

- (c) recognizing the complexities of some of the issues and acknowledging the lead already given by Her Majesty's Government,

encourage Her Majesty's Government and politicians of all parties to continue to press for urgent action by the more affluent nations to cut debt, particularly debt held by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.'

(Adjournment)

THE CHAIR *Canon Jane Sinclair (Sheffield)* took the Chair at 8.30 p.m.

The Chairman: We move now to Questions; 165 have been tabled for answer this evening and, for the benefit of new members, that is some 50 per cent more than the maximum ever tabled at any other Synod session. I am sure that it demonstrates a very healthy level of energy and commitment to our process of accountability in Synod but it also means that we shall have to exercise quite a high degree of self-discipline this evening if we are to make good headway through the Questions. So let the hearers understand! Because of the quantity of Questions, I would like to seek the general consent of the Synod now, under Standing Order 14(e), to extend this sitting by not more than fifteen minutes. Does Synod give its consent? *(Agreed)*

Questions

Questions asked in accordance with Standing Orders 105–109 were answered as follows, those for written answer being marked with an asterisk:

Board of Education

1. *Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Following publication of *The Way Ahead* by the Church Schools Review Group, how does the Board plan to maintain this very positive report's 'impetus for action'?

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Alan Chesters): Over the next few months the Board will be working with dioceses to ensure that the report is widely discussed and its vision communicated to the whole Church. We will fully engage with Government on their proposals for an extension of faith-based schools outlined in their February Green Paper on education. We intend to circulate a short leaflet to all parishes summarizing the report and to arrange a number of regional conferences early in 2002 to explain the report's main recommendations. In addition, we have commissioned audio-visual material on Church schools for use by deaneries and others. Together with the National Society we will be producing supporting material for schools and

parishes, and we will make full use of the National Society web site to publish relevant material.

Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield): I am very grateful for the Bishop's very full reply. Would he also like to encourage Synod to visit the excellent Alcuin and Charlemagne exhibition in York, on the grounds that in the matter of schools Alcuin was Charlemagne's Lord Dearing?

The Bishop of Blackburn: The Synod will have heard Mr Locke's question. I am happy to affirm what he is asking.

Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells): Would the chairman pass on appreciation of the high quality of the work of the secretary to the review group, Colin Hopkins? Would he also urge the Board of Education and the Archbishops' Council to focus priority in the November debate on the Dearing report's apparent key concern and underpinning recommendation, namely:

No factor will be more important in determining the future of Church schools than the Church's ability to recruit Christian teachers [especially young men for primary schools] and to develop heads ... Without an effective programme of action, a lack of Christian teachers could set everything at naught?

The Bishop of Blackburn: Amen to the second part; and the Synod and the Board and everyone else owes an enormous debt to Colin Hopkins. I hope that the Synod will recognize that now in the appropriate way. (*Applause*)

2. *Mr Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

In welcoming the Dearing report *The Way Ahead* and the forthcoming national appeal to raise £25 million to support dioceses in the proposed expansion of Church secondary schools, how much money are the Government proposing to give to the Church of England in extra funds for such additional provision?

The Bishop of Blackburn: In their Green Paper *Schools Building on Success*, published in February 2001, the Government have proposed to reduce the governors' contribution to capital costs in voluntary aided schools from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. Assuming that this proposal becomes law, it would equate to an additional contribution by the Government to voluntary-aided Church of England school capital costs of some £5.1 million in the current financial year, and this figure will rise in subsequent years.

3. *Mrs Ann Clarke (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

How does the Board of Education propose that the Church of England will fund the new initiative to create another 100 Church secondary schools?

The Bishop of Blackburn: The funding of additional provision will be a matter for negotiation case by case. Only a small proportion of the proposed 100 new schools will be new builds, requiring a large capital input by the Church. Some diocesan boards of education have the capital to fund one such school. In some cases, funding might come from development gain, and in others the LEA may be willing to contribute some or all of the Church's contribution. Lord Dearing has, however, proposed a targeted fundraising campaign to supplement diocesan resources where required.

The majority of the additional schools will come about as a result of school reorganizations or situations in which the Church might be asked to take on a struggling community school. In such cases, the costs could be quite modest. The Government have also proposed contract school arrangements, in which a private or voluntary sector sponsor assumes responsibility for a weak or failing community school on a fixed-term contract of five to seven years. This scheme could also apply to a successful community school that wishes to develop a more distinctive identity.

Mrs Ann Clarke (Bath and Wells): With cutbacks in diocesan spending and increases in parish share, is this the right time to be starting a new important initiative?

The Bishop of Blackburn: I think that this is one of the most exciting and opportune moments that the Church of England has had for very many years. (*Applause*) I have never begun anything in my ministry by saying, 'We can't afford it.' If it is God's will, it will be afforded.

4. *Canon Gordon Oliver (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

What evidence would the chairman advise us to seek to identify the nature of an effective Church school that justifies the cost of its establishment rather than a similar expenditure on other missionary youth projects?

The Bishop of Blackburn: Church of England schools have daily contact on Monday to Friday with nearly a million children and young people. They therefore bring the Church into regular contact with their parents and other relatives, and parents often feel more comfortable worshipping in the familiar environment of the school than in the more formal setting of the Church. Let us be realistic, however. If the Church is serious about proclaiming the gospel, we surely build on our strengths. At this point in time Church schools are a major strength. Lord Dearing's report makes it clear that Christian distinctiveness is the prerequisite of Church schools, while evidence has shown that denominational inspection, introduced in the past ten years, has strengthened their Christian distinctiveness.

5. *Mr Robert Leach (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

How much rent does the Church of England receive from the Government for using Church premises to run State schools?

The Bishop of Blackburn: Most Church school premises are held on trusts which require them to be used for the purposes of a Church school, and so their use for such purposes is in execution of the charitable trusts on which they are held. It would be neither lawful nor appropriate for the trustees to seek a rent. Church schools do, however, receive some or all of the cost of upkeep and improvement of their premises and of the provision of new premises from national or local government.

There will be individual cases where a rent is charged for the use of Church premises by a State school (both Church schools and secular schools) but these cases are very unusual, the arrangements are made locally and national figures do not exist for the amount of rent received.

6. *Mr David Webster (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Will the Board consult with the dioceses as to whether they agree with the strong opposition expressed by its general secretary to the proposed changes to school holidays with a fixed spring break to replace the current holiday linked to the variable date of Easter?

The Bishop of Blackburn: The general secretary and his colleagues consult regularly with all diocesan directors of education through weekly email exchanges about issues of current concern. The independent commission's recommendation to the Local Government Association – that is what it is – that there should be a six-term school year ignoring Easter was announced on 1 September last. The view expressed by the general secretary when the Local Government Association published results of opinion research on 1 June had been fully agreed with diocesan directors of education at their December 2000 meeting. It had also incidentally been agreed with ecumenical partners.

Mr David Webster (Rochester): Will the chairman acknowledge that a number of people feel that with a fixed spring holiday in some years children will be in school in Holy Week when the meaning of Easter could be explored and both Good Friday and the Easter weekend would be specifically religious holidays?

The Bishop of Blackburn: I think that this is a really quite difficult issue. There would be educational advantages, and many Church schools extend the spring term into Holy Week. However, the proposals from the Local Government Association make it clear that, in practice, eight times out of ten, schools would be closed for Easter. The potential advantage therefore would be lost, but the holiday would still not be called an Easter holiday because the link with that festival would have been broken.

7. *Dr Irene Riding (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

What steps are being taken to safeguard the rights of teachers not to be forced against their conscience to promote rights on the basis of sexual orientation under the proposed code of conduct by the General Teaching Council?

The Bishop of Blackburn: Teachers are subject to the law and to guidance from the Secretary of State that sets sex and relationship education within a clear moral framework. Teachers must ensure that pupils learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and bringing up children. Teachers may neither promote nor discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. The draft code does nothing to encourage teachers to infringe either the law or the Secretary of State's guidance.

8. *Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

While welcoming the Government's support for Church schools and for the Dearing report, what steps can be taken to discourage any future use by politicians of Church school premises or activities (especially religious worship) in ways which serve, or might be thought to serve, party political purposes?

The Bishop of Blackburn: Within the past two years, with full media attention, William Hague has launched the Opposition's education policy at a Church of England school in south London and Tony Blair has launched the recent general election campaign at another such school, also in south London. The Church of England is proud of its schools and is not beholden to any political party, but I should tell Synod that both the Labour and the Conservative manifestos in the recent election proclaimed their party's support for more Church schools.

*9. *Revd John Cook (London)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

How many Church of England teacher training colleges closed in the last 30 years, how much capital was received on the sale of each of these properties, what is the present capital value of the sums realized and for what purpose is the income generally applied now under the trust deeds?

The Bishop of Blackburn replied: Ten Church colleges have closed in England and one in Wales over the past 30 years. These were all independent institutions and no records are held centrally about how much capital was received from the sale of the properties or of what the present capital value is of the sums realized. There are trusts associated with the majority of the closed colleges, either educational trusts with an emphasis on religious education or for the support of former students.

Board for Social Responsibility

10. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

What is the Church of England doing to reinstate family values, as it seems that it is not expedient for the Government to do it?

The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Tom Butler): The Board's Marriage and Family

Policy officer is working with a wide range of organizations, including the National Society, the Mothers' Union, the FLAME network, the Children's Society, the Girls' Friendly Society and ecumenical partners in Churches Together for Families, to strengthen the Church's contribution to public policy debate in this important area. Discussions involving the board, individual bishops, the Lord Chancellor's Department, the National Family and Parenting Institute and other public and voluntary bodies also seek to inform the debate, as do the contributions by bishops who have spoken in the House of Lords about families and the values that we seek to support.

Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield): In the light of what we have heard this afternoon about the witness of Christians in Africa, for example, how can the Church of England be more proactive about Christian family values with the people on the ground?

The Bishop of Southwark: That is a matter, I think, for all members of Synod. We are conscious of the fact that it is the witness of individual Christians in the parishes and congregations that is the most convincing.

Revd Paul Collier (Southwark): Would the board endorse a Christian understanding of the family which is broad and inclusive and, I would suggest, is best defined by British Rail, as they then were, for the purposes of the family railcard, which stated that the family group need not necessarily be related but they must remain together for the whole journey?

The Bishop of Southwark: I have only been chairman of the board for a month and in that time the board has not discussed the British Rail family railcard!

11. *Miss Sue Booth (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

How can dioceses and deaneries be encouraged to play a part in the work of regional development agencies?

The Bishop of Southwark: Engagement with RDAs should form part of the mission strategy of each diocese. The approach of RDAs to faith communities varies a great deal from region to region. However, the credibility of the Church depends on its track record of engagement at local and other levels over a number of years through project work, its role in economic regeneration partnerships, and industrial mission. Participation in RDAs also depends of course on the capacity and resources made available in deaneries and dioceses.

Miss Sue Booth (Lichfield): Would the chairman agree then that working with RDAs and keeping them informed of Christians and particularly those with expertise is a good way of witnessing?

The Bishop of Southwark: I would absolutely agree with that, and I think that we should work with our ecumenical partners in doing that.

12. *Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

Given that the Church's task is to 'seek justice and encourage the oppressed' (Isaiah 1.17), what representations has the BSR made to the Home Office to investigate the living conditions of asylum-seekers in places like Liverpool, where asylum-seekers themselves have been on hunger strike and local churches are campaigning on their behalf so that those who seek refuge from persecution in their own country will not continue to experience harassment, intimidation and oppression in our own country?

13. *Prebendary Horace Harper (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

With a new Government in office, will the Chairman make further approaches to Her Majesty's Government over the current treatment of asylum-seekers, especially those fleeing danger of death in religious persecution, on issues raised in the General Synod debate of 28 November 1997?

The Bishop of Southwark: With your permission, Madam Chairman, I would like to take 12 and 13 together.

Bishops in the House of Lords, including myself, have made several interventions in debates concerning asylum-seekers. The board has been working with the Churches' Commission for Racial Justice in an ongoing series of meetings with the Home Office at ministerial level. The board has also supported the 'Bonus not bogus' campaign and the research project on the experiences of refugees in cities throughout the UK (including Liverpool), which will be published in the autumn and which will provide a vital body of evidence for future meetings.

Prebendary Horace Harper (Lichfield): Is the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility aware that in the recent general election campaign, as witnessed by many commentators, a fresh mandate was given which is more favourable to improving the plight of asylum-seekers?

The Bishop of Southwark: During that election campaign the bishops made several interventions in terms of the plight of asylum-seekers, and we will have this as part of our watching brief.

Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool): Would the Bishop agree with me that when eight asylum-seekers are sharing a flat in a tower block in Liverpool and paying £100 a week each, or the landlady is being paid £100 a week by the Government, that this is inhuman and wrong and needs to be challenged by the Church?

The Bishop of Southwark: We had many concerns and expressed them when the decision was taken to disperse asylum-seekers round the country. Our major concern was that they would be cut off from the resources that would give them the kind of information that they need in order to make a new life in this country.

14. *Revd Paul Collier (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

Given that some police forces are now finding homophobic crime as serious or more serious a problem than racist crime, has the Board for Social Responsibility considered promoting a study on institutional homophobia to match the work already being done to counter institutional racism?

The Bishop of Southwark: No, but the board is co-operating closely with the Metropolitan Police service and the Dioceses of London and Southwark. It has helped establish several centres in churches where hate crime – which includes racism, homophobia and domestic violence – can be reported. More are planned next year.

Revd Paul Collier (Southwark): When will the Board take responsibility for the fact that people are harassed, threatened and beaten up because of the way that the Church talks about and treats lesbian and gay people, which is used by others as justification for violence and prejudice?

The Bishop of Southwark: The matter of homophobic crime is a proper matter for the Board for Social Responsibility, and it will no doubt pay attention to it when members of the Board ask it to do so. The more general question about human sexuality is being dealt with by a working party of the House of Bishops.

15. *Mr Paul Boyd-Lee (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

Is the Science, Medicine and Technology Committee still an active body of inquiry, is it under the direction of the Archbishops' Council, and will it be submitting a report to the Synod of its activities in the near future?

The Bishop of Southwark: No. The committee was established in 1995 as one of the Board's advisory committees, but the new Board has decided that no committees will be appointed at least until the conclusions of the current review of the Church and World area are known. Staff will continue to be accountable to the board, which reports to the General Synod through the Archbishops' Council.

Mr Paul Boyd-Lee (Salisbury): In view of the fact that the nation is increasingly concerned about ethical issues and the urgency of decisions on these matters, could the

Board please give priority to this matter of setting up the committee again or doing whatever is necessary to give appropriate responses?

The Bishop of Southwark: The Board certainly puts resources into this area of work. We are not convinced that having a sub-committee dealing with it is the swiftest or most appropriate way of handling the issue.

16. *Miss Fay Wilson-Rudd (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

Can the Chairman of the BSR assure Synod that it will take steps to ensure that the procurement officers of Her Majesty's armed forces are encouraged to buy British, whether this is food or equipment?

The Bishop of Southwark: No. The Board has no power to ensure such an outcome.

17. *Miss Fay Wilson-Rudd (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

In view of the way Synod has put pressure on Nestlé over its trading practices, what plans has the BSR to apply pressure to UK dairy companies to ensure that British farm produce, rather than imported produce, is promoted in our supermarkets?

The Bishop of Southwark: Responsibility for rural affairs rests with the Board of Mission rather than the Board for Social Responsibility. Both Boards, I am sure, would want individual consumer choice, as well as supermarket provision, to be subjected to ethical scrutiny. However, the debate over globalization reminds us that such ethical scrutiny requires us to ensure that the needs of all food producers and consumers are attended to. Synod members will see from the issue of *Country Way* which has been circulated to us that there are things that individual Christians can do; the first case study on page 5 is about buying local produce.

18. *Miss Fay Wilson-Rudd (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility:

Can the Chairman of the BSR advise Synod what steps, if any, are being taken in conjunction with the Arthur Rank Centre to ensure that those wishing to leave agriculture can do so with dignity, bearing in mind that only a small proportion of those declared bankrupt in the last three years came from the farming community?

