

# The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	401
Commission Membership .....	402
1. Reduction in size of House of Deputies .....	402
a. Proportional representation .....	402
b. Three in each order .....	405
c. Minority report .....	407
2. Voting in the House of Bishops .....	407
3. Early election of Deputies .....	408
4. Sites of General Convention .....	408
5. The Joint Standing Committee on Nominations .....	409
6. Evaluation of the process of nominating and electing Presiding Bishop .....	409
7. Titles of Presiding Officers of Executive Council .....	410
8. Duties of the Registrar and Secretaries .....	410
9. Past policies and positions of the Episcopal Church .....	411
10. Resolutions for action .....	411
11. Provinces .....	411
12. Autonomy for the Philippine Church .....	412
13. The Autonomy Process .....	413
14. The Episcopal Church in Navajoland .....	413
Financial Report of Past Triennium .....	417
Goals and Objectives for the Next Triennium .....	417
Proposed Budget of Commission for the Next Triennium .....	417

## INTRODUCTION

The Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church (hereinafter referred to as the commission) is charged by the Canons (Title I, Canon 1, Section 2(n)(7) to “. . . study and make recommendations concerning the structure of the General Convention and of the Church . . .” and to “. . . review the operation of the several Committees and Commissions to determine the necessity for their continuance and the effectiveness of their functions and to bring about a coordination of their efforts.”

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

Since the establishment of the General Convention Office (recommended in the Structure Commission’s 1976 report), the task of reviewing and coordinating the efforts of the several committees and commissions has become steadily easier. Communications have improved. Summaries of the minutes of these bodies are distributed. Each of them is represented at the “challenge process” session of the Joint Standing Committee

on Program, Budget, and Finance held by the Assessment Section, at which they are required to defend their budget requests; and Executive Council minutes are sent to each chairperson. The Executive Officer of the General Convention has attended most meetings of the interim bodies, and has been invaluable in the coordination function.

### COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

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

The Rt. Rev. Willim C. Frey (1991, Colorado)  
The Rt. Rev. Sam Byron Hulsey (1988, Northwest Texas)  
The Rt. Rev. Rustin Kimsey (1988, Eastern Oregon)  
The Rev. Edward Rodman (1988, Massachusetts)  
The Rev. Robert M. Wainwright, *Chair*, (1991, Rochester)  
The Ven. Lorentho Wooden (1991, Los Angeles)  
Mr. John K. Cannon (1991, Michigan)  
Mr. Charles M. Crump, *Vice Chair*, (1988, West Tennessee)  
Mrs. Rosella A. Jim (1991, Navajoland)  
Ms. Diana Midence (1991, Honduras)  
Mrs. William K. Nicrosi (Harold), *Secretary*, (1988, Alabama)  
Mr. Thomas M. Van Culin (1988, Hawaii)

The Commission voted to authorize Bishop Hulsey with respect to the House of Bishops, and the chairman, Father Wainwright, and the vice chairman, Mr. Crump, as to the House of Deputies, to accept or reject, on behalf of the commission, any non-substantive amendments proposed in the respective Houses.

The full commission met four times during the triennium: at the Episcopal Church Center, April 28-30, 1986, October 20-22, 1986, October 26-28, 1987; and in San Pedro Sula, Honduras March 16-18, 1987.

### 1. REDUCTION IN THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES

The Structure Commission continues to think that the House of Deputies is too large. Following are two proposals to reduce the size, thus reducing costs and increasing efficiency. The majority of the commission prefers the proportional representation plan, since two-thirds of our domestic dioceses use a similar plan for their diocesan conventions. No constitutional change would be necessary.

A minority report opposing both plans is appended.

#### A. Proportional Representation

The commission, through the able assistance of the Church Center staff, asked all of the dioceses to indicate the method each utilized in determining voting rights at their respective diocesan conventions. We received responses from almost 100 percent of those asked, for which we are grateful. From them, the commission learned that approximately two-thirds of the dioceses utilize a proportional representation system in determining voting privileges. The concept of proportional representation being so widespread among the several dioceses, it seems appropriate and logical to adopt that concept in determining voting rights in the House of Deputies. Therefore, the commission proposes the following resolution regarding proportional representation:

**Resolution #A168**

**Resolved**, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Canon I.1.1. be amended by adding thereto a new subsection denominated (k) to read as follows:**

*(k). The number of Deputies to which the Church in each Diocese shall be entitled to have in the House of Deputies shall be as follows:*

- 1. The Church in a Diocese with 30,001 or more baptized members shall be entitled to representation by not more than four ordained persons and not more than four Lay Persons.*
- 2. The Church in a Diocese with 15,001 to 30,000 baptized members shall be entitled to representation by not more than three ordained persons and not more than three Lay Persons.*
- 3. The Church in a Diocese with 15,000 or fewer baptized members shall be entitled to representation by not more than two ordained persons and not more than two Lay Persons.*

