

Attachment 2: Other items from the letters of the Churches to General Synod Carman 2013 (unfinished business to be discussed with the URC church order committee counterpart)

The committee decided to discuss matters and to seek revision of the PJCO with the URC brothers on the following matters.

1. To agree with Grand Valley that “been” is missing in PJCO 25 B: the phrase should read, “...that no matters have **been** submitted by...”
2. To agree with Grand Valley that for the sake of consistency the pronouns used in reference to God in PJCO 45 should not be capitalized.
3. To agree with Carman West that the terminology of “with a consistory” in PJCO 21 D would be improved with “from a consistory.”
4. To agree with Carman West that “shall be convened” is better than “shall convene” in PJCO 28 given that this fits better with Regional Synod not being a permanent body, and that this wording is in line with PJCO 30 regarding General Synods
5. To agree with Abbotsford that the question of whether or not churches are honouring the decisions of the major assemblies should be added to PJCO 25. This matter is very important; the fact that this is mentioned in Foundational Statements 10 and PJCO 21 E and PJCO 31 is not sufficient.
6. To agree with Abbotsford that neither the PJCO nor the draft regulations themselves indicate how the regulations might be changed. We should take note of this as a “to do item” as we continue to work on the regulations.
7. To agree with Abbotsford that in the Guideline for Appeals to General Synod, the sentence, “An appeal is a written request for a judgment regarding a matter previously decided upon by a regional or general synod” could better be written as “An appeal is a written request for a judgment regarding a matter decided upon by a previous regional or general synod.”

The committee decided to discuss matters and to seek revision of the examination regulations with the URC brothers on the following matters.

1. To agree with Flamborough and Elora that the examination regulations should stipulate that the decision to proceed to the next part of the exam should be made in closed session.

2. To agree with Abbotsford, Aldergrove, Flamborough, and Elora that the ecclesiastical examination for a minister coming from a church with which we have ecclesiastical fellowship needs work. The current examination regulation does not contend sufficiently with the reality of ecclesiastical fellowship; A colloquium doctum would be more appropriate.
3. To agree with Elora that the examination regulations should stipulate that the “practica” ought to be done in closed session. This would serve to protect the integrity of the brother.
4. To agree with Abbotsford that the examination regulations are not clear on how often classis has to vote. What constitutes a section? Does a classis vote after each part of the exam? Should this be left up to each classis? Should the voting be done in closed session? Should the voting be done with a show of hands? If the purpose of voting is simply to ascertain whether sufficient information has been gathered, then what is the point of setting time limits? If within the time limits classis cannot decide, is there not a problem? This should all be discussed with the URC brothers.
5. To agree with Surrey’s observation of inconsistency between the Candidacy Examination and the Ordination Examination (final paragraph of point 7). This should be addressed with the ordination examination following the wording of the candidacy examination since the wording of the latter is superior.

The committee decided to not seek revisions regarding the following matters.

1. Re. support of needy students: Grand Rapids and London made suggestions forgetting that the PJCO is designed for a combined federation.
2. Re. the suggestion of Grassie to add “concurring advice of the deputies of Regional Synod” in the first part of PJCO 12: this is not necessary as the phrase already appears in PJCO 12 c.
3. Re. the suggestion of Surrey regarding PJCO 12 d to change “eligibility for call” to “availability for call” since all ministers are already eligible for call. The point is that even though the man has been released from his duties within the congregation he served, he is still eligible for call because he was not deposed from office.
4. Re. the suggestion of Surrey that “in accordance with God’s Word” is better than “principles taught in God’s Word” since it is simpler, more comprehensive, and reduces the need to decide first what principles are in view. Something may be in accordance with the Word of God without being a principle.
5. Re. the puzzlement of Surrey about why PJCO 18 is a separate article since its contents belong with PJCO 3 and 17. PJCO 3 and 17 focus on protection from “within” (like CanRC 16, 22) while PJCO 18 focuses on protection from the outside (like CanRC 27).

6. Re. Abbotsford's contention of an inconsistency between PJCO 21 D and the decision of Synod Burlington to allow churches to approach synod directly. This forgets that the PJCO is for a combined federation.
7. Re. Surrey's suggestion that PJCO 25 A needs a clause just like PJCO 28 about convening a classis sooner if needed. Classis is to be convened every four months while Regional Synod once a year.
8. Re. Flamborough's desire to stipulate annual church visitation. This has already been dealt with.
9. Re. Flamborough's and Grand Valley's reservations re. PJCO 26 regarding the phrase "and they shall admonish those who have been negligent. The phrase is in CanRC 46.
10. Re. Surrey's suggestion to change "they shall admonish" to "they shall fraternally admonish" in PJCO 26. The word "fraternally" occurs earlier on already.
11. Re. Surrey's suggestion that the first sentence of PJCO 52 A 2 should be improved linguistically: true, it is a run on sentence but the meaning is sequential and clear.
12. Re. Surrey's suggestion that "No Lording it over" (PJCO 54) should be moved to section II. It is in section III in the Dort CO and in the CanRC CO
13. Re. Surrey's suggestion that the last sentence of PJCO 58 is unnecessary. PJCO 58 highlights how property exists and how it is managed. Should there be a disagreement on how it is managed, the management of the property is governed by its own rules and that is made clear with the last line. This is necessary as a safeguard.
14. Re. questions from Grand Rapids, Langley, and Lynden about the PJCO being "provisionally" adopted. It should be noted that "provisional" in this context means "providing union happens between the federations."
15. Re. Carman West's view regarding the synodical regulations that once the convening church has examined the credentials and reported the results to the meeting of delegates, then there is nothing further to report. The convening church cannot report to a synod that is not yet constituted; its last act, therefore, is to give its report to synod that is now in session.
16. Re. Carman West's view regarding the synodical regulations that the phrase that the chairman "shall state matters of fact" should be either clarified or deleted in light of the fact that prior to that there already is the phrase, "he shall place before synod every motion that is properly made and seconded, etc." There is no problem here as these actions go in tandem.
17. Re. Abbotsford's request that the committee give attention to the matter of incorporation. Our committee has flagged this for synods twice already.
18. Re. Abbotsford's concern that the PJCO decentralizes financial assistance given to seminary students while the CanRCs have recently centralized it. This fails to recall that the PJCO is for a new federation.

19. Re. Abbotsford's concern that the report makes no mention of previous CanRC Synod decisions about speaking an edifying word. This fails to recall that the PJCO is for a new federation.
20. Re. Abbotsford's suggestion that laying on of hands could be done by "the executive of the consistory." This does not square with equality of the office-bearers.
21. Re. Surrey's suggestion that foundational statement 16 could be improved linguistically. We fail to see the problem.
22. Re. Surrey's questioning of the repeating of "practica" in the ordination examination. Something could have happened between the candidacy examination and the ordination examination – and there could also be two different classes (different areas) involved.