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MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION


1994 GENERAL CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO THE COMMISSION

The primary work of the Commission during the triennium focused on General Convention Resolution 1994 A038a to which the Commission responds as follows:

1. INTRODUCTION

The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church (in this Report “SCS”) is charged by Canon I.1.2.(n)(8) in part as follows (p. 17):

It shall be the duty of the commission to study and make recommendations concerning the structure of the General Convention and of the Church. It shall, from time to time, 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. ...

Resolution A038a of the 1994 General Convention provided:

Resolved, That the Standing Commission on Structure is directed to review the effectiveness of, the need for, and the purpose of the present canonically established interim bodies, and to make recommendations as to their number and/or membership.

In addition, on January 4, 1995, the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies issued their “Charge to The Standing Commission on Structure, 1994-97” by stating:

Resolution A038a of the 1994 General Convention has given us an opportunity to enhance the church’s capacity for mission and ministry in the twenty-first century by reviewing the institutional structures that support our work.

Their charge asked SCS to go beyond the letter of Resolution A038a and view their directive in light of the broader scope of SCS’ canonical duty and mandate even to the back-to-the-beginning question:

If we were starting a new institution to carry out the mission and ministries authorized by the General Convention, how would we organize ourselves?

The Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies invited all the Interim Bodies to a Joint Meeting at Minneapolis, October 14-17, 1995. This invitation provided SCS with the
opportunity to meet with, listen to and hear each Interim Body present at that Meeting during a personal visitation as a follow up to data that had been provided to SCS by each Interim Body earlier in 1995.

After the preparation and review of internal draft reports, in July of 1996, SCS issued a “Comment Draft Report” to the church at large, which was widely distributed to the leadership of the church and other interested groups and individuals. Based upon the responses received by SCS, further revisions were made to reflect many of these excellent suggestions, comments and criticisms.

A Note on “Mission” and “Ministry”

The terms “mission” and “ministry” will be used frequently throughout this report. Several respondents to the Comment Draft Report requested that SCS adopt clear and distinct definitions for these terms. While mutually interdependent, these terms are clearly not synonymous nor are they interchangeable. For the purposes of this Report:

“Mission” shall be used to express God’s mission of redemption and reconciliation “to restore all people to unity with God and each other in Christ.” (BCP, p. 855)

“Ministry” shall mean the many and diverse ways that Christians participate in the one mission of God as articulated by the Baptismal Covenant in the five broad areas of worship, forgiveness, proclamation, service and securing justice. (BCP, pp. 304-305)

As SCS organized to carry out its work, it was not unmindful of the substantial debate within the life of the church as to the effect of all the existing structures of the church upon the church’s ability to carry out its mission and ministry and particularly the proliferation of Interim Bodies and programmatic efforts existing and being proposed. SCS early on determined that although tinkering with definitions of tasks and compositions of Interim Bodies, trying to identify and eliminate duplication of efforts, improving communication, and clarifying questions of program versus policy might eliminate some present ambiguities and inefficiencies (that would most likely creep back in time given institutional and human proclivities), these efforts would not get to the root issues about the principles that would govern the structure of the church and which must be debated and resolved within this church as it enters the next century.

It is to be noted at the outset that SCS has not been driven by financial or budgetary concerns or constraints, but by the development and application of general structural principles. SCS is not unmindful that the proposals in this report may have a beneficial impact on the stewardship and allocation of the resources of the church. However, SCS believes that the resources of the church will be applied in response to generally accepted principles of organization.

It also became apparent to SCS early on in its work that one overarching concern within the church was whether or not existing church structures are determining, narrowly defining and even limiting the ministry and mission of the church rather than adapting to and assisting the church’s ministry and mission as the same is stimulated and guided by the Holy Spirit within the Body of Christ.
SCS concluded that the best service that the commission might provide to the church at this time would be to issue a report to the church and the General Convention that presents proposals for structuring the church's ministry and mission for the church's full and forthright discussion and debate. SCS also provides suggested implementing legislation so that the church might envision these revised structures in practice.

In the past, efforts to consider any substantive restructuring of the church's organization for exercising the ministry and mission of this church have become caught up in and bogged down by the many definitions of the exact nature of this ministry and mission of which we all speak so often. In reality, the "what" of ministry and mission and the interests, priorities, and imperatives ascribed to each and every possible element thereof legitimately vary as widely as the individuals, groups, congregations, and geographic natures and interests of this church are able to envision and live out this ministry and mission in the church and in the world. The temptation of an institutional church is to jump to corporate conclusions as to what ministry and mission are, or rather more often, what they ought to be. SCS believes that so long as the discussion as to the structure of the church is cast solely in terms of trying to define ministry and mission, the structure of the church will be codified only in response to the currently prevailing corporate opinion of the programmatic "whats" of ministry and mission as the church moves from General Convention to General Convention. Inasmuch as this approach to the "what" has been framed and defined essentially on a national level, which is then inevitably circumscribed by financial constraints, no matter how generous they may be, it is clear that a church so structured can limit and perhaps even smother other possibilities for ministry and mission on other levels of the church.

It is a calling of this church to assist its members to develop an educated conscience to guide them as followers of our Lord. A major task of the church in its pastoral care of its members is to sustain them in the sacramental life and to provide sound theological and educational bases through which the church's members may participate intelligently and appropriately in the ongoing dialogue and dialectic through which the church, over time, develops its understanding of both its faith positions and social responsibilities. In a similar way, members of this church enter into the wider discussions of the body politic of a pluralistic and multi-cultural society. Thus, the church truly works most effectively in society through its members and not through its structures.

Presiding Bishop Browning recently commented:

My concern is that any one aspect of our ministry predominate when our church is a beautiful tapestry of ministries. Our focus is not any one aspect of ministry; it is to glorify God and to love and serve our Lord as we are each called. And, we are all called differently.

Our Church can't just "focus" on any one thing. Our church is the Body of Christ, all of us together. We each have different ministries, all important. ... We can't all do everything. We each are called differently. 2
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Consequently, SCS has focused this Report not on the “what” of mission and ministry, but instead on “how” and “where” the ministry and mission of the church occurs, using as the definition of the “what” the fundamental Baptismal Covenant:

> to continue in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, the breaking of bread, and in the prayers; to resist evil and to repent and return to the Lord; to proclaim by word and example the Good News of God in Christ; to seek to serve Christ in all persons, loving our neighbors as ourselves; and to strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being.

SCS herein poses the question: “Are there certain fundamental principles that have and should guide the structure of this church at all levels, that speak to how and where its ministry and mission are accomplished and which provide the potential necessary for the myriad aspects of ministry and mission to take place?”, and believes that the answer is unequivocally: “Yes!”

SCS proposes in this Report a basic set of guiding general principles which provide both a way of evaluation and a flexible structure for creative implementation of ministry and mission of the church on each and every level within the church, as determined by the members of the church living out their Baptismal Covenant.

This Report is not intended to be merely a reaction to, or an evaluation of, what has transpired programmatically in the life of the church over the past several decades. This would not be helpful, but also unfair. SCS is instead asking the church to look forward and define its nature and structure to help guide its members in the years to come. Also, where examples are used in the Report they are most sincerely not intended to be pejorative or critical, but only illustrative.

The basic structures of this church have served well the church and its ministry and mission for over two centuries. There is clearly no need to hastily abandon the fundamental components of order and hierarchical polity as to authority and Holy Orders that are this church’s character, nature and being. SCS proposes in this Report a return to some of these basic components and a shift of emphasis of the locus of ministry.

So that this Report does not end up as one more “study” that is only debated in a philosophical context, this Report includes proposed legislative canonical, and suggested other corporate enactments that could exemplify and provide the framework and mechanisms as to what might possibly be required of the church, should these general principles be adopted as guiding principles for the 1997 General Convention and for the church. Remembering that the Canons of this church are guides and pathways, SCS has not attempted finite answers to every configuration, linkage and network that might occur within the basic structure. This is left to the natural evolution of the institution as the proposed principles are put into operation.

Finally, in recognition of the fact that all, some, few or none of the structural proposals contained in this Report may be adopted in the natural course of any sort of political and legislative process, SCS’s legislative and corporate proposals in this Report have not been prepared and are not offered on an all or nothing basis. The rejection or amendment of one aspect will not cause the whole scheme to fail. Rather, these proposals are offered in a format whereby elements of these...
proposals may be considered and debated and then accepted, amended or even rejected on their own merits. The General Convention may implement less than the whole proposal and still move to restructure appropriate and significant aspects of the church.

II. STATEMENT OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In formulating and presenting the recommendations contained in this Report, SCS has been guided by the following six general principles:

1. This church is a national church participating fully in the Anglican Communion.
2. This church is one diverse community of Christ's reconciling ministry in the world.
3. This church will commit to the dioceses and provinces only that mission and ministry which cannot be accomplished effectively by parishes and congregations.
4. This church will commit to national structures only that mission and ministry which cannot be accomplished effectively by dioceses and provinces.
5. The form of this church will follow function and the structure of this church will follow ministry and mission.
6. This church must be structured at all levels so that structures do not inhibit deliberate change.

A Note on Polity and Partnership

These general principles and the exposition concerning them are in no way intended to suggest a shift away from the traditionally understood Episcopal polity of the church to some new congregationalism. The diocese is, and will continue to be, the fundamental unit of organization of this church expressive of the historic episcopate. The primary responsibility and authority for the mission of the church historically belongs to a diocesan bishop. Ministry, as the specific ways in which Christian people participate in the mission of God, however, is located with individuals and through a variety of communities of faith.

SCS sees these general principles as intending to express a partnership among all elements of the church: local congregations, dioceses, provinces, and a national church centered in the General Convention. The emphasis on the locus of ministry and mission is not to suggest a separation or segregation of congregations, dioceses, provinces and a national church, but, rather, to identify the several communities of faith where appropriate ministries would be most effective. The distinctions made in Principles #3 and #4 are intended to place an emphasis on where effective ministry and mission can best occur.

Clearly, the mission of the church "to restore all people to unity with God and each other in Christ" is the same throughout all elements of the church. Ministry will vary as to the opportunities afforded to the church and to its people. The ministries of the church's laity and clergy occur through the context of the community of faith and in the participation of transformed laity in the world.
PRINCIPLE #1: THIS CHURCH IS A NATIONAL CHURCH PARTICIPATING FULLY IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

- The Episcopal Church "... is a constituent member of the Anglican Communion, a fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted dioceses, provinces, and regional churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, upholding and propagating the historic Faith and Order as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer." (Constitution, Preamble, p. 1.)
- The Preamble to the Constitution states that the fundamental nature of this church is essentially national and must be so in order to take its place within the worldwide Anglican Communion. Any structure established for the church must at the very least make provision for the church to fulfill this role.
- This church is also national in that it is hierarchical as to its polity, Holy Orders, and the central authority of the General Convention as to matters affecting the common life, worship, doctrine and discipline, and property rights.
- Included in the concept of "national" are those foreign dioceses being part of this church through covenant and admitted into union with the General Convention and expressive of the missionary nature of this church.

PRINCIPLE #2: THIS CHURCH IS ONE DIVERSE COMMUNITY OF CHRIST'S RECONCILING MINISTRY IN THE WORLD

- The Episcopal Church is a very diverse community of people of all sorts and conditions. Canon I.17.5. (p. 49) assures to its members "... rights and status in the life, worship and governance of the Church without regard to race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, disabilities or age." Corporately as a church and as individual members of this church, we all recognize and honor diversity. During the past thirty years, great progress has been made in this regard, yet all is not perfect and much more remains to be accomplished. We must continue, as our existing structures and formularies have done, to enable full participation and leadership by people who are broadly representative of the constituencies of the church. "Efforts to be inclusive, to celebrate the diversity of thought and expression among those from whom the church has not heard before, touch the ministry of the church so profoundly that the church can never again see itself in the old patterns. Opportunities for growth, forgiveness and reconciliation have brought new understandings to the life of the church."
- SCS believes that the church is now at a point where a fundamental choice has to be made between an institution whose structures represent and emphasize the oneness composed of diverse peoples and interests or an institution which seeks to define, isolate and institutionalize differences, priorities and interests. The Episcopal Church is called to be one community of diverse peoples holding many different legitimate views and priorities. SCS does not propose the assimilation of the diverse, but a oneness growing from the strengths of the natures of the diverse.
STRUCTURE

• The Episcopal Church cannot afford fragmentation and organization primarily around characteristics, priorities, and interests. We are a “... community of the New Covenant ... as the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head and of which all baptized persons are members.” (BCP, p. 854) Our oneness is rooted in Christ and without this rootedness in Christ, the institution of the church withers and the community of faith is fragmented.

• This is not to say that the church does not honor and support such diversities. However, the Commission sees these diversities working through networks of persons and groups sharing that common interest, priority or strategy receiving appropriate support from the national church.

PRINCIPLE #3: THIS CHURCH WILL COMMIT TO THE DIOCESES AND PROVINCES ONLY THAT MISSION AND MINISTRY WHICH CANNOT BE ACCOMPLISHED EFFECTIVELY BY PARISHES AND CONGREGATIONS

• At the organization of the Episcopal Church in the 1780s, a universally accepted fundamental organizing principle was that every power that need not be delegated for the good of the whole would be retained in the parishes. Only those things which could not be done effectively on a local level were to be done on a diocesan level, and only those things that could not be done effectively on a diocesan level would be done on a national level.

• The Episcopal Church has historically been both confederated and federated in nature. Since the 1960s, however, the church has become more “federal” in appearance and in its programmatic efforts. This appearance of a federal programmatic church continues, but the reality is that there is a ground swell throughout the church to return to and resume a greater reliance upon the local parishes and congregations, and when necessary dioceses and provinces as the locus of the primary ministry, mission and program of the church.

