

The Standing Commission on The Structure of the Church

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	334
Commission membership	335
Polity and Authority Committee	335
Committee membership	335
Office of Presiding Bishop	336
Historical considerations.....	336
Biblical and theological considerations	337
Canonical considerations.....	337
Metropolitan authority.....	337
Functional considerations.....	338
Proposed changes in titles.....	339
Other changes.....	341
General Convention Process Committee	343
Committee members	343
Deacons as deputies	343
Joint Nominating Committee [for the election of the Presiding Bishop]	343
Size of the House of Deputies	344
Board for Church Deployment.....	345
Follow-up on General Convention actions	346
Other matters concerned with General Convention	346
Committee on Bishops	347
Financial Report	347
Objectives and Goals for Next Triennium	348

INTRODUCTION

The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) is charged by the Canons (Title I, Canon 1, Section 2(n)(6)) to "... study and make recommendations concerning the structure of the General Convention and of the Church..." and to "... review the operation of the several Committees and Commissions to determine the necessity for their continuance and the effectiveness of their functions and to bring about a coordination of their efforts."

The agenda of the Commission originates from (1) specific referrals by resolutions of the preceding General Convention; (2) the Commission's review of "... the operation of the several Committees and Commissions..."; (3) resolutions introduced at preceding General Conventions but not adopted (at times because of lack of time for full consideration); (4) matters requested for consideration by other commissions, committees, organizations or individuals; and (5) matters identified by members of the Commission.

Since the establishment of the General Convention Office (recommended in the

Structure Commission's 1976 report), the task of reviewing and coordinating the efforts of the several committees and commissions has become steadily easier. Communications have improved. Summaries of the minutes of these bodies are distributed. Each of them is represented at the "challenge process" session of the Joint Standing Committee on Program, Budget, and Finance held by the expense section, at which they are required to defend their budget requests; and Executive Council minutes are sent to each chairperson. The Executive Officer of the General Convention has attended most meetings of the interim bodies, and has been invaluable in the coordination function.

The members of the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church are very grateful for the guidance and counsel of the current Executive Officer, the Rev. Canon James R. Gundrum, D.D.

Upon consideration of its agenda, the 1979-1982 Commission divided itself into three committees: Polity and Authority, General Convention Process, and Bishops.

The Commission's report is divided into sections according to its committees' responsibilities, and the Commission's recommendations appear in bold-face type following the discussion on each subject.

Commission membership

The composition of this Commission, with date of expiration of term and diocese of each member being placed in parentheses, is as follows:

The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Cochrane (1982, Olympia)
The Rt. Rev. Alexander D. Stewart (1982, Western Massachusetts)
The Rt. Rev. Robert C. Witcher (1985, Long Island)
The Rev. Jesse F. Anderson, Jr. (1982, Washington)
The Rev. Carlos Touche-Porter (1985, Central and South Mexico)
*The Rev. Robert M. Wainwright (1985, Rochester)
Mrs. Donald C. Barnum (Lois), *Chairman* (1982, Bethlehem)
Mr. George T. Guernsey, *Secretary* (1985, Missouri)
Mrs. William K. Nicrosi (Harold) (1985, Alabama)
Mrs. Henry N. Somsen (Anne) (1982, Minnesota)
Mr. Robert J. Wesley (1985, Kansas)
Mr. Frank T. Wood, Jr. (1982, Central New York)

The full Commission met three times during the triennium: April 23-24, 1980; October 27-29, 1980; and October 21-23, 1981. A fourth meeting had been planned for January or February, 1982, which could not be held due to uncertainty as to the availability of funds. Therefore the Commission and Committee chairmen have taken major responsibility for the writing of this report. The entire Commission membership has, however, had an opportunity to review, revise, and concur with the final report.

POLITY AND AUTHORITY COMMITTEE

Committee membership

The Rt. Rev. Robert C. Witcher, *Chairman*
The Rev. Carlos Touche-Porter
The Rev. Robert M. Wainwright
Mr. Robert J. Wesley

Aware that our present Presiding Bishop is required by the Canons to retire on the

*Executive Council Liaison

first of January following the 1985 General Convention and that, therefore, the Joint Nominating Committee [for the election of the Presiding Bishop] (hereinafter referred to as the Nominating Committee) must be elected at the 1982 General Convention, the Commission assigned to the Polity and Authority Committee the preparation of a report on the role and function of the Office of the Presiding Bishop, to assist the members of the 1982 General Convention as they elect the Nominating Committee, and to assist the Nominating Committee as they work during the ensuing triennium. The Polity and Authority Committee was also assigned the responsibility for making recommendations for constitutional and canonical changes, if needed, regarding the Office of Presiding Bishop, the subject of metropolitanical authority, and elections/appointments to the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) and the Anglican Church in North America and the Caribbean (ACNAC).