The Bishop of Southwark: The National Rural Officer, who is based at the Arthur Rank Centre, reports to the Board of Mission which, as I have indicated, has responsibility for these issues. I am sure that tomorrow's debate will provide a fuller answer to Miss Wilson-Rudd's Question.

Council for Christian Unity

19. *Miss Sue Booth (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

What steps have been taken to ensure that a full discussion of the forthcoming report on the results of the Anglican/Methodist talks will take place at deanery synod and at circuit level?

The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Ian Cundy): The formal conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church believe that they have completed the task that they were given. Their draft report is now out for confidential consultation with appropriate bodies in the two Churches. It is hoped to publish the report before the end of the year and it is due to be considered by the Methodist Conference and this Synod in June and July next year. It is highly likely that the motion before the two bodies will involve a reference to the local churches and there will be an encouragement to dioceses to invite responses from deanery synods. The staff of CCU, together with Methodist colleagues, are preparing study materials to assist discussion at every level.

20. *Dr David Bowen (Canterbury)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

Since most Christian denominations have agreed to do together everything that we are able to, and since there is a risk that some 'Churches Together in ...' organizations are becoming a new denomination, what plans does the council have to promote the search for real budgets to support real work which we can do together, based on the various ecumenical bodies?

The Bishop of Southwark: Dr Bowen's Question contains a rather broad-brush description of some local ecumenical developments. If only it were true that 'most Christian denominations have agreed to do together everything' that they are able to. We still have a long way to go. There is indeed, as he suggests, a danger of local ecumenical relationships drifting from their moorings as far as ecclesial identity is concerned, but I do not think that on the whole this is a danger for 'Churches Together' groups. As we come closer together, through local fellowship and collaboration, and through formal ecumenical agreements, we shall certainly want to explore the possibilities for shared work in all dimensions of the Church's life.

Dr David Bowen (Canterbury): What prospects are there for devolving real budgets to have, for instance, youth work or social responsibility work or industrial chaplaincy managed ecumenically in the near future?

The Bishop of Peterborough: I think that it is in your hands. These things are done locally, in deaneries and dioceses. You do not need permission from us to get on with

it and budget for it and finance it properly. So I hope that you will get on with it and do it.

21. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

Given that the House of Bishops (HB(01)M2 – item 5) has agreed to the proposal from the Meissen Commission for the development of local ecumenical partnerships (LEPs) between congregations of the Church of England and the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)*, can such partnerships now be set up, and what guidelines are available concerning how to do so?

The Bishop of Peterborough: At its recent meeting the House of Bishops approved the draft guidelines for local ecumenical partnerships under the Meissen Agreement. The guidelines, based on the Churches Together in England covenant model, are the result of considerable work by the Meissen English Committee and the CCU. They will now go to the full Meissen Commission in September where some technical details, related to the rules of the Evangelical Church in Germany, will be added.

A number of parishes in dioceses with strong Meissen links have already expressed interest in being considered as pilots under this provision, and we hope that the first partnerships will be under way within the next twelve months. The guidelines give a clear framework in which parishes, and sector ministries such as educational chaplaincies, in the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany can grow together in fellowship and mission. Members of the Meissen Commission will be actively involved in a network of support and guidance for the parishes concerned.

22. *Mrs Alison Ruoff (London)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

When may Synod have the privilege of being able to debate Anglican/Roman Catholic relations and reports that relate to the subject, and is there an appropriate timetable that can be shared with members?

The Bishop of Peterborough: The Council for Christian Unity looks forward to facilitating a General Synod debate on Anglican/Roman Catholic relations. The CCU presentation on ecumenical issues tomorrow afternoon will set the scene for developments later in this quinquennium. The CCU has consistently advised the Synod and the Business Committee that it is important to act in step with the rest of the Anglican Communion in this matter. The Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations was set up by the last Lambeth Conference in order to co-ordinate the study of ecumenical developments across the Communion. One of the steps that it took at its first meeting last December was to inaugurate a measured process to deal with the backlog of ARCIC reports. In preparation for a debate in the Synod, our Faith and Order Advisory Group is already engaged on a substantial study of *The Gift of Authority*.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): If the timetable for discussing these official reports is to be determined by this international commission, first of all can we know what the timetable is and, second, do the CCU and others in this Synod realize that as long as reports go undebated they get quoted as being official agreements, when they may not have been agreed?

The Bishop of Peterborough: I do not have details of any timetable that they have published. If one exists, I am certainly happy to let Bishop Buchanan have a copy of it. I entirely take his second point, and it is my hope that we will have a debate this quinquennium in this Synod on these reports.

Mr Tim Royle (Gloucester): What has been the reaction of the Roman Church to the House of Bishops' recently issued response?

The Bishop of Peterborough: The House of Bishops has issued a response to *One Bread, One Body*. I do not think that this is strictly within the Question, and indeed I think it is the subject of another Question; we are in fact collecting responses to that document and they will be looked at by FOAG later this year, and FOAG will report to the House of Bishops in due course. However, I think that this is the subject of a Question to the Chairman of the House of Bishops.

Prebendary Brian Tubbs (Exeter): What steps are being taken to communicate to members of this Synod and Anglicans in general the statement from the Mississauga conference last year of Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops, which no one seems to have ever heard of but which referred once again to the special relationship between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church, as stated originally in Vatican II?

The Chairman: I am afraid that that does not relate to the Question as put on this occasion, so I cannot allow it to be answered.

23. *Mr Paul Boyd-Lee (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

Is the Church of England in communion with the Open Episcopal Ministry Church and, if not, can a brief explanation be given as to why not?

The Bishop of Peterborough: I am aware of the existence of the Province for Open Episcopal Ministry and Jurisdiction and of the Society for Independent Christian Ministry. The Province for Open Episcopal Ministry and Jurisdiction provides episcopal oversight for those within the Society for Independent Christian Ministry and beyond who wish for it. The society offers ordination to the priesthood or to the episcopate.

The Church of England is not in communion with the Province for Open Episcopal

Ministry and Jurisdiction. Being 'in communion' is a term that has a particular ecclesiological significance for the Church of England. It is grounded in a shared faith and a common order. The Archbishop of Canterbury decides, on advice, with which Churches the Church of England is in communion.

Business Committee

24. *Dr Sheila Grieve (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Business Committee:

Does the decision, taken in July 1992 after lengthy debate, that Synod should meet only twice each year as a cost-cutting exercise still inform the Presidents' decision today, and would a change from two meetings per year to three require a debate in Synod in the same way as the reduction in the number of sessions required a debate in 1992?

The Dean of Derby (Very Revd Michael Perham): The Synod decided in July 1992 that there should normally be two groups of sessions a year. However, the report of the Standing Committee being debated at that time envisaged that a reserve date should be fixed for a third group of sessions in case it was essential for the Synod to meet then for urgent legislative or other reasons. The Presidents continue to act on that basis. If Synod wishes to alter it, Dr Grieve is correct in suggesting that the Synod would need to pass a further resolution. The position is also referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report of the Business Committee (GS 1411).

Mr Ian Smith (York): Would the Chairman of the Business Committee commend the Private Member's Motion standing in my name under the heading 'Date of Sessions' as an effective way of bringing this issue to debate, and urge members to sign it as soon as possible? (*Laughter*)

The Chairman: The Chairman of the Business Committee need not answer that supplementary.

The Dean of Derby: The very new Chairman of the Business Committee confesses that he has not read the text of your motion. When he has studied it he will decide whether he can commend it.

The Chairman: I think that the point was made.

Clerk to the Synod

25. *Mrs Beatrice Brandon (Peterborough)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Is there a separate definitive paper setting out the current agreed understanding of the theology underpinning synodical government at all levels, or is the theological understanding that which is spread across several reports over the past few years?

The Clerk to the Synod (Mr David Williams): A number of reports, of which the most recent include *Bishops in Communion* (GS Misc 580) and the report of the Synodical Government Review (GS 1252), have touched more or less extensively on the theology of synodical government, or aspects of it. However, this aspect of the Church of England's ecclesiology, like many others, is not set out in a separate definitive paper. Rather, it is implicit in the structures themselves, their history, and the legal provisions which govern them, and is informed by the general theology, law and practice of the Church through the ages.

26. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

In view of the welcome introduction recently of a new General Synod link on the Church of England web site, what plans are there to develop this further so as to make the work and members of the Synod more accessible and to encourage the broadest range of people (in particular young people, who tend to be more fully conversant with the Internet) to take an interest in its activities?

The Clerk to the Synod: The Business Committee has agreed to consider ways in which the web can be used to help the work of the Synod at its next meeting, and I will make sure that the concerns of the questioner are brought to its attention. Mr Hargreaves-Smith will be aware that there are, inevitably, significant resource issues involved in these matters.

27. *Mrs Penny Granger (Ely)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Will he please accept the grateful thanks of Synod members for the resiting of GS numbers in bold type in the top right-hand corner of documents?

The Clerk to the Synod: I will happily convey Mrs Granger's gratitude to my colleagues.

28. *Mr Richard Leyton (Winchester)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

What policies are there regarding provision of members' names and addresses to Synod members or third parties for the circulation of unofficial mailings, and is he satisfied that the procedures are working satisfactorily?

29. *Dr Susan Atkin (Chelmsford)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Would the Clerk to the Synod ensure that when unsolicited mailings are made to members of General Synod each such mailing includes a clear indication of its author and origin, the recent circulation of *Pro Episcopus ad Scripturas* being a case in point?

The Clerk to the Synod: With permission, Chairman, I will answer these Questions together.

When I wrote to members recently about the implications of the new data protection legislation and the information that we hold about Synod members, I made clear that we do not vet requests for labels from third parties. Members were of course given the opportunity to withdraw from this arrangement if they wished to do so. On that basis there is little control that we can exercise over the use to which such labels are put. I will nevertheless ask the Business Committee to consider whether guidelines governing the issue of labels should be introduced.

Revd David Houlding (London): Would the Clerk to the Synod please be aware that this particular publication is absolutely nothing to do with the catholic side of this Synod?

The Clerk to the Synod: I will convey that to the Business Committee. There are questions to do with the provenance and authorship of these documents and we will need to reflect on these matters.

30. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

What will be the publication date of the special electoral roll application forms, with the tear-off annex for the collection of statistics on ethnic origins, to be used for the general revision of electoral rolls next year, and what steps will be taken to encourage the use of these forms?

The Clerk to the Synod: The forms will be published by Church House Publishing and SPCK in late September. They will be promoted through the Christian book trade by SPCK. We will be writing to dioceses, reminding them about the six-yearly revision of the electoral rolls and about the special form which parishes will be asked to use next year. We will be providing all dioceses with paper and electronic copies of all the suggested forms relating to the collection of statistics on ethnic origins, and we will be giving guidance to dioceses shortly on how to undertake the exercise of collecting the data.

Secretary General

31. *The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan)* asked the Secretary General:

In the recent removal from the clergy of the disqualification which had previously prevented them from being elected to Parliament, what part was played by the Archbishops' Council or any other body of the Church of England?

The Secretary General (Mr Philip Mawer): The timing of the introduction of legislation removing the disqualification was entirely a matter for the Government, but the decision followed consultation with the Church of England and other Churches following the recommendation of the Home Affairs Select Committee in 1998 that the disqualification be lifted, a recommendation which we endorsed at the time. We were

also in touch with the Home Office about various legal matters during the passage of the legislation.

32. *The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan)* asked the Secretary General:

What steps are the Archbishops' Council planning to take to press the Government (in accordance with their earlier undertakings) to make the proposals of the Jenkins commission on electoral reform the subject of a national referendum in the near future?

The Secretary General: None, although I notice that in the debate on the address the Lord Chancellor repeated the Government's manifesto commitment to review the experience of the electoral system for the devolved institutions and the report of the Jenkins commission in order to assess whether changes might be made to the electoral system for the House of Commons.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): As this Synod practises just and fair forms of election, would it not be appropriate for us to press the Government to go ahead with the Jenkins recommendations?

The Secretary General: There are many things that we could be pressing the Government on, not a few of which are favourites of the Bishop of Woolwich; but I am glad as always to be confirmed by him in the opinion that the Church of England is ahead of Parliament in its practice of democracy.

33. *The Archdeacon of Birmingham (Ven. Hayward Osborne)* asked the Secretary General:

What steps have been taken, or can in future be taken, to encourage membership of Parliament's Ecclesiastical Committee by people who understand the needs of the Church and have sympathy with its concerns?

The Secretary General: The reconstitution of the Ecclesiastical Committee following the recent general election is a matter for the parliamentary authorities. This is being actively pursued by the Second Church Estates Commissioner.

34. *Mrs Margaret Cosh (Hereford)* asked the Secretary General:

What plans are there for returning to the issue dropped when clause 9 of the Churchwardens Measure was withdrawn so that parishes have a means of ensuring that children are protected?

The Secretary General: As the Synod knows, the Churchwardens Measure 2001 has now received the Royal Assent. It of course includes the provision under which a person who has a conviction for an offence falling within Schedule 1 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1933 is disqualified from being a churchwarden. The

Archbishops' Council will be giving further consideration to the issue of suspension of churchwardens in the autumn.

35. *Mr David Blackmore (Chester)* asked the Secretary General:

Why has there been no report to Synod from the working group which is reviewing aspects of marriage law, and when can such a report be expected?

The Secretary General: The working group understands that the Government's White Paper on the review of the civil registration scheme is likely to have a bearing on its own work. It is therefore awaiting publication of the White Paper before finalizing its recommendations. The White Paper is now expected to be published in the autumn, and on that basis the group hopes that, following consideration by the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops, its report will be ready for submission to the Synod for debate at the November 2001 group of sessions.

36. *Mrs Penny Granger (Ely)* asked the Secretary General:

Given the continuing postponement, without explanation in the text of the Business Committee's report (GS 1411), of the Southwell Diocesan Synod Motion (No. 800) on residential qualifications for marriage, when is the review of marriage law (noted in the annex to GS 1411) due to report and when will it and the Southwell motion be debated by the Synod?

The Secretary General: As I have just indicated, the working group hopes that its report will be debated in November. The Southwell motion has been parked, pending publication of the group's report, because the group's terms of reference cover the issues that it raises. The group envisages that the motions for debate in November will be structured so as to allow full discussion of the issues raised in the Southwell motion and of the group's recommendations for dealing with those issues.

37. *Mrs Beatrice Brandon (Peterborough)* asked the Secretary General:

Could this Synod please be presented with a report on spiritual direction in the Church of England before the end of this quinquennium?

The Secretary General: With administrative resources at Church House, Westminster increasingly constrained, I am afraid that I can give Mrs Brandon no comfort that such a report could be produced; but if she would like to write to me, setting out the reasons for her request, I will ensure that they are considered by the appropriate body.

38. *The Dean of Worcester (Very Revd Peter Marshall)* asked the Secretary General:

Are there any plans to review the working of the Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986 and, in view of concerns about pastoral insensitivity arising from the inflexible

timescales of section 7(1) regarding vacancy by reason of the death of the incumbent, could an early review of that section be put in hand?

The Secretary General: Members of Synod will realize that there is a limit to the number of reviews that can be sustained at any one time, and we must wait for the conclusion of Professor Toyne's review of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Team and Group Ministries Measures and related Measures before we consider any further ones.

Although there is some relation between those three named Measures and the Patronage (Benefices) Measure, I should make it clear that it is unlikely that Professor Toyne's group will address the work for which the Dean is asking.

The Dean of Worcester: Would you consider subsection (2) which is freer, allowing the bishop to exercise a pastoral concern, which reads 'subject to such notice as he considers reasonable' –

The Chairman: Excuse me, Dean. There is a ruling that we are not allowed to have abstruse legal points made in supplementary questions.

