new legislation to be enacted. This meant that archdeacons should not be subject to any formula which aimed to ensure comparability between the size of special constituencies. Rather, what mattered was that they should have representation of a size appropriate to their special role.

7. Some argued that the retention of the *status quo* was therefore the option to be preferred – e.g. because archdeacons represented their diocese as a whole in a way that elected clergy or laity did not. And others argued that the proposed constituency of twelve was too small to enable archdeacons effectively to make the special contribution referred to above, let alone to maintain the high level of involvement on synodical committees and other bodies that archdeacons had previously had (especially if at the same time the possibility of election by the proctorial route was to be removed). It was suggested that a more appropriate size of constituency would be in the region of twenty-four, possibly based on the regional groupings of archdeacons so as to promote the dissemination of information to the other archdeacons. But if a constituency of an adequate size was not to be provided, then it was suggested that it would be preferable to abolish the special constituency altogether and instead retain the possibility of archdeacons standing in the proctorial elections.
8. The Committee agreed that archdeacons made a distinctive and highly valued contribution to the life of the Church and that their continued representation on the Synod was vital. However, a significant reduction in their number was needed, and achieving it would create a fairer and more proportionate balance between them and elected proctors in the House of Clergy. In response to the argument that a larger constituency than twelve archdeacons was needed because of the extensive use of archdeacons on synodical bodies, it was suggested that having a smaller constituency of archdeacons could have the beneficial effect of encouraging the Synod to find different ways of working that placed more reliance on archdeacons who were not members of General Synod.
9. The Committee considered that the key question was what the purpose of the archdeacons' representation in the Synod was. If it was to represent the diocese, then representation by one archdeacon per diocese was the only defensible option. If, however, its purpose was to represent the skills, perspectives and experiences of the office of archdeacon generally, then a constituency of significantly fewer than one per diocese could fulfil that purpose effectively.
10. Not least in the light of the views that had been expressed to it, the Committee favoured the second of these views. It accordingly rejected the proposal that each diocese should be represented by one archdeacon (whether with or without the possibility of additional representation via the proctorial elections). It also rejected the option of having no special constituency, with archdeacons participating in the proctorial elections

instead, partly because of concerns that archdeacons might have an unfair advantage in standing in such elections. Rather, it favoured two special constituencies, with the proctorial route being closed down. Although initially minded to support special constituencies totalling eighteen (partly on the basis that they might be linked to what the Committee believed at the time to be the nine regional groupings of archdeacons), for the reasons explained below the Committee's final decision was to retain the special constituencies of eight and four respectively for which the draft legislation provided.



## Deans

11. The representations received on the representation of deans recognised that deans would have to have a smaller constituency, yet had concerns that a constituency of five would reduce the voice of the cathedrals in the deliberations of the Synod to an inappropriate degree, as well as lessening the impact of the synodical agenda on the life of the cathedrals. A constituency of five could encourage any tendencies that there might be for cathedrals to become detached from the life of the remainder of the Church, would reduce the chances of senior women clergy gaining seats on the Synod and would inevitably mean that the deans would not be able to undertake the same range of synodical commitments as they had undertaken in the past (in particular on the Cathedrals Fabric Commission and the Council for the Care of Churches). There was also opposition to a national constituency for deans (which did not guarantee northern representation) or placing the deans in the proctorial elections (which was thought to be inappropriate on the ground that the role of cathedral dean was so intrinsically different from that of the parochial clergy). The Deans of the English Cathedrals therefore proposed as a fair and effective level of representation two special constituencies, one of seven from the south and one of three from the north.
12. It was the view of the Committee that it was essential that the voice of cathedrals continued to be heard on the Synod, although it noted that this voice could also be heard through residentiary canons and members of cathedral councils who were elected to Synod. It therefore rejected a proposal to abolish the special constituency for deans and require them to stand in the proctorial elections. Instead, it favoured the retention of a special constituency or constituencies.
13. As to the size of any constituency or constituencies, in response to the argument that an extensive appointment of deans to synodical offices in the past was a reason for having a larger constituency, it was again suggested that the Synod would simply need to find new ways to do its business. Members of the Committee also questioned whether a smaller constituency than that proposed in the draft legislation would necessarily make it more difficult in practice for deans from the newer cathedrals to secure election.
14. Rejecting the proposal for a special constituency of ten (seven from the southern province and three from the north) and the other variations proposed, the Committee initially favoured a national constituency of

seven deans, with at least two deans having to be elected from the northern province. (A constituency of that size was proportional to the Committee's initial proposal of a constituency of eighteen archdeacons, the number of seats in both cases representing approximately 15% of the electorate). However, for the reasons explained below, the Committee's final decision was in favour of two provincial constituencies of three and two respectively.

## **House of Bishops**

15. The Committee received a number of proposals to reduce the size of the House of Bishops, based on the retention of special constituencies for suffragan bishops or on one of a range of other proposals involving the abolition of those special constituencies and the creation of a House consisting of (a) diocesan bishops only, (b) one bishop per diocese (whether diocesan or suffragan) or (c) fewer than one bishop per diocese.
16. The Bishop of Woolwich argued that the case for the retention of the special constituency for suffragan bishops was grounded on the fact that without it there would be no guaranteed seats for suffragan bishops on the General Synod. The suffragans valued their participation in the House (the attendance level of suffragans during Synod debates being generally higher than for diocesans) and brought a distinctive vitality to the House deriving from the fact that they had sought election to it. They often brought a 'grass roots' feel for issues and a generally 'pro-active' approach to the House, as well adding to theological expertise and the spread of churchmanship.
17. The most strongly advocated alternative to the special constituency was a House of Bishops of one bishop per diocese (whether diocesan or suffragan) for all dioceses except Canterbury and York. This would involve the diocesan House of Bishops deciding at the start of each quinquennium (or on the subsequent appointment of the new diocesan) which bishop should represent the diocese until the end of the quinquennium. Under this proposal, suffragans would not be treated as having a 'special' or 'distinctive' character, but simply, alongside their diocesans, as bishops, any of whom could adequately represent their diocese on the General Synod. Indeed, it was suggested that as one of the vital roles of the bishops in the Synod was to take information back to their dioceses, it might be better in particular dioceses to have a suffragan representing the diocese rather than the diocesan.

18. The Committee agreed that there were strong theological and ecclesiological reasons why there should be a minimum of one bishop per diocese on the Synod (to sit alongside representatives of the clergy and laity of the diocese) and so could not support any proposal giving representation to fewer than one bishop per diocese. Nor did the Committee favour a House of just diocesan bishops. In principle, the Committee saw no objection to the proposition that a diocese could be represented by one bishop only, whether the diocesan or a suffragan. But the Committee did not consider that this principle should be acted on, for practical reasons. Any arrangement would have to be in place for the lifetime of a Synod (if it was to provide stability and continuity) and therefore a diocesan bishop would, in effect, have to decide at the start of each quinquennium whether or not to give up his right to sit in the Synod for the whole of that five year period. It was doubtful whether any diocesan bishop would wish to do that, in which case this proposal could result in no, or at least very few, suffragan bishops being members of the Synod. Furthermore, this proposal would mean that whether a suffragan became a member of the Synod or not would be totally dependent on which diocese he was in and whether his diocesan bishop wished to participate in the Synod. Finally, such an arrangement might also be perceived to be undemocratic.
19. This pointed to the retention of a special constituency or constituencies for suffragan bishops. The preliminary view of the Committee was to enlarge the special constituencies for which provision was made in the draft legislation, to seven from the south and three from the north (again on the basis that representation of this size would be consistent with that it originally had in mind for archdeacons and deans). However, for the reasons explained below, the Committee again finally decided to leave the arrangements contained in the draft legislation in place, involving constituencies of four and three respectively.

### **Archdeacons, cathedral deans and suffragan bishops**

20. On returning to review its preliminary thinking on these constituencies after completing consideration of all of them, the Committee agreed on the importance of ensuring that the proportion between the size and the electorate of all three constituencies was the same, as to do otherwise would inevitably result in a loss of coherence. The Committee also agreed that decisions on the size of constituencies had to be taken in the context of the formal composition of the Synod and should not take into account actual levels of attendance.

21. Against that background the Committee revisited its decision on whether or not to retain a special constituency for archdeacons. Having been provided with details of the regional groupings for archdeacons the Committee agreed that these groupings varied too much in size, frequency of meetings and business discussed to be used as the basis of a special constituency. Some members were in favour of the archdeacons standing in the proctorial elections as the simplest solution, and also the most democratic, as ultimately the clergy would decide the number of archdeacons that were elected. However, others expressed concern that if archdeacons stood in proctorial elections they would in practice have an unfair advantage over other clergy. That was questioned by the Archdeacon of Norwich, who cited past results of elections of diocesan representatives to the Crown Appointments Commission as evidence that it was not always 'senior clergy' who were elected by their fellow clergy. But the majority of the Committee were opposed to archdeacons standing in proctorial elections and therefore voted in favour of a special constituency or constituencies.
22. On the question of numbers, the majority view was that no compelling argument had, in the end, been made for moving away from the size of constituencies provided for in the draft legislation (namely eight and four) and that any increase would, essentially, be an arbitrary decision and would, in turn, reduce the number of seats available to the elected proctors. In taking this decision, the Committee also bore in mind that the regional groupings of archdeacons (which had been one of the reasons in favour of a total representation of eighteen) had not in the event proved to be a viable basis for the formation of these constituencies.
23. The Committee went on to agree that its previously agreed position on the proportionality of these three special constituencies should now be applied to the constituencies for cathedral deans and suffragan bishops. That would suggest that the constituency or constituencies for suffragan bishops and deans should also represent some 10% of the electorate in each case. It therefore agreed on a total representation of seven for suffragan bishops (four from the southern province and three from the north) and five for cathedral deans.
24. The Committee went on to give further consideration to how the constituency for deans should be constituted. Three options were discussed: a national constituency for cathedral deans (without reserved

- places) as provided for in the draft legislation; a national constituency (with reserved places for the northern province) as originally favoured by the Committee; and separate constituencies for the two provinces. It was noted that ‘reserved places’ under STV were in effect constraints on how the preferences of the electorate were translated into seats and that giving such places could be seen as giving an unfair advantage to one set of electors over another (as electors in a province with guaranteed seats could use their votes more productively to sway the result in the other province). The Committee accordingly felt that the simplest and fairest way to address the concerns of the northern deans would be to create two separate constituencies, although this would mean, exceptionally, that the constituency for the northern deans would consist of two members only.
25. The Archdeacon of Norwich wished it to be recorded that since joining the legislative drafting group in October 2002 he had become progressively convinced that the General Synod should see special constituencies as the exception rather than the rule and that simple Houses of Clergy and Laity should be the basis for all elections. Adopting this procedure could enable the overall size of Synod to be reduced still further.

## **Universities**

26. The main focus of the representations made in relation to the universities constituencies was the challenging of what were said to be misconceptions about the representation of the universities on the Synod - in particular, the view that the purpose of university representation was primarily to bring theological expertise. Rather, it was suggested, the primary role of university members was to represent university clergy - the bringing of theological expertise being an added bonus rather than the rationale for the constituencies. However, it appeared to be accepted that the existing constituencies needed to be modernised and expanded to include the laity, reflecting the amendment accepted by the Synod in July 2001 which called for, *inter alia*, a special constituency of “*university recognised teachers of theology*”. It was suggested that the legislative drafting group had been honour bound to implement this instruction and had abandoned it on inadequate grounds, when one method of implementation was found to be unsatisfactory.
27. More generally, it was argued that the universities should continue to have a special constituency or constituencies as they were a distinctive group which either (a) would be ineligible to seek election through the diocesan proctorial route (not usually having the bishop’s licence) or (b)

if they were eligible, would find it very difficult to secure election (as most of their ministry would be outside the diocesan structures). The end result of abolishing the special constituency for university clergy would therefore be that this group of clergy would effectively be disenfranchised. And, in wider terms, it would be perceived that the Synod was cutting a valued and valuable link between the academic world and the wider Church.