Office of Presiding Bishop

The Committee has been entrusted with the responsibility of studying the role and office of the Presiding Bishop and putting forward proposed changes in the Constitution and Canons related to that office.

A corollary task has been to offer background materials and suggestions to the Nominating Committee for their use in selecting nominees for the Office of Presiding Bishop at the 1985 General Convention. The Commission makes a clear distinction between the *office* of Presiding Bishop and such individuals as may be nominated to fill that office. Our basic concerns deal with the office of Presiding Bishop; the Nominating Committee must propose individuals to fill that office.

The process for the election of a Presiding Bishop is ordered in Article I, Sec. 3 of the Constitution of the Church. Nominating Committee membership and its function is described in Title I, Canon 2. As the Nominating Committee begins to carry out its function, it should consider carefully the nature of the office of Presiding Bishop in the life of the Church today. The Commission recommends that this task be carried out objectively until a clear understanding of the role and office of Presiding Bishop is set forth. Only then should the Nominating Committee consider individuals to be nominated. The Commission urges the Nominating Committee to use the resources the Church provides to implement this process.

Historical Considerations

As the Polity and Authority Committee studied the office, its first consideration was *historical*. In order to view the office of Presiding Bishop in the context of its historical evolution, we sought to determine how the office has evolved into its present shape in order better to prepare for its future occupant. Using a generous grant from the trustees of the Mercer Scholarship Fund of the Diocese of Long Island, we were fortunate to be able to persuade the Rev. Dr. Roland Foster, an ecclesiastical historian, to undertake a scholarly research process and prepare a paper, "The Role of Presiding Bishop." In this paper Dr. Foster describes the office not only in its canonical evolution but in the unique manner in which the office has functioned through the gifts which the various Presiding Bishops have brought to it.

A second research paper on the office of Presiding Bishop was prepared by the Rev. Canon Charles M. Guilbert, entitled "Changes in the Structure, Organization, and Government of the Episcopal Church in the Last Sixty Years." This paper emphasizes the canonical evolution of the office of Presiding Bishop in its relationship to General Convention and the Executive Council.

A third reference provides a deeper historical understanding of the structure of

episcopacy in the Episcopal Church. The monograph by Frederick G. Mills, entitled *Bishops by Ballot: An Eighteenth Century Ecclesiastical Revolution*, vividly portrays the genesis and evolution of the unique form *episcopate* has taken in the polity of this Church.

Biblical and theological considerations

A second major consideration, and a primary framework for our understanding of the Office of Presiding Bishop, is in the *biblical* and *theological* areas. A large bibliography of such literature as it relates to the office of Bishop and of the office of Presiding Bishop exists, such as Kenneth Kirk's *Apostolic Ministry*. The Commission wishes only to underline the necessity of viewing the office of Presiding Bishop in the context of scripture and Christian theology before it views this office from its administrative and functional perspectives. An understanding must be developed of *episcopate* as a scriptural and theological development before "chief pastor" can be properly understood.

Canonical considerations

Thirdly, the office of Presiding Bishop is described in its canonical role (especially I.2.4) in the context of the polity of a Church which describes itself as "Episcopal," which is one led by bishops. We call special attention to a distinction between governance (administration) and order. Clearly, order is prior to governance; and our presumption is that the order of the episcopate in general, and the office of the Presiding Bishop specifically, is a gift of God which has been given for ministry within the Church and for leadership in mission.

Metropolitan authority

A fourth consideration is the role of the Presiding Bishop as he relates to other primates (by whatever name they are called) of other Anglican Churches and ecumenically to other Christian communions. This aspect is generally subsumed under the heading of "metropolitan authority" and is a subject of paramount concern in the worldwide circles of the Anglican Communion today.

We make reference to two documents for further study in the area of metropolitan authority. One is a letter from Bishop John Howe, Secretary-General of the ACC, (ACC, June 28, 1977) which proposes a definition of metropolitan authority. In this letter Bishop Howe states: "metropolitan authority is one of the basic concepts of Anglican Church structure. This is usually exercised within the provincial structure of the Anglican Communion, but it is also exercised in extra-provincial dioceses which are related to a particular archbishop. . . . This concept confirms the conviction that no diocese should exist in isolation, but should receive pastoral support and should develop within the general Anglican ethos—which it should continually help to form." The eight areas defined by the ACC for exercising such authority are as follows:

1. The provision of pastoral oversight over the area concerned, assuring both that its constitution and canonical development is in accordance with general Anglican tradition and practice, and that the provisions of its constitution and canons are adhered to.
2. The giving of authority for the division of dioceses and the creation of new dioceses.
3. The giving of authority for the election, and/or translation, of bishops within the diocese or dioceses concerned, and the confirming of the same.
4. The provision of adequate episcopal oversight in the case of vacancies.