The Dean of Worcester: Part of the difficulty is that there are two issues here. One is that when an incumbent dies the bishop has to decide as soon as practicable, whereas when an incumbent resigns he can take a decision when he considers it is reasonable to do so. It seems unfair and unhelpful to a bishop who wants to practise pastoral care.

Would you consider that a question worth considering?

The Secretary General: Well, I am clear that the Dean considers it a question worth considering! In the light of that, I suggest that the most sensible thing would be if he were to write to me, explaining his concern, and then we can give it proper consideration and decide how most appropriately his concern might be addressed.

39. *Canon Jim Wellington (Leicester)* asked the Secretary General:

In the light of the glaring inequalities in the provision of episcopal ministry among the dioceses, as revealed in the Mellows report (with particular reference to the absence of a suffragan see in Leicester despite such provision having been made for dioceses of a smaller or similar size), would the Secretary General support a review of the present distribution of episcopal personnel?

The Secretary General: The current review of the Dioceses and Pastoral Measures (chaired by Professor Toyne) is already addressing perceived flaws in current arrangements for deploying episcopal ministry (contained in the Dioceses Measure 1978). As Canon Wellington's Question suggests, solutions to present problems may lie as much in the sharing of episcopal ministry across diocesan boundaries (or in the adjustment of those boundaries) as in the provision of more episcopal posts.

Mr John Higginbotham (Leicester): Is it appreciated that some dioceses are still dependent on assistant bishops who are, historically, returning colonial or overseas bishops, who are now very much an endangered species?

The Secretary General: It is appreciated that some dioceses are in the situation that Mr Higginbotham described. We treat the question of whether dioceses should receive support from the Church Commissioners in relation to assistant bishops in the same way as we would treat the question whether an additional suffragan see should be created, and they are therefore both issues subject to consideration by the Dioceses Commission in consultation with the Church Commissioners.

*40. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General:

To what extent, and in what ways, are dioceses currently working together to share administrative activities; and what (in so far as it is possible to quantify them) are the resultant savings in terms of both money and the time of (unpaid) committee members?

The Secretary General replied: Although there is *ad hoc* co-operation between dioceses in certain areas of administration, the statutory provision for formalizing such sharing (included in the Dioceses Measure 1978) has never been utilized. That means that there is no reliable record of co-operation which might already be taking place either on a permanent or on a time-limited basis.

This whole issue will certainly come into the remit of Professor Toyne's current review of the Dioceses Measure. That may suggest an accessible process for encouraging sharing of resources without requiring too heavy an intervention from the centre, though some reporting to the centre would be needed to make it possible to give the information for which Mr Oldham asks.

41. *Mr Mike Tyrrell (Coventry)* asked the Secretary General:

Is the Secretary General aware of any action being taken to bring an appeal against the recent Court of Appeal decision in the case of *Aston Cantlow PCC v Wallbank* and another, concerning chancel-repairing liability?

The Secretary General: The Court of Appeal decided that the chancel-repair liability attached to Mr and Mrs Wallbank's land at Aston Cantlow was unenforceable as a result of the Human Rights Act 1998. This is clearly an important decision for the Church as a whole, both from a financial point of view and on the question how far a PCC is a 'public authority' under the Human Rights Act. The PCC is therefore seeking leave to appeal to the House of Lords, with financial support from more than one central Church body. If leave is granted, the question whether to fund the appeal itself will need to be examined in more detail.

42. *Canon Jim Wellington (Leicester)* asked the Secretary General:

Has progress been made regarding what is to happen to the CUF, following the debate in November 2000 and, in particular, whether plans are in place to secure its long-term future?

The Secretary General: Constructive discussions are in progress between members of the Archbishops' Council, trustees of the Fund and representatives of the Urban Bishops' Panel. A consultation document on the way forward for the Fund is expected to be published in the autumn, with a view to a final report to this Synod, as requested last November, in the summer of next year.

43. *Mrs Diana Taylor (Bath and Wells)* asked the Secretary General:

Who is representing the Church of England in the review of tax and VAT rates announced by the European Commission on 25 May 2001?

The Secretary General: Although the Church of England cannot be involved directly in the review, we will be making sure that our case is heard indirectly, through the United Kingdom Government and by other means. Our main channel of contact on these matters is the Churches' Main Committee, of which the Bishop of London is chairman, but we have also established useful contacts with various other groups, both in the United Kingdom and in Europe, which are in a position to bring pressure to bear upon those conducting the review.

44. *Mrs Alison Ruoff (London)* asked the Secretary General:

What steps are taken to ensure that the Church's investment managers exercise voting rights at shareholders' meetings in a manner consistent with the Church's ethical investment principles?

The Secretary General: The responsibility for exercising voting rights at shareholders' meetings on behalf of the three main investment bodies of the Church of England lies with their respective trustee bodies, namely the Church Commissioners, the Central Board of Finance Church of England Funds and the Church of England Pensions Board. The Ethical Research Unit, which conducts research and provides other ethical services to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group, seeks to ensure that there is effective communication and a consistency of approach between the investment bodies wherever possible.

45. *Canon Jim Wellington (Leicester)* asked the Secretary General:

Given that in the debate on the report *Called to Lead* at the November sessions, the Archbishops' Council were asked to consult with CMEAC or other representatives of minority ethnic Anglicans on the advisability of the provision for direct constitutional representation of minority ethnic Anglicans on the General Synod's boards and committees, has any such consultation taken place and, if so, with what result?

The Secretary General: Both the Archbishops' Council and the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (CMEAC) have reflected on the debate at the November sessions and the various points made in it. There was no demand arising from those discussions to pursue Canon Wellington's point any further, but I shall refer his Question and my answer to the chairman of CMEAC in case that committee wishes to give it further thought.

I should point out that the Appointments Committee's guidelines state that its own key test is that the appointments made should, taken together, best ensure the most effective completion of the jobs to be done; after the question of skills, the next consideration is that of balance, specifically including the question of ethnicity. In the past, we have taken the view that such an approach is preferable to any kind of quota system.

46. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield)* asked the Secretary General:

How have the newly elected and appointed boards and councils responded to paragraph (b) of the motion passed at the end of the *Youth A Part* debate (July 2000) 'that this Synod ... actively encourage young people's participation in decision-making in the Church'?

The Secretary General: The newly elected boards and councils have in many cases met only once and thus not had a great deal of opportunity to address such questions. However, younger members have already been appointed as well as elected to a number of boards, and I am sure that further appointments will be made where this is appropriate, as committees and panels of boards are constituted.

47. *Mr Chris Pye (Liverpool)* asked the Secretary General:

In the light of recent scientific evidence, have the Archbishops' Council reconsidered the advice given to PCCs regarding the siting of communication masts and base stations on Church property, including schools, given that the young would appear to be particularly affected by the radiation emitted?

The Secretary General: The Archbishops' Council intend to cover health and safety issues in the guidelines being prepared for parishes. Those guidelines will reflect the conclusions and recommendations of the report *Mobile Phones and Health* issued by the Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones chaired by Sir William Stewart, whilst making parishes aware of other views which have been put forward.

The report cautioned against the excessive use of mobile phones by children, and, while not identifying any particular risks to children from mobile phone masts, nevertheless recommended that there should be consultation with schools and parents where the main beam of intensity from a mobile phone aerial is expected to fall on school grounds or buildings.

48. *Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Secretary General:

Given the significant evidence that mobile phone masts can damage public health, will this evidence be made available to churches who have such equipment already as well as those churches who are thinking about having it installed?

The Secretary General: The Stewart group concluded, on the balance of evidence, that there is no general health risk to the people living near to base stations, but, as I stated in answer to Mr Pye, we will also make parishes aware of other views in the guidelines which are being prepared. Those guidelines will be made available to any parish which wants to see them.

49. *Revd Richard Thomas (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General:

What was the total cost of (a) line rental; and (b) telephone call costs to the boards and councils of the General Synod for the last financial year?

The Secretary General: The new telephone switchboard and cable network covers all the data, voice and Internet needs of *all* the national Church institutions. It would be extremely difficult and time-consuming to isolate the two individual costs (line rental and call charges) from last year's composite telephone accounts, which also contain data line rental, switchboard maintenance, Internet connection and telephone handset/fax replacement. However, I can tell Mr Thomas that COLT – our telephone carrier – do not charge for line rental for the 64 lines connecting the national Church institutions to the outside world; that the total cost of voice network between all the institutions' buildings is around £16,000 per annum, of which the Archbishops' Council's share is 49 per cent; and that the Council's telephone call charges for the year were just over £18,000.

50. *Revd Richard Thomas (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General:

Have the Archbishops' Council considered the new telecom environment as an opportunity to own their own network, reduce costs and provide services to a community of users who share a common interest and mission?

The Secretary General: We saw the merits and benefits of setting up our own network for the national Church institutions but the experts who helped us advised that extending our network to dioceses would not be economical. We are not aware of any recent developments which should cause us to reassess that conclusion.

51. *Mr Mike Tyrrell (Coventry)* asked the Secretary General:

What was the total number of lay candidates standing in the General Synod elections for 2000 and for how many places, and what was the total number of clergy candidates and places in the same election?

The Secretary General: On the information available to me, the figures requested are: Laity – 411 candidates for 237 seats; Clergy – 350 candidates for 185 seats. In addition, six candidates stood for five seats in the universities constituency.

52. *Dr Irene Riding (Bath and Wells)* asked the Secretary General:

What steps are being taken to reconsider the issue of widening the electoral base for House of Laity members of General Synod, such as enfranchising all electoral roll members?

The Secretary General: Although the issue of lay franchise for General Synod was discussed in the review of synodical government in the Church of England chaired by Lord Bridge, the debate on the first report to Synod of the Follow-up Group in November 1999 did not lead to any action being taken to change the current electoral base for the House of Laity. That position has not altered in the course of the legislation, which received final approval this morning.

Dr Riding will know that the second report from the Follow-up Group is to be debated on Tuesday, and that may lead to further legislative proposals. Any move to reopen the question of the electoral base for the House of Laity would be best considered in that context.

Dr Irene Riding (Bath and Wells): Thank you for that helpful reply. Could it be noted that, if the House of Laity were fully representative, General Synod could be significantly reduced in size, in line with the original Bridge report?

The Secretary General: I understand that that is an argument that Dr Riding would like to develop in the debate on Tuesday morning and no doubt she will have ample opportunity, if the Chairman allows, to do so then. Meanwhile members have heard what she has said.

53. *Dr Irene Riding (Bath and Wells)* asked the Secretary General:

In thanking the deaneries sub-group of the Bridge report Follow-up Group for its *Good Practice in Deaneries*, what guidelines have been issued to dioceses to ensure that General Synod members will be given adequate opportunity to report the proceedings of General Synod to deaneries?

The Secretary General: No guidelines have been issued to regulate how General Synod members report to deanery synods in their dioceses. That is essentially a matter for General Synod members to negotiate with the officers of the deaneries concerned between themselves, so as to ensure that there is a cover for all deanery synods in the diocese.

54. *Canon Jim Pendorf (Birmingham)* asked the Secretary General:

Given the confidential results under the Data Protection Act of the request at the November sessions of the General Synod for members to indicate their churchmanship from among twelve categories, including 'other', would the Secretary General provide the broad percentages of churchmanship represented by the current membership, and for the record would he remind Synod of the formal and informal role that churchmanship plays in the life of synodical government?

The Secretary General: These data were collected explicitly and solely for those involved in advising on and making the limited number of appointments where churchmanship is a relevant factor, and cannot therefore be tabulated and released in the way that Canon Pendorf seeks. As to the second half of his Question, churchmanship plays no formal role in synodical government; of its informal role members will be better placed to speak than am I.

*55. *Dr Graham Campbell (Chester)* asked the Secretary General:

Given that, when the voting papers for the committees of General Synod were distributed in February 2001, it was made clear that candidates could only be elected to serve on one committee, and paper A(01)3 issued in May shows that some people are appointed to serve on three or even four committees, can the Secretary General clarify the rules as to the number of committees on which a Synod member may serve?

The Secretary General replied: Various restrictions on cross-membership are laid down by the Synod and the Business Committee. The chief ones are set out in the National Institutions Measure 1998 and GS Misc 596, published by the Archbishops' Council and Business Committee last year. I attach an extract from the GS Misc paper explaining the situation. It is these restrictions, which apply to a number of the principal boards and other bodies, which were reflected in the nomination papers for the boards, councils et cetera circulated earlier this year.

None of the appointments reported in paper A(01)3 falls foul of these restrictions.

Extract from GS Misc 596

Implications for cross-membership

Prior to 1999, the Standing Orders did not allow anyone (Synod member or not) to be a member of more than one of the five advisory committees (ABM, BoEd, BoM, BSR and CCU). The thinking behind this restriction is that cross-membership is unhelpful for the Synod in that cross-membership can concentrate power in the hands of a few persons; and it acts against the objective of having as many Synod members as possible being appointed to other bodies. It may also be argued that it does not further the work of these bodies because it can lead to conflicts of interest ...

The [Archbishops'] Council and the Business Committee have decided that the way forward [under the revised Standing Orders] is to [have] ... two groups: those where

cross-membership will only be permitted by the Business Committee in extraordinary circumstances; and those where cross-membership will automatically be permitted or indeed encouraged. Using such an approach, the policy will be:

- (a) that nobody can be a member or stand for election for more than one of the following nine bodies, without the consent of the Business Committee: DRACSC, VRSC, TETC, CMADP, BoEd, BoM, BSR, CCU and the Finance Committee, except for the two members of the Finance Committee who are also members of DRACSC (as required under the DRACSC constitution) ...;
- (b) that there will be no limitations on members of the following five bodies also being members of one another or of one of the nine bodies in the group above: CCC, CFCE, HCC, CMEAC and the Audit Committee except where specified in these bodies' constitutions ...; and
- (c) the eleven synodical bodies [Business Committee, Crown Appointments Commission, Dioceses Commission, Doctrine Commission, Elections Review Group, Fees Advisory Commission, Legal Advisory Commission, Legal Aid Commission, Legislative Committee, Liturgical Commission and the Standing Orders Committee], the Appointments Committee and other bodies such as the Central Readers' Council do not come into the equation at all, so members of these bodies are free to be members of other bodies except as proscribed by the National Institutions Measure. (The Measure rules out cross-membership through election by the Synod or one of its Houses of: the Archbishops' Council; the Church Commissioners; the Pensions Board; the Appointments Committee; and the Business Committee.)

56. *Revd Jeremy Fletcher (Southwell)* asked the Secretary General:

Could the Secretary General assure the Synod that review and redundancy procedures in Church House demonstrate best practice at all times, and that the report in the *Church Times* of 20 April concerning the redundancy of two members of staff was therefore inaccurate and detrimental to Church House practice in such matters?

The Secretary General: We seek to observe best practice in this as in other aspects of HR management. However, these matters are complex and not necessarily straightforward to handle. The *Church Times* report quoted part of a letter that included some inaccuracies. Nevertheless all involved in these events have learned lessons for the future.

Revd Roger Combes (Chichester): Can we know what sort of proportion of redundancies among Church House staff the Archbishops' Council are currently looking for?

The Secretary General: No, because the policy of implementing a freeze on expenditure in the years 2002–2004 is currently under consideration, and

implementation proposals are still being developed by staff; the implications for the number of posts and the consequent implications for any redundancies cannot yet be estimated. Members will understand that it would be my intention and that of my colleagues to try so to manage things that, although posts will certainly have to be reduced, we keep to the minimum number possible any redundancies which might have to happen. We shall obviously seek to handle these things in as careful and sensitive a way as we can.

57. *Mrs Sarah James (Gloucester)* asked the Secretary General:

What progress has been made since November to make the meeting rooms in Church House, and the other services offered there, properly accessible to people with disabilities?

The Secretary General: A staff group has been set up to consider a range of matters relating to access for people with disabilities, including facilities in the first floor committee rooms of Church House. Disability access audits have been commissioned for all the premises of the national Church institutions and the first of these – the one relating to Church House – has been received and is now being studied. Cost will of course be a factor to consider, along with the new requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.