28. However, the Committee was left with concerns about precisely what a special constituency or constituencies for the universities would represent. If it was not theological expertise *per se*, then what particular and distinctive viewpoint would a constituency of, say, university clergy or university recognised teachers, represent? Both would create problems of their own: in the case of university clergy, the issue would arise of whether the special position of the ancient universities could continue and whether it was correct to still exclude the laity; and a new constituency of ‘university recognised teachers’ would beg the question of why there was not a constituency for education as a whole and not just higher education. The Committee also agreed that clergy and laity involved in the life of the universities (and of higher education more generally) would continue to be found on the Synod amongst the diocesan elected members and that a special constituency for the universities was not needed to ensure that this distinctive voice was heard. The Committee could not therefore support any of the amendments that had been proposed.
29. The Committee noted that there was currently no legal impediment to clergy working in universities seeking and receiving the bishop’s licence (as many currently did), but to ensure that there was no ‘disenfranchisement’ of university clergy as a result of their special constituency disappearing (and recognising some of the sensitivities that might attach to some university clergy seeking the licence of the diocesan bishop), the Committee considered that university clergy should be given the right to vote and stand in the diocesan proctorial elections, whether or not they held the bishop’s licence. It accordingly agreed to include new provisions in the draft legislation to enable that to be possible.
30. Conversely, given that it had been conceded that the current university representation was not primarily about providing theological expertise, and that the Committee was confident that sufficient theological expertise would continue to be provided to the Synod by other routes, it

agreed to remove the provisions in the draft legislation for the appointment by the Archbishops of theological experts.

### **Retired clergy on the General Synod**

31. Representations were received proposing, on the one hand, the extension of voting rights and the right to stand for election to General Synod to all 'retired clergy' (i.e. those with permission to officiate) and, on the other hand, that 'retired clergy' should continue to be unable to participate in General Synod elections, either as candidates or voters. A further proposal was also received giving 'retired clergy' on the deanery synod (rather than the diocesan synod as provided in the draft legislation) the right to stand and vote in such elections.
32. Some members of the Committee expressed concern that any provision allowing 'retired clergy' to be members of Synod would make it possible for long serving members of Synod to continue their membership into retirement, thus making it difficult for new members to be elected. It might also be thought that the indirect route that was being provided implicitly suggested that retired clergy should not really be elected to the Synod. However, the Committee noted that when a cleric retired it would not be possible in practice for him or her to carry on serving on the General Synod without a break, as there would inevitably be a gap between the cleric retiring and becoming a (retired clergy) member of the relevant synod, whether diocesan or deanery.
33. In part because of the uneven geographical spread of retired clergy across the country, but more importantly because such a move would be unfair to the serving clergy, the Committee voted against the proposal that full voting rights and the right to stand for election should be given to all 'retired clergy', voting one in favour, nine against, with no abstentions. The Committee also voted against the proposal to remove the provisions allowing for some 'retired clergy' to vote and stand, voting none in favour, eight against, with two abstentions: it considered that it was manifestly unjust that retired clergy who continued to contribute significantly to the ministry of the Church should be barred from gaining a seat on the Synod, if they wished to do so. However, the Committee voted in favour of the proposal that the provision to vote and stand be extended to 'retired clergy' on the deanery synod rather than the diocesan synod, voting six in favour, none against, with four abstentions: it favoured this amendment as it simplified the procedure to be applied and

put in place arrangements parallel to those applying to the House of Laity elections.

### **The armed forces**

34. The Committee voted against the proposal that the provisions in the draft legislation for the representation of the armed forces should be removed and that the *status quo* should be retained, voting none in favour, nine against, with one abstention. In doing so it took account of the fact that the existing provision of one archdeacon per service failed to address the concerns of the forces themselves, for instance in not providing for lay representation. The Committee also voted unanimously against the proposal that each of the armed services should be treated as a separate diocese in electing proctors only, believing that this proposal failed to reflect the reality of the numbers of clergy and laity involved and how the armed forces governed themselves.

### **Prison chaplains**

35. The Committee voted unanimously against the proposal that prison chaplains should be treated as a separate diocese, believing that this proposal, like that for the armed forces, failed to reflect the reality of the essentially ‘non-diocesan’ way in which the prison chaplaincy service operated.

### **Religious Communities**

36. The Committee was unanimous in rejecting a proposal that the special constituency for the Religious Communities for clergy (and by implication for the laity as well) should be abolished, with the Religious participating instead in the diocesan elections. The Committee did not believe that the Religious were likely to be elected through the diocesan route and therefore concluded that their special constituency needed to remain in order to ensure that their important and distinctive voice was heard on the Synod.

### **Archdeacons of the diocese in Europe**

37. A submission was received from the Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe asking that the seven archdeacons from the diocese of Europe should not be included in a special constituency for archdeacons (as provided in the draft legislation) but rather that those archdeacons should remain



eligible, as at present, to stand in the proctorial election for the diocese or, if this was thought to be unfair to the remaining clergy in that election, for one seat (from the existing two) to be reserved for the European archdeacons alone.

38. The Committee agreed unanimously that the European archdeacons should be eligible to stand in the proctorial election for the diocese of Europe and should not be included in the archdeacons' special constituency. The Committee accepted that the European archdeacons would not be widely known by the other archdeacons of the Church of England and so would be unlikely to be elected if they were put into an archdeacons' special constituency. Conversely, inclusion of these archdeacons in a special constituency would prevent the best-known clergy in the diocese in Europe (all of whom were also 'parish' priests) from standing in its own proctorial election.

#### **Voting rights for ex-officio members and Synod seats for appointed members of the Archbishops' Council**

39. The Committee received proposals for amendment of the voting rights of the ex-officio members' (including the appointed members of the Archbishops' Council) centring on how, in a smaller Synod, their votes could influence a close decision. It was suggested that an alternative to creating 'non-voting' members might be to remove the voting rights of non-elected members for certain items of business only (finance or Article 7 and 8 business, for example). Concern was also expressed that any lay appointed members of the Archbishops' Council would not be representative of the laity, yet had seats in that House. (A proposal for amendment to the procedure for appointing members of the Archbishops' Council was not within the Committee's remit to consider, involving as it would changes to the National Institutions Measure 1998.)
40. The Committee voted unanimously against the proposal that ex-officio members of the General Synod should not have a vote. The Committee noted that there were currently no 'non-voting' members of the General Synod and considered this concept to be inappropriate for a Christian body such as the General Synod. The Committee felt that to have 'non-voting' members would create a two-tier membership and that to remove the right to vote on particular items of business only would in some ways be even more invidious, not only to the members concerned, but also in terms of creating a hierarchy of Synod business.

41. The Committee voted against a proposal that ‘less than six’ of the appointed members of the Archbishops’ Council should be ex-officio members of the General Synod, voting one in favour, nine against, with no abstentions. Whilst there was some sympathy on the Committee for the proposition that it might not be necessary to have all six on the Synod, the Committee was aware of the difficulties that would be encountered in having fewer than the full number of appointed members on the Synod (especially since their terms of office were no longer coterminous) and agreed that the inclusion of all six appointed members as full members of the Synod was important in grounding the Council in the life of the Church and the Synod.

### **Abandon provincial allocation**

42. Amendments were received to provide that, instead of a specific number of seats being allocated to each province (the draft legislation moving this proportion from 68/32 to 70/30) there should be an equal maximum number of places for the Convocations and for the House of Laity as a whole, which would then be divided between the dioceses at the beginning of each quinquennium in proportion to clergy numbers and electoral rolls, without any assurance that either province would receive a minimum number of places - thus in effect allowing the balance of representation as between the provinces to change every five years without further legislative amendment or indeed any decision on the part of the General Synod.
43. The Committee was informed that a move to a ‘nationally’ based allocation of seats would, on present figures for electoral rolls and clergy numbers, result in a significant reduction in the number of seats from the northern province. An additional effect would also be that the provincial balance in the House of Clergy would almost certainly be different from that in the House of Laity. The Committee felt that to adopt a national allocation would undermine the identity of the provinces and introduce greater instability and more disparity, all of which would be unwelcome. It also noted that the current ‘fixed’ allocation could be amended to take account of changes in electoral rolls or clergy numbers and so should not be seen as a bar to just and fair representation. The Committee therefore voted against the proposal that the maximum number of proctors for the Convocations should be 195 (with consequent amendments to the House of Laity), voting none in favour, six against, with one abstention. It also voted against an alternative proposal for a House of Laity of 225, voting none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions.

44. An amendment was also received that the House of Laity, as a national House, should not be subject to provincially based allocations. The Committee was of the view that the provincial balance within the House of Laity was an important factor as it recognised the value of treating clergy and laity in the same way. Therefore the Committee voted against the proposals for equality of treatment between provinces in the House of Laity, voting none in favour, five against, with two abstentions.

#### **‘Cushioning’ the move to provincial allocations of 70%/ 30%**

45. A proposal was received asking that with any change in the provincial ratio the reduction applied to any diocese should be a maximum of two. It was argued that this ‘cushion’ was needed to prevent dioceses in the northern province whose electoral rolls were growing being penalised. However, the Committee did not feel that the proposed change in the provisional allocation would penalise such dioceses as they would still have a higher proportion of the seats available in their province, even if in absolute terms the number of seats might be reduced. The Committee therefore voted against the proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions.

#### **Allocation of seats**

46. It was proposed that in CRR 36(1) the words “shall not exceed” be replaced with a more flexible form of words for the allocation of an extra seat in the case of dead heat between dioceses, so that all the available seats could be allocated. The Committee noted that such a dead heat had not occurred in the past. Although it was theoretically possible that it might happen in the future, the Committee felt that the potential loss of one seat did not warrant the further elaboration of the Rules to prevent this happening. The Committee therefore voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions.

#### **Divisor method**

47. An amendment was proposed to CRR 36(2) to substitute a reference to the final distribution of seats being by the use of ‘the arithmetic mean divisor method’ in place of the current wording “as nearly as possible proportionate”, it being argued that the current wording was too imprecise, leaving doubt as to which of the five possible divisor methods could be used and thus (since different methods could produce different results) scope for dispute about the allocation of seats. The Committee

noted that (subject to one exception) the arithmetic mean divisor method (see appendix VII) had in practice always been the method used in the application of this rule in recent years. Given the difficulties of defining what was meant by ‘the arithmetic mean divisor method’ in legislation, an alternative proposal was made by the Chairman, namely that the divisor method to be used should not be specified in the rules but that they should provide for the Business Committee to specify from time to time which divisor method should be used. However, it was suggested that this alternative might place a further, perhaps unnecessary burden, on the Committee, which would need to be advised on which method to adopt. The Committee did not carry the original proposal that the arithmetic mean divisor method be specified in the rules, voting three in favour, three against, with one abstention. Neither did the Committee carry the alternative proposal involving the Business Committee, voting three in favour, three against, with one abstention. .

### **Accurate figures to be used in calculating the distribution of seats**

48. The question was raised of the apparent problem of obtaining accurate figures on clergy eligible to vote and electoral roll numbers, which are used in determining the number of seats in the House of Clergy and the House of Laity respectively. The Committee noted the difficulties that were often encountered in collating this information but felt that, overall, the figures provided could be relied upon to be accurate. No member of the Committee proposed any amendment to the rules governing this process.

### **Representation of smaller dioceses**

49. A number of submissions were received relating to the seats allocated to ‘smaller’ dioceses. All attempted to address the perceived unfairness under the current system of a smaller diocese always being guaranteed three seats (however far its electoral roll numbers fell) whereas a larger diocese in a similar position would lose seats. Various options for change were proposed:
- (i) smaller dioceses should be combined into single electoral areas electing five members, or two small dioceses should alternate, one electing three members and the another two, to be reversed each quinquennium;

- (ii) no diocese should receive three seats unless its numbers justified that number and dioceses which did not should be combined with others into electoral areas; and
  - (iii) smaller dioceses should have numbers of seats proportionate to their size (say, two) and therefore be allowed to drop below the current minimum of three seats.
50. The Committee was concerned that option (i) would be complicated to enact and ignored the often higher degree of identity enjoyed by smaller dioceses over larger ones. The proposal would also face practical problems in matching smaller dioceses together in an operable way (especially in terms of effective reporting back). The Committee therefore voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions. Option (ii) would face similar problems and the Committee also voted against it, none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions. As for option (iii), the Committee noted that it was necessary to maintain a minimum number of three elected places in order to ensure the effective representation of minorities under STV (although special provision was made, for good reason, in the case of the dioceses of Europe and Sodor and Man). It therefore also voted against option (iii), voting none in favour, six against, with one abstention.