*The Convocation of the American Churches in Europe shall be entitled to representation by not more than two ordained persons and not more than two Lay Persons.*

*The number of baptized members (as defined in Canon I.17.1[a]) shall be determined from the annual diocesan reports filed pursuant to Canon I.6.2 relating to the year in which the preceding General Convention was held.*

**EXPLANATION:** Governance of the Episcopal Church has often been compared to that of the United States, with the House of Deputies being the equivalent of the House of Representatives and the House of Bishops being the equivalent of the Senate. In such a comparison, it can be said that, like the Senate, the House of Bishops assures that every diocese is represented more or less equally. But, unlike the House of Representatives, the number of deputies entitled to vote in the House of Deputies bears no relationship to the size of the diocese from which they come.

As an example, our larger dioceses with 70,000 or more baptized members, send the same eight deputies to General Convention as our smaller, 5,000 or fewer baptized member dioceses. The three dioceses in Wisconsin, with a total of 28,400 baptized members, send 24 deputies while the Diocese of Washington, with 38,700 baptized members, sends eight. Stated more starkly, each of the eight deputies from the Diocese of Massachusetts can be said to represent 12,075 baptized members, while each deputy from the Diocese of Eau Claire is representing 325.

On the next page is a chart showing the dioceses in the United States, the number of baptized members in each and the number of deputies each diocese would have under the proposed proportional representation. All other dioceses have less than 15,000 baptized members.

## THE BLUE BOOK

### UNITED STATES DIOCESES LISTED BY NUMBER OF BAPTIZED MEMBERS

Present: 8 Deputies each

Proposed: 8 Deputies each

1. Massachusetts	96,600	51. Rochester	17,600
2. Connecticut	85,300	52. East Carolina	17,400
3. Virginia	77,800	53. Kansas	17,200
4. Long Island	77,300	54. Missouri	17,200
5. Los Angeles	76,900	55. El Camino Real	16,300
6. Texas	76,300	56. Milwaukee	16,100
7. Pennsylvania	73,600	57. Georgia	16,000
8. New Jersey	66,400	58. Rio Grande	15,900
9. New York	64,500	59. East Tennessee	15,800
10. Michigan	58,300	60. Western Louisiana	15,800
11. Maryland	51,100	61. Western Michigan	15,700
12. Chicago	50,000	62. Iowa	15,600
13. Ohio	48,700	63. New Hampshire	15,400
14. Newark	46,500	64. West Virginia	15,000
15. Atlanta	44,100		
16. Southwest Florida	41,000	Present: 8 Deputies each	
17. North Carolina	41,700	Proposed: 4 Deputies each	
18. Southeast Florida	39,000		
19. Washington	38,700	65. Delaware	14,300
20. Colorado	38,200	66. West Missouri	13,600
21. Central Florida	36,000	67. Arkansas	13,600
22. Southern Virginia	36,000	68. Nebraska	13,600
23. Olympia	35,200	69. Western North Carolina	13,400
24. Dallas	34,100	70. Southwestern Virginia	13,300
25. Rhode Island	34,000	71. Indianapolis	12,600
26. Minnesota	31,600	72. West Tennessee	12,500
27. California	31,400	73. Tennessee	12,400
		74. Spokane	11,900
Present: 8 Deputies		75. South Dakota	11,600
Proposed: 6 Deputies		76. San Joaquin	11,400
		77. Kentucky	11,000
28. West Texas	29,800	78. Hawaii	10,900
29. Albany	29,100	79. Northwest Texas	10,700
30. Central New York	28,800	80. Fond du Lac	9,700
31. Southern Ohio	28,800	81. Wyoming	9,700
32. Florida	26,900	82. Vermont	9,700
33. Alabama	25,700	83. Lexington	8,900
34. Western Massachusetts	25,400	84. Easton	8,800
35. South Carolina	23,700	85. Northern Indiana	8,700
36. Arizona	25,300	86. Northwestern Pennsylvania	8,100
37. Upper South Carolina	25,000	87. Springfield	7,700
38. Oregon	24,500	88. Montana	7,300
39. Western New York	24,400	89. Alaska	6,900
40. Pittsburgh	22,000	90. Nevada	5,300
41. Oklahoma	21,800	91. Utah	5,200
42. Louisiana	21,700	92. Idaho	5,000
43. San Diego	21,200	93. Eastern Oregon	4,700
44. Mississippi	21,100	94. North Dakota	3,600
45. Bethlehem	19,600	95. Northern Michigan	3,600
46. Central Gulf Coast	19,600	96. Western Kansas	3,400
47. Forth Worth	18,600	97. Quincy	3,000
48. Central Pennsylvania	18,500	98. Eau Claire	2,600
49. Northern California	17,900	99. Navajoland	1,000
50. Maine	17,800		

With 118 dioceses now entitled to vote in the House of Deputies, it has the potential for 944 deputies in attendance. Under the proposal, the size of the House would be reduced by 290 deputies, or 31%, to 654. The monetary savings from such a reduction are illustrated in the portion of this report that follows which deals with an across-the-board reduction in the size of deputations by one in each order.