As a first step, we are in discussions with three suppliers for the provision of hearing induction loop systems in all the remaining committee rooms in Church House that do not at present have these facilities, and for a similar provision for the reception desks.

Mrs Sarah James (Gloucester): Thanking the Secretary General for the progress that has been made in the past few months, I would like also to ask what plans, if any, there are to advise and encourage dioceses and parishes about the steps that they too should be taking to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.

The Secretary General: From my knowledge, which is imperfect on the detail of this matter, we are in touch with dioceses about the requirements of the Act; anyway I certainly will look into the point which has been raised and make sure that appropriate guidance is being issued. I know that we are certainly issuing it, for example, in relation to the question of access to church buildings and so on. Whether we are covering the full range of the requirements of the Act is the point of doubt in my mind which I shall want to check up on in the light of Mrs James's supplementary.

58. *Revd Annette Cooper (Southwell)* asked the Secretary General:

In the light of the increasing number of non-stipendiary/self-supporting ministers in charge of parishes, what systems are in place to ensure that such ministers receive the same communications and information from national sources as their stipendiary colleagues?

The Secretary General: This is a nut that we have been trying to crack for some time. The Archbishops' Council are committed to finding ways of ensuring that their communications to the clergy reach everyone, whether stipendiary or not. Unfortunately, we do not currently have a reliable and cost-effective means of doing so. We are therefore doing two things: first, we have renewed our efforts to ensure that, whenever there is a mailing to the clergy, we organize it in such a way that no one misses out; and, second, we are now publishing a gazette on the web site written especially for clergy and lay Church leaders. We will continue to strive to improve our arrangements.

Mr Tim Royle (Gloucester): What provision is being made for such clergy in the terms of liability et cetera for their protection as they are not in the same position as full-time stipendiary ministers?

The Chairman: I am not sure that that relates to the original Question.

The Secretary General: No, I was not sure either; but if Mr Royle would like to write to me subsequently to let me know his concern I will certainly look into the point.

59. *Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Secretary General:

How many parishes have passed Resolution B under the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993?

The Secretary General: As at 30 September 1999, the latest date for which figures are available, 967 parishes had passed Resolution B.

Dr Carole Cull (Oxford): Is the Secretary General able to provide figures for those parishes which have passed Resolutions but subsequently rescinded them?

The Secretary General: I understand the point behind Dr Cull's question. I frankly hesitate to get into regular trawls of dioceses for information on this question. I am sure that our statistical adviser – and I recognize that Dr Cull has much experience in this area too – would be wary of our making regular requests to dioceses and thereby potentially exhausting their patience with us on such matters. We need to pace and time the requests we make of them for further statistical information.

Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester): In view of the fact that the information you have is nearly two years out of date, would you try and get some more up-to-date information on this subject?

The Secretary General: For what purpose? I am strongly opposed to getting information just for the sake of it, simply because the current information available is two years old, without being very clear why we need the information and to what use we would be putting it. I must make it clear to Synod members that we are in a

situation in which the resources of the Church at national level are increasingly constrained and I am not therefore willing to advise the Archbishops' Council or my colleagues among the staff simply to go in for exercises because we happen to think that it might be quite helpful to have the information. We need to be very clear why we would want such information before we trouble – do not forget – the dioceses and the parishes who would have to supply it, to produce the information for us. It is purely an administrative point that I am making here but it is one that goes also to the heart of our responsibility for those and to those whom we serve, the parishes and the dioceses.

60. *Mrs Margaret Brown (Chichester)* asked the Secretary General:

Who appoints the Chaplain-General to the Prison Service, and on his appointment is he required to make the declaration of assent as provided in Canon C 15?

The Secretary General: The Chaplain-General is appointed by the Home Secretary. The new Chaplain-General will be licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury later this month, having made the declaration of assent.

Mrs Margaret Brown (Chichester): In view of the fact that the Chaplain-General to the Prison Service has made a declaration of assent under Canon C 15, how can he pioneer and approve of multi-faith worship in prisons?

The Secretary General: I think that Mrs Brown needs to distinguish between, on the one hand, the responsibility of the Prison Service, 20 per cent of whose inmates are of other faiths than the Christian faith, to provide appropriate forms and opportunities for worship for those 20 per cent, an obligation which it is required to fulfil under the Human Rights Act, and the Chaplain-General's responsibility for ensuring that such provision is available, and, on the other hand, the Chaplain-General's pursuit of the gospel, which I know he fully and entirely endorses. I am quite clear from the information which the Bishop to Prisons, the Bishop of Lincoln, has given me that the new Chaplain-General is wholly committed to the Christian faith and to the obligations which Canon C 15 places upon him, just as much as any other priest in the Church of England.

I do urge Mrs Brown to talk to the Bishop of Lincoln about this matter, and I am sure that he will be able to satisfy her concerns upon the point.

*61. *Mr James Humphery (Salisbury)* asked the Secretary General:

Will the Secretary General introduce a practice rule to the effect that any board publishing a report or other material for the information of dioceses shall deliver to the Director of Communications not less than 48 hours before such publication a one-page summary of the material which it intends to publish?

The Secretary General replied: I would expect any board to be in touch at an even

earlier stage with the Director of Communications, at least in normal circumstances. I shall discuss with the Director and other senior colleagues how to encourage best practice in this regard.

Liturgical Commission

62. *Canon Paul Brett (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Why does the Greeting in Holy Communion Order One conclude 'be with you', and the (differently worded) Greeting in Holy Baptism 'be with you all', and why does the Blessing in Order One conclude 'be among you' and the (identically worded) Blessing in Holy Baptism 'be upon you', and which versions does he recommend for use when Baptism is set within Holy Communion?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd David Stancliffe): The reason why the Greeting in Holy Communion Order One concluding 'be with you' is different from the Greeting in Holy Baptism 'be with you all', is that they are quite different Greetings, drawn from different epistles. The one commonly called 'The Grace' is the one recommended, rather than mandated, for use at Baptism; but if the Baptism rite is inserted into the regular parish Eucharist then one of the Greetings from Order One, or whichever, would probably be preferred.

As far as the Blessing is concerned, it has now been agreed that the Blessing formula will be standardized as 'be among you' rather than 'upon you'. The Blessings in future editions of *Common Worship* will all conform to this pattern. As the text of Blessings does not involve the congregation, I hope that ministers will feel able to make this minor change without necessarily feeling that they must buy a complete set of the revised edition of *Common Worship* for the congregation!

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): Does the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission have a view on the pronouncement of the Vatican that the correct response is 'And with your spirit'?

The Chairman: I really do not think that your question is allowable under the terms of the original Question. You could perhaps have a word with the Chairman some other time.

Dr Christina Baxter (Southwell): I wonder if the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission might explain to us theologically – not now but on another occasion – why the Blessing has been changed and what difference it makes to how God will view it if we do it another way.

The Bishop of Salisbury: I would very much like to be answering that question now but I think that it would try everybody's patience considerably. (*Members*: Ah!)

The Chairman: I think, Bishop, that we will move on. Another occasion perhaps.

63. *Revd Michael Norman (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Has the Liturgical Commission considered making minor corrections, alterations or variations to the order to texts in *Common Worship* services in the light of experience in common use?

The Bishop of Salisbury: Mr Norman will realize that *Common Worship* is the result of a lengthy process in General Synod and cannot be arbitrarily altered by the Liturgical Commission (much as it might sometimes wish to). Minor typographical corrections will be incorporated in future printings as they occur, but anything of greater substance would require a further synodical process. The new commission has met only once and will be looking to its future programme of work, including that of liturgical formation, rather than revisiting texts so recently agreed.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): In this context would the Liturgical Commission consider demonstrating the availability of using the first person singular as an alternative to the first person plural in the Creed as a written option, that is, to use 'I believe' as an option, as an alternative to 'We believe'?

The Bishop of Salisbury: I do not think that that is a matter that would be considered a minor thing that I or anybody else could do. The member will recall that the extensive debates on the Creed were concerned to produce the most accurate translations, and in the case of the Niceno-Constantino-whatever-it-is Creed the Greek of the text is in the plural.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): Is not the Bishop's answer to this Question in direct contradiction to his answer to the previous one?

The Bishop of Salisbury: Possibly – (*laughter*) – but we might have had the excursus on 'upon' and 'among' instead, which would have provided an adequate buffer state, and which I might be tempted to reintroduce if I am pressed.

The Chairman: I think that we will move on!

64. *Revd Michael Norman (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Are there any plans to bring forward the review of the daily lectionary, particularly the Psalms, in the light of adverse criticism?

The Bishop of Salisbury: Mr Norman will know that the Weekday Lectionary is authorized only to the end of 2004. There is already extensive comment on this

provisional lectionary which is being looked at and will be the basis for revision which will come to Synod (for the full procedure) before a definitive Weekday Lectionary is authorized. The extent of the comment already received suggests that it might well be necessary to extend the existing provisional Weekday Lectionary for a further year to give time for this necessary and important and perhaps quite extensive work to be done. Whether such an extension will be needed or not will, I think, be known by the time of the November group of sessions.

65. *Revd David Bird (Peterborough)* asked the Bishop of Salisbury:

Given the support expressed in debates during the life of the last Synod for some liturgical material for use specifically when children were present, and the issues raised by *Faith in the City* about liturgy for a non-book culture, what plans does the Commission have for addressing these issues in the near future?

The Bishop of Salisbury: Mr Bird will remember his participation in the revision committees in the last Synod when the issue of reconciling texts judged by some, including himself, to be suitable for use when children are present with the need to provide authorized texts for use in any context was debated. The new Liturgical Commission, like its predecessor, is aware of the requests to produce texts which are suitable for use when children are present and the recommendations in reports such as *Faith in the City*; these considerations, however, have always to be balanced with the need to produce acceptable texts for authorization for everyone everywhere and at all times.

However, Mr Bird will like to know that a new edition of *Patterns for Worship* is on its way, and other publications, with the needs of children especially in mind, are in preparation in consultation with staff and members of the Board of Education.

Mr Bird may agree that it is probably wise to allow a period when what has already been drafted and laboriously authorized is allowed to take root in our worship before an assessment is made of what future material might be needed in addition.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): May I ask whether the Liturgical Commission has any intention of bringing forward a Eucharistic rite specifically for use with children, which many of us consider is much needed?

The Bishop of Salisbury: The Liturgical Commission works to instructions from the House of Bishops, and it will be for the House of Bishops, having considered where we have got to and how the existing rites are being used, to give us any further instruction. Then we would be producing something for them, and it would be for them to decide when and if to introduce it to the Synod for authorization processes (all 22 stages of them).

Revd David Bird (Peterborough): Would the Bishop agree with me that there is some

urgency in this matter, in the light of figures showing a continuing decline in the number of children and young people in contact with the Church and also in the light of the Archbishops' Council's themes, which include theme three: welcoming and encouraging children?

The Bishop of Salisbury: There is always urgency to work at the highest level with anything to do with engaging with children and young people, but whether multiplying the variety of liturgical texts – given how long they actually take to go through the authorization process – is the right thing to do at the next stage I would be ready to question. I can say to Mr Bird, however, that for those parts of our worship that are not governed by detailed authorization, given the fact that we have legislated for a lot of framework where a good deal of material may be optional and drawn from a wide variety of sources, there is more material on its way, as I have suggested.

If Mr Bird is asking, like Fr Trott, for a whole Eucharistic rite or something like that, the answer is that it has to wait until we have considered what we have now or until there is a resolution from this Synod to do otherwise; but that is very much in Synod's hands.

Canon Bob Baker (Norwich): In the light of your earlier answer about instructions from the House of Bishops, is it not the case that the House of Bishops gave that instruction many years ago and that it still has not met with a response from the Liturgical Commission?

The Bishop of Salisbury: I would have thought that the worship that has been brought by the Liturgical Commission to the previous Synod for authorization was in large part designed to meet exactly that. There were a number of prayers as well as various forms of service which were crafted with that in mind. Whether the whole of the Synod had agreed that it wanted to receive all those or not, or whether it wanted to amend them in ways which would please some more and others less, is not for *this* Synod to determine. We have done what we have done, and that was a decision of the whole Synod as it was then. There were those who during the revision, for example, of Eucharistic Prayers were pressing for more prayers for use with children; there were those who were pressing for fewer. I believe that where we have got to is where the Church actually is as a whole in that matter, and we will need to reopen the question and seek further guidance as things move; but it is clear that things do move, and I am sure that this Synod, like its predecessors, will address this question at some stage.

Legal Advisory Commission

66. *Mr Robert Leach (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Legal Advisory Commission:

Given that *Legal Opinions* states that the organist is entitled to a fee for playing at weddings and funerals, has the Commission considered the question of who

determines the amount of the fee, including any increases or decreases, if the incumbent and organist disagree?

Professor David McClean: As Mr Leach's Question indicates, the Commission's opinion entitled 'The Organist and Choirmaster and Church Musicians' is published in the volume entitled *Legal Opinions concerning the Church of England* which all members of Synod will rush to buy. It states that the organist should always be appointed by an agreement in writing between the organist him- or herself, the incumbent and the PCC. The agreement may deal with the fees for playing at weddings and funerals and, if so, its terms will prevail. Otherwise, the opinion states that the organist is entitled to the 'customary' fee for playing. How this is calculated will depend on what is normal in the parish concerned. The organist may also claim the normal fee if those for whom the service is held wish someone else to play the organ for the service.

Council for the Care of Churches

67. *Canon Cedric Catton (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

What resources have been allocated through the Archbishops' Council to take further the VAT campaign and the grant scheme announced by the Chancellor in the Budget?

The Dean of York (Very Revd Raymond Furnell): No specific funds have been allocated for this purpose but that has not arrested work being done by departments of the national Church, including the CCC, Finance, Legal and Communications departments. The staff concerned are also working closely with the staff of the Churches' Main Committee on this issue.

68. *Mr Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

When did Church representatives last meet with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport with regard to the grant proposed in lieu of VAT, and when are they next due to meet?

The Dean of York: Representatives from the Churches' Main Committee, which, as Synod is aware, is leading the consultations as the body which can speak for all the Christian denominations and the Jewish community, and which is supported by representatives of the Church House VAT group, met with the DCMS on 19 March, shortly after the Chancellor's statement. Following that meeting, the DCMS, the Treasury and Customs and Excise were sent draft proposals for the new scheme and invited to discuss these and the rules governing the control mechanisms, frequency and methods of payment. No further meetings have been fixed at this point, but the secretary of the CMC is in constant contact with officials at each of the Government

bodies mentioned. I can, however, assure Synod that informal representations continue to be made by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the highest level to key people in the Government to push for real progress on this issue.

69. *Revd William Smith (Worcester)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

Are there any indications of a budget cap in the operation of the new Government VAT grant scheme?

70. *The Archdeacon of Richmond (Ven. Kenneth Good)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

Will the introduction of the Government's VAT grant scheme result in a reduction in the English Heritage grants to Churches?

71. *Mrs Beatrice Brandon (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

What assurances does the Church have that the grant scheme to compensate in part for the burden of VAT on church repairs will be funded from new money?

72. *Mr Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

Will organs, bells and churchyard walls be included in the VAT grant scheme for repairs to listed churches announced in the Budget by the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

The Dean of York: With permission, Chairman, I will answers these Questions together.

The Government's attention has been drawn to each of these issues raised by the questioners. There has been no indication to date of capping or limitation on the funding or reductions in other areas, and we understand that full account is being taken of our comments. Synod should draw reassurance from the Chancellor's March Budget statement, which I quote:

our churches are essential centres for civic life and are at the heart of our rich heritage as a nation. To help preserve that heritage and to cut the costs of saving and repairing our listed church buildings we will introduce for repairs started after April 1st a new grant, the equivalent of a VAT reduction from 17.5 per cent to 5 per cent, a reform long sought by congregations across the country.