### **Special constituencies in the House of Laity**

51. A submission raised the perceived problem that senior lay diocesan officers are almost always elected to the General Synod, if they stand, this acting as a disincentive to less well known members of the laity, in particular the young or people from minority ethnic groups, and placing them at a disadvantage. Although not explicitly stated, the proposal hinted at the creation of special constituencies in the House of Laity to address this problem. The Committee recognised the potential problem described, but did not feel that the creation of special constituencies was required as the 'less well known' groups were already gaining election to the Synod. In particular, the issue of young peoples' representation was already under active consideration and seemed likely to be addressed by other means. The Committee therefore voted against the principle of introducing special constituencies into the House of Laity, voting none in favour, seven against, with no abstentions.

## **United House of Clergy for bishops, priests and deacons**

52. A proposal that there should be a unified House of Clergy (with consequential revision of the voting arrangements of the Synod) was outside the remit of the Committee as such proposals could not be implemented by the draft legislation.<sup>1</sup>

## **ELECTIONS TO THE GENERAL SYNOD**

### **Continuous service**

53. The drafting group had decided against including any restriction on service in General Synod, leaving it to the voters to decide in individual cases whether people who had served previously should be re-elected. A proposal had been received which argued in favour of some sort of limitation of service, focusing on the possible adverse implications of having long-serving members of the Synod (including that they could have a disproportionate influence on the work of the Synod). The Committee agreed unanimously to reject this proposal on the basis that, in the end, the electorate should not be constrained, but rather be allowed the freedom to elect whom they chose.

### **Lay members working at diocesan offices or married to clergy**

54. Proposals were received expressing concern at lay members of General Synod working in diocesan offices.<sup>2</sup> The Committee noted that the Bridge Review had considered the possibility of extending the current restrictions so as to disqualify from election any person holding any paid office or employment with a DBF but rejected it, essentially on the ground that the electorate should remain free to decide. The Committee did not accept the suggestion that diocesan officers elected to the Synod might not be representative of the laity. The Committee recognised the argument against lay people employed by the NCIs standing for election to the General Synod (to avoid blurring the boundary between members of the ‘civil service’ of the Church and its elected representatives) and saw that this objection might, equally, apply to diocesan officers elected to the General Synod (who became ex-officio members of their diocesan

---

<sup>1</sup> The requirement that the General Synod consist of three houses is laid down in Schedule 2 to the Synodical Government Measure 1969, provisions of which can only be varied by Measure.

<sup>2</sup> CRR 46A(c) and Canon H2.5 preclude lay people and clergy respectively from election to or membership of General Synod if holding any paid office or employment with the NCIs, but there is no corresponding restriction in relation to diocesan paid office or employment.

synod), but the Committee did not see how it could impair the effectiveness of a diocesan officer as a member of the General Synod itself. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.

55. On a related proposal concerning lay members being married to clergy, which seemed to question the ability of such people to represent their constituents, the Committee could not share the concerns expressed and could identify no issues of conflict of interest or any reason why a lay person married to a cleric could not act as an effective member of the Synod. The Committee voted unanimously against this proposal.

### **Guidance material**

56. A proposal was made that a full set of election rules (in plain English) should be provided to all candidates and deanery officers. It was noted that the Legal Office would in 2005 continue its established practice of producing guidance material for dioceses, supported by a national consultation for presiding officers and their staff. The Committee did not consider that the rules themselves, which were inevitably highly detailed and technical, could be produced in a simple form and therefore voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.

### **Enfranchise all members of church electoral rolls**

57. The Committee noted that this proposal was considered carefully by the Bridge Review, and rejected by it for a number of reasons, not the least of which was its cost. Such a move would represent a fundamental change in the electoral system and the Committee considered it inappropriate to reopen now a matter which had already been the subject of careful consideration and which had not been raised in subsequent debates. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, eight against, with one abstention.

### **Timing of electoral process**

58. The question was raised with the Committee of whether a presiding officer should be able to hold general elections at a different time from that determined centrally.<sup>3</sup> The Committee was content with the current

---

<sup>3</sup> Under CRR 39, all presiding officers are required to hold general elections in such period as the Archbishops specify within the three months following the dissolution of General Synod. The presiding officers have some

provisions in this regard, which it felt provided the correct balance by setting an overall timetable while also providing some flexibility for dioceses within it. The Committee was unaware of any pressure from dioceses to change this rule and voted against any change, voting none in favour, six against, with three abstentions.

## **Nominations**

59. A proposal questioned the efficiency of the current provision for the making of nominations in lay elections.<sup>4</sup> It was suggested that this was a costly process that did not ‘target’ the right people, namely those who might wish to stand for election. As an alternative, it was suggested that at a much earlier stage (for instance in the spring of an election year) notice should be given of the holding of elections, via PCC secretaries and others, leaving it to those wishing to stand or those wishing to nominate candidates to approach the presiding officer for nomination papers. This process, it was argued, would provide effective notice of a forthcoming election (and probably elicit the same number of candidates as under the current system) but at far less financial cost.
60. Initially the Committee voted, in principle, in favour of this proposal, voting six in favour, two against, with one abstention. The Committee recognised that the current system was costly and that to target those eligible to stand could prove to be more cost effective. However, on further investigation (including the scale of the amendments which would be required, especially if, as was logical, a similar approach was taken in relation to diocesan synod elections), the Committee recognised that the proposal had potentially far reaching implications for the fairness and smooth running of the electoral process as a whole. In particular, the implications of transferring responsibility for giving notice of elections to parishes and away from the centre and the reduced number of nomination papers in circulation were matters that the Committee believed required further consideration. The Committee was also not attracted to the idea of having different procedures for general elections

---

flexibility over the dates for holding each stage of the electoral process within the period set by the Archbishops, but do not have any discretion to alter this period.

<sup>4</sup> Under CRR 39(3), it is currently required that a nomination form be sent to all qualified electors (lay members of deanery synods) and any other person who requested a form - a qualified elector being required to nominate and second any person eligible to stand for election (defined by CRR 37(1) as, *inter alia*, those entered on an electoral roll).



and elections to fill casual vacancies, which it was advised might well be necessary.<sup>5</sup>

61. The Committee concluded that this proposal needed to be thought through thoroughly before what were clearly going to be complex amendments were introduced to give effect to it. Even if such amendments were made in this draft legislation, it was doubtful if they could be in place and fully explained to dioceses and parishes before the 2005 elections. Therefore, the Committee agreed that it would be unwise to seek to implement the proposal in this legislation. But it remained of the view that the proposal merited further investigation and accordingly decided unanimously to maintain its support for it in principle and to request the Business Committee to investigate the practicalities of its implementation.
62. A second proposal on nominations was that the nomination form (not prescribed by the CRRs) should contain a column for the candidate's title or form of address. This would be helpful, it was suggested, for use on later occasions, including when providing details to Church House of those elected to the Synod. The Committee agreed that this was a sensible proposal, voting five in favour, one against, with three abstentions, and recommended that the nomination form in the 2005 guidance for dioceses be amended accordingly.
63. Finally, a proposal was made that the Rules needed to be clarified as to whether an appeal could be brought if the presiding officer either allowed an invalid nomination to stand or rejected a valid nomination. The Committee was advised that it plainly could, as the Rules stood. The Committee therefore voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions. Consequently, the Committee did not need to consider a request for a definition of what happened if a presiding officer failed in his or her duties.

## **Election addresses**

64. Proposals were received that candidates should continue to produce their own election addresses, suggesting that the proposed change in the draft legislation (requiring the production of election addresses to be undertaken by the diocese) was an undesirable move to uniformity at the

---

<sup>5</sup> Currently elections to fill casual vacancies are to be conducted in the same manner as general elections (the qualifying date for eligibility to vote and stand being the date at which nomination papers are issued). The continuance of this principle with the new nomination system could be problematic, so that specific (and different) provision might need to be made for elections to fill casual vacancies.

expense of the right of each individual candidate to produce their own address. The Committee noted that the format and content of election addresses would remain at a candidate's discretion. Also, candidates would still be able to circulate additional material at their own expense (although the production costs for election addresses would in future all be met by the dioceses). Additionally, central production of addresses should ensure that sufficient addresses were produced so that all electors received them. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, nine against, with no abstentions.

65. It was also proposed on environmental grounds that candidates should continue to produce their own election addresses. If copying were to be undertaken by the diocese, it was argued, candidates could not be certain that the diocese would use re-cycled paper (which a candidate might choose to do). The Committee noted that the proposed change did not necessarily present an objection from the environmental point of view, since dioceses might choose to use re-cycled paper. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.
66. A proposal that candidates should have the option of producing their own election addresses or allowing them to be produced by the diocese was designed to provide flexibility and choice for the candidates and the possibility of reduced costs for the dioceses. However, the Committee considered that this proposal was incompatible with the objective of securing the greater uniformity that would be gained under the proposal in the draft legislation. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, nine against, with no abstentions.
67. A proposal was also received to allow a single copy of the election address to be submitted in electronic format, if desired. The Committee agreed that this was a sensible proposal (which was consistent with other moves to allow for the use of e-mail) which would be particularly valuable given the short period in which addresses normally have to be submitted. The Committee voted in favour of this proposal, voting seven in favour, one against, with one abstention.

### **Details of electors and candidates' mailings**

68. Two related proposals were received that (a) candidates should be sent details of each elector's recorded e-mail address (if any) and (b) the parishes they represented, in addition to their names and addresses, as

currently required. Whilst the Committee was anxious to avoid placing any undue extra burdens on the dioceses, it considered that the inclusion of e-mail addresses would be consistent with its previous decisions, and voted in favour of this proposal, voting eight in favour, one against, with no abstentions. It was noted that in most cases the voter's parish could be discerned from the address provided and so voted against this proposal, voting one in favour, six against, with two abstentions.

69. A further proposal was received that it should be a requirement that the electors' names and addresses be provided to candidates in deanery order. The Committee was not convinced that to prescribe the manner in which this information was provided was justified. This proposal was withdrawn. It was also put to the Committee that candidates should be discouraged from extra mailings (although no specific proposal was made). The Committee was not convinced that the practice of candidates taking additional steps to promote their candidatures was in principle objectionable and agreed that any regulation of this practice through legislation was most unlikely to be effective.

## **Hustings**

70. Proposals were received that dioceses should be more supportive and proactive in encouraging and promoting hustings. The Committee recognised that important issues were being raised here about participation in the electoral process but had no particular recommendations to make. Instead, it agreed that these proposals should be referred to the Business Committee, for possible implementation in time for the 2005 elections.

## **Voting papers**

71. It was proposed that including in the voting paper that a candidate was standing for re-election would give that candidate an unfair advantage. The Committee noted that this provision was designed to ensure that voters could, if they chose, take a candidate's previous service into account when deciding whether to vote for them. The drafting group had decided against introducing a limitation on the number of terms of office for which a member could serve and instead had favoured this route. The Committee felt that it was equally conceivable that this information could persuade or dissuade a voter from supporting a candidate. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.

72. The Steering Committee subsequently proposed that voters should be given more precise information, namely the candidates' terms of office (which would indicate when they served previously) rather than merely the length of their previous service. The Committee agreed to this proposal unanimously. A proposal was also received to remove the words "and descriptions" from the voting paper and provide that the voter write his or her name in block capitals on voting paper. The Committee recommended that both of these proposals be dealt with in the revision of the voting paper (which is not prescribed by the CRRs).

### **The count**

73. A proposal was made that there should be a universal return to manual counts (it having been suggested that there were "some minor flaws" in the computerised STV programme) and that all counts should be held on the same day. The Committee understood that the program currently in use had been validated by the Electoral Reform Society and felt that there was no basis for abandoning computer counts and imposing a requirement to conduct all counts manually. As to the suggestion that it was unfair for some candidates to have to wait longer for the results than others, the Committee was not persuaded by this and noted that, in practice, most counts take place within a few days of each other. The Committee voted unanimously against both these proposals. A further proposal was received to allow papers to be entered as received – with candidates' rights preserved. The Committee recommended that this proposal to be considered when the Single Transferable Vote Regulations 1990 and 1998 (which govern these matters) are next revised.