• “... the church pursues its mission as it prays and worships, proclaims the Gospel, and promotes justice, peace and love” and “... carries out its mission through the ministry of all its members” (BCP, p. 855). Our people find themselves day to day called “... to bear witness to him wherever they may be; and, accordingly to the gifts given to them, to carry on Christ’s work of reconciliation in the world ...”? (BCP, p. 855)

• “The old model of the church in its simplest terms suggested that ‘church work’ was done by a selected few, usually in orders, representing the whole. The ‘paradigm shift’ taking place in the church is that all baptized persons will take their places in the decision making and the ministry and mission of the church”.5 “Recently, based upon the Diocesan Visitations, the Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Executive Council reported to the Executive Council that: “The overarching theme of what we heard in our diocesan visits is that ministry is carried on at the local level and that the role of the national church should be to support, enable and facilitate that ministry.”

• There is no doubt that both the overwhelming quality and quantity of the church’s resources are its people and their time, talent and treasure, and the most viable of the church’s capacities to provide for ministry and mission are found at the local level. It is at this level that the focus of the church’s energies must be aimed to live out our common Baptismal Covenant.
• The individuals of this church’s parishes and congregations, singly and in networks within these parishes, congregations and dioceses, must provide the basic ministry and mission of this church. Ministry and mission should be undertaken by dioceses and provinces only to the extent that they are beyond the resources of individuals, parishes and congregations and/or it is more effective and efficient to commit such ministry and mission to dioceses and provinces.

• Concurrently, individuals, parishes, and congregations must assume ever greater responsibility and initiative for what they alone can do. Commitments of faith can only be dispositions that reflect and further deepen a person’s relationship to God when made individually and not when imposed by the larger community. The Episcopal Church has always been clear that the individual must follow his or her own conscience. The church is to provide theological, spiritual, and sacramental support, but decisions as to ministry and mission that reflect a person’s fundamental convictions and values must be made by the individual. The people of the church are transformed by the word and sacraments to go out into the world and minister in and to the world.

• SCS envisions the primary mission and ministry of the church taking place on the local level through individuals and groups of individuals in parishes and congregations. However, there are clearly areas of mission and ministry which are either beyond the capacities and/or interests of individuals and parishes and congregations or which are more effectively, efficiently or economically done on broader bases. These are to be committed to and accomplished by dioceses or provinces or, just as legitimately, by networks, or caucuses or other groups coming together in common causes, priorities, and interests to meet the challenges and tasks of ministry and mission.

**PRINCIPLE #4: THIS CHURCH WILL COMMIT TO THE NATIONAL STRUCTURES ONLY THAT MISSION AND MINISTRY WHICH CANNOT BE ACCOMPLISHED EFFECTIVELY BY DIOCESES AND PROVINCES**

• As a national church and a constituent part of the Anglican Communion, there are certain activities that must be undertaken on a national level: relations with and within the Anglican Communion; national and international ecumenical relations with other denominations; foreign world mission; common worship; common issues affecting the ordained ministry; issues of polity, governance, discipline, and authority; and finance and restoration of all people to unity with God and each other in Christ. These areas are the proper and primary responsibilities of a national organization and structure.

• Only to the extent that the church conclusively calls for national policies, priorities, strategies, and program efforts and the General Convention specifically directs the establishment of and funds the same, should the church be involved in any such programs on a national level.

• "To support the new community of faith, the present hierarchical organization of the church’s common life must develop a more counciliar approach. If the church is to be the new community it wishes to be, ways must be found to support all ministries at all levels. We must encourage each form of ministry at each level -- personal, parochial, diocesan, provincial and national -- to develop its own uniqueness, and at the same time, to strengthen its commitment to assistance, affirmation and support of all others."
STRUCTURE

- Therefore, programs of mission and ministry should not be primarily conceived, created, or managed on a national basis and then passed down from a national executive or secretariat. Rather, the same are to be raised up and authenticated on the parochial, diocesan, and provincial levels, and through their constituent networks for nurturing, support, and funding. Instead of institutionalizing such programs on a national level, with the attendant resource constraints, the church may be better served by funding and supporting ad hoc interest groups, caucuses, and networks which are formed, reformed, and organized and reorganized from time to time in response to policies, priorities, and interests in the life of the church.

PRINCIPLE #5: THE FORM OF THE CHURCH WILL FOLLOW FUNCTION AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH WILL FOLLOW MINISTRY AND MISSION

- Due to its polity and sense of order particularly in the relationship of, among, and between Holy Orders, and its acceptance of authority and governance through the General Convention, the Episcopal Church is hierarchical in nature.
- For the past few decades, this “top down” relationship of “order” has been adopted and combined with contemporary corporate and governmental models as a concomitant structure for administration and program of this church. This leads to management systems (on every level of the church, diocesan as well as national) that naturally function as vertical monopolies. The inevitable consequence is that the highest echelon of these systems defines areas of service as they function and, in so interpreting, pass judgment on the general directives within which the system functions.
- One unfortunate result is that internal groups based upon discharging specific tasks and addressing specific issues (be they full time national church staff positions or volunteer service on Interim Bodies) become compartmentalized and isolated as do the policies, priorities, and issues with which they are to deal.
- It is not uncommon to hear within the church that: “We are not involved in evangelism [for which we could as easily substitute “racism,” “sexism,” “stewardship,” “peace,” “justice,” “empowerment,” “ecumenism”] as that is the job of Commission ‘X’ or such and such a national church staff position or activity, or a diocesan committee, ...” SCS proposes that generic themes of this magnitude cannot be locked up vertically or compartmentalized and that any such compartmentalization (and the attendant abdication of obligation) borders on disobedience of the Baptismal Covenant.
- Every Canon proposed, every activity, policy, and program established, and every dollar committed by the church should be always asking: “How does this fight racism, sexism, and all the other ism-evils we face? How does this work for or possibly impede the spread of the Kingdom and the commission to baptize all peoples? How does this work to unite us all in the Body of Christ and reconcile the world to Christ? How does this deal with the stewardship of creation and the time, talent, and treasure of the people of God?” These basic concerns of the Baptismal Covenant are the essence of all that we are and do as a community of faith and cannot be the concern only of this Interim Body or that national church staff position. Compartmentalization of these concerns must be eradicated within the structures of this church.
PRINCIPLE #6: THE CHURCH MUST BE STRUCTURED AT ALL LEVELS SO THAT STRUCTURES DO NOT INHIBIT DELIBERATE CHANGE

- The structures of the church must be always prepared for change in a deliberate and faithful way. The church, as the Body of Christ, cannot allow itself to become static, immutable or obstructionist on any level, or become locked in place, but must always permit and provide for revelation and spiritual growth. If our structures are too rigid or if faithful change is impeded by our structures, rules, and technicalities, we are vulnerable to change by the experimentation of the few and not by the participation and acquiescence of the many.

During the past three decades, a powerful transforming force bringing into the life of the church those who previously were not included has been experienced in this church and has changed the church as an institution for the better in many ways. However, we must be wary lest this transforming power becomes itself institutionalized and resistant to change and transformation. This can be moderated, if not obviated, by more active and intentional participation by, and directives from, the church as a whole acting through General Convention and from the General Convention through its Executive Council.

What follows is an application of the foregoing six principles to existing structures of the church, accompanied by implementing Resolutions to bring about changes to conform to these principles.

Generally, the effective date of Resolutions adopting canonical amendments is as of the first day of January following the General Convention. Inasmuch as deferring the effective date of many of the Resolutions proposed in response to Resolution A038a of the 1994 General Convention could cause substantial confusion, it is proposed that many of the Resolutions in this report be effective as of the date of adoption.

III. THE GENERAL CONVENTION

The General Convention is the highest legislative and juridical body of the church and through its resolutions, statements and actions speaks at the highest level of responsibility for the church, to the church, and to the world. As such, it should primarily concern itself with making such general regulations, directives and policy statements, entertaining such requests and expending such sums as are judged necessary for continuing the church’s constituent parts as an ongoing religious communion and a member of the Anglican Communion.

General Convention should convene to hear and debate major issues of concern to the church, and only legislate on the most essential matters: the restoration of all people to unity with God and each other in Christ through the proclamation of commonly accepted general policies applicable to all members of the church; the church’s role in the Anglican Communion; world mission; national and international ecumenical relations; matters of common worship; continuing authority over all Holy Orders and who will be recruited, trained, ordained and retained in the ordained ministry of the church; issues of polity, governance, discipline, and authority; and finance; and, within these subjects, only those clearly of major policy concern to the church.
Concerns as to what are “major” issues, concerns and policies and who will make that decision would be answered by the regular legislative process wherein legislative committees and those testifying before them would have an opportunity to cast proposed legislation in form and substance for appropriate consideration by the General Convention.

We must always remember that ideally the individual representatives of the church convene, debate and legislate as members of the Body of Christ and not as partisans pressing for interests, issues, and priorities. As a church, we have become too immersed in thinking solely in terms of the quasi-legislative mode and formulating and enacting resolutions. The church and its General Convention need to think more along the lines of teaching and building a broad consensus on major issues of concern to offer to the church at large rather than the present win or lose, pass or defeat, methodology as to specific legislation, which often speaks only to a small or tangential piece of the issue, priority, or concern.

The national decision making processes and structures, with the attendant shared space for all people of the church, embracing and honoring our diverse community, have served this church well since its founding and deserve continued support. Our national nature has provided for stability and equity for its people through many difficult times in the life of this church and this nation. General Convention clearly acts as a provincial church of the Anglican Communion in council and its actions are the actions of this church. The proposals contained in this report do not suggest anything to the contrary. However, we seek to find a way to speak and act with less ambiguity and redundancy and with greater clarity, elegance and power.

It is proposed that the General Convention can and must be modestly restructured so that it can provide this primary leadership.

A. General Convention Resolutions

In 1994, a major and somewhat successful attempt was made to reduce the number of Resolutions considered by the General Convention. [A compilation of the actions on these Resolutions is annexed as Appendix “A”.] However, many observers and participants are of the opinion that too much of the time and energy of the General Convention still is consumed and expended on matters that are not major or core issues to be considered by this body.

Debate on and consideration of clearly major issues of concern to a national church are stymied by the clutter of Resolutions of tangential and minor importance to the church. Sometimes Resolutions are even more appropriate to secular legislative international and national bodies rather than a national church. Legislation of major importance is often crammed into very limited Special Orders of Business, measured in minutes and not hours, much less in days. Consideration of these matters is often late in the meeting of the General Convention when the pressure is on to conclude all legislation. The diversions of lesser Resolutions leave less and less time to listen to and hear each other on clearly major issues of policy, priority and concern. That time is needed to carefully perfect the legislative actions of the church that speak with authority for the church, to the church and to the world. Accordingly, SCS proposes that further attempts be made to reduce the number of such Resolutions and to sharpen and enhance the substance, quality, and importance of both debate and legislation.
Note: As to the proposed amendments that follow, matter to be deleted is indicated by strikethrough and matter to be added is indicated by italics.

Resolution A148 Amend HDRO VI.21(c) on Resolutions

Resolved, That the House of Deputies Rules of Order be amended as follows (p. 199):

VI. Resolutions and Memorials
21(c). All resolutions Resolutions of Deputies shall be proposed by one Deputy and be endorsed by not less than two additional Deputies. Deputies proposing or endorsing Resolutions may be but need not be of different Dioceses. Individual Deputies shall be limited to proposing and endorsing not more than a total of three resolutions Resolutions.

Explanation
The proposed limitation of a total of three resolutions and endorsements per Deputy should not impede open debate or legislation, but, rather, cause Deputies to be judicious as to what they propose and endorse, and makes room for greater participation by other Deputies and the House as a deliberating whole.

Note: Legislative action required only by the House of Deputies.

Resolution A149 Amend HDRO VI.21(e): HD Resolution Submission Deadline

Resolved, That the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies be amended as follows (pp. 199-200):

VI. Resolutions and Memorials
21(e)(1) Any such Resolutions must be received in duplicate by the Secretary of the House of Deputies at least ninety (90) days prior to the opening date of the Convention and shall be referred to the proper Legislative Committee or Special Committee Chair at least sixty (60) days prior to the opening date of Convention. The Secretary shall acknowledge receipt of all such Resolutions to the proposer.

(2) Any such Resolution received by the Secretary less than ninety (90) days prior to the opening date of the Convention and prior to the second legislative day of Convention shall be referred by the President to the Committee on Rules of Order. If such Committee shall by two-thirds vote advise the President that such Resolution is of major concern to the House, the President shall refer such Resolution as hereinafter provided; provided, however, notwithstanding Rule 21(c), that such a Resolution may be filed with the Secretary without resort to the Committee on Rules of Order when submitted by a Deputy on behalf of a Legislative Committee and endorsed by the Chair of that Legislative Committee.
**STRUCTURE**

**Explanation**
- Canon I.1.4(a) (p. 18), requires all Deputies to be chosen “not later than twelve months preceding the opening date of the General Convention for which they are chosen.” Thus, each Deputy has not less than nine months between being chosen and the cut off date for Deputy Resolutions. Except for the most extraordinary cases, any Deputy Resolution that merits the attention and action of the General Convention should be able to be carefully thought out, prepared, sponsored, and filed well before the ninety day period preceding the General Convention.

- Recommendations were made to SCS that all prefiled Resolutions be mailed to the deputys and bishops after the ninety day period was reached. Upon inquiry, the General Convention Office advised SCS that the cost and time involved would be substantial and probably beyond the capacity of that office given other demands made in preparation for the General Convention.

- Of the 140 Deputy Resolutions submitted to the 1994 General Convention, 36 Deputy Resolutions were filed prior to the ninety day period, 14 Deputy Resolutions were filed between the ninety day period and the opening of General Convention and 90 were filed at the General Convention itself during the first two legislative days. The frantic last minute typing of Deputy Resolutions to comply with Rule of Order VI.24 (p. 200) is illustrative of SCS’ concerns that are intended to be dealt with by this proposal.