As the Red Book went on to point out, this is intended to be an interim solution until the Government can take forward their discussions of reduced VAT rates with the

European Commission as part of the general review in 2003, a fact that we must not lose sight of. With this in mind, it is therefore difficult to see a convincing intellectual or moral case for reductions in other support, capping or exclusion of valuable heritage items. However, we await with interest a further announcement.

Mr Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): Given that long answer and the fact that most people in this House will be particularly interested to take that back to their parishes, could I, through you, Madam Chairman, ask the Dean of York if that answer could be made available to us all?

The Dean of York: Yes, indeed.

73. *Mrs Sue Johns (Norwich)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

When will the grant scheme equivalent to a reduction on VAT on church repairs, which was announced in the last Budget, come into operation?

74. *Dr John Bull (Newcastle)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

How and from whom will parishes who have already undertaken repair work started after 1 April 2001 be able to receive a grant under the Government's scheme to reduce the burden of VAT on church building repairs?

The Dean of York: With permission, Madam Chairman, I will answer these Questions together.

As I said in my previous reply, we await an announcement from Government, but preliminary indications from the DCMS were that they hoped that the administration of the grant scheme would commence as soon as it was practicable, following consultations with the relevant Church authorities and other Government departments. At the time we alerted dioceses that a realistic timescale might be 1 September, and this now seems prescient. It is of concern that, despite the Church's best efforts, grants which were due from 1 April can still not be applied for, and that there is currently no indication of when the scheme will come into effect. This has been raised in correspondence by the Churches' Main Committee and through other channels and indeed in private conversations by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the meantime, our advice to parishes is to keep all relevant paperwork against future claims.

75. *Mr Andrew David (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

As the Church comes to terms with the implications of the present financial challenges,

what pressure is being brought to bear at national level on the new Government to ensure that imaginative schemes of church plant redevelopment, including closures, demolitions and rebuilds, are not encumbered by negative responses from organizations such as English Heritage?

The Dean of York: As I guess Mr David knows, there is scope in his Question for several debates on the substance of what he is saying. Suffice it to say that we maintain close relationships with English Heritage and other bodies with an interest in our buildings and their contents, regarding both their care and adaptive use and development. The Church can be proud of its record of managing its church buildings; they are well kept and still used for their original purpose. However, they also form a significant part of our nation's built heritage, and bodies such as English Heritage have a duty to remind us of the responsibilities that this brings.

There are no easy answers to the tension that can develop (less often than people suppose) between mission and conservation. It is a great benefit to the Church that, in cases of adaptation or redevelopment of churches in use, these can be resolved by chancellors under the faculty jurisdiction system.

76. *Mr John Freeman (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

Given that polycarbonate will protect against most vandalism (especially small stones and air gun pellets) better than any other form of protection, will the Archbishops' Council put pressure on English Heritage to return to its former policy of allowing polycarbonate protection for church windows, including those of Grade I listed churches?

The Dean of York: The Council's advice, which has been formulated with the EIG, discourages the use of polycarbonate guards, both for aesthetic reasons and because they can create micro-climates which can significantly damage church fabric. Where protection is required, it is preferable to use mesh screens, which are generally proof against all but the most accurate of stones and pellets. That said, each case must be judged on its merits and there are circumstances, especially in unlisted churches, where they can be appropriate. English Heritage's guidance, which is broadly accepted by all bodies concerned with the conservation of windows, of course relates to the most significant of our historic buildings, into which category a great many churches fall.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Are you aware that the present policy of English Heritage means that we can have plate glass on one side of a church, polycarbonate on another and they want us to put wire mesh on a third? That is not the way to look after Grade I listed buildings. The contractors are fully aware of the problems of micro-climates. I would like you to kick them again.

The Dean of York: Did you say 'kick', sir?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Wake them up.

The Dean of York: Oh, I see. Thank you. Deans do not kick; they only push.

77. *The Archdeacon of Stoke (Ven. Alan Smith)* asked the Chairman of the Council for the Care of Churches:

Following the Diocesan Synod Motion which was passed by the General Synod on 18 November 1998, what progress has the Archbishops' Council made 'to investigate the possibilities in the law covering the re-use of old graves, the reopening of closed churchyards and appropriate memorialization'?

The Dean of York: In response to the motion passed in 1998, the Legal Advisory Commission produced an opinion on 'Further Burials in Existing Graves and in Land already used for Burials'. Further consideration is now being given to those issues in the light of a report on cemeteries from the House of Commons Select Committee on Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs. The report, which was published in March this year, called for a complete review of the law relating to burial and cemetery management, including churchyards. The Archdeacon may find helpful the new edition of the CCC's Churchyards Handbook, also published this year, which discusses the issue within the wider context of the management of churchyards.

Church Commissioners

78. *Professor David McClean (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners:

What pressure was put upon Mr John Sclater by the officers or committees of the Church Commissioners to resign as First Church Estates Commissioner, and what complaints of misconduct (if any) were made against him?

The Archbishop of York (Dr David Hope): As deputy chairman of the Board of Governors, I have been asked to respond to this Question.

I should first note that the office of First Church Estates Commissioner is a Crown appointment.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society closed its doors to new business in December 2000. A large number of serving clergy had made additional voluntary contributions to the Equitable Life. There had been commercial failure at Equitable Life and allegations of mismanagement. Mr Sclater had honourably taken responsibility and resigned as president of the Equitable, along with the whole board.

Given the above facts, and following soundings within the wider Church, Mr Sclater subsequently tendered his resignation as First Estates Commissioner to the Crown, but

the issue was certainly not misconduct, much less any reflection on Mr Sclater's own personal integrity.

79. *Professor David McClean (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners:

What reasons were given by Mr Edward Nugee QC and Sir Richard Baker-Wilbraham for their resignation as Commissioners?

The Archbishop of York: Mr Nugee tendered his resignation to the Archbishop of Canterbury following the resignation of Mr John Sclater. He did not feel that these events at Equitable Life had damaged confidence in Mr Sclater and on Mr Sclater's resignation he did not feel able to continue to serve as a Commissioner.

Sir Richard Baker-Wilbraham was a Crown-appointed Commissioner. Sir Richard indicated that it had always been his intention to retire at the annual general meeting of the Church Commissioners in June this year, but since Sir Richard shared a similar view to Mr Nugee he brought forward the date of his resignation.

80. *Mrs Ruth Dunnett (Chichester)* asked the Church Commissioners:

When were the actuaries appointed to the Church Commissioners and the Church of England Pensions Board, and when will these appointments be reviewed?

Lady Brentford (Third Church Estates Commissioner, ex officio): Watson Wyatt were appointed actuaries to the Church Commissioners in 1994. All professional appointments are reviewed from time to time, although the timetable for the review by the Commissioners of their actuaries has not been settled.

Mrs Daphne Brotherton (Chichester): While I appreciate the most successful management of the Church Commissioners' assets over the past ten years, are the Commissioners aware that there is some feeling that, because of acting on present actuarial advice, the Commissioners have had to be unduly cautious, to the detriment of income being available to assist the Church?

The Chairman: I think that you were beginning to ask for a matter of opinion there, so, if you do not mind, I will not allow that supplementary.

81. *Mrs Ruth Dunnett (Chichester)* asked the Church Commissioners:

How will the apportionment of the welcome extra £10 million to be granted by the Church Commissioners towards increased pension contributions be made?

Lady Brentford: The Commissioners' AGM agreed that an additional £10 million in transitional relief should be made available to dioceses between April 2002 and December 2004, as their final payment to assist the transition towards the new

contributory pension scheme. All dioceses will be offered some relief to cushion the immediate impact of the change. The bulk of the payment will, however, be targeted principally at dioceses most in need, assessed in line with the figures for diocesan resources per minister produced following the work of the allocations and apportionment review group (otherwise known as the Darlow group).

Dioceses were advised by letter on 27 June about the precise amounts available. Any amounts not taken up will be used to give further support to those more in need.

82. *Mrs Daphne Brotherton (Chichester)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Given that the yield on the Church Commissioners' investments is well below that recorded by funds such as the CBF, would the Church Commissioners consider dividing their assets for investment purposes, so that that part not allocated to meet pension commitments could be invested in such a way as to provide a higher yield to the benefit of the whole Church?

Lady Brentford: The Commissioners' policy for their non-pensions distributions is to determine, on advice of their actuaries, the level of distribution that they can sustain year on year into the indefinite future. Their aim is to sustain in real terms the value of their payment annually for non-pensions purposes. Their distribution aim is not linked to the level of income. No purpose can therefore be served by increasing the income level on their investments. Indeed, their investment policy would be constrained if an income requirement were imposed, and the Church would quite soon feel the effect of reductions in the Commissioners' distributions as their investment results deteriorated.

83. *Mrs Daphne Brotherton (Chichester)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Do the Church Commissioners accept that their proposals for the Octavia Hill estates are already undermining the credibility of the Church of England in the areas around these estates and beyond, and also run contrary to the Church's commitment to promote conditions favourable to stable family life?

84. *Revd Paul Collier (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Do the Church Commissioners accept that their proposals for the Octavia Hill estates have already seriously damaged the reputation of the Church of England in their local areas – among local residents, local councillors, the Greater London Authority and local MPs – and that the implementation of these proposals would be even more damaging?

Lady Brentford: With permission, Chairman, I will answer these Questions together.

In accordance with the renewed focus given by the National Institutions Measure 1998 to the Commissioners' duty to provide financial support for the Church's ministry in

parishes throughout the country, the Board of Governors has set in hand a fundamental review of all their asset classes, aimed at ensuring that that obligation is met.

The proposals currently being considered for the Octavia Hill estates have been the subject of detailed consultation, and we have received a wide range of views and options, not least at the fringe meeting this evening. These views will be fully taken into account when a decision is made about future letting policy.

Revd Paul Collier (Southwark): Could not this whole matter be referred to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group so as to determine how to strike the right balance between people and profit on this matter?

Lady Brentford: That is a question which I have not heard discussed, and which I will have to take back to our board and the Assets Committee. Thank you.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): In view of the fact that each resident on the Octavia Hill estates benefits from a subsidy of at least £7,000 per annum from the Church Commissioners – money which could be available for areas of need and opportunity throughout the country – does the Third Estates Commissioner feel that the Archbishops' Council would be inclined to confirm the Church's desire to provide social housing in this area and, if so, is it realistic to carry out a financial analysis or means testing of the residents' circumstances?

The Chairman: Mr Oldham, you are asking for an opinion and I cannot allow your supplementary, I am afraid.

85. *Revd Benny Hazlehurst (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Has the Assets Committee of the Church Commissioners already decided in principle to proceed with its proposals for the Octavia Hill estates, even before the consultation is complete, and, if so, does this not undermine the very consultation which the Commissioners are engaging in?

Lady Brentford: No decision has yet been taken. The thorough consultation process requested by the Assets Committee is a serious matter for us and is ongoing. We have received a wide range of views and opinions, and all have been or will be reported to the Assets Committee before it takes a decision in this matter. The fringe session here at Synod forms part of the consultation process, allowing Synod members the opportunity to consider the national implications of the proposals. Members of the Commissioners' Board and Assets Committee have visited some of the estates and spoken directly to tenants' representatives and will reflect upon the views that are being put forward.

86. *Revd Benny Hazlehurst (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Given the importance which the Church Commissioners are attaching in their proposals to their financial projections for refurbishment and increased returns for the Octavia Hill estates, why have the Commissioners refused to allow these projections to be examined in detail, especially in view of the clause in the Commissioners' own code of conduct which states 'Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands this'?

Lady Brentford: Costed assessments of the works proposed have been made available under broad headings, together with details of the financial assumptions made in calculating potential future income. The projections to which the questioner refers are, however, provisional as the works proposed are in part negotiable, that is, where they do not affect outstanding repairs or health and safety issues, and we have made it clear that we would want to consult with our residents' associations on the estates before drawing up detailed specifications.

Revd Benny Hazlehurst (Southwark): Given that the only information provided by the Commissioners on refurbishment fits on one side of an A4 sheet of paper, do the Commissioners usually take £35 million budgetary decisions on so little information, and are they aware that there is considerable doubt over the claim of £10 million per annum increased profits from these proposals and that, based on the assumptions of the Commissioners as provided, an alternative model has suggested only £3 million per annum?

Lady Brentford: Mr Hazlehurst will be aware, I am sure, that if you are doing a major exercise in refurbishment of several estates – not just one – there will be considerable paperwork attached. What it is appropriate at this point to put into the public arena is another matter. I do not sit on the Assets Committee, as he knows, and I do not know the details of that, so I am unable to answer that part of his question adequately. As regards the second part of the question, the calculations have been made by our finance director with his team, and I have never yet had reason to question them. We have used the words '£10 million in 15 years' time' and that is as it were using today's values with RPI in mind. So that is the only answer that I can give Mr Hazlehurst: that detail will become clear. It is going to be a sliding scale if this proposal is taken forward, but no decision has been made.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): This is simply a question of whether I heard aright. Did I hear aright that in your first answer you said that a detailed specification had not yet been drawn up and in your second answer you said that they could not be released?

Lady Brentford: Well clearly, to arrive at a figure of £35 million the Bishop will know that it will require more than one page of A4. As to what it is wise to put in the public arena, he also well knows the code of public conduct on that sort of issue and I do not

need to tell him that it is not always wise to give every working of one's committees for every item on the agenda for these things.

87. *Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield)* asked the Church Commissioners:

What is the total amount of housing benefit currently owed to them by local authorities in respect of all the residential properties which they own?

Lady Brentford: At the end of May 2001 the total amount of housing benefit owed on all the Commissioners' residential properties was £256,737. Of that figure, £167,966 was in respect of their Octavia Hill estates; the remaining £88,771 was owed on the Hyde Park estate.

Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield): What representations are the Church Commissioners making to the political leaders of the relevant local authorities and to Ministers of central Government, if necessary, in order to get these arrears cleared and for housing benefit in future to be paid promptly when due?

Lady Brentford: It is well reported that two of the London boroughs, for instance, with whom the Commissioners deal have recognized that the contractors employed to administer the housing benefit system for them have not fulfilled the terms of their contract, and those contracts have subsequently been terminated. It is fully expected that the backlog in payments for the Commissioners' residents will therefore continue for some considerable time.

88. *Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Church Commissioners:

What is being done to support mission at parish level in line with the Church Commissioners' historic responsibilities?

Lady Brentford: The Church Commissioners' funds for the support of parish ministry are paid, in line with the provisions of the National Institutions Measure 1998, to the Archbishops' Council for selective allocation to dioceses for stipends according to the level of financial need within that diocese. Alternative means of distributing at least part of the Commissioners' support for parish ministry are not ruled out for the future. New possibilities are currently being explored jointly by the Commissioners and the Council. In those discussions the board is concerned to focus upon mission in line with the Commissioners' obligation to make 'additional provision for the cure of souls'.

89. *Ms Sallie Bassham (Bradford)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Given the potentially far-reaching effects of the report *Resourcing Bishops*, have staff in the relevant departments of the Church Commissioners been consulted as to their reaction to this document?

Lady Brentford: Staff of the bishoprics and cathedrals department have been asked for their reaction to *Resourcing Bishops* by both senior management and the Bishoprics and Cathedrals Committee. They have worked hard to produce detailed responses to the report and should be congratulated on their efforts in doing so.

90. *Mr Andrew David (Southwell)* asked the Church Commissioners:

In the light of the significant impact that the publication of *Resourcing Bishops* has had on staff at the Church Commissioners, especially in the bishoprics department, what practical measures are currently being employed to ensure that staff are given much needed and, in some cases, overdue support and counsel?

Lady Brentford: I am sure that all members of Synod will have a concern for the staff of the NCIs at this difficult time. With regard to the publication of *Resourcing Bishops*, the Bishoprics and Cathedrals Committee has already expressed strong support for the staff, which has been greatly appreciated. It is likely to be some time before decisions are taken on the recommendations contained in the report, and senior management are alert to the need for careful support of staff during this period of undoubted uncertainty.