### **Election scrutineer**

74. A proposal was made for the insertion of a power for the election scrutineer to order a recount within a period (say five days) calculated from the date he received the declaration of the result, rather than the current provision which provides that the election scrutineer can order a recount within a period (ten days) after the declaration of the result. The Committee recognised that there could be a problem under the current rule if, for some reason, the declaration did not reach the scrutineer for some considerable time. However, the difficulty with the proposal was that if there was a delay in the election scrutineer receiving the result, and there was an error, then the result would need to be reopened some

time after the original election. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions, whilst recommending that presiding officers be further reminded in the general election guidance material of their existing duties in this area.

### **Election appeals**

75. It was proposed that in CRR 44(6)(b), the words “or might be” be deleted from before the words “material to the result of the election”, the proposer questioning whether the ‘mere possibility’ that an error (of one of the specified kinds) might be material to the result of an election should constitute grounds for appeal, or whether some higher degree of probability should be required. The Committee agreed that it would be undesirable for it to have to be shown by an appellant that an error plainly was material before an election could be set aside. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.
76. It was further proposed that in CRR 48(6)(c) the words “the previous election” be replaced with the words “a previous election”. This proposal sought to clarify the meaning of this provision, which requires the presiding officer to ask every candidate in “the previous election” if he or she consents to serve (if they do, they will be included a re-run of an election to fill a casual vacancy). The Committee was advised that there was no problem with the current wording as the expression “the previous election” means the immediately preceding election, including an election conducted using the ballot papers of an earlier election. The Committee voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, eight against, with one abstention.

### **Casual vacancies**

77. A proposal was received to keep the current two year period in which to use previous ballot papers to fill a casual vacancy. In doing so, the importance of the ‘representativeness’ of the original ballot was asserted. The draft legislation provided for this period to be reduced to one year, reflecting the possibility that reliance on the original voting papers could in fact lead to a candidate with little support being elected. The basis of the proposal to keep to the *status quo* was that under STV the re-run of an election to fill a casual vacancy tended to favour the election of a similar candidate to the one who had vacated their seat, whereas a fresh election was likely to lead to a candidate representing the majority group

being elected (which could lead to minority groups coming to feel that they were under-represented). A further consideration was the extra cost of having to run a new election after only a year. The Committee was persuaded by this proposal and accordingly voted in favour of it, voting eight in favour, none against, with one abstention. On a related proposal, that the current two year period should be extended to five years if the Bishop's Council so wished, the Committee feared that this could open up a Bishop's Council to claims that it had exercised its discretion improperly, with a view to achieving a particular result. The Committee voted unanimously against this proposal.

78. The Steering Committee reported an inconsistency between the parallel provisions in the Canons and the Clergy Representation Rules in dealing with the filling of casual vacancies.<sup>6</sup> The Steering Committee proposed that this inconsistency should be removed by amending Clergy Representation Rule 23 so as to bring it into line with Canon H2. The Committee agreed to this proposal unanimously.

## **OTHER AREAS OF SYNODICAL GOVERNMENT**

### **Formation of new electoral rolls and the pattern of synodical elections**

79. A range of proposals was received from the South East Regional Diocesan Secretaries and others (see appendix VIII) regarding the cycle of the formation of new electoral rolls and deanery, diocesan and general synod elections. Those making proposals were wholly in support of the aim of the draft legislation (to ensure that at least every other round of elections to deanery synods should take place on the basis of up-to-date information on electoral rolls) but not the means by which the draft legislation aimed to bring this about (moving the deanery election back a year in the cycle), which would result in a permanent clash every three years of deanery and diocesan synod elections ((A) in appendix VIII).
80. They therefore proposed alternative ways to bring about the desired aim: either (a) to keep the *status quo*, but move the date for the formation of the new electoral roll forward a year ((B) in appendix VIII) or, (b) keep the current provision in the draft legislation to move the deanery synod

---

<sup>6</sup> Canon H2 provides that a casual vacancy is to be filled, so far as possible, within six months of its occurrence and, in the event of the vacancy not being filled within that period, for the Prolocutor to give directions to the presiding officer as to the date by which the vacancy must be filled. But Clergy Representation Rule 23(1) provides that an election to fill a casual vacancy in the Lower House of a Convocation shall be completed within six months from the issue of the citation, and does not make any provision for the Prolocutor to give directions in the event of default.

elections back a year but also, at the same time, move the diocesan synod elections back a year ((C) in appendix VIII). The diocesan secretaries had also advocated changing the term of office of the General Synod from five to six years so that it would fit the six year cycle as applied to the revision of the electoral roll and the three year cycle of elections to deanery and diocesan synods ((D) in appendix VIII).

81. The Committee understood that the legislative drafting group, in giving effect to a proposal originally contained in a Diocesan Synod Motion from the diocese of Lincoln relating to the formation of a new electoral roll and deanery synod elections (GS 1494-7X pp 30-31), had not appreciated that the way it chose to achieve this would have the effect of making the cycle of deanery synod elections coincide permanently with that of diocesan synod elections. This had, in particular, two manifest disadvantages: (a) the short time between the election of lay members of deanery synods and the election of lay members of diocesan synods and (b) elections to deanery, diocesan and General Synod would, in consequence, all coincide in 2015 and at fifteen year intervals from then on. Furthermore, the Committee noted that the pattern proposed would also be inconsistent with the General Synod's decision of principle in February 1981 that diocesan synod elections should take place in the year after deanery synod elections.
82. Of the alternatives before it, the first (namely for a once-only move in the compilation of the new electoral roll to bring it forward from 2008 to 2007) appeared to the Committee to achieve the desired result without any of the adverse consequences described above. The Committee noted that the Research and Statistics Department of the Archbishops' Council had been consulted on this proposal and had confirmed that it would seem to have no significant adverse consequences in relation to the gathering of statistics for Church purposes. The Committee considered that the proposal would establish a sensible relationship between the preparation of the new roll, deanery synod elections and diocesan synod elections and therefore voted in favour of it, voting nine in favour, none against, with one abstention.
83. The Committee considered the second alternative to be a more complex and less attractive solution. It would involve further extensions of current terms of office and the coincidence of elections to diocesan synods and the General Synod in 2010 (an event which would not happen under the other proposal until 2015). It might also have unforeseen adverse consequences at diocesan level in terms of the cycle of elections to

diocesan committees. As this proposal was put forward as an alternative to the proposal to which the Committee had already agreed, it was not voted on by the Committee.

84. The Committee noted that it could not consider the proposal to extend the period of office of General Synod to six years as that was outside the scope of the draft legislation.<sup>7</sup> The Committee nevertheless recognised that a six-year term for the General Synod would sit more comfortably with the three-year term for deanery and diocesan synods and the six-year revision of the electoral roll. It would allow for a logical progression of elections and would avoid the fifteen-year clashes of elections to the General Synod with those of deanery and diocesan synod elections (something that would always occur with a five-year term). On the other hand, the Committee noted that a six-year term might deter some people from standing for election to the General Synod, being seen as too great a commitment of time. The Committee accepted that this proposition, although clearly not being one that it could pursue, warranted further consideration and the Committee therefore unanimously agreed that the possibility of a six-year cycle of elections to the General Synod should be referred to the Business Committee for its consideration.

### **Entry on electoral roll**

85. A proposal was made to the Committee to make the application form for entry on an electoral roll (as prescribed by CRR1(2) and Appendix 1) easier for a lay person to complete. Given the importance of the electoral roll as the basis of lay participation in all levels of synodical government, the Committee recognised the importance of obtaining accurate information. To that end, the Committee felt that the proposed revision should not be adopted because it would not secure all the information required and, in some respects, asked inappropriate questions that had no foundation in the Church Representation Rules. The Committee therefore voted against amending section 1 of Appendix I, voting none in favour, four against, with two abstentions. However, the Committee sympathised with the mission-influenced desire to make this form as user-friendly as possible and requested that CHP and SPCK, as the joint publishers of the

---

<sup>7</sup> This is because under section 1(4) of the Synodical Government Measure 1969 the General Synod is brought into being and dissolved by reference to the bringing into being and dissolution of the Convocations; and their term is defined by the Church of England Convocations Act 1966, section 1(2) of which provides that the Convocations “shall (unless sooner dissolved pursuant to Her Majesty’s directions) stand dissolved at the expiration of the period of five years”. Thus the General Synod has a maximum term of five years., and this position could only be changed by a further Act or Measure.



forms, be asked to consider ways in which the format of the form could be improved to make it more ‘user-friendly’, which they have agreed to do.

### **Coming into effect of the new electoral roll**

86. A request was received to clarify CRR 2(7), which provides that the new electoral roll comes into effect when it is first published, to address the apparent misconception in some parishes that it comes into effect at the APCM. The Committee agreed that this rule should be amended to make it clearer that the new roll comes into effect on the date of publication, voting ten in favour, none against, with no abstentions.

### **Voting at the Annual Parochial Church Meeting**

87. A proposal for amendment had been received to ensure that the results of elections to the PCC and deanery synod using postal votes should be announced at the APCM itself. The Committee noted that implementing this proposal would require the removal of the ability to nominate candidates at the APCM and changes in the timing of the processes leading up to the APCM. The Committee felt that, given the relatively uncommon use of postal voting in such elections, this proposed amendment and the complications entailed in it were not justified. The Committee therefore voted against the proposal, voting none in favour, five against, with one abstention. A further proposal, that the outcome of the election of churchwardens should be known before the end of the APCM was not considered by the Committee as it was based on a misconception, since postal voting is not in fact available in the election of churchwardens.<sup>8</sup>
88. A further proposal was received that STV should be used for all elections or the restriction of a single vote for any one candidate should be removed. The Committee noted that under CRR 12 the adoption of STV for elections of lay members of PCCs and deanery synods is optional and requires a two-thirds majority of those attending and voting at an APCM for it to be adopted. The Committee felt that the requirement for STV (or any form of multiple voting) to be used in these elections would be seen by the parishes as unnecessary over-regulation from the centre and

---

<sup>8</sup> The Committee agreed unanimously to a small amendment to the form of application for a postal vote to correct the reference to Rule 11(2) to Rule 12(2).

therefore voted against the proposal, voting none in favour, six against, with no abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

### **Publication of the accounts of the Parochial Church Council after approval at the Annual Parochial Church Meeting**

89. The Committee noted the introduction of a new accounting regime for charities (under what is now the Charities Act 1993) as a result of which significant changes were made to the accounting regime for PCCs, involving changes both to the CRRs and the making of the Church Accounting Regulations<sup>10</sup>. However, the CRRs still needed to be rectified in respect of their treatment of the publication of the accounts of a PCC. This is because CRR 9(4) implies that the Church Accounting Regulations make provision for publication of the accounts once they have been considered at the APCM, when they do not in fact do so.
90. It was the view of the Steering Committee that no practical purpose would be served by imposing a requirement for further publication of a PCC's accounts once they have been considered by the APCM. That being so, the Steering Committee proposed the deletion of the reference in CRR 9(4) to such further publication. The Committee supported this proposal, as a desirable tidying up of the law, voting six in favour, none against, with no abstentions.

### **Convening meetings of the Parochial Church Council**

91. A proposal was received that would allow a PCC to pass a resolution to require the chairman to convene meetings of the PCC on pre-determined dates. The Committee considered this proposal to be over-prescriptive, believing that the existing provisions on the minimum number of meetings per year and the power to call meetings were sufficient. The Committee therefore voted against this proposal, voting none in favour, six against, with no abstentions. As regards a second proposal, that it should be permissible for notice of a meeting to be given by e-mail, the Committee agreed that this should be allowed, where a PCC member had

---

<sup>9</sup> The Committee also agreed unanimously to an amendment to Note 2(a) on the Notice of an APCM to reflect that the basis of eligibility was altered by the Synodical Government (Amendment) Measure 2003, so that it is now necessary not only for a person's name to be entered on the roll but for it to have been so entered for at least the preceding six months (unless under the age of eighteen at the date of election).