### **B. Three in Each Order**

Prior to the recommendation on proportional representation, the commission, once again, had agreed to recommend reduction of 25% in the size of the House of Deputies.

At a subsequent meeting, by majority vote the commission agreed to recommend reduction of deputies in each order from four to three *only* as an *alternative* to proportional representation, in the event the latter is not approved. The commission believes it is important to achieve reduction of approximately 25% with proportional representation as the preferred alternative.

The Joint Committee on the Structure and Organization of General Convention, predecessor to this commission, in its report to the 1952 General Convention recommended reduction in the size of deputations from four to three. The Joint Committee in its report to the 1958 General Convention recommended proportional representation by dioceses ranging from three to six in each order from the dioceses according to their number of communicants. This commission and its predecessors recommended plans of proportional representation until its report to the 1976 Minnesota Convention, when it recommended reduction to three deputies in each order from each diocese. Prior to this date, the distinction between dioceses and missionary districts had been abolished so that all units of the Church were entitled to four deputies in each order. The 1976 General Convention rejected the proposal to reduce the number of deputies and referred the question of proportional representation to this commission for study and report.

The commission again recommended to the 1979 Convention straight reduction from four to three rather than proportional representation. The Legislative Committee on Structure recommended rejection of the resolution, although, this recommendation was approved by a close enough margin to require a standing vote.

This commission again recommends reduction in size of deputations from four to three in each order in the earnest hope that this issue will be given full consideration by the Legislative Committee on Structure and ample opportunity for debate on the floor of the House of Deputies.

In preparing its report to the 1985 General Convention, this commission carefully studied statistics to determine whether such reduction would adversely affect representation by women and minorities and found that actually there would be a slight increase in the proportionate representation of these groups.

This commission obtained from the staff of the Executive Office of the General Convention the following statistics on the total number of female and minority deputies, and those in the fourth place from each domestic diocese in attendance at the 1985 Anaheim Convention:

**THE BLUE BOOK**

	CLERICAL			LAY		
	Total	Fourth place	Percent	Total	Fourth place	Percent
Male	370	94	25%	229	60	26%
Female	24	6	25%	164	40	24%
	<u>394</u>	<u>100</u>	25%	<u>363</u>	<u>100</u>	25%
Non-Minority	366	95	26%	360	95	26%
Minority	28	5	18%	33	5	15%
	<u>394</u>	<u>100</u>	25%	<u>393</u>	<u>100</u>	25%

These figures reveal that female clerical and lay deputies in fourth place are equal to or, in the lay order, slightly below the percentage of all deputies. But the minority are far below the percentage for all deputies. Consequently, female and minority representation will not be reduced proportionately by reduction from four to three in each order.

From the office of the General Convention Manager, the commission obtained the following statistics on estimated cost savings based on 1985 expenses:

Average expense per deputy:

Air travel .....	\$ 375.00
Hotel-\$68.25 x 10 .....	682.50
Meals-(Executive Council guidelines) \$35 x 9 .....	315.00
Registration fee .....	<u>65.00</u>
	\$ 1,437.50

Multiplied by 101 dioceses sending four deputies in each order .....

	\$145,187.50
--	--------------

Multiplied by two deputies in each diocese—estimated savings to dioceses .....

	\$290,375.00
--	--------------

Estimated savings to the national Church in printed material distributed to fourth deputies .....

	<u>1,750.00</u>
--	-----------------

Total savings .....

	\$292,125.00
--	--------------

There should be additional savings to dioceses in the cost of the fourth deputy to attend Synods and possibly diocesan meetings.

As dioceses divide and create new dioceses, the cost savings will continue to increase.

The General Convention Office reported that there would not be a significant difference in the number of potential sites, as the only facility directly affected would be the meeting room of the House of Deputies.

This commission recommends to the 1988 General Convention adoption of the following resolution:

**Resolution #A169**

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That there be enacted a new Canon I.I.I (k) to read as follows:**

*Sec. 1 (k). The Church in each Diocese which has been admitted into union with the General Convention shall be entitled to representation in the House of Deputies by three Presbyters or Deacons, canonically resident in the Diocese, and by three Lay Persons, communicants of this Church, in good standing in the Diocese but not necessarily domiciled in the Diocese.*

### **C. Minority Report on Reduction in Size**

It is reported that the first time a reduction in the size of the House of Deputies was proposed was more than 100 years ago. Each and every vote to reduce the size of the House has been defeated. Members of the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church who join in submitting this minority report hope that such will be the case again in 1988.