5. Consecrating or issuing the mandate for the consecration of bishops in the diocese or dioceses concerned.
6. Provision for the necessary approval of all changes in the constitution and canons of the diocese or dioceses insofar as they pertain to faith and order and the relations with other parts of the Anglican Communion.
7. Fullest consultation about the calling of meetings of synods and standing committees.
8. Receiving appeals allowed by the appropriate constitution and canons.

The other document is from the primates meeting in Washington, D.C., April 1981, entitled, "Authority in the Anglican Communion." In this booklet, four papers are presented which shed considerable light on the concept of authority in our Anglican system which relates to the office of Presiding Bishop.

Functional considerations

A fifth consideration is functional. In 1972 the House of Bishops developed a brief document which dealt with the "Expectations of the Office of Presiding Bishop." This was a useful vehicle at that time; it gave the Church some concept of what to expect of its newly elected Presiding Bishop, and gave the new incumbent an idea of what the Church expected of him. While recognizing that the office of Presiding Bishop has been historically molded to a degree by the incumbent, and also recognizing that the world changes, it is reasonable to assume that certain expectations of the person holding the office may change as well. This is legitimate as long as those changes are understood in the light of the five considerations enumerated above.

A further statement regarding the office was included in the Structure Commission's report to the 1976 General Convention (Louisville), particularly the section headed "Report Relating to the Administrative Function" (1976 *Journal*, AA-13 to AA-21). The Commission commends this material to those persons elected to the Nominating Committee; in fact, we recommend that all bishops and deputies read the material under the subheadings "Election of the Presiding Bishop" and "Joint Nominating Committee" (1976 *Journal*, pp. AA 19-20), as they prepare to elect the members of this very important committee.

The task of the Nominating Committee is to propose not fewer than three nominees for the office of Presiding Bishop. The Commission believes that *each person* who becomes a member of the Nominating Committee must be prepared to develop a clear understanding of the office of Presiding Bishop before considering any possible nominees. In addition to the above considerations the materials listed in the bibliography which follows are, we believe, valuable tools for this purpose. The task will require a considerable commitment of time, energy, study, and prayer.

The Commission also suggests that the Nominating Committee members listen to the needs of the Church in our own day, and gather such information into a form which will assist them in determining the particular kind of leadership required in the office of Presiding Bishop. Their next task will be to determine the background, experience, personal qualifications, and skills which are especially needed to fulfill the office as it has historically evolved and is canonically constituted.

The Presiding Bishop is the symbol of apostolic order and is the chief pastor of our Episcopal Church today and tomorrow, and the possible nominees must be viewed in the light of this leadership role. The Nominating Committee should analyze and enumerate such qualities—which can be reduced to a profile clearly understandable by the Church, especially by members of the House of Bishops and House of Deputies.

All of this, the Commission suggests, should be done within the context of the historic evolution of the office of Presiding Bishop and with the biblical and theological models as the constant frame of reference. All of this, the Commission believes, will be done as a genuine offering to God, with constant prayer, by the Nominating Committee.

The Commission feels strongly about the importance of the use of this process by the Nominating Committee. Therefore, we recommend the passage of the following resolution:

Resolution #A—140.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Nominating Committee [for the Election of the Presiding Bishop] be instructed to consider the Office of Presiding Bishop in the light of the requirements of the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church which define his responsibilities as Chief Pastor of the Episcopal Church, as the Primate in relation to other Anglican Provinces, and as the primary ecumenical link to other Christian and non-Christian bodies; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Nominating Committee [for the Election of the Presiding Bishop] develop a profile of the Office of Presiding Bishop in the light of its historical development and its present position, outlining such qualifications, background, experience, education, and unique gifts as may be required in the Bishop selected to fill this office; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church monitor and evaluate the process for the election of the Joint Nominating Committee (for the Election of the Presiding Bishop) and its operation, and report all findings when appropriate to succeeding General Conventions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACC, letter from Bishop John Howe re metropolitan authority, June 28, 1977 (1723).

Barnds, William Joseph, "A Study of the Development of the Office of Presiding Bishop in the American Episcopal Church, 1794-1944."

Historical Magazine, Dec. 1958, pp. 254-86.

Barnes, C. Rankin, "The Presiding Bishops of the Church."