- Access to the Committee on Rules of Order for consideration will insure that last minute Deputy Resolutions of extraordinary matters of major concerns, if deemed appropriate, could get before the House. In addition, Resolutions essentially arising out of the work of a Legislative Committee need not go to the Committee on Rules of Order.

- Rule of Order IV.24 still provides access to the legislative process by leave of two-thirds vote of the House of Deputies after the second legislative day.

**Note:** Legislative action required only by the House of Deputies.

**Resolution A150 Amend HDRO IV.14: HD Review by Committees on Constitution and Canons**

1. Resolved, That the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies be amended as follows (p. 197):

2. **IV. Legislative Committees**

3. 14. Any Resolution recommended by a Legislative or Special Committee which involves an amendment to the Constitution or Canons, shall be referred by the President to the appropriate Legislative or Special Committee for action and simultaneously to the Committee on the Constitution or the Committee on Canons, as the case may be, and such Committee shall make certain that the Resolution is in proper constitutional or canonical form, achieves consistency and clarity in the Constitution or Canons, and includes all amendments necessary to effect the proposed change, and shall promptly communicate its recommendations to the Legislative or Special Committee. [Remainder of Rule unchanged.]
Explanation
- This amendment will permit the Committee on the Constitution and the Committee on Canons to consider immediately proposed constitutional and canonical changes as they are proposed rather than await the final action of a Legislative or Special Committee. This also allows these Committees to provide recommendations as to form during the legislative committee process so as to expedite these approvals and to provide guidance to the Legislative or Special Committees as they perform their substantive evaluation of the legislation. This will avoid further delay and the frustration of a determination that finally perfected legislation does not pass constitutional or canonical muster.
- Also, it has been the experience of the Committee on Canons that proposed amendments may inadvertently have effects beyond the subject matter of the legislation under consideration by the Legislative or Special Committee that must be addressed before the Resolution can be considered by the House.

Note: Legislative action required only by the House of Deputies.

Resolution A151 Amend HBRO XIII(c): HB Review by Committee on Constitution and Canons
1 Resolved, That the Rules of Order of the House of Bishops be amended as follows (p. 187):
2 XIII(c). Any Resolution recommended by a Legislative or Special Committee, which involves an amendment to the Constitution or Canons, shall be referred to the appropriate Legislative or Special Committee for action and simultaneously to the Committee on the Constitution or the Committee on Canons, as the case may be, and such Committee shall make certain that the Resolution is in proper constitutional or canonical form, achieves consistency and clarity in the Constitution or Canons, and includes all amendments necessary to effect the proposed change, and shall promptly communicate its recommendations to the Legislative or Special Committee.
3 [Note: Remainder of Rule unchanged.]

Explanation
This amendment conforms the Rules of Order of the House of Bishops to those of the House of Deputies.
Note: Legislative action required only by the House of Bishops.

B. Size and Composition of General Convention.

For the thirty years prior to the General Convention of 1991, SCS proposed major changes in the size of the General Convention by the reduction of the number of deputies and/or proportional representation, neither of which has been adopted by the General Convention and all of which failed of adoption by overwhelming negative votes. SCS makes no recommendations as to the restructuring of size or frequency of the meetings of General Convention at this time. Such consideration in the future may naturally flow from the experience gained from adoption of the major principles and proposals in this report.

It must be noted that Article I.4. (p. 2) of the Constitution entitles each diocese to not more than four lay and four clergy deputies, but does not require full representation. Some dioceses have determined to be represented by fewer deputies in each order.
C. Legislative Committees of General Convention.

The Legislative Committee system has been reasonably successful in receiving, hearing, perfecting, and presenting legislation to the Houses for consideration. If General Convention is successful in further reducing the number of Resolutions and increasing the substantive importance of legislation, thorough and efficient Legislative Committee work will continue to be essential to sharpen and enhance debate and legislation.

The General Convention legislative system permits active participation in the Legislative Committee process by many, but not all deputies. First time deputies (historically about 40% of the House of Deputies) are unlikely to receive a Legislative Committee assignment, as are many second time deputies. Fewer Legislative Committees may reduce the number of deputies serving on Legislative Committees. Having assignments to Legislative Committees with light or nominal assignments has little merit. These deputies and the General Convention might be better served by the deputies being freed to attend the open legislative hearings of Legislative Committees considering legislation of clearly major importance to the church.

One substantial problem created by a proliferation of Legislative Committees, all meeting at essentially the same time throughout General Convention and usually staffed by the most senior and experienced deputies, is that there is very limited opportunity for them to participate in the consideration of major legislation before other Legislative Committees prior to the legislation actually reaching the floor of General Convention. Thus, their wisdom and experience is not available until the matter is on the floor for final debate, which can be of very limited duration and is haphazard at best, no matter what care is taken with Special Orders.

Unless there is important legislation before them, Legislative Committees are of little consequence to the General Convention and the Legislative Committee members themselves. Alternatively, fewer and slightly larger Legislative Committees, which can then assign work as necessary to subcommittees, could provide for more effective service and legislation. A reduced legislative agenda and the concomitant meetings required, might allow Legislative Committee members the opportunity to attend other Legislative Committees’ meetings and public hearings.

Lack of continuity between Legislative Committees and Interim Bodies has resulted in Legislative Committees making substantial revisions of Resolutions flowing from the Interim Bodies’ Blue Book Reports, which were prepared and submitted by the Interim Bodies after vast commitments of volunteer time and expertise and substantial expense to the church. This indicates that either the work of the Interim Bodies does not reflect the mind of the deputies on the Legislative Committees, perhaps because the Committee has not had the exposure experienced by the Interim Body, or that the legislative process lacks some discipline. Either situation poses a problem for the church. If the General Convention moves towards teaching on a broader basis, some commonality of service between Standing Commissions and Legislative Committees could be appropriate.

Some of these legislative concerns can be met by creative Special Rules of Order. For example, during the 1994 General Convention, and for the first time in modern memory, a Special Rule of Order for the consideration of the House of Deputies of the massive revision of the church’s
Disciplinary Canons included a provision that the Legislative Committee would hold a well-publicized early morning hearing elsewhere than on the floor of the House. All interested Deputies could then obtain clarification and voice their concerns in a less formal, but orderly meeting with the Cognate Legislative Committees on Canons about aspects of the legislation without belaboring the particularity of their concerns on the floor of the House of Deputies. Thus, all deputies having an interest in or specific concern about this legislation could participate and resolve their concerns, without taking the time of the entire House and of the other deputies who were satisfied with the legislation. This is a model to be commended.

**Resolution A152 Amend HDRO IV.7: On Legislative Committees**

Resolved, That the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies be amended to read as follows (p. 195):

IV. Legislative Committees.

7. Not later than 90 days in advance of the opening date of the Convention, the President shall appoint the following Legislative Committees, and designate the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary thereof,

1. Dispatch of Business.
2. Certification of Minutes.
3. Rules of Order, of which the President shall be Chair, ex officio.
5. Canons.
7. Admission of New Dioceses.
8. Consecration of Bishops.
10. Domestic Mission and Evangelism
11. National Concerns
12. Anglican and International Concerns
13. National and International Problems
14. Social and Urban Affairs
15. Church-in-Small-Communities
16. Evangelism
17. Ecumenical Relations.
19. Church-Music
20. Ministry.
21. Education.
22. Church Pension Fund.
23. Stewardship and Development.
24. Communications, Miscellaneous Resolutions and Privilege and Courtesy.
25. Miscellaneous Resolutions.
27. Committees and Commissions.
28. Credentials
29. Sergeant-at-Arms.
30. Environment.
In addition, the President shall appoint Legislative Committees on Admission of New Dioceses and Consecration of Bishops, if such legislation will be presented to the Convention.

Explanation
- This proposal consolidates the organic themes of a foreign and domestic national church legislating only on matters of major concern to the church and follows the patterns of the proposed revisions in the Standing Commissions.
- The aim of this proposal is to avoid both compartmentalization and redundancy. The mission of the church must include evangelism, social and environmental concerns, for example, as well as attention to the context in which mission and ministry are to occur, whether urban or rural, small or large communities. Similarly, education is one aspect of ministry and the two may be joined in one Legislative Committee. The logic of other combinations is implicit in their names, e.g. “Prayer Book, Liturgy, and Church Music” being all aspects of common worship.
- SCS strongly supports the inclusion in the membership of these Legislative Committees of some persons who have served on Interim Bodies whose work will be considered by the legislative bodies so as to provide for greater liaison and continuity.

Note: Legislative action required only by the House of Deputies.

Resolution A153 Amend HBRO General Rule I: On Standing Committees
Resolved, That the Rules of Order of the House of Bishops be amended to read as follows (p. 184):

1 I. ... The Standing Committees ... shall be as follows:
2 (1) Dispatch of Business.
3 (2) Certification of Minutes.
4 (3) Rules of Order, of which the Presiding Bishop shall be a member, ex officio.
5 (4) Constitution.
6 (5) Canons.
7 (6) Structure, Committees and Commissions.
8 (7) Admission of New Dioceses.
9 (8) Consecration of Bishops.
10 (9) World Mission.
11 (10) Domestic Mission and Evangelism
12 (11) National Concerns
13 (12) Anglican and International Concerns
14 (13) National and International Problems
15 (14) Social and Urban Affairs
16 (15) Church in Small Communities
17 (16) Church in Small Communities
18 (17) Evangelism
19 (18) Ecumenical Relations.
21 (20) Church Music
22 (21) Ministry.
23 (22) Education.
24 (23) Church Pension Fund.
26 (19 15) Stewardship and Development.
27 (24 16) Communications, Miscellaneous Resolutions and Privilege and Courtesy.
28 (22) Miscellaneous Resolutions.
29 (23) Privilege and Courtesy.
30 (24) Committees and Commissions.
31 (25 17) Credentials
32 (26 18) Sergeant-at-Arms.
33 (27) Environment.
34 (A) Pastoral Letter.
35 (B) Resignation of Bishops.
36 (C) Religious Communities.
37 (D) On Nominations and Elections.
38 In addition, the Presiding Officer shall appoint Standing Committees on Admission of New
Dioceses and Consecration of Bishops, if such legislation will be presented to the Convention.

Explanation
This proposal coordinates the changes proposed for the House of Deputies.

Note: Legislative action required only by the House of Bishops.

Resolution A154 Amend Joint Rule of Order VIII.22: Legislation on Committees and
Commissions
Resolved, the House of ________concurring, That the Joint Rules of Order are hereby amended
to read as follows (p. 218):

VIII. Joint Legislative Committee Legislation on Committees and Commissions
22. There shall be a Legislative Committee to be designated the Joint Committee on Committees
and Commissions to which shall be referred all All Resolutions relating to the creation,
continuation, merger or other changes in Joint- Standing Committees and Commissions,
Boards and other Agencies of the Church and the creation of Task Forces shall be referred to the
Legislative Committees on Structure, Committees and Commissions.

Explanation
This amendment conforms the Joint Rules to the consolidation of the former Joint Legislative
Committees on Committees and Commissions into the cognate Legislative Committees on
Structure, Committees and Commissions.

IV. STANDING COMMISSIONS, TASK FORCES, AGENCIES AND NETWORKS

The present Interim Bodies of the church are set forth in Appendix “B” to this Report. Until the
1970s, most of what the church considers today to be the canonical Interim Bodies were in fact
governed by the Rules of Order and not canonically mandated. Since that time the General
Convention has seen a proliferation of Standing Commissions, which in many instances have
strayed from the canonical mandate “... to study and make recommendations to the General
CONVENTION ON **major subjects** considered to be of **continuing** concern to the Church." (Canon I.1.2(a). p. 13)

Even the most cursory review of past *Blue Book* Reports indicates that many Interim Bodies write their own "mission statements" and "charges" within their broad canonical mandates and set their own agendas (as well as proposed agendas for the following triennium and the newly constituted body) and then proceed to spend the balance of the Triennium responding to the same.

In addition, numerous *ad hoc* bodies have been formed for single purposes, but which then continue on and either expand the original purpose and mandate or, with the best of intentions, even spill over into other areas and issues very often duplicating work of other Interim Bodies in progress. There also always seem to be arguable reasons why these bodies should be continued for another three years.

This is not to say that many Interim Bodies and *ad hoc* committees have not accomplished important work during their existence; most have at one time or another. However, it is reasonably safe to say that from time to time there are not "major subjects considered to be of continuing concern to the Church" before many of the Interim Bodies, yet these Interim Bodies labor on in peaks and valleys from General Convention to General Convention. In the best of all worlds, "standing" commissions should be organized to stand by on call to act when, as and if needed and directed by the church. However, this theoretical institutional discipline flies in the face of our human natures "to do something" and the inherent desire of the church's clergy and laity to pro-actively serve their church. Further, some of these policy making Interim Bodies from time to time become extensively involved in attempting to develop and implement national programs to bring birth to their policies, priorities and concerns, which further confuses roles and purposes.

SCS proposes that there shall be a very limited number of canonical Interim Bodies established to deal primarily with the ongoing organic and generic needs and concerns of the General Convention and the core concerns of this church in its role as a national church.

**A. Standing Commissions and Joint Commissions - Organization and Administration**

SCS proposes that the following organizational and administrative canonical amendments be made to improve and enhance the operations of the Standing Commissions, which are appropriate no matter what final decisions are made as to the number, nature and tasks of the Standing Commissions themselves.

**Resolution A155 Amend Canon I.1.2: Discontinue Joint Commissions**

1 Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon I.1.2. is hereby amended to read as follows
2 (p. 13):

3 Sec. 2(a) The General Convention by Canon may establish Standing Commissions, to study and
4 make recommendations to the General Convention on major subjects considered to be of
5 continuing concern to the Church, and Joint Commissions, to study and make recommendations
6 to the General Convention on specific matters of concern during a single interval between two
regular meetings of the General Convention. Joint Commissions shall cease to exist at the end of
the single interval for which they were created, unless extended by action of the General
Convention. The Canon shall specify the size, composition and duties of each such Commission.
Such Standing Commissions shall be composed of Bishops and Deputies, and may include
Presbyters, Priests and Deacons of this Church and Lay Persons, who shall be confirmed adult
communicants of this Church in good standing not members of the House of Deputies. Priests,
Deacons and Lay Persons may but need not be members of the House of Deputies.

