

GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP

REPORT TO GENERAL SYNOD

June 2007

Origin and History of the Governance Working Group

The Governance Working Group (“GWG”) came into being as a result of Act 54 of the General Synod of 2004, viz: “That this General Synod request the Council of General Synod to review the governance of General Synod with a view to enhancing the work and mission of General Synod.”

In late spring and early summer 2005 the Primate appointed the following members to the GWG:

Ms. Shelagh Balfour (Rupert’s Land)
The Venerable Sidney Black (Calgary)
The Venerable Jim Boyles (Toronto)
The Honourable Mr. Justice Brian Burrows (Edmonton)
The Very Reverend Peter Elliott (New Westminster)
The Venerable Helena-Rose Houldcroft (Qu’Appelle)
Mr. Tim Morgan (Rupert’s Land)
The Most Reverend David Crawley (Kootenay), Chair

The following terms of reference were drawn up by a group of General Synod officers and staff:

Purpose

To examine the governance of the General Synod and prepare a report proposing a new structure or possible structures.

Membership

Not more than six people, appointed by the Primate on behalf of the Planning and Agenda Team (“PAT”) and representative of the orders of lay, clergy and bishops.

Timeline

GWG to be appointed in June 2005

Progress report to PAT for its meeting Oct. 7-8, 2005, with possible adjustment of terms of reference if advisable.

Final report to PAT for its meeting March 16-17, 2006, with possible extension of the timeline and terms of reference.

Terms of Reference

To prepare a report that summarizes the current context in which the General Synod is governed, including but not limited to:

- review the governance implications for the General Synod of the separate incorporation of PWRDF, the Pension Department, and The Anglican Journal
- review alternate models of governance being developed by Aboriginal Anglicans, dioceses, provinces as well as inter-diocesan agreements, drawing out the implications for the overall structure and governance of the whole church
- review the role or roles of the partners, (aboriginal, ecumenical, overseas, religious orders, etc.), that attend General Synod, the Council of General Synod (“COGS”) and its committees, councils and boards, highlighting the positive and negative aspects of these roles.
- review the current process for electing General Synod members, highlighting positive and negative aspects of this process.
- review of the Handbook of General Synod to determine timeline for making changes to governance, suggesting possible ways of speeding up the change process.
- review the model for shared Episcopal ministry, highlighting possible future structural changes this model might precipitate.
- include in the report suggestions for a process to encourage discussion of governance at diocesan and provincial synods, committees, commissions and other gatherings.
- propose new structures for governance within the Anglican Church of Canada, including the General Synod, Provincial Synods and Dioceses.

The GWG realized that the envisioned task was both broader and deeper than the members had originally understood it to be, that time was short and the budget very limited. It was decided that a member, or sometimes two members, would work on each of the first seven designated tasks.

The group met by conference call on July 25th and Sept. 28th, 2005, and face to face in Toronto from Sunday evening Nov. 20th – Tuesday noon Nov. 22nd. A report was presented to PAT in March 2006 and to the Council of General Synod in May 2006. At that meeting the GWG was reconstituted with the following membership:

The Venerable Sid Black (Calgary) (*reappointed in November 2006*)
The Venerable Jim Boyles (Toronto)
The Honourable Mr. Justice Brian Burrows (Edmonton)
The Most Reverend David Crawley (Kootenay)
The Very Reverend Peter Elliott (New Westminster)
Mr. Bob Falby (Toronto - *Chancellor*)
The Most Reverend Caleb Lawrence (Moosonee) (added in November 2006)
The Right Reverend Sue Moxley (Nova Scotia & PEI)
The Venerable Dr. Michael Pollesel (*General Secretary*)
Ms. Sue Winn (Montreal - *Deputy Prolocutor, General Synod*)

Staff: Ms. Margaret Shawyer

A new timeline for reporting was provided and the group was directed to work particularly on Section 8 of the terms of reference, i.e., new structures for governance within the Anglican Church of Canada.

The new group had a number of telephone meetings and one face to face meeting. Although it was necessary to broaden the base of the original group, the departure of three members, the addition of four new members, and the late appointment of two members meant a good deal of restarting.