<sup>10</sup> No changes had been made to section 8 of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure 1956. This meant that the 1956 Measure was inconsistent in a number of respects with the Church Representation Rules and the Church Accounting Regulations, a position that was currently being addressed by the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 200- currently before the General Synod.

authorised notice to be given to him or her in that way, voting six in favour, none against, with no abstentions.

### **Deciding numbers to be elected to deanery synods**

92. The Committee considered a proposal that a diocesan synod, in deciding numbers to be elected to deanery synods, should be able to have regard not only to the numbers on parishes' electoral rolls but also to the number of parish churches in each parish. At present, under CRR 25(2), this determination was on the basis of electoral roll numbers alone, which it was suggested was increasingly being seen by parishes as unfair and unrepresentative, particularly in team ministries. Examples were provided of how, under the present system, deanery numbers could fall as a result of single parishes joining together as one parish in a team ministry. The proposal represented a possible response to the problem, involving a mixed formula for the determination of deanery synod numbers, using both electoral roll numbers and the number of parish churches (or alternatively districts) in each parish (see appendix IX). The exact 'weighting' within the formula, and the decision on whether parish churches or districts were to be used, could be left to each diocesan synod to determine. No additional administration would be required as data on the number of parish churches or districts was already held in diocesan registries. The Committee was clear that there was a real issue of fairness here which this proposal went a long way to redress and therefore voted in favour of it, voting six in favour, none against, with no abstentions.

### **The eligibility of persons associated with cathedrals for election to the deanery and diocesan synods**

93. The Committee noted that the draft legislation included amendments to change the basis of eligibility for election to the General Synod on the part of laity who worship at a cathedral which is not a parish church<sup>11</sup>. The drafting group had also recognised that there was a case for making a corresponding change in relation to the rules for eligibility for election to deanery and diocesan synods, but left the consideration of that possibility to later in the synodical process. The Steering Committee had consulted the Association of English Cathedrals about the proposed

---

<sup>11</sup> For lay people (who worship at such a cathedral and are not on the roll of a parish) to be eligible for election to the General Synod the draft legislation provides that they would need to be entered on the roll required to be kept under the Cathedrals Measure 1999 of "members of a cathedral community", instead of having (as at present) to be certified by the dean to be an "habitual worshipper" at the cathedral.

changes<sup>12</sup> and proposed that corresponding amendments should be made in relation to the rules for eligibility to election to deanery and diocesan synods to those already provided in the draft legislation for eligibility for election to the General Synod. The Committee agreed to this proposal unanimously.

94. However, the Steering Committee also reported that it is not possible to use membership of a cathedral roll as the criterion for eligibility for election in the case of the Royal Peculiars or Christ Church, Oxford (which are treated as ‘cathedrals’ for the purposes of these rules) as these institutions are not required to maintain such rolls. The Steering Committee therefore proposed the retention of the alternative qualification of certification by the dean in the case of these institutions and the amendment to the draft Amendment Resolution (which overlooked that consideration) accordingly. The Committee agreed to this proposal unanimously.
95. The Steering Committee also raised the issue of the continued appropriateness of the second requirement in CRR 31(3) for lay people to be eligible for election by a deanery synod to the diocesan synod, that of being certified by the dean to be associated with the deanery in question. The Steering Committee proposed the repeal of this requirement, principally on the basis that it would be questionable whether in practice a cathedral dean would be in a position to certify such an association. The Committee voted in favour of this proposal, voting seven in favour, one against, with one abstention.

### **Lowering of minimum age for election to deanery and diocesan synod**

96. A proposal that the minimum age for election to deanery and diocesan synod should be lowered from eighteen to sixteen was received, based, it was said, on the real preference of young people to be allowed to enter the synodical structures through the normal route rather than have special procedures provided for them. At sixteen and seventeen, young people would be living at home and, if interested, should be encouraged to be elected to deanery and diocesan synods. With the advent of ‘gap’ years, this could mean that young people could have up to three years on a synod before moving away to university, if indeed they did so. To lower

---

<sup>12</sup> The AEC position was that (a) there should be the maximum opportunity for lay people who worship at cathedrals to participate in the synodical system; and (b) in due course the cathedral roll will become the ‘badge’ of membership of the worshipping community of a cathedral which is not a parish church.

the age to sixteen would also be consistent with eligibility for membership of the PCC.

97. The Committee was advised that there appeared to be no legal impediment to the adoption of this proposal. No issues arose from the point of view of capacity of minors, given that deanery and diocesan synods as such would not themselves be entering into legal engagements and were not legislative bodies. Nor were there any problems under charity law as neither a deanery nor a diocesan synod, as such, was a charity. The Committee voted unanimously in favour of this proposal, which it considered to be a practical example of how the structures of synodical government should and could adapt and respond to real opportunities.

### **Elections to diocesan synod**

98. A proposal was received that in the election of diocesan synods and committees there should be a short time (48 hours) when the candidates should know the identity of each other and have the opportunity to withdraw. The Committee noted that an election to a committee of diocesan synod was a matter for diocesan synod to determine (under its standing orders) and therefore this was not a matter for this Committee to consider. So far as elections to diocesan synods were concerned, the Committee felt that this proposal introduced a somewhat negative dimension into the electoral process, as well as entailing an extension to the election period. The Committee was also concerned that to introduce this provision into the electoral process for diocesan synods would logically also require its inclusion in elections to the General Synod, thereby increasing the complexity of the rules, arguably unnecessarily. The Committee therefore voted against the proposal, voting none in favour, six against, with no abstentions.
99. A further proposal was that, in the case of the voting papers for elections to diocesan synods, the column for voting preferences (given in figures) should be kept apart from the year of birth (also in figures), in order to assist in the count. This could either be achieved by printing a column for the year of birth or a column for voting preferences on the left hand side of the voting paper. The Committee decided in favour of the latter, to assist diocesan officers in conducting elections, voting five in favour, none against, with one abstention.

### **General Synod election and deanery synod elections in 2005**

100. Concerns were raised with the Committee over the fact that elections to deanery synods and the General Synod would both have to take place in 2005. The Committee noted that under the present cycle of synodical elections these ‘clashes’ occurred every fifteen years, dating back to a change made to the electoral arrangements for 1985. This had, *inter alia*, ensured that the elections to deanery synods and elections to the General Synod did not both take place that year. Nevertheless, it was recognised at the time that under these new arrangements deanery synod elections and elections to the General Synod would take place in the same year in 1990 and once in every fifteen years thereafter. The Committee was not aware of any attempt before 1990 to prevent this clash of elections taking place in that year or of any insuperable difficulties in the elections to the General Synod of that year. The Committee noted that it was too late to follow a similar practice now to that adopted for 1985 (to shorten the term of office of lay deanery synod members so that they ended in 2004). The alternative was to postpone the deanery synod elections by a year (to 2006), which would have the effect of making them take place in the same year as diocesan synod elections, with all the adverse consequences already noted by the Committee.
101. The Committee had informally consulted a number of diocesan secretaries on this issue and they were unanimously in favour of keeping the *status quo* in 2005. It was accepted that this would entail some difficulties in completing the roll of electors in time for the elections to General Synod but delaying the deanery synod election to 2006 would in their view be worse, not least because the diocesan synod election process starts earlier. The Committee agreed that the ‘least worst’ alternative available was therefore to leave both deanery and General Synod elections to take place in 2005.

### **TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS**

102. The Committee noted that on the grounds of simplicity alone there was a case for bringing all the provisions of the draft legislation into force on the same date. On the other hand, the Committee saw the advantage of bringing into force specific provisions at earlier and more opportune dates. The Committee therefore unanimously agreed to the insertion of transitional provisions into the draft legislation that provided for the following:

*The Composition of the General Synod and elections to it*

- (a) the draft Amending Canon would come into effect when promulgated (which the Committee hoped would be in February 2005), but subject to a saving provision “*that nothing in the Canon will have effect in relation to the composition or meetings of the Convocations in existence on the date in which it comes into force*” (thereby safeguarding the current membership of the Houses of Bishops and Clergy);
- (b) since, in the absence of other provision, the draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution and the draft Religious Communities (Lay Representation) Rules (Amendment) Resolution would come into effect when given Final Approval by the Synod (which the Committee hoped would be in July or November 2004), they contain a provision postponing their coming into effect until such time as Amending Canon comes into effect, but again subject to a saving provision which will mean that they will not apply in relation to the filling of casual vacancies in the current General Synod;
- (c) those changes made by the draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution which relate to the composition of the General Synod and the elections to it need, similarly, to come into effect when the Amending Canon comes into effect (subject to provisions safeguarding the current membership of the House of Laity).

*Other changes*

- (d) The provisions relating to deanery synods, and the changes made to the procedures for determining the number of lay members to be elected to the General Synod, will take effect on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2004, in time for the deanery synod elections in 2005; with
- (e) all other provisions (including those relating to PCCs) will take effect on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005, in time for that year’s APCMs.

**On behalf of the Committee**  
**Alan Cooper**  
**Chairman**

**23 December 2003**



## Appendix I                      Statistics on revised composition of the General Synod

*Details are given in Table 2 of the make-up of the provincial allocation of 70/30 for elected proctors and laity.*

**Table 1 - Revised Composition of the General Synod**

	<u>CANTERBURY</u>		<u>YORK</u>		<u>NON- PROVINCIAL</u>		<u>Current Total</u>	<u>Revised Total</u>	<u>Change</u>
	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>			
<b><u>House of Bishops</u></b>									
Diocesan*	30	30	14	14			44	44	0
Suffragans	6	4	3	3			9	7	-2
Bishop of Dover*	1	1					1	1	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>			<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b><u>House of Clergy</u></b>									
Elected Proctors (revised to 70/30)	125	127	58	57			183	184	+1
Archdeacons	29	8	14	4			43	12	-31
Deans	10	3	5	2			15	5	-10
University Proctors	4	0	2	0			6	0	-6
Armed Service Clergy	3	3					3	3	0
Religious Communities	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	0
Chaplain General of Prisons*	1	1					1	1	0
Dean of Guernsey or Jersey	1	1					1	1	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-46</b>
<b><u>House of Laity</u></b>									
Elected Laity (revised to 70/30)	166	138	79	61			245	199	-46
CI Elected Laity	2	2					2	2	0
Armed Service Laity					0	3	0	3	3
Religious Communities	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	-1
First & Second Church Commissioners*					2	2	2	2	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-44</b>

	<u>CANTERBURY</u>		<u>YORK</u>		<u>NON- PROVINCIAL</u>		<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Change</u>
	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	
<b><u>House of Clergy or</u></b>									
<b><u>House of Laity</u></b>									
Dean of the Arches and Auditor*^					1	1	1	1	0
Vicars-General*	1	1	1	1			2	2	0
Third Church Estates Commissioner*^					1	1	1	1	0
Chairman of C of E Pensions Board*^					1	1	1	1	0
Total:	1	1	1	1	3	3	5	5	0
<b><u>Any of the three Houses</u></b>									
Six Appointed members					6	6	6	6	0
Archbishops' Council									
Seventh Armed Services					0	1	0	1	1
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	382	<b>319</b>	178	<b>142</b>	11	<b>19</b>	571	<b>480</b>	<b>-91</b>
<b><u>Co-opted &amp; appointed members (maximum)</u></b>									
House of Clergy	3	3	2	2			5	5	0
House of Laity					5	5	5	5	0
<b><u>Non-voting representatives</u></b>									
Ecumenical Representatives					7	7	7	7	0

\* = ex-officio

^These officers sit in the Canterbury Convocation if they are clerks in holy orders