(b) The terms of all members of Standing Commissions shall be equal to the interval between the
regular meeting of the General Convention preceding their appointment and the adjournment of
the second succeeding regular meeting of the General Convention, and such terms shall be rotated
so that, as near as may be, the term of one half of the members shall expire at the conclusion of
each regular meeting of the General Convention. The terms of all members of Joint Commissions
shall be only from the time of appointment until the adjournment of the first regular meeting of
the General Convention following their appointment.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This proposal will discontinue Joint Commissions as being both confusing and overly
structured in favor of "task force" type assignments. If a Task Force, referred to later in this
Report, is needed for a major concern facing the church, this may be best met with thoughtful
and careful legislation establishing a Task Force structured as to the composition, timing and
goals rather than the present Canon, which is too protectively restrictive. It may well be that the
church might want a study of a major concern that would not be limited to a three year cycle
and which might require the very best members of the church that might be identified and co-
 opted.
- This amendment also clarifies inconsistent language and requires that lay members be
confirmed adult communicants in good standing, as is the custom for important lay
appointments throughout the Constitution and Canons, e.g. Deputies to General Convention,
Chancellor to the Presiding Bishop, lay members of Executive Council.

Resolution A156 Delete References to Joint Commissions
Resolved, the House of concurred, That the Secretary of General Convention be and
hereby is authorized to amend and revise the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies, House of
Bishops and Joint Rules to delete references to "Joint Commissions".

Resolution A157 Amend Canon I.1.2(b): Vacancies on Standing Commissions
Resolved, the House of concurred, That Canon I.1.2(b). be amended by the addition of
the following sentence (p. 13):

The term of a member shall become vacant in the event of two absences from meetings of the
Commission occurring in the interval between successive regular meetings of the General
Convention unless excused by the Commission for good cause.
STRUCTURE

Explanation
This amendment will provide for an automatic vacancy due to absences. Each Standing Commission requires the continuing and active participation of all of its members.

Resolution A158 Amend Canon I.1.2(c): Filling Vacancies on Standing Commissions
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(c). be amended to read as follows
(p. 13):

(c) The Presiding Bishop shall appoint the Episcopal members, and the President of the House of
Deputies the Lay and other Clerical members, of such Commissions as soon as practicable after
the adjournment of the General Convention. Episcopal members appointed after the adjournment
of any General Convention at which a Presiding Bishop is elected shall be appointed by the
Presiding Bishop-elect. Vacancies shall be filled in similar manner; provided, however, that
vacancies occurring within one year of the next regular General Convention shall not be filled
unless so requested by the Commission. One member of each such Commission shall be appointed
from the membership of Executive Council to serve as liaison therewith.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption

Explanation
- This amendment is intended to avoid an appointment of a new member to fill a vacancy on a
Standing Commission late in its work cycle. An appointment of a member without prior
experience with that particular commission could easily impede the work of the commission.
- This amendment also reforms present practice whereby appointments of members of Executive
Council have been made to Standing Commissions, ostensibly as a liaison person, but who are
appointed to commissions as an actual member. Thus, the appointing officer of a liaison
member can consume some of the appointive capacity of the other appointing officer. Provision
for the appointment of Executive Council members as liaison person to Standing Commissions
is included in the amendment to Canon I.1.2.(d) below.

Resolution A159 Amend Canon I.1.2 (c): Joint Appointment of Chair of Standing
Commissions
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(c). be amended by the addition of
the following (p. 13):

From the members of each Standing Commission, The Presiding Bishop and the President of the
House of Deputies shall appoint jointly a Chair who shall convene the Standing Commission and
prepare the work of the Standing Commission for its organization meeting.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
**Explanations**

- This amendment permits the Presidents of the Houses to appoint the Chairs of the Standing Commissions so that they may have their work organized for the first meeting with prior assignments made and work ready for consideration at the first meeting. Present practice delays most substantive decision making to the second meeting. Given the fact that Standing Commissions may not meet for many months after a General Convention and must finish their reports not less than six months before the next General Convention, less than two years may be actually available for the work entrusted to the commission. Lost months following a General Convention cannot be made up.

- The revised process will insure that a person fully familiar with the work of the Standing Commission will be appointed as Chair to organize the commission’s work rather than relying upon some concept of seniority that may not in fact apply.

- Inasmuch as the Presiding Officers have the appointive authority as to membership on the Standing Commissions (and the Legislative Committees that will receive their work product), allowing them jointly to appoint Chairs is on balance an efficiency that offsets the desirability of the selection of a Chair by the commission. The Vice Chair and Secretary will continue to be elected by the commission.

**Resolution A160 Amend Canon I.1.2 (g): Standing Commissions’ Chair to Convene Meetings**

*Moved by the House of __________ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(g) be amended to read as follows (p. 14):*

(g). Every Commission shall be convened by the senior Bishop in service on the Commission Chair, and when convened shall elect a Chair, organize by electing a Vice Chair, and a Secretary.

In the event that the Commission is not organized convened as above provided within six months from the date of adjournment of each regular General Convention, any-three one-third of the members may take such action as shall be necessary to organize convene the Commission. After the Commission shall have been convened and its officers—chosen Vice Chair and Secretary elected, the Chair or, in the absence of the Chair or in the Chair’s inability or refusal to act, the Vice Chair shall be empowered to call a meeting and fix the time and place and shall do so upon the signed request of three one-third of the members.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

**Explanation**

This amendment provides that the appointed Chair will organize and convene the Standing Commission’s first meeting, provides for the Commission to elect its Vice Chair and Secretary, and adjusts the ability to call the Commission to session as noted.
Resolution A161 Amend Canon I.1.2(d): Executive Council Liaisons to Standing Commissions

Resolved, the House of ______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(d) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 13):

(d) The Presiding Bishop, in respect of Bishops, and the President of the House of Deputies, in respect of Clergy and Lay Persons, may jointly appoint members and staff of the Executive Council, or other experts, as consultants or coordinators as liaison persons to assist in the performance of its functions to provide for communication between the Executive Council and any Commission. Notice of such appointments shall be given to the Secretaries of both Houses. Such appointed liaison persons shall not be members of the Commission and shall have voice but not vote. The reasonable expenses thereof shall be provided for by the Executive Council. Each such Commission shall have power to constitute committees and to request the services of Executive Council staff, and, subject to the Commission's budget, engage the services of consultants and coordinators necessary to the carrying on of its work.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- Joint appointment of liaison members expresses the collegiality of the two presiding officers. It is submitted that Executive Council members now and in the future will be fully committed as to their time and talents and may not be able to make the time and effort commitment required by full membership on a Standing Commission and, thus, should not fill a working position on the commission.
- Present practice of shifting the expense of these Executive Council liaison representatives to the budget of the Standing Commission is eliminated.
- The use of Executive Council staff, experts, consultants, and coordinators is shifted from appointment, whether or not requested or desired by the Standing Commission, to only those cases where such services and persons are requested by the Standing Commission itself, which knows best its requirements in meeting its responsibilities from time to time.
- This amendment also makes it clear that the expense generated by any other experts, consultants or coordinators will be borne by the Standing Commission from its budget.

B. Standing Commissions - Consolidation and Re-Configuration

The following presentation is essentially topical and is geared to revise Canon I.1.2 so that I.1.2(n) will be reconstructed to contain all Standing Commissions that are established elsewhere in the Canons. In order to show what is being created or restructured, this Report will first indicate what it is that is proposed to be deleted or replaced. Therefore, as a matter of legislative action, if the first proposal in a set is not adopted in its entirety, generally speaking, the balance of proposals in that set would become moot. All Standing Commissions proposed or continued will be found in this section of the Report.
Resolution A162 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Discontinue Standing Commissions

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended to delete the following (p. 15-17):

(n)(1). A Standing Commission on the Church in Small Communities ... 
(2). A Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons .... 
(3). A Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations ... 
(4). A Standing Commission on Health ... 
(5). A Standing Commission on Human Affairs ... 
(6). A Standing Commission on the Church in Metropolitan Areas ... 
(7). A Standing Commission on Peace with Justice ... 
(8). A Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church ... 
(9). A Standing Commission on World Mission ... 
(10). A Standing Commission on Stewardship and Development ... 
(11). A Standing Commission on Evangelism ... 

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation

- As in the case of Legislative Committees of the General Convention, one aim of this proposal is to avoid both compartmentalization and redundancy. Specific aspects of work as to “matters of major subjects of continuing concern” and as to the policy of this church can be reassigned to existing Standing Commissions as hereinafter revised and also assigned to Task Forces specifically created and designed solely for that purpose by General Convention as appropriate from time to time.
- Much of the major policy and strategy work of the Standing Commissions proposed to be discontinued as well as ad hoc committees and special non-program committees of Executive Council would be lodged in the proposed Standing Commission on Domestic Mission and Evangelism, Standing Commission on National Concerns, and Standing Commission on Anglican and International Concerns.

Resolution A163 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Create Standing Commission on Anglican and International Concerns

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended by the addition of the following (p. 17):

(1) A Standing Commission on Anglican and International Concerns consisting of 14 members (4 Bishops, 4 Priests or Deacons and 6 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to develop recommendations and strategies as to common ministry opportunities and concerns with other Provinces of the Anglican Communion as to the work of this Church and the Anglican Communion on issues of international peace and justice and to make recommendations pertaining thereto to the Presiding Bishop, the Executive Council and the General Convention.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
Explanation
- This amendment creates a new Standing Commission designed to deal with global issues of ministry concerns and opportunities, i.e. the many diverse ways that Christians participate in the one mission of God through proclamation, service and securing justice, within the context of the Anglican Communion as this church and the other provinces of the Anglican Communion work towards common ministry opportunities as the same affect issues of peace and justice. The international component of Peace with Justice has been assigned to this new commission.
- This amendment is also intended to emphasize the nature of this church as “a national church participating fully in the Anglican Communion” (SCS’s General Principle #1) . It also is intended to clarify that the role of this commission is to be one of participating in focusing this church’s commitment to participation in activities of ministry within and as a part of the Anglican Communion with particular emphasis on issues of international peace and justice.

Resolution A164 Amend Canon II.4: Discontinue Standing Liturgical Commission
Resolved, the House of ______ concurring, That Canon II.4. (Of a Standing Liturgical Commission) is hereby deleted in its entirety (p. 55).

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment permits the consolidation of the former Standing Liturgical Commission into a new Standing Commission on Common Worship.
- As was true in the preparation of The Book of Common Prayer (1979), any future major revision of the BCP would require a major Task Force to be established by the General Convention under Article X of the Constitution.

Resolution A165 Amend Canon II.6.2: Discontinue Standing Commission on Church Music
Resolved, the House of ______ concurring, That Canon II.6.2. (Standing Commission on Church Music), is hereby deleted in its entirety (p. 56).

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment permits the consolidation of the former Standing Commission on Church Music into a new Standing Commission on Common Worship.
- The consolidation of this Standing Commission with the former Standing Liturgical Commission is an attempt to better focus on policies and strategies established by the General Convention with some oversight of programs to be provided by outside agencies and resources.
Resolution A166 Amend Canon I.1.2(n)(1): Create Standing Commission on Common Worship

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That a new Canon I.1.2(n)(1) be added to read as follows (p. 15):

(1) A Standing Commission on Common Worship consisting of 16 members (4 Bishops, 4 Priests or Deacons and 8 Lay Persons). In addition, the Custodian of The Book of Common Prayer shall be a member ex officio with voice, but without vote. The Standing Commission shall:

(i) Discharge such duties as shall be assigned to it by the General Convention as to policies and strategies concerning the common worship of this Church.

(ii) Collect, collate and catalogue material bearing upon possible future revisions of The Book of Common Prayer.

(iii) Cause to be prepared and to present to the General Convention recommendations concerning the Lectionary, Psalter, and offices for special occasions as authorized or directed by the General Convention or House of Bishops.

(iv) Recommend to the General Convention authorized translations of the Holy Scripture from which the Lessons prescribed in The Book of Common Prayer are to be read.

(v) Receive and evaluate requests for consideration of individuals or groups to be included in the Calendar of the Church year and make recommendations thereon to the General Convention for acceptance or rejection.

(vi) Collect, collate, and catalogue material bearing upon possible future revisions of The Hymnal 1982 and other musical publications regularly in use in this Church and encourage the composition of new musical materials.

(vii) Cause to be prepared and present to the General Convention recommendations concerning the musical settings of liturgical texts and rubrics, and norms as to liturgical music and the manner of its rendition.

(viii) At the direction of the General Convention, serve the Church in matters pertaining to policies and strategies concerning Church music.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- The purposes of the new Standing Commission have been limited to major concerns of policies and strategies of the church’s common worship as well as some functional activities in the area of this commission’s special expertise.
- A review of recent Blue Book Reports for the Standing Liturgical Commission and the Standing Commission on Church Music indicates that there is substantial program activity in conjunction with existing national church staff, other Interim Bodies and church agencies. This is to be encouraged wherever possible depending upon the resources available from time to time.

- This is an area ripe for creation of this new Standing Commission to provide policy and strategy oversight in these areas, engaging existing church agencies, task forces, experts, and resources for implementing programs and development of liturgy and music.

- By consolidating these two commissions, meeting expenses are reduced and some existing program funding may be made available to be used for obtaining theological and musical program services from the existing agencies of the church such as seminaries and their faculties, professional musicians, national church center staff, and other persons of special expertise.

Resolution A167 Amend Canon II.3.6(c): Delete Reference to Standing Liturgical Commission

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon II.3.6(c). is hereby amended to read in part as follows (p. 54):

(c) ... Provided, however, that it shall be competent for the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies, jointly, on recommendation by a resolution duly adopted at a meeting of the Standing-Liturgical Commission Standing Commission on Common Worship ...