In March 2007 the GWG presented to COGS a series of motions that it proposed should be presented to General Synod. The motions were listed in three categories as follows:

- motions to enable and facilitate change
- motions that will change the structures of General Synod
- a motion proposing a process to deal with structural matters that are not within the legislative power of the General Synod.

COGS directed that the motions in Categories 1 & 3 should go forward to General Synod, but those in Category 2 were referred back to a reconstituted and remanded GWG for further work, and therefore will not come before this General Synod. The motions coming before you will be described in the body of this report, and for legislative purposes are listed appropriately in the convening circular.

Why Restructure?

Several factors, some already present, others either clearly foreseeable or distinctly possible, lie behind Act 54 of the 2004 General Synod.

Among those factors already present is a widely-held view that our Church is over-governed, i.e., our governance structures are too big, too multi-layered and too complicated. The result is that at every level of the Church too much time, energy and money is spent managing the structures; time, energy, and money that could be better spent furthering the God-given mission of the Church.

A second factor pressing hard upon us is a lack of money at virtually every level of our Church.

A third factor is the distinct lack of interest in “running” the institution among many of its younger members – particularly those under forty (the so-called “Generation X”) – who have little trust in institutions generally.

Among factors that are clearly foreseeable or distinctly possible, the most important and immediate is the endorsement by General Synod of the “New Agape” proposal for a self-governing aboriginal “church within a church”. As this plan moves to fruition profound changes in our governing structures will take place at national, provincial, diocesan and even parish levels.

Although what will happen at the international Anglican level is as yet unclear, that the Anglican Communion may split along theological lines (a not unknown phenomenon in the history of Christianity) is a distinct possibility that could well result in two or more separate or largely separate Anglican entities in Canada.

While these and probably other factors press us from the inside to consider the nature and scope of our governing structures, from the outside the increasing secularization of society both presses us and offers us a unique opportunity to seek change.

Since Constantine joined the Christian Church to the Roman Empire by the closest possible ties, churches have tended to take on, officially or unofficially, the character and governance models of the secular state. To this day the Roman Catholic Church retains the central governance and organizational homogeneity characteristic of the Roman Empire – “all roads still lead to Rome”.

In Canada Christianity became virtually co-terminus with the wider society. Churches took on its dominant political/legal/business model as their form of governance, and to a significant degree as their way of life. There grew up an unspoken and often unrecognized compact between church and state. Governments granted the churches status, privilege and power, tailoring legislation to reflect the practices of the major Christian bodies. In return the churches, by and large, supported the structures and institutions of society. The death of this compact was proven beyond dispute by the conflict between government and church over issues arising from the Residential Schools.

The Church in its widest sense, i.e. institutionalized Christianity, and society are no longer co-terminus, a change that allows us to recreate the Church’s structures and life to reflect not the values of society but the values of the Gospel.

Central in the Gospel is the puzzling God/man figure of Jesus Christ and central to our understanding of Him is the concept of faithfulness. In Jesus the Christ we see what Scottish theologian T.F. Torrance once described at the “Incarnate Faithfulness of God and the answering faithfulness of man”. The faithfulness of Jesus Christ includes within one person the faithfulness of God and the responding faithfulness of the man Jesus. As it was for Jesus, faith for us is faith in the faithfulness of God, or in simpler terms, trust in God’s trustworthiness. “Trustworthy” describes not only the nature of God but inevitably it must also describe the life of the Church. Trust must be at the core of our life, our structures, our governance and our mission.

It was a concern for mission that led, in 1893, the Provinces of Canada and Rupert’s Land, with the extra-provincial dioceses in British Columbia, to create the Anglican Church of Canada. To do so, the church leaders of the day had to overcome a great deal of mistrust between the predominantly mission church of the west and the settler church of the east. One can see not only in our Constitution and Canons, but in the structural nature of our Church evidence of this mistrust.

It is not difficult to see that the enormous impending changes in the life of our Church will necessitate relying more on trust and less on long used and canonically enshrined patterns and practices.

Some fifty years ago, when the several semi-autonomous boards, councils, societies and committees that did the work of the Church at the national level were integrated (more or less) the vision was one Church – One Program. We would like to suggest that we need to think now of One Church – One Body, but acknowledge that the manner in which the parts of the Body relate to one another needs to be reconceived.