**Table 2 – Diocesan Proctors and Lay members (70%/ 30% provincial allocation)**

<u>Canterbury</u>	<u>Proctors</u>			<u>Laity</u>			<u>York</u>	<u>Proctors</u>			<u>Laity</u>		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>+ Revised</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Existing</i>	<i>+/-</i>	<i>Revised</i>		<i>Existing</i>	<i>+ Revised</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Existing</i>	<i>+/-</i>	<i>Revised</i>
Bath & Wells	4	0	4	7	-1	6	Blackburn	5	0	5	8	-2	6
Birmingham	3	0	3	3	0	3	Bradford	3	0	3	3	0	3
Bristol	3	0	3	4	-1	3	Carlisle	3	0	3	5	-1	4
Canterbury	3	0	3	4	-1	3	Chester	5	0	5	11	-3	8
Chelmsford	6	0	6	9	-2	7	Durham	5	0	5	6	-2	4
Chichester	6	0	6	10	-2	8	Liverpool	5	0	5	7	-2	5
Coventry	3	0	3	3	0	3	Manchester	7	0	7	8	-1	7
Derby	3	0	3	4	-1	3	Newcastle	3	0	3	4	-1	3
Ely	3	1	4	4	-1	3	Ripon & Leeds	3	0	3	4	-1	3
Europe	2	0	2	2	0	2	Sheffield	4	0	4	5	-1	4
Exeter	4	0	4	6	-1	5	Sodor & Man	1	0	1	1	0	1
Gloucester	3	0	3	5	-1	4	Southwell	4	0	4	4	-1	3
Guildford	4	0	4	5	-1	4	Wakefield	4	0	4	5	-1	4
Hereford	3	0	3	3	0	3	York	6	-1	5	8	-2	6
Leicester	3	0	3	3	0	3	<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>-18</b>	<b>61</b>
Lichfield	6	0	6	9	-2	7							
Lincoln	4	0	4	5	-1	4							
London	9	0	9	10	-2	8							
Norwich	4	0	4	5	-1	4							
Oxford	8	1	9	10	-2	8							
Peterborough	3	0	3	3	0	3							
Portsmouth	3	0	3	3	0	3							
Rochester	4	0	4	6	-1	5							
St Albans	6	0	6	8	-1	7							
St E & I	3	0	3	5	-1	4							
Salisbury	5	0	5	8	-1	7							
Southwark	7	0	7	8	-1	7							
Truro	3	0	3	3	0	3							
Winchester	4	0	4	7	-2	5							
Worcester	3	0	3	4	-1	3							
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>-28</b>	<b>138</b>							

## Appendix II      Submissions

### Part one      Synod members who made proposals for amendment to the Committee

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency and Synod Number</i>
Miss Rachel Beck*	Sheffield (501)
Dr David Blackmore	Chester (346)
Mrs Mary Bordass	Salisbury (494)
The Reverend Dr Richard Burridge*	London University (550)
Dr Graham Campbell	Chester (348)
The Reverend Dr Joseph Cassidy	Durham And Newcastle Universities (552)
Mr Jim Cheeseman*	Rochester (474)
The Archdeacon of Chesterfield (the Venerable David Garnett)	Derby (129)
The Dean of the Arches and Auditor (the Right Worshipful Sheila Cameron QC)*	Ex-officio (560)
The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (the Right Reverend Geoffrey Rowell)+~	Diocesan Bishops (18)
Mrs Penny Granger	Ely (379)
Mr Lee Humby*	London (431)
Mr James Humphery	Salisbury (498)
The Reverend Timothy Jenkins*	Cambridge University (549)
Mr Allan Jones*	Liverpool (420)
The Reverend Canon David Lickess	York (297)
The Bishop of Lincoln (the Rt Reverend John Saxbee)	Diocesan Bishops (25)
The Archdeacon of Malmesbury (the Venerable Alan Hawker)*	Bristol (93)
Mr Harry Marsh*	Chelmsford (340)
The Archdeacon of Northumberland (the Venerable Peter Elliott)	Newcastle (203)
The Bishop of Portsmouth (the Right Reverend Kenneth Stevenson)	Diocesan Bishops (32)
Mr Hugh Privett	Salisbury (500)
The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (the Right Reverend John Packer)<	Diocesan Bishops (33)
The Reverend Dr Paul Roberts and the Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman (jointly)	Bristol (96) and Southern Universities (551)
The Bishop of Rochester (the Right Reverend Michael Nazir-Ali)	Diocesan Bishops (34)

The Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman	Southern Universities (551)
The Reverend Peter Spiers	Liverpool (183)
The Archdeacon of Surrey+*	Guildford (154)
The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (the Venerable Clive Mansell)	Rochester (233)
The Reverend Stephen Trott+	Peterborough (224)
The Dean of Wakefield (the Very Reverend George Nairn-Briggs)*	Northern Deans (68)
Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams	Exeter (389)
The Bishop of Woolwich, (the Right Reverend Colin Buchanan)+*	Southern Suffragans (51)

**Part two    Non-Synod members (or bodies containing non-Synod members) who made proposals for amendment to the Committee**

Mr John Allen*	Assistant Diocesan Secretary, Derby
The Archdeacons' National Forum	from the Archdeacon of Lincoln, Chairman
Standing Committee of the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation	from the Reverend Canon Michael Hodge
Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England+#	from Ms Paula Griffiths, Secretary
Deans of the English Cathedrals^	from the Dean of Canterbury, Chairman
The Dean of Guernsey (the Very Reverend Marc Trickey)	
Mr Robert Higham=	Diocesan Secretary, Worcester
The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge*	Election Scrutineer
Mr Duncan Kent	Synod Officer, London
Mr Simon Parton	Diocesan Secretary, Southwark
The Reverend Canon John Rees	Joint Provincial Registrar, Canterbury
Retired Clergy Association	from the Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, President

Mrs Mary Saunders	Electoral Registration Officer, Oxford
South East Regional Diocesan Secretaries\$	from Mr Michael Bishop, Deputy Diocesan Secretary, Guildford
Ms Anne Toms	

- + Proposals received out of time (but still considered by the Committee).
- \* Attended one or more meetings of the Committee in person and spoke to their proposals.
- ~ The bishop's chaplain, the Reverend Jonathan Goodall, attended one meeting of the Committee on behalf of the bishop.
- < Mr Allan Jones spoke on behalf of the bishop at one meeting of the Committee.
- # Ms Paula Griffiths (Secretary) and Mr Tony Redman (Member) attended one meeting on behalf of the CFCE.
- ^ The Dean of Canterbury and the Dean of Leicester attended one meeting on behalf of the Deans of the English Cathedrals.
- = Submission originally made by Mr John Wood (then a Synod member) on behalf of Mr Higham.
- \$ Mr Michael Bishop attended one meeting on behalf of the South East Regional Diocesan Secretaries.

**Appendix III**      **A summary of the proposals received and of the Committee’s consideration of them**

*There were no proposals for amendment of the draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200- or the draft Religious Communities (Lay Representation) Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200-, other than those which were consequential on proposals for amendments listed in this appendix.*

**Part one**                      **Draft Amending Canon No. 26**

<b>Paragraph of draft amending canon</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Committee’s decision</b>
2(a) and 3(a) (Deans)	No special constituency and deans should be included in proctorial elections.	Mrs Mary Bordass The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.
	Deans should be free to stand in proctorial elections – which should take place after elections of special constituency.	Dr David Blackmore	Not accepted.
	To reduce the deans from to five would “significantly inhibit a proper balance of discussion in Synod”.	Cathedrals Fabric Commission	Not accepted.
	Deans should be reduced by one-third only to ten – the two provincial constituencies should not be amalgamated – so seven from the South and three from the North.	Deans of the English Cathedrals The Dean of Wakefield	Not accepted.
	Is it right to have national constituencies for seats in provincial Convocations?	Standing Committee of Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation	Otiose as removed provision for a national constituency.
	Greater representation.	The Archdeacon of Surrey	Not accepted.
2(c) and 13(a) (Armed Forces)	Remove new proposal and retain present arrangement.	Mrs Penny Granger	Not accepted.
	Each of Armed services should be treated as a separate diocese in electing proctors only.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.





	<p>Either increase representation to eighteen or twenty seven or abolish constituency and allow archdeacons to stand in proctorial elections.</p> <p>Should be “not more” than twelve archdeacons elected from each province.</p> <p>Twenty four archdeacons (seventeen Canterbury; seven York) – the rest of the remaining cut in House of Clergy to come from proctors.</p> <p>A minimum of twenty seven, elected on a regional basis.</p> <p>Elected regionally and report to regions.</p> <p>If proctorial route is closed, all archdeacons should vote in special constituency – with a minimum representation offered to each region.</p> <p>Archdeacons should remain free to stand in proctorial elections – which should take place ‘not coincident’ with elections of special constituency.</p> <p>European archdeacons should remain in proctorial election for diocese of Europe or have a special constituency of their own.</p>	<p>The Archdeacon of Malmesbury</p> <p>Mr Lee Humby</p> <p>Mr Allan Jones</p> <p>The Archdeacon of Surrey</p> <p>The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds</p> <p>The Archdeacon of Tonbridge</p> <p>Dr David Blackmore</p> <p>The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe</p>	<p>Neither alternative accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>First alternative accepted.</p>
2(e), 3(d), 4, 6, 9, 13(b) and 14(a) (Universities)	<p>Remove provision to delete universities’ constituencies and for the appointment of theological experts.</p> <p>Replace universities’ constituencies with constituency of “university recognised teachers” as per July</p>	<p>The Reverend Dr Richard Burrige The Bishop of Portsmouth</p>	<p>First proposal not accepted, second accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p>

	<p>2001 amendment.</p> <p>Need official representatives because of vision of Church that includes colleges, universities and other HE institutions.</p> <p>Provisions for appointment of theological experts should be deleted.</p> <p>Retain university representation – part of the wider Church, often not part of the diocese.</p> <p>Possibilities: give collegiate clergy right to vote in proctorial election regardless of holding bishop’s licence; bishop’s licenses relating to capacity of clergy as collegiate; vote based on licence to officiate in surrounding diocese to collegiate position; keep a universities’ constituency to represent a <u>particular group of clergy</u> and not to provide theological expertise.</p>	<p>The Reverend Canon Dr Joseph Cassidy</p> <p>Mr Lee Humby</p> <p>The Reverend Timothy Jenkins</p> <p>The Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>First option accepted, others not accepted.</p>
2(f), 3(c) (Religious Communities)	Special constituency for clergy (and by implication for laity as well) should be abolished.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.
5(a) (Numbers of Proctors)	The maximum number of proctors for each Convocation to be 195.	Mr Lee Humby	Not accepted.
7(c) (Retired clergy)	<p>Full voting rights for all clergy with PTO.</p> <p>Remove new provision allowing “retired clergy” to stand for election to General Synod.</p> <p>Extend provision to “retired clergy” on deanery synod.</p> <p>Some account should be taken of where retired clergy are – will affect some dioceses more than others.</p>	<p>The Reverend Stephen Trott</p> <p>Mrs Penny Granger The Reverend Peter Spiers</p> <p>Mr Lee Humby</p> <p>Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Noted – but final decision is with clerical electorate.</p>

## New proposals

<p>Appointed members</p>	<p>Concern at number of appointed members in a smaller Synod especially on Article 7 and 8 business.</p> <p>Number of Archbishops' Council appointed members should be 'less than six'.</p> <p>Appointed members (existing and proposed theological experts) should not have a right to vote.</p> <p>Process of Synodical approval of appointed members should be such as to provide the Synod with a real opportunity to choose – should apply to Archbishops' Council members and proposed "theological experts".</p>	<p>Mr Jim Cheeseman</p> <p>Mr Allan Jones</p> <p>The Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman Mrs Penny Granger</p>	<p>Concern not shared by Committee.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted (extension to theological experts otiose).</p> <p>Not considered as outside of Committee's remit.</p>
<p>House of Bishops</p>	<p>Further thought should be given to reducing the size and composition of the House of Bishops – don't need one per diocese.</p> <p>House of Bishops to be diocesan bishops only.</p> <p>Each diocese to be represented by one bishop.</p> <p>Explore further a suffragan as alternative to a diocesan bishop.</p> <p>Move to one bishop per diocese.</p> <p>A national constituency of eight suffragan bishops.</p>	<p>Dr Graham Campbell</p> <p>The Reverend Stephen Trott</p> <p>Mr Allan Jones</p> <p>The Reverend Canon David Lickess The Reverend Peter Spiers</p> <p>The Archdeacon of Malmesbury The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds The Archdeacon of Surrey</p> <p>The Bishop of Woolwich</p>	<p>Specific proposal of 'less than one bishop per diocese' not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Proposal explored but not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p>

Prison Chaplains	Prison chaplains should form separate constituency, as if constituted as a diocese.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.
------------------	---	----------------------------	---------------

**Part two**

**Draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment)**  
**Resolution 200-**

<b>Paragraph of draft amendment resolution</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Committee's decision</b>
4(1) (Election and choice of members of deanery synods)	Diocesan Synod elections should always be in year after deanery synod elections. Question holding deanery and General Synod elections in same year.	Mr Jim Cheeseman	Accepted.
	Elections to diocesan synod in second and fifth year.	SE Region Diocesan Secretaries	Not accepted.
	Deanery and diocesan synod elections should be pushed forward a year.	Mr Harry Marsh	Not accepted.
	Act to avoid clash of deanery elections and elections to General Synod in 2005.	Mrs Mary Saunders	Not accepted.
6(a) (Number of elected members)	Delete words "shall not exceed" and replace with a more flexible form of words for allocation of extra seat in case of dead heat between dioceses.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Not accepted.
	Equality of treatment between provinces.	Mr Jim Cheeseman	Not accepted.
	Alternatives provided on numbers of members in each province.	Mr Lee Humby	Not accepted.
8(a) (Conduct of elections)	Seeking re-election should <u>not</u> be included.	Mr Jim Cheeseman	Not accepted.
	8(b)  Candidates should continue to produce their own election addresses.  Candidates should have the option of producing their own election	Mr Jim Cheeseman Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams	Not accepted.
Mr Lee Humby		Not accepted.	