91. *Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Given that the parish clergy are required to account to their diocese for any fees earned, is there a similar requirement for bishops and, if so, does this extend to such items as attendance allowance at the House of Lords or fees for radio and TV appearances?

Lady Brentford: Payments to bishops who attend the House of Lords are not fees but an allowance paid for overnight accommodation, subsistence and secretarial costs. Payment is also made for travel. The appropriate comparison is with parish clergy who have their working costs reimbursed.

Fees are another matter. Bishops are advised that if they take on further, paid commitments involving time that would otherwise be used for episcopal responsibilities, they should inform the Commissioners of the gross annual amount; an equivalent sum can then be deducted from their stipend. Bishops are not required to tell the Commissioners of commitments undertaken during their own time, which is consistent with the guidance given for all clergy by the Central Stipends Authority.

The following Questions were answered in writing:

Finance Committee

92. *Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

In the year 2000 which dioceses received less than 95 per cent of the quota payments sought from parishes in respect of the year 2000?

Mr Michael Chamberlain replied: This information can be derived from the parish finance returns, but the figures for 2000 are not yet available and will not be available for some months.

93. *Mr Mike Tyrrell (Coventry)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

What advice, if any, is being given to PCC treasurers about the Charity Commission's recent revision of SORP 2, *Accounting for Charities*?

Mr Michael Chamberlain replied: Mr Tyrrell was a member of the working group that prepared guidance on the Charities Act 1993 and the SORP for parishes in 1997. We intend to publish a revision of this guidance in the autumn to cover the revision to the SORP and it will be widely available for treasurers. They will relate to accounts for 2001, prepared in the first four months of 2002. The changes are not major – and they are slight for those preparing receipts and payments accounts – and should be seen as an ongoing development of accounting practice.

94. *Mr Hugh Privett (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

Since it would obviate the need for the current audit trail requirements and probably cost the Government relatively little, is there any intention to try to persuade the Government to permit recovery of tax on all gifts to charities irrespective of whether the donor is a taxpayer?

Mr Michael Chamberlain replied: Matters of this nature are properly taken up with Government through the Churches' Main Committee, of which the Church of England is a member. Proposals similar to those made by Mr Privett were included in the Churches' Main Committee response to the Government's charity taxation review in 1997, which led to the changes that we are now enjoying with Gift Aid. Government were not prepared to write the almost blank cheque that Mr Privett proposes and there are no plans to pursue Government at this time.

95. *Mr John Pope (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

What consultations have taken place with diocesan boards of finance regarding the proposal to increase the amount of their outgoings in the form of increased pension contributions, and have diocesan authorities been formally asked to agree any increase or changes in retirement terms under the clergy pension scheme?

Mr Michael Chamberlain replied: The results of the actuarial review of the clergy pensions scheme and the consequential need for higher contributions were discussed with diocesan representatives at the meeting of the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum on 15 May. The increase will be payable from 1 April next year if the current package of pension benefits is to be maintained. It is up to General Synod to determine any changes in retirement terms for the clergy pension scheme. In the light of work now

being done and also the stipends level review, the Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee, through the Ministry Division and the Council, will, I am sure, be reporting to Synod in due course.

*96. *Dr Graham Campbell (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

Given that GS 1393, the annual report of the Audit Committee to the year 31 May 2000, states in paragraph 8 that there would be a decrease in the internal audit work for the Church Commissioners following the transfer of their equity portfolio to CCLA, would the Audit Committee consider offering the services of the internal audit department to other organizations within the Church of England on a consultancy basis?

Mr Michael Chamberlain replied: Yes, and preliminary discussions of this sort are already under way with one such body.

Pensions Board

97. *Mr John Pope (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

By what authority can such potential additional impositions as set out in clauses 3 and 4 of the draft Church of England (Pensions) Measure be placed unilaterally upon diocesan boards of finance which in effect mean additional financial burdens on parishes?

Mr Allan Bridgewater replied: Clause 3 would extend the Board's power to assist with the provision of retirement accommodation. As indicated in the explanatory memorandum to the draft Measure, this would enable the Board to be even-handed with regard to ongoing housing assistance if a couple in receipt of such assistance divorce after retirement. It is expected that the number of occasions when the Board would need to exercise the additional power would be fairly small. Following discussions with the Church Commissioners, the resources needed will be found from the Pensions Board's discretionary funds.

Clause 4 contains no new provision. Existing legislation already makes the diocese responsible for the costs of compensation, including the attached pension augmentation.

98. *Mr James Humphery (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

When did the Chairman of the Pensions Board inform the communications officer about the recommendations of the recent triennial review of the clergy pension scheme?

Mr Allan Bridgewater replied: At the Pensions Board's meeting on 26 April, at which

the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee and the Secretary General were also present, the actuary's calculations were discussed with him and a conclusion regarding the contribution rate was reached by the Board. The Director of Communications was informed of that conclusion immediately after the meeting. It was included in a paper for the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum which was issued a few days after the Board had met.

99. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

What provisions currently exist for stipendiary clergy to defer retirement beyond the normal retirement age, and what reductions in the contributions rate could be achieved if the average age of retirement were to be deferred by one, three and five years?

Mr Allan Bridgewater replied: As most clergy do not have an employment contract as such, there is no contractual 'normal retirement age'. The Age Limit Measure 1974 lays down requirements about the age of retirement. Subject to the provisions of that Measure, the right to choose a retirement date lies with the individual. The rules of the pension scheme provide for a 'minimum normal pension age' of 65.

It is not possible to answer the second part of the Question without obtaining advice from the actuary, and hence incurring considerable costs.

100. *Dr Graham Campbell (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

Has the Pensions Board any plans to revisit the assumptions which underpinned the recent actuarial valuation of the Church of England funded pension scheme with a view to mitigating the financial impact of the valuation on the parishes?

Mr Allan Bridgewater replied: As mentioned in the annex to the letter that I sent to Synod members with the Board's annual report, the actuary indicated a range of possible assumptions about future investment returns and increases in stipends. The stronger, or more pessimistic, the assumptions made, the higher the immediate rate of contributions required but the greater the possibility of a reduction in the future.

The Board, having regard to its responsibilities as trustee and bearing in mind the impact on dioceses and parishes of the overall position disclosed by the valuation, decided to adopt the rate indicated by the most optimistic of the range of assumptions, that is, the lowest rate. There have been no significant changes in conditions since the effective date of the valuation. I do not believe, therefore, that it would be appropriate to revisit the assumptions.

We have asked the actuary to report annually on his view of the future compared with the assumptions made at the last full valuation.

101. *Mrs Sheila Saunders (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

What are the arrangements for the appointment of actuaries for the Pensions Board, and are there regular reappraisals of the contract?

Mr Allan Bridgewater replied: Lane Clark & Peacock were appointed as the Board's actuaries in 1988. As one would expect, the professionalism of all the firms interviewed was not in question. The decision rested on other factors, one of the most important of which was clarity of presentation of the technical matters involved. The appointment does not have a fixed term. We continue to be very satisfied with both the professionalism and the presentational skills of the firm.

It is Lane Clark & Peacock's policy to carry out regular 'satisfaction audits' with its clients. I had such a meeting with a senior partner not involved in our work just over a year ago.

The Board will from time to time conduct a thorough review of each of its professional advisers.

House of Bishops

102. *Revd David Butterfield (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House of Bishops considered the responses from diocesan synods concerning the discussion document *Marriage in Church After Divorce* and, if so, (a) do these responses suggest that it is likely that the Church will be able to have 'a greater degree of consistency and confidence' in its response to those who 'return to marriage after divorce' and 'request the ministry of the Church'; and (b) will a report be given to General Synod for consideration at the November sessions?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The House gave initial consideration to the responses from dioceses at its meeting last month. These indicated a substantial level of general support for the recommendations in *Marriage in Church after Divorce*, with majorities in favour in nearly 60 per cent of dioceses. Varying degrees of opposition, inevitably to some extent mutually contradictory in content, were nevertheless evident, and the House has asked that some further work be done on aspects of the proposals before it submits a report and a proposal to the General Synod. Given this work – and a number of legal matters that require further clarification – I judge that the House's report is unlikely to be ready in time for the November sessions. However, the timing of this report is ultimately a matter for the House to determine in consultation with the Business Committee.

103. *Mr David Wright (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In view of the discretion, proposed in the report *Marriage in Church after Divorce*,

whether or not to permit the remarriage in church of a divorced person, has the question been considered whether, in an increasingly litigious society, and in the light of the human rights legislation, a decision to refuse to allow marriage in a particular case may render the priest, the bishop or the Church as an institution liable to a claim for compensation in a civil court, and has legal advice been obtained on this point?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I can assure you that the impact of the Human Rights Act on the report's proposals is one of the aspects on which the House has sought legal advice, and that it will seek to cover this in its eventual report to the General Synod on this matter.

104. *Mr Lee Humby (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What steps is the House taking to promote revival in our nation?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: Without wishing to underestimate the authority of the House of Bishops, I had always understood that such a revival would be led by the Holy Spirit!

At every institution and licensing, ordained ministers are charged by the bishop in front of the whole congregation to bring 'the grace and truth of Christ to this generation and [make] him known' to those in their care. Taken seriously, these are serious steps towards revival. Mission is a task for all Christians, not just bishops.

105. *Mr Lee Humby (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Is the House aware of the deep hurt and pain that is caused to many people who become Christians, often through Alpha and similar courses, and who seek a public demonstration of their conversion, cleansing from sin and spiritual rebirth, but cannot be baptized because of the Church's doctrine of infant baptism, and that new Christians are being damaged by it?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The service of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith (fully authorized since 1997) was devised with the express intention of meeting the situation outlined by Mr Humby. It arose from a request from General Synod in 1991 for just such a strong act of commitment to be available for those who are already baptized and confirmed and who had come to a renewed commitment after a period when they had moved away from the Faith. In this service the first question asked of those coming for affirmation of baptismal faith is 'Have you been baptized?', and the person is required to acknowledge that they are indeed already baptised.

The teaching of the Church of England as set out in the baptism service in the Book of Common Prayer and Article XXVII makes it clear that baptism, at whatever age it takes place, is 'not only a sign of profession' but is also 'a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into

the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, of our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God'. It goes on to say that the baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church as agreeable with the institution of Christ.

106. *Mr Robert Leach (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Is Celtic worship authorized for use in the Church of England, and is it compatible with the teachings of the Church?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: 'Celtic worship' is not a discrete or defined entity; it is rather a style of worship which uses a characteristic set of resources. It follows that there are opportunities within the authorized framework of *Common Worship* for the use of such resources, e.g. forms of intercession et cetera. Much that is characterized as Celtic worship takes the form of song, and Synod will be aware that there is no control in the Church of England over texts which are sung as hymns or songs.

Common Worship establishes a framework or structure for each act of worship and requires *authorized* material to be used at particularly sensitive points. Such material has been through a synodical process to establish it as consonant with the doctrine of the Church of England.

107. *Mr David Wilkinson (Derby)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What steps has the House of Bishops taken to evaluate the reception given to the occasional paper *The Eucharist, Sacrament of Unity*?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: *The Eucharist, Sacrament of Unity* was launched as a House of Bishops occasional paper on 21 March this year. Since then it has received extensive attention and has sold extremely well. It has elicited several substantial discussions in the religious press. It was welcomed by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and has been on the agenda of the English Anglican-Roman Catholic Committee. I understand that it has been studied by the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity in Rome.

It is too early for a full appraisal of how this document has been received, but the Faith and Order Advisory Group, who worked with the House of Bishops on the text, will be receiving a report at its September meeting and in due course will evaluate its reception and offer a report to the House of Bishops.

108. *Mr Paul Boyd-Lee (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Bearing in mind that a senior Church figure endorsed the use of the recently published *Cockney Bible*, what progress has the House's theological group made towards recommending Bible versions to be used for reading in public worship?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I can assure you that the theological group has considered this matter and that its proposals are due to be considered by the House of Bishops shortly.

109. *Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What status do the guidelines for good practice emanating from the report of the working party of the House of Bishops (GS 1395 on the Act of Synod) have?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: They are *guidelines* offered by the House of Bishops to the Church in the light of bishops' particular responsibility for pastoral oversight. They do not have statutory force.

110. *Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

By what process did the House of Bishops decide to issue its recommended guidelines for good practice from the report of the working party of the House of Bishops (GS 1395 on the Act of Synod)?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The House fully considered these guidelines at its residential meeting in January this year. They were then issued under a covering note from the Archbishop of York as Chairman of the House's Standing Committee following its meeting on 7 March.

111. *Mr David Webster (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House discussed the suggestion made by the Chairman of the House of Laity earlier this year that the House should invite women to attend its meetings if the bishops are serious about hearing women's voices?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: No, but I can assure Synod that the House does take steps to listen as necessary to voices outside its ranks. A recent example in which the House has taken particular care to listen to women's views will have been evident in the composition of its working party on women in the episcopate, five of whose members are women.

112. *Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

How does the House of Bishops envisage evangelism among young people being taken forward and adequately funded in the light of its recent discussion of the feasibility study into the proposed youth evangelism fund, with its encouraging evidence of potential donors?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: At its recent meeting the House of Bishops had

its first opportunity to consider in depth the role and nature of the proposed youth evangelism fund. The House expressed general support for the idea of such a fund. However, it also felt that more work is needed, both to identify the potential impact of such a fund on other initiatives and on already hard-pressed parishes, and also to consider more carefully how the fund would integrate evangelism, Church and young people.

Work is being done to bring greater clarity to these areas of concern, prior to further consideration in the autumn.

113. *Mrs Margaret Brown (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What arrangements exist to ensure that, when a man becomes a diocesan bishop, he conforms to the collegiality of the House of Bishops?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: No formal arrangements apply but I can assure the Synod that members of the House of Bishops are conscious of their special role in keeping the Church true to the apostolic teaching and ministry. I would, however, resist too narrow a definition of collegiality. As stated in *Bishops in Communion* (GS Misc 580), 'Episcopal collegiality involves the delicate and complex task of making room for those of different opinions while guarding and promoting unity ... speaking collegially does not mean speaking in full agreement on every subject.'

114. *Mrs Margaret Brown (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

When a moral issue is coming before the House of Lords, do those bishops who are members of the House discuss this beforehand so that a Christian moral lead is given?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: Given the limited notice of House of Lords business, it is not always possible – given the gaps between meetings of the House of Bishops – for such matters to be discussed by the House beforehand. It does, however, endeavour to do so and has in the past carefully considered such issues as the age of consent and human cloning. I am sure that in expressing their views in the House of Lords bishops would have regard to the collegiality of the House of Bishops and that in speaking and voting on these matters they would wish to bring Christian teaching to bear. The House of Lords is, however, a legislative chamber, and it may be perfectly possible for bishops to vote differently on the precise details of legislation on such matters while still faithfully witnessing to the Church's teaching.

115. *Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What is the difference in principle between alternative episcopal oversight available to Church of England parishes under the Act of Synod and arrangements being established by Archbishops Emmanuel Kolini and Datuk Yong Ping Chung to assist parishes associating with the Anglican Mission in America, and should not traditional

Anglican ecumenism be perfectly comfortable with any threatened autonomy of an alternative Anglican 'local church' in the United States, in the sense so encouragingly outlined by Cardinal Walter Kasper in his recent argument with Cardinal Ratzinger?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The *extended* episcopal ministry offered under the Act of Synod differs from the American example quoted in two very significant respects: first, PEVs carry out episcopal duties with the concurrence of the relevant diocesan bishop (who continues to function as the Ordinary of the diocese for the parishes concerned). Second, these arrangements have lawful authority stemming from an Act approved, overwhelmingly, by this body. I do not consider that Anglicans should be comfortable – as the questioner puts it – with a situation in which episcopal acts are carried out without the permission of the bishop of the diocese concerned.

Third, when the provinces of South East Asia and Rwanda were inaugurated their metropolitans were given no authority to exercise their ministry beyond the boundaries of their provinces. Unlike bishops operating under extended episcopal ministry, the Primates have exceeded their authority by arrogating privileges to themselves that have not been constitutionally entrusted to them.