Explanation

This amendment conforms this Canon to the new name of the Standing Commission.

Resolution A168 Amend Canon I.1.2(n)(2): Expand Duties of Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n)(2) is hereby amended to read as follows (pp. 15-16):

(23) A Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons consisting of 12 members (3 Bishops, 3 Presbyter Priests or Deacons, and 6 Lay Persons). The Standing Commission shall:

(i) Review such proposed amendments to the Constitution and Canons as may be submitted to the Commission, placing each such proposed amendment in proper Constitutional or Canonical form including all amendments necessary to effect the proposed change. The Commission shall express its views with respect to the substance of any such proposal only to the proponent thereof; Provided, however, that no member of the Commission shall, by reason of membership, be deemed to be disabled from expressing, before a Legislative Committee or on the floor of the House of membership, personal views with respect to the substance of any such proposed amendment.

(ii) Conduct a continuing comprehensive review of the Constitution and Canons with respect to their internal consistency and clarity, and on the basis of such review propose to the General Convention such technical amendments to the Constitution and Canons as in the opinion of the
Commission are necessary or desirable in order to achieve such consistency and clarity without altering the substance of any Constitutional or Canonical provisions; Provided, however, that the Commission shall propose, for the consideration of the appropriate legislative committees Legislative Committees of the two Houses, such amendments to the Constitution and Canons as in the opinion of the Commission are technically desirable but involve a substantive alteration of a Constitutional or Canonical provision.

(iii) On the basis of such review suggest to the Executive Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society such amendments to their respective By-laws as in the opinion of the Commission are necessary or desirable in order to conform the same to the Constitution and Canons.

(iv) Discharge such other duties as shall from time to time be assigned by the General Convention.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- The amendments to clauses (i) and (ii) are for clarity only and propose no new duties.
- The addition of clause (iii) is intended to provide guidance from this commission of canonical and legal experts as to actions that may be necessary or desirable as to By-laws that are interactive with the Constitution and Canons.
- The addition of (iv) is in recognition that the General Convention has from time to time issued assignments to the commission beyond its technical canonical mandate.
- However, these revisions are in no way intended to suggest passing jurisdiction for any other technical or substantive rulings or interpretations to this Standing Commission.

Resolution A169 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Create Standing Commission on Domestic Mission and Evangelism

Resolved, the House of concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended by the addition of the following (p. 16):

(4) A Standing Commission on Domestic Mission and Evangelism consisting of 16 members (2 Bishops, 6 Priests or Deacons and 8 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to identify, study and consider major general policies, priorities and concerns as to the domestic mission of this Church. This shall include a review of the shaping of new patterns and directions for evangelism particularly in rural and metropolitan areas. The Commission shall develop and recommend to the General Convention comprehensive and coordinated policies and strategies for the restoration of all people to unity with God and each other in Christ.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
Explanation
- The creation of a Standing Commission on Domestic Mission and Evangelism will emphasize the "mission" of the church and affords the church an opportunity to form a group to challenge the church to do mission, i.e. the restoration of all people to unity with God and each other in Christ, at home, i.e. beyond our own communities be they defined geographically, politically, racially, ethnically, linguistically, or economically. The work of this commission is to identify and recommend policies and strategies to the church, as it carries out this mission, which may lead to new and effective ways of ministry faithful to the Baptismal Covenant wherein each member of this church has promised to proclaim by word and example the Good News of God in Christ, to seek to serve Christ in all persons, loving our neighbors as ourselves, and to strive for justice and peace among all people and to respect the dignity of every human being.
- This commission will combine the issues formerly considered by the Standing Commissions on Evangelism, Churches in Small Communities and Metropolitan Areas.
- It is right and proper for the church to continue to do and support ministry through mission abroad, but it is frequently much more challenging to do mission through ministry at home. There are many interests, priorities, and groups that ask for and deserve the support of the church as its members strive to engage in ministry where they live.

Resolution A170 Amend Canon I.1(n)(3): To Revise Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n)(3) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 16):

(8)(5) A Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations consisting of—18 14 members (6 4 Bishops, 6 4 Presbyters Priests or Deacons and 6 Lay Persons). Its duties shall be to recommend to the General Convention a comprehensive and coordinated policy and strategy on relations between this Church and other Churches, to make recommendations to General Convention concerning interchurch cooperation and unity, and to carry out such instructions on ecumenical matters as may be given it from time to time by the General Convention. It shall also nominate for appointment by the Presiding Bishop, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, persons to serve on the governing bodies of ecumenical organizations to which this Church belongs by action of the General Convention, who shall report to the Presiding Bishop, Executive Council and the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations and to participate in major conferences as convened by such organizations.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment clarifies terminology, reduces the size of this commission and emphasizes its role as a policy and strategy body and not a programmatic participatory body.
- Working day to day ecumenical relations with the senior echelons of other denominations and judicatories are best managed at the national church level by the Executive Council and by national church staff, consultants and members of the church appointed to the many ecumenical bodies with which the Episcopal Church formally and informally participates.
Based upon the Diocesan Visitations, the Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Executive Council reported to the Executive Council that: “There is recognition that in certain areas of ministry such as ecumenical relations ... the National Church must continue to have a primary role.”

Given the rather substantial number of Episcopal Church representatives to various Boards and Consultations, 39 persons in number (1994 Blue Book, pp. 184-185), this is an area to be considered by the Executive Council as to the actual requirements for representation of the church and the accountability and effectiveness of such representation.

Local and regional ecumenical relations should continue to be encouraged by and through Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (“EDEO”) and their networks, established at the initiative of these diocesan officers and essentially supported by the several dioceses and with support from the national church staff, with continued funding assistance from the national church.

Resolution A171 Discontinue Council for the Development of Ministry

Resolved, the House of concurring, That the Council for the Development of Ministry be and hereby is discontinued.

Explanation

The Council for the Development of Ministry has been continued from General Convention to General Convention since 1976 and has carried out missions and objectives self-determined by the CDM over the years and as assigned to CDM by the General Convention and Executive Council and its officers.

These missions and objectives have ebbed and flowed over the years between issues of the ordained ministry and those of lay ministry. SCS believes that the day to day functional aspects of this work can continue through the national church staff.

However, the larger questions of policy, strategy and priorities require a broader integration with issues affecting the ordained ministry.

It is proposed that some aspects of the CDM will be consolidated in a new Standing Commission on Ministry.

Resolution A172 Amend Canon III.31: Discontinue Board for Theological Education

Resolved, the House of concurring, That Canon III.31. (Of the Board for Theological Education) is hereby deleted in its entirety (p. 103).

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation

The Board for Theological Education will be merged into the new Standing Commission on Ministry.

Resolution A173 Amend Canon III.33: Discontinue Board for Church Deployment

Resolved, the House of concurring, That Canon III.33. (Of the Board for Church Deployment) is hereby deleted in its entirety (p. 106).
This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption

Explanation
The Board for Church Deployment will be merged into the new Standing Commission on the Ministry.

Resolution A174 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Create Standing Commission on Ministry
Resolved, the House of ________ concurring. That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended by the addition of the following (p. 17):

(6) A Standing Commission on Ministry consisting of 24 members (6 Bishops, 6 Priests or Deacons and 12 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to recommend policies and strategies as to matters affecting the Lay and Ordained Ministry to the General Convention:

(i) As to Ministry of Lay Persons in the Church:

A. To recommend policies and strategies to the General Convention for development and utilization of the ministries of Lay Persons in the worship and under the discipline of this Church.

B. To recommend policies and strategies to the General Convention for the development and enhancement of the ministry of all Lay Persons in and to the world.

C. To recommend policies and strategies to the General Convention for the development and enhancement of the ministry of Lay Persons exercising their vocations in the life of this Church.

(ii) As to Theological Education:

A. To study the needs and trends of theological education for this Church and to make recommendations thereon to the General Convention, the House of Bishops, the Executive Council and the several Seminaries.

B. To provide counsel and advice to the several Seminaries and other institutions of this Church as to the recruiting and training of persons for Holy Orders reflecting the diversity of this Church and its constituencies.

C. To advise the General Convention, the Executive Council and the several Seminaries as to policies that will promote cooperation between the Church and the Seminaries and as between and among the Seminaries and other like institutions of this Church.

D. To compile and present to each regular meeting of the General Convention and annually to the Executive Council and each of the several Seminaries and other like institutions of this Church a complete statistical report of the educational and financial data, including a
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statement of mission and goals and the progress in fulfilling them, for each of such Seminaries and institutions.

E. To recommend policies and strategies to the General Convention for the continuing education of the Clergy and for theological education of Lay Persons.

F. To recommend policies and strategies to the General Convention, the Executive Council, the House of Bishops and the several Seminaries and educational institutions of this Church for financial support of theological education.

G. To provide liaison with the General Board of Examining Chaplains.

(iii) As to identifying persons for Ordained Ministry:

A. To study the needs and requirements of the Church for the ordination of persons as Priests and Deacons including the application and implementation of the Canons relating thereto, and make recommendations thereon to the General Convention.

B. To propose policies, strategies and methods of identifying and recruiting persons for the ordained ministry reflecting the diversity of this Church and its constituencies.

C. To provide counsel and advice to those charged with assisting Diocesan Bishops, Commissions on Ministry, the General Board of Examining Chaplains and others charged with the responsibilities of identifying, recruiting, authenticating, training and ordaining persons for Holy Orders.

(iv) As to deployment of the Clergy of this Church:

A. To study the needs and trends concerning the deployment and utilization of the Clergy for the ministry and mission of this Church and to make recommendations thereon to the General Convention, the House of Bishops and the Executive Council.

B. To maintain a confidential and independent Church Deployment Office, and upon consultation with the Chair of the Executive Council appoint the staff and personnel, which Office and staff operate under the authority and direction of the Commission, but in cooperation with the Executive Council Staff.

C. To provide oversight of the operations of the Church Deployment Office and render a report on these operations to the Executive Council at least annually.

D. To compile and present to each regular meeting of the General Convention and annually to the Executive Council and the House of Bishops a report on the work of the Church Deployment Office.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
STRUCTURE

Explanation
- The order and recitation of duties of the Standing Commission on Ministry follow that of "An Outline of Faith" (BCP, p. 855)
- This amendment combines the several functions of the CDM, BTE and CDO Board into one integrated policy body charged with recommending policies and strategies on ministry issues.
- The programmatic aspects of the CDM and BTE will devolve to national church staff as to national programs, and to the provinces and dioceses and networks, especially as to the identifying, training and utilization of lay ministries.
- A separate and confidential Church Deployment Office will be continued under the authority, oversight and direction of and accountable to the commission, or, at its discretion, a subcommittee of the commission (and through the commission to the Chair of Executive Council and Executive Council) so as to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of that office. Notwithstanding the quasi-independent nature of the day to day program and operations of the CDO, policies and strategies affecting deployment as an integrated component of the ministry of this church will be the responsibility of the commission.
- Through subcommittees and the co-option of others interested in this area of ministry and mission, such as seminary deans and faculty, networks of diocesan administrators involved in theological education and ordination and other networks and associations concerned with these issues, the commission of twenty-four persons should be able to handle the work of the commission in lieu of the 52 previously involved (BTE 16, CDO 12 and CDM 24).
- There may be some initial loss of networking as the former lay ministry work of CDM is combined in the proposed Standing Commission. However, SCS believes that the invigorated and enhanced reliance upon parishes and congregations, dioceses, provinces, and concerned networks will evolve as the appropriate locus and focus for the development and education of lay ministry in the place of CDM.

Resolution A175 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Create Standing Commission on National Concerns
Resolved, the House of _________ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended by the addition of the following (p. 16):

(7) A Standing Commission on National Concerns consisting of 16 members (2 Bishops, 6 Priests or Deacons and 8 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to identify, study and consider major general policies, priorities and concerns about the theological, ethical and pastoral issues and strategies as to the ministries of this Church in serving Christ and striving for justice and peace among all peoples through the proclamation of commonly accepted general policies applicable to all members of the Church, and develop and recommend to the General Convention comprehensive and coordinated policies and strategies applicable to the same.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- The creation of a Standing Commission on National Concerns brings together in one commission issues formerly considered by the Standing Commissions of Health, Human Affairs, the domestic component of Peace with Justice, and other social concerns.
- It is proposed that the work of this commission would center on the four broad areas of “ministry” (p.1) of forgiveness, proclamation, service, and securing justice. This commission would also be concerned with how the church ministers as to these issues as it proclaims by word and example the Good News of God in Christ.

- SCS proposes that this commission would identify issues pertaining to policies and strategies, which could then be assigned to an appropriate Task Force formed by General Convention. Thus, the diverse and representative nature of the membership of the commission need not be “expert” in all areas which may commend themselves to the commission’s attention.

Resolution A176 Amend Canon I.2(n)(10): Revise Language for Standing Commission on Stewardship and Development

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) (10) is amended to read as follows (p. 17):

(10) A Standing Commission on Stewardship and Development, consisting of 12 members (2 Bishops, 2 Presbyter Priests or Deacons, and 8 Lay Persons) ...

Explanation
This amendment conforms the language of this Canon to that used throughout the Canons.

Resolution A177 Amend Canon I.6.3 Discontinue Committee on the State of the Church

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.6.3 is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 33):

Sec. 3(a) ...