	<p>addresses or allowing them to be produced by the diocese – if candidate supplies sufficient copies of address they are to be distributed, otherwise presiding officer to make sufficient copies.</p> <p>Copy of election address may be provided electronically.</p> <p>Candidates should produce election addresses – otherwise may penalise new candidates or those wishing to be “green”.</p>	Mr Allan Jones	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p>
10 (Casual vacancies)	<p>Keep current two year period in which to use previous ballot papers to fill a casual vacancy – or extend this to five years if the Bishop’s Council so wished.</p> <p>Delete provision to reduce period for a re-run of original election to one year.</p>	Mr Jim Cheeseman  The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge Mr Lee Humby	<p>First proposal accepted, second not accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p>

**New proposals (left hand column refers to existing provisions of the CRRs)**

1(2) and Appendix 1 (Formation of roll)	Amend application form to make it easier for a lay person to supply necessary information.	The Reverend Peter Spiers	Not accepted, but referred to CHP and SPCK regarding presentation.
2(4) (Electoral roll revision)	<p>Move electoral roll revision to 2007.</p> <p>Electoral roll at revision be curtailed and last for five years.</p> <p>Move electoral roll revision start date to 2008.</p>	<p>SE Region Diocesan Secretaries Mr Duncan Kent Mr Simon Parton</p> <p>Mr Harry Marsh</p> <p>The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>Superseded by above decision.</p>
2(7)	Clarify that new roll comes into effect on day of publication.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Accepted.
10(1)(c), 24(7), 30(5)(c) and 31(3) (Deanery and diocesan synod elections)	Age for election to deanery and diocesan synod should be lowered from eighteen to sixteen.	Miss Rachel Beck	Accepted.

12 (Variation of method of election)	Changes in rules for postal votes at APCM so results can be announced at the meeting – involve removal of right to nominate at the APCM.	Ms Anne Toms	Not accepted.
13 (Conduct of election of church wardens)	Outcome of elections should be known before end of meeting.	Ms Anne Toms	Based on misconception, so not considered.
25(2) (Election and choice of members)	A diocesan synod in deciding numbers to be elected to deanery synods should be able to have regard to the number of parish churches (or districts) in each parish as well as to roll numbers.	Mr Robert Higham	Accepted.
31 (Election of diocesan synods and committees)	There should be a short time (48 hours) when the candidates should know the identity of each other and have opportunity to withdraw.	Ms Anne Toms	Not within Committee's remit for diocesan committees, not accepted for diocesan synods.
32(6) and Appendix I (Election of diocesan synod)	Year of birth and voting preferences should be separated on voting paper.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Accepted.
35(3) (House of Laity electorate)	Enfranchise all members of parish electoral rolls.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.
36(2) (Number of elected members)	With any change in provincial ratio the reduction applied to any diocese should be a maximum of two.  For the House of Laity: combine smaller dioceses into a single constituency electing five members or allocate one diocese three members and another two, to be reversed each quinquennium.	Dr Graham Campbell	Not accepted.  Not accepted.
36(3)	No diocese should be entitled to three seats if hasn't got the numbers to justify it – combined electoral areas across dioceses.  Smaller dioceses should have two members.	Mr Jim Cheeseman  The Reverend Canon David Lickess	Not accepted.  Not accepted.

	Determine which Divisor Method is to be used. Problem of obtaining accurate figures in determining distribution of seats.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Not accepted. No specific proposal made.
39(1) (Conduct of General Synod Elections)	Should the presiding officer be able to hold elections at different times from that determined centrally?	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Content with current provisions.
39(3)	A new and cheaper way should be found to invite nominations that does not depend on contacting all electors but rather relies on prescribed notices ‘targeted’ at those eligible to stand.	Mr John Allen	Not accepted, but recommend that this be investigated further by the Business Committee.
39(5)(a)	Determine what happens if presiding officer makes mistake in determining validity of a nomination.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Not accepted, already provided in rules.
39(5)(b)	Recorded details of the e-mail address (if any) and the parish of each qualified elector to, additionally, be provided to candidates.	Mr Lee Humby	First proposal accepted, second not accepted.
39(8)	Details of voters in deanery order.	Mr Allan Jones	Withdrawn.
39(11)	Return to manual counts. Counts should all be on the same day.  Amend power for election scrutineer to order a recount to within five days of <u>receipt</u> of result.  Define what happens if presiding officer fails in his duties.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Neither accepted.  Not accepted.  Considered in context of nominations process.
44(6)(b) (Election appeals)	Insert the words “or might be” before the words “material to the result of the election”.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Not accepted.
48(6)(c) (Casual vacancies)	Replace the words “the previous election” with the words “a previous election”.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Not accepted.
Appendix (Notice of meetings of	Proviso to be added requiring chairman to convene meetings of the PCC on pre-determined dates	Mr Lee Humby	First proposal not accepted, second proposal accepted.

PCC)	and providing that notice may be given by e-mail.		
Channel Islands	Conduct of elections in the Channel Islands.	The Reverend Canon Michael Hodge	Withdrawn.



Ex-officio voting rights	Ex-officio members should have full speaking rights but no right to vote.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not accepted.
Extra mailings	Candidates should be discouraged from extra mailings.	Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams	Did not vote as no specific proposal was made.
General Synod Elections	Full set of election rules (in plain English) to all candidates and deanery officers.  Dioceses more supportive and proactive.	Mr Allan Jones  The Reverend Peter Spiers	Not accepted.  Referred to other bodies, including the Business Committee, prior to 2005 elections.
Hustings	Encouragement and promotion of hustings .	Mr Allan Jones	Referred to other bodies, including the Business Committee, prior to 2005 elections
Laity interests	Concern at Laity members working at diocesan offices or being married to clergy.  Laity who do paid work for their dioceses should be excluded from standing for election.	Mrs Mary Bordass  Mr Allan Jones	Neither accepted.  Not accepted.
Limitation on continuous service	Balance may be in favour of some sort of limitation on continuous service for General Synod.	Dr Paul Roberts and Professor Bernard Silverman	Not accepted.
Nomination paper for General Synod elections	Nomination paper to include candidate's title.	Mr John Allen	Accepted for inclusion in revision of guidance for 2005 elections.
Period of office of General Synod	Extend period of office of General Synod to six years.	SE Region Diocesan Secretaries Mr Duncan Kent	Not considered as outside of Committee's remit, but recommendation made to Business Committee to explore.
Special constituencies for Laity	Prevalence of senior lay office holders being elected, if they stand, and disadvantage this places on other laity to get elected.	Dr Graham Campbell	Not accepted.
STV	STV should be routinely used for all elections.	Ms Anne Toms	Not accepted.
STV Regulations 1990 and 1998	Change regulations on count – to allow papers to be entered as received – with candidates rights preserved.	Mr John Allen	Not considered as outside of Committee's remit – recommend that proposal be considered

			at next revision of regulations.
--	--	--	----------------------------------

Unified House of Clergy	United house for bishops, priests and deacons.	The Reverend Stephen Trott	Not considered as outside of Committee's remit.
Voting paper for General Synod elections	Remove the words "and descriptions" from the voting paper and voter to write name in block capitals on voting paper.	Mr John Allen	Recommended that be dealt with in revision of guidance for 2005 elections.

**Appendix IV      Destination tables**

**Draft Amending Canon No. 26**

<b>GS 1484 (as at First Consideration)</b>	<b>GS 1484A (as amended by the Revision Committee)</b>
1	1
2(a) to 2(d)	2(a) to 2(d)
2(e)	-
3(a) to 3(c)	3(a) to 3(c)
3(d)	-
4	4
5(a) to 5(d)	5(a) to 5(d)
6	6
7(a)	7(c)
-	7(a) to 7(b)
7(b)	-
7(c)	7(d)
7(d)	-
-	7(e)
8 to 11	8 to 11
-	12
12	13
13(a)	14(a)
-	14(b)
13(b)	-
13(c)	14(c)
14(a)	-
14(b)	15
-	16

**The draft Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200-**

<b>GS 1485 (as at First Consideration)</b>	<b>GS 1485A (as amended by the Revision Committee)</b>
-	1
-	2
1 to 2	3 to 4
3	5(a)
-	5(b)
4	-
-	6
-	7 to 9
5 to 7	10 to 12
8(a)	13(a)
-	13(b)
8(b) to 8(c)	13(c) to 13(d)
9	14(c)

-	<b>14(a) to 14(b) and 14(d) to 14(f)</b>
<b>10</b>	-
-	<b>15 to 16</b>
<b>11(1) to 11(3)</b>	<b>17(1) to 17(3)</b>
-	<b>17(4)</b>

**The draft Clergy Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200-**

<b>GS 1486 (as at First Consideration)</b>	<b>GS 1486A (as amended by the Revision Committee)</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	-
<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
-	<b>6</b>
-	<b>7</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8 to 12</b>	<b>9 to 13</b>
<b>13(a)</b>	<b>14(a)</b>
-	<b>14(b)</b>
<b>13(b) to 13(c)</b>	<b>14(c) to 14(d)</b>
<b>14(a)</b>	-
-	<b>15(a)</b>
<b>14(b)</b>	<b>15(b)</b>
<b>15(1) to 15(3)</b>	<b>16(1) to 16(3)</b>

**The draft Religious Communities (Lay Representation) Rules (Amendment) Resolution 200-**

<b>GS 1487 (as at First Consideration)</b>	<b>GS 1487A (as amended by the Revision Committee)</b>
<b>1 to 5</b>	<b>1 to 5</b>
<b>6(1) to 6(3)</b>	<b>6(1) to 6(3)</b>

## **Appendix V**      **Voting figures on the representation of archdeacons, cathedral deans and suffragan bishops on the General Synod**

### **Archdeacons**

#### **Preliminary decisions**

The Committee decided, unanimously on both occasions, that it did not favour retaining the *status quo* (namely one archdeacon per diocese and the ability to stand in the proctorial elections), neither did it favour keeping one archdeacon per diocese but closing down the ability to stand in the proctorial elections.

The Committee voted in favour of a proposal from the Reverend Simon Killwick, seconded by the Bishop of Dover, that the Committee should explore the possibility of a special constituency with the proctorial route being closed (although not whether one should be adopted), voting five in favour, two against, with two abstentions. Having established that, the Committee then took a series of votes to determine what size any special constituency should be:

- (a) the Committee voted against a proposal from the Reverend Simon Killwick, seconded by the Bishop of Dover for a special constituency of twelve with no proctorial route (i.e. what was currently contained in the draft legislation), voting three in favour, five against, with one abstention.
- (b) the Committee voted in favour of a proposal from Mrs Nicolette Fisher, seconded by Sister Janette for a special constituency of eighteen with no proctorial route (this figure being proposed as it was divisible by nine - the number of regional groupings for archdeacons the Committee then understood there to be), voting five in favour, four against and no abstentions.
- (c) on a proposal from the Archdeacon of Norwich for a special constituency of twenty seven with no proctorial route, there was no seconder.