Historical Magazine, Dec. 1937, pp. 350-69.

"Expectations of the Office of Presiding Bishop," prepared for the Joint Nominating Committee 1972.

Foster, Roland, "The Role of the Presiding Bishop." An unpublished manuscript written for the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church.

Guilbert, Charles, "Changes in the Structure, Organization, and Government of the Episcopal Church in the Past Sixty Years." An unpublished study delivered at the 1981 Johnson Lectures at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary.

Journal of the General Convention, 1976, "The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church, Report Relating to the Administration Function," pp. AA-13 - AA-21.

Mills, Frederick G., *Bishops by Ballot: An Eighteenth Century Ecclesiastical Revolution*. Oxford University Press, N.Y., 1978.

Proposed changes in titles

In order to clear up an anomaly existing between the Rules of Order of the Executive Council and certain Canons, where the Presiding Bishop is at times called "Chairman" and at other times called "President" of the Council, the canonical change contained in the following resolution is recommended:

Resolution #A—141.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon I.2, Sec. 4(a)(1) be amended as follows:

(1) Be charged with responsibility for leadership in initiating and developing the policy and strategy of the Church and, as ~~Chairman~~ *President* of the Executive Council of General Convention, with ultimate responsibility for the implementation of such policy and strategy through the conduct of policies and programs authorized by the General Convention or approved by the Executive Council of the General Convention;

The Committee's study of the office of the Presiding Bishop necessarily included consideration of the title of the chief pastor of the Episcopal Church in its historic evolution. The Presiding Bishop began in a timid way as the Presiding Officer of the House of Bishops. He later became the Presiding Bishop of the Church and the President of the Executive Council. In the Anglican world today, which has expanded to 28 autonomous national Churches, the title, "Presiding Bishop," is almost unique to the American Church. Other Anglican provinces use the title "Primate" or "Archbishop." After considerable discussion the Commission, by a majority vote, agreed to recommend the title "Archbishop" as being most descriptive of the office of Presiding Bishop as it exists today. This implies no change of his authority or any archepiscopal jurisdiction, as is associated in other Christian bodies. It simply puts the Presiding Bishop on a par with other Anglican metropolitans, and clearly identifies his role as chief pastor of the Episcopal Church.

Therefore, the Commission agreed to recommend the constitutional change set forth below. Upon passage at second reading, a resolution to bring the canonical language into conformity with the constitutional language should be proposed.

Resolution #A—142.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Article I, Sections 3 and 6; Article II, Section 7, and Article III of the Constitution be amended as follows:

ARTICLE I.

Sec. 3. At the General Convention next before the expiration of the term of office of the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop*, it shall elect the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop* of the Church. The House of Bishops shall choose one of the Bishops of this Church to be the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop* of the Church by a majority of all Bishops, excluding retired Bishops not present, except that whenever two-thirds of the House of Bishops are present a majority vote shall suffice, such choice to be subject to confirmation by the House of Deputies. His term and tenure of office and duties and particulars of his election not inconsistent with the preceding provisions shall be prescribed by the Canons of the General Convention.

But if the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop* of the Church shall resign his office as such, or if by reason of infirmity he shall become disabled, or in case of his death, the Bishop who, according to the Rules of the House of Bishops, becomes its Presiding Officer, shall (unless the date of the next General Convention is within three months) immediately call a special meeting of the House of Bishops, to elect a member thereof to be the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop*. The certificate of election on the part of the House of Bishops shall be sent by the Presiding Officer to the Standing Committees of the several Dioceses, and if a majority of the Standing Committees of all the Dioceses shall concur in the election, the Bishop

ected shall become the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop* of the Church.

Sec. 6. The General Convention shall meet not less than once in each three years, at a time and place appointed by a preceding Convention; but if there shall appear to the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop*, acting with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the Church or of a successor canonical body having substantially the powers now vested in the Executive Council, sufficient cause for changing the place or date so appointed, he, with the advice and consent of such body, shall appoint another place or date, or both, for such meeting. Special meetings may be provided for by Canon.

ARTICLE II.

Sec. 7. It shall be lawful for the House of Bishops to elect a Suffragan Bishop who, under the direction of the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop*, shall be in charge of the work of those chaplains in the Armed Forces of the United States who are ordained Ministers of this Church. The Suffragan Bishop so elected shall be consecrated and hold office under such conditions and limitations other than those provided in this Article as may be provided by Canons of the General Convention. He shall be eligible as Bishop or Bishop Coadjutor or Suffragan Bishop of a Diocese, or he may be elected by the House of Bishops as a Bishop of a Missionary Diocese.