116. *The Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr John Moses)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Whether the House will consider the recent irregular episcopal consecrations in Denver and their implications for the Anglican Communion?

117. *Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Will the House consider the consecration of American bishops by the Archbishops of Rwanda and South East Asia?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I wonder if I might take both Questions together.

I am sure that the House will wish to touch on this disturbing matter when it next meets, but members of Synod will be interested to know that there are three troubling aspects to the Denver consecrations that distinguish them from those in Singapore in 1999. a) They were performed on ECUSA territory; b) they were performed *after* the explicit admonition by all the Primates not to repeat such a practice; and c) they were ordained for an *organized* group of churches (AMiA founded 28 July 2000).

There are at least three areas that the House might wish to consider: 1) Should it be discovered that the Primates of South East Asia and Rwanda had the support of the bishops of their own provinces, what would that say about the relationship of the see of Canterbury with those provinces? 2) If there are plans afoot to incorporate one or several of the irregularly consecrated bishops into the House of Bishops of South East

Asia or Rwanda, I rather suspect that it would be difficult for me to be in communion with some bishops of a province and not others. 3) The issue at stake is not about the abuse of primatial authority but one of an illegitimate exercise of ill-gained authority which the two primates have arrogated to themselves.

*118. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What plans are being made by the Church at national or provincial level to celebrate the Golden Jubilee of the Queen's accession and to mark Her Majesty's 50 years of faithful service and dedication, as Sovereign, to Church and nation?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The centrepiece of the Golden Jubilee celebrations will be a national service of thanksgiving at St Paul's Cathedral on Tuesday 4 June 2002. Plans are also being developed in many parts of the country for individual services and other events and acts of worship. Attention is also being given to the possibility of ecumenical worship and to the preparation of appropriate worship materials. It is also intended that there should be an inter-faith dimension to the Jubilee celebrations.

Crown Appointments Commission

119. *The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Appointments Commission:

Did the Crown Appointments Commission, or anyone acting on its behalf, have any contact with the *Sunday Times* before it published an apology and correction on 13 November 2000 to an earlier report concerning the names put forward by the Commission for the bishoprics of Carlisle and Ely?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The *Sunday Times* report was wrong in virtually every particular, and the Chairman of the Crown Appointments Commission asked the secretary to contact the editor and ask for a correction and apology accordingly.

120. *Ms Sallie Bassham (Bradford)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Appointments Commission:

In the past decade what is the maximum number of bishops to retire in any given three-month period and how many of our present bishops are eligible to retire by the end of 2001?

The Archbishop of York replied: The maximum number of bishops to retire in any given three-month period in the past decade was three. If by 'eligible to retire' is meant 'reach the age of 65', 14 of our present bishops will have reached that age by the end

of 2001. The figure includes the Bishops of Lincoln and Bath and Wells who will be retiring before the end of the year. This does not of course mean that all those bishops will retire at the age of 65. They are eligible to continue in ministry until the age of 70.

121. *Ms Sallie Bassham (Bradford)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Appointments Commission:

How long does it take the Crown Appointments Commission to do the work involved in appointing one new bishop, and is the CAC able to do the work involved in appointing a new bishop for several bishops simultaneously?

The Archbishop of York replied: The average time between the announcement of a bishop's retirement and the announcement of the name of his successor is, by a happy coincidence, nine months. Although each meeting of the CAC only considers one vacancy in see, various parts of the preparatory work such as the vacancy-in-see committee and the consultations may be handled concurrently for different vacancies. For example, both in 1991 and in 1997 the CAC handled six vacancies in the year.

122. *Mr Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Appointments Commission:

As far as he is aware and able to reveal, how many clergy have declined an invitation to become a diocesan bishop since the Crown Appointments Commission was established in 1977?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: To some extent, it depends on whether the Question is intended to include translations. In any case, I decline to give an exact figure but Mr Bruinvels can take it that it is very few.

Archbishops' Council

123. *Mr Nigel Holmes (Carlisle)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Given that seats on public committees and bodies are now rarely granted to Church representatives as of right, will the Archbishops' Council consider encouraging suitably qualified Christians to put their names forward for such posts?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I am sure that the Archbishops' Council share your wish to encourage Christians to serve on public committees and bodies. The Council have no particular locus to influence such appointments, but I am sure that there are many opportunities for Christian leaders in all parts of the Church to provide discreet encouragement where this is needed.

124. *Revd Eric Bramhall (Liverpool)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Given that the Prime Minister will put forward recommendations made by the House of Lords Appointments Commission to the Queen without intervention (save in the most exceptional circumstances), will the Archbishops' Council request the Prime Minister also to give an assurance that he will advise Her Majesty to appoint the first person nominated by the Crown Appointments Commission in the case of the appointment of diocesan bishops?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Archbishops' Council have no plans to make such a request. It is for the Crown to decide how it wishes to be advised in such matters.

125. *Mr Ian Smith (York)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Following the replacement on the Archbishops' Council of the Bishop of Durham by the Bishop of Rochester, resulting in two diocesan bishops from the southern province serving on the council, will the chairman give assurances that representation by a northern bishop will be reconsidered at an early opportunity?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: Under the National Institutions Measure, the House of Bishops *elects* two of its members on to the Council. The Bishops of Guildford and Rochester were chosen in this way in 2000 in an uncontested election. No northern bishop stood for election.

Having said this, there is of course one bishop on the Council, an archbishop indeed, whose northern credentials are second to none!

126. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Following requests at the height of the foot and mouth crisis for a national day of prayer, will the Chairman clarify why he did not feel that he wished to take such an initiative and reflect further on the view which he then expressed that the Church of England has no distinctive tradition of such special days of prayer, other than in times of war?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The response of the Church of England to the foot and mouth crisis is one in which I think we can take modest pride. We have responded with energy and commitment. The Archbishop of York and I commended not a day of prayer but special prayers for use in churches throughout the crisis. They were used very widely and were greatly valued. We also gave strong support to the setting up of a fund to provide material assistance to those most in need in rural communities. That fund raised millions of pounds. In addition, the practical action of both clergy and laity in rural communities, in offering pastoral care and support during the crisis, has been deeply appreciated.

127. *Mrs Margaret Cosh (Hereford)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

While acknowledging the generous contributions given to the Addington Fund to support farmers through the crisis, are the Archbishops' Council aware of the new wave of need as the knock-on effect escalates into the small associated businesses, and will the Archbishops' Council renew their efforts to draw in more contributions to boost these fast-diminishing funds?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Council were briefed on the Fund at their March meeting and applauded the remarkable achievement of the staff of the Arthur Rank Centre and the trustees of the Fund in raising and channelling such large sums in such a short time. It is a wonderful example of the Churches working together. I would also like to salute the contribution that the Bishop of Blackburn and Jeremy Martineau have been making to the Government's Rural Task Force.

I understand that the Fund is still able to channel funds to agricultural businesses and to other parts of the damaged rural economy as funds allow, in recognition of the very serious effect which the foot and mouth epidemic has had on them. The trustees and staff of the Fund are considering how the Churches might most effectively play a part in rural regeneration by an adaptation of the terms of the Fund to attract external funding. The Council look forward to hearing the outcome of that consideration.

128. *Revd John Cook (London)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

What steps have the Archbishops' Council taken to ensure that money that they distribute is in accordance with section 67 of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840?

129. *Mr David Wilkinson (Derby)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Are there missiological or ecclesiological reasons why money distributed by the Archbishops' Council using Church Commissioners' funds should not be given to parishes directly, rather than via block grants to the needier dioceses?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I shall answer these two Questions together.

Section 67 of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840 sets out that money which the Commissioners are able to make available should be applied 'for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is most required'. That clause can be interpreted flexibly and is not confined solely to stipends support.

The Council have to date followed the methodology used for many years by the Commissioners in channelling stipend support money to parishes in the form of block grants to dioceses, with dioceses themselves determining (using their own quota systems) how this should be allocated to parishes according to need. This follows principles of subsidiarity. The means by which allocations are made to dioceses has

itself been the subject of a major review over the past two years, which is to be considered by Synod on Monday.

The recent proposal that some monies might instead be given in the form of direct grants to parishes does indeed raise missiological, ecclesiological and also administrative questions which need to be weighed carefully in considering the proposal. There is, however, no legal impediment to funds being applied directly to parishes, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners did in fact make such grants for the entire hundred years of their history. The proposal to apply funds for parish mission is one of a number of options which are at present the subject of discussion between the Council and the Commissioners and dioceses.

130. *Mr Richard Leyton (Winchester)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Do the Council commend the lead that they and the Church Commissioners have shown in freezing budgets at 2001 levels for three years to dioceses?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Archbishops' Council reflected at their May meeting on the situation facing the Church in the light of the significant increase in the contribution rate for the clergy pension scheme. They came to the conclusion that the Council should recognize the implication for parishes and make reductions in the national Church budget. The Commissioners have adopted a similar approach in order to maximize the amount of parish ministry support that they can provide. We recognize that cuts are painful and we hope that the Synod will look sympathetically in November at the Council's detailed budget proposals as we face a challenging but, I believe, necessary task. We ask you to have the Council and the Commissioners and their staff in your prayers as we work through the difficult process of determining how we can minimize the impact of cuts on the mission and ministry of the Church.

131. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

In view of the regrettable number of misleading and, in some instances, erroneous reports recently in the media on Church affairs (not least on Church finances and the resourcing of bishops), and considering the false impressions given by such reports, how does the Church respond to inaccurate articles and what efforts are made to encourage journalists to report Church news responsibly, accurately and based on the full range of available information?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: Where news reports are inaccurate or factually untrue, the Communications Unit seeks to secure a published correction. Where there is a difference in interpretation of a story between a journalist and the Church, the Unit will seek to make clear the Church's interpretation by negotiating a letter for publication, in discussion with the journalist or editor concerned. In cases where an

actual mistake has occurred, this is usually successful; when a news story highlights something that is factually true but not central to what the Church is saying, it is far less successful. The Communications Unit works to foster good relations with all parts of the media and is always available to answer journalists' enquiries as accurately as possible.

132. *Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Are the Archbishops' Council in favour of increasing the amount of worship and Christian broadcasting in both the public and the independent sectors, and what steps are being taken to safeguard existing levels of production?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Archbishops' Council and indeed General Synod are very much in favour of increasing high quality religious broadcasting, including acts of worship, which will appeal to a large number of people. The Council, in partnership with this Synod's Religion in Broadcasting group under the leadership of the Bishop of Wakefield, and supported by the Communications Unit, actively pursue these issues with the broadcasters and the Government.

133. *Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

How much involvement have the Archbishops' Council had in the White Paper consultation in preparation for this year's broadcasting Bill, and what was the result?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: After wide ecumenical consultation, the Church of England submitted a formal response to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport to the White Paper *A New Future for Telecommunications*. Since then, further representations have been made, and three Church of England representatives were present at a consultation between the DCMS and people from a range of religious organizations including the Central Religious Advisory Council.

134. *Revd Jeremy Fletcher (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Is the Church House Communications Unit aware of the appreciation of many in this Synod of its painstaking work behind the scenes in ensuring that representations of *Common Worship* liturgies on *EastEnders* and other soap operas are both accurate and helpful, and will the Chairman ensure that the Unit is given encouragement and resources to enable this work to continue?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: On behalf of the Communications Unit, thank you. As a result of the Unit's efforts many soaps follow the Church's authorized liturgy more faithfully and consistently than some parishes that I know. This work with drama

producers and writers of soap operas is just one aspect of the 24-hours-a-day, 365-days-a-year work of the Unit. It is time-consuming and often requires tenacity; and it has to be remembered that programme-makers are naturally more interested in the dramatic possibilities of a realistic scenario than in the detailed accuracy of every aspect of its portrayal.

I cannot give Mr Fletcher the assurances that he seeks in relation to resources. I can assure him, however, that giving specialist help in response to the six thousand-odd calls which come each year from people working in radio, television and the newspapers will remain one of the Unit's core tasks.

135. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

What representations have the Archbishops' Council made to the management and/or governors of the BBC about the implications arising from the early retirement as head of religion and ethics of Revd Ernie Rea, and the failure thus far to appoint a successor?

136. *Mr David Webster (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Has there been any consultation by the BBC with the Director of Communications or the head of broadcasting and electronic media over its disappointing failure to appoint a new director of religious broadcasting?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I will reply to these two Questions together.

On the morning of the announcement of Mr Rea's departure from the BBC, the Director of Communications issued a strong statement of concern, a copy of which I am arranging to be posted on the notice-board. Since then, there has been no formal consultation by the BBC. However, the media-lead bishops, including the Bishops of Wakefield and Liverpool and I, and others, supported by the Communications Unit, have made several private representations to the chairman, governors and senior staff of the BBC. They have been left in no doubt as to the Church of England's concerns. This week, an open meeting of the all-party BBC parliamentary group followed the formal laying before Parliament of the BBC's annual report and accounts. The Bishop of Wakefield took the personal opportunity to press these concerns directly with the chairman and director general of the BBC. They gave public assurances that they are working hard to appoint, and also that the new head of religion and ethics at the BBC will have guaranteed access to the schedules of BBC1 and BBC2, and will have commissioning powers and budget.

137. *Revd David Bird (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Has the Communications Department considered putting an evangelistic explanation

of the Christian faith on the Church of England web site in order to help casual visitors browsing the Internet to engage with the content of the gospel?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: This has been under constant and active consideration for a number of years. In 1998 and again in 1999 Synod members were consulted at a well-attended series of fringe meetings about the shape and direction of the main web site. It emerged very quickly in those consultations and in subsequent discussions that there was no common view as to how this kind of material might be approached. It was also felt that it should not be done in isolation and would require people deployed to back up such activity. There are some external sites in development by ecumenical groups at the moment and it is hoped that, as these reach full development, it will be possible to link to them directly from our site.

138. *Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Is it the intention of the Archbishops' Council to publish and debate the result of their listening group programme and, if so, when will this important information be available for use by parishes and deaneries?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Council have considered the results of the listening group programme and concluded that, despite its limited scope, it represents a useful resource for the Church and should be used to inform the further work of the Council and Synod. Its main conclusions are available on request.

139. *Mr Stuart Emmason (Manchester)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

What strategies, if any, have the Archbishops' Council been pursuing, following their consideration of the report on Christian homophobia, in order to combat homophobia in the Church and its structures?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Church has consistently made clear its rejection of homophobia, and a number of recommendations in the LGCM report (to which I assume Mr Emmason is referring) are common ground. The Church is continuing its theological work on these issues. The Council are committed to equal opportunities, as expressed in the policy that they have joined in implementing for the national Church institutions. We are opposed to all forms of bullying wherever they happen. In a number of its statements and recommendations the LGCM report takes a different view from that set out in the House of Bishops' teaching document *Issues in Human Sexuality*. The Council have referred the LGCM report to the group chaired by the Bishop of Oxford, which is working on behalf of the House on these matters.

140. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Have the Archbishops' Council sought to apply pressure to Church House Publishing concerning the lamentable omission to provide large-print versions of Morning and Evening Prayer on Sunday and, if not, will the Council raise this matter as one of urgency, aware that the absence of such versions is causing widespread dismay in parishes?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: *Common Worship* publishing decisions are taken by the Liturgical Publishing Group, which I chair, advised by staff from Church House Publishing and other departments. The two volumes of *Common Worship* and selected individual services are available in a large format with larger print. This year we have also responded to requests by publishing Holy Communion cards in larger print. We are always open to suggestions but have not so far received indications of widespread demand for Morning and Evening Prayer in larger print. All the material is available free of charge on the web site and can be printed off in the varying type sizes which different individuals need. Mindful of the needs of others with visual impairment, and after consultation with the Royal National Institute for the Blind, we have now published the main volume in Braille at the heavily subsidized price to registered Braille users of £1 for each of 19 parts.