Members of the commission who oppose reduction trust that as you prepare to vote on this issue you will carefully evaluate the effect your decision will have within the following context: "Will reduction in the size of the House of Deputies:

- Include minorities and minority viewpoints?
- Will these voices be otherwise heard?
- Limit opportunities for training emerging and new leadership?
- Improve communication among Church membership?
- Increase "politicking" for election to the House?
- Create an impression that the House is exclusionary?"

Clearly, a strong case has repeatedly been made for cost reduction. However, whenever the Church gathers, whether as a parish, diocese, province, or as the General Convention, the same case can be argued. "It would be easier and less costly if we had only 15 members on Diocesan Council rather than 20." "It would be better and cheaper if we had proportional representation rather than four in each order of the House of Deputies."

The Church when gathered together celebrates the differences among our people as we glimpse the vision of our true purpose in being the Church. Our very presence together gives testimony to our marvelous diversity and to our unity in Christ.

Participation and inclusion give witness and testimony to a genuinely shared and collegial style ministry—not just talked about but lived out. The money saved by reducing the size of the House of Deputies may not make up for the greater loss of opportunity to learn from and share with each other.

The Rev. Edward Rodman, Massachusetts, Province I  
Mrs. Rosella A. Jim, Navajoland, Province VIII  
Ms. Diana Midence, Honduras, Province IX  
Mr. Thomas M. Van Culin, Hawaii, Province VIII

## **2. VOTING IN THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS**

The increase in the number of dioceses, the increasing number of suffragan bishops, active and retired, the move towards earlier retirement of bishops, whether diocesan, suffragan or assistant, and general increased longevity, have interacted to increase the size of the House of Bishops from 223 in 1976, to 260 in 1985. Of greater import, however, is the fact that of the 260 bishops entitled to vote under the existing constitutional provision, only 146 are active within dioceses. Adoption of the proposed constitutional change will assure that those bishops voting will have meaningful, current

## THE BLUE BOOK

---

contact with the Church, just as the deputies in the House of Deputies are persons who are currently and meaningfully active in Church affairs.

Historically, not all bishops have had a vote in the House of Bishops. As an example, while the canonical prohibition of electing suffragan bishops was repealed in 1904, it was not until 1943 that the Constitution was amended to include suffragan bishops among those entitled to vote (partly on the grounds that it was unjust to allow inactive retired bishops to vote while withholding it from active suffragans).

### Resolution #A170

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Article I, Sec. 2 of the Constitution be amended to read as follows:**

~~“Each~~ *The Presiding Bishop, every Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction, every Bishop Coadjutor, every Suffragan Bishop, every and Assistant Bishop, and every Bishop who by reason of advanced age or bodily infirmity, or who, under an election to an office created by the General Convention, or for reasons of mission strategy determined by action of the General Convention or the House of Bishops, has resigned his jurisdiction, while acting as such within a Diocese, the Suffragan Bishop for the Armed Forces and the Suffragan Bishop of the Convocation of the American Churches in Europe, shall have a seat, with voice and a vote, in the House of Bishops. All other Bishops of this Church shall have a seat, with voice but without vote. A majority of all Bishops entitled to vote, exclusive of Bishops who have resigned their jurisdiction or positions, shall be necessary to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.*”

### 3. EARLY ELECTION OF DEPUTIES

In response to a request from the Very Rev. David B. Collins, the commission approved the following changes to enable the President of the House of Deputies to make timely appointments to committees:

#### Resolution #A171

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the first sentence of Canon I.1.4 be amended to read as follows:**

Sec. 4. All jurisdictions of this Church entitled by the Constitution or Canons to choose Deputies to the General Convention shall be required to do so not later than ~~the year preceding the year of~~ *twelve months preceding the opening date of the General Convention for which they are chosen.*

### 4. SITES OF GENERAL CONVENTION

The commission agrees with the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Planning and Arrangements that the General Convention can make a more meaningful selection if not more than five sites are presented, but with retention of the requirement that at least three sites be presented. This can be accomplished by the following Resolution:

#### Resolution #A172

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Canon I.1.14(b) be amended to read as follows:**

(b). From the sites recommended by the Joint Committee, the General Convention shall approve ~~not less~~ *no fewer* than three *nor more than five* sites as possible for such meeting of the General Convention.

## 5. THE JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

The commission feels that the time has come for an elected rather than an appointed Nominating Committee and also feels that such a committee should put forward nominees for President and Vice President of the House of Deputies along with other officers of General Convention.