Our legal and operational structures have always been based on geography. Parishes, dioceses, provinces and the national church were all geographical entities that defined the boundaries of both responsibility and authority. In England parishes were not just ecclesiastical entities but also the units of local government. The vestigial remains of this system can still be seen in some parts

of Canada in the names of districts or communities. In larger centres we have long since given up the idea that residence within the boundaries of a parish is the basis of membership in the

community of faith. Even the more reasonable idea that parish boundaries define the area of responsibility for mission of a congregation has begun to vanish. Where there is a variety of congregations the faithful make their choices for theological, liturgical, family, historical or any of a dozen of other reasons.

We have kept the formal structure of a parish-based church but have adjusted it to the realities of a highly mobile society. We have begun to move slowly and with an appropriately high degree of hesitation into a similar adjustment of the geographical basis of diocesan responsibility and authority. The recent guidelines on the provision of alternate episcopal care are a very small - and for some very unwelcome - step in that direction. If the "New Agape" develops as proposed, the principle of a non-geographical jurisdiction will be extended beyond the diocesan level to the provincial and national.

It may be that some of our dioceses will merge with others or disappear altogether. It may be that provinces will disappear or be radically reshaped into non-geographical, interest-based affiliations. The Council of the North is just such a body which, although it exists in parallel to geographically-based jurisdictions, is seen by many of its members as more valuable and more important than provincial structures.

At the national level we will have to develop structures that strike the right balance between being one church that acts together on certain matters and allowing its component parts a significant degree of autonomy.

Dealing with these changes creatively and usefully will require not only a new perception of what it means to be One Church-One Body but also very significant changes to our governance structures. These cannot be accomplished quickly. Many of the necessary changes would, under our present Constitutions and Canons, take up to six years to bring into being.

The Governance Working Group has had neither time nor budget to develop a comprehensive and detailed plan for changing our governance structures. We have looked at the issues that we perceive to be fueling the belief that we need to change the way we govern ourselves, and to the best of our ability have tried to see their implications. In the last section of this report we have proposed a number of actions that can be undertaken in the next two to four years. The actions are largely designed to prepare the way for the comprehensive and far reaching steps that we believe will be more evident and more needed as the full implications of impending change become clearer.

We have done so believing that planning is not foretelling the future, but rather seeing clearly the implications of our decisions. Our work has been based on the basic premise that the purpose of governance is to enable the Church to fulfill its God-given mission to worship God and to serve the world for which Christ died by its proclamation, Spirit-filled community and service.

Governance

The purpose of governance is to enable an organization to achieve its goals. Corporate governance is the system by which corporations are directed and controlled. The corporate

governance structure specifies the distribution of rights and responsibilities among different participants in the corporation. By doing this, it also provides the structure through which the organization's objectives are set, and provides the means of attaining those objectives and monitoring performance.

In the case of our church, governance structure should specify the rights and responsibilities among the different participants in the church. Governance should provide the structure through which the church's mission is accomplished, and means of attaining the church's objectives and of monitoring the work of the church. The structures and processes should serve the mission of the church.

Some Thoughts on Mission

The mission of the church is given to it by God and it is not for the church to alter it, although the way in which it is understood, expressed and carried out has varied greatly over the centuries and from place to place. In its simplest form the mission of the church is to worship God and to serve the world for which Christ died. This service has three elements:

- (i) proclamation of the Gospel (in the language of Scripture, *Kerygma*)
- (ii) creation of spirit-filled loving community (*Koinonia*)
- (iii) service to the world, especially to the dispossessed (*Diaconia*).

These elements cannot be neatly separated, for it is the life of the community that authenticates to its hearers the proclamation of the Gospel. "If you would know the truth of what I say, see how these Christians love one another". At the heart of this community lies the radical equality of the two great sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. All come to the altar as penitent sinners, all leave the altar with the same gift of grace, no more, no less, for in the eyes of God all are of equal value. The community as a whole and its members as individuals must struggle constantly to make real in the life of community this radical equality and to extend it into a difficult and demanding but ultimately redeemed and redeemable world.