(b) A Committee of the House of Deputies shall be appointed following the close of each General Convention, to serve ad interim, and to prepare and present to the next meeting of the House of Deputies a report on the state of the Church; which report, when agreed to by said House, shall be sent to the House of Bishops.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- The Committee on the State of the Church was established in 1804. In an era of information and data processing, the data presented to the General Convention is actually collected and collated by the Executive Officer of the General Convention.
- The data collected and reported by the Executive Officer is comprehensive and empirical in nature, but to be meaningful it is also worthy of some critical evaluation and report.
- This information should be a working tool for the Executive Council and for the church and not just the subject of a periodic report to one House of the General Convention for transmittal to the other.
- The Executive Officer of General Convention would be responsible for the reporting of this data to the General Convention and to the church. The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church would assume responsibility for how this data bears upon the structure and governance of the church.
Resolution A178 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Standing Commission on Structure

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 17):

(8)(9) A Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church, consisting of 12 members (3 Bishops, 3 Presbyters Priests or Deacons and 6 Lay Persons). It shall be the duty of the Commission to study and make recommendations concerning the structure, governance and state of the General Convention and of the Church to the General Convention and to the Executive Council. It shall, from time to time, review the operation of the several Committees and Standing Commissions and any interim bodies to determine the necessity for their continuance and the effectiveness of their functions and to bring about a coordination of their efforts. Whenever a proposal is made for the creation of a new Committee body or Commission, it shall, wherever feasible, be referred to the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church for its consideration and advice.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment includes within the concerns of the Structure Commission issues of governance and state of the church which would affect the structures of the General Convention, its commissions and committees, the Executive Council, and other pertinent bodies.
- Other matters formerly considered by the Committee on the State of the Church as pertains to policies and strategies would be the concern of the Executive Council.

Resolution A179 Amend Canon I.1.2(n): Standing Commission on World Mission

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(n) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 17):

(9) (8) A Standing Commission on World Mission, consisting of 12 members (3 2 Bishops, 3 4 Presbyters Priests or Deacons, and 6 Lay Persons), of whom one-half shall come from jurisdictions outside the continental whose members shall include persons broadly representative of constituencies of this Church outside the United States of America. Its duties It shall be the duty of the Commission, as to all mission outside the United States, to review, and evaluate existing policies, priorities and strategies and, with the Executive Council, to plan and propose policy on overseas mission to policies, priorities and strategies for the participation in such mission and to make recommendations pertaining thereto to the Executive Council and the General Convention.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
STRUCTURE

Explanation
- This amendment is intended to clarify that the role of this Standing Commission is to be one of participating in focusing this church’s commitment to participation in effective mission activities, the mission of redemption and reconciliation to restore all people to unity with God and each other in Christ, outside the fifty United States.
- This is an evolving area as networks of communions, national churches, dioceses, and congregations, missionary societies, existing efforts such as the United Thank Offering and the Presiding Bishop’s Fund for World Relief seek to address what some believe to be a missionary crisis within the Episcopal Church.
- This commission would play a key role in the forming, reforming and activities of the networks of concerned members of this church as to the church’s roles and activities in world mission of each and every nature.
- By concentrating on defining and invigorating essential policies and strategies, this commission could help to develop a more unified and cooperative response on behalf of all agencies, organizations and networks of this church dedicated to world mission in the decisions of the Executive Council and the General Convention.
- The proposed flexibility as to members from outside the United States will allow for response to evolving circumstances, relationships, and opportunities without need for canonical rigidity. SCS is mindful of pending proposals for partnership in global mission, and believes that this proposal would encompass the same.

C. Task Forces

When the General Convention perceives a major subject of concern to the church, Task Forces to be structured for, and tailored to, that specific subject and with a report and termination date, may be established with a clear legislative mandate and funding and are to be composed of persons broadly representative of the constituency of this church of special expertise in the subject area under consideration. In the past, the General Convention has been presented with a topic or concern and has resolved thorny legislative proposals by expeditiously referring them out to an existing Interim Body or hastily forming some new body. SCS proposes a Rule of Order to require greater deliberation and thought to guide the General Convention, when such action on major concerns is truly desirable.

Resolution A180 Amend Joint Rule IX: Provide for Task Forces

Resolved, the House of ________ concurring, That the Joint Rules of Order are hereby amended by the addition of the following (p. 218):

IX. Task Forces of the General Convention.

23. By concurrent action, the General Convention may from time to time establish Task Forces of the General Convention to consider and make recommendations to the General Convention on specific subjects of major importance to the Church and its ministry and mission requiring special attention and competence not otherwise provided for in the Canons and/or Joint Rules, or as shall be otherwise determined by the General Convention to require the appointment of such a Task Force. The Resolution shall specify the size and composition, the clear and express duties assigned, the time for completion of the work assigned and the amount and source of the funding of each such Task Force. No Task Force shall be continued beyond the time for completion of the
work assigned except by a concurrent vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting in each of the Houses. Unless otherwise specifically provided in the establishing Resolution, the Presiding Bishop shall appoint the Episcopal members and the President of the House of Deputies shall appoint the Priests and Deacons and the Lay Persons. Such Resolution may, but need not, provide for the service of Executive Council staff and other experts as consultants and coordinators for the Task Force.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment is intended to replace the prior Joint Commissions and provide for Task Forces that will be tailored for each and every assignment rather than trying to fit such a need into an existing body.
- It is hoped that this process will cause great care and attention to be taken in establishing each such Task Force and the work assigned so that the Task Force will truly be constituted for major concerns facing the church.
- It is suggested that proposers of such Task Forces would be required to submit legislation of sufficient detail to be sure that consideration and debate may be had and taken on the issue at hand to the end that the creation of such a Task Force is truly the will of the General Convention on behalf of the whole church and not an expedient device. Such proposals could conceivably come from any source that could introduce a Resolution to General Convention or from deputies or bishops on behalf of any other bodies which might seek to establish a Task Force of the General Convention for the goals stated.
- Great flexibility is intended so it is conceivable that a Task Force could be created and funded for periods beyond a three year cycle.
- This provision would not limit Executive Council from forming its own committees or even ad hoc committees in carrying out general directives assigned to it by the General Convention.
- Prayer Book and Hymnal revision are examples of topics that would be suitable for the creation of Task Forces.

D. Agencies of the Church

Existing Agencies of the church, networks within the church, and within and between provinces, and among and within dioceses, which are organized and structured to assure fundamental accountability, whenever and wherever possible, should be engaged in the programmatic activities of the General Convention by General Convention and Executive Council. In keeping with the principle to do ministry and mission on the most local level possible, groups and caucuses within the church also will be encouraged to develop programs within their interests and areas of priority with national funding to be made available as appropriate and possible.

Local, diocesan, provincial, and network activity, flexibility, efficiency, and economy are to be preferred over centralized and institutionalized activities and programs and overhead expense.

In reality, the utilization of agencies outside the national church staff for activities in support of many national church policies, priorities, and programs has been the case and has been increasing with the reduced financial support experienced on the national level.
These agencies usually have a very narrow focus of expertise and interest and try not to expand too far beyond their core concerns. Thus, their use provides the church with in place, corporately organized and often endowed operations dedicated to some particular aspect of the church’s ministry and mission. The Episcopal Church Building Fund has assumed responsibility for the management, lending and collection of the Executive Council’s General Loan Fund in addition to the Building Fund’s own planning and lending operations. Seminaries participate in centers for spirituality, programs for newly ordained bishops, programs for congregational development, training of musicians for small congregations, training for lay ministries, and increasingly in online programs for theological education and training for laity and clergy. The Episcopal Church Foundation is involved in ministry development through the Cornerstone Project as well as capital formation. The Presiding Bishop’s Fund for World Relief provides for national and international fund raising for disaster and mission financial outreach. The United Thank Offering is a major collegial ministry and source of financial support for mission outreach. These are merely a few examples of what is already successfully being implemented by church agencies throughout the life of the church.

Church agencies, for example the seminaries of the church and their faculties, have extensive expertise, experience and knowledge that might be utilized for service. There are opportunities for creative transfer of programs and activities to such agencies on a volunteer or fee basis. Agencies are responsible and accountable both to their boards and to the church, and would be good stewards of resources allocated to them as well as being grateful for the ministry and mission program opportunities provided and for the new funding made available to them. Management responsibilities of the Executive Council would be reduced and more easily focused on policy and strategy, with the performance by contracting agencies able to be evaluated against agreed upon standards.

This recommendation is essentially a management decision based upon policies, strategies, and priorities adopted by the General Convention and assigned to the Executive Council. A policy Resolution, not a canonical enactment, is sufficient at this time.

Resolution A181 Utilize Agencies for Program Development and Implementation

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That this General Convention, as a matter of highest priority and stewardship, commends to the Executive Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society the utilization of agencies of this church for programmatic development and implementation to the greatest extent possible consistent with the policies, strategies and priorities established by the General Convention.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

E. Networks

The church has been, is, and will continue to be, served by networks of people, congregations, dioceses, and provinces formed and reformed around common interests of mission, ministry, geography, political issues of advocacy and justice, race, gender, ethnicity, language, economics, churchmanship, and numerous other areas where common interests, priorities and concerns can be identified.
These must not only be encouraged to continue, but given appropriate support as natural resources of the church. These networks have a serious and dedicated focus on the primary issues that have caused them to form and coalesce. It is in, and from, these forums that areas of concern to the whole Church are identified, nurtured and advocated. Throughout the history of the church such groups have been instrumental in raising the consciousness of the church as to issues that must be faced and considered by the whole church.

For every interim body listed in Appendix “B” of this report, there can be identified a concurrent formal or informal network, which shares its focus with one of more aspects of the work of the formal national commission, committee, board or agency. The vitality and depth of concern of these networks is and should be a tremendous resource for both the mission and the ministry of the church. A perception has arisen in the past few decades that the priority or interest of the network is only validated or authenticated by finding its way to recognition through a staff position or line item in the General Convention Budget or the establishment of a companion commission or committee for that priority or interest. It is respectfully suggested that such a position is not supported by the history of the church nor its present performance.

SCS proposes that rather than seek to formalize through Canon, national budget or “desk,” these networks continue to be identified, encouraged, appropriately supported, and possibly funded by the General Convention through the Executive Council.

Resolution A182 Utilize and Support Networks

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That this General Convention recognizes and encourages the utilization, support and funding of networks on the diocesan, provincial and national levels in support and enhancement of the mission and ministry of and on behalf of this Church, consistent with the policies, strategies and priorities of the General Convention, and commends such utilization, support and funding to the Executive Council, the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society and the several parishes and dioceses of the Church.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

V. THE PRESIDING BISHOP

By Canon, the Presiding Bishop is the Chief Pastor and Primate of the Church, and is presently vested with responsibility for leadership in initiating and developing the policy and strategy of the church and with the ultimate responsibility for the implementation of such policy and strategy. Thus, this church has called the Presiding Bishop to be the President of the House of Bishops; the Chief Pastor to the Church, its people, clergy, and especially its bishops and their families; the church’s Primate as to the Anglican Communion, sister Christian churches, other ecumenical bodies, and the world; and to be the church’s chief executive, operating officer, and management officer.

In 1926, a commentator wrote:

Under the weight of our increasing machinery or organization, the concept of the episcopate is changing ... Our bishops are not as free as they were to function as the
spiritual leaders of their flocks. More and more they tend to become parts of a hierarchy...

... It cannot be said too emphatically that the more a bishop becomes immersed in the details of organization and finance, the less firmly is the Church safeguarding its spiritual future. The normal result of any mechanical obsession is the loss of creative spiritual leadership, and this loss will be felt, not only by the rank and file of the clergy and laity, but also by the bishops themselves.\(^\text{11}\)

This warning was echoed by Bishop W. Appleton Lawrence of Western Massachusetts in 1964:

> If the Church wants her bishops to be what they are called to be - chief shepherds of the flock of Christ - something must be done to review and rethink what is currently required of them. In doing so, I am afraid that we shall discover that the Church, instead of converting the world, has fallen victim to a good many of its ways and methods. Actually, I believe that much of the present organization has slowly become top-heavy, so that a bishop spends more time in keeping the machinery in order than in the “care and cure of souls.”\(^\text{12}\)

These warnings and their wisdom are equally applicable and valid today on all levels of the episcopacy of this church.

With any shift in emphasis of programs to local and diocesan levels, and with all national policy and strategy of this church to be more clearly established by the General Convention with oversight provided through the Executive Council, it is hoped that the Presiding Bishop, in the role of Chair of Executive Council can be more focused on providing the leadership for the initiation and development of policy and strategy with less of the Presiding Bishop’s energies devoted to managing and implementing policy and strategy. The energies of a Presiding Bishop should be directed to being: a prophetic voice of expressive power and fearlessness so as to “speak God’s words to the Church and to the world, as the representative of this Church and its episcopate ...” (Canon I.2.4(a).2 (p. 25); the Chief Pastor to the bishops of this church and their families; as Primate of this church, its representative to the Anglican Communion and our sister churches; and chief consecrator of this church’s bishops.

There has historically been disagreement about the exercise of these components of the role of the Presiding Bishop:

> “Indeed, one of the major tensions about the office has been that between the presiding representative and the presiding bishop as spokesman - often controversial spokesman - of the gospel as he comprehends the gospel.\(^\text{13}\)

In 1967, the Mutual Responsibility Commission made nine proposals to the General Convention representing canonical amendments. Roland Foster states:

> The commission did recognize that too much was expected of a presiding bishop, but the report of the commission did not help much. In effect three distinct images of the office, all of which have shorter or longer precedents in the church, were combined. The office was to be a combination of chief executive officer, chief pastor, and prophetic
witness. Although the recommendations of the commission were not accepted by the General Convention without amendment, all three images are still clearly articulated in the present canons.\textsuperscript{14}

It is clear that in the modern era of this church there has existed and exists today an ambivalence about the role of the Presiding Bishop. However, one aspect of this office is and has been clear, and that is that this church has always been unwilling to grant to its Presiding Bishop archiepiscopal and/or metropolitical authority over the church or its bishops. In 1982, even a proposal by the Structure Commission to grant the Presiding Bishop the title of “Archbishop” was rejected by the General Convention in favor of the use of the word “Primate.”\textsuperscript{15} Without metropolitical authority, however, this church’s Presiding Bishop, if to be effective, must do so through the prophetic role and not through the exercise of granted authority.