Since the Convention will elect such a committee at each Convention to serve in the event of a vacancy in the office of Presiding Bishop, it seems appropriate for this committee to be the Joint Standing Committee on Nominations.

### Resolution #A173

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Rules 18 and 19 of Section VII of the Joint Rules of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies be amended to read as follows:**

#### VII. Joint Standing Committee on Nominations

~~18. There shall be a Joint Standing Committee on Nominations, which shall submit nominations for the election of:~~

*18. The Joint Nominating Committee for the Election of the Presiding Bishop as prescribed in Canon I.2.1 shall also serve as the Joint Standing Committee on Nominations, and shall submit nominations for the election of:*

(a) Trustees of The Church Pension Fund, serving as the Joint Committee referred to in Canon I.8.2.

(b) Members of the Executive Council under Canon I.4.1(c).

(c) The Secretary and the Treasurer of the General Convention under Canon I.1.

(d) Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, serving in lieu of the separate Committees on the General Theological Seminary of the two Houses.

(e) General Board of Examining Chaplains.

~~19. The Joint Standing Committee on Nominations shall be composed of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and six Lay Persons.~~

*19. The members of the Joint Nominating Committee elected by the House of Deputies shall submit the nominations for the President and Vice President of the House of Deputies as set forth in Canon I.1.1(b).*

## 6. EVALUATION OF THE PROCESS OF NOMINATING AND ELECTING A PRESIDING BISHOP

The Commission on Structure was asked to evaluate the whole process of the election of Bishop Browning as Presiding Bishop.

1. In evaluating the process, the commission had the benefit of input from three of the members of the Joint Nominating Committee and from two of the four nominees. It was agreed that the committee should be especially commended for the confidentiality displayed and the great concern shown for the nominees. It seemed that the "rumor mill" was a negative factor in the process, but this was not considered a fault of the

committee. The commission feels that the public announcement of the final four nominees was made too early. This caused prolonged anxiety for the four nominees and their dioceses as well as for those bishops (and dioceses) who had been visited but not included in the final slate. The commission recommends that, in the nominating process for Presiding Bishop, interviews of potential nominees be held as late as possible so that public announcement of the final slate be made no more than 45 days before the ensuing General Convention.

2. In light of the concerns of Bishop Browning, the commission recommends that the Executive Council make provision for the transition period between Presiding Bishops with special attention given to the financial and personal affairs of the new Presiding Bishop and make appropriation for the installation and transition expenses.

### 7. TITLES OF PRESIDING OFFICERS OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Canon 1.4.3, which provides for the officers of the Executive Council, does not conform to the present designation or election of officers. The commission recommends the following clarifying amendments:

#### Resolution #A174

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Canon 1.4.3 be amended to read as follows:**

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

(b). *The Chairman and President shall preside at meetings of the Council, shall perform such other duties as are usual and customary for such offices including, 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 Chairman, the Vice-Chairman 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 Chairman or the Council may from time to time designate.*

(c). The additional officers, agents and employees of the Council shall be such and shall perform such duties as the ~~Presiding Bishop~~ *Chairman* and the Council may from time to time designate.

### 8. DUTIES OF THE REGISTRAR AND SECRETARIES

Canon 1.1.5 sets out the duties of the Registrar, including the procuring of a "suitable book" for the recording of episcopal consecrations. In practice, this book has been kept for some time by the Secretary of the House of Bishops, although the Registrar fulfills the other responsibilities in the Canon. Subsection (f) requires the Secretaries of the two Houses of Convention to supply manuscript minutes of the Convention "within six months after the adjournment" of Convention. In fact, the minutes and the accompanying documents are needed almost immediately after Convention, so that resolution texts can be perfected and certified and the publications editor can begin the editorial process that will result in the Convention Journal.

**Resolution #A175**

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That (1) Canon I.1.5 (b) be amended as follows:**

(b). It shall be the duty of the said Registrar to ~~procure a~~ *maintain* suitable ~~book, and to enter therein the~~ records of the ordinations and consecrations of all Bishops of this Church, . . .

**(2) Canon I.1.5(f) be amended to read as follows:**

(f). It shall be the duty of the Secretaries of both Houses, within ~~six months~~ *30 days* after the adjournment of the General Convention, to deliver to the Registrar . . .

**9. MAKING PAST POSITIONS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACCESSIBLE AND UNDERSTOOD**

One of the frustrations about the proposals and resolutions put before each General Convention is the lack of knowledge about positions taken in the past. The Commission on Structure urges the Presiding Bishop and the Secretary of General Convention to examine this problem and take action.

In this age of computers, it appears feasible to record and index past official actions of the Church for quick and accurate recall. This would help avoid taking either contradictory action or continuing to re-invent the wheel every three years.