ARTICLE III.

Bishops may be consecrated for foreign lands upon due application therefrom, with the approbation of a majority of the Bishops of this Church entitled to vote in the House of Bishops, certified to the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Archbishop*; under such conditions as may be prescribed by Canons of the General Convention. Bishops so consecrated shall not be eligible to the office of Diocesan or of Bishop Coadjutor of any Diocese in the United States or be entitled to vote in the House of Bishops, nor shall they perform any act of the episcopal office in any Diocese or Missionary Diocese of this Church, unless requested so to do by the Ecclesiastical Authority thereof. If a Bishop so consecrated shall be subsequently duly elected as a Bishop of a Missionary Diocese of this Church he shall then enjoy all the rights and privileges given in the Canon to such Bishops.

Other changes

In the course of studying the office of the Presiding Bishop, the members of the Polity and Authority Committee interviewed the present Presiding Bishop. During that interview he stated his opinion that it would be helpful to the Church generally if, among the listed duties of the Presiding Bishop, were included the duty to consult with the Ecclesiastical Authority in a diocese where there is an episcopal vacancy.

The Presiding Bishop already possesses the authority to visit dioceses of the American Church and its missionary dioceses. The proposed Canon is intended to give continuing episcopal oversight to the ecclesiastical authority in a diocese during an episcopal vacancy, through consultations with the chief pastor. It would not give the Presiding Bishop jurisdiction, but a pastoral consultative role with the ecclesiastical authority to insure that interim episcopal oversight is provided. Therefore, the Commission recommends enactment of the following resolution:

Resolution #A—143.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That a new section be added to Title

I, Canon 2, Section 4(a), to be numbered (3) and to read:

(3). In the event of an Episcopal vacancy within a Diocese, consult with the Ecclesiastical Authority to insure that adequate interim Episcopal services are provided.

and be it further

Resolved, That the present paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) be renumbered (4), (5), and (6).

In its study the Committee realized that Section 8(a) of Title I, Canon 2 is out of date and recommended its elimination. The Commission therefore recommends passage of the following resolution:

Resolution #A—144.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Title I, Canon 2, Section 8 be amended as follows:

~~Sec. 8 (a). At the expiration of his term of office the Presiding Bishop, and any other Bishop who shall have held the office of Presiding Bishop, shall receive a retiring allowance of six thousand dollars per year, less whatever retiring allowance they may receive from The Church Pension Fund.~~

~~(b).~~ Upon the acceptance of his resignation prior to the expiration of his term of office for reasons of disability, the Presiding Bishop may be granted, in addition to whatever allowance he may receive from The Church Pension Fund, a disability allowance to be paid by the Treasurer of the General Convention in an amount to be fixed by the [General Convention] *Joint Standing Committee on Program, Budget, and Finance, and ratified at the next regular meeting of the General Convention.*

As this Committee studied the office of Presiding Bishop in its relationship to other provinces in the Anglican Communion, the difficulty of having this Church's representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) elected by the General Convention became apparent. Because the General Convention meets only every three years and the Anglican Consultative Council does not meet on this same schedule, it is impossible to conform the terms of office of the Episcopal Church's representatives to that body to our triennial schedule. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the election of representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council (and other intra-Anglican or ecumenical bodies) be assigned to the Executive Council, by passage of the following resolution:

Resolution #A—145.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Joint Rule of Order 18(g) (Calling for the Joint Committee on Nominations to propose nominees for the representatives of this Church on the Anglican Consultative Council) be eliminated; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That a new subsection (g) be added to Title I, Canon 4, Section 2, to read:

(g) The Council shall elect representatives of this Church to the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), the Anglican Church in North America and the Caribbean (ACNAC), and to other Anglican and ecumenical bodies for which no other procedure is provided.

GENERAL CONVENTION PROCESS COMMITTEE**Committee membership**

The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Cochrane
Mr. George T. Guernsey III
Mrs. Henry N. Somsen (Anne)
Mr. Frank T. Wood, Jr., *Chairman*

The General Convention Process Committee was assigned a number of matters having to do with the General Convention and its interim bodies.

Deacons as deputies

An amendment to the Constitution which would allow deacons to be seated as deputies to General Convention will be before the 1982 General Convention for second reading. The Structure Commission recommends adoption, and thus final passage, of this amendment.

Joint Nominating Committee [for the election of the Presiding Bishop]

As our present Presiding Bishop approaches the end of his twelve-year term (Title I, Canon 2, Sec. 2) the canonical provisions for the nomination of his successor, passed at the 1976 General Convention, are being utilized for the first time. The Commission members (as well as others active at the national Church level) realized the necessity for clarification of the relevant Canon, as contained in the two resolutions recommended below.