Although the church's mission is unchanging, the organizational structures and the strategies with which it is fulfilled must change to suit the time and place. It was this need that led to the creation of the General Synod in 1893. At that first General Synod, Archbishop Robert Machray, Metropolitan of Rupert's Land and first Primate of All Canada, identified the following reasons for forming a General Synod:

- United practical work through systematizing, unifying and consolidating the work of the church in its various departments for the purpose of improved mission to the north and the west.
 "Surely the vast mission field will have its needs much more clearly recognized and more adequately met, if the whole church has them kept before it, and is made to feel its responsibility" (Machray)

- Provision of any necessary additional services so that there may be, if possible, a uniformity of use throughout the Dominion.
 “It would seem then that while the Church is busy promoting missions, despatching missionaries, and making proselytes, the very condition still wanting which our Lord regarded as the precursor of belief and the acceptance of His divine mission, and how often is the fact of disunity a pointed objection to the acceptance of faith by unbelievers” (Machray)
- Stating the mind of the Church on social, moral and religious questions as may be needed. (Unfortunately, he didn't address this in the sermon!)

Archbishop Machray clearly saw the purpose of General Synod as reflecting the church's mission of proclamation, community and service. While we would describe them in different terms and on a wider perspective, in general his reasons remain the purposes of General Synod.

Structures do not in themselves fulfill the mission of the church, but they can either enable or inhibit its fulfillment. The goal of the work envisioned in Act 54 of the 2004 General Synod was to assist the General Synod to be more enabling. The Council of General Synod, recognizing the reality of the life of our church, enlarged that task to include the provinces and dioceses.

The Nature of our Structures

When the idea of a national structure for the various bodies of the Church of England (and Ireland) in Canada came into fruition in 1893 there were two ecclesiastical provinces: Canada and Rupert's Land. In addition there were three extra-provincial dioceses in British Columbia. Twenty of our thirty dioceses were already established. There was significant mistrust between the predominantly “missionary church” with its vast, largely empty lands, and the “settler church” with its growing cities. The most difficult question to settle was the nature of representation on General Synod. Should it be equal representation as was the case in the provincial synods, or should it be some form of representation by population? Eventually it was decided to have the latter, although it was recognized that the huge differences in population size precluded the possibility of a true representation by population.

To provide for a balance of power what developed was a confederal system that defined the powers of the General Synod and of the provincial synods, leaving all other powers to the dioceses, which differ significantly in terms of legal structure, Canons, and practices. In contrast, the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. began as one jurisdiction with one bishop and was divided, so it has a federal system in which all undefined jurisdiction belongs to the national church.

This confederal system has its consequences. For example, we have no national legal definition of membership, so we cannot base General Synod representation on general membership. We base it instead on the number of licensed clergy, but that is no more reliable because each diocese decides who is licensed and who functions on the authority of a letter of permission to officiate. The General Synod has the authority to rule on matters of doctrine and discipline but nowhere is either doctrine or discipline defined, and the Constitution and Canons provide no means of determining it except the Court of Appeal which involves a lengthy and expensive process of litigation. Inevitably matters for decision arise that were not contemplated in 1893, e.g., the ordination of women to the priesthood.

The continuation of the episcopacy is the responsibility of the provincial Metropolitans and the provincial Houses of Bishops. Each provincial Metropolitan is responsible for the pastoral care and discipline of the bishops of his/her province. The provincial synods have the authority to create new dioceses and to change diocesan boundaries with the consent of the dioceses affected and the approval of General Synod. However, most of our dioceses were incorporated by an act of civil legislation making change even more complicated.

But our confederal structure is not the only factor that complicates the task of restructuring our church. Our church inherently, at each level, has two parallel components. One is the synodical system which governs the church. The other is the Episcopal system which orders the church. The governance structures include synods, council, church committees. The ordering structure includes bishops, archdeacons, regional deans and clergy. Although these two structures intersect at some points, each has specific responsibilities. Sometimes, because some of those responsibilities are based upon tradition rather than legislation uncertainty and even conflict arise.

This is further complicated because, except when it is sitting as part of General Synod, the national House of Bishops has no constitutional status. What authority it has is based not in itself but in the fact that its members have, in a variety of forms, diocesan jurisdiction. In that it is somewhat akin to a meeting of provincial and territorial premiers.