Having established, albeit provisionally, that if a special constituency were to be created it would be of eighteen archdeacons, the Committee voted against a proposal from Mr Stuart Emmason, seconded by Canon Sarah James, for the alternative of no special constituency for archdeacons but for them to be free to stand in the proctorial elections (with no cap or restriction), voting four in favour, five against, with no abstentions.

#### **Final decisions**

On revisiting its preliminary decisions, the Committee voted against a proposal from the Chairman “that there should not be a special constituency for archdeacons”, voting four in favour, six against, with no abstentions.

The Reverend Canon Michael Walters, seconded by the Reverend Prebendary Kay Garlick, proposed that the Committee confirm its preliminary decision in favour of a special constituency of eighteen for archdeacons (twelve from the province of Canterbury and six

from the province of York) and the Committee voted against this proposal, voting four in favour, five against, with one abstention. The Archdeacon of Norwich wished it to be recorded that he voted against this proposal and in doing so was maintaining his previous position.

There being no further amendments proposed by any member of the Committee, the Secretary confirmed that the proposal for a constituency of twelve archdeacons (eight from the province of Canterbury and four from the province of York) as contained in the draft legislation as given first consideration remained unamended by the Committee.

### **Cathedral Deans**

The Committee voted -

- (a) against a proposal from Mrs Mary Bordass that the deans' special constituency should be abolished and deans should be eligible to stand in proctorial elections, voting one in favour, eight against, with one abstention;
- (b) against a proposal from Mr Stuart Emmason, seconded by the Archdeacon of Norwich, that the deans' special constituency should be abolished and deans should be eligible to stand in proctorial elections save for the Deans of Canterbury and York who would be members of the Synod ex officio, voting three in favour, seven against, with no abstentions;
- (c) against a proposal from Dr David Blackmore that the deans should vote in a special constituency after having had the opportunity to stand in the proctorial elections, voting none in favour, eight against, with one abstention.

### Preliminary decisions

- (a) against a proposal from the Deans of the English Cathedrals collectively and the Dean of Wakefield individually that the deans' special constituency should total ten, seven elected by the southern province and three elected by the northern province, voting three in favour, six against, with one abstention;
- (b) the Committee voted in favour of a proposal from the Reverend Simon Killwick, seconded by Mrs Nicolette Fisher that the constituency for deans should total seven, voting nine in favour, none against, with one abstention; and
- (c) the Committee voted unanimously in favour of a proposal from Mr Harry Marsh, seconded by the Bishop of Dover that the deans' constituency should be elected nationally with at least two deans having to be elected from the northern province (the number of two being open to review if the preliminary decision on the overall size of the constituency was changed).

### Final decisions

On revisiting its preliminary decisions, the Reverend Canon Michael Walters, seconded by the Reverend Simon Killwick, proposed that the Committee confirm its preliminary decision on the size of the special constituency for cathedral deans (a constituency of seven cathedral deans) and the Committee voted against this proposal, voting two in favour, six against, with two abstentions. There were no further proposals for amendment on the size of the special constituency for cathedral deans and the Secretary confirmed that the proposal for a constituency of five cathedral deans as contained in the draft legislation as given first consideration remained unamended by the Committee.

The Bishop of Dover, seconded by the Reverend Simon Killwick, therefore proposed that the Committee's other preliminary decision (in favour of a national constituency with reserved places for the northern province) should be nullified and replaced by a decision in favour of a two special constituencies (three cathedral deans elected from the province of Canterbury and a two cathedral deans elected from the province of York) the Committee voting in favour of this proposal, voting nine in favour, one against, with no abstentions.

### **House of Bishops**

The Committee voted -

- (a) against the proposal that the House of Bishops should be reduced to fewer than one per diocese, voting one in favour, nine against, with no abstentions;
- (b) against the proposal that the House of Bishops should be reduced to diocesan bishops only, voting two in favour, six against, with two abstentions;
- (c) against a proposal from the Archdeacon of Norwich, seconded by the Bishop of Dover, that the House of Bishops should be reduced to diocesan bishops only with a recommendation that the Standing Orders of the House be amended to allow for the election of suffragan bishops to attend (but not vote) at separate meetings of the House, voting three in favour, seven against, with no abstentions;
- (d) against the proposal that the House of Bishops should be reduced to one bishop per diocese (either diocesan or suffragan), voting two in favour, five against, with three abstentions;

### Preliminary decisions

The Committee then voted, on a preliminary basis, in favour of a proposal from the Reverend Simon Killwick, seconded by Mr Stuart Emmason, that the special constituency for suffragan bishops be increased to ten, seven to be elected from the southern province, three from the northern province, voting five in favour, four against, with one abstention.



## Final decisions

On revisiting its preliminary decision, the Chairman proposed that that the Committee confirm its preliminary decision in favour of a constituency of ten suffragan bishops, seven elected from the province of Canterbury and three from the province of York, the Committee voting against this proposal, voting one in favour, eight against, with one abstention.

The Secretary informed the Committee that due to a drafting error in the draft legislation as given first consideration, there was currently no provision within this draft legislation to amend the representation of suffragan bishops. The Bishop of Dover, seconded by the Reverend Simon Killwick, therefore proposed a special constituency of seven suffragan bishops (four from the province of Canterbury and three from the province of York) (this being the proposal of the legislative drafting group), the Committee voting in favour of this proposal, voting seven in favour, one against, with two abstentions.

**Appendix VI**      **Voting figures on the representation of the universities on the General Synod**

The Committee voted -

- (a) against the proposal that the existing universities constituency for clergy proctors should be re-instated, voting none in favour, eight against, with two abstentions;
- (b) against a proposal from the Reverend Dr Richard Burrige that there should be a “one or more special constituencies of university recognised teachers with theological expertise, whether bishops, clergy or laity, male or female”, voting three in favour, five against, with two abstentions;
- (c) against a proposal from the Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman for a special constituency for collegiate clergy in the four ancient universities only, voting three in favour, five against, with two abstentions;
- (d) in favour of a proposal from the Reverend Professor Bernard Silverman for collegiate clergy to be given the legal right to vote and stand in the diocesan proctorial election whether or not they hold the bishop’s licence, voting eight in favour, none against, with two abstentions;
- (e) in favour of a proposal from Mr Lee Humby that the provision for the appointment of up to three theological experts should be deleted, voting nine in favour, one against, with no abstentions.
- (f) against a proposal from Mr Harry Marsh, seconded by the Reverend Canon Michael Walters, that “there should be a special constituency for university representation”, voting two in favour, seven against with one abstention.

## **Appendix VII      Divisor Methods**

Information supplied to the Committee by the Reverend Canon Michael Hodge.

1. Church Representation Rule 36 (1) and (2) spells out the procedure for allocating the number of members to be elected by each diocese.
2. In practice, the first step is the allocation to the diocese in Europe and the diocese of Sodor and Man, both of which elect a fixed number of members.
3. The next step is the provisional allocation to the other dioceses of the number of members to be elected by each.
4. The provisional allocation to some of the dioceses may be less than the prescribed minimum of three. These dioceses are then “topped up” so as to ensure that each has the minimum allocation of three.
5. As the “topping up” procedure is at the expense of other dioceses, a new provisional allocation to these other dioceses is calculated.
6. The integer part of the figure calculated in paragraph 5 is the new provisional allocation for these dioceses.
7. The total sum of the provisional allocations is always less than the total number to be elected.
8. Church Representation Rule 36 (2) says that the final allocation shall be “as nearly as possible proportionate to the number of names certified [for each diocese]”, but subject to the minimum of three and the fixed numbers for two dioceses.
9. The natural expectation is that the remaining seats will be allocated to the dioceses with the largest decimal remainder at the end of paragraph 6. Unfortunately, this is not satisfactory and, arguably, does not meet the requirement stated in paragraph 8.
10. The problem is that allocating in accordance with the largest decimal remainders is non-monotonic, that is, an increase in the total number to be elected in a province may result in a decreased representation in one or more dioceses, and vice versa.
11. A divisor method must be used to overcome this problem. There are five divisor methods available, any one of which comply with the “as nearly as possible proportionate” requirement.
12. The Largest Divisor Method tends to favour those dioceses with the larger certified numbers.
13. The Smallest Divisor Method tends to favour those dioceses with the smaller certified numbers, not including those that had to be topped-up.
14. In between come the Harmonic Mean and Geometric Mean. In practice, these rapidly converge on the Arithmetic Mean.
15. All elections, except one, to the General Synod have been based on the Arithmetic Mean Divisor Method. The one exception was the subject of a successful appeal.
16. The Arithmetic Mean is calculated by dividing the number of licensed clergy or church electoral roll numbers in each continuing diocese by  $(n + \frac{1}{2})$ , where  $n$  is the integer number calculated in paragraph 6.
17. The Arithmetic Mean numbers are arranged in numerical order, and the remaining places (paragraph 7) are allocated in order.
18. In the Largest Divisor Method, the division is by  $(n + 1)$ . In the Smallest Divisor method, the division is by  $(n)$ .

## Appendix VIII      Cycle of preparation of new electoral roll and synodical elections

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Status quo

<b>New Electoral Roll</b>	<b>ER</b>					<b>ER</b>						<b>ER</b>	
<b>Deanery Synod</b>	<b>DEA</b>		<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>	
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>	<b>DIO</b>			<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>					<b>DIO</b>
<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>		<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>

(A) Draft Legislation as at First Consideration

<b>New Electoral Roll</b>	<b>ER</b>					<b>ER</b>						<b>ER</b>	
<b>Deanery Synod</b>	<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>				<b>DEA</b>				<b>DEA</b>	
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>	<b>DIO</b>			<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>	
<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>		<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>

(B) Status quo and move roll revision (once)

<b>New Electoral Roll</b>	<b>ER</b>				<b>ER</b>							<b>ER</b>	
<b>Deanery Synod</b>	<b>DEA</b>		<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>	
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>	<b>DIO</b>			<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>	
<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>		<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>

(C) Draft Legislation as at First Consideration and amend CRR31

<b>New Electoral Roll</b>	<b>ER</b>					<b>ER</b>						<b>ER</b>	
<b>Deanery Synod</b>	<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>				<b>DEA</b>				<b>DEA</b>	
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>	<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>
<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>		<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>

(D) Status quo and move roll revision (once) and make General Synod election every six years

<b>New Electoral Roll</b>	<b>ER</b>				<b>ER</b>						<b>ER</b>		
<b>Deanery Synod</b>	<b>DEA</b>		<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>	
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>	<b>DIO</b>			<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>				<b>DIO</b>	
<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>		<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>					<b>GS</b>

Illustration of “six year” General Synod cycle

<b>Year</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>New Electoral Roll</b>				<b>ER</b>			
<b>Deanery Synod</b>		<b>DEA</b>			<b>DEA</b>		
<b>Diocesan Synod</b>			<b>DIO</b>			<b>DIO</b>	

<b>General Synod</b>	<b>GS</b>						<b>GS</b>
----------------------	-----------	--	--	--	--	--	-----------

## **Appendix IX      Determining numbers of lay members of deanery synods**

### **Current table**

<b>Number on parish electoral roll</b>	<b>Number of lay representatives on deanery synod</b>
Up to 25	1
26 to 100	2
101 to 200	3
201 to 300	4
301 to 400	5
401 to 500	6
501 to 750	7
751 to 1000	8
Over 1000	9

**Illustration of a modified table which also has regard to numbers of parish churches (or districts) provided by Mr Robert Higham.**

<b>Number of lay representatives on deanery synod</b>				
<b>Number on parish electoral roll</b>	<b>1 parish church in the parish</b>	<b>2 parish churches in the parish</b>	<b>3 parish churches in the parish</b>	<b>4 or more parish churches in the parish</b>
Up to 25	1	1	1	1
26 to 100	2	2	2	2
101 to 200	3	4	4	4
201 to 300	4	5	5	5
301 to 400	5	6	7	8
401 to 500	6	7	8	9
501 to 750	7	8	9	10
751 to 1000	8	9	10	11
Over 1000	9	10	11	12