Freed from day to day administrative responsibilities and the ever increasing time constraints of managing a bureaucracy, with the attendant personal and institutional loyalties to a personally recruited and appointed staff and their initiatives demanded of such a manager, the Presiding Bishop then would be free to speak prophetically and also be able to “Visit every Diocese of this Church for the purpose of ... pastoral consultations ... Preaching the Word ... and ... Celebrating the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.” (Canon I.2.4(a).(6) p. 25) in discharge of these canonical duties.

Further, freeing the Presiding Bishop from an “in house” mind set should mitigate somewhat the isolation of this office by putting the Presiding Bishop in more frequent personal, rather than managerial, contact with sister and brother bishops and the laity and other clergy of the church.

SCS proposes a creative and effective role for a Presiding Bishop in calling the church to ministry and mission through the General Convention and prophetic appeals directly to the people of this church. Thereby, SCS proposes a shift in emphasis from managing to leading. There is, and should be, a clear distinction between the office and role of the Presiding Bishop and the Presiding Bishop’s duties as Chair and President of Executive Council and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (“D&FMS”). While the same person fills both roles, the roles are not identical and have separate natures and functions. SCS proposes to clarify these distinctions. SCS also proposes re-focusing the locus of the development, implementation and management of the ministry and mission of the church on the national level within the Executive Council.

**Resolution A183 Amend Canon I.2.4(a): Chief Pastor and Primate**

1 **Resolved**, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.4(a) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 25):

2 Sec. 4(a). The Presiding Bishop shall be the Chief Pastor and Primate of the Church, and shall:

3 (1). Be charged with responsibility for leadership in initiating and developing the policy and strategy of in the Church and , as Chair of the Executive Council of General Convention, with ultimate responsibility for the implementation of such policy and strategy through the conduct of speaking for the Church as to the policies, strategies and programs authorized by the General Convention or approved by the Executive Council of the General Convention.
This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment focuses the role of the Presiding Bishop when acting as Chief Pastor and Primate and confirms the Presiding Bishop’s primary role to speak to and for the church.
- The responsibilities of the Presiding Bishop as the presiding officer of the House of Bishops and as an officer of the General Convention are covered by other Canons and Rules of Order.
- The Presiding Bishop, by virtue of that office, is the Chair and President of the Executive Council and the D&FMS and responsibilities assigned to the Presiding Bishop as Chair and President of Executive Council and D&FMS are considered under those sections of this report.

Resolution A184 Amend Canon I.2.4(6)(iii): Revise Language as to Visitations by the Presiding Bishop
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.4(a)(6) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 25):

(iii). Celebrating the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper Holy Eucharist.

Explanation
This amendment conforms this Canon to the terminology of the BCP: see pp. 323, 355 and 859.

Resolution A185 Amend Canon I.2.4(c): Presiding Bishop may Appoint Personal Assistants
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.4(c) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 25-26):

(c) The Presiding Bishop shall perform such other functions as shall be prescribed in these Canons; and to be enabled better to perform such duties and responsibilities, the Presiding Bishop may appoint, to positions established by the Executive Council of General Convention, officers responsible to the Presiding Bishop, who may delegate such authority as shall seem appropriate and may appoint such personal assistants responsible to the Presiding Bishop as may be necessary during that Presiding Bishop’s term of office for the effective performance of the duties of the office of Presiding Bishop.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment continues present practice as to the Presiding Bishop’s personal assistants who must and should be solely the Presiding Bishop’s appointees. These assistants are those who would be primarily serving the Presiding Bishop in that role and not in the Presiding Bishop’s role as Chair and President of Executive Council and D&FMS.
- The amendment consolidates in one place a provision from Canon I.2.6 as to terms of such personal assistants.

Resolution A186 Amend Canon I.2.6: Expenses for Presiding Bishop’s Office
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.6. is amended to read as follows (p. 26):

Resolution A187 Amend Canon I.2.7: Personal Assistant of the Presiding Bishop
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.7 is amended to read as follows (p. 26):

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment continues present practice as to the Presiding Bishop’s personal assistants who must and should be solely the Presiding Bishop’s appointees. These assistants are those who would be primarily serving the Presiding Bishop in that role and not in the Presiding Bishop’s role as Chair and President of Executive Council and D&FMS.
- The amendment consolidates in one place a provision from Canon I.2.6 as to terms of such personal assistants.

Resolution A188 Amend Canon I.2.8: Expenses for the Office of the Presiding Bishop
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.2.8 is amended to read as follows (p. 26):

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment continues present practice as to the Presiding Bishop’s personal assistants who must and should be solely the Presiding Bishop’s appointees. These assistants are those who would be primarily serving the Presiding Bishop in that role and not in the Presiding Bishop’s role as Chair and President of Executive Council and D&FMS.
- The amendment consolidates in one place a provision from Canon I.2.6 as to terms of such personal assistants.
Sec. (6) The stipends of the Presiding Bishop and such personal assistants as may be necessary during the Presiding Bishop’s term of office for the effective performance of the duties and the necessary expenses of that office, shall be fixed by the General Convention and provided for in the budget to be submitted by the Treasurer, as provided in the Canon entitled “Of the General Convention” Canon I.1.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
This amendment deletes language now made redundant by the amendment to Canon 1.2.4(c) above.

VI. THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council acts for the General Convention when the General Convention is not in session. Other than the members ex officio, the members, both those elected by the General Convention and Provincial Synods, are essentially “deputies “to that body from the church at large. These members are not representatives from constituencies nor are they “delegates” from other bodies but, rather, “deputies” of independent judgment and discernment acting for the good of the church as a whole.

With a shift in ministry and mission to the congregations, dioceses and provinces, as well as the proposed reduced number of Interim Bodies, the work of the Executive Council will be more focused and visionary and it will have and exercise greater corporate programmatic direction and oversight of the remaining programs.

The Executive Council is the executive board of the church and as such a directing board exercises full corporate and fiduciary responsibility for the policies, strategies and budgets adopted and mandated by the General Convention and will function as a true directing board. It is proposed that a volunteer board will be competent and capable of discharging these duties.

With Executive Council interacting with dioceses, provinces, networks, caucuses, this will require a national church staff responsible to General Convention through Executive Council and working on a collegial basis for the implementation of the programs of a national church.

Resolution A187 Amend Canon I.4.1(a): Function of Executive Council

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.4.1(a). is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 27):

Sec. 1(a). There shall be an Executive Council of the General Convention (which council shall generally be called simply the Executive Council) whose duty it shall be to carry out the program and policies adopted by the General Convention. The Executive Council shall have charge of the unification, coordination, development, and prosecution implementation of the ministry and mission the Missionary, Educational, and Social Work of the Church, and of such other work as may be committed to it by the General Convention.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.
**Explanation**

- Executive Council acts for the General Convention when the General Convention is not in session. SCS proposes that the Executive Council will have charge over the national ministry and mission programs of the Church, but only such as are particularly committed to it by the General Convention.

- General Convention has previously vested Executive Council under Canon I.4.1(a) with the authority to carry out the program and policies adopted by the General Convention and to have charge of the "unification," "development," and "prosecution" of work committed to it by General Convention.

The national church staff has been functioning as the program staff of the Presiding Bishop. The present Canon (I.4.3(c).) contemplates that the national church staff "shall perform such duties as the Chair [Presiding Bishop] and the Council may from time to time designate." Thus, the Executive Council has little, if any, oversight over many of these "officers, agents and employees of the Council". The national church staff has seemingly been included within Canon I.2.4(c). (p. 25), which provides:

(c). The Presiding Bishop shall perform such other functions as shall be prescribed in these Canons; and to be enabled better to perform such duties and responsibilities, the Presiding Bishop may appoint, to positions established by the Executive Council of General Convention, officers, responsible to the Presiding Bishop, who may delegate such authority as shall deem appropriate.

There is no doubt that the present Canons do contain ambiguities which confuse and muddy the several rights and privileges of the leadership entities. With the proposed shift in emphasis in the role of the office of the Presiding Bishop to prophetic leadership from management, it becomes appropriate for the program staff to be accountable to the Executive Council as the representative of General Convention when General Convention is not in session.

However, it must be clearly understood that the accountability of the officers of the Executive Council and the program staff to the Executive Council is through and subject to the authority, direction, and oversight of the Chair and President of the Executive Council – the Presiding Bishop. Thus, the Presiding Bishop has the responsibility and accountability for the officers, staff, and program to Executive Council through the Presiding Bishop's role as Chair and President and not through the office of Presiding Bishop.

*Note:* A proposed amendment to Canon I.2.4(c) is set forth under the topic "V. The Presiding Bishop".

**Resolution A188 Amend Canon I.4.3(c): Additional Officers of the Executive Council**

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.4.3(c). is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 29):

(c). The additional officers, agents and employees of the Council shall be such and perform such duties as the Chair and the Council may from time to time designate upon the recommendation and under the authority and direction of the Chair and President.
This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

**Explanation**
- This amendment provides that the designation of officers, agents and employees of the Council and definition of their duties lies with the Council. These persons would be recommended to the Executive Council for engagement, appointment, and termination by the Chair and President, who is the Presiding Bishop.
- The Chair and President would have primary and direct authority and oversight over and accountability for these persons.
- In addition, inasmuch as Executive Council and D&FMS often appoint and function in tandem, this revision complies with the State of New York Not-for-Profit Corporations Law, which makes a board of directors responsible for the appointment of officers. (N-PCL Sec. 713)

Symbolic of our mutual roles as ministers of this church and the fulfillment of our common Baptismal Covenants, the responsibility of leadership within this church falls upon laity and all orders of clergy alike. We repeat the prophetic quote from the Executive Council’s Discernment Retreat Proceedings:

The old model of the church in its simplest terms suggested that “church work” was done by a selected few, usually in orders, representing the whole. The ‘paradigm shift’ taking place in the church is that all baptized persons will take their places in the decision making and the ministry and mission of the church.16

SCS proposes that the Executive Council will be both a focus and locus of this “paradigm shift” as this collegial body of the baptized, lay and clergy alike, moves to assume greater responsibility for developing the policy and strategy of this church as initiated and mandated by the General Convention.

To complete this shift of emphasis towards management being focused in Executive Council, SCS proposes the creation of a canonical office of Executive Director.

**Resolution A189 Amend Canon I.4.3(a): Officers of the Executive Council**

Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.4.3(a) is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 28):

Sec. 3(a) The Presiding Bishop shall be **ex officio** the Chair and President. The President of the House of Deputies shall be **ex officio** the Vice Chair. The Secretary of the General Convention shall be **ex officio** the Secretary. The Executive Council shall elect a Vice President and a Treasurer, such elections to be upon nomination of the Chair. The Chair and President shall be the chief executive officer of the Executive Council.

(b) The President of the House of Deputies shall be **ex officio** the Vice Chair.

(c) The Secretary of the General Convention shall be the Secretary of the Executive Council **ex officio**.

(d) Upon joint nomination of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Executive Council shall appoint an Executive Director, who shall be a confirmed adult communicant of this Church in good standing.
or a member of the clergy of this Church in good standing, who shall be the Chief Operating and
Administrative Officer of the Executive Council, shall serve at the pleasure of the Executive
Council, and shall report and be accountable to the Chair of Executive Council. If a vacancy
should occur in the office of Executive Director, a successor shall be appointed in like manner.

(e) Upon joint nomination of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Executive Council shall appoint a
Financial Officer of the Executive Council, who may, but need not, be the same person as the
Treasurer of the General Convention and who shall serve at the pleasure of the Executive Council
and report and be accountable to the Chair of Executive Council. If a vacancy should occur in
that office, a successor shall be appointed in like manner.

(b) The Chair and President shall preside at meetings of the Council, shall perform such other
duties as are usual and customary for such offices, without limitation, the appointment of all
members of Committees of the Council, and shall perform such other duties as may be conferred
by Canon and by the By-laws of the Council. In the absence or at the request of the Chair, the
Vice-Chair shall preside at meetings of the Council and shall perform such other duties as may be
conferred by Canon and by the By-laws of the Council or as the Chair or the Council may from
time to time designate.

(f) The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Council, shall perform such other duties as are
customary for such office and shall perform such other duties as may be conferred by Canon and
the By-laws of the Council. In the absence or at the request of the Chair, the Vice-Chair shall
preside at meetings of the Council and shall perform such other duties as may be conferred by
Canon and by the By-laws of the Council.

(g) The Executive Council shall establish by its By-laws such committees of the Executive Council
as shall be deemed appropriate and necessary by the Executive Council for the discharge of its
duties, the members of which are to be nominated jointly by the Chair and Vice Chair and
appointed by the Council.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
- This amendment recognizes the increased role of the President of the House of Deputies and
has the effect of both sharing the leadership responsibilities as between the Presiding Bishop
and the President of the House of Deputies in nominating officers, while vesting in the
Executive Council the authority for the appointment of key officers and providing for
participatory appointment of the several committees.
- The concept of an Executive Director is new and is geared towards finding an executive
manager who will direct the programs of the Executive Council under the direction and
supervision of the Chair and President, subject to the final authority of the Executive Council.
This will be a key position in the church as this person, lay or clergy, will be, in effect, the day
to day manager of the Executive Council’s discharge of the responsibilities vested in it by the
General Convention.
STRUCTURE

- Inasmuch as a reduced and contracted national “program” in favor of expanded, parochial, diocesan, and provincial programs and one more clearly defined by and accountable to the General Convention is envisioned, the office of Executive Director should be administrative and accountable to the ongoing oversight, direction, and authority of the Chair and President and through that office to the Executive Council.

- This amendment proposes eliminating the title “Treasurer” of Executive Council and substituting “Financial Officer.” The Treasurer of the General Convention is the Treasurer for the Church. In addition, this may further reduce the appearance that Executive Council is a body separate and distinct from General Convention, rather than acting for General Convention, when General Convention is not in session.