141. *Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

How long will the lucrative Church House Publishing monopoly over *Common Worship* be preserved, and why was the decision taken to forego the consumer benefit of competitive publishing by a number of different houses which might have resulted in a Church of England modern worship book usable by ordinary people becoming part of the national culture at a price as reasonable as the old ASB?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: The Archbishops' Council's decision to appoint Church House Publishing as the official publisher of *Common Worship* was reported to the Synod in GS 1355. In November 1999 the Synod debated the report and approved the plans for publishing *Common Worship*. The decision has enabled the Liturgical Publishing Group to control the way in which the material is presented and the price at which it is sold, and it has ensured that the Church rather than the shareholders of commercial publishers will benefit from any surplus which remains at the end of the liturgical publishing programme. The decision has resulted in a worship book sold at a price as reasonable as the ASB. The general response to *Common Worship* shows that it is already establishing itself as part of the national culture, especially since it is published not only in book form but in a variety of electronic formats and is available on the Internet free of charge. There are no plans to change this policy.

142. *Mr Stuart Emmason (Manchester)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

How do the Archbishops' Council intend to protect the work within their key themes, such as 'welcoming and encouraging children and young people', within the context of the significant budget cuts that they are proposing?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Council will take their key themes into account alongside other factors in assessing relative priorities in the use of the reduced resources that they expect to have at their disposal.

143. *Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

In view of the urgency identified in Lord Dearing's report of the Church's need to recruit, retain and support Christian teachers for all schools, what actions will the Archbishops' Council be taking to raise the profile of teaching as a Christian vocation?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The Archbishops' Council have not yet formally discussed Lord Dearing's report, but the question relates to an important issue that will need sustained action by the whole Church. The very practical advice about promoting the vocation to teach contained in *The Way Ahead* will need to be disseminated widely. The Council will work through the Church of England Board of Education and National Society in developing appropriate material for use in parishes and schools, and in raising the awareness of teaching as a Christian vocation through Education Sunday and other events.

144. *Mr Allan Jones (Liverpool)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

What is the latest position in the setting up of the fund for youth evangelism first discussed in Synod in November 1999?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I refer to the answer given to Mr Peter LeRoy's Question to the Chairman of the House of Bishops. The Archbishops' Council hope to report to the General Synod on this matter in November, following further consultation with the House of Bishops.

145. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

What was the cost of carrying out the feasibility study on the prospects of raising funds for the youth evangelism fund?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The feasibility study was carried out by charity consultants for £20,000 plus VAT and expenses. The cost was funded from within the contingency budget within the 2000 budget for Vote 2.

146. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

When will the results of the feasibility study on the youth evangelism fund be available to members of the General Synod?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: I refer to my earlier answer to Mr Jones.

147. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

How many members of the Archbishops' Council have now attended racial awareness training, and what target date has been set for the remainder to do so?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: Thirteen members of the Council have so far attended racism awareness training arranged through the Archbishops' Council or other bodies. A further training programme is planned for September. I hope that most members will have attended training by the end of this year.

148. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

How and when will racial awareness training be extended to include all boards and committees?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: That is potentially a very extensive programme. We have not as a Council assessed how it might be done but we will need to prioritize where the needs are most urgent, both in relation to the work of different boards and committees and by an assessment of the level of training experience that individual members already have. We will also have to consider the resourcing implications, which are considerable. However, the question is a valuable prompt.

149. *Mr John Freeman (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Archbishops' Council:

Will the Archbishops' Council arrange for a complete overhaul of ecclesiastical law to bring it into line with the needs of the twenty-first century?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The process of reviewing aspects of ecclesiastical law which need to be brought up to date is a constant one, as Synod members will know from their own experience of Synod debates. It would be quite impractical for the Archbishops' Council to launch a massive review and overhaul of the whole body of law relating to the Church, because of the resource implications, but the review of aspects of marriage law and the review of the Dioceses and Pastoral Measures are examples of work on significant areas of ecclesiastical law which is already in progress.

Appointments Committee

150. *Mr Ian Smith (York)* asked the Chairman of the Appointments Committee:

Will the Chairman of the Appointments Committee give details of the occasions when members of his Committee have been allocated to boards, committees and councils, and advise Synod how many such appointments are held by each member of his Committee?

Canon Hugh Wilcox replied: The Appointments Committee has appointed three of its members to Boards, Councils, Committees of equivalent status and the main Commissions:

- Martin Dales to the Council for Christian Unity;
- Ian Garden to the Legal Advisory Commission; and
- Jayne Ozanne to the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (the CMEAC constitution requiring such cross-membership).

Three other members of the Appointments Committee arrive on such bodies by other routes: two elected by the Synod and one appointed by the Archbishops' Council to a post set aside for a Council member.

Appointments Committee members are also members of a number of other bodies, as can be seen from the *Who's Who* section of the *Church of England Yearbook*. (For example, I am Chairman of the Liturgical Publishing Group and Vice-Chairman of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group.) The appointing body varies from case to case – sometimes it is the Appointments Committee.

The approach that the Appointments Committee takes over these matters is this: it aims always to act in accordance with best practice, as explained in its report about its work last year (GS Misc 620). Whenever a post falls to be filled, the Committee seeks to identify the person most suited for it, taking into account the information available (a person's appointments survey, *Church of England Year Book* entry, any specific expression of interest in the post et cetera). The Committee usually considers a number of candidates for each appointment, and from time to time this pool will include one of its own members. If so, the case for the appointment of that member is considered in exactly the same way as the cases for the other candidates, the discussion taking place while he or she is out of the room. Sometimes Committee members have been appointed; more often, in fact, they have not.

Ministry Division

151. *Revd Dr Alan Hargrave (Ely)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

In the light of the Data Protection Act, will candidates for selection to ordained ministry now have the right to see the so-called 'bishop's letters'?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: Yes. The Data Protection Act 1998 makes provision for any person, called in the Act a data subject, to see data held about them in any retrievable filing system. Ministry Division staff have been working to offer guidelines to the House of Bishops and diocesan staff to ensure that the Church of England complies with the Act in the area of selection for training for ordained and accredited lay ministries. The House of Bishops has agreed that, once the bishop has made his decision, in the light of the advice of the bishops' selectors, about whether a candidate should enter training, the report of the bishops' selectors will be shown to the candidate as a matter of course.

152. *Revd David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

How are bishops' selectors themselves selected, and how is the overall selection monitored to correlate with the often mentioned three main traditions within the Church of England (Evangelical, Catholic and Liberal), as they are expressed both in the Church as a whole today and, more specifically, in actual candidates at selection conferences or ordinands in training?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: Bishops' selectors are nominated by the diocesan bishops and a request from the Ministry Division is made for a balanced panel that includes a good mix of the following: men and women, lay and clergy (including religious); stipendiary and non-stipendiary; of new and experienced selectors; as well as a variety of ethnic backgrounds; a range of ages; different Church traditions; and a variety of life experience. The Ministry Division does not have a record of selectors' churchmanship designations but assumes that care has been taken to ensure that there is balance at the point of nomination. Selection panels are not selected with this in mind in relation to candidates on issues of tradition and churchmanship at selection nor during training; instead selectors are encouraged to apply agreed criteria equally to all candidates, irrespective of their affiliations.

153. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Given the considerable benefits which could be gained by achieving a significant reduction in the average age of those entering the ordained ministry, what steps are being taken to ensure that the Church is present at university open days for career selection by co-ordinating attendance from respective dioceses throughout the country and ensuring that they are equipped with the appropriate resources?

Bishop of Guildford replied: At present there is no proactive recruitment drive being carried out in colleges and universities, but, when invited, the vocations officer of the Ministry Division may attend vocational events. This is entirely at the discretion of college chaplains, and effort in this area varies in emphasis. However, the Ministry Division does respond to requests from school, college and university careers departments for vocational literature and information. In addition, the vocations adviser's newsletter is sent to all chaplains of colleges of higher education and so they

are made aware of all the vocations initiatives in the diocese. There is a limit to what can be done nationally on the basis of one 25 per cent post for vocations. A lot of good work is done by the dioceses in schools and further education institutions. We fully support the desire to see more younger candidates.

154. *Mr Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What are the guidelines governing the serving of titles in the Diocese of Europe, given that it is normally recommended to be in a different church from one's sending church in other dioceses, and is it normal practice to suggest that an ordinand should move to another diocese in order to serve their title?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: Bishops who ordain and principals of colleges and courses share responsibility for advising about the parish where a minister will serve. Candidates are not obliged to serve their title in their sponsoring diocese, but until 31 October of the year preceding ordination candidates should only consider posts in their sponsoring dioceses unless they have received, in writing, the goodwill of their diocese to look elsewhere. In 2001, according to the information that we currently hold, there are 195 stipendiary candidates who are returning to their sponsoring dioceses and 112 stipendiary candidates who have found posts elsewhere. The Diocese in Europe tries to ensure that candidates gain experience in churches other than their sending church but placement, which is always subject to episcopal and pastoral oversight, is largely governed by funding and family circumstances.

155. *The Archdeacon of Middlesex (Ven. Malcolm Colmer)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Which theological colleges and courses give specific child protection training to ordinands?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: The Ministry Division does not currently hold this information but will be collecting and collating it.

156. *Mr Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

In the light of the increase in the numbers being recommended for training, the pressures on finance, and the cutbacks in other areas of the central Church's work, are there any plans to reconsider the method, efficacy and cost of delivery of theological training?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: The question of the delivery of theological training is being looked at by the working party on the structure and funding of ordination training set up by the Archbishops' Council last year. The working party, under the

chairmanship of the Bishop of Chichester, will report to the Council in 2003; its terms of reference include the areas of the method, efficacy and cost of theological training.

157. *Mr Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Whether he will give the latest available figures for the number of priests with freehold title, male and female, and for those who do not hold such title, and also, of those in the second category, how many are team vicars?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: According to the latest edition of *Statistics of Licensed Ministers*, which is being published later this month, there were, at 31 December 2000, 5,004 male incumbents, 267 female incumbents, 1,531 male clergy of incumbent status, of whom 514 were team vicars, and 351 female clergy of incumbent status, of whom 152 were team vicars. The figure for incumbents includes team rectors. Team rectors in post before the coming into force of the Team and Group Ministries Measure 1994 may or may not have freehold whereas those appointed after this date will not have the freehold; but these figures are not readily available as the information has not been updated since the Measure came into effect.

158. *Canon Gordon Oliver (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Would the Chairman please explain to the Synod what the arrangements are to be for debate of the recently published *Mind the Gap* report on continuing ministerial education?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: The report was warmly recommended by the Ministry Division, Bishops' Committee for Ministry and House of Bishops for study and implementation in the dioceses.

159. *Canon Gordon Oliver (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

In the light of assurances given at the meeting of the General Synod in York in July 2000, would the Chairman inform the Synod of how well the arrangements are working in which the national CME post is incorporated into the work of the director of the Ministry Division, and whether it is anticipated that this arrangement will be continued in the future?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: Because of unexpected vacancies, this temporary arrangement was reviewed earlier than anticipated. A selection secretary, Revd Jane Rawling, will commence work in October with responsibility for CME similar to her predecessor.

160. *Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Will the Ministry Division consider the possibility of, on the one hand, abandoning

universal provision of clergy pensions and freeing clergy (after suitably enhancing their pay levels) to make their own stakeholder or other pension arrangements like most of their parishioners, while also, on the other hand, introducing flexible alternative clergy contracts to replace the existing demarcation between stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy posts, of 25 per cent, 50 per cent, 75 per cent or other proportions of the full stipend, to achieve more efficient and (for parishes) bearable and understandable deployment of clerical effort?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: A small working group is already examining aspects of the current pensions benefits package and other related financial issues, and hopes to produce a preliminary report for consideration in the autumn. I will ensure that the points that Mr Sutcliffe makes are passed to the group. Most clergy do not have contracts. There is already provision for clergy to work on a part-time basis. At the end of 2000 about 1 per cent of the stipendiary clergy worked part-time.

161. *The Archdeacon of Middlesex (Ven. Malcolm Colmer)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Given the current climate of financial stringency and that parishioners have a right to burial in churchyards, why cannot the fees for this service be made commercial?

The Bishop of Guildford replied: Last year, the Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee considered the question of whether to have a special increase in the fee for burials in the churchyard. It took the view that increasing the fee for burials in churchyards might discourage people from having funerals in church. It considered that such a move would be wrong, particularly in the light of the motion on the conduct of funerals passed by the Synod at the November 1998 sessions.

In response to concerns about the impact of the actuarial review, this year's draft Order proposes an increase of 8.5 per cent in the level of fees. This represents a substantial increase on the 3 per cent that would have been proposed if we had applied the current policy, which increases parochial fees by the same percentage as the national stipend benchmark for incumbents. It is not possible to set a single national fee that would be wholly commercial, as the level of the fee would have to vary in response to market conditions and, in particular, the amount of space available in churchyards, which varies considerably across the country. Furthermore, comparisons with local authority fees for burials are difficult as they include fees for digging the grave and making it good, whereas parochial fees do not.

Board of Mission

162. *Miss Sue Booth (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Mission:

What is being done to encourage parishes to share time, talents and finance with other denominations locally when planning a time of mission and outreach?

The Bishop of Liverpool replied: Encouraging ecumenical and interdenominational sharing in mission and evangelism is a feature of the national work of the staff of the Board of Mission. This is carried out through the group for evangelization of Churches Together in England, which includes representatives of all the main denominations, new Churches and interdenominational bodies such as the Evangelical Alliance and Bible Society. Within dioceses, the advice that diocesan missionaries and evangelists give covers the need to think and act with other Christians in plans for mission and outreach.

163. *Revd Paul Collier (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Mission:

Given the Church of England's declared policy that lesbian and gay people are welcome in their local parish church, has the Board of Mission considered giving advice to enable individual churches to communicate effectively the message that lesbian and gay people are genuinely welcomed without prejudice?

The Bishop of Liverpool replied: The specific issue of advising parishes on communicating the message that lesbian and gay people are genuinely welcomed without prejudice has not been considered either in the last quinquennium or as the new Board begins its life. The general issue of the welcome given to those coming new or afresh to Church was identified as an important lesson from the Decade of Evangelism and one of which diocesan missionaries are well aware. It has been widely publicised in the leaflet *20 from 10* lessons from the Decade of Evangelism.

164. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Mission:

In view of the important work of St George's College, Jerusalem, providing a centre in the Holy Land for field work, study and reflection, and the opportunity to meet with people from all local communities, and the fact that the college is trying to maintain its local Palestinian staff at full strength as they would be otherwise without work, what steps are being taken to encourage clergy, readers and other laypeople to take up places on courses as violent events in Israel/Palestine are nearly always predictable and therefore avoidable?

The Bishop of Liverpool replied: Since the *intifada* St George's has continued with its full programme without any direct physical threat. The following measures are being taken to encourage greater participation: the college's dean and the chair of the British committee, the Bishop of Hertford, have written to all British bishops, explaining the opportunities for ordinands and young priests; the letter includes an invitation to a special course for British bishops in December 2002, aiming to raise the profile of the college; and for the rest of 2001 all ordinands are being offered places on existing courses for half the normal fees.

165. *Mr Andrew David (Southwell)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Mission:

What practical steps has the Church of England taken, in the past ten years, to increase its membership from 2 per cent of the population, and with what results?

The Bishop of Liverpool replied: The Decade of Evangelism has made considerable impact on both the attitude of churches to evangelism and on their practice. Increasingly, evangelism is seen as a high priority in churches from different traditions. Many churches now run courses for inquirers such as Alpha, Emmaus or Credo, and seek to orientate their worship so that it is accessible and welcoming, and their ministry so that it reflects mission priorities. Statistics show that apparent decline needs to be measured against the reality that many people *are* coming to faith through the evangelistic and mission endeavours of the Church, and that patterns and frequency of Church attendance are changing. The evangelistic task is considerable in a society with a rapidly diminishing understanding of the gospel and of Christian faith.

The Session was adjourned at 10.14 p.m.