Any major restructuring can only proceed with the trust and cooperation of all levels of our church.

PROPOSED MOTIONS for GENERAL SYNOD:

CATEGORY ONE:

These are motions that will alter the Declaration of Principles, the Constitution and the Rules of Order, so that changes, other than those of Doctrine or Discipline, can be made at one meeting of General Synod.

A. In May 2006 the Council of General Synod directed the Chancellor to write a resolution removing the description of the membership of General Synod from the Declaration of Principles, leaving it in the Constitution. It now appears in both. The text of this motion is not included in this report as COGS has already dealt with it.

B. Reform of Requirements for Adoption of Legislation

Note: For convenience, the present wording of each subsection section is inserted in a different font after the proposed wording of the subsection. These insertions are not part of the motion.

1. That the Declaration of Principles, section 11 be amended to read as follows:
11. Amendments

a) *Notice of Motion*

No amendment to the Declaration of Principles, no amendment to the Constitution, no Canon, and no amendment to any existing Canon, shall be proposed to, or enacted by, the General Synod unless notice has been transmitted by the General Secretary of the General Synod to the members of the General Synod at least 90 days before the meeting of the General Synod, or unless it has been left over as unfinished business and printed in the journal of the previous session of the General Synod.

No Canon, or amendment to the Declaration of Principles or to the Constitution or to any existing Canon, shall be proposed or enacted unless notice has been transmitted by the General Secretary of the General Synod to the members of the General Synod at least thirty days before the meeting of the General Synod, or unless it has been left over as unfinished business and printed in the journal of the previous session. [Rules of Order and Procedure, s. 13]

b) *Amendments to the Declaration of Principles*

- i) The Solemn Declaration of the Declaration of Principles belongs in a particular historic context and therefore cannot be altered or amended.

The Solemn Declaration of the Declaration of Principles, while continuing to be part of the Declaration of Principles belongs in a particular historic context and therefore cannot be altered or amended.

- ii) An amendment to the Declaration of Principles can be considered only when a majority of each Order is present at the session of the General Synod.

A change in the Declaration of Principles (except for section 1) can be considered when a majority of each Order is present at a session of the General Synod.

- iii) Subject to subsection iv), an amendment to the Declaration of Principles shall take effect when passed by a two-thirds majority in each Order.

To take effect it shall require a two-thirds majority in each Order voting at two successive sessions of the General Synod, the change proposed having been referred for consideration to all dioceses and provincial synods following the first approval of the General Synod.

- iv) An amendment to sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Declaration of Principles shall take effect only when the General Synod has adopted it in the manner prescribed in subsection iii), and the synods of each of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Anglican Church of Canada have consented to it.

No change in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Declaration of Principles can be effected without the consent of all provincial synods . . .

- v) The synod of an ecclesiastical province of the Anglican Church of Canada shall be deemed to have consented to an amendment to section 6, 7 or 8 of the Declaration of Principles adopted by the General Synod if no resolution proposing consent to the amendment has been voted upon in the provincial synod before the expiration of 3 years from the date the amendment was passed by the General Synod.

. . . except that if a vote on the proposed amendment has not taken place in any provincial synod prior to the next regular session of the General Synod, such provincial synod shall be deemed to have approved the amendment.

- vi) Where a proposed amendment to the Declaration of Principles has been defeated by the General Synod, or where an amendment to section 6, 7 or 8 of the Declaration of Principles passed by the General Synod has not taken effect pursuant to subsection iv), the proposed amendment may be introduced again at any subsequent session of the General Synod.

Any proposed amendment to the Declaration of Principles which has been defeated by a vote of the General Synod, or of a provincial synod with respect to sections 6, 7 and 8, may be introduced again at any subsequent session of the General Synod.

b) *Amendments to the Constitution*

- i) An amendment to a section of the Constitution which has its origin in the Declaration of Principles must be consistent with the Principle concerned.
- ii) An amendment to the Constitution of the General Synod shall take effect when passed by a two-thirds majority of each Order voting at a session of the General Synod.