**Resolution #A176**

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the Secretary of General Convention be asked to formulate and initiate a process by which past actions of the General Convention, the House of Bishops, and the Executive Council can be readily available.**

**10. RESOLUTIONS PASSED WITH NO ONE DESIGNATED TO INITIATE ACTION**

From time to time, resolutions on important issues are passed but remain unknown to the Church because no one has been specifically instructed to communicate said resolutions.

**Resolution #A177**

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Rule 13 of Section III of the Joint Rules of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies be amended by adding to existing Rule 13 the following:**

Each such proposal calling for action shall designate the individual or body for communication and implementation, but if no such designation is included in the resolution as adopted, it shall be referred to the Office of the Secretary of General Convention for communication and implementation.

**11. PROVINCES**

In the course of the past triennium, the commission undertook a review of the existing provincial structures as they manifest themselves currently in the life of the Church. This review was undertaken collectively, in the sense that each province's documents were reviewed by the commission, as well as individually, in that each member of the commission took a province and made an assessment of it.

When the two were put together, the commission was able to come to the following conclusions:

The Episcopal Church in the United States of America is blessed with a rich variety of provincial structures and modes of operation that reflect the nature of the regions they serve. At no point did the commission detect serious dissatisfaction with the provincial model that was in place, or with the programmatic, ecclesiastical and communication functions that the provinces are intended to provide. What was found was a great deal of enthusiasm at the provincial level for various types of activities, ranging from evangelism to a wide variety of mission projects.

The commission did discern the need, however, for greater cross-fertilization between the provinces so that certain programmatic and organizational ideas that are working could be shared to the benefit of all.

In conclusion, therefore, the commission finds no reason to question either the effectiveness or the role of the provincial structure at this time, but rather, would encourage broader information sharing regarding its success and potential for being a significant vehicle for mission activity in the life of the Church.

Under the Rules of Order of the House of Deputies, provinces are not included among those individuals and bodies which can introduce resolutions. The commission recommends the adoption of the following House of Deputies resolution:

### **Resolution #A178**

*Resolved, That House of Deputies Rule of Order 21 (b) be amended by inserting a new item "(3) Provinces" and by renumbering the subsequent items.*

## **12. AUTONOMY FOR THE PROVINCE OF THE PHILIPPINE EPISCOPAL CHURCH**

The Commission on Structure has met with representatives of the World Mission department, the Treasurer's office, and the Church Pension Fund regarding the developing covenant between the Philippine Episcopal Church and PECUSA which paves the way for the Philippine Episcopal Church to become an autonomous province of the Anglican Communion. This proposal will come before the 1988 General Convention for approval. Since all of the details of the covenant were not completed at the time of the final meeting of this commission, we cannot officially endorse it. However, we have been encouraged by what we have seen and extend our approval on principle.

We do, however, have some observations to share at this time:

1. The World Mission department and the Treasurer's office of the national Church recommend the adoption of this covenant agreement. Both groups feel that the Philippine Episcopal Church has made outstanding progress in its leadership, its five year plan, its financial management, and its ability to chart its future course.
2. The date at which this covenant and the independence of the Philippine Episcopal Church goes into effect depends in large measure on an agreed-upon plan for those currently vested in the Church Pension Fund to be integrated into a new planned pension fund. There are legal and financial implications which must be approved by others. (The Pension Fund is a New York State-chartered institution.) We are pleased with the willingness of the Church Pension Fund to be very sympathetic and cooperative for this venture.
3. It may be another generation before the Philippine Episcopal Church will be able to provide full financial self-support.

4. However, we are pleased with the covenant thus far agreed upon, which has profited from some of the mistakes of the past, and we look with confidence at the prospect of the Philippine Episcopal Church as a full and independent province of the Anglican Communion.

### 13. THE AUTONOMY PROCESS

1. The word autonomy is being used in a wide variety of ways and with conflicting definitions. It means "complete independence," but it is used in situations that fall far short of that. Looking to the future, we feel that a different and more commonly understood vocabulary would be helpful for clarification. The road to separation and independence has to be understood as a much more gradual growing into a covenant relationship that eventually leads to independence in various stages. The Episcopal Church has made some hasty decisions in the past which have led to continuing problems.

2. The ongoing financial responsibilities of the Episcopal Church need to be more completely spelled out as they go hand in hand with our continuing responsibilities regarding accountability.

3. There is a lack of clarity concerning Resolution #A162 (1982 General Convention) in terms of what it actually means. It refers to the World Mission Committee and the Structure Committee of General Convention as being involved in having to give approval. Does this refer to the two respective Standing Commissions or the Cognate Committees of the two Houses? The answer we get depends upon of whom we ask the question. How are these committees (commissions) involved? Is it an ongoing involvement or do we just say yes or no at the end of the process? Which of the two committees takes the lead? During the next triennium, these questions must be addressed by someone and clarifications made.