As the Commission points out in the Polity and Authority section of this report, the Nominating Committee will have a very important responsibility. We urge each deputation to this General Convention to prepare for its role in the election of this Committee by studying carefully the process as embodied in Canon I. 1.2. We point out that the nominees for the Nominating Committee must be members of the General Convention (i.e., bishops or deputies); that they must be nominated by another member from the same province—bishops nominated by bishops and deputies nominated by deputies (although not necessarily in the same orders); and that the election is to be by the entire House from the slates nominated according to province, the election to be confirmed by the other House.

The Commission further recommends in the Polity and Authority section of this report that, since this is the first time this new procedure has been used for the election of a Presiding Bishop, the Nominating Committee elected at the 1982 General Convention develop and publicize throughout the Church recommended criteria for the office of Presiding Bishop. This Commission also recommends that the system be carefully monitored by the Structure Commission during the 1982-1985 interim, and any suggested changes be recommended to the 1985 General Convention.

Resolution #A—146.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Title I, Canon 2, Sec. 1(b) and Sec. 1(c) be amended as follows:

Sec. 1(b). At the General Convention next before the Convention at which a Presiding Bishop is to be elected, the House of Deputies shall elect one clerical and one lay Deputy from each Province as members of the Joint Nominating Committee. A Deputy from a particular Province may be nominated only by

another Deputy from the same Province, but the election of each Member of the Committee shall be by the entire membership of the House of Deputies, with a majority of those voting necessary for election.

Sec. 1(c). *At the General Convention next before the convention at which a Presiding Bishop is to be elected*, the House of Bishops shall elect, by a majority vote of those voting, one Bishop from each Province as Members of the Joint Nominating Committee. A Bishop from a particular Province may be nominated only by another Bishop from the same Province.

and be it further

***Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That this resolution be effective immediately.**

Size of the House of Deputies

For at least thirty years the size of the House of Deputies has been a concern to the Church. In 1952 the Joint Committee on Structure and Organization of the General Convention recommended a canonical amendment reducing the representation of each diocese in the House of Deputies to three presbyters and three laymen. In 1946 both Massachusetts and Virginia memorialized the General Convention regarding proportional representation. Both subjects have been surfacing regularly ever since.

This Structure Commission reviewed past Structure Commission reports, particularly the report to the 1976 General Convention in Minnesota, and agreed to reaffirm the statement made in that report: "So long as the Church remains (as stated in the Preamble to the Constitution) 'a Fellowship . . . of . . . Dioceses,' it is constitutional, proper, and entirely fitting that the vote and the representation of every Diocese be precisely equal to that of every other." Therefore, this Commission does not favor proportional representation.

However, the members of the Commission agree unanimously that reducing the size of the House of Deputies is essential to the continued well-being of the Church.

One consideration that has caused this proposal to fail in the past was the fear that such a reduction in the size of the House of Deputies would adversely affect the proportionate representation of minorities and women. This Committee has studied the available information, and believes this fear to be unwarranted.

We have outgrown most convention centers. The number of deputies has become so large as to diminish greatly the possibilities of deputy participation in the legislative process. The expenses of the General Convention have gone far beyond the level of good stewardship.

Although the members of the Commission agree about the need, we do not agree about the method. The minority view would ask General Convention to limit the number of deputies in each order to two per diocese (the greatest possible reduction allowed by our Constitution). The majority of the Commission, however, favors recommending to the 1982 General Convention passage of the resolution appearing below, which was recommended to the Louisville Convention in 1973 by the House of Deputies Committee on Structure, and to the 1976 and 1979 General Conventions by the Structure Commission. The suggested renumbering rearranges the Canon in a more logical manner.

Resolution #A—147.

***Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That Canons I.1.3(a) and I.1.3(b) be renumbered as Canons I.1.4(a) and I.1.4(b), that Canon I.1.4 be renumbered as Canon**

I.1.3(c), that present Canon I.1.3(c) be renumbered as Canon I.1.3(b) and that there be enacted new Canon I.1.3(a), to read as follows:

Sec. 3(a). The Church in each Diocese which has been admitted to union with the General Convention shall be entitled to representation in the House of Deputies by three Presbyters canonically resident in the Diocese and by three Lay Persons, communicants of this Church, in good standing in the Diocese but not necessarily domiciled in the Diocese.