The Constitution of the General Synod may be amended by a two-thirds majority of each Order voting at a session of the General Synod, except that any section of the Constitution which has its origin in the Declaration of Principles must be consistent with the Principle concerned.

c) *Canons and Amendments to Canons*

- i) All Canons dealing with doctrine, and amendments to such Canons, shall take effect when passed by a two-thirds majority in each Order at two successive sessions of the General Synod, the Canon or amendment proposed having been referred for consideration to diocesan and provincial synods, following the first approval of the General Synod.

All Canons dealing with doctrine, worship, or discipline, and all alterations to such Canons, shall require to be passed by a two-thirds majority in each Order voting at two successive sessions of the General Synod, the Canons and alterations proposed having been referred for consideration to diocesan and provincial synods, following the first approval of the General Synod.

- ii) All Canons dealing with matters other than doctrine or amendments to such Canons, shall take effect when passed by a two-thirds majority of the Order of Bishops, and of the Orders of Clergy and Laity voting together.

All other Canons may be approved or amended by a two-thirds majority of the Order of Bishops, and of the Orders of Clergy and Laity voting together.

d) *Amendments to the Rules of Order and Procedure*

An amendment to the Rules of Order and Procedure shall take effect when passed by a two-thirds majority of the Order of Bishops, and of the Orders and Clergy and Laity voting together.

The Rules of Order and Procedure may be amended at any regular session of the General Synod by a two-thirds majority of the members voting in the normal manner.

e) *Amendments on Second Reading at Synod*

- i) Where a resolution proposing a Canon dealing with doctrine or an amendment to such a Canon has been:
 - a) passed at one session of the General Synod,
 - b) referred for consideration to all diocesan and provincial synod, and
 - c) brought before a second session of the General Synod,

it shall be in order for the General Synod to adopt any amendment to the resolution which would have been in order when the resolution was considered at the first session of the General Synod.

- ii) A resolution amended pursuant to subsection i) shall take effect if passed by the required majority at the second session notwithstanding the amendment.

Where a proposed change to the Declaration of Principles (other than to sections 6, 7, or 8 thereof) or to a Canon dealing with doctrine, worship, or discipline has been:

- a) *passed at one session of the General Synod,*

- b) *referred for consideration to all diocesan and provincial synod,
and*
- c) *brought before a second session of the General
Synod for consideration,*

it shall be in order for the General Synod to adopt any amendment to the proposed change which would have been in order when the proposed change was considered at the first session of the General Synod and the proposed change shall take effect if passed by the required majority at the second session with or without such amendment.

Where a proposed change to sections 6, 7 or 8 of the Declaration of Principles has been:

- a) *passed by the required majority at one
session of the General Synod,*
- b) *referred for the consideration of all diocesan
synods,*
- c) *referred for consent to all provincial synods, and*
- d) *brought before a second session of the General
Synod for consideration,*

it shall be in order for the General Synod to adopt any amendment which does not alter the proposed change in any substantive way but which merely improves the clarity or form of the proposed change and the proposed change shall take effect if passed by the required majority at the second session with or without such amendment.

2. Upon the coming into force of section 1 of this resolution, Rules of Order and Procedure, section 13 shall be repealed.

Explanation

Under the present rules certain types of legislation require a higher level of approval than regular resolutions.

Amendments to most of the Declaration of Principles, and to Canons dealing with doctrine, worship or discipline, and amendments to such Canons, come into effect only when passed by a 2/3 majority of each of the three Orders of the General Synod at two successive sessions. Between sessions they must be referred to all diocesan and provincial synods for consideration.

Amendments to the three sections of the Declaration of Principles which distribute jurisdiction between the General Synod and the Provinces and which describe the General Synod's jurisdiction regarding discipline (section 6, 7 and 8) must also have the consent of the provinces before they are brought before the second session of the General Synod.

These higher approval standards exist for at least two reasons: 1) the subject matter of such legislation is of a high level of importance and 2) legislation on these subjects affects the whole church so there should be a high level of consultation prior to enactment.

Because General Synod cannot act at one session to enact this type of legislation, progress towards the accomplishment of structural and other changes can be very slow. The Governance Working Group is of the view that this is an impediment to efficient and effective governance. It believes that, with one exception, the requirement that these types of legislation be passed at two successive synods should be abandoned.