As the Legislative Committees of the two Houses meet only during the General Convention, they would not have time to engage in the full study which appears to be contemplated. Consequently, this commission believes that the two Standing Commissions on Structure and on World Mission are the appropriate bodies to receive such notice. We therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

#### **Resolution #A179**

*Resolved*, The House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That Resolution #A162 (of the 1982 General Convention) regarding autonomy be studied and evaluated by the Standing Commission on Structure, and a report be submitted for consideration to the next General Convention.**

### 14. THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN NAVAJOLAND

The 1985 General Convention requested that the Commission on Structure conduct a review of the status and concept of the Navajoland Area Mission.

The commission has been blessed with the presence of Rosella Jim from Navajoland as a member and full participant. Bishop Wesley Frensdorff, the Interim Bishop of Navajoland, has been extremely cooperative, and there are members of Province VIII and Coalition 14 on the commission.

Bishop Frensdorff has announced his retirement as of September 1988, and his departure makes future planning all the more imperative. The Council of the Episcopal Church in Navajoland spent six months developing the appended Proposal for the

Future. The Structure Commission endorses this report in principle, makes recommendations and proposes it as a blueprint for the future, as has the National Committee on Indian Work. The entire report is reprinted here in order to give the bishops and deputies the necessary historical background. The legislative references are Constitution Article VI and Canon I.11.

The commission makes the following recommendations:

1. That for the immediate future Navajoland will remain as an Area Mission, but that the clergy and lay leadership of Navajoland be urged to continue pursuing the goal of being accepted as a missionary diocese when the time is appropriate.
2. That the Presiding Bishop make provision for interim episcopal leadership and oversight for Navajoland, until a more permanent bishop is elected and in place.
3. That the House of Bishops agree in principle to elect as Bishop of Navajoland the suggested nominee put forward by the Convocation of the Navajoland Area Mission at such time as a single appropriate and qualified nominee is selected and placed in nomination.
4. That the Navajoland Area Mission Council be encouraged to enter into negotiations with an appropriate diocese as a partner, as described in their report.
5. That continued financial support from the national Church be provided through Coalition 14.
6. That accountability be maintained through Coalition 14, the partnership diocese, the House of Bishops and the Office of the Presiding Bishop.
7. Since one-half of the Native Americans in the United States now live in urban areas throughout the country, but particularly in the Western states, it is hoped that the ongoing leadership of the Navajoland Area Mission can be involved in the planning and implementation of this Church's mission and ministry to their fellow Native Americans living in urban areas.

### PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE

*To the House of Bishops and General Convention 1988  
From the Episcopal Church in Navajoland  
Gathered in Convocation June 12-14, 1987*

#### Historical Background

(as summarized by Owanah Anderson)

Navajoland Area Mission was officially established by the House of Bishops in 1977. This action was a result of a movement which began in the 1950s, when a resource team noted that the separation of the Episcopal Church's missions into three dioceses (Arizona, Rio Grande, and Utah) was not in harmony with other Navajo tribal activities.

The largest of the nation's Indian reservations, the Navajo Nation, spreads into three states and is approximately the size of the state of West Virginia. An estimated 160,000 Navajos reside in the 25,000-square-mile reservation.

Episcopal mission among the Navajo began in the late 1800s. Episcopal hospitals were opened at the Mission of the Good Shepherd in Fort Defiance, Arizona, and later at San Juan Mission near Farmington, New Mexico. Work in Utah came later and was spearheaded by an evangelistic team headed by Fr. Harold Liebler, who is said to have baptized 10,000 Navajos between the years 1943 and 1966.

By the early 1970s, the three Episcopal dioceses in which portions of the Navajo Reservation were situated recognized that the geographical isolation of the area and the unique language and culture of the Navajo people required a unified plan for mission. In 1973, the House of Bishops rejected a proposal for a Navajo Diocese but directed that a Navajo Episcopal council be formed. From 1973 to 1976, the Navajo Episcopal Council and the diocesan bishops proceeded to work out necessary steps to gradually bring the mission into one jurisdiction.

The General Convention of 1976 accepted from the Diocese of Arizona and Utah a cession of such portions of the said Dioceses as encompass lands of the Navajo Reservation . . . in order that the House of Bishops may establish an Area Mission within said ceded territory in accordance with Article VI, Section 1; such cession to be contingent upon the decision of the House of Bishops to establish such a mission.