Board for Church Deployment

In the course of reviewing "... the operation of the several Committees and Commissions..." as required by Canon I.1.2(n)(6), this Commission considered particularly the various interim bodies having to do with ministry. In order to achieve more uniformity with other interim bodies this Commission recommends that the existence of the Board for Church Deployment (formerly the Board for Clergy Deployment) be based in the Canons, and that the Board's membership be selected as are the other interim bodies, i.e., by appointment of the Presidents of the two Houses of General Convention. The following resolution was largely developed by the present Board; the Structure Commission recommends its adoption.

Resolution #A—148.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon III.8 be renumbered as Canon III.9, that succeeding Canons be renumbered accordingly, and that a new Canon III.8 be enacted as follows:

Of a Board for Church Deployment

Sec. 1(a). There shall be a Board for Church Deployment of the General Convention consisting of twelve members, three of whom shall be Bishops, three of whom shall be Presbyters or Deacons, and six of whom shall be Lay Persons.

(b). The Bishops shall be appointed by the Presiding Bishop. The Presbyters or Deacons and Lay Members shall be appointed by the President of the House of Deputies. All appointments to the Board, except those to fill vacancies, shall be subject to the confirmation of the General Convention.

(c). The Members shall serve terms beginning with the adjournment of the General Convention at which their appointments are confirmed, and ending with the adjournment of the second regular General Convention thereafter.

(d). At the General Convention in which these provisions are adopted, two Bishops, one Presbyter or Deacon, and three Lay Persons shall be appointed to serve for one half of a regular term and one Bishop, two Presbyters or Deacons, and three Lay Persons shall be appointed to serve full terms. At each succeeding regular General Convention one half of the membership shall be appointed to serve full terms.

(e). Positions on the Board which become vacant between regular meetings of the General Convention shall be filled by appointment of the respective Presiding Officers, and those appointed shall serve until the next regular meeting of the General Convention. Vacancies which exist at the time of the General Convention shall be filled by appointment in the usual way, and those appointed shall serve until the end of the term of the position which was vacant.

Sec. 2 The duties of the Board for Church Deployment shall be:

- (1). *To oversee the Church Deployment Office.*
- (2). *To study the deployment needs and trends in the Episcopal Church and in other Christian bodies.*
- (3). *To issue and distribute such reports and aids concerning deployment as it deems helpful to the Church.*
- (4). *To cooperate with the other Boards, Commissions, and Agencies of the Church which are concerned with ministry, and particularly with the Executive Council.*
- (5). *To report on its work and the work of the Church Deployment Office at each regular meeting of the General Convention.*
- (6). *To report to the Executive Council at regular intervals as a part of its accountability to the Council for the funding which the Church Deployment Office receives.*
- (7). *To direct the executive of the Church Deployment Office to work in cooperation with the Church Center staff, especially with those concerned with the Ministry and Mission of the Church.*
- (8). *To fulfill such other responsibilities as may be assigned to it by the General Convention.*

and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this resolution be effective immediately.

Follow-up on General Convention actions

The Committee on the State of the Church communicated to the Commission its concern that actions taken by the General Convention are not always followed up by dioceses after conventions. As a result of discussion of this matter, the Commission agreed to propose an additional Joint Rule regarding proposals for legislative consideration. This rule would require that, when action by bishops and deputies following General Convention is expected, the expected action be specifically stated in a separate Resolved clause. Hence, the commission recommends adoption of the following resolution:

Resolution #—149.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Rules of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies be amended by renumbering Joint Rule III.14 to III.15, and all subsequent Joint Rules accordingly, and by inserting the following new Joint Rule III.14:

- 14. Each proposal for legislative consideration on which Bishops and/or Deputies are expected to take action following the General Convention shall state, in a separate Resolved clause, the specific action expected.*

Other matters concerned with General Convention

The Commission considered several other matters arising from referrals and from resolutions introduced at earlier General Conventions but not adopted, and decided not to make recommendations regarding them. These include the General Convention as a unicameral body (memorial from the Diocese of Virginia), equalization of deputies' expenses (defeated in previous conventions), and the divided vote (proposed solutions to the problem defeated in previous conventions).

The matter of holding Joint Sessions for debate of major issues, which was defeated by the previous convention, was discussed; there was agreement not to reintroduce the

proposal but instead to suggest that legislative committees of the two Houses meet together as authorized by House of Deputies Rule of Order No. 51, to enable members of each House to understand the rationale for positions taken by members of the other House.

COMMITTEE ON BISHOPS

- The Rt. Rev. Alexander D. Stewart, *Chairman*
- The Rt. Rev. Robert C. Witcher
- The Rev. Jesse F. Anderson, Jr.
- Mrs. William Nicrosi (Harold)

The Committee on Bishops, as its name suggests, studied and made recommendations on matters having to do with bishops.