Obviously, this would mean that the requirement for reference of such legislation to dioceses and provinces for consideration would also be abandoned. Rather, the GWG proposes that the requirement for notice of motion be increased from 30 days to 90 days. This would give members of General Synod time to consult in their dioceses about the proposed change before synod.

Where the proposed change is to the jurisdiction distributing sections, provincial consent would still be required. Such a change would not come into force until consented to. If a provincial synod did not consider the change during the 3 years following its enactment by General Synod, it would be deemed to have consented.

The one exception to this proposed change relates to matters of doctrine. The GWG is of the view that matters of doctrine are sufficiently important that Canons dealing with them should come into effect only when passed by the required majority at two successive synods with reference between synods to dioceses and provinces.

Other changes to the existing provisions have been made to improve the drafting. They are not intended to be substantive.

To come into effect, this resolution, being an amendment to the Declaration of Principles, would need to be passed by a 2/3 majority of each Order of the General Synod voting separately, and two successive sessions having been referred between those sessions to the dioceses and provinces for consideration.

CATEGORY TWO:

These resolutions concerning the membership of both General Synod and the Council of General Synod were referred by COGS back to the GWG for further development, and therefore are not included.

CATEGORY THREE:

As noted above, the confederal nature of our church means that many matters lie entirely or partly outside the jurisdiction of General Synod. . It is clear that any serious discussion of structure must include all levels of the church. The following motion is an attempt to begin that process:

That the Primate, after consultation with the House of Bishops, be requested to initiate discussion with the provinces and dioceses of the Anglican Church of Canada regarding:

- 1) the possible reform of the provincial organization of the Anglican Church of Canada, and, in particular, whether the effectiveness and efficiency of the Anglican Church of Canada would be significantly improved by:
 - a) entirely eliminating the four provinces from the organizational structure of the church and transferring the powers and authority the provinces presently hold to the General Synod, or
 - b) maintaining the existing provincial structure for some part of its present purpose and transferring part of provincial power and authority, for example part or all of provincial legislative authority, to the General Synod, or
 - c) reorganizing the dioceses into groupings with greater common goals, concerns, needs and interests than the collections of dioceses forming the existing provinces.

- 2) the possible reform of the diocesan organization of the Anglican Church of Canada, in particular by:
 - a) adjusting diocesan boundaries to reflect modern transportation patterns and population shifts created by social and economic changes,
 - b) reducing of the number of dioceses within the Anglican Church of Canada,
 - c) implementing any other change that might improve the effectiveness, efficiency, or economy of the operation of dioceses.

Explanation

General Synod in 2004 asked the Council of General Synod to review its governance structures. The Governance Working Group undertook this work and is presenting to General Synod several recommendations and proposed constitutional changes that would affect the form and operations of the General Synod.

In pursuing this work it soon became evident that issues of governance arise at all levels of church life. Although General Synod has no jurisdiction with regard to the organization or life of provinces, dioceses or parishes, it does have a concern for the well-being of the entire church, as expressed in Section 8 of the Declaration of Principles:

- i. Subject to the provisions of Section 7 the General Synod shall have authority and jurisdiction in all matters affecting in any way the general interest and well-being of the whole Church ...

In this spirit the Working Group proposed to the Council of General Synod that other levels of church government - provinces and dioceses - be invited into discussions on the points raised above.

Role of Provinces

It is always a risk for General Synod to raise questions about provincial synods. Inevitably it will be interpreted as an improper quest for a more centralized authority. In framing this resolution however, the attempt is to invite dioceses and provinces into discussion about the amount of government that is appropriate in this day and age for a declining church. Is our current three level structure sustainable? Would it be possible for provinces to cede its jurisdiction to General Synod, in fact making the national church the 'province' as that term is understood in other parts of the Anglican Communion? Another approach might be to cede some elements of jurisdiction and retain others, perhaps replacing provincial synods with less formal provincial councils.

Diocesan and Provincial Boundaries

Jurisdiction with regard to boundaries and realignments or amalgamations rests with provinces and dioceses, although the consent of the General Synod is required (Declaration of Principles, Section 7.b.iii). Canada was divided into provinces and dioceses as the country was settled and in relation to transportation and settlement patterns that were relevant at the time. Some dioceses and provinces correspond to civil jurisdictions; some do not. Some are small, some large, some heavily populated, some sparsely so. In recent years there has never been a systematic study of dioceses and provinces in relation to population, geography, transport patterns and cultural communities.