At its meeting in 1977, the House of Bishops constituted the Navajo Area Mission. The Convention of 1979 accepted the cession of portions of the Diocese of the Rio Grande, "composed of the reorganized Navajo Tribal Chapters in the State of New Mexico," to be added to the territory of the mission. This action completed the process of forming the Navajo Area Mission.

### The Vision

The vision behind the process which brought the Navajo Area Mission into being can be summarized as follows:

- to be a Church within the Episcopal/Anglican tradition, multi-cultured, also expressing Navajo life, culture and tradition;
- with Navajo leadership at all levels, and welcoming and serving all the people in Navajoland;
- as an equal partner with other dioceses of the Episcopal Church;
- with a full church life in each congregation, including
  - worship and sacraments,
  - education and spiritual growth, and
  - fellowship (community) and mutual care;
- and from each congregation service outreach to the people of the "neighborhood,"
  - witness to God's love in Christ, and
  - service in his Name;
- with growing stewardship and responsible administration of resources, becoming increasingly self-reliant.

It is to be noted that this vision statement has been reaffirmed periodically and that it is consistent with the conclusions of the two consultations sponsored by the NCIW and C-14, as well as with the implementation recommendations of the "Minnesota Memorandum" by the Joint Task Force.

### Implementation—1977-1987—The First Decade

- 1977-79      Start-up; initial organization; getting acquainted; Steven Plummer as first Navajo Priest had been ordained in 1975 and 1976; Bishop of Utah, Otis Charles, is bishop-in-charge.
- 1980-82      Gaining identity; canonical organization; developing national sup-

port; administrative staff and procedures secured; full-time resident bishop appointed: Frederick Putnam, former Suffragan Bishop of Oklahoma.

1983-present Clarification of vision; Education for Ministry Program, including Covenant with Seabury-Western Theological Seminary; leadership development, including calling process; one Navajo postulant, others in process; strong support staff; meaning of indigenization being explored; part-time appointed bishop: Wesley Frensdorff, resigned Bishop of Nevada, Assistant Bishop of Arizona, who will complete this ministry in September 1988, following the General Convention.

The Future—The Second Decade

*The alternatives generally recognized:*

1. End the experiment; each region goes back to the original diocese.  
ECN Response: This is not acceptable and would be considered destructive.
2. Become a diocese with all the normal expectations and requirements.  
ECN Response: This is not considered appropriate at this time.
3. Continue as Area Mission and develop according to the vision, with full-time or part-time bishop appointed by the House of Bishops with ECN consultation.  
ECN Response: In that form this alternative is not sufficient. It needs to be *expanded* in order to make possible a *significant* step forward in autonomy. To make that possible it also needs a support system. Navajoland would also benefit from a vision of mission beyond itself.

Therefore ECN's *recommendations* for the future are an expansion of alternative #3 as follows:

*Remain as Area Mission*

with

*The bishop, "called" locally and elected by the House of Bishops, (this was recommended by the 1982 Advisory Committee) could serve full-time, or could serve as one of the Regional Vicars with sufficient clergy and other staff or could serve also as Ministry Development Coordinator;*

and

*A partnership relationship with a neighboring diocese for mutual support and some sharing of resources.*

Continuing financial support through C-14.

Accountability to C-14, the partnership diocese and the House of Bishops, through the Presiding Bishop.

and

*A possible expanded mission: Navajoland, with its bishop, could relate to and support some of the Indian ministry in the western dioceses, especially the developing urban ministries.*

(models for collegial episcopates available in New Zealand and Australia)

## STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH

---

The Process - (as ECN understands it.)

Final version of these recommendations go from Convocation to Standing Commission on Structure, the Presiding Bishop, NCIW and C-14.

If accepted, they would be considered at General Convention in 1988.

If passed there, the process would include:

choosing of Partnership Diocese,

implementation period with appointed episcopal oversight until election of a bishop at 1989 meeting of the House of Bishops,

election and ordination of bishop, October 1989 to December 1989.

*Adopted by the 12th Annual Convocation of the Episcopal Church in Navajoland on Trinity Sunday, June 14, 1987.*

### FINANCIAL REPORT

	1986	1987	1988
Appropriated	\$10,670	\$21,145	---
Expenses	11,298	17,364	---

### GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT TRIENNIUM

1. Continue the evaluation of interim bodies.
2. Continuation of monitoring the autonomy process especially in Province IX.
3. Consideration of material referred by General Convention, by the Presiding Bishop, by Executive Council, and others.

### PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE NEXT TRIENNIUM

The commission therefore estimates its costs for the next triennium as detailed below and submits the following resolution:

	1989	1990	1991
Meetings	\$16,200	\$16,200	\$2,600

### Resolution #A180

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, **That there be appropriated from the Assessment Budget of General Convention for the expenses of the Standing Commission on Structure of the Church, the sum of \$35,000 for the triennium of 1989-91.**