The Commission was asked to study the constitutional provision allowing for translation of bishops (Article II, Section 8) in order to clarify the clause "... *Provided*, that he shall have served not less than five years in his present jurisdiction" There were two questions raised:

- (1) When does the five-year period begin? and
- (2) Does the term "jurisdiction" allow combining the time a bishop may have served as Coadjutor with the time he has served as the Ordinary?

It is the opinion of the Structure Commission that the five-year period begins with the bishop's consecration, but that the intent of the constitutional proviso is that the entire five years be served in the specific category of the episcopate in which a bishop is currently serving. It does not, in our opinion, refer to five years of accumulated service in two differing categories of the episcopate. An individual who has served as a bishop coadjutor for more than five years is, in our opinion, eligible for translation.

The Commission was also asked to study Title III, Canon 16, Section 8, which reads: "No Suffragan Bishop, while acting as such, shall be Rector or settled Minister in charge of a Parish or Congregation." As a result of our study, we do not recommend any changes in this section.

We recognize the problems confronting dioceses with a large geographical area or an unusually large number of congregations that have only one bishop, the diocesan. To resolve the problems by adding suffragans who are rectors or settled ministers in charge of a parish or congregation will complicate the situation rather than solve it.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Income	1980	1981	1982
Appropriated by the Convention	\$6,872	\$ 5,800	\$2,918
Special grant from the Trustees of the Mercer Scholarship Fund of the Diocese of Long Island for study of office of the Presiding Bishop		5,000	
Special grant from the Episcopal Church Foundation, for publication of above study			5,000
Total	\$6,872	\$10,800	\$7,918

THE BLUE BOOK

Expenses

Meetings—travel, hotel	\$2,609	\$ 256	800 (est.)
Meals, etc.	553	3,727	
	3,468		
Administrative expenses	58	85	260 (est.)
Xeroxing special study		1,192	
Copies of "Bishops By Ballot"	184		
To Roland Foster, for special study		5,000	
To Forward Movement, publication of study			5,000
Total	\$6,872	\$10,260	\$6,060 (est.)

OBJECTIVES AND GOALS FOR NEXT TRIENNIUM

It is impossible to know what specific matters General Convention may refer to the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church, but we do venture some predictions as to items that may be on the Commission's agenda.

1. It is our hope that our successor Commission will monitor the process of the election of the Joint Nominating Committee [for the election of the Presiding Bishop] and the subsequent functioning of that committee, and recommend such structural changes as are needed.

2. The constitutional provision for filling a vacancy in the office of the Presiding Bishop (Article III) needs to be examined in relation to the election of a Joint Nominating Committee [for the election of the Presiding Bishop].

3. In the interview with the present Presiding Bishop described in the Polity and Authority section of this report, the Presiding Bishop stated his opinion that an examination of the nature and names of the domestic areas of this Church called provinces is needed. Further, the Diocese of Iowa at its 128th Convention memorialized the 1982 General Convention and the Executive Council "to renew serious and practical efforts to realign diocesan and provincial boundaries." This Commission did not give priority to addressing this issue because we sensed that, at this time, the issue does not have a high priority in the minds of the Church at large and, in the time available, nothing substantive could be added to previous reports on the subject.

4. If efforts to shorten the time of the General Convention are successful there may be more matters referred to the interim bodies for study and report. Increasing costs for meetings of these bodies mandate consideration of more cost-effective methods of accomplishing their tasks.

5. In discharging its responsibility "... to review the operation of the several Committees and Commissions. . .," the Commission has yet to devote attention to the General Board of Examining Chaplains.

6. If the Convention does indeed confront the issue of its increasing size and cost by reducing the size of the House of Deputies, it will be appropriate again to consider the question of a vote in the House of Bishops for retired bishops.

If the next Commission follows past practice, it will assign topics to committees for preliminary study and report, but the full Commission will need to meet at least three times. And committees will need to meet, too, even though they make maximum use of

correspondence and conference calls. Increased costs for postage and copying are also a fact of today's life. However, we must be prepared to pay these costs so that all Commission members can participate in the decision-making process.

The Commission therefore estimates its costs for the next triennium as detailed below, and submits the resolution following.

	1983	1984	1985
Commission meetings @ \$7,920	\$ 7,920	\$7,920	\$7,920
Committee meetings @ \$1,000	2,000	1,000	
Administrative expense	750	500	750
Total	\$10,670	\$9,420	\$8,670

Resolution #A—150.
Budget request.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That there be appropriated from the assessment Budget of the General Convention for the expenses of the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church the sum of \$28,760 for the triennium of 1983-1985.