Several factors would suggest that such a study and conversation is appropriate now:

- a) Since 1971 the number of Anglicans identified in the Canadian census has decreased by 20%. Church statistics collected from dioceses indicate that the number of Anglicans on parish rolls had decreased by 42%. The attached appendix shows the decrease by diocese. While numbers have decreased substantially during this period, governance structures have been unchanged, in fact in some instances, have grown. General Synod itself now has approximately 20 more members than it did in 1971.
- b) Financing the work of the church at all levels is an increasing challenge. The proportion of budgets that supports governance grows, as it is usually easier to cut expenses in other areas of work. The mission of the church suffers. Ministry in the northern dioceses through the Council of the North is threatened as the General Synod budget is under continuing pressure.
- c) A volunteer organization always struggles with a governance model that involves a wide representation of members in governance, and at the same time provides the volunteer hours needed in front line service. Time taken at parish meetings, diocesan synods or national committee gatherings might diminish the possibilities for mission in neighbourhoods and on the streets.
- d) The church has much to learn from secular society in matters of efficiency in governance. There are experts in our pews who know how organizations operate, how leadership is nurtured and supported. There is an opportunity to call forth these people and engage them in discussion and debate as to our organization and its effectiveness.

Number of Dioceses

In 1971 there was an average of 38,249 Anglicans in each diocese, according to the parish rolls. By 2001, that number had dropped to 21,395. Twenty dioceses had numbers below this average. There may be significant advantages in reducing the number of dioceses in several parts of the country by amalgamation or grouping of dioceses to seek efficiencies in delivery of ministry and in administrative costs.

If the above motion is passed by General Synod, further work would need to be done in preparation of a series of papers expanding on the issues of jurisdiction, the history and evolution of provinces, dioceses and General Synod, and possible options to assist in promoting and furthering these discussions.

Governance Issues related to the office of National Indigenous Bishop

One of the original tasks assigned to the Governance Working Groups was “to review alternative models of governance being developed by Aboriginal Anglicans . . . drawing out the implications for the overall structure and governance of the whole church”. The first report of the GWG in March 2006 included a discussion of this matter.

Since then, Bishop Mark MacDonald has been appointed as the first National Indigenous Anglican Bishop. He will now lead the national church’s ministry with indigenous Anglicans. This is an important step in the implementation of the 1995 General Synod Resolution supporting these initiatives and of the petition of the Sacred Circle presented to the Primate at Pinawa in 2005.

Currently Bishop MacDonald functions as a member of the General Synod Staff. It is intended, however, that his position will evolve into a full episcopal office, future incumbents of which will be elected by a representative assembly, be consecrated if not already a bishop, have a status in the church equal to that of all other bishops, and have Episcopal authority within a defined jurisdiction.

At present the legislative authority relating to Episcopal offices resides with the ecclesiastical provinces. General Synod in 2007 will be asked to consider legislation that would create jurisdiction in General Synod in relation to the office of national Indigenous Anglican Bishop equivalent to the jurisdiction presently held by the p[rovinces in relation to “conventional” bishops. This new General Synod authority can be created only with the consent of the Provinces. If the General Synods of 2007 and 2010 adopt this legislation, and if the provinces consent, it will be possible for the General Synod to adopt legislation relating to the election, confirmation and consecration of the National Indigenous Anglican Bishop at the General Synod of 2010.

It appears, therefore, that over the next three years there should be careful consultations and discussions concerning the many issues raised by this proposed evolution of the office of National Indigenous Anglican Bishop. These issues include:

- a) Issues relating to the election of future National Indigenous Anglican Bishops;

What will be the electing body? How will its members be selected? What will the nomination and election procedures be? How will the election be confirmed in the community of bishops? How will the bishop-elect be consecrated?

- b) Issues relating to the authority of the National Indigenous Anglican Bishop.

The Governance Working Group is grateful for the support of General Synod staff, especially Margaret Shawyer.

Respectfully submitted,

Governance Working Group