- The offices of Financial Officer (formerly the Treasurer) of Executive Council and the Treasurer of the General Convention may but need not, be the same person. Historically, when the Treasurer of General Convention has not been the same person as the Treasurer of Executive Council, this has been a volunteer and unpaid position.

VII. THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY

Since 1821, the corporate entity holding title to real and personal property of the national church is “The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America” and embraces “all persons who are members of the Church.” It is appropriate that “All persons who have received the Sacrament of Holy Baptism with water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, whether in this Church or in another Christian church, and whose Baptisms have been duly recorded in this Church ...” (Canon I.17.1., p. 47) should be “members” in this historic society for both domestic and foreign mission and that the members of this church do not lose sight of this comprehensive call to ministry and mission.

The Executive Council of the General Convention comprises the Society’s board of directors and there is a similarity, but not exact duplication of officers. At present, the President of the House of Deputies has no role in the governance of the DFMS, except as an ex officio member of the Board of Directors. If the recommendations as to the Executive Council are adopted, it would be appropriate to also amend the Constitution and By-Laws of DFMS.

Resolution A190 Amend Canon I.3: Article III Constitution of the DFMS

Resolved, the House of ________ concurring, That Canon I.3 is hereby amended to read as follows (p. 26):

ARTICLE III. The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and such Assistant Secretaries and Assistant Treasurers other officers as may be appointed in accordance with the Canons or By-Laws. The Presiding Bishop of the Church shall be the President of the Society; one Vice President shall be the person who is the President of the House of Deputies; and the one Vice President shall be the person who is the Vice President Executive Director of the Executive Council; and shall have such powers and perform such duties as may be assigned by the By-Laws. The; the Treasurer shall be the person who is the Treasurer Financial Officer of the Executive Council; and The the Secretary shall be the person who is the Secretary of the Executive Council, and shall have such powers and perform such duties as may be assigned by the By-Laws. The other officers of the Society shall be such as are provided for by
the By-Laws thereof of the Society. The tenure of office, compensation, powers, and duties of the officers of the Society shall be such as are prescribed by the Canons and by the By-laws of the Society not inconsistent therewith.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
This amendment conforms the Constitution of DFMS to the proposed changes to the Executive Council, provides for offices which could be created, such as an Executive Vice President, as well as Assistant Secretaries and Treasurers, and removes redundant language.

Resolution A191 Amend DFMS Constitution and Conform By-Laws
Resolved, the House of ________ concurring, That, pursuant to Canon I.4. ARTICLE IV. (p. 27), this General Convention respectfully requests that the Board of Directors of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society promptly take appropriate action under the Statutes of the State of New York to amend the Constitution of the Society and to conform the By-laws of the Society to the revision of Canon I.3, ARTICLE III.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
In order to amend the Society’s Constitution as a matter of law and record, a Certificate of Amendment must be executed and filed in the State of New York.

VIII. PROVINCES

As the principles and proposals for restructuring stated above evolve, much more will be expected and required of the provinces, networks within the provinces, and networks between and among provinces and dioceses. At this time, SCS makes no recommendations as to any generic changes in the provincial structure and suggests that any such changes await the legislative outcome of action on this report and the church’s common experience arising therefrom.


LEGISLATION PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION

Resolution A192 Amend Canon I.1.2(o); Delete Joint Commission Reference
Resolved, the House of ________ concurring, That Canon I.1.2(o) be deleted (p. 17):

(o) There shall be the following Joint Commissions:

(l) A Joint Commission on Aids ....
**Explanation**
Resolution A128a of the 1994 General Convention established an AIDS Commission of the Executive Council and not as a Joint Commission of the General Convention. Accordingly, an amendment of the Canons is necessary to delete the reference to a Joint Commission on AIDS.

**Resolution A193 Amend Canon I.1.1(b) Chancellor to the President of the House of Deputies**
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.1(b) be amended by the addition of the following at the end of clause (b) thereof (p. 11):

The President may also appoint a Chancellor to the President, a confirmed adult communicant of the Church in good standing who is learned in both ecclesiastical and secular law, to serve so long as the President may desire, as counselor in matters relating to the discharge of the responsibilities of that office.

**Explanation**
The commission proposes that canonical provision be made for a Chancellor to the President of the House of Deputies to provide legal and canonical assistance. This provision mirrors that of the Chancellor to the Presiding Bishop.

**Resolution A194 Amend Canon I.1.8: Expenses for Chancellor to the President of the House of Deputies**
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Canon I.1.8. be amended to read in part as follows (p. 20):

Sec. 8. The General Convention shall adopt, at each regular meeting, a Budget to provide for the contingent expenses of the General Convention, the stipend of the Presiding Bishop together with the necessary expenses of that office, the necessary expenses of the President of the House of Deputies including the staff, the Chancellor to the President and Advisory Council required to assist in the performance of the duties and matters related to the President’s office, and the applicable Church Pension Fund assessments ...

**Explanation**
The commission proposes that canonical provision be made for the expenses of a Chancellor to the President of the House of Deputies. This provision mirrors that of the Chancellor to the Presiding Bishop.

**Resolution A195 Amend Title V: General Provision as to Vacancies on Canonical Bodies.**
Resolved, the House of _______ concurring, That Title V be amended by the addition of a new Canon V.4. to read as follows (p. 132):

CANON 4.

Of Vacancies on Canonical Bodies
Sec. 1(a) Except where the Constitution or Canons of the General Convention provide to the contrary, the term of a member in any body of the General Convention consisting of several members shall become vacant as follows:
structure

(1) upon absence from two successive regularly scheduled meetings of the body between successive regular meetings of the General Convention unless excused by the body;

(2) upon inhibition, Admonition, Suspension, or Deposition of a Member of the Clergy then serving on the body;

(3) upon the renunciation of the ministry of this Church by a Member of the Clergy;

(4) upon the certification to the Presiding Bishop by the Advisory Committee as to the abandonment of the communion of this Church by a bishop pursuant to Canon IV. 9.;

(5) upon the certification by the Standing Committee as to the abandonment of the communion of this Church by a Priest or Deacon pursuant to Canon IV. 10.; or

(6) for cause deemed sufficient by a two-thirds vote of all the members of the body.

(b) The term of any member specified to be filled by a Priest or Deacon shall become vacant upon that member's ordination to the episcopacy.

(c) The term of any Member of the Clergy specified to be filled by virtue of a provincial or diocesan canonical residence shall become vacant upon the change of canonical residence to another diocese or to a diocese in a different province, as the case may be.

(d) The term of any Lay Person specified to be filled by virtue of a provincial or diocesan residence or domicile shall become vacant upon the change of residence or domicile to another diocese or to a diocese in a different province, as the case may be.

This Resolution shall be effective as from the date of adoption.

Explanation
This addition to the Canons is intended to provide for the termination of membership on a body due to cause, ordination to the episcopacy, and a change in a member of the clergy's canonical domicile, or a lay person's change in residence or domicile where geographic representation is the intention of the requirement.

Autonomy Issues and Province IX

Resolution A196 Amend Canon I.9.1: Revision of Province IX

Resolved, the House of concuring, That Canon I.9.1. be amended as follows (p. 37):

The Ninth Province shall consist of the Dioceses of this Church in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and the Canal Zone.

Explanation
This amendment reflects the membership of the Ninth Province with the deletion of the autonomous diocese noted.

1991 General Convention Resolution A235a
Resolution A235a of the 71st General Convention requires that the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church act on proposed autonomy for Dioceses in relation to this Church. The Diocese of Panama and the Canal Zone, El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua are requesting autonomy from the Episcopal Church to form the new Iglesia Anglica de la Region Central de America (“IARCA”). The Diocese of Honduras is also accompanying this process, but will not
request autonomy at this time. This Standing Commission offers this report at the request of these Dioceses.

The commission has studied these materials made available to it in connection with this request for autonomy:

1. 1991 General Convention Resolution A235a and the time line for compliance.
2. Minutes of the Central American Covenant Committee meeting of December 5-6, 1995.
3. Letter dated June 13, 1996 from The Rev. Dr. Ian Douglas to Mr. Vincent Currie.
5. Draft of the Covenant dated June 19, 1996 between IARCA and ECUSA.
6. Copy of the Executive Council Resolution dated November 18, 1996 concerning autonomy for IARCA.

Based upon its review of these materials, the commission approves in principle the request to create the Iglesia Anglican de la Region Central de America.

The commission acknowledges the effort and commitment to this work by the Covenant Committee. To aid the implementation of the plan for autonomy, the commission recommends that the ECUSA membership of the Covenant Committee be expanded to include representatives from:

- The Office of the Presiding Bishop
- The Executive Council
- The Standing Commission on World Mission
- The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church
- The Office of the Treasurer of General Convention.
- The Church Pension Fund

The expanded team will work with the Covenant Committee to coordinate and define the entire process for and the pathway to autonomy to be presented to the General Convention in 2000.

**Consideration of Province IX**

The autonomy of the Iglesia Anglicana de la Region Central de America will have a substantial impact upon the role, structure, and composition of Province IX. Inasmuch as upon the autonomy of IARCA the Ninth Province shall consist only of the dioceses of this Church in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, and Honduras, it is appropriate to consider the structure of the Ninth Province at this time in contemplation of the grant of autonomy.

**Resolution A197 Province IX Task Force**

1. Resolved, the House of ________ concurring, That a Task Force be created by the General Convention consisting of representatives of the Dioceses of this Church in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador and Honduras, The Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Executive Council, the Standing Commission on World Mission, and the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church to jointly study the structure and role of the Ninth Province following the autonomy of the Iglesia Anglicana de la Region Central de America and make recommendations thereon to the General Convention in 2000.
1994 - 1997 FINANCIAL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated</td>
<td>$12,667</td>
<td>$25,437</td>
<td>$12,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>$25,176</td>
<td>$26,965</td>
<td>$8,500 (estimate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED BUDGET AND BUDGET RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolution A198 Standing Commission on Structure Budget Appropriation

Resolved, the House of ______ concurring, That there be appropriated from the Assessment Budget of General Convention for the expenses of the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church the sum of $48,500 for the triennium 1997-2000.

SCS REPORT ON 1994 A038a: APPENDIX “A”

1994 GENERAL CONVENTION ACTIONS ON ALL SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“A”</th>
<th>“B”</th>
<th>“C”</th>
<th>“D”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resolutions</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Action by Both Houses</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Rejected</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Adopted by one House but Not Concurred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Discharged</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Referred to Interim Body</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action by One House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Resolution subject to inclusion in Budget</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent to Consecration of a Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Bishops’ Courtesy Resolutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Deputies’ Courtesy Resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Bishop’s Rules of Order Amendments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Deputies’ Rules of Order Amendments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Resolutions Considered from all Sources: 359

Note:
“A” Resolutions are Resolutions of Interim Bodies, printed in the Blue Book.
“B” Resolutions are Resolutions submitted by Bishops under the Rules of Order of the House of Bishops.
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"C" Resolutions are Resolutions submitted by Provinces and Dioceses under the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies.
"D" Resolutions are Resolutions submitted by Deputies under the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies.

SCS REPORT ON 1994 A038a: APPENDIX "B"

INTERIM BODIES OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
Committees, Commissions, Boards and Agencies, 1994-1997

Standing Commissions
- On Constitution and Canons
- On Ecumenical relations
- On Evangelism
- On Health
- On Human Affairs
- Standing Liturgical Commission
- On the Church in Metropolitan Areas
- On Church Music
- On Peace with Justice
- On the Church in Small Communities
- On Stewardship and Development
- On the Structure of the Church
- On World Mission

Joint Standing Committees
- On Nominations
- On Planning & Arrangements
- On Program, Budget and Finance

Boards and Agencies
- The General Board of Examining Chaplains
- The Church Deployment Board
- The Board of Trustees for the Church Pension Fund
- The Executive Council
- The Board of Trustees for the General Theological Seminary
- The Board for Theological Education
- The Board of Archives of the Episcopal Church
- The Council for the Development of Ministry
- Forward Movement Publications

Committees Reporting to General Convention
- Committee on Continuing the Dialogue on Human Sexuality (B012a)
- Joint Nominating Committee for the Election of the Presiding Bishop
- Committee on Sexual Exploitation (A063)

Committees Reporting to Executive Council
- Commission on HIV/AIDS (A128a)
- Justice Peace and Integrity of Creation
- Economic Justice Implementation Committee for 1995 (D124)
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Environment Working Group (A041a)
Jubilee Working Group (A082)
Anti- Racism Working Group (A047)
Committee on the Status of Women (A049)
Dialogue Committee on Canon III.8.1 (C004sa)

Committees Reporting to the President of the House of Deputies
President of the House of Deputies Advisory Council
Committee on the State of the Church

Committees Reporting to the Presiding Bishop/House of Bishops
House of Bishops Council of Advice
House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development

ENDNOTES

1 As used in this Report, “Interim Bodies” shall mean all Standing Commissions and Joint Commissions established by the General Convention and/or the Canons, and all other such bodies established or whose establishment is directed by Resolution of the General Convention and/or the Executive Council (other than internal committees established under the By-Laws of the Executive Council and/or Domestic & Foreign Missionary Society).


3 In addition to the citation of the Constitution, a Canon or Rule of Order in a proposed Resolution, the page of the Constitution and Canons 1994 is also cited for ease of reference.


5 Ibid, p. 10

6 Ibid, p. 12

7 As used in this Report, “national church staff” shall mean those positions staffed and operating for example in the program and other areas of the church primarily at the Church Center and also in satellite offices.

8 See for example: Journal of the General Convention, 1964, pp.312-313

9 In keeping with the revisions as to Titles III and IV substituting “Priest” for “Presbyter”, the canonical proposals in this Report will make the same revisions.

10 As used in this Report, “agencies” or “church agencies” shall mean independently established and/or incorporated entities allied and affiliated with the church, for example: the several seminaries, the Episcopal Church Foundation, Episcopal Church Building Fund, Presiding Bishop’s Fund for World Relief.
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14 Ibid, Foster, p. 23.